U.S. Congress
137

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

4295
6033

CONTAINING

Pat

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

FIFTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

VOLUME XXVIII.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1896.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

KF35 .J11 1940 4th ext

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
JAN 30 1940
DIVISION OF DOCUMENTS

SURPLUS - 1
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
DUPLICATE

VOLUME XXVIII, PART I.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

FIFTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 2, 1895.*

The first Monday of December being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the first session of the Fifty-fourth Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

The VICE-PRESIDENT of the United States (Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON, of the State of Illinois) called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

PRAYER.

Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D., Chaplain to the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we devoutly bless Thee that the men chosen to represent the sovereign States of this Union upon the floor of this body Thou hast had in Thy care and guardianship; that none has been smitten by the shadow feared of man, but all are ready to answer to the roll call of the Senate. Gird them for their responsible and laborious duties. Grant them, and all that are dear to them, help, strength, cheer, and peace.

Amidst our gratulations and joy our hearts of sympathy turn to a darkened home in Iowa, where a wife and daughter sit mourning the departure from them of the husband and father, lately a member of this House. Visit them, O God, who didst shed the tears of sympathy at Bethany, and grant them Thy consolation.

We likewise commend to Thy fatherly goodness the household of an humble and faithful servant of this House, who through many years in his lowly place, by fidelity, courtesy, and stainless character, adorned the doctrines of God his Saviour. We pray that they may find consolation and strength in the faith of the resurrection and eternal life.

Likewise we commend to Thy fatherly tenderness the time-honored officer of this House who for more than threescore years has been present at the opening of every session of Congress, but who now lies upon a bed of affliction, worn with pain and exhausted by suffering. Comfort and bless him, O Lord, and grant to raise him from his couch and bring him back to his accustomed place.

Keep us all by Thy Divine Providence, and grant that by our devotion to Thee in the gospel of Thy Son, in life and death we may be Thine, wholly Thine; and so at the end of this mortal journey come to the land of everlasting life. Through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

CREDENTIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented the credentials of George L. Shoup, chosen by the legislature of the State of Idaho a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1895; which were read and ordered to be filed.

SWEARING IN OF SENATORS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The names of the newly elected Senators whose credentials are on file will now be called by the Secretary. As their names are called they will please come forward and receive the oath of office.

The Chief Clerk read the names of—
Augustus O. Bacon, of the State of Georgia.
Lucien Baker, of the State of Kansas.
James H. Berry, of the State of Arkansas.
Marion Butler, of the State of North Carolina.

As their names were called the respective Senators-elect came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

The Chief Clerk called the names of—
Donelson Caffery, of the State of Louisiana.
Thomas H. Carter, of the State of Montana.
William E. Chandler, of the State of New Hampshire.
Horace Chilton, of the State of Texas.

The respective Senators-elect whose names had been called (with the exception of Mr. Caffery) came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

The Chief Clerk called the names of—
Shelby M. Cullom, of the State of Illinois.
Stephen B. Elkins, of the State of West Virginia.
William P. Frye, of the State of Maine.
John H. Gear, of the State of Iowa.

As their names were called the respective Senators-elect came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

The Chief Clerk called the names of—
Isham G. Harris, of the State of Tennessee.
George F. Hoar, of the State of Massachusetts.
William Lindsay, of the State of Kentucky.
George W. McBride, of the State of Oregon.

The respective Senators-elect whose names had been called (with the exception of Mr. Lindsay) came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

The Chief Clerk called the names of—
James McMillan, of the State of Michigan.
Thomas S. Martin, of the State of Virginia.
John T. Morgan, of the State of Alabama.
Knute Nelson, of the State of Minnesota.

As their names were called the respective Senators-elect came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

The Chief Clerk called the names of—
R. F. Pettigrew, of the State of South Dakota.
William J. Sewell, of the State of New Jersey.
George L. Shoup, of the State of Idaho.
John M. Thurston, of the State of Nebraska.

As their names were called the respective Senators-elect came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

The Chief Clerk called the names of—
Benjamin R. Tillman, of the State of South Carolina.
Edward C. Walthall, of the State of Mississippi.
Francis E. Warren, of the State of Wyoming.
George P. Wetmore, of the State of Rhode Island.
Edward O. Wolcott, of the State of Colorado.

The respective Senators-elect whose names had been called (with the exception of Mr. Wolcott) came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

SENATORS PRESENT.

The Senators-elect having been sworn and taken their seats in the Senate, the following Senators were present:

From the State of—
Alabama—John T. Morgan and James L. Pugh.
Arkansas—James H. Berry and James K. Jones.
California—George C. Perkins and Stephen M. White.
Colorado—Henry M. Teller.
Connecticut—Joseph R. Hawley and Orville H. Platt.
Florida—Wilkinson Call and Samuel Pasco.
Georgia—Augustus O. Bacon and John B. Gordon.
Idaho—Fred T. Dubois and George L. Shoup.

Illinois—Shelby M. Cullom.
Indiana—David Turpie and Daniel W. Voorhees.
Iowa—William B. Allison and John H. Gear.
Kansas—Lucien Baker and William A. Peffer.
Kentucky—Joseph C. S. Blackburn.
Maine—William P. Frye and Eugene Hale.
Maryland—Charles H. Gibson and Arthur P. Gorman.
Massachusetts—George F. Hoar and Henry Cabot Lodge.
Michigan—Julius C. Burrows and James McMillan.
Minnesota—Cushman K. Davis and Knute Nelson.
Mississippi—James Z. George and Edward C. Walthall.
Missouri—Francis M. Cockrell and George G. Vest.
Montana—Thomas H. Carter and Lee Mantle.
Nebraska—William V. Allen and John M. Thurston.
Nevada—William M. Stewart.
New Hampshire—William E. Chandler and Jacob H. Gallinger.
New Jersey—William J. Sewell and James Smith, jr.
New York—Edward Murphy, jr.
North Carolina—Marion Butler and Jeter C. Pritchard.
North Dakota—Henry C. Hansbrough and William N. Roach.
Ohio—Calvin S. Brice and John Sherman.
Oregon—George W. McBride and John H. Mitchell.
Pennsylvania—Matthew S. Quay.
Rhode Island—Nelson W. Aldrich and George P. Wetmore.
South Carolina—Benjamin R. Tillman.
South Dakota—James H. Kyle and R. F. Pettigrew.
Tennessee—William B. Bate and Isham G. Harris.
Texas—Horace Chilton and Roger Q. Mills.
Vermont—Justin S. Morrill and Redfield Proctor.
Virginia—John W. Daniel and Thomas S. Martin.
Washington—Watson C. Squire and John L. Wilson.
West Virginia—Stephen B. Elkins and Charles J. Faulkner.
Wisconsin—John L. Mitchell and William F. Vilas.
Wyoming—Clarence D. Clark and Francis E. Warren.

HOUR OF MEETING.

On motion of Mr. COCKRELL, it was

Ordered, That the hour of the daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock m. until otherwise ordered.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled, and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. VILAS submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed, to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the committee on the part of the Senate, and Mr. VILAS and Mr. ALLISON were appointed.

RECESS.

On motion of Mr. HARRIS, the Senate took a recess for one hour; and at the expiration of the recess (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) reassembled.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 3, 1895, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 2, 1895.*

This day, in compliance with the provision of the Constitution, the members-elect of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth Congress assembled in their Hall and at 12 o'clock m. were called to order by Mr. JAMES KERR, Clerk of the last House.

The CLERK. The Chaplain of the last House will offer prayer.

Rev. E. B. BAGBY offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose kingdom ruleth over all! As we meet together in the halls of legislation we would first unitedly take Thy name upon our lips and acknowledge our dependence upon Thee. Thou art our fathers' God; and we extol Thee. Thou art our God; and we praise Thee. Thou hast never dealt so bountifully with any other nation. The lines have fallen to us in pleasant places; and we have a goodly heritage. We call upon our souls and all that is within us to bless and praise and magnify Thy holy name.

Graciously bless, we beseech Thee, the President of the United States and his Cabinet, the Senate and the House of Representatives, and all that administer the affairs of this nation. May their doings be guided by Thy spirit and ordered by Thy will. Be the God of this nation! Rule Thou in the hearts of our rulers! Satisfy our people with good things, temporal and spiritual; and may all men learn to praise Thee for the riches of grace in Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

The CLERK. Representatives-elect, under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, this is the hour fixed by law for the meeting of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth Congress of the United States of America. The Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-third Congress will read the names of those whose credentials show that they were regularly elected to this body in pursuance of the laws of their respective States and of the United States. As the roll is called, following the alphabetical order of the States, those present will please answer to their names, that we may discover if there is a quorum present.

The roll was called, showing the presence of the following-named Members and Delegates:

ALABAMA.

Jesse F. Stallings.
George P. Harrison.
Gaston A. Robbins.
James E. Cobb.
John H. Bankhead.
Milford W. Howard.
Joseph Wheeler.
Oscar W. Underwood.

ARKANSAS.

Philip D. McCulloch, jr.
John S. Little.
Thomas C. McRae.
Hugh A. Dinsmore.
Robert Neill.

CALIFORNIA.

John A. Barham.
Grove L. Johnson.
Samuel G. Hilborn.
James G. Maguire.
Eugene F. Loud.
James McLachlan.
William W. Bowers.

COLORADO.

John C. Bell.

CONNECTICUT.

E. Stevens Henry.
Nehemiah D. Sperry.
Charles A. Russell.
Ebenezer J. Hill.

DELAWARE.

Jonathan S. Willis.

FLORIDA.

Stephen M. Sparkman.
Charles M. Cooper.

GEORGIA.

Rufus E. Lester.
Benjamin E. Russell.
Charles F. Crisp.
Charles L. Moses.
Leonidas F. Livingston.
Charles L. Bartlett.
John W. Maddox.
Thomas G. Lawson.
Farish Carter Tate.
J. C. C. Black.
Henry G. Turner.

IDAHO.

Edgar Wilson.

ILLINOIS.

J. Frank Aldrich.
William Lorimer.
Lawrence E. McGann.
Charles W. Woodman.
George E. White.
Edward D. Cooke.
George E. Foss.
Albert J. Hopkins.
Robert R. Hitt.
George W. Prince.
Walter Reeves.
Joseph G. Cannon.
Vespasian Warner.
Joseph V. Graff.
Benjamin F. Marsh.
Finis E. Downing.
James A. Connolly.
W. F. L. Hadley.
Benson Wood.
Orlando Burrell.
Everett J. Murphy.
George W. Smith.

INDIANA.

James A. Hemenway.
Alexander M. Hardy.
Robert J. Tracewell.
James E. Watson.
Jesse Overstreet.
Henry U. Johnson.
Charles L. Henry.
George W. Faris.
J. Frank Hanly.
Jethro A. Hatch.
George W. Steele.
J. D. Leighty.
Lemuel W. Royse.

IOWA.

Samuel M. Clark.
George M. Curtis.
David B. Henderson.
Thomas Updegraff.
Robert G. Cousins.
John F. Lacey.
John A. T. Hull.
William P. Hepburn.
Alva L. Hager.
Jonathan P. Dolliver.
George D. Perkins.

KANSAS.

Richard W. Blue.
Case Broderick.
O. L. Miller.
S. S. Kirkpatrick.
Charles Curtis.
W. A. Calderhead.
William Baker.
Chester I. Long.

KENTUCKY.

John K. Hendrick.
John D. Clardy.
W. Godfrey Hunter.
John W. Lewis.
Walter Evans.
Albert S. Berry.
William C. Owens.
James B. McCreary.
Samuel J. Pugh.
Joseph M. Kendall.
David G. Colson.

LOUISIANA.

Adolph Meyer.
Charles F. Buck.
Henry W. Ogden.
Samuel M. Robertson.

MAINE.

Thomas B. Reed.
Nelson Dingley, jr.
Seth L. Milliken.
Charles A. Boutelle.

MARYLAND.

Joshua W. Miles.
William B. Baker.
Harry W. Rusk.
John K. Cowen.
Charles E. Coffin.
George L. Wellington.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Ashley B. Wright.
Frederick H. Gillett.
Joseph Henry Walker.
Lewis Dewart Apsley.
William S. Knox.
W. H. Moody.
William E. Barrett.
Samuel W. McCall.
John F. Fitzgerald.
Harrison H. Atwood.
William F. Draper.
Elijah A. Morse.
John Simpkins.

MICHIGAN.

John B. Corliss.
George Spalding.
Alfred Milnes.
Henry F. Thomas.
William Alden Smith.
David D. Aitken.
Horace G. Snover.
William S. Linton.
Roswell P. Bishop.
Rosseau O. Crump.
John Avery.
Samuel M. Stephenson.

MINNESOTA.

James A. Tawney.
James T. McCleary.
Joel P. Heatwole.
Andrew R. Kiefer.
Loren Fletcher.
Charles A. Towne.
Frank M. Eddy.

MISSISSIPPI.

John M. Allen.
John C. Kyle.
Thomas C. Catchings.
Hernando D. Money.
John S. Williams.
Walter M. Denny
James G. Spencer

MISSOURI.

Charles N. Clark.
Uriel S. Hall.
Alexander M. Dockery.
George C. Crowther.
John C. Tarsney.
David A. De Armond.
John P. Tracy.
Joel D. Hubbard.
William M. Treloar.
Richard Bartholdt.
Charles F. Joy.
Seth W. Cobb.
John H. Raney.
Norman A. Mozly.
Charles G. Burton.

MONTANA.

Charles S. Hartman.

NEBRASKA.

Jesse B. Strode.
David H. Mercer.
George D. Meiklejohn.
Eugene J. Hainer.
William E. Andrews.
Omer M. Kem.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Cyrus A. Sulloway.
Henry M. Baker.

NEW JERSEY.

Henry C. Loudenslager.
John J. Gardner.
Benjamin F. Howell.
Mahlon Pitney.
James F. Stewart.
Richard Wayne Parker.
Thomas McEwan, jr.
Charles Newell Fowler.

NEW YORK.

Richard C. McCormick.
Dennis M. Hurley.
Francis H. Wilson.
Israel F. Fischer.
Charles G. Bennett.
James R. Howe.
Franklin Bartlett.
James J. Walsh.
Henry C. Miner.
William Sulzer.
George B. McClellan.
Richard C. Shannon.
Lemuel E. Quigg.
Philip B. Low.
Ben L. Fairchild.
Benjamin B. Odell, jr.
Jacob Lefever.
Frank S. Black.
George N. Southwick.
David F. Wilber.
Newton M. Curtis.
Wallace T. Foote, jr.
Charles A. Chickering.
James S. Sherman.
George W. Ray.
Theodore L. Poole.
Sereno E. Payne.
Charles W. Gillet.
James W. Wadsworth.
Henry C. Brewster.
Rowland B. Mahany.
Charles Daniels.
Warren B. Hooker.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Harry Skinner.
Fred. A. Woodard.
John G. Shaw.
William F. Strowd.
Thomas Settle.
James A. Lockhart.
A. C. Shuford.
Romulus Z. Linney.
Richmond Pearson.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Martin N. Johnson.

OHIO.

Charles P. Taft.
Jacob A. Bromwell.
Paul J. Sorg.
Fernando C. Layton.
Francis B. De Witt.
George W. Hulick.
George W. Wilson.
Luther M. Strong.
James Harding Southard.
Lucien J. Fenton.
Charles H. Grosvenor.
David K. Watson.
Stephen R. Harris.
Winfield S. Kerr.
Henry C. Van Voorhis.
Lorenzo Danford.
Addison S. McClure.
Robert W. Tayler.
Stephen A. Northway.
Clifton B. Beach.
Theodore E. Burton.

OREGON.

Binger Hermann.
William R. Ellis.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Galusha A. Grow.
George F. Huff.
Henry H. Bingham.
Robert Adams, jr.
Frederick Halterman.
John E. Reyburn.
Alfred C. Harmer.
John B. Robinson.
Irving P. Wanger.
Joseph J. Hart.
Constantine J. Erdman.
Marriott Brosius.
Joseph A. Scranton.
John Leisenring.
Charles N. Brumm.
Ephraim M. Woomer.
James H. Codding.
Frederick C. Leonard.
Monroe H. Kulp.
Thaddeus M. Mahon.
James A. Stahle.
Josiah D. Hicks.
Daniel B. Heiner.
John Dalzell.
William A. Stone.
Ernest F. Acheson.
Thomas W. Phillips.
Matthew Griswold.
Charles W. Stone.
William C. Arnold.

RHODE ISLAND.

Melville Bull.
Warren O. Arnold.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

William Elliott.
W. Jasper Talbert.
Asbury C. Latimer.
J. Stanyarne Wilson.
Thomas J. Strait.
John L. McLaurin.
J. William Stokes.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Robert J. Gamble.
John A. Pickler.

TENNESSEE.

W. C. Anderson.
Henry R. Gibson.
Foster V. Brown.
Benton McMillin.
James D. Richardson.
Joseph E. Washington.
Nicholas N. Cox.
John E. McCall.
James C. McDearmon.
Josiah Patterson.

TEXAS.

Samuel B. Cooper.
Charles H. Yoakum.
Joseph W. Bailey.
Jo Abbott.
George C. Pendleton.
Charles K. Bell.
Joseph D. Sayers.
Miles Crowley.
William H. Crain.
George H. Noonan.
Jeremiah V. Cockrell.

VERMONT.

H. Henry Powers.
William W. Grout.

VIRGINIA.

William A. Jones.
D. Gardiner Tyler.
Tazewell Ellett.
William R. McKenney.
Claude A. Swanson.
Peter J. Otey.
Smith S. Turner.
Elisha E. Meredith.
James A. Walker.
Henry St. G. Tucker.

WASHINGTON.

Samuel C. Hyde.
William H. Doolittle.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Blackburn B. Dovener.
Alston G. Dayton.
James H. Huling.
Warren Miller.

WISCONSIN.

Henry A. Cooper.
Edward Sauerhering.
Joseph W. Babcock.
Theobold Otjen.
Samuel S. Barney.
Samuel A. Cook.
Michael Griffin.
Edward S. Minor.
Alex. Stewart.
John J. Jenkins.

WYOMING.

Frank W. Mondell.

ARIZONA.

Nathan O. Murphy.

NEW MEXICO.

Thomas B. Catron.

OKLAHOMA.

Dennis T. Flynn.

UTAH.

Frank J. Cannon.

The CLERK. The Clerk desires to state for the information of members-elect that the roll as called is complete with the exception of the Tenth district of the State of New York and the district of the State of Nevada, credentials from those districts not having yet been filed with the Clerk. The Clerk also desires to present for the information of the House, and in order to make a permanent record, a tabulated statement showing the changes that have occurred since the regular election of members of the Fifty-fourth Congress; and he asks that the same be incorporated in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

List of changes since the regular election of the Fifty-fourth Congress.

District.	Name.	Date of vacancy.	Name of successor.
Fifteenth Pennsylvania.	Myron B. Wright*....	Nov. 13, 1894	James H. Codding.
Tenth New York....	Andrew J. Campbell*	Dec. 6, 1894	A. J. Cummings.
Tenth Illinois.....	Philip S. Post*.....	June 6, 1894	George W. Prince.
Third Michigan	Julius C. Burrows†...	Jan. 23, 1895	Alfred Milnes.
Tenth Georgia.....	James C. C. Black†....	Mar. 4, 1895	James C. C. Black.
Sixth Massachusetts	William Cogswell*....	May 22, 1895	W. H. Moody.
Eighteenth Illinois..	F. Remann*.....	July 14, 1895	W. F. Hadley.

*Died. †Resigned.

The CLERK. It appearing that 341 members have answered to their names, a quorum of the House is present. The first and only business now in order is the election of a Speaker to preside over the deliberations of the Fifty-fourth Congress. Nominations are now in order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Clerk, I have the honor to present the name of Hon. THOMAS BRACKETT REED, a Representative in this body from the State of Maine, for the office of Speaker. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Clerk, I have the honor to place in nomination for the same office Hon. CHARLES F. CRISP, a Representative from the State of Georgia. [Loud applause.]

Mr. KEM. Mr. Clerk, I have the honor to nominate for the office of Speaker Hon. JOHN C. BELL, a Representative-elect from the State of Colorado.

The CLERK. Are there any other nominations? [A pause.] If

not, the nominations are now closed. The Clerk requests that Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois, Mr. LOUD of California, Mr. CATCHINGS of Mississippi, and Mr. ERDMAN of Pennsylvania act as tellers during the choice of Speaker, as the rules require that the election shall be viva voce. The gentlemen named will please take their places at the Clerk's desk.

The roll call will proceed; the names of members-elect will be called alphabetically.

The tellers having taken their places, the roll was called with the following result:

For Thomas B. Reed, of Maine—240.

Acheson,	Dingley,	Hyde,	Prince,
Adams,	Dolliver,	Jenkins,	Pugh,
Aitken,	Doolittle,	Johnson, Cal.	Quigg,
Aldrich,	Dovener,	Johnson, Ind.	Raney,
Anderson,	Draper,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Ray,
Andrews,	Eddy,	Joy,	Reeves,
Apsley,	Ellis,	Kerr,	Reyburn,
Arnold, Pa.	Evans,	Kiefer,	Robinson, Pa.
Arnold, R. I.	Fairchild,	Kirkpatrick,	Royse,
Atwood,	Faris,	Knox,	Russell, Conn.
Avery,	Fenton,	Kulp,	Sauerhering,
Babcock,	Fischer,	Lacey,	Scranton,
Baker, Md.	Fletcher,	Lefever,	Settle,
Baker, N. H.	Foote,	Leighty,	Shannon,
Barham,	Foss,	Leisenring,	Sherman,
Barney,	Fowler,	Leonard,	Simpkins,
Barrett,	Gamble,	Lewis,	Smith, Ill.
Bartholdt,	Gardner,	Linney,	Smith, Mich.
Beach,	Gibson,	Linton,	Snover,
Bennett,	Gillet, N. Y.	Long,	Southard,
Bingham,	Gillett, Mass.	Lorimer,	Southwick,
Bishop,	Graff,	Loud,	Spalding,
Black, N. Y.	Griffin,	Loudenslager,	Sperry,
Blue,	Griswold,	Low,	Steele,
Boutelle,	Grosvenor,	Mahany,	Stephenson,
Bowers,	Grout,	Mahon,	Stewart, N. J.
Brewster,	Grow,	Marsh,	Stewart, Wis.
Broderick,	Hadley,	McCall, Mass.	Stone, C. W.
Bromwell,	Hager,	McCall, Tenn.	Stone, W. A.
Brosius,	Hainer, Nebr.	McCleary,	Strode,
Brown,	Halterman,	McClure,	Strong,
Brumm,	Hanly,	McCormick,	Sulloway,
Bull,	Hardy,	McEwan,	Taft,
Burrell,	Harmer,	McLachlan,	Tawney,
Burton, Mo.	Harris,	Meiklejohn,	Tayler,
Burton, Ohio	Hartman,	Mercer,	Thomas,
Calderhead,	Hatch,	Miller, Kans.	Towne,
Cannon,	Heatwole,	Miller, W. Va.	Tracewell,
Chickering,	Heiner, Pa.	Milliken,	Tracy,
Clark, Iowa	Hemenway,	Milnes,	Treloar,
Clark, Mo.	Henderson,	Minor, Wis.	Updegraff,
Codding,	Henry, Conn.	Mondell,	Van Voorhis,
Coffin,	Henry, Ind.	Moody,	Wadsworth,
Colson,	Hepburn,	Morse,	Walker, Mass.
Connolly,	Hermann,	Mozly,	Walker, Va.
Cook, Wis.	Hicks,	Murphy,	Wanger,
Cooke, Ill.	Hilborn,	Noonan,	Warner,
Cooper, Wis.	Hill,	Northway,	Watson, Ind.
Corliss,	Hitt,	Odell,	Watson, Ohio
Cousins,	Hooker,	Otjen,	Wellington,
Crowther,	Hopkins,	Overstreet,	White,
Crump,	Howe,	Parker,	Wilber,
Curtis, Iowa	Howell,	Payne,	Willis,
Curtis, Kans.	Hubbard,	Pearson,	Wilson, Idaho
Curtis, N. Y.	Huff,	Perkins,	Wilson, N. Y.
Dalzell,	Hulick,	Phillips,	Wilson, Ohio
Danford,	Huling,	Pickler,	Wood,
Daniels,	Hull,	Pitney,	Woodman,
Dayton,	Hunter,	Poole,	Woomer,
De Witt,	Hurley,	Powers,	Wright.

For Charles F. Crisp, of Georgia—95.

Abbott,	Downing,	McGann,	Sorg,
Allen,	Ellett, Va.	McKenney,	Sparkman,
Bailey,	Elliott, S. C.	McLaurin,	Spencer,
Bankhead,	Erdman,	McMillin,	Stallings,
Bartlett, Ga.	Hall,	McRae,	Stokes,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Harrison,	Meredith,	Strait,
Bell, Tex.	Hart,	Meyer,	Sulzer,
Berry,	Hendrick,	Miles,	Swanson,
Black, Ga.	Jones,	Miner, N. Y.	Talbert,
Buck,	Kendall,	Money,	Tarsney,
Catchings,	Kyle,	Moses,	Tate,
Clardy,	Latimer,	Neill,	Tucker,
Cobb, Ala.	Lawson,	Ogden,	Turner, Ga.
Cobb, Mo.	Layton,	Otey,	Turner, Va.
Cockrell,	Lester,	Owens,	Tyler,
Cooper, Fla.	Little,	Patterson,	Underwood,
Cooper, Tex.	Livingston,	Pendleton,	Walsh,
Cowen,	Lockhart,	Richardson,	Washington,
Cox,	Maddox,	Robbins,	Wheeler,
Crowley,	Maguire,	Robertson, La.	Williams,
De Armond,	McClellan,	Rusk,	Wilson, S. C.
Denny,	McCreary,	Russell, Ga.	Woodard,
Dinsmore,	McCulloch,	Sayers,	Yoakum.
Dockery,	McDearmon,	Shaw,	

For John C. Bell, of Colorado—6.

Baker, Kans.	Kem,	Skinner,	Strowd.
Howard,	Shuford,		

For David B. Culberson, of Texas—1.

Crain.

Mr. HOPKINS (the roll call having been concluded). Mr. Clerk, on behalf of the tellers appointed to canvass the vote for Speaker, I am directed to report that they have agreed in their tally, with this result: Whole number of votes cast 342; of which number THOMAS B. REED, of Maine, has received 240, CHARLES F. CRISP, of Georgia, 95; JOHN C. BELL, of Colorado, 6, and DAVID B. CULBERSON, of Texas, 1.

The CLERK (having restated the report of the tellers). In accordance with the result as reported by the tellers, the Clerk announces that Mr. THOMAS B. REED, a Representative from the State of Maine, having received a majority of all the votes cast, is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth Congress. [Loud and long-continued applause.] Mr. CRISP of Georgia, Mr. GROSVENOR of Ohio, and Mr. BELL of Colorado are designated to conduct the Speaker-elect to the chair.

Mr. REED, on appearing with the members designated, was greeted with loud applause, which was renewed when he ascended to the chair.

The CLERK. Mr. HARMER, a Representative-elect from the State of Pennsylvania, being the member present who has served longest continuously as a Representative in this body, is designated by the Clerk to administer the prescribed oath of office to the Speaker-elect.

The oath of office being administered by Mr. HARMER,

The SPEAKER addressed the House as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: It will not be unbecoming in me, I hope, if I acknowledge to this assembly that it is very agreeable to me to stand once more in the place which I left four years ago. Of the past, however, I shall not speak, for the past speaks for itself [applause] in terms more fitting and appropriate than any words which could come from my lips. Nor shall I speak of the future, for we are not now putting off the harness, but putting it on. Yet I think I may venture to say of the future, in the light of the past, that if we do some things which for the moment seem inadequate it may be that time, which has justified itself of us on many occasions, may do so again. Those who have acted with wisdom heretofore may be fairly expected to act with wisdom hereafter.

I am sorry to say that the pleasure associated with the honor you have bestowed on me, an honor which no American citizen can fail to appreciate and for which I give thanks, is but for the moment, while the cares and responsibilities extend over many days.

So far as the performance of my duties affects the whole people of the United States, I invoke their considerate judgment. So far as it affects the members of this House, I ask from both sides of the Chamber that cordial cooperation without which I can not hope to succeed, assuring them that no effort on my part will be spared to aid them in the performance of their duties by that entire impartiality which is their just due. [Loud applause.]

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER then administered the oath of office, the Members and Delegates presenting themselves, as their names were called by States, in the area in front of the Speaker's desk, and taking the oath required by law.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. NEWLANDS of Nevada, has been duly elected to the Fifty-fourth Congress as a Representative from that State; but owing to some cause, which is unknown to him, the credentials have not been forwarded and filed with the Clerk, so that his name has necessarily been left off the roll. I ask unanimous consent, in view of the facts, that Mr. NEWLANDS be now permitted to take the oath of office, notwithstanding the absence of his credentials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, from the Tenth district of the State of New York Mr. CUMMINGS has been elected to fill a vacancy occasioned by death. The local canvassing board has certified the result, but the State board has not yet met. Mr. CUMMINGS is present, and I ask unanimous consent, there being as I understand it no question of contest, that the oath of office be administered also to him, in order that he may take his chances with other members present in the drawing for seats soon to take place.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that there is no question as to the election. Is there objection?

Mr. DINGLEY. One moment, Mr. Speaker. I understand that there is no contest or question respecting the election?

Mr. CRISP. I am so informed.

Mr. DINGLEY. On that statement, I think there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to hear my name called during the roll, and I ask that I may be sworn in at this time.

Mr. GROUT. I also desire the same privilege.

The SPEAKER. Any other gentlemen who may be present, but did not respond when their States were called, may now pre-

sent themselves, and the oath of office will be administered to them at the same time it is administered to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS].

The swearing in of members was then concluded.

ELECTION OF CLERK AND OTHER OFFICERS.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of completing the organization of the House of Representatives, I offer for immediate adoption the resolution I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Alexander McDowell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Benjamin F. Russell, of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives;

That William J. Glenn, of the State of New York, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph C. McElroy, of the State of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives; and

That Henry M. Couden, of the State of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the resolution just read, which I ask to be considered at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That James Kerr, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth Congress;

That Herman W. Snow, of the State of Illinois, be, and is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth Congress;

That Alvin B. Hurt, of the State of Tennessee, be, and is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth Congress;

That John T. Ross, of the State of Maryland, be, and is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth Congress; and

That the Rev. Edward B. Bagby, of the State of Virginia, be, and is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The question being taken on the substitute offered by Mr. SAYERS, it was rejected.

The original resolution offered by Mr. GROSVENOR was adopted.

The SPEAKER then administered the oath of office to the officers-elect of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. COX, its Secretary, informed the House of Representatives that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled, and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Also:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States, and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The Vice-President appointed as said committee Mr. VILAS and Mr. ALLISON.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. HENDERSON submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected THOMAS B. REED, a Representative from the State of Maine, Speaker, and Alexander McDowell, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE.

Mr. DALZELL submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that THOMAS B. REED, a Representative from the State of Maine, has been elected Speaker, and Alexander McDowell, a citizen of Pennsylvania, Clerk; and that the House is ready to proceed to business.

COMMITTEE OF NOTIFICATION.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers a resolution, which will be reported to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to wait on the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the two Houses has assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to; and in accordance with the terms thereof the Speaker appointed Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CANNON of Illinois, and Mr. CRISP.

THE RULES.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the rules of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-first Congress be adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth Congress.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. I have no desire to debate the proposition, but I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. Since the Fiftieth Congress there has been no proposition of this sort submitted to the House. Prior to and including the Fiftieth Congress it was customary, upon the assembling of each House, to adopt the rules of the preceding House until otherwise ordered. That proposition was departed from in the Fifty-first Congress, and has not obtained since that time, either when that side was in the majority or when this side was in the majority; and the only question which I desire to ask the gentleman is—so that the House may have some information upon the subject—whether it is intended that the House shall have an opportunity, by a report from the Committee on Rules, to pass upon the rules which are to be adopted for the government of the House, or whether, simply by a motion of this sort at this time, without a report, we are to adopt rules which are to obtain during the remainder of the session?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that the House finds itself now without rules, except those that might obtain as being ordinarily applicable to parliamentary bodies. It seems to me desirable that the House should adopt rules for its guidance. I will say to the gentleman, however, that opportunity will be offered for the amendment of these rules hereafter.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the gentleman, the only point is this—the gentleman sees it well enough—that the adoption of this rule, or this motion, at this time, puts it in the power of the majority of this House, or of a majority of the Committee on Rules, to preclude the discussion of the question afterwards at any time during the existence of this Congress. The gentleman understands that.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In reply to the gentleman——

Mr. CRISP. One moment. The purpose I had in view was simply to find out whether, if we should agree now—of course we may have to agree whether we wish to or not—but if we should voluntarily agree now that this rule should be adopted, whether it is understood that at an early day we shall have a report from the Committee on Rules on the question of rules? If that be true, of course that will bring up the whole question, and will give any member on this side the right, if he chooses to exercise it, to criticise the rules and to offer a substitute for them. Now, without such an understanding, the adoption of this order or resolution at this time absolutely destroys the right of any man to object to any one of these rules at any time, or to have an opportunity, without the assent of the Committee on Rules and the majority of the House, to make any objection.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In reply to the gentleman I will state that the Fifty-first Congress, after great consideration, adopted rules with which it was content, acting through a small majority. Later on the Fifty-second and the Fifty-third Congresses, in process of evolution, adopted rules that were satisfactory to the majority of the House in those two Congresses. Now, it is evidently proper, as anybody can see, that at the earliest possible moment, if it is practicable to do so, rules should be adopted for the guidance of the House governing the introduction of bills and many other things, so that we may proceed in an orderly manner, for the convenience of members on both sides. It is entirely within the power of the majority to change the rules at any time, and to amend; and while I do not desire to make an agreement about the matter—it being entirely in the power of the majority—I do say to the gentleman that as I understand there is no objection on this side of the House to the proposition that later on opportunity be given for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], or other members, to be heard touching the rules that should govern this House by way of amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will pardon me——

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to know whether it is not the purpose, so far as it has been communicated upon this side of the House, that these rules, at the proper time, shall be referred to the appropriate committee, and reported back, with such amendments as may be thought proper, giving ample opportunity for gentlemen upon the other side to move any amendments to the same that they may see fit?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, certainly; as I understand it.

Mr. CRISP. My point is simply this: So far as I am concerned, I do not wish in any way to interfere with the adoption of temporary rules. I merely desire to have the right at some time to criticise the rules, if it be deemed desirable to do so.

The resolution was agreed to.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, and ask for its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

DRAWING OF SEATS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the usual formal resolutions completing the organization of the House have been adopted; and as it is understood that the message of the President will not be sent in to-day, there is ample opportunity for the drawing of seats. In order to reach that business, I offer the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House do now proceed to draw seats for Members and Delegates of the present Congress in pursuance of Rule XXXII of the last House, and when names of members absent from the city or on account of sickness are called that seats be selected for them by their colleagues.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield a moment to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Speaker, I believe it has been the custom, since the beginning of the Fifty-first Congress, to allow ex-Speakers of the House of Representatives to select their seats without participating in the drawing. I offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. DINGLEY. I would suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky that after the adoption of the resolution I have offered it is customary to ask unanimous consent that ex-Speakers be allowed to choose their seats. That has been done by unanimous consent; and I prefer that the resolution should be adopted as offered.

Mr. McCREARY. I have no objection; and then I will offer this proposition.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that ex-Speakers of the House of Representatives be allowed to select their seats prior to the drawing. That would include the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is accordingly agreed to.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to make a statement of interest to the House in reference to the selection of seats. Ordinarily, when the membership of the two leading parties is nearly equal, the custom has obtained that gentlemen members of the Republican party for their convenience have selected seats upon the left of the aisle, and gentlemen of the Democratic party seats on the right of the aisle; but at the present time, as in the Fifty-second Congress, there is so great a disproportion in the number of members of the two leading parties that it is impracticable, of course, to do this. It will be remembered by some gentlemen present that in the Fifty-second Congress, prior to the drawing, an agreement was made that the Republican members should select from this side of the aisle [standing in the first aisle to the left of the main aisle] for the first two blocks, that in the last two blocks selections be made indiscriminately, and that in the aisle to my left, and on all the other side of the main aisle, the members of the Democratic party should select their seats.

It has been suggested, after a conference between gentlemen on both sides of the House, that the same arrangement reversed, the political parties being now reversed, should obtain at the present time. I have conferred with gentlemen upon both sides of the House, and especially with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], and, so far as I know, this arrangement meets with approval.

Mr. CRISP. The exact matter as it appears in the RECORD is as stated by the gentleman from Maine. As there are only a few words, I will read:

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I beg to make a statement to the House. An informal conference between members on both sides of the House has resulted in a suggestion which will be acceptable to members on both sides—that in the drawing of seats this side—

That was then the Democratic side—

will take the seats on this side of the aisle and the first block of seats on the right-hand side of the aisle—

That is, the block in which the gentleman stands—

or opposite, that the Republicans will take the two next blocks of seats and the remaining seats will be selected as gentlemen may choose on drawing.

That was the agreement reached at that time. That is the agreement, as I understand, the gentleman now proposes. So far as I am concerned, it is entirely satisfactory.

A MEMBER. Under that rule that side of the House would take all of that side and the first block on this side to the right of the main aisle.

Mr. CRISP. The minority, in this case the Democratic party, would occupy first, exclusively, these two blocks of seats, and then the excess of members not so accommodated would take their chances in the last two blocks.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is simply the plan which was adopted in the Fifty-second Congress reversed.

Mr. CRISP. That is agreeable to gentlemen on this side, so far as I have been able to ascertain.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may be in full possession of the facts pertaining to this matter, it is not, I hope, inappropriate for me to add to what has been stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], that while they have stated correctly the plan adopted in the Fifty-second Congress, yet, in the succeeding Congress, when the majority was still large, a similar proposition was made by our side, but was objected to on the other side because it was claimed that the plan had worked hardship by giving too great an advantage to the majority. I think the RECORD will bear me out in that statement.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct my friend from Tennessee. The objection was not that the plan had worked hardship, but that in the succeeding Congress the Republican membership had largely increased, so that what had been just in the Fifty-second Congress was not so in the Fifty-third, because of the changed conditions.

Mr. McMILLIN. I may be in error as to the motive of the objection, which I have stated only from the impression left on my mind, but the fact remains that objection was made.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct the gentleman on one point. The objection came, not from this side of the House, but from Mr. SIMPSON, a Populist member from Kansas.

Mr. DINGLEY. And the objection was not that the plan had not worked well in the preceding Congress, but that the conditions had changed.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It was an objection that was raised because gentlemen desired another arrangement.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that no objection is made now to the proposition I have submitted.

The SPEAKER. The arrangement can be carried out by common consent. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask to have Rule XXXII read.

REPORT OF THE RETIRING CLERK.

The SPEAKER. Before that is done the Chair will submit the report of the retiring Clerk of the House, with a letter transmitting a list of contested-election cases. Without objection these documents will be received and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The letter transmitting the list of contested-election cases is as follows:

CONTESTED ELECTION CASES.

Letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a list of the contests for seats in the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth Congress of the United States.

CLERK'S OFFICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 2, 1895.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives a list of contests for seats in the House of Representatives for the Fifty-fourth Congress of the United States, notices of which have been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House, and also to transmit therewith all original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto, as follows, to wit:

State of Alabama.—Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Ninth Congressional districts.
State of Georgia.—Seventh Congressional district.
State of Illinois.—Third and Sixteenth Congressional districts.
State of Kentucky.—Seventh and Tenth Congressional districts.
State of Louisiana.—Second, Third, and Fifth Congressional districts.
State of Maryland.—Third Congressional district.
State of Missouri.—Fifth Congressional district.
State of Mississippi.—Seventh Congressional district.
State of New York.—Eighth, Ninth, and Twelfth Congressional districts.
State of North Carolina.—Second, Third, and Sixth Congressional districts.
State of South Carolina.—First, Third, Sixth, and Seventh Congressional districts.
State of Texas.—Fourth, Sixth, and Tenth Congressional districts.
State of Virginia.—Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Tenth Congressional districts.

The Clerk wishes also to state that he has opened and printed the testimony in all the above cases excepting in the contest from the Third Congressional district of Illinois, Hugh R. Belknap *vs.* Lawrence E. McGann, the testimony not being filed within the time required by law.

Also in the contest from the Third Congressional district of Louisiana, Taylor Beattie *vs.* Andrew Price, the testimony not all being filed at the time fixed for the opening of the same, as required by law, viz, August 15, 1895. The case was continued and the testimony remains unopened.

Also in the contest from the Eighth Congressional district of New York, J. Murray Mitchell *vs.* James J. Walsh, and the Ninth Congressional district of New York, Timothy J. Campbell *vs.* Henry C. Miner. In neither of these cases has the contestee filed any testimony, and the testimony of the contestants having been filed after the time required by law the Clerk did not think it proper to open the testimony in either case, but to submit the same for the consideration of the House.

In the Twelfth Congressional district of New York, R. A. Cheesebrough *vs.* George B. McClellan; the Seventh Congressional district of Mississippi, A. M. Newman *vs.* J. G. Spencer, and the Fourth Congressional district of Texas, J. H. Davis *vs.* D. B. Culberson, there are filed with the Clerk notices of contest, together with copies of the answers of contestees, and the affidavit of the contestee in each case that no testimony has been taken.

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act relating to contested elections," such portions of the testimony in the above cases (with the exceptions referred to) as the parties in interest agreed upon, or as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed, together with the notices of contest and the answers thereto; and such portions of the testimony as were not printed, with all the

original papers, have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in each case have been mailed to the contestant and the same number to the contestee. The law in reference to the briefs of both the contestee and contestant in each case has been complied with as far as possible upon the receipt by the Clerk of said briefs. Owing to delays in this matter, over which the Clerk has no control, all of said briefs have not yet been returned to him by the parties to these contests; but so far as the briefs have been furnished to the Clerk they are also ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections upon the order of the House, together with a tabulated statement, which has been prepared by the Clerk, showing the number of pages of testimony and the present status of each and every contested-election case, as well as the docket which has been kept, and all the papers in connection therewith.

Very respectfully,

JAMES KERR,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Contested-election cases, Fifty-fourth Congress.

	Contestant.	Contestee.	District.	Testimony opened.	Printed testimony forwarded.	Printed pages of testimony and briefs.		
						Testimony.	Briefs.	Total.
				1895.	1895.			
1	W. C. Robinson	George P. Harrison	Third Alabama	June 24	Sept. 20	462	22	484
2	W. F. Aldrich	Gaston A. Robbins	Fourth Alabama	June 7	July 20	309	115	424
3	A. T. Goodwyn	James E. Cobb	Fifth Alabama	June 24	Oct. 3	562	72	634
4	T. H. Aldrich	Oscar W. Underwood	Ninth Alabama	June 7	July 20	893	220	1,113
5	W. H. Felton	John W. Maddox	Seventh Georgia	June 8	July 23	627	189	816
6	Hugh R. Belknap*	Lawrence E. McGann*	Third Illinois	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
7	John I. Rinaker	Finis E. Downing	Sixteenth Illinois	June 8	July 20	670	109	779
8	George Denny, jr	William C. Owens	Seventh Kentucky	June 8	July 20	1,010	149	1,159
9	N. T. Hopkins	Joseph M. Kendall	Tenth Kentucky	June 10	July 23	108	33	141
10	H. Dudley Coleman	Charles F. Buck	Second Louisiana	Aug. 24	Sept. 25	658	113	771
11	Taylor Beattie†	Andrew Price†	Third Louisiana	(†)	(†)	(†)	(†)	(†)
12	Alexis Benoit	Charles J. Boatner	Fifth Louisiana	June 10	Aug. 9	190	69	259
13	William S. Booze	Harry W. Rusk	Third Maryland	June 17	Aug. 5	459	78	537
14	Robert T. Van Horn	John C. Tarsney	Fifth Missouri	June 24	Aug. 31	955	124	1,079
15	J. Murray Mitchell*	James J. Walsh*	Eighth New York	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
16	Timothy J. Campbell*	Henry C. Miner*	Ninth New York	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
17	R. A. Cheesebrough‡	George B. McClellan‡	Twelfth New York	(‡)	(‡)	(‡)	(‡)	(‡)
18	Henry P. Cheatham	Fred. A. Woodard	Second North Carolina	June 11	Aug. 9	514	107	621
19	Cyrus W. Thompson	John G. Shaw	Third North Carolina	June 11	July 23	326	243	569
20	Charles H. Martin	James A. Lockhart	Sixth North Carolina	June 11	July 23	396	102	498
21	George W. Murray	William Elliott	First South Carolina	June 15	July 23	919	226	1,145
22	Robert Moorman	Asbury C. Latimer	Third South Carolina	June 15	Aug. 9	302	83	385
23	Joshua E. Wilson	John L. McLaurin	Sixth South Carolina	June 15	Aug. 5	683	82	765
24	Thomas B. Johnston	J. William Stokes	Seventh South Carolina	June 15	Aug. 5	472	88	560
25	J. H. Davis‡	D. B. Culberson‡	Fourth Texas	(‡)	(‡)	(‡)	(‡)	(‡)
26	Jerome C. Kearby	Jo Abbott	Sixth Texas	June 17	Aug. 5	325	83	408
27	A. J. Rosenthal	Miles Crowley	Tenth Texas	June 17	Aug. 5	155	87	242
28	R. T. Thorp	William R. McKenney	Fourth Virginia	June 17	Aug. 9	787	455	1,242
29	George W. Cornett	Claude A. Swanson	Fifth Virginia	June 18	Aug. 9	145	32	177
30	J. Hampton Hoge	Peter J. Otey	Sixth Virginia	June 18	July 20	65	----	65
31	Jacob Yost	H. St. George Tucker	Tenth Virginia	June 18	Aug. 16	583	171	754
32	A. M. Newman‡	J. G. Spencer‡	Seventh Mississippi	(‡)	(‡)	(‡)	(‡)	(‡)
						12,575	3,052	15,627

	Contestant.	Contestee.	Contestant notified to file brief.	Contestant's brief filed.	Contestant's brief sent to contestee.	Contestee notified to file brief.	Contestee's brief filed.	Contestee's brief sent to contestant.	Contestant files brief in reply.	Contestant's brief in reply sent to contestee.
1	W. C. Robinson	George P. Harrison	Sept. 20	Nov. 25	Nov. 25	Nov. 25	----	----	----	----
2	W. F. Aldrich	Gaston A. Robbins	July 20	Aug. 20	Aug. 26	Aug. 26	Sept. 23	Sept. 30	----	----
3	A. T. Goodwyn	James E. Cobb	Oct. 3	Oct. 31	Nov. 25	Nov. 25	----	----	----	----
4	T. H. Aldrich	Oscar W. Underwood	July 20	Sept. 24	Sept. 24	Sept. 24	Nov. 11	Nov. 11	----	----
5	W. H. Felton	John W. Maddox	July 23	Aug. 22	Aug. 26	Aug. 26	Sept. 21	Sept. 21	Nov. 8	Nov. 9
6	Hugh R. Belknap*	Lawrence E. McGann*	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
7	John I. Rinaker	Finis E. Downing	July 20	Aug. 19	Aug. 26	Aug. 26	Sept. 24	Sept. 25	Oct. 26	Oct. 26
8	George Denny, jr	William C. Owens	July 20	Aug. 20	Aug. 26	Aug. 26	Sept. 30	Oct. 1	Nov. 11	Nov. 11
9	N. T. Hopkins	Joseph M. Kendall	July 23	Oct. 16	Nov. 16	Nov. 16	----	----	----	----
10	H. Dudley Coleman	Charles F. Buck	Sept. 25	Oct. 26	Oct. 28	Oct. 28	Nov. 27	Nov. 27	----	----
11	Taylor Beattie†	Andrew Price†	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
12	Alexis Benoit	Charles J. Boatner	Aug. 9	Sept. 9	Sept. 11	Sept. 11	----	----	----	----
13	William S. Booze	Harry W. Rusk	Aug. 5	Sept. 4	Sept. 10	Sept. 10	Oct. 16	Oct. 17	Nov. 18	Nov. 19
14	Robert T. Van Horn	John C. Tarsney	Aug. 31	Sept. 23	Sept. 23	Sept. 23	Oct. 21	Oct. 21	Nov. 18	Nov. 19
15	J. Murray Mitchell*	James J. Walsh*	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
16	Timothy J. Campbell	Henry C. Miner*	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
17	R. A. Cheesebrough‡	George B. McClellan‡	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
18	Henry P. Cheatham	Fred. A. Woodard	Aug. 9	Oct. 2	Oct. 3	Oct. 3	----	----	----	----
19	Cyrus W. Thompson	John G. Shaw	July 23	Aug. 20	Aug. 26	Aug. 26	Sept. 25	Sept. 25	Nov. 26	Nov. 26
20	Charles H. Martin	James A. Lockhart	July 23	Sept. 11	Sept. 16	Sept. 16	Nov. 5	Nov. 6	----	----
21	George W. Murray	William Elliott	July 23	Aug. 23	Aug. 26	Aug. 26	Oct. 17	Oct. 17	----	----
22	Robert Moorman	Asbury C. Latimer	Aug. 9	Sept. 9	Sept. 11	Sept. 11	Oct. 16	Oct. 17	Nov. 22	Nov. 22
23	Joshua E. Wilson	John L. McLaurin	Aug. 5	Sept. 4	Sept. 5	Sept. 5	Oct. 18	Oct. 19	Nov. 22	Nov. 22
24	Thomas B. Johnston	J. William Stokes	Aug. 5	Sept. 3	Sept. 4	Sept. 4	Nov. 12	Nov. 13	----	----
25	J. H. Davis‡	D. B. Culberson‡	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
26	Jerome C. Kearby	Jo Abbott	Aug. 5	Aug. 28	Aug. 30	Aug. 30	Sept. 28	Sept. 30	Oct. 28	Oct. 28
27	A. J. Rosenthal	Miles Crowley	Aug. 5	Sept. 5	Sept. 5	Sept. 5	Oct. 11	Oct. 11	----	----
28	R. T. Thorp	William R. McKenney	Aug. 9	Sept. 6	Sept. 9	Sept. 9	Oct. 5	Oct. 5	Nov. 2	Nov. 2
29	George W. Cornett	Claude A. Swanson	Aug. 9	Oct. 29	Oct. 29	Oct. 29	----	----	----	----
30	J. Hampton Hoge	Peter J. Otey	July 20	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
31	Jacob Yost	H. St. George Tucker	Aug. 16	Sept. 21	Sept. 21	Sept. 21	Oct. 22	Oct. 22	Nov. 25	Nov. 25
32	A. M. Newman‡	J. G. Spencer‡	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

*Testimony not opened. †Case considered August 15. Testimony not opened. (See record.) ‡No testimony filed.

DRAWING OF SEATS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read the rule under which the House is proceeding.

The Clerk read as follows:

RULE XXXII—DRAWING OF SEATS.

1. At the commencement of each Congress, immediately after the Members and Delegates are sworn in, the Clerk shall place in a box, prepared for that purpose, a number of small balls of marble or other material equal to the number of Members and Delegates, which balls shall be consecutively numbered and thoroughly intermingled, and at such hour as shall be fixed by the House for that purpose, by the hands of a page, draw said balls one by one from the box and announce the number as it is drawn, upon which announcement the Member or Delegate whose name on a numbered alphabetical list shall correspond with the number on the ball shall advance and choose his seat for the term for which he is elected.

2. Before said drawing shall commence each seat shall be vacated and so remain until selected under this rule, and any seat having been selected shall be deemed forfeited if left unoccupied before the call of the roll is finished, and whenever the seats of Members and Delegates shall have been drawn, no proposition for a second drawing shall be in order during that Congress.

The SPEAKER. In order to carry out the resolution as to the selection of seats under the rule, it will be necessary for members to retire from the body of the Hall.

The members present retired behind the railing.

The SPEAKER. Before the drawing for seats begins the gen-

tleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW], who have been authorized by the House to choose seats in advance, will please make their selections.

Mr. CRISP and Mr. GROW accordingly chose seats.

The SPEAKER. Members will please remain outside the railing during the drawing. When gentlemen come inside while the drawing is in progress there is likely to be misunderstanding as to what seats are occupied and confusion arises which had better be avoided. The drawing will now begin.

The drawing of seats was begun at seven minutes before 2 o'clock p. m., and concluded at thirty-two minutes past 3.

PRINTING OF THE RULES.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Ordered, That there be printed for the use of the House 500 copies of the rules of the Fifty-first Congress.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LINTON: A bill (H. R. 1) to reclassify railway postal clerks and prescribe their salaries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 2) disposing of two condemned cannon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3) to provide for the relief of aged and disabled letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4) making ineligible for appointment as assignee or receiver officers of corporations engaged in interstate commerce—to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: Resolution of the National Board of Trade, asking Congress to pass a law making officers of public corporations ineligible for receivership—to the Committee on Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 3, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

GEORGE GRAY, a Senator from the State of Delaware, JOHN M. PALMER, a Senator from the State of Illinois, and JOHN P. JONES, a Senator from the State of Nevada, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

Mr. T. O. TOWLES, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, appeared below the bar of the Senate and delivered the following message:

Mr. President, I am directed by the House of Representatives to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that THOMAS B. REED, a Representative from the State of Maine, has been elected Speaker; that Alexander McDowell, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, has been elected Clerk, and that the House is ready to proceed to business.

Also, that a committee of three has been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate, to wait on the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of each of the two Houses has assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make; and that Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CANNON of Illinois, and Mr. CRISP have been appointed such committee on the part of the House.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. VILAS and Mr. ALLISON, the committee appointed in conjunction with a similar committee of the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States, appeared below the bar, and

Mr. VILAS said: Mr. President, the committee appointed to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each of the Houses of Congress has assembled and is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, have performed the duty assigned them, and were requested by the President to give his respectful salutation to the Houses of Congress and to say that he will immediately communicate to each House a message in writing.

PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE.

Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of the secretaries of the President of the United States, appeared below the bar, and said:

Mr. President, I am directed by the President of the United States to deliver to the Senate a message in writing.

The message was received from the secretary and handed to the Vice-President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the message of the President of the United States, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary (Mr. WILLIAM R. COX) read the message, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The present assemblage of the legislative branch of our Government occurs at a time when the interests of our people and the needs of the country give especial prominence to the condition of our foreign relations and the exigencies of our national finances. The reports of the heads of the several administrative Departments of the Government fully and plainly exhibit what has been accomplished within the scope of their respective duties and present such recommendations for the betterment of our country's condition as patriotic and intelligent labor and observation suggest.

I therefore deem my executive duty adequately performed at this time by presenting to the Congress the important phases of our situation as related to our intercourse with foreign nations, and a statement of the financial problems which confront us, omitting, except as they are related to these topics, any reference to departmental operations.

I earnestly invite, however, not only the careful consideration, but the severely critical scrutiny of the Congress and my fellow-countrymen to the reports concerning these departmental operations. If justly and fairly examined they will furnish proof of assiduous and painstaking care for the public welfare. I press the recommendations they contain upon the respectful attention of those charged with the duty of legislation, because I believe their adoption would promote the people's good.

By amendatory tariff legislation in January last, the Argentine Republic, recognizing the value of the large market opened to the free importation of its wools under our last tariff act, has admitted certain products of the United States to entry at reduced duties. It is pleasing to note that the efforts we have made to enlarge the exchanges of trade on a sound basis of mutual benefit are in this instance appreciated by the country from which our woolen factories draw their needful supply of raw material.

The Missions boundary dispute between the Argentine Republic and Brazil, referred to the President of the United States as arbitrator during the term of my predecessor, and which was submitted to me for determination, resulted in an award in favor of Brazil upon the historical and documentary evidence presented, thus ending a long-protracted controversy and again demonstrating the wisdom and desirability of settling international boundary disputes by recourse to friendly arbitration.

Negotiations are progressing for a revival of the United States and Chilean Claims Commission, whose work was abruptly terminated last year by the expiration of the stipulated time within which awards could be made.

The resumption of specie payments by Chile is a step of great interest and importance both in its direct consequences upon her own welfare and as evincing the ascendency of sound financial principles in one of the most influential of the South American Republics.

The close of the momentous struggle between China and Japan, while relieving the diplomatic agents of this Government from the delicate duty they undertook at the request of both countries, of rendering such service to the subjects of either belligerent within the territorial limits of the other as our neutral position permitted, developed a domestic condition in the Chinese Empire which has caused much anxiety and called for prompt and careful attention. Either as a result of a weak control by the central Government over the provincial administrations, following a diminution of traditional governmental authority under the stress of an overwhelming national disaster, or as a manifestation upon good opportunity of the aversion of the Chinese population to all foreign ways and undertakings, there have occurred in widely separated provinces of China serious outbreaks of the old fanatical spirit against foreigners, which, unchecked by the local authorities, if not actually connived at by them, have culminated in mob attacks on foreign missionary stations, causing much destruction of property, and attended with personal injuries as well as loss of life.

Although but one American citizen was reported to have been actually wounded, and although the destruction of property may have fallen more heavily upon the missionaries of other nationali-

ties than our own, it plainly behooved this Government to take the most prompt and decided action to guard against similar or perhaps more dreadful calamities befalling the hundreds of American mission stations which have grown up throughout the interior of China under the temperate rule of toleration, custom, and imperial edict. The demands of the United States and other powers for the degradation and punishment of the responsible officials of the respective cities and provinces who by neglect or otherwise had permitted uprisings, and for the adoption of stern measures by the Emperor's Government for the protection of the life and property of foreigners, were followed by the disgrace and dismissal of certain provincial officials found derelict in duty, and the punishment by death of a number of those adjudged guilty of actual participation in the outrages.

This Government also insisted that a special American commission should visit the province where the first disturbances occurred, for the purpose of investigation. This latter commission, formed after much opposition, has gone overland from Tientsin, accompanied by a suitable Chinese escort, and by its demonstration of the readiness and ability of our Government to protect its citizens, will act, it is believed, as a most influential deterrent of any similar outbreaks.

The energetic steps we have thus taken are all the more likely to result in future safety to our citizens in China, because the Imperial Government is, I am persuaded, entirely convinced that we desire only the liberty and protection of our own citizens and redress for any wrongs they may have suffered, and that we have no ulterior designs or objects, political or otherwise. China will not forget either our kindly service to her citizens during her late war, nor the further fact that, while furnishing all the facilities at our command to further the negotiations of peace between her and Japan, we sought no advantages and interposed no counsel.

The Governments of both China and Japan have in special dispatches transmitted through their respective diplomatic representatives expressed in a most pleasing manner their grateful appreciation of our assistance to their citizens during the unhappy struggle and of the value of our aid in paving the way to their resumption of peaceful relations.

The customary cordial relations between this country and France have been undisturbed, with the exception that a full explanation of the treatment of John L. Waller by the expeditionary military authorities of France still remains to be given. Mr. Waller, formerly United States consul at Tamatave, remained in Madagascar after his term of office expired, and was apparently successful in procuring business concessions from the Hovas of greater or less value. After the occupation of Tamatave and the declaration of martial law by the French he was arrested upon various charges, among them that of communicating military information to the enemies of France, was tried and convicted by a military tribunal, and sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment.

Following the course justified by abundant precedents, this Government requested from that of France the record of the proceedings of the French tribunal which resulted in Mr. Waller's condemnation. This request has been complied with to the extent of supplying a copy of the official record, from which appear the constitution and organization of the court, the charges as formulated, and the general course and result of the trial, and by which it is shown that the accused was tried in open court and was defended by counsel. But the evidence adduced in support of the charges—which was not received by the French minister for foreign affairs till the first week in October—has thus far been withheld, the French Government taking the ground that its production in response to our demand would establish a bad precedent. The efforts of our ambassador to procure it, however, though impeded by recent changes in the French ministry, have not been relaxed, and it is confidently expected that some satisfactory solution of the matter will shortly be reached. Meanwhile it appears that Mr. Waller's confinement has every alleviation which the state of his health and all the other circumstances of the case demand or permit.

In agreeable contrast to the difference above noted respecting a matter of common concern where nothing is sought except such a mutually satisfactory outcome as the true merits of the case require is the recent resolution of the French Chambers favoring the conclusion of a permanent treaty of arbitration between the two countries.

An invitation has been extended by France to the Government and people of the United States to participate in a great international exposition at Paris in 1900 as a suitable commemoration of the close of this the world's marvelous century of progress. I heartily recommend its acceptance, together with such legislation as will adequately provide for a due representation of this Government and its people on the occasion.

Our relations with the States of the German Empire are, in some aspects, typical of a condition of things elsewhere found in countries whose productions and trade are similar to our own. The close rivalries of competing industries; the influence of the delusive doctrine that the internal development of a nation is promoted and its wealth increased by a policy which in undertaking to reserve its home markets for the exclusive use of its own producers necessarily obstructs their sales in foreign markets and prevents free access to the products of the world; the desire to retain trade in time-worn ruts, regardless of the inexorable laws of new needs and changed conditions of demand and supply, and our own halting tardiness in inviting a freer exchange of commodities and by this means imperiling our footing in the external markets naturally open to us, have created a situation somewhat injurious to American export interests, not only in Germany, where they are perhaps most noticeable, but in adjacent countries. The exports affected are largely American cattle and other food products, the reason assigned for unfavorable discrimination being that their consumption is deleterious to the public health. This is all the more irritating in view of the fact that no European State is as jealous of the excellence and wholesomeness of its exported food supplies as the United States, nor so easily able, on account of inherent soundness, to guarantee those qualities.

Nor are these difficulties confined to our food products designed for exportation. Our great insurance companies, for example, having built up a vast business abroad and invested a large share of their gains in foreign countries in compliance with the local laws and regulations then existing, now find themselves within a narrowing circle of onerous and unforeseen conditions, and are confronted by the necessity of retirement from a field thus made unprofitable, if indeed they are not summarily expelled, as some of them have lately been from Prussia.

It is not to be forgotten that international trade can not be one-sided. Its currents are alternating and its movements should be honestly reciprocal. Without this it almost necessarily degenerates into a device to gain advantage or a contrivance to secure benefits with only the semblance of a return. In our dealings with other nations we ought to be openhanded and scrupulously fair. This should be our policy as a producing nation, and it plainly becomes us as a people who love generosity and the moral aspects of national good faith and reciprocal forbearance.

These considerations should not, however, constrain us to submit to unfair discrimination nor to silently acquiesce in vexatious hindrances to the enjoyment of our share of the legitimate advantages of proper trade relations. If an examination of the situation suggests such measures on our part as would involve restrictions similar to those from which we suffer, the way to such a course is easy. It should, however, by no means be lightly entered upon, since the necessity for the inauguration of such a policy would be regretted by the best sentiment of our people, and because it naturally and logically might lead to consequences of the gravest character.

I take pleasure in calling to your attention the encomiums bestowed on those vessels of our new Navy which took part in the notable ceremony of the opening of the Kiel Canal. It was fitting that this extraordinary achievement of the newer German nationality should be celebrated in the presence of America's exposition of the latest developments of the world's naval energy.

Our relations with Great Britain, always intimate and important, have demanded during the past year even a greater share of consideration than is usual.

Several vexatious questions were left undetermined by the decision of the Bering Sea Arbitration Tribunal. The application of the principles laid down by that august body has not been followed by the results they were intended to accomplish, either because the principles themselves lacked in breadth and definiteness or because their execution has been more or less imperfect. Much correspondence has been exchanged between the two Governments on the subject of preventing the exterminating slaughter of seals. The insufficiency of the British patrol of Bering Sea, under the regulations agreed on by the two Governments, has been pointed out, and yet only two British ships have been on police duty during this season in those waters.

The need of a more effective enforcement of existing regulations, as well as the adoption of such additional regulations as experience has shown to be absolutely necessary to carry out the intent of the award, have been earnestly urged upon the British Government, but thus far without effective results. In the meantime the depletion of the seal herds by means of pelagic hunting has so alarmingly progressed that unless their slaughter is at once effectively checked their extinction within a few years seems to be a matter of absolute certainty.

The understanding by which the United States was to pay, and Great Britain to receive, a lump sum of $425,000 in full settlement of all British claims for damages arising from our seizure of British sealing vessels unauthorized under the award of the Paris Tribunal of Arbitration was not confirmed by the last Congress, which declined to make the necessary appropriation. I am still of the opinion that this arrangement was a judicious and advantageous one for the Government, and I earnestly recommend that it be again considered and sanctioned. If, however, this does not

meet with the favor of Congress, it certainly will hardly dissent from the proposition that the Government is bound by every consideration of honor and good faith to provide for the speedy adjustment of these claims by arbitration as the only other alternative. A treaty of arbitration has therefore been agreed upon, and will be immediately laid before the Senate, so that in one of the modes suggested a final settlement may be reached.

Notwithstanding that Great Britain originated the proposal to enforce international rules for the prevention of collisions at sea, based on the recommendations of the Maritime Conference of Washington, and concurred in suggesting March 1, 1895, as the date to be set by proclamation for carrying these rules into general effect, Her Majesty's Government, having encountered opposition on the part of British shipping interests, announced its inability to accept that date, which was consequently canceled. The entire matter is still in abeyance, without prospect of a better condition in the near future.

The commissioners appointed to mark the international boundary in Passamaquoddy Bay according to the description of the treaty of Ghent have not yet fully agreed.

The completion of the preliminary survey of that Alaskan boundary which follows the contour of the coast from the southernmost point of Prince of Wales Island until it strikes the one hundred and forty-first meridian at or near the summit of Mount St. Elias awaits further necessary appropriation, which is urgently recommended. This survey was undertaken under the provisions of the convention entered into by this country and Great Britain July 22, 1892, and the supplementary convention of February 3, 1894.

As to the remaining section of the Alaskan boundary, which follows the one hundred and forty-first meridian northwardly from Mount St. Elias to the Frozen Ocean, the settlement of which involves the physical location of the meridian mentioned, no conventional agreement has yet been made. The ascertainment of a given meridian at a particular point is a work requiring much time and careful observations and surveys. Such observations and surveys were undertaken by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in 1890 and 1891, while similar work in the same quarters under British auspices are believed to give nearly coincident results; but these surveys have been independently conducted and no international agreement to mark those or any other parts of the one hundred and forty-first meridian by permanent monuments has yet been made. In the meantime the valley of the Yukon is becoming a highway through the hitherto unexplored wilds of Alaska, and abundant mineral wealth has been discovered in that region, especially at or near the junction of the boundary meridian with the Yukon and its tributaries. In these circumstances it is expedient, and, indeed, imperative, that the jurisdictional limits of the respective Governments in this new region be speedily determined. Her Britannic Majesty's Government has proposed a joint delimitation of the one hundred and forty-first meridian by an international commission of experts, which, if Congress will authorize it and make due provision therefor, can be accomplished with no unreasonable delay. It is impossible to overlook the vital importance of continuing the work already entered upon, and supplementing it by further effective measures looking to the exact location of this entire boundary line.

I call attention to the unsatisfactory delimitation of the respective jurisdictions of the United States and the Dominion of Canada in the Great Lakes at the approaches to the narrow waters that connect them. The waters in question are frequented by fishermen of both nationalities and their nets are there used. Owing to the uncertainty and ignorance as to the true boundary, vexatious disputes and injurious seizures of boats and nets by Canadian cruisers often occur, while any positive settlement thereof by an accepted standard is not easily to be reached. A joint commission to determine the line in those quarters, on a practical basis, by measured courses following range marks on shore, is a necessity for which immediate provision should be made.

It being apparent that the boundary dispute between Great Britain and the Republic of Venezuela concerning the limits of British Guiana was approaching an acute stage, a definite statement of the interest and policy of the United States as regards the controversy seemed to be required both on its own account and in view of its relations with the friendly powers directly concerned. In July last, therefore, a dispatch was addressed to our ambassador at London for communication to the British Government, in which the attitude of the United States was fully and distinctly set forth. The general conclusions therein reached and formulated are in substance that the traditional and established policy of this Government is firmly opposed to a forcible increase by any European power of its territorial possessions on this continent; that this policy is as well founded in principle as it is strongly supported by numerous precedents; that as a consequence the United States is bound to protest against the enlargement of the area of British Guiana in derogation of the rights and against the will of Venezuela; that considering the disparity in strength of Great Britain and Venezuela, the territorial dispute between them can be reasonably settled only by friendly and impartial arbitration, and that the resort to such arbitration should include the whole controversy, and is not satisfied if one of the powers concerned is permitted to draw an arbitrary line through the territory in debate and to declare that it will submit to arbitration only the portion lying on one side of it. In view of these conclusions, the dispatch in question called upon the British Government for a definite answer to the question whether it would or would not submit the territorial controversy between itself and Venezuela in its entirety to impartial arbitration. The answer of the British Government has not yet been received, but is expected shortly, when further communication on the subject will probably be made to the Congress.

Early in January last an uprising against the Government of Hawaii was promptly suppressed. Martial law was forwith proclaimed and numerous arrests were made of persons suspected of being in sympathy with the Royalist party. Among these were several citizens of the United States, who were either convicted by a military court and sentenced to death, imprisonment, or fine, or were deported without trial. The United States, while denying protection to such as had taken the Hawaiian oath of allegiance, insisted that martial law, though altering the forms of justice, could not supersede justice itself, and demanded stay of execution until the proceedings had been submitted to this Government and knowledge obtained therefrom that our citizens had received fair trial. The death sentences were subsequently commuted or were remitted on condition of leaving the islands. The cases of certain Americans arrested and expelled by arbitrary order without formal charge or trial have had attention, and in some instances have been found to justify remonstrance and a claim for indemnity, which Hawaii has not thus far conceded.

Mr. Thurston, the Hawaiian minister, having furnished this Government abundant reason for asking that he be recalled, that course was pursued, and his successor has lately been received.

The deplorable lynching of several Italian laborers in Colorado was naturally followed by international representations, and I am happy to say that the best efforts of the State in which the outrages occurred have been put forth to discover and punish the authors of this atrocious crime. The dependent families of some of the unfortunate victims invite by their deplorable condition gracious provision for their needs.

These manifestations against helpless aliens may be traced through successive stages to the vicious *padroni* system, which, unchecked by our immigration and contract-labor statutes, controls these workers from the moment of landing on our shores, and farms them out in distant and often rude regions, where their cheapening competition in the fields of bread-winning toil brings them into collision with other labor interests. While welcoming, as we should, those who seek our shores to merge themselves in our body politic and win personal competence by honest effort, we can not regard such assemblages of distinctively alien laborers, hired out in the mass to the profit of alien speculators and shipped hither and thither as the prospect of gain may dictate, as otherwise than repugnant to the spirit of our civilization, deterrent to individual advancement, and hindrances to the building up of stable communities resting upon the wholesome ambitions of the citizen and constituting the prime factor in the prosperity and progress of our nation. If legislation can reach this growing evil, it certainly should be attempted.

Japan has furnished abundant evidence of her vast gain in every trait and characteristic that constitutes a nation's greatness. We have reason for congratulation in the fact that the Government of the United States, by the exchange of liberal treaty stipulations with the new Japan, was the first to recognize her wonderful advance and to extend to her the consideration and confidence due to her national enlightenment and progressive character.

The boundary dispute which lately threatened to embroil Guatemala and Mexico has happily yielded to pacific counsels, and its determination has, by the joint agreement of the parties, been submitted to the sole arbitration of the United States minister to Mexico.

The commission appointed under the convention of February 18, 1889, to set new monuments along the boundary between the United States and Mexico has completed its task.

As a sequel to the failure of a scheme for the colonization in Mexico of negroes, mostly emigrants from Alabama under contract, a great number of these helpless and suffering people, starving and smitten with contagious disease, made their way or were assisted to the frontier, where, in wretched plight, they were quarantined by the Texas authorities. Learning of their destitute condition, I directed rations to be temporarily furnished them through the War Department. At the expiration of their quarantine they were conveyed by the railway companies at comparatively nominal rates to their homes in Alabama, upon my assurance, in the absence of any fund available for the cost of their transportation, that I would recommend to Congress an appropriation for its payment. I now strongly urge upon Con-

gress the propriety of making such an appropriation. It should be remembered that the measures taken were dictated not only by sympathy and humanity, but by a conviction that it was not compatible with the dignity of this Government that so large a body of our dependent citizens should be thrown for relief upon the charity of a neighboring State.

In last year's message I narrated at some length the jurisdictional questions then freshly arisen in the Mosquito Indian strip of Nicaragua. Since that time, by the voluntary act of the Mosquito Nation, the territory reserved to them has been incorporated with Nicaragua, the Indians formally subjecting themselves to be governed by the general laws and regulations of the Republic instead of by their own customs and regulations, and thus availing themselves of a privilege secured to them by the treaty between Nicaragua and Great Britain of January 28, 1860.

After this extension of uniform Nicaraguan administration to the Mosquito strip, the case of the British vice-consul, Hatch, and of several of his countrymen who had been summarily expelled from Nicaragua and treated with considerable indignity, provoked a claim by Great Britain upon Nicaragua for pecuniary indemnity, which, upon Nicaragua's refusal to admit liability, was enforced by Great Britain. While the sovereignty and jurisdiction of Nicaragua was in no way questioned by Great Britain, the former's arbitrary conduct in regard to British subjects furnished the ground for this proceeding.

A British naval force occupied without resistance the Pacific seaport of Corinto, but was soon after withdrawn upon the promise that the sum demanded would be paid. Throughout this incident the kindly offices of the United States were invoked and were employed in favor of as peaceful a settlement and as much consideration and indulgence toward Nicaragua as were consistent with the nature of the case. Our efforts have since been made the subject of appreciative and grateful recognition by Nicaragua.

The coronation of the Czar of Russia at Moscow in May next invites the ceremonial participation of the United States, and in accordance with usage and diplomatic propriety our minister to the imperial court has been directed to represent our Government on the occasion.

Correspondence is on foot touching the practice of Russian consuls within the jurisdiction of the United States to interrogate citizens as to their race and religious faith, and upon ascertainment thereof to deny to Jews authentication of passports or legal documents for use in Russia. Inasmuch as such a proceeding imposes a disability, which in the case of succession to property in Russia may be found to infringe the treaty rights of our citizens, and which is an obnoxious invasion of our territorial jurisdiction, it has elicited fitting remonstrance, the result of which it is hoped will remove the cause of complaint.

The pending claims of sealing vessels of the United States seized in Russian waters remain unadjusted. Our recent convention with Russia establishing a *modus vivendi* as to imperial jurisdiction in such cases has prevented further difficulty of this nature.

The Russian Government has welcomed in principle our suggestion for a *modus vivendi*, to embrace Great Britain and Japan, looking to the better preservation of seal life in the North Pacific and Bering Sea, and the extension of the protected area defined by the Paris Tribunal to all Pacific waters north of the thirty-fifth parallel. It is especially noticeable that Russia favors prohibition of the use of firearms in seal hunting throughout the proposed area and a longer closed season for pelagic sealing.

In my last two annual messages I called the attention of the Congress to the position we occupied as one of the parties to a treaty or agreement by which we became jointly bound with England and Germany to so interfere with the government and control of Samoa as in effect to assume the management of its affairs. On the 9th day of May, 1894, I transmitted to the Senate a special message with accompanying documents giving information on the subject and emphasizing the opinion I have at all times entertained, that our situation in this matter was inconsistent with the mission and traditions of our Government, in violation of the principles we profess, and in all its phases mischievous and vexatious.

I again press this subject upon the attention of the Congress and ask for such legislative action or expression as will lead the way to our relief from obligations both irksome and unnatural.

Cuba is again gravely disturbed. An insurrection, in some respects more active than the last preceding revolt, which continued from 1868 to 1878, now exists in a large part of the eastern interior of the island, menacing even some populations on the coast. Besides deranging the commercial exchanges of the island, of which our country takes the predominant share, this flagrant condition of hostilities, by arousing sentimental sympathy and inciting adventurous support among our people, has entailed earnest effort on the part of this Government to enforce obedience to our neutrality laws and to prevent the territory of the United States from being abused as a vantage ground from which to aid those in arms against Spanish sovereignty.

Whatever may be the traditional sympathy of our countrymen as individuals with a people who seem to be struggling for larger autonomy and greater freedom, deepened as such sympathy naturally must be in behalf of our neighbors, yet the plain duty of their Government is to observe in good faith the recognized obligations of international relationship. The performance of this duty should not be made more difficult by a disregard on the part of our citizens of the obligations growing out of their allegiance to their country, which should restrain them from violating as individuals the neutrality which the nation of which they are members is bound to observe in its relations to friendly sovereign States. Though neither the warmth of our people's sympathy with the Cuban insurgents, nor our loss and material damage consequent upon the futile endeavors thus far made to restore peace and order, nor any shock our humane sensibilities may have received from the cruelties which appear to especially characterize this sanguinary and fiercely conducted war, have in the least shaken the determination of the Government to honestly fulfill every international obligation, yet it is to be earnestly hoped, on every ground, that the devastation of armed conflict may speedily be stayed and order and quiet restored to the distracted island, bringing in their train the activity and thrift of peaceful pursuits.

One notable instance of interference by Spain with passing American ships has occurred. On March 8 last the *Allianca*, while bound from Colon to New York, and following the customary track for vessels near the Cuban shore, but outside the 3-mile limit, was fired upon by a Spanish gunboat. Protest was promptly made by the United States against this act as not being justified by a state of war, nor permissible in respect of vessels on the usual paths of commerce, nor tolerable in view of the wanton peril occasioned to innocent life and property. The act was disavowed, with full expression of regret, and assurance of nonrecurrence of such just cause of complaint, while the offending officer was relieved of his command.

Military arrests of citizens of the United States in Cuba have occasioned frequent reclamations. Where held on criminal charges their delivery to the ordinary civil jurisdiction for trial has been demanded and obtained in conformity with treaty provisions, and where merely detained by way of military precaution under a proclaimed state of siege, without formulated accusation, their release or trial has been insisted upon. The right of American consular officers in the island to prefer protests and demands in such cases having been questioned by the insular authority, their enjoyment of the privilege stipulated by treaty for the consuls of Germany was claimed under the most-favored-nation provision of our own convention and was promptly recognized.

The long-standing demand of Antonio Maximo Mora against Spain has at last been settled by the payment, on the 14th of September last, of the sum originally agreed upon in liquidation of the claim. Its distribution among the parties entitled to receive it has proceeded as rapidly as the rights of those claiming the fund could be safely determined.

The enforcement of the differential duties against products of this country exported to Cuba and Puerto Rico prompted the immediate claim on our part to the benefit of the minimum tariff of Spain in return for the most favorable treatment permitted by our laws as regards the production of Spanish territories. A commercial arrangement was concluded in January last securing the treatment so claimed.

Vigorous protests against excessive fines imposed on our ships and merchandise by the customs officers of these islands for trivial errors have resulted in the remission of such fines in instances where the equity of the complaint was apparent, though the vexatious practice has not been wholly discontinued.

Occurrences in Turkey have continued to excite concern. The reported massacres of Christians in Armenia and the development there and in other districts of a spirit of fanatic hostility to Christian influences naturally excited apprehension for the safety of the devoted men and women who, as dependents of the foreign missionary societies in the United States, reside in Turkey under the guarantee of law and usage and in the legitimate performance of their educational and religious mission. No efforts have been spared in their behalf, and their protection in person and property has been earnestly and vigorously enforced by every means within our power.

I regret, however, that an attempt on our part to obtain better information concerning the true condition of affairs in the disturbed quarter of the Ottoman Empire, by sending thither the United States consul at Sivas to make investigation and report, was thwarted by the objections of the Turkish Government. This movement on our part was in no sense meant as a gratuitous entanglement of the United States in the so-called Eastern question, nor as an officious interference with the right and duty which belong by treaty to certain great European powers, calling for their intervention in political matters affecting the good government and religious freedom of the non-Mussulman subjects of the Sultan, but it arose solely from our desire to have an accurate

knowledge of the conditions in our efforts to care for those entitled to our protection.

The presence of our naval vessels which are now in the vicinity of the disturbed localities affords opportunities to acquire a measure of familiarity with the condition of affairs, and will enable us to take suitable steps for the protection of any interests of our countrymen within reach of our ships that might be found imperiled.

The Ottoman Government has lately issued an imperial *iradé* exempting forever from taxation an American college for girls at Scutari. Repeated assurances have also been obtained by our envoy at Constantinople that similar institutions maintained and administered by our countrymen shall be secured in the enjoyment of all rights, and that our citizens throughout the Empire shall be protected.

The Government, however, in view of existing facts, is far from relying upon such assurances as the limit of its duty. Our minister has been vigilant and alert in affording all possible protection in individual cases where danger threatened or safety was imperiled. We have sent ships as far toward the points of actual disturbance as it is possible for them to go, where they offer refuge to those obliged to flee, and we have the promise of other powers which have ships in the neighborhood that our citizens, as well as theirs, will be received and protected on board those ships. On the demand of our minister, orders have been issued by the Sultan that Turkish soldiers shall guard and escort to the coast American refugees.

These orders have been carried out, and our latest intelligence gives assurance of the present personal safety of our citizens and missionaries. Though thus far no lives of American citizens have been sacrificed, there can be no doubt that serious loss and destruction of mission property have resulted from riotous conflicts and outrageous attacks.

By treaty several of the most powerful European powers have secured a right and have assumed a duty not only in behalf of their own citizens and in furtherance of their own interests, but as agents of the Christian world. Their right is to enforce such conduct of Turkish government as will restrain fanatical brutality, and if this fails their duty is to so interfere as to insure against such dreadful occurrences in Turkey as have lately shocked civilization. The powers declare this right and this duty to be theirs alone, and it is earnestly hoped that prompt and effective action on their part will not be delayed.

The new consulates at Erzerum and Harpoot, for which appropriation was made last session, have been provisionally filled by trusted employees of the Department of State. These appointees, though now in Turkey, have not yet received their exequaturs.

The arbitration of the claim of the Venezuela Steam Transportation Company under the treaty of January 19, 1892, between the United States and Venezuela, resulted in an award in favor of the claimant.

The Government has used its good offices toward composing the differences between Venezuela on the one hand and France and Belgium on the other, growing out of the dismissal of the representatives of those powers on the ground of a publication deemed offensive to Venezuela. Although that dismissal was coupled with a cordial request that other more personally agreeable envoys be sent in their stead, a rupture of intercourse ensued, and still continues.

In view of the growth of our interests in foreign countries and the encouraging prospects for a general expansion of our commerce, the question of an improvement in the consular service has increased in importance and urgency. Though there is no doubt that the great body of consular officers are rendering valuable services to the trade and industries of the country, the need of some plan of appointment and control which would tend to secure a higher average of efficiency can not be denied.

The importance of the subject has led the Executive to consider what steps might properly be taken without additional legislation to answer the need of a better system of consular appointments. The matter having been committed to the consideration of the Secretary of State, in pursuance of his recommendations an Executive order was issued on the 20th of September, 1895, by the terms of which it is provided that after that date any vacancy in a consulate or commercial agency with an annual salary or compensation from official fees of not more than $2,500 or less than $1,000 should be filled either by transfer or promotion from some other position under the Department of State of a character tending to qualify the incumbent for the position to be filled, or by the appointment of a person not under the Department of State, but having previously served thereunder and shown his capacity and fitness for consular duty, or by the appointment of a person who, having been selected by the President and sent to a board for examination, is found, upon such examination, to be qualified for the position. Posts which pay less than $1,000 being usually, on account of their small compensation, filled by selection from residents of the locality, it was not deemed practicable to put them under the new system.

The compensation of $2,500 was adopted as the maximum limit in the classification for the reason that consular officers receiving more than that sum are often charged with functions and duties scarcely inferior in dignity and importance to those of diplomatic agents, and it was therefore thought best to continue their selection in the discretion of the Executive without subjecting them to examination before a board. Excluding seventy-one places with compensation at present less than $1,000, and fifty-three places above the maximum in compensation, the number of positions remaining within the scope of the order is one hundred and ninety-six. This number will undoubtedly be increased by the inclusion of consular officers whose remuneration in fees, now less than $1,000, will be augmented with the growth of our foreign commerce and a return to more favorable business conditions.

In execution of the Executive order referred to, the Secretary of State has designated as a board to conduct the prescribed examinations the Third Assistant Secretary of State, the Solicitor of the Department of State, and the Chief of the Consular Bureau, and has specified the subjects to which such examinations shall relate.

It is not assumed that this system will prove a full measure of consular reform. It is quite probable that actual experience will show particulars in which the order already issued may be amended, and demonstrate that, for the best results, appropriate legislation by Congress is imperatively required.

In any event these efforts to improve the consular service ought to be immediately supplemented by legislation providing for consular inspection. This has frequently been a subject of Executive recommendation, and I again urge such action by Congress as will permit the frequent and thorough inspection of consulates by officers appointed for that purpose or by persons already in the diplomatic or consular service. The expense attending such a plan would be insignificant compared with its usefulness, and I hope the legislation necessary to set it on foot will be speedily forthcoming.

I am thoroughly convinced that in addition to their salaries our ambassadors and ministers at foreign courts should be provided by the Government with official residences. The salaries of these officers are comparatively small and in most cases insufficient to pay, with other necessary expenses, the cost of maintaining household establishments in keeping with their important and delicate functions. The usefulness of a nation's diplomatic representative undeniably depends much upon the appropriateness of his surroundings, and a country like ours, while avoiding unnecessary glitter and show, should be certain that it does not suffer in its relations with foreign nations through parsimony and shabbiness in its diplomatic outfit. These considerations and the other advantages of having fixed and somewhat permanent locations for our embassies would abundantly justify the moderate expenditure necessary to carry out this suggestion.

As we turn from a review of our foreign relations to the contemplation of our national financial situation we are immediately aware that we approach a subject of domestic concern more important than any other that can engage our attention, and one at present in such a perplexing and delicate predicament as to require prompt and wise treatment.

We may well be encouraged to earnest effort in this direction when we recall the steps already taken toward improving our economic and financial situation, and when we appreciate how well the way has been prepared for further progress by an aroused and intelligent popular interest in these subjects.

By command of the people a customs-revenue system, designed for the protection and benefit of favored classes at the expense of the great mass of our countrymen, and which, while inefficient for the purpose of revenue, curtailed our trade relations and impeded our entrance to the markets of the world, has been superseded by a tariff policy which in principle is based upon a denial of the right of the Government to obstruct the avenues to our people's cheap living, or lessen their comfort and contentment, for the sake of according especial advantages to favorites, and which, while encouraging our intercourse and trade with other nations, recognizes the fact that American self-reliance, thrift, and ingenuity can build up our country's industries and develop its resources more surely than enervating paternalism.

The compulsory purchase and coinage of silver by the Government, unchecked and unregulated by business conditions and heedless of our currency needs, which for more than fifteen years diluted our circulating medium, undermined confidence abroad in our financial ability, and at last culminated in distress and panic at home, has been recently stopped by the repeal of the laws which forced this reckless scheme upon the country.

The things thus accomplished, notwithstanding their extreme importance and beneficent effects, fall far short of curing the monetary evils from which we suffer as a result of long indulgence in ill-advised financial expedients.

The currency denominated United States notes and commonly known as greenbacks was issued in large volume during the late civil war, and was intended originally to meet the exigencies of that period. It will be seen by a reference to the debates in Con-

gress at the time the laws were passed authorizing the issue of these notes that their advocates declared they were intended for only temporary use and to meet the emergency of war. In almost if not all the laws relating to them some provision was made contemplating their voluntary or compulsory retirement. A large quantity of them, however, were kept on foot and mingled with the currency of the country, so that at the close of the year 1874 they amounted to $381,999,073.

Immediately after that date, and in January, 1875, a law was passed providing for the resumption of specie payments, by which the Secretary of the Treasury was required, whenever additional circulation was issued to national banks, to retire United States notes equal in amount to 80 per cent of such additional national-bank circulation until such notes were reduced to $300,000,000. This law further provided that on and after the 1st day of January, 1879, the United States notes then outstanding should be redeemed in coin, and in order to provide and prepare for such redemption the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized not only to use any surplus revenues of the Government, but to issue bonds of the United States and dispose of them for coin, and to use the proceeds for the purposes contemplated by the statute.

In May, 1878, and before the date thus appointed for the redemption and retirement of these notes, another statute was passed forbidding their further cancellation and retirement. Some of them had, however, been previously redeemed and canceled upon the issue of additional national-bank circulation, as permitted by the law of 1875, so that the amount outstanding at the time of the passage of the act forbidding their further retirement was $346,681,016.

The law of 1878 did not stop at distinct prohibition, but contained, in addition, the following express provision:

"And when any of said notes may be redeemed or be received into the Treasury, under any law, from any source whatever, and shall belong to the United States, they shall not be retired, canceled, or destroyed, but they shall be reissued and paid out again and kept in circulation."

This was the condition of affairs on the 1st day of January, 1879, which had been fixed upon four years before as the date for entering upon the redemption and retirement of all these notes, and for which such abundant means had been provided.

The Government was put in the anomalous situation of owing to the holders of its notes debts payable in gold on demand which could neither be retired by receiving such notes in discharge of obligations due the Government nor canceled by actual payment in gold. It was forced to redeem without redemption and to pay without acquittance.

There had been issued and sold $95,500,000 of the bonds authorized by the resumption act of 1875, the proceeds of which, together with other gold in the Treasury, created a gold fund deemed sufficient to meet the demands which might be made upon it for the redemption of the outstanding United States notes. This fund, together with such other gold as might be from time to time in the Treasury available for the same purpose, has been since called our gold reserve, and $100,000,000 has been regarded as an adequate amount to accomplish its object. This fund amounted on the 1st day of January, 1879, to $114,193,360, and though thereafter constantly fluctuating, it did not fall below that sum until July, 1892. In April, 1893, for the first time since its establishment, this reserve amounted to less than $100,000,000, containing at that date only $97,011,330.

In the meantime, and in July, 1890, an act had been passed directing larger governmental monthly purchases of silver than had been required under previous laws, and providing that in payment for such silver Treasury notes of the United States should be issued payable on demand in gold or silver coin at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. It was, however, declared in the act to be "the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law." In view of this declaration it was not deemed permissible for the Secretary of the Treasury to exercise the discretion in terms conferred on him, by refusing to pay gold on these notes when demanded, because by such discrimination in favor of the gold dollar the so-called parity of the two metals would be destroyed, and grave and dangerous consequences would be precipitated by affirming or accentuating the constantly widening disparity between their actual values under the existing ratio.

It thus resulted that the Treasury notes issued in payment of silver purchases under the law of 1890 were necessarily treated as gold obligations, at the option of the holder. These notes on the 1st day of November, 1893, when the law compelling the monthly purchase of silver was repealed, amounted to more than $155,000,000. The notes of this description now outstanding added to the United States notes still undiminished by redemption or cancellation constitute a volume of gold obligations amounting to nearly $500,000,000. These obligations are the instruments which, ever since we have had a gold reserve, have been used to deplete it.

This reserve, as has been stated, had fallen in April, 1893, to $97,011,330. It has from that time to the present, with very few and unimportant upward movements, steadily decreased, except as it has been temporarily replenished by the sale of bonds.

Among the causes for this constant and uniform shrinkage in this fund may be mentioned the great falling off of exports under the operation of the tariff law until recently in force, which crippled our exchange of commodities with foreign nations and necessitated to some extent the payment of our balances in gold; the unnatural infusion of silver into our currency, and the increasing agitation for its free and unlimited coinage, which have created apprehension as to our disposition or ability to continue gold payments; the consequent hoarding of gold at home and the stoppage of investments of foreign capital, as well as the return of our securities already sold abroad; and the high rate of foreign exchange, which induced the shipment of our gold to be drawn against, as a matter of speculation.

In consequence of these conditions the gold reserve on the 1st day of February, 1894, was reduced to $65,438,377, having lost more than $31,000,000 during the preceding nine months, or since April, 1893. Its replenishment being necessary, and no other manner of accomplishing it being possible, resort was had to the issue and sale of bonds provided for by the resumption act of 1875. Fifty millions of these bonds were sold, yielding $58,633,295.71, which was added to the reserve fund of gold then on hand. As a result of this operation this reserve, which had suffered constant and large withdrawals in the meantime, stood on the 6th day of March, 1894, at the sum of $107,446,802. Its depletion was, however, immediately thereafter so accelerated that on the 30th day of June, 1894, it had fallen to $64,873,025, thus losing by withdrawals more than $42,000,000 in five months and dropping slightly below its situation when the sale of $50,000,000 in bonds was effected for its replenishment.

This depressed condition grew worse, and on the 24th day of November, 1894, our gold reserve being reduced to $57,669,701, it became necessary to again strengthen it. This was done by another sale of bonds amounting to $50,000,000, from which there was realized $58,538.500, with which the fund was increased to $111,142,021 on the 4th day of December, 1894.

Again disappointment awaited the anxious hope for relief. There was not even a lull in the exasperating withdrawals of gold. On the contrary, they grew larger and more persistent than ever. Between the 4th day of December, 1894, and early in February, 1895, a period of scarcely more than two months after the second reenforcement of our gold reserve by the sale of bonds, it had lost by such withdrawals more than $69,000,000, and had fallen to $41,340,181. Nearly $43,000,000 had been withdrawn within the month immediately preceding this situation.

In anticipation of impending trouble, I had on the 28th day of January, 1895, addressed a communication to the Congress fully setting forth our difficulties and dangerous position, and earnestly recommending that authority be given the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds bearing a low rate of interest, payable by their terms in gold, for the purpose of maintaining a sufficient gold reserve, and also for the redemption and cancellation of outstanding United States notes and the Treasury notes issued for the purchase of silver under the law of 1890. This recommendation did not, however, meet with legislative approval.

In February, 1895, therefore, the situation was exceedingly critical. With a reserve perilously low and a refusal of Congressional aid, everything indicated that the end of gold payments by the Government was imminent. The results of prior bond issues had been exceedingly unsatisfactory, and the large withdrawals of gold immediately succeeding their public sale in open market gave rise to a reasonable suspicion that a large part of the gold paid into the Treasury upon such sales was promptly drawn out again by the presentation of United States notes or Treasury notes and found its way to the hands of those who had only temporarily parted with it in the purchase of bonds.

In this emergency, and in view of its surrounding perplexities, it became entirely apparent to those upon whom the struggle for safety was devolved not only that our gold reserve must, for the third time in less than thirteen months, be restored by another issue and sale of bonds bearing a high rate of interest and badly suited to the purpose, but that a plan must be adopted for their disposition promising better results than those realized on previous sales. An agreement was therefore made with a number of financiers and bankers whereby it was stipulated that bonds described in the resumption act of 1875, payable in coin thirty years after their date, bearing interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, and amounting to about $62,000,000, should be exchanged for gold, receivable by weight, amounting to a little more than $65,000,000.

This gold was to be delivered in such installments as would complete its delivery within about six months from the date of the contract, and at least one-half of the amount was to be furnished from abroad. It was also agreed by those supplying this gold that

during the continuance of the contract they would by every means in their power protect the Government against gold withdrawals. The contract also provided that if Congress would authorize their issue, bonds payable by their terms in gold and bearing interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum might within ten days be substituted at par for the 4 per cent bonds described in the agreement.

On the day this contract was made its terms were communicated to Congress by a special Executive message, in which it was stated that more than sixteen millions of dollars would be saved to the Government if gold bonds bearing 3 per cent interest were authorized to be substituted for those mentioned in the contract.

The Congress having declined to grant the necessary authority to secure this saving, the contract, unmodified, was carried out, resulting in a gold reserve amounting to $107,571,230 on the 8th day of July, 1895. The performance of this contract not only restored the reserve, but checked for a time the withdrawals of gold and brought on a period of restored confidence and such peace and quiet in business circles as were of the greatest possible value to every interest that affects our people. I have never had the slightest misgiving concerning the wisdom or propriety of this arrangement, and am quite willing to answer for my full share of responsibility for its promotion. I believe it averted a disaster the imminence of which was, fortunately, not at the time generally understood by our people.

Though the contract mentioned stayed for a time the tide of gold withdrawal, its good results could not be permanent. Recent withdrawals have reduced the reserve from $107,571,230 on the 8th day of July, 1895, to $79,333,966. How long it will remain large enough to render its increase unnecessary is only matter of conjecture, though quite large withdrawals for shipment in the immediate future are predicted in well-informed quarters. About $16,000,000 has been withdrawn during the month of November.

The foregoing statement of events and conditions develops the fact that after increasing our interest-bearing bonded indebtedness more than $162,000,000 to save our gold reserve we are nearly where we started, having now in such reserve $79,333,966, as against $65,438,377 in February, 1894, when the first bonds were issued.

Though the amount of gold drawn from the Treasury appears to be very large, as gathered from the facts and figures herein presented, it actually was much larger, considerable sums having been acquired by the Treasury within the several periods stated without the issue of bonds. On the 28th of January, 1895, it was reported by the Secretary of the Treasury that more than $172,000,000 of gold had been withdrawn for hoarding or shipment during the year preceding. He now reports that from January 1, 1879, to July 14, 1890, a period of more than eleven years, only a little over $28,000,000 was withdrawn, and that between July 14, 1890, the date of the passage of the law for an increased purchase of silver, and the 1st day of December, 1895, or within less than five and a half years, there was withdrawn nearly $375,000,000, making a total of more than $403,000,000 drawn from the Treasury in gold since January 1, 1879, the date fixed in 1875 for the retirement of the United States notes.

Nearly $327,000,000 of the gold thus withdrawn has been paid out on these United States notes; and yet every one of the $346,000,000 is still uncanceled and ready to do service in future gold depletions.

More than $76,000,000 in gold has, since their creation in 1890, been paid out from the Treasury upon the notes given on the purchase of silver by the Government; and yet the whole, amounting to $155,000,000, except a little more than $16,000,000, which have been retired by exchanges for silver at the request of the holders, remains outstanding and prepared to join their older and more experienced allies in future raids upon the Treasury's gold reserve.

In other words, the Government has paid in gold more than nine-tenths of its United States notes and still owes them all. It has paid in gold about one-half of its notes given for silver purchases without extinguishing by such payment one dollar of these notes.

When added to all this we are reminded that to carry on this astounding financial scheme the Government has incurred a bonded indebtedness of $95,500,000 in establishing a gold reserve, and of $162,315,400 in efforts to maintain it; that the annual interest charged on such bonded indebtedness is more than $11,000,000; that a continuance in our present course may result in further bond issues, and that we have suffered or are threatened with all this for the sake of supplying gold for foreign shipment or facilitating its hoarding at home, a situation is exhibited which certainly ought to arrest attention and provoke immediate legislative relief.

I am convinced the only thorough and practicable remedy for our troubles is found in the retirement and cancellation of our United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, and the outstanding Treasury notes issued by the Government in payment of silver purchases under the act of 1890.

I believe this could be quite readily accomplished by the exchange of these notes for United States bonds of small as well as large denominations, bearing a low rate of interest. They should be long-term bonds, thus increasing their desirability as investments, and because their payment could be well postponed to a period far removed from present financial burdens and perplexities, when with increased prosperity and resources they would be more easily met.

To further insure the cancellation of these notes and also provide a way by which gold may be added to our currency in lieu of them, a feature in the plan should be an authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury to dispose of the bonds abroad for gold if necessary to complete the contemplated redemption and cancellation, permitting him to use the proceeds of such bonds to take up and cancel any of the notes that may be in the Treasury or that may be received by the Government on any account.

The increase of our bonded debt involved in this plan would be amply compensated by renewed activity and enterprise in all business circles, the restored confidence at home, the reinstated faith in our monetary strength abroad, and the stimulation of every interest and industry that would follow the cancellation of the gold-demand obligations now afflicting us. In any event the bonds proposed would stand for the extinguishment of a troublesome indebtedness, while in the path we now follow there lurks the menace of unending bonds, with our indebtedness still undischarged and aggravated in every feature. The obligations necessary to fund this indebtedness would not equal in amount those from which we have been relieved since 1884 by anticipation and payment, beyond the requirements of the sinking fund, out of our surplus revenues.

The currency withdrawn by the retirement of the United States notes and Treasury notes, amounting to probably less than $486,000,000, might be supplied by such gold as would be used on their retirement or by an increase in the circulation of our national banks. Though the aggregate capital of those now in existence amounts to more than $664,000,000, their outstanding circulation based on bond security amounts to only about $190,000,000. They are authorized to issue notes amounting to 90 per cent of the bonds deposited to secure their circulation, but in no event beyond the amount of their capital stock, and they are obliged to pay 1 per cent tax on the circulation they issue.

I think they should be allowed to issue circulation equal to the par value of the bonds they deposit to secure it, and that the tax on their circulation should be reduced to one-fourth of 1 per cent, which would undoubtedly meet all the expense the Government incurs on their account. In addition they should be allowed to substitute or deposit in lieu of the bonds now required as security for their circulation those which would be issued for the purpose of retiring the United States notes and Treasury notes.

The banks already existing, if they desired to avail themselves of the provisions of law thus modified, could issue circulation in addition to that already outstanding, amounting to $478,000,000, which would nearly or quite equal the currency proposed to be canceled. At any rate, I should confidently expect to see the existing national banks or others to be organized avail themselves of the proposed encouragements to issue circulation and promptly fill any vacuum and supply every currency need.

It has always seemed to me that the provisions of law regarding the capital of national banks which operate as a limitation to their location fails to make proper compensation for the suppression of State banks, which came near to the people in all sections of the country and readily furnished them with banking accommodations and facilities. Any inconvenience or embarrassment arising from these restrictions on the location of national banks might well be remedied by better adapting the present system to the creation of banks in smaller communities or by permitting banks of large capital to establish branches in such localities as would serve the people—so regulated and restrained as to secure their safe and conservative control and management.

But there might not be the necessity for such an addition to the currency by new issues of bank circulation as at first glance is indicated. If we should be relieved from maintaining a gold reserve under conditions that constitute it the barometer of our solvency, and if our Treasury should no longer be the foolish purveyor of gold for nations abroad or for speculation and hoarding by our citizens at home, I should expect to see gold resume its natural and normal functions in the business affairs of the country and cease to be an object attracting the timid watch of our people and exciting their sensitive imaginations.

I do not overlook the fact that the cancellation of the Treasury notes issued under the silver-purchasing act of 1890 would leave the Treasury in the actual ownership of sufficient silver, including seigniorage, to coin nearly $178,000,000 in standard dollars. It is worthy of consideration whether this might not, from time to time, be converted into dollars or fractional coin and slowly put into circulation, as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury the necessities of the country should require.

Whatever is attempted should be entered upon fully appreciating the fact that by careless, easy descent we have reached a dangerous depth, and that our ascent will not be accomplished without laborious toil and struggle. We shall be wise if we realize that we are financially ill and that our restoration to health may require heroic treatment and unpleasant remedies.

In the present stage of our difficulty it is not easy to understand how the amount of our revenue receipts directly affects it. The important question is not the quantity of money received in revenue payments, but the kind of money we maintain and our ability to continue in sound financial condition. We are considering the Government's holdings of gold as related to the soundness of our money and as affecting our national credit and monetary strength.

If our gold reserve had never been impaired; if no bonds had ever been issued to replenish it; if there had been no fear and timidity concerning our ability to continue gold payments; if any part of our revenues were now paid in gold, and if we could look to our gold receipts as a means of maintaining a safe reserve, the amount of our revenues would be an influential factor in the problem. But unfortunately all the circumstances that might lend weight to this consideration are entirely lacking.

In our present predicament no gold is received by the Government in payment of revenue charges, nor would there be if the revenues were increased. The receipts of the Treasury, when not in silver certificates, consist of United States notes and Treasury notes issued for silver purchases. These forms of money are only useful to the Government in paying its current ordinary expenses, and its quantity in Government possession does not in the least contribute toward giving us that kind of safe financial standing or condition which is built on gold alone.

If it is said that these notes if held by the Government can be used to obtain gold for our reserve, the answer is easy. The people draw gold from the Treasury on demand upon United States notes and Treasury notes, but the proposition that the Treasury can on demand draw gold from the people upon them would be regarded in these days with wonder and amusement. And even if this could be done, there is nothing to prevent those thus parting with their gold from regaining it the next day or the next hour by the presentation of the notes they received in exchange for it.

The Secretary of the Treasury might use such notes taken from a surplus revenue to buy gold in the market. Of course he could not do this without paying a premium. Private holders of gold, unlike the Government, having no parity to maintain, would not be restrained from making the best bargain possible when they furnished gold to the Treasury; but the moment the Secretary of the Treasury bought gold on any terms above par he would establish a general and universal premium upon it, thus breaking down the parity between gold and silver which the Government is pledged to maintain, and opening the way to new and serious complications. In the meantime the premium would not remain stationary, and the absurd spectacle might be presented of a dealer selling gold to the Government, and with United States notes or Treasury notes in his hand immediately clamoring for its return and a resale at a higher premium.

It may be claimed that a large revenue and redundant receipts might favorably affect the situation under discussion by affording an opportunity of retaining these notes in the Treasury when received, and thus preventing their presentation for gold. Such retention to be useful ought to be at least measurably permanent; and this is precisely what is prohibited, so far as United States notes are concerned, by the law of 1878 forbidding their further retirement. That statute in so many words provides that these notes when received into the Treasury and belonging to the United States shall be "paid out again and kept in circulation."

It will, moreover, be readily seen that the Government could not refuse to pay out United States notes and Treasury notes in current transactions when demanded and insist on paying out silver alone and still maintain the parity between that metal and the currency representing gold. Besides, the accumulation in the Treasury of currency of any kind exacted from the people through taxation is justly regarded as an evil, and it can not proceed far without vigorous protest against an unjustifiable retention of money from the business of the country and a denunciation of a scheme of taxation which proves itself to be unjust when it takes from the earnings and income of the citizen money so much in excess of the needs of Government support that large sums can be gathered and kept in the Treasury. Such a condition has heretofore in times of surplus revenue led the Government to restore currency to the people by the purchase of its unmatured bonds at a large premium and by a large increase of its deposits in national banks, and we easily remember that the abuse of Treasury accumulation has furnished a most persuasive argument in favor of legislation radically reducing our tariff taxation.

Perhaps it is supposed that sufficient revenue receipts would in a sentimental way improve the situation, by inspiring confidence in our solvency and allaying the fear of pecuniary exhaustion. And yet through all our struggles to maintain our gold reserve there never has been any apprehension as to our ready ability to pay our way with such money as we had; and the question whether or not our current receipts met our current expenses has not entered into the estimate of our solvency. Of course the general state of our funds, exclusive of gold, was entirely immaterial to the foreign creditor and investor. His debt could only be paid in gold, and his only concern was our ability to keep on hand that kind of money.

On July 1, 1892, more than a year and a half before the first bonds were issued to replenish the gold reserve, there was a net balance in the Treasury, exclusive of such reserve, of less than $13,000,000; but the gold reserve amounted to more than $114,000,000, which was the quieting feature of the situation. It was when the stock of gold began rapidly to fall that fright supervened and our securities held abroad were returned for sale and debts owed abroad were pressed for payment. In the meantime extensive shipments of gold and other unfavorable indications caused restlessness and fright among our people at home. Thereupon the general state of our funds, exclusive of gold, became also immaterial to them, and they, too, drew gold from the Treasury for hoarding against all contingencies. This is plainly shown by the large increase in the proportion of gold withdrawn which was retained by our own people as time and threatening incidents progressed. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, nearly $85,000,000 in gold was withdrawn from the Treasury and about $77,000,000 was sent abroad, while during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, over $117,000,000 was drawn out, of which only about $66,000,000 was shipped, leaving the large balance of such withdrawals to be accounted for by domestic hoarding.

Inasmuch as the withdrawal of our gold has resulted largely from fright, there is nothing apparent that will prevent its continuance or recurrence, with its natural consequences, except such a change in our financial methods as will reassure the frightened and make the desire for gold less intense. It is not clear how an increase in revenue, unless it be in gold, can satisfy those whose only anxiety is to gain gold from the Government's store.

It can not therefore be safe to rely upon increased revenues as a cure for our present troubles.

It is possible that the suggestion of increased revenue as a remedy for the difficulties we are considering may have originated in an intimation or distinct allegation that the bonds which have been issued ostensibly to replenish our gold reserve were really issued to supply insufficient revenue. Nothing can be further from the truth. Bonds were issued to obtain gold for the maintenance of our national credit. As has been shown, the gold thus obtained has been drawn again from the Treasury upon United States notes and Treasury notes. This operation would have been promptly prevented if possible; but these notes having thus been passed to the Treasury, they became the money of the Government, like any other ordinary Government funds, and there was nothing to do but to use them in paying Government expenses when needed.

At no time when bonds have been issued has there been any consideration of the question of paying the expenses of Government with their proceeds. There was no necessity to consider that question. At the time of each bond issue we had a safe surplus in the Treasury for ordinary operations, exclusive of the gold in our reserve. In February, 1894, when the first issue of bonds was made, such surplus amounted to over $18,000,000; in November, when the second issue was made, it amounted to more than $42,000,000, and in February, 1895, when bonds for the third time were issued, such surplus amounted to more than $100,000,000. It now amounts to $98,072,420.30.

Besides all this, the Secretary of the Treasury had no authority whatever to issue bonds to increase the ordinary revenues or pay current expenses.

I can not but think there has been some confusion of ideas regarding the effects of the issue of bonds and the results of the withdrawal of gold. It was the latter process and not the former that by substituting in the Treasury United States notes and Treasury notes for gold increased by their amount the money which was in the first instance subject to ordinary Government expenditure.

Although the law compelling an increased purchase of silver by the Government was passed on the 14th day of July, 1890, withdrawals of gold from the Treasury upon the notes given in payment on such purchases did not begin until October, 1891. Immediately following that date the withdrawals upon both these notes and United States notes increased very largely, and have continued to such an extent that since the passage of that law there has been more than thirteen times as much gold taken out of the Treasury upon United States notes and Treasury notes issued for silver purchases as was thus withdrawn during the eleven and a half years immediately prior thereto and after the 1st day of January, 1879, when specie payments were resumed.

It is neither unfair nor unjust to charge a large share of our present financial perplexities and dangers to the operation of the

laws of 1878 and 1890 compelling the purchase of silver by the Government, which not only furnished a new Treasury obligation upon which its gold could be withdrawn, but so increased the fear of an overwhelming flood of silver and a forced descent to silver payments that even the repeal of these laws did not entirely cure the evils of their existence.

While I have endeavored to make a plain statement of the disordered condition of our currency and the present dangers menacing our prosperity, and to suggest a way which leads to a safer financial system, I have constantly had in mind the fact that many of my countrymen, whose sincerity I do not doubt, insist that the cure for the ills now threatening us may be found in the single and simple remedy of the free coinage of silver. They contend that our mints shall be at once thrown open to the free, unlimited, and independent coinage of both gold and silver dollars of full legal-tender quality, regardless of the action of any other Government and in full view of the fact that the ratio between the metals which they suggest calls for 100 cents' worth of gold in the gold dollar at the present standard and only 50 cents in intrinsic worth of silver in the silver dollar.

Were there infinitely stronger reasons than can be adduced for hoping that such action would secure for us a bimetallic currency moving on lines of parity, an experiment so novel and hazardous as that proposed might well stagger those who believe that stability is an imperative condition of sound money.

No government, no human contrivance or act of legislation, has ever been able to hold the two metals together in free coinage at a ratio appreciably different from that which is established in the markets of the world.

Those who believe that our independent free coinage of silver at an artificial ratio with gold of 16 to 1 would restore the parity between the metals, and consequently between the coins, oppose an unsupported and improbable theory to the general belief and practice of other nations, and to the teaching of the wisest statesmen and economists of the world, both in the past and present, and, what is far more conclusive, they run counter to our own actual experiences.

Twice in our earlier history our lawmakers in attempting to establish a bimetallic currency undertook free coinage upon a ratio which accidentally varied from the actual relative values of the two metals not more than 3 per cent. In both cases, notwithstanding greater difficulties and cost of transportation than now exist, the coins whose intrinsic worth was undervalued in the ratio gradually and surely disappeared from our circulation and went to other countries where their real value was better recognized.

Acts of Congress were impotent to create equality where natural causes decreed even a slight inequality.

Twice in our recent history we have signally failed to raise by legislation the value of silver. Under an act of Congress passed in 1878 the Government was required for more than twelve years to expend annually at least $24,000,000 in the purchase of silver bullion for coinage. The act of July 14, 1890, in a still bolder effort increased the amount of silver the Government was compelled to purchase, and forced it to become the buyer annually of 54,000,000 ounces, or practically the entire product of our mines. Under both laws silver rapidly and steadily declined in value. The prophecy and the expressed hope and expectation of those in the Congress who led in the passage of the last-mentioned act, that it would reestablish and maintain the former parity between the two metals, are still fresh in our memory.

In the light of these experiences, which accord with the experiences of other nations, there is certainly no secure ground for the belief that an act of Congress could now bridge an inequality of 50 per cent between gold and silver at our present ratio, nor is there the least possibility that our country, which has less than one-seventh of the silver money in the world, could by its action alone raise not only our own, but all silver to its lost ratio with gold. Our attempt to accomplish this by the free coinage of silver at a ratio differing widely from actual relative values would be the signal for the complete departure of gold from our circulation, the immediate and large contraction of our circulating medium, and a shrinkage in the real value and monetary efficiency of all other forms of currency as they settled to the level of silver monometallism. Everyone who receives a fixed salary and every worker for wages would find the dollar in his hand ruthlessly scaled down to the point of bitter disappointment if not to pinching privation.

A change in our standard to silver monometallism would also bring on a collapse of the entire system of credit which, when based on a standard which is recognized and adopted by the world of business, is many times more potent and useful than the entire volume of currency and is safely capable of almost indefinite expansion to meet the growth of trade and enterprise. In a self-invited struggle through darkness and uncertainty our humiliation would be increased by the consciousness that we had parted company with all the enlightened and progressive nations of the world, and were desperately and hopelessly striving to meet the stress of modern commerce and competition with a debased and unsuitable currency, and in association with the few weak and laggard nations which have silver alone as their standard of value.

All history warns us against rash experiments which threaten violent changes in our monetary standard and the degradation of our currency. The past is full of lessons teaching not only the economic dangers, but the national immorality that follows in the train of such experiments. I will not believe that the American people can be persuaded after sober deliberation to jeopardize their nation's prestige and proud standing by encouraging financial nostrums, nor that they will yield to the false allurements of cheap money, when they realize that it must result in the weakening of that financial integrity and rectitude which thus far in our history has been so devotedly cherished as one of the traits of true Americanism.

Our country's indebtedness, whether owing by the Government or existing between individuals, has been contracted with reference to our present standard. To decree by act of Congress that these debts shall be payable in less valuable dollars than those within the contemplation and intention of the parties when contracted would operate to transfer, by the fiat of law and without compensation, an amount of property and a volume of rights and interests almost incalculable.

Those who advocate a blind and headlong plunge to free coinage in the name of bimetallism and professing the belief, contrary to all experience, that we could thus establish a double standard and a concurrent circulation of both metals in our coinage, are certainly reckoning from a cloudy standpoint. Our present standard of value is the standard of the civilized world and permits the only bimetallism now possible, or at least that is within the independent reach of any single nation, however powerful that nation may be. While the value of gold as a standard is steadied by almost universal commercial and business use, it does not despise silver nor seek its banishment. Wherever this standard is maintained there is at its side in free and unquestioned circulation a volume of silver currency sometimes equaling and sometimes even exceeding it in amount, both maintained at a parity notwithstanding a depreciation or fluctuation in the intrinsic value of silver.

There is a vast difference between a standard of value and a currency for monetary use. The standard must necessarily be fixed and certain. The currency may be in divers forms and of various kinds. No silver-standard country has a gold currency in circulation; but an enlightened and wise system of finance secures the benefits of both gold and silver as currency and circulating medium by keeping the standard stable and all other currency at par with it. Such a system and such a standard also gives free scope for the use and expansion of safe and conservative credit, so indispensable to broad and growing commercial transactions and so well substituted for the actual use of money. If a fixed and stable standard is maintained such as the magnitude and safety of our commercial transactions and business require, the use of money itself is conveniently minimized.

Every dollar of fixed and stable value has through the agency of confident credit and astonishing capacity of multiplying itself in financial work. Every unstable and fluctuating dollar fails as a basis of credit, and in its use begets gambling speculation and undermines the foundations of honest enterprise.

I have ventured to express myself on this subject with earnestness and plainness of speech because I can not rid myself of the belief that there lurks in the proposition for the free coinage of silver, so strongly approved and so enthusiastically advocated by a multitude of my countrymen, a serious menace to our prosperity and an insidious temptation of our people to wander from the allegiance they owe to public and private integrity. It is because I do not distrust the good faith and sincerity of those who press this scheme that I have imperfectly, but with zeal submitted my thoughts upon this momentous subject. I can not refrain from begging them to reexamine their views and beliefs in the light of patriotic reason and familiar experience, and to weigh again and again the consequences of such legislation as their efforts have invited. Even the continued agitation of the subject adds greatly to the difficulties of a dangerous financial situation already forced upon us.

In conclusion, I especially entreat the people's representatives in the Congress, who are charged with the responsibility of inaugurating measures for the safety and prosperity of our common country, to promptly and effectively consider the ills of our critical financial plight. I have suggested a remedy which my judgment approves. I desire, however, to assure the Congress that I am prepared to cooperate with them in perfecting any other measure promising thorough and practical relief, and that I will gladly labor with them in every patriotic endeavor to further the interests and guard the welfare of our countrymen whom in our respective places of duty we have undertaken to serve.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *December 2, 1895.*

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the message lie on the table and be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year ended October 31, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report of the Secretary of the Senate, communicating, in obediedce to law, a statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate from July 1, 1894, to June 30, 1895; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Senate, submitting, in obedience to law, a full and complete account of all property belonging to the United States in his possession on the 2d day of December, 1895; which was which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

REPORTS OF SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, submitting a full and complete account of all property belonging to the United States in his possession December 2, 1895; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, transmitting a full and complete statement of all money received from sale of condemned property belonging to the United States from December 3, 1894, to date, and disposition made of same; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Government directors of the Union Pacific Railway Company for the year 1895; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads, and ordered to be printed.

CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY BUILDING.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the report of Thomas L. Casey, brigadier-general United States Army, relative to the progress of the construction of the building for the Library of Congress during the year ended December 1, 1895; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Select Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by that court and the amounts thereof for the year ended November 30, 1895; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of New York; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, *In Assembly, Albany, February 15, 1895.*

Whereas from published reports of the stranding of the schooners *John V. Manning* and *Louis V. Place*, on the coast of Long Island, between the Lone Hill and the Blue Point life-saving stations, during the terrible storm of wind and snow which swept over the country through the night of February 7 and the day of February 8, it is made entirely clear that the rescue of the crew of the former vessel and of the two survivors of the crew of the latter vessel was effected by the brave men of the above-named stations only through the exercise by them of the highest qualities of human endurance, energy, skill, and dauntless devotion to duty; and

Whereas the tribute of popular esteem and applause is due to such self-sacrificing heroism in the cause of our common humanity: Therefore be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the legislature of the State of New York feels a proper pride in recognizing such noble deeds on the part of its citizens, and does hereby extend the thanks of the people of this State to Captains Baker and Rourke and their gallant crews of the Lone Hill and Blue Point stations for the service they rendered not only to the immediate subjects of their courage and skill, but also to the whole "brotherhood of man," when for over forty hours of continuous effort, without rest or sleep, night and day, they labored through gloom and gale and bitter frost to save human lives, and when at midnight of February 9 they launched a lifeboat into an ice-covered sea and at the peril of their own lives pushed off to snatch from the jaws of death two seemingly doomed victims of the storm. Such a service belongs to humanity and deserves universal admiration.

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That an engrossed copy of these resolutions be sent to each person named therein, properly attested by the president and clerk of the senate and the speaker and clerk of the assembly; and also to the United States Senate and House of Representatives at Washington.

By order of the assembly.

HAMILTON FISH, *Speaker.*
A. E. BAXTER, *Clerk.*

IN SENATE, *February 18, 1895.*

Concurred in without amendment.
By order of the senate.

CHARLES T. SAXTON, *President.*
JNO. S. KENYON, *Clerk.*

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago and Quincy, in the State of Illinois; a petition of sundry citizens of Hobart, N. Y.; a petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., and a petition of the Ministerial Association of Harrisburg, Pa., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM. I present resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the citizens of Evanston, Ill., in relation to the deplorable condition existing in Turkey, and calling upon our Government to do everything in its power to save life, and in favor of those institutions of Christian civilization that make for peace, liberty, and religious toleration. I move that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the board of supervisors of Sangamon County, Ill., praying that an appropriation be made to build a substantial, permanent roadway from the city of Springfield, in the State of Illinois, to Camp Butler, a national cemetery in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition in the shape of resolutions adopted by the Methodist Episcopal Church of Marlboro, N. H., signed by George W. Buzzell, pastor, praying that the Armenian wrongs be immediately and permanently righted; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the selectmen and 350 other citizens of Marblehead, Mass., praying that an appropriation be made to build a sea wall for the protection of Marblehead Harbor; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Rev. Charles H. Oliphant and other citizens of Methuen, Mass., and the petition of Rev. Professor Smyth, of the Andover (Mass.) Theological Seminary, and other citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the immediate establishment of United States consulates in the Armenian centers, and that every proper effort be made by the Government for the protection of the Christian population of Turkey; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DUBOIS. I present a memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, passed after the adjournment of the last Congress, praying for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people. I ask that the memorial be read and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The memorial was read, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Secretary's Office, State of Idaho:

I, I. W. Garrett, secretary of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 5, which was filed in this office the 5th day of March, A. D. 1895, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State.

Done at Boise, the capital of Idaho, this 18th day of March, A. D. 1895.
[SEAL.] I. W. GARRETT, *Secretary of State.*

[House joint memorial No. 5.]

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent, that the sentiment of the people of the State of Idaho is almost unanimous in favor of the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and we petition your honorable body to submit to the States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will require the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

The secretary of state is hereby authorized to send certified copies of this memorial to our representatives in Congress.

Passed the house of representatives February 21, 1895.

R. V. COZIER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate March 4, 1895.

FREDERICK J. MILLS,
President of the Senate.

Approved this 5th day of March, 1895.

W. J. McCONNELL, *Governor.*

Mr. DUBOIS presented a memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, praying that an appropriation be made for the purpose of removing certain obstructions in Clarks Fork of the Columbia River, near the international boundary line between the United States and British Columbia; which was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Secretary's Office, State of Idaho:

I, I. W. Garrett, secretary of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 5, which was filed in this office the 5th day of March, A. D. 1895, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State.

Done at Boise, the capital of Idaho, this 18th day of March, A. D. 1895.
[SEAL.] I. W. GARRETT, *Secretary of State.*

[Senate joint memorial No. 5.—By Browne.—Praying for the removal of certain obstructions existing in the Clarks Fork of the Columbia River.]

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Idaho, represent to your honorable body that there now exists in Clarks Fork of the Columbia River, at or near the international boundary line between the United States and British America, certain falls which prevent the access of

the Columbia River salmon into the lakes and rivers of northern Idaho and western Montana. We further represent that by the removal of said obstructions these fish would be able to ascend into the large lakes and rivers of a great area of country, embracing all of northern Idaho and western Montana, and that the benefits of the citizens of these States would be very great, not only in furnishing food, but in also making possible the establishment of large canning and fishing industries. For these and other reasons, your memorialists earnestly pray for an appropriation for the purpose of removing those obstructions.

Approved March 5, 1895.

W. J. McCONNELL, *Governor.*

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lake County, Oreg., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Modoc County, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation giving permission to any person or persons to tap the waters of Goose Lake, in those counties; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented the petition of John Thurman, of Portland, Oreg., praying that compensation be granted him for injuries received while employed as a deck hand on the steamboat *Corvallis*, which was engaged in the improvement of the Cowlitz River in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of citizens of Skagit County, in the State of Washington, respectfully showing, by a reference to the map of the State, that the Skagit River is the largest and most important tributary to Puget Sound. The petitioners state that the river is navigable for steamers plying on that sound for a distance of 90 miles from its mouth; and that it is an important stream for national purposes. The petitioners also call attention to the fact that very small appropriations have been made by Congress for improving the Skagit River, whilst large amounts, aggregating over $1,000,000, have been contributed and expended for that purpose by the citizens of Skagit County and for protecting their lands by diking against the waters. They also state that much damage to crops, lands, and timber has been done in this valley by recent floods, estimating their loss at $1,000,000; and they pray that sufficient appropriations be made for improving the navigation of Puget Sound and its tributaries, and that the appropriation for Skagit River be segregated and expended in that work. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Commerce. I regard it as being worthy of the careful attention of the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Commercial Club, a body of business men, of Tacoma, State of Washington, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TURPIE. I present the petition of Mrs. Eliza J. Gray, widow of Hon. Isaac P. Gray, deceased, late United States minister to the Republic of Mexico, praying that relief be granted her in consequence of the death of her late husband, which resulted from a severe cold contracted whilst on his way to his post. I move that the petition and accompanying paper be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PASCO presented a petition of the city council of St. Augustine, Fla., and a petition of the city council of Tampa, Fla., praying for the recognition of the government recently organized on the Island of Cuba as a belligerent power in their contest with Spain; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of the legislature of the State of Maine, praying that the birthday of Abraham Lincoln be made a national holiday; which was referred to the Committee on the Library, as follows:

STATE OF MAINE:

Whereas a grateful and united nation recognize that Abraham Lincoln was the savior of his country, as Washington was its defender; and

Whereas his exalted leadership as President of the United States through the darkest hours of the nation's life has rendered his name immortal by his distinguished services for union and liberty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the people of Maine, by its senate and house of representatives in legislature assembled, earnestly ask that, by an act of Congress, the 12th day of February, the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, be made a national holiday.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolves be sent by the secretary of state to each member of our delegation in Congress.

HOUSE, *March 19, 1895.*

Read and adopted.
Sent up for concurrence.

W. S. COTTON, *Clerk.*

SENATE, *March 20, 1895.*

Read and adopted in concurrence.

KENDALL M. DUNBAR, *Secretary.*

A true copy. Attest:
NICHOLAS FESSENDEN,
Secretary of State.

REPORT ON THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Mr. MILLS presented a special report of the Librarian of Congress, made in obedience to a provision of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act passed by the last Congress in March, 1895, requiring the Librarian of Congress to make to the next regular session of Congress a full report touching a complete reorganization of the Library of Congress; which was referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 2) to provide for the free and unlimited coinage of silver; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3) to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to a portion of the Pyramid Lake Reservation, in Nevada, and to the entire Walker River Reservation, in said State, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4) for the relief of Gen. Napoleon J. T. Dana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5) referring to the Treasury Department the claims of sundry persons for examination, adjustment, and report to Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6) for the relief of P. S. Corbett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7) to refund illegal internal-revenue tax collected of the late Alexander W. Baldwin as United States district judge for the district of Nevada; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 8) for the relief of William J. Murtagh, late proprietor of the National Republican, of Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 9) to amend chapter 6 of Title XXXII of the Revised Statutes, relating to mineral lands and mining resources; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also introduced a bill (S. 10) to provide for the formation of cooperative business corporations in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also introduced a bill (S. 11) to remove the political disabilities of Gen. B. H. Robertson, of Amelia Court-House, Amelia County, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 12) for the relief of the La Grange Synodical College of La Grange, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 13) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel Tate, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 14) for the relief of Pearson C. Montgomery, of Memphis, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 15) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Bethel Springs, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 16) for the relief of W. J. Smith and D. M. Wisdom; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 17) for the relief of Mary Ellen Atkinson, administratrix of the estate of Richard Atkinson, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 18) for the relief of D. W. and Minna H. Glassie and Joseph C. Nash; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 19) for the relief of John L. Rhea, executor of Samuel Rhea, deceased, and John Anderson, administrator of Joseph R. Anderson, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 20) for the relief of Cumberland Female College of McMinnville, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 21) to authorize the investigation by the Attorney-General of certain claims alleged to be due the late proprietors of the Knoxville Whig for advertising, and authorizing the payment therefor by the Secretary of the Treasury of any amounts found by the Attorney-General to be legally or equitably due; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 22) for the relief of James Warr estate; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 23) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 24) for the relief of N. C. Perkins, administrator; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 25) authorizing the Dyersburg and Mississippi River Railway and Improvement Company to bridge the Obion River in the State of Tennessee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 26) fixing the fees of United States circuit court commissioners, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 27) for the relief of Mrs. F. W. Wallace; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 28) to provide for continuing the system of trunk sewers in the District of Columbia, for completing the system of sewage disposal and protection against floods, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 29) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," approved March 2, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 30) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," approved March 2, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 31) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 32) for the relief of the legal representatives of John C. Howe, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced a bill (S. 33) for the relief of William H. Foster, of Boston, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, receiver of the Union Steamship Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 34) for the relief of Clara A. Graves, Lewis Smith Lee, Florence P. Lee, Mary S. Sheldon, and Elizabeth Smith, heirs of Lewis Smith, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 35) granting arrearages of pay to Edmund C. Binley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 36) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 37) for payment of balance unpaid on Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war claims for suppression of Indian hostilities in 1855 and 1856, as found due by commission appointed by Secretary of War, consisting of Gen. Rufus Ingalls, Capt. A. J. Smith, and Hon. L. F. Grover, pursuant to act of Congress, and disallowed by Third Auditor of the Treasury, as per his report of February 7, 1860; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 38) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 39) to provide for the construction of a military and commercial telegraphic line along the coast between Yaquina, on Yaquina Bay, and Port Orford, to connect with Newport, on Yaquina Bay; Alsea Bay; Florence, on Siuslaw Bay; Gardiner, on the Umpqua River; Empire City and Marshfield, on Coos Bay, in the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 40) defining and permanently fixing the northern boundary line of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 41) to establish postal savings depositories and subdepositories, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 42) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 43) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes,' approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 44) pensioning soldiers who served in the Cayuse Indian war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 45) pensioning soldiers who served in Indian wars; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 46) entitling veterans of Indian wars to admission to the soldiers' homes in the United States on the same terms as veterans of the late war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 47) to secure the efficiency of the National Guard of the different States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 48) for the relief of the citizens of the States of Oregon, Idaho, and Washington who served with the United States troops in the war against the Nez Perces and Bannock and Shoshone Indians, and for the relief of the heirs of those killed in such service, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 49) fixing the times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States, relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 50) explanatory of an act entitled "An act to settle certain accounts between the United States and the State of Mississippi and other States, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 51) extending the privilege of bounty land to persons who served in the Indian wars of the United States subsequent to March 3, 1855; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 52) to increase and limit the appropriation for a public building at Portland, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 53) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 54) for the relief of Ezra S. Havens; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 55) for the relief of William O'Brien; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 56) for the relief of John M. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 57) for the relief of Napoleon B. Giddings; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 58) for the relief of John S. Neet, jr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 59) for the relief of Joseph W. Carmack; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 60) for the relief of George A. Orr; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 61) for the relief of Frederick Gramm; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 62) to provide for pay and certificates of honorable service to the officers and men of Foster's Cavalry Battalion, Missouri Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 63) for the relief of Charles Wagemann; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 64) for the relief of Jacob Swofford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 65) for the relief of J. E. Gillingwaters; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 66) for the relief of Moses Pendergrass, of Missouri; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 67) for the relief of E. R. Shipley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 68) for the final adjustment of the agricultural college grant to the State of Missouri; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 69) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle the claims of the legal representatives of S. W. Marston, late United States Indian agent at Union Agency, Ind. T., for services and expenses; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 70) to perfect the title of the United States to the tract of land lying on the west side of Lake Pepin and the Mississippi River, in the State of Minnesota, which belonged to the half-breeds or mixed bloods of the Dakota or Sioux Nation of Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 71) for the relief of the Catholic Church at Macon City, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 72) for the relief of Charles P. Chouteau, survivor of Chouteau, Harrison & Valle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 73) for the relief of J. C. Irwin & Co. and Charles A. Perry & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 74) for the relief of William Wolfe, of Shelbina, Shelby County, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 75) for the relief of St. Charles College; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 76) for the relief of L. W. Pritchett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 77) for the relief of Joseph Diehl, of Moniteau County, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 78) for the relief of Aaron Bell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 79) for the relief of Samuel A. Lowe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 80) for the relief of John F. W. Dette; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 81) for the relief of John S. Logan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 82) for the relief of the heirs of James Bridger, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 83) for the relief of Edwin F. Mathews; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 84) for the relief of William Phipps, William Blankenship, and the legal representatives of Moses Summers, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 85) for the relief of D. K. Ponder, of Ripley County, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 86) for the relief of James Price; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 87) for the relief of Sarah E. B. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 88) for the relief of Mary J. Bealmear; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 89) for the relief of William M. Pleas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 90) for the relief of William P. Buckmaster; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 91) for the relief of John L. Peters; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 92) for the relief of Calvin Gunn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 93) to permit Anna M. Colman, a widow, to prosecute a claim; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 94) for the relief of Henry J. Hewitt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 95) for the relief of Michael Dittlinger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 96) to refer the claim of David C. Allen to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 97) for the relief of Benjamin Peter Bailey, treasurer of the Missouri State Lunatic Asylum; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 98) for the relief of Michael Dittlinger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 99) for the relief of William Heryford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 100) for the relief of the estate of John R. Bigelow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PASCO introduced a bill (S. 101) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle the mutual account between the United States and the State of Florida, heretofore examined and stated by said Secretary under the authority of the Congress, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 102) defining the rights and privileges of mixed-blood Indians under the treaties and statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 103) relating to final proof in timber-culture entries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 104) to provide for a governmental telegraph system; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 105) for the erection of a public building at Aberdeen, S. Dak.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 106) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain damages resulting to any person who made entry upon lands within the present limits of the Sequoia and Yosemite National parks, in the State of California, prior to October 1, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 107) granting a pension to Jacob Niebels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 108) to relieve Jacob Wolhart of the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 109) for the relief of John Donnelly, dependent father of Frank Donnelly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 110) for the relief of Lieut. Herbert Cushman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 111) to correct the military record of Reese P. Peoples; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 112) for the relief of Capt. William Fletcher, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 113) to fix the rank, pay, and emoluments of the Commander of the Army of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 114) for the relief of Anna W. Osborne; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 115) for the relief of the estate of Ramsay Crooks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 116) for the relief of the estate of Ramsay Crooks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 117) to increase the appropriation for the erection of a public building at St. Paul, Minn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 118) for the relief of Richard W. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 119) for the relief of William Stanley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 120) for the relief of Jean Louis Legare, of the Dominion of Canada; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 121) extending the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890, to certain persons; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 122) granting a pension to Jerusha Sturgis, widow of Brig. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 123) for the relief of the widow and heirs of Samuel Kramer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 124) to expunge from the records the charge of desertion against Jeremiah Sullivan, Company F, Fourth New Hampshire Volunteers, and to grant him an honorable discharge; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 125) for the relief of Elizabeth J. Cook, of Arkadelphia, Clark County, Ark., widow of Robert T. Cook; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 126) for the relief of Thomas Boles; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 127) for the relief of the legal representatives of Calvin B. Cunningham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 128) making an appropriation toward the construction of a dry dock at the Portsmouth Navy-Yard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 129) for the relief of Capt. George H. Perkins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 130) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 131) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Nashua, in the State of New Hampshire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 132) for the relief of Secor & Co., Perine, Secor & Co., and the executors of Zeno Secor; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 133) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs, or have been totally disabled in them, or have additional disabilities; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 134) to provide for the restatement, readjustment, settlement, and payment of dues to army officers in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 135) to codify and arrange the laws relating to pensions; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 136) granting an increase of pension to Horace Townsend; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 137) granting an increase of pension to William W. French; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 139) granting an increase of pension to Caroline B. Bradford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 140) granting a pension to Mary A. Wise; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 141) granting a pension to Julia A. Hill; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 143) granting an increase of pension to Eugenia R. Sweeny; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 144) granting an increase of pension to Theophilus C. Ingalls; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 145) granting an increase of pension to Maud Ardelle Bliss; which was read twice by its title, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 146) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Towne; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 147) granting a pension to Elvira Bachelder; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 148) granting a pension to Catharine Dillon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 149) granting a pension to Helen M. Jacob; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 150) granting a pension to George W. Gasaway; which was read by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 151) granting a pension to Susan A. Jenkins; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 152) granting a pension to Abel S. Chase; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 153) authorizing the persons therein named to accept certain decorations and testimonials from the late Hawaiian Government; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 154) to provide for the erection of a public building at Indianapolis, Ind.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 155) to construct a road from Springfield, Ill., to the national cemetery adjacent thereto; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 156) granting an increased pension to Washington T. Otey; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 157) for the relief of Jacob A. Henry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 158) to appoint Commodore Edward E. Potter, United States Navy, now on the retired list, to the rank and pay of rear-admiral, retired; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 159) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frederick A. Noeller; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CALL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 160) to amend the charter of the Capital Traction Company of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 161) to restore to the public domain certain lands in the southern extremity of Florida, known as the "Perrine grant," and to enable settlers within the limits of said grant to homestead the tracts actually occupied by them; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 162) for the erection of a monument and statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant on ground belonging to the United States Government in the city of Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 163) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Tacoma, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 164) to set apart certain lands, now known as Pacific Forest Reserve, as a public park, to be known as the Washington National Park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 165) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the times and places to hold terms of the United States courts in the State of Washington;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 166) to accept, ratify, and confirm certain agreements heretofore concluded with certain Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 167) for the relief of John O'Keane, of the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 168) to increase the pension of Julia H. H. Crosby; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 169) to promote Lieut. A. B. Wyckoff, United States Navy, retired, to the grade of lieutenant-commander on the retired list of the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 170) for the relief of Robert Williams, sergeant of ordnance, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 171) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Seattle, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 172) for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 173) for the relief of Howard Lodge, No. 13, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Gallatin, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 174) to construct a road to the national cemetery at Dover, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 175) for the relief of Mrs. Clementine H. Holman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 176) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 177) granting a pension to Sophia D. Clendenin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 178) granting a pension to Betsey J. Webber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE. I send to the desk several bills embodying the recommendations of the Commissioner of Navigation touching ships and shipping. I introduce them by request, approving cordially some of them and disapproving others with equal cordiality. I ask that they may be read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bills were severally read the first and second time by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

A bill (S. 179) to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels in the coasting trade;

A bill (S. 180) concerning sail vessels over 700 tons;

A bill (S. 181) to promote repair work in American shipyards;

A bill (S. 182) to abolish imprisonment of seamen in the common jails of the United States for desertion;

A bill (S. 183) concerning tonnage tax;

A bill (S. 184) to amend sections 7 and 8 of the act of August 28, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes;"

A bill (S. 185) to prohibit advances and regulate allotments of wages to seamen;

A bill (S. 186) to encourage American shipping;

A bill (S. 187) to amend the laws relating to navigation;

A bill (S. 188) to encourage American shipbuilding; and

A bill (S. 189) to encourage American shipping.

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (S. 190) for the relief of J. M. Billings; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 191) granting to the State of California 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the cash sales of public lands in said State; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 192) to repeal an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, and to define, punish, and restrain acts, contracts, and combinations in restraint of trade and interstate commerce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 193) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 194) for the relief of Dr. James L. Ord, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, at Fort Grant, Ariz.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 195) for the relief of James S. Crawford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 196) for the relief of Matthew McGuirk, of Los Angeles, Cal.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also introduced a bill (S. 197) to extend the mineral land laws of the United States to lands embraced within reservations created by Presidential proclamation, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 198) for the relief of William Hunter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 199) granting a pension to Gabrilla P. Moody; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 200) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a court of private land claims, and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 201) to add certain conditions and limitations to grants of public lands heretofore made by the Government of the United States to certain corporations, companies, and individuals for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroad and telegraph lines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 202) to increase the pension of Lucretia C. Waring; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 203) to facilitate the quieting of adverse titles to lands which are mineral or within public reservations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 204) authorizing surveyors-general to appoint deputies to survey the public lands and to have surveys made on petition of actual settlers who may have arranged to pay the expense of same; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 205) granting a pension to Mary O. H. Stoneman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 206) to provide an American register for the steamer *Kahului;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 207) granting to the State of California 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the cash sales of public lands in said State; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 208) to regulate final proofs in placer-mining entries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 209) to amend the various acts relative to immigration and to provide for the exclusion of alien anarchists; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced a bill (S. 210) establishing additional regulations concerning immigration to the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 211) to amend "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 212) fixing the compensation of United States district attorneys, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 213) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Missouri River between its mouth and the mouth of the Dakota or James River, and across the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Minnesota River, in the State of Minnesota, and South Port, in the State of Louisiana, and across the Illinois and Des Plaines rivers between the mouth of the Illinois and the city of Joliet, in the State of Illinois, and to prescribe the character, location, and dimensions of the same; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 214) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, from some suitable point between the north line of St. Clair County, Ill., and the southwest line of said county; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 215) to amend section 1910 of chapter 2, Title XXIII of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 216) fixing the compensation of the clerks of the circuit and district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 217) fixing compensation of United States marshals and deputies, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 218) to provide for the erection of a public building for the use and accommodation of the post-office at Mammoth Hot Springs, in the Yellowstone National Park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 219) to create a bureau in the Department of Agriculture for the giving public information of the production and shipping of live stock; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.

He also introduced a bill (S. 220) to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 221) to prohibit monopoly in the transportation of cattle to foreign countries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on the Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.

He also introduced a bill (S. 222) to authorize the acquisition of certain real estate, in the city of Washington, D. C., and the erection thereon of buildings to be used for a hall of records, a folding room for the House of Representatives, a storage warehouse, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 223) to provide for the compulsory education of Indian children; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 224) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a court of private land claims, and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 225) to regulate the removal of causes by Federal corporations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 226) to place on the pension rolls the name of John J. Chapman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 227) to permit the withdrawal of certain papers and the signing of certain receipts by John Finn or his attorney; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 228) for the benefit of Joshua Bishop; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 229) for the relief of Robert McGee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 230) for the relief of Samuel A. Lowe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 231) for the relief of Jacob Kern; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 232) granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation in said State, for the purpose of establishing western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College and of the Kansas State Normal Institute thereon, and for a public park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 233) to relieve persons who have settled on the public lands and who have lost their homes by reason of misfortune for which they are not responsible; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 234) to establish a bureau of irrigation and to prescribe the duties thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 235) to provide for the daily publication of a summary of the proceedings of Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.

He also introduced a bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during sessions of Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.

He also introduced a bill (S. 237) to protect the rights of parties defendant in certain injunction cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 238) to prohibit officers of the Government from refusing to pay moneys appropriated by act of Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.

He also introduced a bill (S. 239) to prohibit the collection of special liquor taxes from persons other than those who are duly authorized by State laws to traffic in intoxicating liquors; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 240) relating to and protecting the rights of pensioners; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 241) to grant service pensions to surviving soldiers of the war of the rebellion, with additional amounts to prisoners of war, and to repeal section 2 of the pension act of June 27, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 242) to require payment of pension money to wives in cases where male pensioners desert or abandon their families, or are habitual drunkards, or for any reason fail and neglect to support their families; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 243) to repeal all laws authorizing the issue and sale of bonds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 244) to protect interstate commerce; to prevent dealings in "options" and "futures;" to prohibit the formation of "trusts," "combines," "corners," and other combinations which affect prices; and to punish conspiracies against freedom of trade among the people of the several States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 245) to provide for the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver bullion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 246) granting a pension to Nancy Carson Blunt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 247) granting a pension to Wallace McGrath; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 248) granting a pension to Martha Allen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 249) granting a pension to Charles E. Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 250) for the relief of W. H. L. Pepperell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 251) for the relief of Peter D. Staats; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 252) for the relief of Stalnaker Marteney; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 253) for the relief of Charles H. Wilson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 254) for the relief of Jerome Kunkel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 255) to prevent desecration of the national flag; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 256) to establish a military post at or near the city of Grand Forks, in Grand Forks County, in the State of North Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WILSON introduced a bill (S. 257) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Spokane Falls, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 258) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Walla Walla, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 259) granting to the Columbia and Red Mountain Railway Company a right of way through the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MANTLE introduced a bill (S. 260) to provide for the construction of a public building at Butte City, Mont.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 261) for the relief of Arthur P. Selby; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 262) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the extermination of fur-bearing animals in Alaska," and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 263) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 264) providing for the location and purchase of public lands for reservoir sites; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 265) extending relief to Indian citizens, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 266) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Deadwood, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 267) to provide for the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 268) for the erection of a public building for the use of the custom-house and post-office at Newport News, in the district of Newport News, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 269) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reexamine and resettle the accounts of certain States and the city of Baltimore, growing out of moneys expended by said States and the city of Baltimore for military purposes during the war of 1812; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 270) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Portsmouth, in the State of Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 271) for the relief of the Newberry College, Newberry, S. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 272) to provide for the regulated free coinage of silver bullion into standard dollars of the United States, and for the preservation of the parity of value of the various kinds of coined money of the United States; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. SQUIRE. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words, not in the way of making a speech, but merely to ask the attention of the Senate and of the Committee on Finance to the proposition embodied in the bill. It provides for the regulated free coinage of silver bullion, and endeavors to present a method which may afford a solution of the difficulty that confronts all of us, and as to which the differences seem at present to be irreconcilable.

The plan is to provide for the further recognition and use of coined silver as money, to the extent of its production in this country, on what may be deemed a sound and conservative basis, and to provide for the withdrawal of greenbacks from circulation, temporarily at least and under certain conditions, after the greenbacks have been once redeemed; also for the substitution of silver currency for the greenbacks withdrawn, thereby maintaining the same circulation as before their withdrawal; and then, in addition, backing the whole with a moderate gold reserve. Perhaps on further consideration I may wish to change some of the minor features of the bill. At present I venture to submit it as my contribution toward a fair and reasonable settlement of this vexed question, to the end that the money of this country may not be reduced below the needs of its business and people, and that at the same time there may be no apprehension of the suffering of our credit as a people and a nation from what some may think to be too great or too sudden prospective inflation.

I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 1) relative to the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the joint resolution be read at length, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States deem it proper to assert, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American Continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

Resolved, That we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere; but with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

Resolved, That in accordance with the doctrine laid down by President Monroe, as stated in the preceding resolutions, the United States declares that it proposes to maintain the principles embodied in that doctrine and will regard any infringement of it or any attempt on the part of any European power to take or acquire new territory on the American Continent, whether under pretense of boundary disputes or otherwise, as an act of hostility to the United States.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate these resolutions to the governments of all nations with whom we have relations of amity and commerce.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 2) providing for the adjustment of certain claims of the United States against the State of Tennessee and certain claims of the State of Tennessee against the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia) introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 3) to extend the time for making an assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CALL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 4) declaring that a state of public war exists in Cuba, and that belligerent rights be accorded to the Cuban government; which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, That the Government of the United States recognizes a condition of public war between the Government of Spain and the government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba; and the United States of America hereby declare that they will maintain a condition of strict neutrality between the contending powers and accord to each all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States; the Congress of the United States protest and remonstrate against the barbarous manner in which the war in Cuba has been conducted, and the President is hereby authorized to take such steps as may be expedient in his judgment to secure an observance of the laws of war as required by all civilized nations.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the joint resolution may lie on the table. To-morrow morning at the conclusion of the routine business I shall call it up and ask the privilege of submitting some observations upon it. I ask that it be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the request?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Simply that the joint resolution be printed.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is all right. I did not understand the request.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 5) to provide for the settlement of the claims of the officers and enlisted men of the various militia organizations of the State of Missouri for horses and equipments lost while engaged in the military service of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 6) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators by the votes of the qualified electors of the States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 7) authorizing the issue of duplicate medals where the originals have been lost or de-

stroyed; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VEST introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 8) in regard to the export trade in cattle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on the Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 9) to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to provide for the election of President and Vice-President by a direct vote of the people, to extend the term to six years, to provide that no person shall hold the office of President more than once, and that a Vice-President shall not be eligible to the office of President; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 10) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators by the people; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 11) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the submission of certain matters to a vote of the people; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 12) to enforce the Monroe doctrine; which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the policy proclaimed by President Monroe in his message of December 2, 1823, and since known as the Monroe doctrine, is by precedent and tradition the recognized rightful policy of the United States, and that this Government will regard the establishment by any European Power of any new colonial dependency, or of any protectorate over any existing or future Government, or the extension of any territorial possession, or the control or ownership of any interoceanic canal on the Continent of America as a dangerous menace to the welfare and prosperity of the United States.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the joint resolution may for the time being lie on the table, and I give notice that to-morrow, if it be agreeable to the Senate, or, if not to-morrow, at some early day thereafter, I shall submit some remarks on the subject.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will lie on the table for the present.

POLICY RESPECTING CUBA, ETC.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate—

1. That the Government of the United States of America should promptly recognize the revolutionists of Cuba, who are now honestly struggling to secure their independence of the Spanish Government, as composing an independent nation and possessing the rights thereof according to the law of nations.

2. That all islands in close proximity to the mainland of the United States of America should, as speedily as possible, by treaties of purchase, be annexed to this Government, as essential to our safety in times of war and the convenience and necessity of our commerce in times of peace.

3. That the wise declaration of President Monroe, known as the Monroe doctrine, is a well-established policy of the Government of the United States, and should be promptly and effectually maintained by the Government in its original purity and purpose.

4. That while the Government of the United States should not needlessly or hastily embroil itself with any foreign power, and should only resort to extreme measures in cases of actual necessity, a firmer and more prompt policy on the part of this Government in maintaining the rights of American citizens abroad should be introduced and pursued.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. FAULKNER. As several resolutions covering the same subject have been offered and notice has been given, in connection with those resolutions, that Senators would speak on the question, I think the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska had better lie over until to-morrow.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator from West Virginia will bear with me, I think I can get out of the road in about ten minutes, and that will give a clear track to-morrow for the other resolutions.

Mr. FAULKNER. Perhaps that would be true if no one desired to discuss the resolution now offered. I think it is better, however, that the resolution should go over until to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There being objection, the resolution goes over under the rule.

IMPROVEMENT OF CLEARWATER RIVER, IDAHO.

Mr. DUBOIS submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate any information in his possession relating to the improvement of the Clearwater River, Idaho, begun under a project submitted by Maj. J. M. Wilson, Corps of Engineers, in 1878, and also to express his opinion and the opinion of the Chief of Engineers as to the advisability of continuing the said improvement until the project adopted by Congress has been completed.

SUITS IN COURT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I submit a resolution directing the Attorney-General to report certain information in regard to suits pending in the Court of Claims. It is necessary for Congress to have the information, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate the number of suits against the United States filed in the Court of Claims and not adjudicated at the commencement of the present term of said court; said report to include the number of suits filed under each separate jurisdiction of said court, namely, under the general jurisdiction, the Bowman and Tucker acts (acts of March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887), the District of Columbia, French spoliations, and Indian depredations; the number of suits heard and determined, or otherwise disposed of under each separate jurisdiction thereof during the last term of said court, and the time it will probably require, in the opinion of the Attorney-General, under present existing legislation and without any increase in the force of his office, to hear, determine, and otherwise dispose of said suits.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. PEFFER submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, instructed to prepare and report an amendment of Rule XXXV so that it shall read substantially as follows:

RULE XXXV.—On request of a standing committee that a particular matter then pending before said committee ought to be considered by the Senate in secret session, the presiding officer shall direct that the galleries be cleared and the doors closed. And all executive sessions of the Senate shall be open, except in cases where the President of the United States shall suggest that the subject-matter of a communication requires secrecy.

FUR-SEAL FISHERY CLAIMS.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That the message of the President, received by the Senate on 13th February, 1895, and his message read in the Senate to-day, relating to the payment by the United States of the claims of Great Britain arising out of the Bering Sea controversy, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instruction that said committee examine into the question of such liability to Great Britain, and the amount thereof, if any, and of any liability on the part of Great Britain, or Canada, arising out of said controversy; and that said committee shall have authority to report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask that the resolution lie on the table, and I shall request the unanimous consent of the Senate that I may be heard upon it at the close of the morning hour on Monday next.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table for the present.

HARBOR IMPROVEMENT AT WILMINGTON, CAL.

Mr. WHITE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate at his earliest convenience whether in his opinion the project for further improvement of the harbor at Wilmington, Cal., proposed by W. H. Benyaurd, lieutenant-colonel, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, on June 8, 1894, and fully set forth in Senate Executive Document No. 61, Fifty-third Congress, third session, can be successfully carried out within the estimates submitted in said report, and to make such recommendation as he may deem advisable with reference thereto.

CENTER MARKET REGULATIONS.

Mr. VEST submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be instructed to inquire and report, by bill or otherwise, as to the order recently made by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia requiring the small farmers and gardeners who have been allowed spaces on the sidewalk around Center Market, with awnings thereon erected by the Washington Market Company for their accommodation in exposing their market products for sale, to remove their products to a point farther west on the same street and sidewalk.

Mr. FAULKNER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 4, 1895, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 3, 1895.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT.

Rufus W. Peckham, of New York, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Howell E. Jackson, deceased.

SECRETARY OF STATE.

Richard Olney, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of State, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Walter Q. Gresham, deceased.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Judson Harmon, of Ohio, to be Attorney-General, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Richard Olney, appointed Secretary of State.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 3, 1895.

SECRETARY OF STATE.

Richard Olney, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of State.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Judson Harmon, of Ohio, to be Attorney-General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 3, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful God, our Heavenly Father, we come into Thy presence with reverence and awe, yet with perfect faith and confidence, because Thou art a prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God. We thank Thee for that providence which has been over us as a people, to guide and sustain us through all the vicissitudes of the past; and we pray Thee that that same providence shall guide and sustain us through all the future. Let Thy spirit fall mightily upon these Thy servants here assembled, that they may be guided to truth and right and duty. Especially let Thy spirit rest upon the Speaker of this House, that in all his rulings he may be guided in the ways of justice and equity.

Heavenly Father, let peace reign throughout our borders. Yet may we be quick to resent anything like an insult to this our nation. May prosperity smile upon our land, and peace and happiness come into every home. So may Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven, through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL, ETC.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. DINGLEY (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the roll of members may be omitted in reading the Journal.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal.

The Journal as read was approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the Representative from the First district of Colorado (Mr. Shafroth), who did not take the oath of office yesterday, is now present. If he will come forward, the oath of office will be administered.

Mr. John F. Shafroth came forward, and was duly qualified by taking the oath of office prescribed by law.

REPORT OF THE RETIRING CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

The following is the letter of the retiring Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. James Kerr, accompanying his annual report (presented as a part of yesterday's proceedings) showing the receipts and disbursements of the House of Representatives from July 1, 1894, to June 30, 1895, and from July 1, 1895, to December 2, 1895; which report and letter were ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Accounts:

CLERK'S OFFICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 2, 1895.

SIR: In compliance with the provisions of sections 60, 61, 62, 63, and 70 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and the requirements of a resolution of the House of Representatives of July 24, 1868, I have the honor to submit the following reports for the period from July 1, 1894, to June 30, 1895, both days inclusive, and from July 1, 1895, to December 2, 1895, both days inclusive, showing the names of all the clerks and other persons employed, the time they were actually employed, and the sums paid to each (such clerks and other persons having been usefully employed); detailed statements, by items, of the manner in which the contingent fund of the House has been expended, the several amounts drawn from the Treasury, and the balances remaining in my hands, the quantity and cost of all stationery purchased, the amount delivered, that used in the Clerk's office, the stock on hand, and the amount of the unexpended appropriations.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES KERR,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Hon. THOMAS B. REED,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE.

Mr. PAYNE (appearing at the bar of the House, in company with Mr. CANNON of Illinois and Mr. CRISP) said: Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed by the House, to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait on the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of each of the Houses has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, report that they have performed that duty. The President sends to Congress his respectful salutations, and states that he will communicate at once to the two Houses in writing.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the annual message of the President to the Congress of the United States, which the Clerk will read.

The message, which was read by the Clerk of the House, will be found in full in the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that this message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and that the usual number of copies be printed for the use of the House.

The SPEAKER. How many copies?

Mr. PAYNE. Five thousand, as I understand, is the usual number.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] moves that the message just read be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and that 5,000 copies be printed for the use of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by unanimous consent, obtained indefinite leave of absence, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT TILL FRIDAY.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 5) to pay to holders of Kaw or Kansas Indian scrip the balance due upon said scrip—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 6) constituting Syracuse, N. Y., a port of delivery—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 7) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Americus, in the State of Georgia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8) to provide a home for aged and infirm colored people—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCCALL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9) to amend the immigration laws of the United States—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10) to provide for a public building at Cleveland, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11) to equalize pensions on account of services in Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12) providing for discharges in cases of removal of charges of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 13) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 14) for the relief of purchasers of timber and stone lands under the act of June 3, 1878—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 15) to amend an act entitled "An act in amendment of the various acts relative to immigration and the importation of aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor," approved March 3, 1891—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 16) to provide for the construction of a public building at Anniston, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17) for the erection of a public building at Selma, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18) to establish a port of entry and delivery at the city of Selma, Ala.—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19) to grant land to the State of Alabama for the use of the Industrial School for Girls of Alabama—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. APSLEY: A bill (H. R. 20) for the erection of a public building at Fitchburg, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 21) authorizing the appointment of a nonpartisan commission to collate information and to consider and recommend legislation to meet the problems presented by labor, agriculture, and capital—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 22) providing for a life-saving station at the entrance of Tillamook Bay, in Oregon, and for life-saving crew, etc.—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at mouth of Siuslaw River, in Lane County, Oreg., and for a crew thereat—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24) to provide for the construction of a public building at Salem, Oreg.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war," approved July 27, 1892—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26) to extend the time for filing certain claims for compensation for horses and other property lost in the military service of the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 27) to provide additional means for the construction of a public building in the city of Stockton, State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28) to protect the American laborer from unfair competition, and to prevent foreign-born laborers from coming to the United States—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29) to amend section 2170 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relative to the naturalization of aliens—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30) granting to the State of California 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the cash sales of public lands in said State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 31) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32) for the relief of the State of California—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 33) granting 5 per cent of the land sales on military land warrants to the public-land States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 34) for ascertaining the feasibility and probable cost of constructing a ship canal from the Great Lakes to the navigable waters of the Hudson River—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 35) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua," approved February 20, 1889—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 36) to establish a bureau of public health in the Treasury Department of the United States, to establish and maintain a system of quarantine, and to provide measures of security against the introduction and spread of contagious and epidemic diseases—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 37) to approve a compromise and settlement between the United States and the State of Arkansas—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 38) making a pension a vested right, and authorizing the suspension of pensions obtained by fraud, accident, or mistake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 39) for the free coinage of gold and silver, and for the issue of gold and silver certificates—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 40) to prevent the free use of timber on the public lands for commercial use, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 41) to finally adjust the swamp-land grants, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 42) to ratify certain farm-improvement contracts in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 43) to amend an act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes, approved September 29, 1890—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 44) to provide for the sale of lands of the United States chiefly valuable for building stone, limestone, sandstone, granite, marble, slate, and lands containing gypsum, mica, asphaltum, borax, fire clay, kaolin, petroleum, salt, chalk, and other like mineral substances, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 45) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 46) in relation to the separate estates of married women in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 47) to revive the right of action under the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 48) to refund the cotton tax—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 49) to define and tax trusts, and to authorize the free importations of articles covered by them, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 50) to provide for the purchase of additional land in the square now occupied by the custom-house in the city of Baltimore, Md., and for the preparation of plans and specifications for a new custom-house building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 51) for the recognition of the military service of the officers and enlisted men of certain Pennsylvania military organizations—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 52) to appoint a commission for the investigation of the pollution of water supplies where such pollution affects or threatens to affect the sanitary condition of the people of more than one State—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MILNES: A bill (H. R. 53) to amend section 2 of an act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors, approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 54) granting to the Duluth and North Dakota Railroad Company right of way through certain Indian reservations in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 55) for the establishment of a light-house and fog-signal station at or near Big Oyster Bed Shoals, New Jersey—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 56) to extend to Superior, Wis., the privileges of the first section of an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 57) to amend section 819 of the Revised Statutes, and to authorize United States marshals, under the direction of the court, to provide for feeding a jury after a case is finally submitted, and to authorize courts of the United States to execute letters rogatory to any country where a treaty exists between that country and the United States when requested by the executive or judicial authorities of such country for the purpose of procuring evidence to be used in the prosecution of offenses included within such extradition treaty, and to amend section 988 of the Revised Statutes relating to a stay of execution after judgment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A bill (H. R. 58) providing for the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 59) to provide for the continuance in office of customs officers and assistant treasurers until successors shall have been appointed and qualified—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 60) for the erection of a public building at Holyoke, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 61) to authorize the location of a branch home for volunteer disabled soldiers and sailors at or near the city of Blair, Nebr., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 62) to establish a branch mint of the United States at Omaha, in the State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 63) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of site and the erection of a public building at Omaha, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 64) to establish an assay office in the city of Omaha, Nebr.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 65) to amend sections 140 and 145 and repealing sections 143 and 144 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to Presidential elections—to the Select Committee on Election of President and Vice-President and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 66) authorizing the pay of officers of customs performing duty after the expiration of their terms—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas (by request): A bill (H. R. 67) authorizing the St. Louis, Oklahoma and Southern Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: A bill (H. R. 68) to prohibit the sale of intoxicants to Indians, providing penalties therefor, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 119) to protect public forest reservations—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. APSLEY: Joint resolution (H. Res. 1) providing for the distribution of a complete set of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies to duly organized Grand Army posts and associations of Confederate veterans in the United States—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HERMANN: Joint resolution (H. Res. 2) abrogating the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, concluded April 19, 1850—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. Res. 3) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators by the votes of the people of the States—to the Committee on Election of President and Vice-President and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. McRAE: Joint resolution (H. Res. 4) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Joint resolution (H. Res. 5) to provide for the appointment of a joint committee to examine into and report upon the questions involved in the boundary dispute between British Guiana and Venezuela—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERCER: Joint resolution (H. Res. 6) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan ordnance stores for military instruction in high schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 69) for the relief of Francis L. Abbot, administrator of Thomas J. Treadwell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 70) for the relief of William H. Quinn—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 71) for the relief of Capt. Francis A. Beuter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 72) to increase the pension of Henrietta A. Lewis, widow of Capt. R. F. Lewis, United States Navy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 73) for the relief of the estate of John Ericsson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 74) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Gould Carr, widow of the late Brig. and Bvt. Maj. Gen. Joseph B. Carr, United States Volunteers, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 75) granting a pension to Mary F. Davenport—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 76) to pay Orville J. Jennings, of Fulton, N. Y., for work done under contract of March 28, 1889—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 77) for the relief of Henry McCaffrey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 78) granting a pension to Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

Also, a bill (H. R. 79) for the relief of the legal representatives of William Johnnot, Joseph Torrey, and Thomas Blackwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 80) for the relief of the First National Bank of Newton, Mass.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 81) granting a pension to Jane Flynn, mother of Lawrence Flynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 82) granting a pension to Mrs. Millie Withington, mother of Lewis L. Fisher, deceased, late of Company E, Second Massachusetts Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 83) for the relief of John C. Cutter, late first lieutenant Thirty-sixth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 84) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William J. Blain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 85) to increase the pension of Marion McKibbin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 86) for the relief of H. W. Shipley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 87) for the relief of Henry Judge, of Ashland, Oreg.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 88) for the relief of Charles H. Peirce—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 89) for the relief of William A. Starkweather, of Oregon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 90) for the relief of the legal representatives of Chauncey M. Lockwood—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 91) to pension William Russell for services in Oregon Indian wars—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 92) for the relief of Plinn Cooper, S. Hamilton, and the personal representatives of James Cox, deceased—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 93) for repayment of purchase money on erroneous entry of public lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 94) increasing the pension of Melancthon McCoy, of Company K, One hundred and forty-eighth Illinois Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 95) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas William Lynch, alias William Stevens, United States Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 96) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim against the United States by John Perdue, his heirs and assigns, by reason of the loss of certain lands in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 97) for payment of balance unpaid on Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war claims for suppression of Indian hostilities in 1855 and 1856, as found due by commission appointed by Secretary of War, consisting of Gen. Rufus Ingalls, Capt. A. J. Smith, and Hon. L. F. Grover, pursuant to act of Congress, and disallowed by Third Auditor of the Treasury, as per his report of February 7, 1860—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 98) for the relief of the estate of Arthur P. Selby, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 99) for the relief of Joseph Curriden—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 100) for the relief of the legal representatives of James R. Thompson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 101) granting a pension to Nancy G. Allabach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 102) for the relief of Isaac N. Forrester—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 103) granting a pension to Caroline Loper, formerly Caroline Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LATIMER: A bill (H. R. 104) for the relief of the Newberry College—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 105) for the relief of the estate of James Scull, late of Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 106) for the relief of the estate of Holliday S. Ravell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 107) for the relief of Thomas Boles—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 108) for the relief of the legal representatives of Calvin B. Cunningham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 109) for the relief of the estate of William B. Pool, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 110) for the relief of the estate of J. H. Moseby, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 111) for the relief of the estate of Samuel J. Jones, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 112) for the relief of the firm of Bertrand & Scull, late of Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 113) for the relief of the estate of A. C. Kerr, deceased, late of Jackson County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 114) for the relief of the estate of William K. Sebastin, deceased, late of Phillips County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 115) for the relief of Dr. J. H. Seegraves, surgeon, United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 116) for the relief of J. M. Thomas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 117) for the relief of Theophilus M. Hamilton, of Cross County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 118) for the relief of Thomas Y. Huddleston—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 120) to place the name of Little Berry Sullivan on the pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 121) for the relief of M. A. Lanford, Phillips County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 122) for the relief of A. M. Scott, administrator of Sarah Slate, of Phillips County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 123) for the relief of M. B. Woodyard, Mrs. Alice N. Rush, Mrs. Sue T. Smox, and Joseph N. Woodyard, heirs of Col. Humphrey M. Woodyard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 124) for the relief of the Old School Presbyterian Church, of Helena, Phillips County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 125) to compensate the Baptist Church at Helena, Ark., for destruction of its building during the late war by the Federal Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 126) for the relief of Martha Lindsay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 127) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Col. David Steuart Gordon, of the Sixth United States Cavalry, a brigadier-general in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 128) for the relief of Henry H. Schrawder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 129) for the relief of Thomas B. Reed—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 130) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Augustus P. Burditt—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 131) to remove the charge of desertion standing against John Daley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 132) to reimburse the city of Omaha, Nebr., for money expended in the construction of pavement adjacent to Government property, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 133) granting a pension to Benjamin Cental, of Blair, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 134) for the relief of W. W. Lowe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 135) for the relief of Theodore L. Van Dorn—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 136) for the relief of Wells C. McCool—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 137) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jeremiah F. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 138) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hazlip—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 139) for the relief of Thomas F. O'Reilly—to the Cmmittee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 140) for the relief of John Little and Hobart Williams, of Omaha, Nebr.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS (by request): A bill (H. R. 141) for the relief of Thomas Fawcett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 142) for the relief of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 143) for the relief of Richard Berry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 144) for the relief of C. B. Bryan & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 145) for the relief of J. J. Lints—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 146) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 147) granting a pension to George W. Case, late private Company B, Twenty-second New York Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUIGG: A bill (H. R. 148) for the relief of Secor & Co., Perine Secor & Co., and the executors of Zeno Secor—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 149) for the relief of Samuel Davis, naval apprentice—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 150) for the relief of Charles V. Munier, late of Company D, Fourth Excelsior Brigade, subsequently known as the Seventy-third Regiment New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 151) to pay the heirs of the late John Roach, deceased, $48,858.03 for labor and material furnished for the gunboat *Dolphin*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 152) granting a pension to Mary Ann Tracy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 153) granting a pension to Clara V. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 154) for the relief of Olivia and Ida Walter, heirs and children of Thomas U. Walter, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 155) for the relief of the heirs of John J. McElhone—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 156) for the relief of Payne, James & Co.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 157) restoring Julia L. Roberts, late Julia L. Doty, to the pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 158) granting a pension to Mary Collins—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ATWOOD: A bill (H. R. 159) to increase the pension of Francis F. Gockeritz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: Resolution of citizens of South Chicago, Ill., asking the Congress of the United States to concede belligerent rights to the patriots of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Petition to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, asking for the recognition of belligerent rights to the people of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Petition of John McNulty, M. D., late surgeon, United States Volunteers, asking the refunding of the moneys deducted by paymasters as income tax from his pay as surgeon during the years 1862 to 1865, claiming that under decisions of the United States Supreme Court the said deductions were unconstitutional and the manner of collection a "forced loan"—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POOLE (by request): Petition of citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., asking for the recognition of belligerent rights to the people of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of C. E. Greene and others, praying for the passage of a bill to reclassify and fix the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 4, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM DELAWARE.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise to a question of privilege. I present the petition of Mr. Henry A. Du Pont, of Delaware, claiming a seat in the Senate for the full term commencing the 4th of March last, by virtue of his election by the legislature of the State of Delaware. I ask that the petition be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

The undersigned hereby claims the right to be admitted as a Senator from the State of Delaware under an election by the legislature of said State on the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, to fill the term of six years commencing on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1895, and herewith presents evidence in support of his claim.

H. A. DU PONT.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I ask that the petition be printed and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered in the absence of objection.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. In support of this claim I present a certificate of the election of Mr. Du Pont, signed by the speaker of the Delaware house of representatives, and attested by the clerk of the house, which I also ask to have read, printed, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

I, Henry H. McMullen, speaker of the house of representatives of the State of Delaware, do hereby certify that on Tuesday, the 15th day of January, A. D. 1895, that being the second Tuesday after the meeting and organization of the general assembly of the State of Delaware, the senate and house of representatives of the said State respectively proceeded to vote for a Senator in Congress from said State for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1895; that at 12 o'clock meridian of the day following the members of the said two houses duly convened in joint assembly, and the journal of each house having been then read, and it appearing therefrom that no person had received a majority of the votes in each house for said office, the said joint assembly did then proceed to vote for a person for Senator, and no person having received on said last-mentioned day a majority of all the votes of the joint assembly, the said joint assembly did meet at 12 o'clock meridian of each succeeding day during the session and did take at least one vote, without any person having received such majority until the 9th day of May of said year, when Henry A. Du Pont received 15 votes, Edward Ridgely received 10 votes, John E. Addicks received 4 votes, and Ebe W. Tunnell received 1 vote; that the general assembly of the State of Delaware theretofore duly elected duly organized on the first Tuesday of January, A. D. 1895; that the members of the house of representatives of the State of Delaware who were returned as duly elected thereto from the several counties in said State and took their seats therein at the time of the organization thereof as aforesaid were Henry H. McMullen, Frederick Pyle, William Wilson, Francis M. Walker, George W. Reybold, Walter S. Money, and John W. Jolls, representatives from Newcastle County; Horace R. Mustard, William R. Davis, Clarence D. Sypherd, Alexander M. Daly, Ellwood C. Killen, Thomas A. Watson, and Ezekiel Fleming, representatives from Kent County; and John M. Robbins, Newell Ball, Edward S. Burton, George H. Townsend, Charles L. Moore, Horace Brown, and Henry L. Morgan, representatives from Sussex County; that the members of the senate of the State of Delaware who were returned as duly elected thereto from the several counties in said State at the general election held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in the month of November, A. D. 1894, or continued in the office of senator by virtue of their election to said office at the general election held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in the month of November, A. D. 1892, and who took their seats in said senate at the time of the organization thereof on the first Tuesday of January, A. D. 1895, were Samuel Alrichs, Robert J. Hanby, and John Pyle, senators from Newcastle County; John W. Fenimore, Hezekiah Harrington, and William T. Watson, senators from Kent County, and John M. C. Moore, George F. Pierce, and William T. Records, senators from Sussex County; that all the said senators and representatives, save in so far as hereinafter stated to the contrary, continued to act as senators and members of the house of representatives, respectively, from the first Tuesday of January, A. D. 1895, to the adjournment of the general assembly on the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, except during occasional absence, or during the recess or adjournments of the respective houses.

That Joshua H. Marvil was elected governor of the State of Delaware on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, A. D. 1894, and thereafter on the third Tuesday of January, A. D. 1895, duly qualified as governor of said State for the term of four years, beginning on the day last aforesaid, and ending on the third Tuesday of January, 1899, and entered upon the exercise of said office of governor; that thereafter on the 8th day of April, A. D. 1895, the said Joshua H. Marvil, while continuing to exercise the office of governor, died; that on the day following, to wit, on the 9th day of April, A. D. 1895, the said William T. Watson, who, upon the organization of the senate, upon the first Tuesday of January, A. D. 1895, had been duly elected and qualified as the speaker of the senate, duly took the oath of office as governor

of said State, and thereupon entered upon the exercise of the office of governor of the State of Delaware; that the said William T. Watson during the said session of the general assembly, and until he assumed the office of governor as aforesaid, was and remained the speaker of the senate, and, as such, presided over that body and voted therein, and participated and voted in the sessions aforesaid of the joint assembly of the two houses convened for the purpose of electing a Senator from the State of Delaware in the United States Senate; that upon his qualifying and entering upon the exercise of the office of governor as aforesaid the said William T. Watson ceased to have the right to act as a member of the senate of said State, or to vote in the said joint assembly for the election of a Senator in Congress as aforesaid; that one of the 19 votes so as aforesaid received in said joint assembly on the 9th day of May, A. D. 1895, by Edward Ridgely was then and there given by the said William T. Watson, at that time the governor of the said State; that said vote so given for Edward Ridgely was given by the said William T. Watson illegally, and in violation of the constitution of the State of Delaware, and that Henry A. Du Pont on said ballot having received 15 votes, and Edward Ridgely having received only 9 legal votes, John E. Addicks having received 4 votes, and Ebe W. Tunnell having received 1 vote (no person having theretofore been elected to the office of Senator in Congress from the State of Delaware for said term), the said Henry A. Du Pont having thereby received a majority of the votes of all the senators and representatives then constituting the legislature of the State of Delaware, they being all present and voting, was duly elected Senator in Congress from the State of Delaware for the term of six years from the 4th day of March, A. D. 1895, and was then and there duly declared elected to said office for said term by me as speaker of the house of representatives as aforesaid.

HENRY H. MCMULLEN.
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:
EDGAR T. HASTINGS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. In further support of the claim of Mr. Du Pont I submit four documents: First, an affidavit of the clerk of the house of representatives; second, an affidavit of the speaker of the house of representatives; third, an affidavit of Samuel Alrichs, and fourth, a certified copy of the proceedings of the senate and house of representatives of the State of Delaware in joint assembly from January 16 to May 9, 1895, inclusive. I do not ask that any of these documents be read. I ask, however, that they all be printed together, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That order will be made.

Mr. GRAY. I move that the papers which have just been ordered printed, with the petition, be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. That was my motion, I will state to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. GRAY. I beg the Senator's pardon; I did not so understand his motion.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly; that was my motion, that all the papers be printed and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. GRAY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order has been made, the Chair will state to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. GRAY. I ask unanimous consent that Col. Henry A. Du Pont, whose petition has just been presented to the Senate, pending the examination of the papers that bear upon his claim and the question of his right to a seat, be accorded the privileges of the floor of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CHANDLER. I present the petition of J. W. Jackson and sundry other legal voters of Tallapoosa County, Ala., praying that Congress will guarantee a republican form of government to that State. The petition sets out that Alabama does not now have a republican form of government nor ever will have so long as the organized conspirators now in possession of the administrative, executive, and judicial departments of the State government shall be permitted to perpetuate themselves in power by fraud, bribery, and intimidation.

The petitioners set forth that at the general State election in August, 1892, a majority of the legal voters of Alabama cast their ballots for Reuben F. Kolb for governor, but that by fraudulent and corrupt practices on the part of the election inspectors, returning officers, and county boards of supervisors a majority of the votes cast at said election was returned for James G. Jones for governor, and that in like manner a fraudulent legislature of Alabama was secured. They also set out that at the election held in August, 1894, the same fraud took place; that the State ticket headed by Reuben F. Kolb was again elected and the State ticket headed by William C. Oates was defeated, but that by false registration, stuffing the ballot boxes, and other corrupt practices the returns sent in from the different counties made it appear that said Oates had received a majority of about 27,000. They also set forth that a fraudulent legislature was in 1894 set up in the State by means of said corrupt practices, and that this legislature elected a United States Senator.

I also present the petition of M. Thacker and 70 other legal voters of Walker County, Ala., making the same representation and the same prayer;

Also, the petition of V. W. Morris and 70 other legal voters of Walker County, Ala., making the same prayer;

Also, the petition of A. H. Blackwell and 95 other legal voters of Walker County, Ala., making the same prayer;

Also, the petition of William Robbins and 49 other legal voters of Walker County, Ala., making the same prayer;

Also, the petition of W. E. Ivey and 39 other legal voters of Perry County, Ala., making the same prayer;

Also, the petition of E. B. Langley and 31 other legal voters of Tallapoosa County, Ala., to the same effect;

Also, the petition of R. J. Sewell and 70 other legal voters of Tallapoosa County, Ala., to the same effect;

Also, the petition of E. T. Boland and 70 other legal voters of Tallapoosa County, to the same effect;

Also, the petition of M. J. Abernethy and 40 other legal voters of Cherokee County, Ala., to the same effect;

Also, the petition of H. C. Pierson and 46 other legal voters of Pike County, Ala., to the same effect;

Also, the petition of W. T. B. Lynch and 15 other legal voters of Macon County, Ala.;

Also, the petition of J. J. Williams and 98 other legal voters of Sumter County;

Also, the petition of George Copeheart, jr., and 70 other legal voters of St. Clair County;

Also, the petition of M. L. Brock and 53 other legal voters of Etowah County;

Also, the petition of W. P. Fulmer and 27 other legal voters of Coosa County;

Also, the petition of J. D. Wall and 16 other legal voters of Macon County;

Also, the petition of S. J. Belcher and 50 other legal voters of Barbour County;

Also, the petition of Sam Geiglen and 36 other legal voters of Elmore County;

Also, the petition of J. M. Townsend and 72 other legal voters of Montgomery County;

Also, the petition of Wiley McGee and 55 other legal voters of Tuscaloosa County;

Also, the petition of J. M. Brown and 55 other legal voters of Greene County;

Also, the petition of B. C. Hammond and 54 other legal voters of Coosa County;

Also, the petition of W. D. Richardson and 17 other legal voters of Coosa County;

Also, the petition of W. C. Misson and 47 other legal voters of Coffee County;

Also, the petition of J. R. Woolf and 70 other legal voters of Choctaw County;

Also, the petition of Z. D. Laney and 70 other legal voters of Cherokee County;

Also, the petition of J. A. Sims and 70 other legal voters of Cherokee County;

Also, the petition of J. B. Sloan and 70 other legal voters of Cherokee County;

Also, the petition of J. W. Wharton and 57 other legal voters of Cherokee County;

Also, the petition of D. H. Harper and 70 other legal voters of Coffee County;

Also, the petition of Dr. J. P. Phillips and 70 other legal voters of Choctaw County;

Also, the petition of Jack Manning and 30 other legal voters of Choctaw County;

Also, the petition of J. A. Bell and 21 other legal voters of Choctaw County;

Also, the petition of S. A. Wright and 70 other legal voters of Choctaw County;

Also, the petitions of S. Kelley and 49 other legal voters; of Robert Swan and 25 other legal voters; of V. J. Norwood and 56 other legal voters; of B. P. Floyd and 17 other legal voters; of S. M. Green and 69 other legal voters; of J. L. Brown and 60 other legal voters; of F. L. Banfield and 62 other legal voters; of F. L. Scott and 53 other legal voters; of J. A. Statting and 65 other legal voters; and of W. H. Taylor and 70 other legal voters, all of Choctaw County, Ala.;

Also, the petition of Will Gilmore and 64 other legal voters of Crenshaw County;

Also, the petition of G. Patrick and 64 other legal voters of Chambers County;

Also, the petition of J. H. Vandiner and 70 other legal voters of Cherokee County;

Also, the petition of J. R. Hawkins and 32 other legal voters of Blount County;

Also, the petition of John M. Walker and 36 other legal voters of Blount County;

Also, the petition of T. D. Holcomb and 35 other legal voters of Blount County;

Also, the petition of W. B. Self and 31 other legal voters of Blount County;

Also, the petition of W. A. Jones and 32 other legal voters of Blount County;

Also, the petition of Edward Lindsay and 26 other legal voters of Blount County;

Also, the petition of N. O. McCallum and 22 other legal voters of Blount County;

Also, the petition of A. L. Pass and 34 other legal voters of the State of Alabama;

Also, the petition of J. C. Lock and 53 other legal voters; of B. W. Henson and 22 other legal voters; of J. B. Phillips and 50 other legal voters; and of N. L. Gough and 38 other legal voters, all of Choctaw County, Ala.;

Also, the petition of Dr. J. L. Davis and 70 other legal voters; of A. J. Hunton and 22 other legal voters; and of Dick Foreman and 65 other legal voters, all of Chambers County, Ala.;

Also, the petition of W. K. Gamble and 16 other legal voters of Blount County;

Also, the petition of M. P. Poland and 70 other legal voters and of Jack Spradlin and 64 other legal voters of Calhoun County, Ala.;

Also, the petition of W. J. McBee and 91 other legal voters of Cherokee County;

Also, the petition of M. A. McDowell and 71 other legal voters; of H. O. Wilkinson and 33 other legal voters; and of T. J. Pierson and 46 other legal voters, all of Pike County, Ala.;

Also, the petitions of W. R. Oswald and 33 others, and of M. H. Bafford and 22 others, of Macon County;

Also, the petition of Thomas J. Burke and 27 others, of Cullman County, and the petition of P. Hall and 70 others, of Covington County—

All, I have no doubt, legal voters and good citizens of that State, to the same effect.

I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bessemer, Mich., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the citizens of Andover, Mass., in relation to the atrocities in Armenia; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted by the Farmers' National Congress at Atlanta, Ga., praying for the improvement of harbors and the speedy completion of harbors of refuge; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Austin Quimby, president of the Kearsarge Survivors' Association, and 29 others, survivors of the crew of the U. S. S. *Kearsarge*, praying that certain relics of the *Kearsarge* be turned over to the remaining survivors; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PEFFER presented the petition of R. B. McCammon and sundry other citizens of Sulphur Springs, Ohio, and the petition of Frank Resch and sundry other citizens of the State of Ohio, praying for the free coinage of silver and remonstrating against the further issuance of interest-bearing bonds; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CLARK presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Wyoming, praying that the region embraced between townships 42 and 47 north and ranges 113 and 119 west of the sixth principal meridian be set aside as a public park; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

STATE OF WYOMING, *Office of the Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Wyoming, ss:*

I, Charles W. Burdick, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 4, of the Third State legislature of Wyoming, has been compared with the original, which is on file in this office, and the same is a true and correct copy of said memorial and of the whole thereof, together with the indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 23d day of February, A. D. 1895.

[SEAL.] CHARLES W. BURDICK,
Secretary of State.

[Third legislature of the State of Wyoming. Enrolled joint memorial No. 4, house of representatives, Wyoming.]

Your memorialists, the Third legislature of the State of Wyoming, would respectfully represent:

That the region embraced between townships 42 and 47 north and ranges 113 and 119 west of the sixth principal meridian contains the most noble and inspiring mountain scenery to be found on this continent. It is the Switzerland of America, in which the Matterhorn finds a worthy counterpart in the grand Teton, whose majestic and inaccessible heights are reflected in the clear depths, and whose rugged grandeur is in marvelous contrast to the placid beauty of the mountain lakes which lie at its base. In immediate proximity to the National Park its attractions are of a wholly different character. Together they afford a panorama which in its beauty and diversity of attractions is without a counterpart. The grand Teton is the culmination of this region, the fitting and appropriate landmark of this national pleasure ground.

This region is also the great game preserve of this State and the winter feeding ground of the game which finds a summer home in Yellowstone Park, the greater elevation and heavy snowfall of the latter driving it to the sheltered recesses of this region in winter. If we are to permanently preserve in its native home the nobler wild game of this continent, a winter as well as a summer home must be provided, in which the hand of the hunter can be effectually stayed.

Your memorialists therefore pray that Congress will, by suitable legislation, set this region aside as a public park and pleasure ground, where all can have equal access and enjoyment, and that upon the enactment of proper and adequate legislation by the State of Wyoming for its care and preservation that the ownership of the same be vested in the State.

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested upon the approval of this memorial to forward a duly authenticated copy thereof to the Senators and Representative in Congress from this State, in order that the same may be brought to the attention of Congress.

GEO. W. HOYT,
President of the Senate.
JAY L. TORREY,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 18, A. D. 1895.

WM. A. RICHARDS, *Governor.*

CHEYENNE, WYO., *February 16, 1895.*

I hereby certify that the within memorial originated in the house of representatives.

M. C. BARROW, *Chief Clerk.*

Received from the governor and filed this 19th day of February, 1895.

CHARLES W. BURDICK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CLARK presented the following memorial of the legislature of Wyoming; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

STATE OF WYOMING, *Office of the Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Wyoming, ss:*

I, Charles W. Burdick, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 1 of the Third State legislature of Wyoming has been compared with the original, which is on file in this office, and the same is a true and correct copy of said memorial and of the whole thereof, together with the indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 23d day of February, A. D. 1895.

[SEAL.] CHARLES W. BURDICK,
Secretary of State.

[Third legislature of the State of Wyoming. Enrolled memorial No. 1, house of representatives, Wyoming.]

MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Third legislature of the State of Wyoming, would most respectfully represent—

That section 8 and section 11 of an act to provide for the admission of Wyoming into the Union, and for other purposes, approved July 10, 1890, provides that certain lands donated to the State by Congress shall not be sold for less than $10 per acre.

An experience of four years in the selection and management of these lands has shown beyond question that such minimum selling price is an unwise and injurious condition. It is unwise because it is arbitrary and has no relation to the actual value of the land it affects. Although a minimum price, it is far above the maximum value of unimproved land in this State. So long as the best lands of this or adjoining States can be had under Federal land laws for a nominal price, it is useless to attempt to secure the occupancy or improvement, much less sale, of State land to which this condition attaches. That this is true is shown by the history of the past four years in which the State has sold only 720 acres out of a total grant of over 3,000,000 acres.

To select land for the State under this condition is to withdraw it from sale and settlement for an indefinite period. It places the State in the position of a speculator in land values. A Commonwealth embracing 63,000,000 acres of land with only 60,000 people is not in a position to profitably engage in such an enterprise. What this State needs above all else is population—people to develop its material resources. It is to the best interest of the State that its lands should be occupied and that they should be disposed of on such terms as to attract instead of prevent immigration. The loss to the State in the selling value of the land bears no comparison to the gain which would come in taxable and productive resources from their early occupancy and use.

Because of these facts, we ask Congress to take early action in the passage of a measure repealing the minimum selling price of land heretofore donated or which may hereafter be donated to this State, and leaving such price to be fixed by the State legislature or the State authorities intrusted with the management and disposal of such lands.

Resolved, That his excellency the governor of the State of Wyoming, be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested, upon his approval of this memorial, to forward a duly authenticated copy thereof to the Senators and Representative in Congress from this State, in order that the same may be brought to the attention of that body.

GEO. W. HOYT,
President of the Senate.
JAY L. TORREY,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 16, A. D. 1895.

WM. A. RICHARDS, *Governor.*

CHEYENNE, WYO., *February 19, 1895.*

I hereby certify that the within act originated in the house of representatives.

M. C. BARROW, *Chief Clerk.*

Received from the governor and filed this 16th day of February, 1895.

CHARLES W. BURDICK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CLARK presented the following memorial of the legislature of Wyoming; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

STATE OF WYOMING, *Office of the Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Wyoming, ss:*

I, Charles W. Burdick, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 2 of the Third State legislature of Wyoming has been compared with the original, which is on file in this office, and the same is a true and correct copy of said memorial and of the whole thereof, together with the indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 23d day of February, A. D. 1895.

[SEAL.] CHARLES W. BURDICK,
Secretary of State.

[Third legislature of the State of Wyoming. Enrolled memorial No. 2, house of representatives, Wyoming.]

MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS.

Be it resolved by the Third legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America be memorialized as follows:

The Third legislature of the State of Wyoming respectfully represents to the honorable the Senate and the honorable the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled that they urge the submission of the constitutional amendments now pending in Congress requiring United States Senators to be elected by a vote of the qualified electors of the State.

They believe that the exciting and disturbing contest for seats in the legislature in many of the States has been owing in a great measure to impending contests for United States Senators.

In many States the sessions of the legislature are limited to a specified time, and much of this time has been wasted and consumed in a fruitless effort to elect Senators.

The temptation to corruption and the inducements to influence legislators by questionable means would be entirely removed if the election of Senators were transferred to the people. It is believed the business of the legislature should be confined to matters of legislation, and that the excitement attendant upon the selection of United States Senators by the legislature interferes to a great degree with that business. The growth of public sentiment in this direction we believe to be grounded upon good reasons, calling for an amendment of the Constitution in this respect.

Resolved, That the governor be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested, upon his approval of this memorial, to forward a duly authenticated copy thereof, under the great seal of the State, to the Senators and Representative in Congress from this State, in order that the same may be brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

GEO. W. HOYT,
President of the Senate.
JAY L. TORREY,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 16, A. D. 1895.

WM. A. RICHARDS, *Governor.*

[Indorsements.]

CHEYENNE, WYO., *February 12, 1895.*

I hereby certify that the within memorial originated in the house of representatives.

M. C. BARROW, *Chief Clerk.*

Received from the governor and filed this 16th day of February, 1895.

CHARLES W. BURDICK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of the Toledo Produce Exchange and by the common council, of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the erection of a light-house at the lake connection of the harbor of Toledo; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of T. M. Beer and 107 other citizens of Ashland County, Ohio, praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR. I present the petition of the Commercial Club, a very important organization of business men of the city of Boston, praying for immediate action by the General Government to enlarge and deepen Boston Harbor. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

He also presented the petition of Edwin S. Barrett, president of the Massachusetts Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 2720 of the last Congress, to prevent desecration of the national flag; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HAWLEY presented a petition of the Connecticut Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 2720 of the last Congress, to prevent desecration of the national flag; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Hon. O. Vincent Coffin, governor of Connecticut, and 30 other citizens of that State, and the petition of Hon. James P. Johnson, mayor of New London, Conn., and 39 other citizens of Connecticut, praying that the United States purchase certain lots adjoining Fort Griswold, in the town of Groton, Conn.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CALL presented a petition of the city council of West Tampa, Fla., and a petition of the city council of Key West, Fla., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the mayor and council of the city of Olympia, the capital of the State of Washington, in reference to the improvement of the harbor at Olympia, setting forth that of the $275,000 recommended by the Chief of Engineers for the improvement of Olympia Harbor, but $75,000 has been spent, and that there is a provision in the item of appropriation to the effect that the money shall be expended only on a certain part of the harbor. The petition sets forth the desirability of so changing the terms of the appropriation in the future that a portion of the money may be spent to divert the Des Chutes River into its proper channel on the west side of the river. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I present the petitions of 17 patriotic societies of the country praying for the passage of Senate bill 255, which I had the honor of introducing yesterday, to prevent desecration of the national flag. I move that the petitions, together with the publication entitled "The misuse of the national flag of the United States of America" accompanying them, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. I present 30 petitions of citizens of Alabama, setting forth that the people of that State are denied a republican form of government, and alleging frauds in the elections of 1892 and 1894 which deprived the then elected governor of his seat, and which had a vital influence upon the Congressional representation of that State in Congress. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. I also present resolutions in the form of a petition to Congress adopted by the Populist State convention of Alabama, held at Birmingham, in that State, to the same effect. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY presented the petition of George A. McCall Post, No. 31, Grand Army of the Republic, of Westchester, Pa., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Workingmen's Protective Tariff League of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against further internal taxation and praying that additional revenue be secured through increased duties on exports; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GEAR presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR. I present a petition of the chairman and secretary of a large public meeting of citizens of Worcester, Mass., praying for relief against the outrages upon Armenians in Turkey. This petition is so brief and compact that it is difficult to make an abridged statement of its contents under the rule, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The petition is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

Recognizing the fact that the influence of your honorable and august body, when exerted on behalf of humanity, has been powerful in securing justice for the oppressed, far-reaching in effect and lasting in results, we, the representatives duly accredited by the mass meeting of the Armenian colony of Worcester, Mass., held on Thanksgiving Day, the 28th of November, 1895, humbly petition that vigorous measures be recommended by you to His Excellency the President of the United States for putting a stop to the most horrible crime of the century—the indiscriminate slaughter and annihilation of Armenian Christians at the hands of the Turkish Government.

In times past the strong, eloquent words of American statesmen, uttered on the floor of the House and Senate, have contributed largely to the peace and liberty of wronged nations beyond the seas.

Though the Sultan has given his tardy and reluctant consent to the reforms demanded by Europe, no hope of benefit can be entertained, as the whole machinery of government is centralized in the palace, and the provincial governors are creatures subservient to the Sultan personally, or else fanatical Moslems, who, instead of repressing disorder and murder, in many cases show an inclination to lead the mob and lend the soldiery to aid in the slaughter of life and the destruction of property.

Based, as Turkish law is, upon the Koran, the Sultan is recognized as the shadow of God on earth, and the impossibility of getting justice for Christians in Moslem courts is self-evident. Disarmed, as we are, resistance on our part is useless, and help must come from without.

The sword of Islam is unsheathed, and unless Europe and America step between fanaticism and its helpless victims, Armenia, once a vineyard, must inevitably become a desert and a tomb. Within a year there have been wantonly murdered at least 50,000 of our people, while hundreds of thousands have been reduced to starvation. Yet the massacres still go on, while the war ships of earth's favored nations swing at anchor in Turkish waters. Blinded by mutual jealousy, the powers of Europe refuse to move.

Therefore, turning our eyes to the United States, we look to Congress for words of encouragement and the warning note that will stay the bloody arm of our oppressors.

We appeal to you, not as aliens, but in the name of ten thousand industrious and law-abiding Armenians, now resident in the United States, and who are rapidly giving it their allegiance.

SARKIS SHAGHALIAN, *Chairman.*
H. G. ZONIKIAN, *Secretary.*

WORCESTER, MASS., *December 2, 1895.*

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 273) to establish postal savings depositories and to provide for the conduct and regulation of the same; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 274) to provide for a postal telegraph system; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 275) granting an increase of pension to Andrew T. Bovard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 276) granting a pension to David S. Taylor; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 277) for the relief of the Corn Exchange National Bank, of Philadelphia, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 278) for the relief of Olivia and Ida Walter, heirs and children of Thomas U. Walter, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 279) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Bernhard Stueber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 280) granting a pension to Eliza E. Reed; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 281) for the relief of F. M. Vandling; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 282) for the relief of the heirs of G. W. Ebert, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 283) for the relief of William Brice & Co., of Philadelphia, and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 284) providing for certain experiments for scientific purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 285) for the relief of the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 286) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a public building at Oakland, in the State of California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 287) to amend "An act granting increase of pensions to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases," approved January 5, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 288) for the relief of William R. Wheaton and Charles H. Chamberlain, of California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 289) for the relief of Ames & Detrick, of San Francisco, in the State of California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 290) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the cases of Edward N. Fish and others for supplies furnished the Indian service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 291) to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to vessels propelled by steam, gas, fluid, naphtha, or motor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 292) in relation to trials by juries in United States courts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 293) authorizing the appointment of a nonpartisan commission to collate information and to consider andirecommend legislation to meet the problems presented by labor, agr culture, and capital; which was read twice by its title, and referr ed to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PASCO introduced a bill (S. 294) for the erection of a public building at Tampa, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 295) making an appropriation for the improvement of the road to the national cemetery near Pensacola, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 296) for the relief of William H. Atkins, formerly commissary sergeant, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 297) granting a pension to Alexander Campbell, of Madison County, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 298) granting an increase of pension to William W. Tumblin, of Bradford County, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 299) granting a pension to John W. Matchett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 300) granting a pension to Aaron Daniel, of Suwanee County, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 301) to amend the immigration laws of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 302) to secure aerial navigation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GRAY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 303) to carry into effect the recommendations of theInternational Ameri can Conference by the incorporation of the International American Bank; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 304) to establish wind signal display stations at South Manitou Island, Lake Michigan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 305) for the relief of Eugene Oscar Fechet, late a second lieutenant of the Second Regiment Artillery, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 306) for the relief of Thomas Chambers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 307) for the relief of Richard H. Marsh; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 308) for the relief of Daniel W. Perkins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 309) to establish in the Department of Justice a bureau of identification of criminals; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 310) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth H. David; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 311) providing a pension for George Welz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 312) to increase the pension of John H. Bieling, of Detroit, Mich.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 313) granting a pension to Mrs. Jane Stewart Whiting; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 314) for the relief of Eunice Tripler, widow of Charles S. Tripler; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 315) for the relief of Thomas Antisell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 316) to correct the muster roll of J. Seymour Taylor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 317) providing a pension for Mrs. Julia C. Sharpe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 318) granting a pension to John E. Burnes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 319) for the relief of telegraph operators during the war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 320) to authorize the construction and operation of an electric railroad within the Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 321) granting a pension to James W. Dunn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HARRIS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 322) to secure uniformity in the names of minor streets of the city of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 323) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 324) to provide for the appointment of a public administrator in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 325) to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in

the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 326) for the relief of Catherine E. Whitall, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 327) for the relief of Charles H. Bliss on account of injuries received by the collapse of the building known as Ford's Old Theater on the 9th day of June, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 328) for the relief of Richard S. Taylor; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 329) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William W. Kerbaugh; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 330) for the relief of James B. Boyd, late a private in Company B, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, and Battery H, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 331) providing that no person shall be eligible as assignee or receiver of a bankrupt corporation engaged in interstate commerce who shall have been a director, officer, or employee of such corporation at any time during the three years next preceding such bankruptcy; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. CULLOM. I introduced that bill because it has been sent to me, but not purposing to indorse all its provisions at this moment. I will say, however, that I think there is some ground for giving attention to the subject covered by it. I am in doubt whether it should go to the Committee on the Judiciary or to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. If there be no objection, I shall ask to have it referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HOAR. I think that bill belongs to the Judiciary Committee. It is a bill for the regulation of proceedings in court relative to assignees and receivers of bankrupt corporations engaged in interstate commerce. It seems to me that it would be just as appropriate that a bill providing that a merchant should be dealt with in a certain way in bankruptcy should be referred to the Committee on Commerce, or that a bill providing that a farmer should be dealt with in a certain way should be sent to the Committee on Agriculture, as that this bill should be sent to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I will, however, make no question about it.

Mr. CULLOM. I thought of the view which has been suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts in reference to the bill, and therefore I called the attention of the Senate to it before making any direct motion. I called attention to it also for the reason that I think that a committee should inquire into the question whether some legislation is not necessary in that regard. I shall make no objection to the bill going to the Committee on the Judiciary after what has been said.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, in the absence of objection.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 332) granting an increase of pension to Philip Kershner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 333) granting an increase of pension to James A. Grimes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ROACH (by request) introduced a bill (S. 335) for the relief of Esther A. Keyser; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 336) for the relief of the estate of William B. Todd, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 337) to refer the claim of the owners of the brig *Tally-Ho* to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 338) for the relief of George F. Roberts, administrator of the estate of William B. Thayer, deceased, surviving partner of Thayer Bros., and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 339) for the relief of William H. Rhett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BATE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 340) to amend the military record of John H. Skinner; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 341) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon B. Breedlove; which was read twice by its title. and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 342) to regulate the importation of gunpowder, nitroglycerin, and other explosive substances; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 343) for the relief of George E. Tyson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 344) granting a pension to Mary A. Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 345) granting a pension to Catherine R. Jardine, widow of Brig. Gen. Edward Jardine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 346) granting a pension to Kate C. McDougal; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 347) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Helmuth F. Sœckel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WALTHALL introduced a bill (S. 348) for relief of Stephen Duncan Marshall and George M. Miller, executors of the will of Levin R. Marshall, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 349) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the bill which I have just introduced is one that was prepared and reported by the joint subcommittee on Naval Affairs of the two Houses at the last Congress, but no action was taken upon it. There are some provisions in the bill which I should modify, and there are some good provisions in it as it now stands. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 350) granting an increase of pension to George C. Abbey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 351) for the relief of Samuel Cole; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 352) granting a pension to Philip Kershner, late lieutenant-colonel of the Sixteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 353) to provide for fixing a uniform standard of classification and grading of wheat, corn, oats, barley, and rye, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 354) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in them; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 355) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Van Niman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 356) for the erection of a monument to the late Edwin M. Stanton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 357) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint commissioners to estimate damages done to planted oysters and oyster beds in Raritan Bay and adjoining waters in New York and New Jersey, and to make compensation therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced a bill (S. 358) supplementary to an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who were incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 359) relating to claims of laborers, workmen, and mechanics, removing the bar of the statute of limitations, and giving the right of appeal in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also introduced a bill (S. 360) for the relief of Northrup & Chick; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 361) for the relief of Silas P. Keller; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 362) granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College and of the Kansas State Normal Institute thereon, and for a public park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 363) granting a pension to Fredaline Glastetter; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying petition, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 364) granting a pension to Perry Harter; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying petition, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 365) for the relief of Mrs. Mary L. Roderick; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 366) for the relief of Henry C. Rose; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 367) granting a pension to James M. Ray; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 368) granting a pension to Henry Sands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 369) granting a pension to William H. Shivers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 370) granting a pension to Anderson Morton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 371) granting a pension to Ambrose J. Vanarsdale; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 372) granting a pension to Virginia A. Owen, widow of John Owen, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 373) granting a pension to Myra Freeman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 374) granting a pension to Thomas J. Reid; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 375) for the relief of Dicey Bobbitt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 376) for the relief of the heirs of Catherine E. Nelson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 377) granting a pension to E. C. Curtis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 378) granting a pension to Nancy E. Neely, widow of Alexander Neely; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 379) granting a pension to Levi C. Faught; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 380) for the relief of R. W. Barber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 381) granting a pension to Dora Sauer, widow of Peter Sauer, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 382) granting a pension to Eli Browning; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 383) granting a pension to Lucy F. Watson, widow of Joseph W. Melton, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 384) granting a pension to James F. Crump; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 385) granting a pension to John G. Hanna; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 386) granting a pension to Margaret Garrison, widow of James S. Garrison; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 387) granting a pension to Henry Hahman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 388) for the relief of Eliza Dickerhoff, widow of Louis Dickerhoff, deceased, of Company A, Cape Girardeau (Mo.) Home Guards; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 389) granting a pension to Calvin K. Bynum; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 390) granting a pension to Christ Bueltemann; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 391) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Catlett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 392) granting a pension to Isaac Gann; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 393) granting a pension to William J. Ford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 394) granting a pension to James M. Ray; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 395) granting an increase of pension to Zebedee Parrett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 396) granting a pension to Henry Farmer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 397) restoring a pension to Alvin Rine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 398) granting a pension to John Bartmann; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 399) granting a pension to John A. Pitts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 400) granting a pension to Johnson Hays; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 401) granting a pension to Christ Hahman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 402) granting a pension to Sarah Bailey, late widow of Isaac Long, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 403) granting a pension to Mary G. Isbell, widow of David S. Isbell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 404) granting a pension to Samuel Goldwater; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 405) to increase the pension of Mary A. Wilkins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 406) for the relief of Zerelda Cobb; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 407) explanatory of an act entitled "An act to settle certain accounts between the United States and the State of Mississippi and other States," and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 408) for the relief of persons who have filed declarations of intention to enter desert lands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 409) for the relief of the First Colorado Mounted Militia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 410) granting a pension to John F. Kline; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 411) granting a pension to E. W. Hershe, of Fairplay, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 412) for the relief of Mrs. Emma D. Larsh, of Denver, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 413) for the relief of Charles M. Larsh, of Denver, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 414) granting an increase of pension to George W. Blake; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 415) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Frank A. Land, of Nathrop, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 416) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Dover, in the State of New Hampshire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 417) providing that no pensions for disability, or under the act of June 27, 1890, or to the

widows of soldiers, shall be for a less sum than $12 per month; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 418) concerning the trial and punishment of contempts in the United States courts therein mentioned; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 419) for the erection of a statue of the late Robert Dale Owen, to be placed in the grounds of the Smithsonian Institution; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 420) for the purchase of the oil portrait of Mrs. Dolly Madison, by E. F. Andrews; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 421) for the relief of Calvin Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 422) for the relief of Pay Inspector John H. Stephenson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 423) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the civil service of the United States," approved January 16, 1883; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 13) granting the State of Pennsylvania permission to use the United States courthouse at Scranton, Pa., and at Williamsport, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HARRIS (by request) introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 14) to compile and publish the laws relating to street-railway franchises in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COAST DEFENSES.

Mr. SQUIRE. I introduce a bill to provide for the fortifications and other defenses recommended by the board appointed by the President under the provisions of an act of Congress entitled "An act making provisions for fortifications and other works of defense and for the armament thereof for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1885, for the ports named in the report of the said board as the ports at which fortifications are most urgently needed, namely: New York, San Francisco, Boston, the lake ports, Hampton Roads, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Washington, Baltimore, Portland, Me., Rhode Island ports in Narragansett Bay, Key West, Charleston, S. C., Mobile, New London, Savannah, Galveston, Portland, Oreg., Pensacola, Fla., Wilmington, N. C., San Diego, Cal., Portsmouth, N. H., defenses of Cumberland Sound at Fort Clinch, defenses of ports of the Kennebec River at Fort Popham, New Bedford, Mass., defenses of ports on the Penobscot River, Maine, at Fort Knox, and New Haven, Conn., and, further, for the defense of Puget Sound, and of such other ports as in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War may require permanent works of fortification.

Mr. President, I have quoted a part of the terms of this bill because I wish to ask the attention of the Senate and the country to the character and importance of the bill. We are proposing, I understand, to hear discussions of the Monroe doctrine and the importance of maintaining a high stand as to our national honor and the interest of our country relative to the continents of America. We are asked to consider questions relating to the recognition of Cuba and to take a firm stand as to the settlement of the Venezuela boundary dispute by arbitration, the Alaskan boundary contention, and other great international questions affecting the two American continents; and at the same time we seem to go along dreamily, in blissful ignorance or disregard of the fact that we have no adequate protection at our seacoast cities sufficient to withstand the attack of any nation with a respectable navy. Our much-boasted new Navy is probably not more than one-third the size of the new navy of Great Britain. We are talking about these matters as if we were able to carry a chip on our shoulder, so to speak.

I want to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the fact that it is needful that there should be immediate legislation on this subject, so that our great seacoast cities may be properly defended, and that we ought to deliberately enter upon a system of protection of the seacoast cities, of which there are, according to the official report, twenty-eight in the United States, besides the lake ports, and only one of them has anything like modern defenses—the port of New York—and that is perhaps not one-tenth of what it ought to be. True, there has been something done at Boston and something done at San Francisco, but the character of the defenses there is still inferior—only a few dynamite guns and a few mortars. There is almost nothing in the way of high-power long-range guns to compete with the great guns of the navies of the world. Not even one of the 16-inch guns recommended has ever yet been built in this country. It will take years and years to construct the necessary guns and the emplacements for them. Even at the rate I propose in this bill nearly twelve years will be required to complete the system. I hope the attention of the Senate will be directed to this matter at a very early date, so that we may obtain legislation. About ten years have already passed since the report of the board. Some time has been required to work out problems, particularly as to disappearing gun carriages and lifts, by which these great guns are quickly depressed to be loaded and elevated to be fired.

I do not think it good policy to longer defer appropriations on a scale comporting with the magnitude of the work. The expenditures should be apportioned fairly among all these different ports, according to the consolidated estimates, and the work should commence as near as may be at the same time at each of them, so that all parts of the United States may have their proportional benefits contemporaneously.

The General Commanding the Army and the Secretary of War concur in calling the attention of Congress to the importance of this matter. Admiral Walker, of the Navy, has expressed similar views, and I have just obtained the advice of the two great bureaus of the War Department concerned—that of Engineers and that of Ordnance—in drawing this bill. Authorities agree that the work should proceed much faster than herein proposed and provided for. But it is better to make haste slowly than to court great danger and risk by feebleness and inaction.

The bill (S. 334) to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

ARMENIAN OUTRAGES.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolutions; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Senate will support the President in the most vigorous action he may deem fit to take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey, and to obtain redress for injuries committed upon such citizens there.

Resolved, That the President be desired to make known to the Government of Turkey the strong feeling of regret and indignation with which the people of America have heard of the injuries inflicted upon persons of the Christian faith in Turkey, and that the American people can not be expected to view with indifference any repetition or continuance of such wrongs.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if in his judgment not incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate all information which has been received by him or by the State Department in regard to injuries inflicted upon the persons or property of American citizens in Turkey, and in regard to the condition of affairs there in reference to the oppression or cruelties practiced upon the Armenian subjects of the Turkish Government;

Also to inform the Senate whether all the American consuls in the Turkish Empire are at their posts of duty, and, if not, to state any circumstances which have interfered with the performance of the duties of such consuls.

POLICY RESPECTING CUBA, ETC.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day; which will be read.

The resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. ALLEN was read, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate—

1. That the Government of the United States of America should promptly recognize the revolutionists of Cuba, who are now honestly struggling to secure their independence of the Spanish Government, as composing an independent nation and possessing the rights thereof according to the law of nations.

2. That all islands in close proximity to the mainland of the United States of America should, as speedily as possible, by treaties of purchase, be annexed to this Government, as essential to our safety in times of war and the convenience and necessity of our commerce in times of peace.

3. That the wise declaration of President Monroe, known as the Monroe doctrine, is a well-established policy of the Government of the United States, and should be promptly and effectually maintained by the Government in its original purity and purpose.

4. That while the Government of the United States should not needlessly or hastily embroil itself with any foreign power, and should only resort to extreme measures in cases of actual necessity, a firmer and more prompt policy on the part of this Government in maintaining the rights of American citizens abroad should be introduced and pursued.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the Island of Cuba is but a few hours' ride from the mainland of the United States. It is an island of vast importance, not only from a commercial point of view, but from a strategic point in the event of our becoming involved in war with a foreign power. I am of the number who believe that this Government should promptly recognize the revolutionists of Cuba and assist them in all lawful ways to secure their independence of the Spanish Government and enable them to establish an independent republic. I would not have this Government plunged headlong into a needless quarrel with the Spanish Government, but I would lend every assistance that could be lawfully and properly given to the aspirations of the people of Cuba for a republican form of government. I believe it to be the true policy and the true doctrine of our country that wherever a people show themselves desirous of establishing a republican form of government upon any territory adjacent to us they should receive our encouragement and support. If our form of government is the correct

one, and of that I have no doubt, then its recognition or establishment in other lands should be encouraged, and when an opportunity shall present itself to us to lend this encouragement it should be promptly and effectually given.

It is not my purpose to argue at length in support of these resolutions, but I shall content myself at this time in calling attention to them in a general way. I take it for granted that the Island of Cuba is so situated, our commercial relations with it are such, the relations of its people and the Spanish Government are of such a character, as to make it desirable that a republic should be there established. I fully sympathize with the sentiment existing in this country and so frequently expressed by the public press and in conventions and assemblies of our people in favor of the independence of these people.

It may be said that they are not of our race or tongue, but these things should be matters of indifference to us. It ought to be sufficient for us to know that they belong to a race of people who are striving for liberty. They have a desire to abandon the galling yoke of the King and establish a form of government that will be a blessing to them and their posterity through the ages to come, and we should give them such assistance as may be within our power. I believe the time is speedily coming when not only the people of Cuba will be free, but when the people of all the islands of the seas adjacent to this country will have established a republican form of government, or they will have become integral parts of this country. And this leads me, sir, to observe that all islands in close proximity to the mainland of the United States should be as speedily as possible, by treaties of purchase, annexed to our Government, as essential to our safety in times of war and the convenience and necessity of our commerce in times of peace.

No one can seriously doubt that a due regard to the law of self-preservation will require us to take efficient steps in this direction as speedily as we can do so. I do not believe that we should be possessed of greed for territory, or the glories of conquest, but I do believe that the sober, candid, thinking, patriotic people of this country fully realize the necessity of promptly taking steps in this direction to secure our country against foreign invasion and to extend the interests of our commerce.

I believe that a firmer policy should be pursued. I believe that the time has finally come when we should take prompt steps to transfer the carrying trade of this country to American bottoms, rather than to permit British bottoms to carry it, and when the commerce of the United States should be taken into every port of the known world in American-built vessels, and the sails of our ships should whiten every navigable port and water of the earth. I believe more than this. I believe in the wise doctrine of President Monroe, known as the Monroe doctrine. We should insist that it is the established and settled policy of our country, and should insist on its prompt and effectual maintenance in its original purity and purpose. I can not resist the temptation of remarking that in my judgment the people of this country have become dissatisfied with the foreign policy that has been pursued by our Government for the last twenty-five years. I think we all recognize that it has been dilatory, if not absolutely trivial and contemptible in the main. It is true that in a few instances we have bullied inferior powers, as a strong man will sometimes bully a weaker one, while at the same time we have refused to redress the grievances of American citizens.

Mr. President, this beneficent doctrine is in the line of the second of the resolutions which I have had the honor of introducing. It is to the effect that no portion of the territory of this country shall be occupied by a foreign power, and that no such power shall be permitted to advance its territorial possessions on this continent from the line where they rested at the time this great declaration was made. I believe, as an essential part of this doctrine, that we should not only declare that no foreign power should, without the consent of this Government, acquire additional territory on this continent, but that wherever territory is essential to the safety and security of this country we should not only insist that such powers should not acquire additional territory, but we should also insist that this Government shall have the right to such territory by purchase, and that eventually all foreign powers shall be driven from a land that ought to be fully dedicated to the cause of human liberty.

I have said that our foreign policy was tardy and therefore inefficient. In fact, sir, it has been a hiss and a byword among the people of the United States for more than a quarter of a century. I firmly believe that if this Government had acted promptly, and with a spirit of determination had demanded that Mrs. Maybrick, the unfortunate American woman who is now under a life sentence in an English prison, should have been given a fair trial, she would long ago have been afforded an opportunity to make known her innocence of the crime with which she is charged and that she would now be at liberty, or at least be in a position to demand a fair trial before an English jury. So, sir, I believe that the late consul, Waller, who is now languishing in a French prison for the alleged crime of treason to a Government to which he owes no allegiance, would have been set at liberty long ago if prompt steps had been taken by our Government to that end. But we have engaged in lengthy and useless correspondence on this subject with the French Government, and there the matter has ended.

I believe also that this Government should take prompt steps to protect Christians and Christian missionaries in China and Turkey and in all other countries whose Christian population are citizens of this Republic. I do not believe in what is sometimes called "a brilliant foreign policy," but I do believe in a sensible and efficient foreign policy; one that will guarantee to every American citizen when in a foreign land the full measure of his rights, and one that will not permit the country in which he may be sojourning to make him the sport of its whims or the victim of its malice or the malice of its subjects. Such a policy will command the respect of the entire civilized world and will draw to its support American citizens, regardless of political alignment. I desire it to be distinctly understood that I speak for myself alone, and that I do not, by what I here say, undertake to bind in the slightest degree, the political party of which I am a member. I have offered these resolutions that the Senate may act upon them promptly and by their adoption declare to the world that the doctrines they contain are sound and necessary to the welfare of our country; or by rejecting them declare with equal emphasis that the limp and inefficient policy of the past is to be pursued in the future by this Government.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President——

Mr. CALL. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. CALL. At the suggestion of several Senators I have consented that the consideration of the joint resolution which I introduced yesterday shall be postponed until to-morrow morning at the conclusion of the routine morning business. At that time I shall ask the Senate to consider the joint resolution, with a view of submitting some observations on the subject.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 5, 1895, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 4, 1895.

SOLICITOR FOR DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Walter E. Faison, of North Carolina, to be Solicitor for the Department of State, vice Walter D. Dabney, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES.

Arthur K. Delaney, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for the District of Alaska, vice Warren Truitt, resigned.

Elmer B. Adams, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Henry S. Priest, resigned.

Constantine B. Kilgore, of Texas, to be judge of the United States court of the southern district in the Indian Territory, as provided for by act of Congress approved March 1, 1895.

Yancey Lewis, of Indian Territory, to be judge of the United States court of the central district in the Indian Territory, vice Charles B. Stuart, resigned.

William M. Springer, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States court of the northern district in the Indian Territory, as provided for by act of Congress approved March 1, 1895.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE.

Henry H. Rolapp, of Utah Territory, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Utah, vice W. H. Smith, deceased.

PROBATE JUDGES.

George H. Fennemore, of Utah Territory, to be judge of probate in the county of Beaver, in the Territory of Utah, vice Joseph A. Barton, deceased.

F. A. Hammond, of Utah Territory, to be judge of probate in the county of San Juan, in the Territory of Utah, vice Joseph F. Barton, whose term expired February 14, 1895.

Joseph Houston, of Utah Territory, to be judge of probate in the county of Garfield, in the Territory of Utah, vice David Cameron, whose term expired February 14, 1895.

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS.

Burton E. Bennett, of Washington, to be attorney of the United States for the District of Alaska, vice Lytton Taylor, resigned.

Andrew C. Cruce, of Indian Territory, to be attorney of the United States court of the southern district in the Indian Territory, as provided for by act of Congress approved March 1, 1895.

Samuel D. Dodge, of Ohio, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of Ohio, vice Allan T. Brinsmade, resigned.

William J. Horton, of Indian Territory, to be attorney of the United States court for the central district in the Indian Territory, vice James V. Walker, resigned.

William L. Marbury, of Maryland, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Maryland, vice John T. Ensor, whose term expired May 21, 1894.

Charles B. Simonton, of Tennessee, to be attorney of the United States for the western district of Tennessee, vice Julius A. Taylor, deceased.

DISTRICT MARSHALS.

Michael Devanney, of Ohio, to be marshal of the United States for the southern district of Ohio, vice Henry Bohl, resigned.

James M. Martin, of Louisiana, to be marshal of the United States for the western district of Louisiana, vice Robert L. Luckett, deceased.

Samuel M. Rutherford, of Indian Territory, to be marshal of the United States court of the northern district in the Indian Territory, as provided for by act of Congress approved March 1, 1895.

Charles L. Stowe, of Indian Territory, to be marshal of the United States court for the southern district in the Indian Territory, vice Lucius L. Stowe, deceased.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 5, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting (in compliance with the requirements of an act authorizing the Postmaster-General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty, approved May 9, 1888) the claim of James C. Soape, late postmaster at Shreveport, La., for reimbursement for loss resulting from the theft of money and postage stamps from his office April 9, 1890; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PASCO presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted by the city council of Jacksonville, Fla., and a petition in the form of resolutions from Nassau Camp, No. 104, United Confederate Veterans, of Fernandina, Fla., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lewis County, State of Washington, praying for the adoption of a national system of public roads, and indicating a plan to provide for their construction; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented the petition of Robert Williams, sergeant of ordnance, United States Army, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the President to commission him as a second lieutenant of infantry, to be placed on the retired list of the Army with the pay and allowances of that grade; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MANTLE presented a memorial of the legislature of Montana remonstrating against the enactment of legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue United States bonds at this time and under existing circumstances; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We, your memorialists, the Fourth legislative assembly of the State of Montana, respectfully represent, that

Whereas the President of the United States and other prominent officials of our country have suggested the issuance of a large amount of United States bonds; and

Whereas the country is now in a condition of peace, and the most productive and recuperative nation on earth; and

Whereas believing such issue of bonds would be detrimental to the prosperity of the vast majority of citizens of the country, and would eventually bear especially hard upon the most numerous and poorer class of our people, wherever residing throughout the land, and could only in any event inure to the advantage of the wealthy capitalists and money powers of this country and Europe: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we sincerely and earnestly protest against the Government of the United States issuing bonds, as has been recommended; and be it

Resolved, That we request the Senators and Member of Congress from this State to use their best efforts and all honorable means to prevent the passage of any act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to issue United States bonds at this time and under existing circumstances.

WILBRA H. SWETT,
Speaker of the House.
ALEX. C. BOTKIN,
President of the Senate.

Attest:
E. W. STETSON, *Chief Clerk.*

Mr. MANTLE presented the following memorial of the legislature of Montana; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We, your memorialists, of the Fourth legislative assembly of the State of Montana, respectfully represent:

That by law and the proclamation of the President of the United States made October 15, 1892, the homestead-entry settlers upon the then ceded portion of the Crow Reserve are required to pay $1.50 per acre in addition to complying with the other and usual homestead-entry laws, and in addition to paying the other and usual homestead-entry fees; that said tract of land contained within the lately ceded portion of the Crow Reserve is desert land within the meaning of the desert-entry laws; that all of said land requires artificial irrigation to grow agricultural crops successfully; that said irrigation imposes an additional and large burden upon the homestead-entry settlers.

That we know of no good and sufficient reason why the homestead-entry settlers upon this tract should be subject to greater burdens than homestead-entry settlers are in other parts of the United States.

In view of the above facts we respectfully pray that you will abolish said additional charge of $1.50 per acre and allow the homestead-entry settlers upon this tract to obtain title to their lands upon compliance with the same requirements that obtain upon the general law on the subject, thus relieving a large and worthy class of an unjust burden.

For the early consideration of this our memorial we earnestly pray.

WILBRA H. SWETT,
Speaker of the House.
ALEX. C. BOTKIN,
President of the Senate.

Attest:
E. W. STETSON, *Chief Clerk.*

Mr. MANTLE presented the following memorial of the legislature of Montana; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We, your memorialists, the Fourth legislative assembly of the State of Montana, respectfully represent:

That within the county of Cascade, in this State, there is now a tract of land known as the Fort Shaw Military Reservation;

That said tract contains about 77 square miles of land, and is situated in the heart of the Sun River Valley, embodying within its limits the best and most valuable agricultural lands in said valley;

That said reservation was abandoned for military purposes by act of Congress about three years back, and subsequently our Indian school was established thereon by the Government.

Further, that under existing conditions this large, valuable tract of land is a barren waste, unoccupied and unproductive.

In view of the above facts we respectfully pray:

1. That you will set apart only so much of said tract as may be sufficient for the purposes of said Indian school—said school land to contain the buildings and appurtenances as now existing—which said school tract is to be continued in its present uses; and,

2. That after such selection for said school the remainder of said Fort Shaw Military Reservation be opened to homestead settlers only under such conditions and restrictions as may be deemed wise.

3. That in view of the agricultural immigration now coming to our State we earnestly pray for an early consideration of this our memorial.

WILBRA H. SWETT,
Speaker of the House.
ALEX. C. BOTKIN,
President of the Senate.

Approved.

J. E. RICKARDS, *Governor.*

The above is a true copy.

E. W. STETSON, *Chief Clerk.*

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Delaware River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MILLS introduced a bill (S. 424) to provide for the coinage of silver in the Treasury, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MORRILL introduced a bill (S. 425) to provide for the register of copyrights; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 426) relating to acknowledgments of instruments affecting real estate within the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 427) to provide for a municipal building and court-house in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 428) to prevent fraudulent divorces in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 429) authorizing the construction of a building for the accommodation of the United States Patent Office; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 430) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Huntington, in the State of West Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 431) to amend an act entitled "An act providing a civil government for Alaska;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also introduced a bill (S. 432) to authorize the governor of Alaska to create precincts, and appoint justices of the peace and

constables therein, and for other purposes, in the Territory of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also introduced a bill (S. 433) for the relief of George W. Craig; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 434) for the relief of William F. Wilson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 435) for the relief of the trustee of St. Joseph's Catholic Church, at Martinsburg, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 436) for the relief of Mrs. Ann E. Heiskell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 437) for the relief of Marion Lance, administrator of Henry Lance, deceased, of Barbour County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 438) for the relief of John Pickens, of Barbour County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 439) for the relief of Elizabeth Mulvehill; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 440) for the relief of Lewis Karrickhoff, of Barbour County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 441) for the relief of the administrator of Andrew D. Coplin, deceased, of Harrison County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 442) for the relief of the administrator of Jacob Coplin, deceased, of Harrison County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 443) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Henry T. Woody; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 444) for the relief of the administrator of Andrew D. Coplin, deceased, of Harrison County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 445) for the relief of the county court of Berkeley County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 446) for the relief of Julia Barnet; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 447) for the relief of Asa Kelly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 448) for the relief of James M. Stout; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 449) to refund to the State of West Virginia the money paid to officers of the One hundred and thirty-third Regiment of West Virginia Militia for services rendered during the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 450) for the relief of the estate of A. H. Herr, deceased, late of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 451) for the relief of William M. Morrison; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 452) providing for the payment of the amounts due the employees in and the contractors who furnished castings to the United States Armory at Harpers Ferry, W. Va., from January 1, 1861, to April 19, 1861, inclusive; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 453) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Harpers Ferry, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 454) for the relief of Levi Teets; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 455) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Springfield, Hampshire County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 456) for the relief of M. C. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 457) for the relief of the trustees of Trinity Episcopal Church; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 458) for the relief of Edward Tearney, administrator of William McSherry, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 459) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Flat Woods, Braxton County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 460) for the relief of the executor of C. M. Shaffer, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 461) for the relief of the trustees of the German Evangelical Church of Martinsburg, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 462) for the relief of Nathan Reed, of Barbour County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 463) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Martinsburg, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 464) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Protestant Church of Middleway, Jefferson County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 465) for the relief of Moses Grathouse, of Harrison County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 466) granting a pension to William Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 467) for the erection of a public building at Pierre, S. Dak.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SQUIRE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 468) to increase the number of light-house districts, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 469) granting to the State of Washington 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the sales of public lands in that State; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 470) granting to the State of Washington certain lands therein situated for the purpose of a fish hatchery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 471) for the relief of the purchasers from the United States of land in even-numbered sections within the forfeited portions of railroad grants; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 472) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel B. Sparkman, of Nashville, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 473) for the relief of Mrs. H. B. Clay, of Rogersville, Hawkins County, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 474) fixing times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 475) for the relief of the legal representative of P. S. Schuyler, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PASCO introduced a bill (S. 476) for the relief of Salvador Costa; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 477) to repeal section 553 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, requiring the district judge for the southern district of Florida to reside at Key West; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 478) to establish a term of the district and circuit courts of the United States at Ocala, in the southern judicial district of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 479) to make Anclote, in the State of Florida, a subport of entry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 480) granting a pension to William B. Matchett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GORMAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 481) to permit the Standard Telephone Company of Washington and Baltimore City to install, maintain, and operate a telephone and telegraph plant and exchange in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 482) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Sherwin, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 483) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund Wolf; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (S. 484) providing for the erection of an addition to the public building at Los Angeles, Cal., and appropriating money therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 485) for the relief of Thomas J. Spencer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 486) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Scrivener; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 487) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pension to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 488) for the relief of the legal representatives and devisees of James W. Schaumburg; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 489) for the relief of the legal owners of the Columbia Bridge, at Columbia, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 490) to indemnify the State of Pennsylvania for money expended in 1864 for militia called into the military service by the governor under the proclamation of the President of June 15, 1863; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 491) for the relief of Daniel O'Sullivan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 492) for the erection of a public building at Meriden, Conn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 493) for the erection of a public building at Waterbury, Conn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 494) constituting Stamford, Conn., a port of delivery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 495) for the relief of William Bond & Co. and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 496) to provide, in connection with other nations, for the unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 1 to 15½; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the bill be read at length and lie on the table.

The bill was read the second time at length, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person may deposit in any United States mint gold or silver bullion not less in value than $50, and the same shall be coined free of charge (if the metal be sufficiently pure to need no refining), the gold into the coins provided for by existing laws and the silver into dollars nine-tenths fine, the weight of the pure silver in each dollar to be fifteen and one-half times the 23.22 grains, being the weight of the pure gold in the gold dollar; that is to say, 359.91 grains, which, with 39.99 grains of alloy, will make the total weight of each silver dollar 399.9 grains instead of 412½ grains as now by law provided.

SEC. 2. Payment shall be made to said depositor for such bullion in coins similar to those into which the metal is to be coined, or the Secretary of the Treasury at his option may pay the depositor in Treasury notes of convenient denominations promising to pay an equivalent number of dollars, which notes shall be redeemable in gold or silver at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury. The silver dollars coined in accordance with this law, as well as the gold coins of the United States and the Treasury notes herein provided for, shall be a full legal tender for all debts, public and private. The existing silver dollars shall be retired and recoined according to the new rates, the profits accruing therefrom to be applied to the expenses of maintaining the mints.

SEC. 3. This law shall take effect and become operative when similar laws shall have been adopted by the Governments of England, France, and Germany; which laws shall in substance provide for the purchase of gold and silver bullion without limit, and shall make legal tender of the gold and the principal silver coins and any certificate representing them, the ratio between the gold and silver to be the same provided for in this act; and when such laws have been passed by the Governments aforesaid, the President shall make proclamation accordingly, and this law shall then take effect and be in force.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 497) to provide for a public building at Tampa, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 498) to provide for adequate compensation to the employees of railway corporations engaged in interstate commerce when disabled or killed in the line of duty; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 499) to prevent and punish railroad corporations engaged in interstate commerce from controlling or attempting to control elections; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 500) to provide a salary for the marshals and district attorneys of the northern and southern districts of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 501) to require the judge of the southern district of Florida to reside in Jacksonville, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 502) to approve a compromise and settlement between the United States and the State of Arkansas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 503) authorizing the printing of the monthly summary statement of imports and exports of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 504) to increase the pension of Edmund Woog; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying petition, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MILLS introduced a bill (S. 505) to provide for the payment of pensions to the widows of soldiers who served in the Mexican war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 506) to correct the military record of John Fox, of Albany, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 507) to pension Mollie Crandall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 508) for the relief of John W. Lewis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 509) for the relief of John W. Lewis, of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 510) for the relief of Edward Hughes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 511) granting a pension to P. F. Castleman, of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 512) for the relief of Orville T. Porter, late United States marshal for the District of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 513) to provide for the construction of a public building at Baker City, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 514) for the relief of Warren Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TELLER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 515) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Sexton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 516) for the relief of M. D. Crow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 517) for the relief of Thomas Williams, an employee of the Senate folding room, for injuries received while in the discharge of his duties, in the year 1892; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 518) for the relief of Mrs. Julia A. Humphries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 519) for the relief of Marshall R. Hathaway; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 520) granting to the city of Pendleton, in the State of Oregon, the right to lay pipes and conduct water from the Umatilla River across the Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Government school lands, and the lands of the United

States near the Umatilla Agency, for municipal purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 521) for the relief of Henry Judge, of Ashland, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 522) for the relief of George Hughes, of Portland, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 523) for the relief of John Thurman, of Portland, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 524) for the relief of Avery D. Babcock and wife, of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 525) for the relief of Thomas Guinean, of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 526) to establish an assay office at Baker City, in the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 527) for the relief of Margaret C. McKay, widow of the late Dr. William C. McKay, of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 528) for the erection of a public building for a post-office and United States land office at the city of The Dalles, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 529) for the relief of Peter Grant Stewart, of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 530) for the relief of N. M. Kimball, administrator of the estate of N. S. Kimball, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 531) for the relief of Nicholas Dupuis, sr., of Vancouver, State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 532) for the relief of H. W. Shipley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 533) for the relief of Sidney W. Moss, of Oregon City, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 534) for the relief L. A. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 535) for the relief of William A. Starkweather, of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 536) granting an increase of pension to Samantha Barnes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 537) for the relief of Flora A. Darling; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. STEWART. The bill is accompanied by a paper which I move be printed and referred, with the bill, to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 538) to provide a modern organization for the line of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 539) for the relief of John A. Lynch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 540) to correct the military record of and grant an honorable discharge to Isaac H. Fitzmorris, he having served in the Army of the United States three years six months and six days; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 541) for the relief of Orin R. McDaniel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 542) to pay William A. Terrell, of Company C, Fiftieth Ohio Volunteers, pay and bounty; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 543) for the relief of Frank Denham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 544) granting a pension to Anderson Sherman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 545) granting a pension to John J. Logan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 546) granting a pension to Charles Bauermaster; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 547) granting a pension to Levi C. Mann; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 548) granting a pension to George W. Campbell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 549) for relief of William Martin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 550) granting a pension to Henry L. Flint; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 551) granting a pension to Matthias Reed; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 552) granting accrued pension to the surviving children of Shubal York, surgeon of Fifty-fourth Illinois Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 553) granting to Ira Bacon, of Company A, Fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteers, an additional bounty of $100; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 554) granting a pension to Mary Whetsel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 555) granting an increased pension to John S. Dill, of Captain Mayo's Company, Black Hawk war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VILAS introduced a bill (S. 556) to prevent the carrying of obscene literature and articles designed for indecent and immoral use from one State or Territory into another State or Territory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH introduced a bill (S. 557) granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Neumann; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 558) for the relief of Mary H. Noonan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 559) for the relief of Bvt. Col. Thomas P. O'Reilly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 560) granting an honorable discharge to William Pierce; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 561) authorizing the establishment of a free port at Fort Pond Bay or elsewhere in the waters of Long Island, in the State of New York; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 562) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the carriage of passengers by sea," approved August 2, 1882; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 563) exempting American coastwise sailing vessels piloted by their licensed masters or by a United States pilot from the obligation to pay State pilots for services not rendered; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 564) providing for the collection of fees for furnishing certificates of title to vessels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 565) providing for the establishment and enforcement of rules and regulations for the use and navigation of United States canals and similar works of navigation, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 566) concerning measurement of vessels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 567) for the relief of the Continental Fire Insurance Company and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 568) granting a pension to Mrs. Ann M. Madden; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ROACH (by request) introduced a bill (S. 569) for the relief of Everett Wroe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 570) for the relief of loyal citizens, therein named, of Loudoun County, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 571) for the relief of the Seaboard and Roanoke Railroad Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HARRIS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 572) providing penalties for charter violations by corporations operated in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying letter of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 15) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the Mountain View Cemetery Association, at Oakland, Cal., certain cannon, etc.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GEORGE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 16) to remove suspension of payment of claim of estate of Roger A. Hiern; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. KYLE. Day before yesterday I introduced a bill (S. 106) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain damages resulting to any person who made entry upon lands within the present limits of the Sequoia and Yosemite National parks, in the State of California, prior to October 1, 1890. I asked to have the bill referred to the Select Committee on Forest Reservations. I notice that it has been referred to the Committee on Public Lands. I ask unanimous consent that that committee be discharged from the consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the select committee, to which it properly belongs.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the change of reference will be made.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. DUBOIS submitted the following resolution as an amendment to the rules of the Senate; which was read, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

Resolved, That paragraph 1 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate be amended by striking out the words "All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, except bills making appropriations for rivers and harbors, which shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce," and inserting the following:

"The general appropriation bills shall be referred to committees as follows:

"To the Committee on Appropriations: The bills for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses, for sundry civil expenses, and for all deficiencies.

"To the Committee on Agriculture: The bill for the Agricultural Department.

"To the Committee on Foreign Relations: The consular and diplomatic bill.

"To the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill for the military establishment, including the Military Academy.

"To the Committee on Naval Affairs: The bill for the naval establishment.

"To the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads: The Post-Office appropriation bill.

"To the Committee on Indian Affairs: The bill for Indians and Indian tribes.

"To the Committee on Commerce: The bill for rivers and harbors.

"To the Committee on Coast Defenses: The fortifications bill.

"To the Committee on the District of Columbia: The bill making appropriations for the District; and

"To the Committee on Pensions: The pension appropriation bills."

REPORT ON FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

On motion of Mr. PLATT, it was

Ordered, That the report of the commission appointed to negotiate with the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, known as the Dawes Commission, which report is attached to the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior as Exhibit A, be printed as a Senate document.

IMPRISONMENT OF GENERAL SANGUIALLY.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to send to the Senate all correspondence relating to the trial, conviction, and sentence to hard labor for life of General Sanguially, an American citizen, for alleged complicity in the war against Spain by the Cubans, and if no authentic record should be on file in the State Department, that the Secretary of State be directed to obtain a copy of the record of such trial.

RETIREMENT OF GREENBACKS.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it is unwise and inexpedient to retire the greenbacks.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Whereas the Congress, March 3, 1891, passed a bill, which was approved by the President and became a law, appropriating $250,000 for the purchase of a site and the commencement of the construction of a public building at Portland, Oreg.; and

Whereas on March 2, 1895, the Congress passed another bill, which was approved by the President, appropriating an additional $100,000 for the continuation of the construction of such public building; and

Whereas in pursuance of such appropriations the United States purchased from one John McCraken block No. 51, in Couch's addition to the city of Portland, Oreg., for a site for such public building and received from said McCraken and wife a deed therefor, dated June 3, 1892, the consideration therefor being $160,000: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to advise the Senate at his earliest convenience as to what steps, if any, have been taken by the Department to prepare or procure plans for such building and for proceeding with the construction thereof; and if no steps have been taken, then the reasons fully why not and the cause of the delay in reference thereto.

WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. CALL said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I ask that the joint resolution, which I introduced on the 3d instant, in relation to according belligerent rights to the Cuban government be now laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution heretofore introduced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] and laid on the table at his request. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. R. 4) declaring that a state of public war exists in Cuba, and that belligerent rights be accorded to the Cuban government, was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Government of the United States recognizes a condition of public war between the Government of Spain and the government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba; and the United States of America hereby declare that they will maintain a condition of strict neutrality between the contending powers and accord to each all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States. The Congress of the United States protest and remonstrate against the barbarous manner in which the war in Cuba has been conducted, and the President is hereby authorized to take such steps as may be expedient, in his judgment, to secure an observance of the laws of war as recognized by all civilized nations.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I desire to submit a few observations in support of the joint resolution before its reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Island of Cuba is within a few hours' travel of the southern boundary of the United States. It, with the adjacent keys upon the coast of Florida, constitutes, according to all military authority, the absolute control and power over the Gulf of Mexico. It is, perhaps, the most fertile region of the globe, capable of sustaining a population of eight or ten millions. The climate is adapted to the highest physical development of man. With a government properly constituted and properly administered, it would furnish a home and business for a large portion of the people of the United States. As it is, the country presents a spectacle of ruin, of misgovernment, of barbarous cruelty, which, to say the least, is a disgrace to this civilized age.

I am fully sensible of the great part which Spain has performed in the history of the world, of her ancient chivalry, of the great soldiers of which Gonsalvo de Cordova was the leader and the type, of the glories of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, and of the noble traits of Spanish character, and I speak here of her misgovernment and oppression of the people of Cuba in no spirit of disparagement, but rather attributing these evils to the impossibility of good government under a despotic rule so far removed from the home Government and over a dependency where all classes of the people are resolved on a government founded on principles and organized with powers of their own choice. The heroic traits of Spanish character have been transmitted to their Cuban descendants. Their courage, their fortitude, their self-denial, their earnest convictions, and their enthusiastic patriotism are all possessed by their Cuban descendants, and these qualities make their struggle for freedom the more desperate and the more certain of success.

For more than a half century the people of Cuba have been endeavoring to free themselves, as other Spanish colonies have done, from the control of the European Government. They have exhibited a degree of patriotism, of courage, of capacity equal to any which has been presented in the records of history. They are a people of quick and lively intelligence, easily susceptible of education in the higher branches of learning, and, with the opportunities which they have had, their progress is remarkable. They have presented some of the most conspicuous instances of patriotism, of courage, and of ability which are to be found in history. The late Jose Marti, whose life was given disinterestedly to the cause of his fellow-countrymen, is second scarcely to any character in the pages of history; a man of distinguished learning; a man of independent fortune, devoting his entire life to the relief of his people from despotic government, from misgovernment, from cruelty, he is justly regarded as the patriot martyr of that country. So of the present generals in the field, who have come from places of safety to engage in the war, a war prosecuted by these people without means, without arms, without munitions of war, and a war which is the result of a unanimous sentiment upon the part of the people of all classes in Cuba.

This is not the first attempt that has been made by these people to establish an independent government, a government of their own. Incited by our example, instructed by our teachings, acting upon our advice, these people attempted in 1870 to accomplish their independence. For ten long years they maintained a successful war, and submitted only upon the promise that their griev-

ances should be redressed. The report of a committee of the House of Representatives, a majority of whom adopted the report which I have in my hand, recognized the fact that these people were of right entitled to recognition as a belligerent power. This report, made by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, Mr. Banks, is a full and complete history of that struggle. It contains the references to the public law, which I shall not weary the Senate with reading, conclusively evidencing that where a people are maintaining a civil war, where with any kind of organization, with stability and firmness, they are protecting themselves by the endeavor to establish an independent government of their own, that is a condition which entitles them to the consideration of other nations as belligerents, which entitles them to neutrality on the part of other Governments. In that report I find the following:

The principles involved in this struggle, therefore, are manifest. The people of Cuba fight for—
Independence of Spain;
The right of self-government;
Religious liberty;
The abolition of slavery;
Universal suffrage;
The emancipation of industry and trade;
The freedom of speech and the press;
The rights of assembly and petition;
For general education; and
"All other inalienable rights of the people."

They fight for the termination of European Governments on this continent. They fight against Spanish tyranny; against monarchical, aristocratic, and personal government; against dignities and titles; against the corrupt duplication of offices; against slavery and the slave trade; and against the Government at Madrid, which, to use the language of General Prim, "in this contest stands before the world opposed to self-government, and resisting the abolition of slavery." It is to aid the Spanish cause that Spain appeals to us, and it is against her policy, revolting to the spirit of the age and the theory and practice of the American Government from its foundation, that we protest.

* * * * * * *

CUBAN FORCES.

The Cubans had at Yara October 11, 1868, 147 men; 4,000 the 12th of October; 9,700 in November, and 12,000 in December. They have now 10,000 well-armed men. There are 60,000 enrolled and drilled, but without arms. They claim that with a supply of arms they can put into the field 100,000 or 200,000 fighting men—citizens, farmers, and emancipated blacks—men of the country fighting for its liberties.

MILITARY OPERATIONS.

These hostile forces have not forgotten the objects for which they were organized. From the declaration of Cuban independence at Yara to this hour there has not been a week, scarcely a day, which has not been marked in the calendar of war by fierce and bloody contests. No revolution presents a more constant and determined struggle. Although the Cubans were undisciplined and unaccustomed to the use of arms, of which in the beginning they had few or none, and their enemy was composed of the best troops of the army and navy of Spain, whose places in the military posts of the island had been supplied by the resident Spaniards organized as volunteers, the Cubans nevertheless have been ready to meet their foes in skirmish, combat, or battle, and have shown themselves as brave in attack as defense. A record of two hundred skirmishes, combats, engagements, and battles, occurring from the 11th of October, 1868, to the defeat of Puello and Goyeneche, which terminated the campaign of December, 1869, and January, 1870, give an honorable distinction to the struggle of the Cubans for independence that would in nowise discredit a people long accustomed to self-government or trained to the use of arms.

* * * * * * *

IT IS REGARDED AS WAR BY SPAIN AND THE UNITED STATES, AND IS SO INTENDED BY CUBA.

The proclamation of the captain-general, dated July 8, 1869, declares that the war of insurrection against Spain demands speedy and exemplary punishment, and decrees the penalty of death upon those who may be captured in arms.

* * * * * * *

The American consul at Santiago de Cuba informs the Secretary of State, June 19, 1869, that the Spanish Government applies the most rigorous and barbarous laws, which have made it a war of extermination, shocking to every civilized nation. (Page 98.)

Count Valmaseda issued a decree April 4, 1869, which declares that there is no longer a place for neutrality; that those who were not for him were against him; and, that his soldiers might know how to distinguish them, they were called upon to observe the orders they themselves carried:

1. Every man, from the age of 15 years upward, found away from his habitation, who does not prove a justified motive therefor, will be shot.
2. Every habitation unoccupied will be burned by the troops.
3. Every habitation, from which does not float a white flag, as a signal that its occupants desire peace, will be reduced to ashes. (Page 83.)

The Secretary of State, May 19, is instructed by the President to protest in the most forcible manner against such a mode of warfare, and demands that persons having a right to claim the protection of the United States shall not be sacrificed or injured in the conduct of hostilities upon this basis.

* * * * * * *

The American consul-general at Habana recently received from the British naval officers the assurance of their protection and the offer of a file of marines to protect him whenever it became necessary to seek his safety on board a British man-of-war. And, still later, the American vice-consul at Santiago de Cuba was called to account for dispatches sent to his Government, and published by the order of Congress, by the unauthorized and irresponsible volunteers who govern Cuba; and, under the advice of the Spanish governor, who was unable to protect him, sought his safety from personal violence by taking refuge on board a French frigate, under the protection of French naval officers.

Here upon our immediate shores, here where a people following the declarations of our Declaration of Independence and the principles upon which this Government is founded, a people with acknowledged grievances which all the departments of this Government have affirmed, which the report of the committee of the House of Representatives has declared, which the Secretaries of State for more than twenty-five years, yes, I will say for more than fifty years, have repeatedly brought to the attention of this Government; a people to whom neither law nor liberty is allowed; a people as to whom the laws of war are not regarded by the dominant government, against whom a war merciless in respect to age, sex, and condition is maintained in a case of this kind, where these people, acting upon the principles which we have declared and the advice which we have given to them, assert precisely the same principles and by force of arms endeavor to obtain them, that we should silently permit this war to proceed without a single word of encouragement, without a single word of protection to their legitimate and recognized rights, is certainly not creditable to this Government, and is certainly not in accordance with justice, or with that high position which this people ought to take, and when we affirm the Monroe doctrine, if we permit instances of this kind to occur beneath our very eyes and within our reach, the affirmation is a vain one and should carry no weight or respect with it.

I have here a report, which I shall presently read, from a citizen who has recently been in Mexico and in Cuba, a man of character, of intelligence, a correspondent of the public press, which exhibits a condition of things which imperatively demands immediate action on the part of this Government.

As I have said, the question of public law is a clear one. It is affirmed by Mr. Webster, it is affirmed by Mr. Everett, it is affirmed by all our public authorities, that a state of civil war actually existing, maintained with persistency and earnestness, entitles the parties maintaining that war to recognition as belligerents. In the case of Hungary many years ago the President of the United States sent an agent to examine into the condition of the insurrection or the civil war, with instructions to him, which I have here, that if he found that it was a stable, persistent determination of the people of that country to establish an independent and free government, to say to them that the United States would accord to them not only belligerent rights, but recognize them as an independent power.

The action of President Taylor, through Mr. Clayton, Secretary of State, in sending, in June, 1849, Mr. A. D. Mann as a special agent to investigate the condition of the Hungarian insurrection, is elsewhere considered. (Supra, § 47.) In Mr. Mann's instructions, June 18, 1849, is the following:

"Should the new Government prove to be, in your opinion, firm and stable, the President will cheerfully recommend to Congress at their next session the recognition of Hungary, and you might intimate, if you should see fit, that the President would in that event be gratified to receive a diplomatic agent from Hungary in the United States by or before the next meeting of Congress, and that he entertains no doubt whatever that in case her new Government should prove to be firm and stable, her independence would be speedily recognized by that enlightened body."

President Grant, in his second annual message, in 1870, said:

As soon as I learned that a republic had been proclaimed at Paris and that the people of France had acquiesced in the change, the minister of the United States was directed by telegraph to recognize it and to tender my congratulations and those of the people of the United States. The reestablishment in France of a system of government disconnected with the dynastic traditions of Europe appeared to be a proper subject for the felicitations of Americans. Should the present struggle result in attaching the hearts of the French to our simpler forms of representative government, it will be a subject of still further satisfaction to our people. While we make no effort to impose our institutions upon the inhabitants of other countries, and while we adhere to our traditional neutrality in civil contests elsewhere, we can not be indifferent to the spread of American political ideas in a great and highly civilized country like France.

President Jefferson, in his third annual message, in 1803, said:

Congress witnessed, at their last session, the extraordinary agitation produced in the public mind by the suspension of our right of deposit at the port of New Orleans, no assignment of another place having been made according to treaty.

Mr. Jefferson, in writing to President Madison, April 27, 1809, said:

It will be objected to our receiving Cuba that no limit can then be drawn to our future acquisitions. Cuba can be defended by us without a navy.

Mr. Everett, in discussing the territorial growth of the United States, used the following language:

The Island of Cuba lies at our doors. It commands the approach to the Gulf of Mexico, which washes the shores of five of our States. It bars the entrance of that great river which drains half the North American Continent, and with its tributaries forms the largest system of internal water communication in the world. It keeps watch at the doorway of our intercourse with California by the Isthmus route.

Mr. Everett, writing to Lord John Russell, in 1853, said:

A recent impartial French traveler, M. Ampère, confirms this impression. All the ordinary political rights enjoyed in free countries are denied to the people of that island. The government is, in principle, the worst form of despotism, namely, absolute authority delegated to a military viceroy, and supported by an army from abroad. I speak of the nature of the government, and not of the individuals by whom it is administered, for I have formed a very favorable opinion of the personal character of the present captain-general, as of one or two of his predecessors.

I have here a report which I shall proceed to read. As I have stated, it is from a person who has been formerly connected with the diplomatic affairs of this country in foreign countries, a man of accurate observation, with ample means of observation, a man of character and reliability in every respect. He says:

I came from Mexico to New York by sea, stopping at Habana. I discovered one thing before I had been there six hours, that none of the official reports

sent from Cuba portrayed the real condition of affairs. I met a vast number of people and a number of haciendados, or planters, from the Santa Clara district. I failed to find one Cuban under the age of 35 who was not an office-holder who was not in complete sympathy with the insurgents.

In Habana the feeling is very strong for the belligerents, but the city is so covered with spies that it is difficult for anyone but an American to learn the truth. I was told, and I soon saw for myself, that Habana was as strongly revolutionary as any part of the island. The business condition of that city is deplorable, and will be much worse if the insurgents prevent the grinding of the crops. It is hourly expected that such an order will be issued to the haciendados. This will bring about a complete paralysis of the island, and will make out of every laborer a revolutionist. On the boat from Habana to New York I met one of the wealthiest planters of the Santa Clara district, who is a son of a Spanish marquis. He was introduced to me in Habana as one of the most influential men of the island. He says that it is a great error that the insurgents are made up mostly of negroes. He has been among them, and says they are as fine a body of men as could be gotten together. He had abandoned his hacienda because he had been ordered not to grind. He says that it will not be an unpopular movement for the insurgents to prevent the grinding over the entire island, because every man who owns a foot of land knows that this is the only way to bring the revolution to a close. He says, however, that the insurgent leaders are only waiting to see what this Congress will do. If the United States or other nations fail to recognize the belligerency of Cuba by January the grinding will be prevented. This is a difficult thing to do. The grinding will begin in December. It must be understood that the sugar cane is only planted once in ten or twelve years. There will be no invasion of the plantations, but when a planter continues to grind when ordered not to do so several insurgents are sent out to get employment at such places. When the wind is favorable the cane is fired, and there is no power under heaven that can prevent its total destruction. The planters know this, and will make no attempt to grind if ordered not to do so. Many have already ceased to grind preparatory to the order being issued.

I was told by a number of Cubans who are of pure Spanish descent that it is impossible to put down this revolution even by concessions. The war up to this time has been purely guerrilla fighting. The insurgents fire from ambush and before the Spanish army can recover themselves the insurgents have fled. This is kept up on all the lines of march of the Spanish troops and they are harassed even after they are encamped. But every time the insurgents fire and retreat it is given out officially that they were routed. In Mexico there are a number of young men who have been sent there by their families for fear they would join openly in the rebellion. On the boat with me from Habana there were three whom I was told by other Cubans were being sent abroad until the revolution is over. They, with six others, had left Habana and joined the belligerents. They were recaptured, and their family influence was such that they were sent from the island instead of being imprisoned. The whole hope and feeling of the Cubans, so far as I could learn, is to become a State in the Union. A business man told me in Habana that even the Spanish themselves on the island admit that any condition would be better than that now existing.

The same statement contained in the correspondence is found in the report made by General Banks twenty-five years ago. During all that period of time these people, being promised some relief from the condition of oppressive taxation, of despotic rule which prevailed over them, have been contending against these evils, and now, finding the situation intolerable, finding that property yields no return, that labor is without adequate compensation, that no native Cuban is allowed to hold any office of dignity or trust, that the natives are entirely deprived of all control over their own country and their own affairs, and a military despotism constantly maintained and supported by armed troops brought from Spain, they have protested in the face of the civilized world against these wrongs. They have the same cause precisely that we had for our Declaration of Independence. We may take phrase by phrase that great proclamation which resounded throughout the world with a gleam of hope to all oppressed people, and we will find that their case is parallel in all respects to our own. Take the declaration that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed and that they have a right to assert a change in their form of government when oppressed and deprived of the objects for which government is instituted. We find that the Cubans are precisely in line with ourselves in that respect, and they have a right to claim whatever consideration the public law will allow a power in that condition.

Mr. President, I ask the immediate consideration of the Committee on Foreign Relations to the joint resolution. American citizens are being imprisoned. I understand that General Sanguilly, whom the paper reports was sentenced to hard labor for life, is an American citizen, entitled to the protection of this Government. I am informed, whether correctly or not I am unable to state, that his trial was a mock trial; that there is no just ground of suspicion even against him, much less proof; that it is true he was a general and a leader in the former revolution, but that he has taken no part, whatever his sympathies may be, in the present struggle. If that be true, then it is the imperative duty of this Government to interfere. If there are other cases in which Americans have been deprived of their rights, it is the imperative duty of this Government to interfere. But beyond that, what considerations of public policy are there which justify Spain in continuing to enforce her Government over those people?

The island is very remote from her home country—from the Kingdom of Spain. Cuba is the last remaining vestige, with the little island immediately adjacent to it, of her vast dominion upon this continent. It is a great expense to her. It must yield in the future to the rapidly increasing population of the American Republics and to the force which they can bring to bear. It must yield to the consideration of the necessity for the control of that island by this Government, with its seventy million people, soon to be one hundred million. The future renders it impossible that Spain can maintain her dominion there. Why, then, should not this great Government say that this butchery and destruction of human life shall cease? Why shall we not say to Spain, in peaceable and respectful negotiations, that we are willing to protect the people of Cuba, and to make to her such compensation as may be reasonably adequate, she being the responsible party? I can see no reason why we should not do so.

That island must be subject to our dominion in some shape, and although annexation is not now desirable, yet it is desirable that those people should be an independent people, and that they should be subject to our protection. The island should not be a place from which, under any condition whatever, hostile fleets or hostile armies can be directed against the United States or against our commerce in the Gulf of Mexico. There are, therefore, no considerations of policy which can justify our further aiding the Government of Spain in subjecting Cuba to her domination, nor can there be any considerations in the interest of Spain herself which would justify such a policy.

I see in the public prints which I have here that the people of Spain are themselves beginning to revolt against the home Government; that the vast expense with which this struggle is burdening the people of Spain is creating discontent. It will inevitably destroy the dynasty of the Government if it is persisted in, because the Cuban people stand upon the everlasting principles of right. If our Government is a true government, and is founded upon a true declaration of principles, they have a right to establish their independence. They are justified in the assertion of that right by the oppression and the misgovernment which for more than a century has been imposed upon them. They are justified by the natural and proper ambition of any people for prosperity and for reasonable promotion for their young men in the public service. With one-half the evils that exist in Cuba our people would long ago have risen in revolt against any government, even if it sacrificed the last man in the country.

So, Mr. President, in my judgment there is no consideration which forbids us from immediately according to these people the rights of belligerents in our ports and territory. It would be no cause of offense to Spain. Spain declared that the Confederacy was a belligerent power and recognized it. The proclamation of the English Government recognized the civil war in the South. Both of those proclamations I have in my hand. When this people have acted upon our example, upon our advice, under our instruction; when they are asserting precisely the rights which we have declared in the face of the world justify forcible resistance, the organization of a new government and the establishment of its powers in accordance with their wishes; when they are pursuing precisely the course which we have advised them to pursue, with what justice or propriety can this great people hesitate to accord to them the full rights of belligerents, when Spain did it to the South, when England did it by proclamation? It seems to me we should be glad to do it; that we should embrace eagerly the opportunity to encourage those people by extending to them the same aid that we do to the Spanish Government. Yet what is our attitude?

This Government is actually giving aid and comfort to the Spaniards against the Cubans. It is the power of this Government that to-day maintains the Spanish army in the Island of Cuba. It is this Government which is responsible for the outrages. I do not mean to say that it is the President or his Cabinet, but that it is this Government, and the attitude it occupies in all its branches in not declaring that those people are entitled to belligerent rights in our ports and territory, which to-day is maintaining the power of Spain in the Island of Cuba.

We allow munitions of war to be bought by Spain, we allow ships to be fitted out, we allow Spain to purchase whatever is necessary in the way of supplies to continue the war, but the Cubans are prohibited from doing so, and the whole power of our Government is exercised to deprive them of these rights in our territory. I say there is no ground of public law and no ground of public policy in respect to our relations, present and future, with the Island of Cuba which justify it. I say there is no ground of justice that permits it; no ground of humanity that would tolerate it. It will be a disgrace to our country if a people following our example, acting upon our advice, a people who can claim that every line in our Declaration of Independence furnishes a parallel to their own case, shall, by our aid and our acquiescence, be permitted to be crushed, their women and children murdered, and merciless war maintained against them.

My attention has been called to a proclamation of General Gomez in regard to the destruction of property. The report which I have read explains that matter. It is not a destruction of property. It is simply a declaration that as a military necessity the operation of grinding cane and manufacturing sugar shall not, for the present, be continued. The cane is not destroyed. It is only destroyed where the military order is disobeyed. My information is that the Cuban owners of this property, and even the Spaniards who own it, concur in this order and recognize its pro-

priety and wisdom. But if that were not so, what comparison does that bear to the merciless destruction of human life which is carried on by the other side? What of the arrest and trial upon suspicion of citizens, subjects of Spain or American citizens, and their transportation to the penal colony of Spain, with all its horrors?

Mr. President, I hope the Committee on Foreign Relations will take this subject into consideration. I hope it will not postpone action, but that it will be moved by these considerations to report at an early day in favor of the joint resolution which I introduced, or some other measure that will accord to the people of Cuba the same rights in our territory and our courts that are now given to Spain—the rights which a neutral Government accords whenever there is a condition of civil war. As I have said, I do not care to occupy the time of the Senate for any length of time by reading the various authorities upon the subject of international war, of public war, in case of resistance by a people, but I will read a few citations here.

A civil war—

Vattel says—

is when a party arises in a State which no longer obeys the sovereign, and is sufficiently strong to make head against him, or when, in a Republic, the nation is divided into two opposite factions, and both sides take up arms.

* * * * * * *

When a part of a State takes up arms against the Government, if it is sufficiently strong to resist its action, and to constitute two parties of equally balanced forces, the existence of civil war is thenceforward determined.

* * * * * * *

It is no ground of offense to a nation that civil war is recognized as a public condition of war. It is no ground of offense that neutrality between the contending parties is declared to be the proper attitude of other nations toward such a struggle.

So said Mr. Webster, so said Mr. Frelinghuysen, so declared Mr. Everett, and there is an extensive correspondence here, setting forth by all these different officials and Secretaries of our Government the same declaration of atrocious war, of merciless hostility, of civil war in its most cruel form by the Spanish Government upon the people of Cuba. Here is a half century of declarations of an authentic character from our own Government and our own Secretaries of State, declaring that those people are not only engaged in a war which entitles them to recognition, but that it is a war in which humanity itself demands that they should be accorded the rights of belligerents.

Mr. President, I submit that Cuba is "the queen of the Antilles." It is the most desirable place of residence in the West India Islands for the human race. The conditions of life are easier there; there is less of extreme poverty; labor obtains a more adequate and more comfortable reward than anywhere else. The day will come when it will be the Garden of Eden of the human race. The day will come when a confederated republic of the islands of the West Indies will be established. Unless this civilization of ours is a failure, and this republican Government of ours a fraud and a falsehood, it is the part of wisdom that we should recognize the fact. If these free institutions of ours are to build up a happy people, are to ameliorate the poverty of the world, are to create a higher condition of humanity, it is the part of wise statesmanship in us to say that the cruelties of merciless war shall not be practiced upon a people immediately within our reach and following our example, taught by our precepts to do that which they are doing.

I hope that the disgrace we are now under of actually aiding the Government of Spain by the present condition of the public laws in oppression and merciless rule over these people will be avoided by early action on the part of Congress.

The people of the United States with great unanimity desire this action from us, and require such proceeding as will secure freedom and independence to Cuba.

The will of the people has been expressed in great meetings in New York, Chicago, and the cities of the several States.

It is not the part of friendship to Spain to delay this action. The sooner the United States speaks in determined but friendly and respectful terms the better for Spain, and for Cuba, and all the best interests of the nations.

For all these reasons I urge on the committee and on the Senate the passage of the resolutions as the first step to be taken in the interests of peace and of staying a merciless and cruel war.

Mr. VOORHEES. I ask that the joint resolution be again read.

The Secretary again read joint resolution S. R. 4.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint Resoution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHEES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 9, 1895, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 5, 1895.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

John L. Peak, of Missouri, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Switzerland, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice James O. Broadhead, resigned.

Matt W. Ransom, of North Carolina, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Mexico, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Allen Thomas, of Florida, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Venezuela, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Seneca Haselton, resigned.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

John F. Baker, of Minnesota, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Managua, Nicaragua, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

William W. Russell, of Maryland, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to Venezuela, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Richard M. Bartleman, appointed consul at Antigua, West Indies.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONERS.

John B. Harlow, of Missouri, to be Civil Service Commissioner, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Theodore Roosevelt, resigned.

William G. Rice, of New York, to be Civil Service Commissioner, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Charles Lyman, resigned.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS.

Frank A. Branagan, of Ohio, to be Chief of the Bureau of Accounts in the Department of State of the United States, vice Francis J. Kieckhoefer, resigned.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 5, 1895.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Matt W. Ransom, of North Carolina, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Mexico.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *December 6, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last was read and approved.

PRINTING THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, after the reading of the President's message, I made a motion, which was adopted, that the message be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and also that 5,000 copies be printed for the use of the members of the House. I have since learned, on examination of the proceedings of the last Congress, that provision is already made by the existing law for the printing of 10,000 copies of the message for the use of the House and 5,000 for the use of the Senate. The motion I made on Tuesday last was unnecessary; and I desire, therefore, to move to reconsider that vote for the purpose of rescinding the action taken with reference to the printing of the message.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the vote will be reconsidered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, we do not understand the request of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. The resolution to print the 5,000 copies of the President's message was unnecessary, and is embarrassing, inasmuch as the existing law provides for the printing; and the gentleman from New York asks consent that the motion to print be rescinded. Such action will be taken without formality if there be no objection.

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Terry] was not present when the members were sworn in on Monday last, and I ask that the oath be now administered to him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boatner] is also present. If there are other gentlemen present who have not yet taken the oath they can be sworn in at this time, if they come forward.

Mr. Boatner and Mr. Terry were then qualified, taking the oath of office required by law.

COMMITTEE ON MILEAGE.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of the following members to constitute the Committee on Mileage: ASHLEY B. WRIGHT, of Massachusetts; JOHN A. BARHAM, of California; ORLANDO BURRELL, of Illinois, and GEORGE C. PENDLETON, of Texas.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting detailed statement of the expenditures of the appropriations for the contingent expenses of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of the contingent expenses of the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

PROPERTY REPORT, SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the report of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, transmitting a list of property in his possession belonging to the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

FINANCIAL REPORT, SERGEANT-AT-ARMS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the financial report of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

JUDGMENTS, COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a report from the Court of Claims of judgments rendered by that court for the year ended November 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

INVENTORY OF PROPERTY, CLERK HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting an inventory of the public property in his possession on December 2, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

CLAIM OF JAMES C. SOAPE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting the claim of James C. Soape, late postmaster at Shreveport, La., for reimbursement on account of loss resulting from theft in his office; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

DUTIES ON CERTAIN IMPORTS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the United States consul at Belfast, Ireland, relating to certain duties; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXPENDITURES, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Commissioner of Labor, submitting a statement of all moneys expended under his direction during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ANNUAL REPORT, COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the annual report of his office for the year ended October 31, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the report of the Government directors of the Union Pacific Railway Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

NEW CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY BUILDING.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a report of Brig. Gen. T. Lincoln Casey, United States Army, concerning the construction of the building for the use of the Library of Congress for the year ended December 1, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SALES OF WASTE PAPER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Doorkeeper of the House, transmitting a statement of the sales of waste paper since the commencement of the first session of the Fifty-third Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

EXPENDITURES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a detailed statement of the expenditures of all appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, including supplemental accounts to date; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BOATNER, until January 1, on account of important business.

To Mr. LEISENRING, for this day, on account of important business.

REVISED STATUTES FOR HOUSE LIBRARY.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to furnish the House of Representatives, for the use of the House library, 50 copies of the Revised Statutes of the United States (second edition, 1878), and also 50 copies of the Supplement of the Revised Statutes of the United States (volume 1, second edition, 1874-1891).

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MONTHLY STATEMENT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine presents a joint resolution, which will be reported to the House by the Clerk.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 7) providing for the printing of the monthly summary statement of imports and exports of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department.

Resolved, etc., That there shall be printed monthly by the Public Printer 3,500 copies of the monthly summary statement of imports and exports and other statistical information prepared by the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department, 500 copies of which shall be for the use of the Senate, 1,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies for the use of the Treasury Department.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for that resolution arises out of an accidental omission in the printing act of January last. Prior to the passage of that act of January last the monthly statements of imports and exports and other statistics prepared by the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics were printed by requisition of the Treasury Department; but the printing act of January last provided that there should not be printed exceeding 1,000 copies of any document for which any Department should make requisition. Now, the Treasury Department has already had 1,000 copies, and has used that 1,000 copies for the purpose of foreign exchanges and also for the purpose of acquainting collectors of customs with certain necessary facts. The Treasury Department requires 2,000 copies. There have been none since February last for distribution among either Senators or Representatives. This is an exceedingly important document for the information of both Senators and Representatives. As the document has been put in type and stereotyped, no other expense will be required to print additional copies except simply the cost of paper and presswork, folding, and binding. So there will be little expense attending it. That will come from the ordinary appropriation for printing. Therefore, in accordance with the suggestion of the Government Printer, and in accordance with the suggestion of gentlemen who have been unable to obtain copies of this important document, as the October statement is now ready for printing, it is desirable that this action should be taken by the House and concurred in by the Senate immediately, without waiting for the appointment of committees.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Will the gentleman from Maine yield to me for a minute?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] one minute.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am very heartily in sympathy with the joint resolution offered by the gentleman from Maine. It seems to me it is absolutely necessary for the transaction of business in an intelligent way that the members should have access to the reports. I want to be indulged in making one other observation, that the printing and document bill, if I may so call it, which

was passed about the close of the last Congress, whatever its general merits may prove to be, is breeding much of trouble, disappointment, and friction in the transaction of business; and is likely to do so in many respects, some of which I can now foresee, and many of which, no doubt, I can not now foretell. For instance, I wanted a copy of the RECORD. I was informed that there were but 10 copies for the use of House committees. I hope that at an early day somebody will take up this subject and at least contrive that we may have such documents for the use of House committees and members as are necessary for the orderly transaction of business.

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield such time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] as he may desire.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to address an inquiry to the gentleman from Maine. I could not hear what he said, but from what I gathered of his remarks his resolution provides for the printing of 35,000 copies of this document every month.

Mr. DINGLEY. Thirty-five hundred.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Thirty-five hundred.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the Clerk please look and see whether there is any error as to that?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It was read 35,000 copies.

The SPEAKER. The resolution reads 3,500.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is in the form of a joint resolution.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is a joint resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Had it not better be a concurrent resolution? The printing for the two Houses is usually done under a concurrent resolution. If this joint resolution should be passed it will have to go to the President for his approval.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is a permanent law, and should go to the President for his approval.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Undoubtedly, any permanent law should go to the President for his approval; but the printing for the two Houses is usually done under a concurrent resolution.

Mr. DINGLEY. This is not only for the House and the Senate, but for the Treasury Department and for distribution also. A joint resolution is the proper form.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, in reference to a remark made by the gentleman from Illinois in his criticism of the printing law, if it has the effect he states—that of cutting down the printing—then I want to say that the House and the country ought to be congratulated on its passage. Now, as to the other part of his question, I think he will find a sufficient number of RECORDS printed for the use of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the printing was abolished so as to economize, why not abolish all printing and make a further reduction.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We need some, but not all the printing we were doing, and we economized as much as possible by the passage of the law.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DINGLEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution of information, which I ask to have read, and then I will ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire offers a resolution, which will be reported by the Clerk, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection to its present consideration.

The resolution, calling on the Secretary of Agriculture for information as to the purchase and distribution of valuable seed and the publication and distribution of farmers' bulletins, was read.

The SPEAKER. The present consideration of this resolution requires unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, as that resolution is not in the form that resolutions of inquiry are usually presented, I think it ought to go to the committee, in order that it may be put in the form that is customary when calling on the Departments for information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Will the gentleman tell in what it differs from the usual form?

Mr. MCMILLIN. The gentleman will have no difficulty in discovering. I do not wish to criticise the resolution as introduced, but think that it would be better that it proceed in the usual order.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. On the contrary, I assert that it is the usual method of procedure in these cases.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I have no objection to the resolution being introduced for reference to the committee.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture when appointed.

ARMENIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, representing, as I do, more than one-tenth of the American citizens of Armenian birth and more than one-fifteenth of all persons of Armenian birth in this country, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that it be read and printed in the RECORD, together with a short petition which accompanies it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the reading to the House and the printing in the RECORD of the resolution which he sends to the desk.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Accompanied by the petition.

The SPEAKER. Accompanied by the petition.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. To be read for the information of the House.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let it be read for information.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I desire to ask if it is the intention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to refer the resolution to some committee.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Certainly. My motion includes the reference to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CRISP. Before it is read, there is an inquiry that will arise continually in the House, and I take the liberty of making the point now in order that the Chair may pass upon it. A gentleman sends up a resolution such as this—I do not even know what it is—and asks unanimous consent that it be read and printed in the RECORD. Of course the House is not aware of the contents of the paper until it is read. After it is read, it occurs to some gentleman that it is improper that it be printed, or, unless the mover of the resolution asks unanimous consent for consideration, that it should be considered. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is, does the resolution in such a case go into the RECORD? Having been read at the Clerk's desk, is it to be printed in the RECORD as part of the proceedings of the House?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am willing that objection shall be made after the resolution is read, if any gentleman then desires to object.

Mr. CRISP. The question is one that is constantly arising in the proceedings of the House. A gentleman sends up a resolution and asks unanimous consent that it be considered, but when it is read some member makes objection. Now, the question is whether in such a case the resolution is to be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. After the reading of this resolution, if anyone objects I shall not insist.

The SPEAKER. The present impression of the Chair is that the determination of the question raised by the gentleman from Georgia must depend very much upon circumstances. There might be cases in which it would be essential that the resolution should be printed in order to explain and justify the proceedings of the House; but if objection was made before the proposition was actually read, then it seems to me it might be ruled out entirely. I do not, however, speak advisedly upon the question at this time.

Mr. CRISP. Of course the Chair sees how embarrassment may arise, as in this case. A member asks to have some proposition read and gentlemen feel, as they feel in this case, unwilling to object to its being read, as that would hardly seem courteous; yet it may be that if they knew in advance what was contained in the resolution they would object if they understood that it was also to go into the RECORD.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that this matter has been submitted to some of the most discreet gentlemen in the House.

Mr. CRISP. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I acquit the gentleman from Massachusetts of any purpose to do anything indiscreet. Everyone who knows the gentleman knows that he would not be guilty of an indiscreet action. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. In this case, inasmuch as the request is simply to have the resolution read to the House and printed in the RECORD, if, after the reading, objection is made, the Chair will understand that it is not to be printed in the RECORD. That will dispose of this case unless some gentleman objects to the view of the Chair. The Clerk will read.

The preamble and resolution offered by Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts were then read at length.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon printing in the RECORD the resolution which has just been read, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] asks unanimous consent that it be so printed. Is there objection?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the request of the gentleman and his resolution involve too delicate questions to have the seeming assent of the House in the existing condition of affairs; and I therefore object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 160) to extend to Superior, Wis., the privileges of the seventh section of an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 161) to aid and encourage the holding of the Tennessee Centennial Exposition at Nashville, Tenn., in the year 1896, and making an appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 162) amending section 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, relating to invalid pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 163) for the erection of a public building at Plymouth, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 164) to prohibit the manufacture and sale of spirituous and intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, a bill (H. R. 165) to amend the naturalization laws of the United States—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 166) to regulate immigration and to amend the naturalization laws of the United States—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 167) to protect the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 168) to amend the immigration laws of the United States—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 169) to authorize the Post-Office Department to forward mail matter upon which postage is not prepaid—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 170) to repeal the interstate-commerce law, or "An act to regulate commerce," and all acts in addition thereto—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 171) to secure to the people the advantages accruing from the issue of circulating promissory notes by banks, to increase the volume of such notes, and to supervise and control banks by officers of the United States—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 172) to increase the limit of the appropriation for a public building at Newport, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 173) to provide American registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig*—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 174) for the improvement of the lower Cumberland River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 175) authorizing the Secretary of War to make certain uses of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Park, and other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 176) for a public building at the city of Altoona, Pa., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 177) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for those who responded to and enlisted under the first call of President Lincoln for 75,000 troops to aid in the preservation of the Union—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 178) for the relief of persons who served ninety days or more in the various construction corps attached to the United States Army or railroads operated by the military authorities of the United States from April, 1861, to June, 1865—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 179) for the erection of a public building at the city of Meadville, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 180) to make the city of Erie, Pa., a port of immediate transportation—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LINTON: A bill (H. R. 181) to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 182) to establish a postal savings bank department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 183) prohibiting the coinage in the mints of the United States of gold coins of a less denomination than $5, or the issue by the Treasury of notes, certificates, or any kind of paper currency of a less denomination than $5—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 184) to repeal all laws authorizing the issue and sale of United States bonds—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 185) to establish a uniform rule of naturalization—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 186) to prohibit officers or employees of national banks from holding any office in any savings bank, and to prohibit the location of any national bank or its continuance in business in any building in which the business of a savings bank is conducted—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 187) prohibiting the appointment of aliens to offices or places of honor, trust, or profit under the Government of the United States, within the States, or in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 188) for the relief of soldiers who served in the Mexican war and afterwards in the Confederate army—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 189) to repeal an act entitled "An act to exclude the public lands in Alabama from the operation of the laws relating to mineral lands," approved March 3, 1883—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 190) to authorize an increase of bank circulation—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 191) to amend an act entitled "An act to afford assistance and relief to Congress and the Executive Departments in the investigation of claims and demands against the Government"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 192) to amend an act entitled "An act to restrict the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims, and to provide for the payment of certain demands for quartermaster's stores and subsistence supplies furnished to the Army of the United States"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 193) to amend the Articles of War, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 194) to provide for the purchase of gold and silver bullion and for the coinage thereof—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 195) to create and establish a tariff statistical bureau—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 196) to establish a port of delivery at Florence, Ala.—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 197) to increase the school fund of the State of Alabama—to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 198) to remove the tax from spirits made from fruit in certain cases—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 199) to dispense with proof of loyalty in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 200) to provide for the printing of additional copies of the Records of the War of the Rebellion—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a bill (H. R. 201) to authorize the Secretary of War to appoint a board of review in certain cases—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 202) to establish a marine hospital at Florence, Ala.—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 203) to designate the time for the convening of Congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 204) for the erection of a public building at Decatur, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 205) in relation to claims arising under the provisions of the captured and abandoned property acts, and for extension of time in which to bring suit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 206) to enable the people of Oklahoma to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 207) to authorize the appointment of a commission to draft a code of laws for Alaska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 208) to amend section 3 of an act making appropriations for the Post-Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1886—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 209) to donate certain lands in Alabama for educational purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 210) to provide for the formation and government of municipal corporations in Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 211) to amend an act entitled "An act providing a civil government for Alaska"—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 212) to authorize the governor of Alaska to create precincts and appoint justices of the peace and constables therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 213) providing for an additional United States district judge for the State of Alabama—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 214) providing for representation in Congress of Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 215) to locate a branch of the national prison at Florence, Ala.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 216) to increase the pensions of the soldiers of the Florida war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 217) to grant a township of land to the State of Alabama for the use of the Alabama State Normal College—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TURNER of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 218) to amend the seventh section of the act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 219) to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 220) for the erection of a public building at Stamford, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 221) to authorize the construction of an addition to the public building at Hartford, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 222) to supply courts for the Indian reservations, and to supplement the act approved February 8, 1887—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 223) to grant medals to survivors and heirs of volunteers of the Port Hudson forlorn hope storming party—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 224) to create a commission to promote the uniformity of laws, to prepare codes of procedure in the Federal courts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 225) to provide for the transfer of Fort Omaha Military Reservation to the State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 226) to regulate the telephone service in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 227) requiring bills of sale, conditional sales, mortgages, or deeds of trust of chattels in the District of Columbia to be recorded—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 228) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Keene, in the State of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 229) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Nashua, in the State of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 230) for the erection of a monument and statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 231) to provide for the adjudication and payment of the claim of the State of New Hampshire for reimbursement of the national bounties advanced and paid for the United States by said State upon the authority of the Secretary of War—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 232) for the erection of a public building in Westerly, R. I.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 233) for the erection of a public building in the city of Woonsocket, R. I.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 234) to provide a life-saving station at or near Green Hill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 235) to provide a life-saving station at or near Watsons Pier, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 236) for the improvement of the channel through the island of Conanicut, in Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 237) for the improvement of the harbor at Wickford, R. I.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 238) for the improvement of the harbor at Apponaug, R. I.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 239) authorizing the establishment of a free port at Point Judith, R. I.—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 240) to reimburse the officers and crew of a Government dredge wrecked in Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 241) to make Westerly, in the State of Rhode Island, a port of delivery—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 242) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two condemned cannon to Sedgwick Post, No. 7, Grand Army of the Republic, of South Kingston, R. I.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 243) to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 244) to repeal tax on State banks and State-bank associations—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 245) authorizing commissions to be issued to certain company commanders in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 246) for the erection of a public building at Norwich, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 247) declaring a pension a vested right, and authorizing the suspension of pensions obtained by fraud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 248) empowering and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish four pieces of condemned cannon to the city of Hastings, Mich.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 249) to correct the date of muster of Company F, Pacific Battalion Missouri Home Guards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 250) to enable the Secretary of War to continue the reconstruction of the military post at Jefferson Barracks, Mo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 251) to declare February the twelfth a national holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A bill (H. R. 252) for the erection of a public building at Menominee, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 253) to provide for the erection of a public building at Freeport, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 254) in relation to certain nominations to military office made by Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 255) to amend section 4784 of the Revised Statutes, United States—to the Committee on tee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A bill (H. R. 256) for the erection of a public building in the city of Elmira, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 257) to amend the charter of the Capital Traction Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 258) for the relief of telegraph operators during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 259) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 260) to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 261) making an appropriation for the construction of a military hospital at Fort Snelling, Minn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 262) for the improvement of navigation on St. Croix Lake and River, in Minnesota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 263) to provide for the relief of aged and disabled letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 264) to provide pensions to widows who were wives of soldiers, sailors, or officers while they were serving in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS: A bill (H. R. 265) to levy and collect duties on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 266) for the better control of and to promote the safety of national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALBERT: A bill (H. R. 267) to amend an act entitled "An act to credit and pay to the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia all moneys collected under the direct tax levied by act of Congress approved August 5, 1861," approved March 2, 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERDMAN: A bill (H. R. 268) concerning carriers engaged in interstate commerce and their employees—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 269) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua"—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 270) to detach certain counties from the judicial districts of California, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 271) to amend certain sections of the Revised Statutes of United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 272) to amend section 3980 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 273) to prohibit immigration of all skilled and unskilled foreign manual labor—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 274) to provide for refunding to the several States certain sums of money which were collected from persons residing in said States as a tax upon cotton—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 275) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain the amount still due and unpaid to depositors in the Freedman's Bank—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 276) granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation in said State, for the purpose of establishing western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College and of the Kansas State Normal Institute thereon, and for a public park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 277) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Hastings, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 278) to construct a public building at Oskaloosa, Iowa, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 279) to provide means for gathering and storing rain water in semiarid regions of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: A bill (H. R. 280) to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 281) to enable the United States to terminate and cancel letters patent for inventions in case of general public importance—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 282) granting to the State of Nebraska for the irrigation and reclamation of semiarid lands, and for other purposes, the public lands in said State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GROW: A bill (H. R. 283) providing that the widows of pensioners married before the close of the late war shall receive the same rate of pension that the pensioner was receiving at the time of his death, provided that the rate of her pension shall not be less than $12 a month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 284) to amend the national-bank act—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 285) extending relief to Indian citizens, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 286) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to cause to be made all necessary field examinations, surveys, and experiments for the purpose of demonstrating the extent, etc., with reference to irrigation, of the underflow waters between the ninety-seventh degree of west longitude and the foothills of the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, and making an appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 287) to amend section 2344 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 288) to provide for the free coinage of gold and silver and the maintenance of the reserve fund, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 289) to amend section 34 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 290) setting apart a portion of the Fort Keogh Military Reservation, in the State of Montana, for the purpose of an industrial school for Indian children, for the establishment of such school, for an appropriation for its establishment and maintenance, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 291) for the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 292) providing for free homesteads on the public lands in Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 293) providing for the opening of the Indian Territory to settlement under the homestead laws of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Florida: A bill (H. R. 294) to amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States concerning the distilling of brandy from fruits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 295) fixing times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TURNER of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 296) for the erection of a custom-house and post-office building at Brunswick, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: A bill (H. R. 297) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the cost of paving about the public building in Fremont, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TURNER of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 298) to amend the judiciary act of August 13, 1888—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROW: A bill (H. R. 299) fixing the lowest rate of pension for disability—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 300) to amend paragraph 1 of section 1 of an act approved August 30, 1890, entitled "An act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts, established under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862"—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 301) to transfer the Bureau of the United States Geological Survey and the United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries to the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 302) to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in Alaska—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 303) to establish and maintain a national school of forestry—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 304) to establish a national university—to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 305) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses, and products thereof, which are the subjects of interstate commerce, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 306) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 307) to repeal the laws providing for the retirement of officers of the Navy of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 308) to repeal the laws providing for the retirement of officers of the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 309) to regulate pensions, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 310) relating to jurisdictional questions between the State and Federal courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOATNER: A bill (H. R. 311) to limit the power of judges of the courts of the United States to punish for contempts of court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 312) to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the fifth circuit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 313) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 314) to authorize and require certain land in Savannah, Ga., known as the old public building site, to be used for a marine hospital—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 315) to establish a marine hospital at Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 316) to establish a subtreasury at Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 317) to increase the limit of cost of the public building authorized by act of Congress approved June 30, 1886, to be erected at Savannah, Ga., and authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into a contract or contracts for the construction of any portion or the whole of said building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 318) to repeal section 714 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOATNER: A bill (H. R. 319) to prohibit courts of the United States from enforcing the specific performance of contracts for personal service by writs of injunction or other legal process—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COBB of Alabama (by request): A bill (H. R. 320) to permit the Standard Telephone Company of Washington and Baltimore City to install, maintain, and operate a telephone and telegraphic plant and exchange in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 321) to put surgical instruments upon the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 322) to put in force in the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory the law of the State of Arkansas entitled "An act to regulate the rates of charges for the carriage of passengers by railroads," approved April 4, 1887—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 323) to put in force in the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory certain laws of the State of Arkansas—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 324) in relation to issuance of writs of habeas corpus by Federal courts or judges thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 325) to provide that United States railroad corporations shall, for purposes of jurisdiction, be deemed citizens of the respective States into which their line of railway may extend—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 326) in relation to issuance of writs of habeas corpus by Federal courts or judges thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 327) to set apart certain lands, now known as Pacific Forest Reserve, as a public park, to be known as the Washington National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 328) to provide for the disposition and sale of lands known as the Vashon Island Military Reserve, State of Washington—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 329) to give United States circuit courts concurrent jurisdiction with the Land Department of the United States in certain matters—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 330) to amend section 1 of the act of August 4, 1892, entitled "An act to authorize the entry of lands chiefly valuable for building stone under the placer-mining laws"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 331) to establish an army post in Pierce County, at or near the city of Tacoma, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 332) to amend section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 333) appropriating $100,000 for the purpose of ascertaining subterranean water supplies in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 334) to divide the State of Washington into two judicial districts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 335) to grant the Tacoma and Yakima Land Company a right of way through the Yakima Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 336) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua," approved February 20, 1889—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 337) providing for the distribution among the heirs of the Puyallup Indians of the common lands of said tribe, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 338) to amend section 4414 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 339) to provide salaries for the clerks of the United States circuit and district courts in the district of Washington—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 340) to enlarge the powers and duties of the Bureau of Labor and to create an executive department to be known as the Department of Labor—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 341) to open for settlement the lands in Military Reserve No. 23, heretofore withdrawn by Executive order of September 22, 1866—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 342) opening for settlement the Gig Harbor and Millville Military reservations in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 343) to remove the restrictions upon the disposition of the lands within the Puyallup Indian Reservation, Washington—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 344) to provide for the construction of a public building at Tacoma, Wash.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 345) to authorize the construction and operation of an electric railroad in the Yellowstone National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 346) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the times and places to hold terms of the United States courts in the State of Washington"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 347) to provide for the disposition and sale of lands known as the Vashon Island Military Reserve, State of Washington—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 348) to fix the salaries of the officials of the Government—to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 349) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend chapter 67, volume 23, of the Statutes at Large of the United States, so as to place upon the retired list soldiers, sailors, and members of the Marine Corps who have served thirty years—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 350) granting a bounty to soldiers, sailors, and marines in the Regular Army who were in service at the outbreak of the war of the rebellion, and who continued in such service thereafterwards for the space of two years and received no bounty from the United States or any State—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 351) to purchase, inclose, and improve the sites, or portions thereof, of certain forts, battlefields, and graves of American soldiers, sailors, and marines in the Maumee Valley, and to erect thereon appropriate monuments and commemorative tablets—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Joint resolution (H. Res. 8) granting permission to the Pennsylvania superior court to occupy the Federal court room in Scranton—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN: A resolution calling on the Secretary of the Interior for information as to why the Wichita Indian lands in Oklahoma have not been allotted—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee to investigate public officials in Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: A resolution requesting the President to communicate to the House of Representatives all information received by him or the State Department relating to the arrest, trial, and imprisonment of John L. Waller—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A resolution calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture for certain information regarding the distribution of seed—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: A resolution relative to the treatment of American citizens in Turkey, denouncing same, and pledging the support of the Representatives in Congress to the executive branch of the Government in taking such steps justified by international law and common humanity to vindicate the rights of our fellow-citizens—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS: A resolution of the legislature of Massachusetts asking for further national legislation for the suppression of the lottery traffic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A resolution of the general assembly of Connecticut relating to the transportation of parcels by the post-office—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a resolution of the joint assembly of Connecticut concerning the constitutional rights of citizens—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 352) for the relief of Thomas G. Corbin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 353) for the relief of Maj. Samuel T. Cushing—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 354) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Susannah P. Swoope—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 355) for the relief of James A. Gothright, heir of Malissia Gothright, deceased, late of Chickasaw, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 356) extending provisions of an act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors, approved June 27, 1890, to the Eighteenth and Nineteenth regiments of Kansas Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 357) granting a pension to David E. Redmon, of Pendleton County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 358) granting a pension to James Loyd Young, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 359) granting a pension to Milton C. Tully—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 360) for the relief of Thomas M. Barton, of Pendleton County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 361) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph B. Kennedy, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 362) for the relief of Lewis Stephens—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 363) for the relief of Fannie Bostwick, widow of Martin B. Strader—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 364) for the relief of John M. Curry—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 365) to fix the date of the discharge of Thomas Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOATNER: A bill (H. R. 366) for the relief of the heirs of John T. Mason—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 367) for the relief of Joseph Cordill—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 368) granting a pension to Nathan Hite—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 369) for the relief of James J. Dundas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 370) for the relief of Emma C. Lovelace and Stephen D. Clark—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 371) granting a pension to Talbot A. Routon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 372) for the relief of the estate of J. S. Douglass, deceased, late of Tensas Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 373) for the relief of the heirs of Robert M. Browning, deceased, late of Claiborne Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 374) to correct the military record of Capt. Henry Troll—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 375) for the relief of B. J. Van Vleck, administrator of Henry Van Vleck, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 376) for the relief of John Scott—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 377) for the relief of George W. Harbaugh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 378) for the relief of the legal representatives of Simeon Gilbreath, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 379) for the relief of Thomas M. Leneave, administrator of Irvy T. Leneave, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 380) for the relief of M. A. Buford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 381) for the relief of W. H. Felker, of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 382) for the relief of William J. Hines—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 383) for the relief of S. J. Stodard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 384) for the relief of the legal representatives of Granderson Jones, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 385) for the relief of A. B. Phillips—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 386) for the relief of Walter O. West for quartermaster's supplies—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 387) for the relief of Alfred A. Young for himself and as executor of Joseph Young, deceased, of Giles County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 388) for the relief of R. H. Ogilvie—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 389) for the relief of the estate of A. A. Dickerson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 390) for the relief of the estate of William Grigsby, deceased, late of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 391) for the relief of Snowden B. Herbert, of Lawrence County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 392) for the relief of William M. Beasley, of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 393) to authorize the Quartermaster-General to investigate the claim of the representatives of Robert T. Williams, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 394) for the relief of William M. Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 395) for the relief of the Protestant Episcopal Church of St. Paul, at Franklin, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 396) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Pulaski, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 397) for the benefit of citizens of Tennessee and to pay claims approved by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 398) for relief of Frank M. Dooley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 399) for the relief of Leman Montgomery, of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 400) for the relief of Rhoda Rucker, of Tennessee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 401) for the relief of Jerrie Henson, of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 402) for relief of S. E. Johnson, heir of John W. Johnson, deceased, late of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 403) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Pulaski Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 404) for relief of James W. Hardin, and to remove charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 405) for the relief of J. S. Woody, Martins Mills, Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 406) for the relief of the estate of J. A. Milhous, deceased, late of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 407) for the relief of Shields and H. Bryant, executors of J. Youngblood, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 408) for the relief of John E. Horton, Sims, Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 409) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. F. M. Harris, deceased, late of Williamson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 410) for the relief of Thomas J. Lawson, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 411) for relief of Walter R. Billingslea—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 412) for the relief of Jackson Briscoe—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 413) for the relief of Allen E. Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 414) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Butter, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 415) for relief of Walter R. Billingslea—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 416) for the relief of the estate of Phœbe Cummings, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 417) for the relief of the estate of Phœbe Cummings, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 418) for the relief of the estate of Jarred R. Cook, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 419) for the relief of Aquilla Bowie, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 420) for the relief of the estate of Jared R. Cook, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 421) for the relief of Preston Chavis, of Warren County, Miss., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 422) for the relief of Brig. Gen. William P. Carlin, retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 423) for the relief of Platte County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 424) for the relief of Napoleon B. Giddings—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 425) for the relief of John McCracken, of Madison County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 426) for the relief of George W. Pierce, of Berryville, Carroll County, Ark.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 427) for the relief of A. M. Webb, of Green Forest, Carroll County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 428) to pay E. J. Woolen, of Washington County, Ark., for carrying the mails from Rome, Ga., to Blue Mountain, Ala.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 429) for the relief of Mary Hutchens—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 430) for the relief of the estate of Charles Crowell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 431) for the payment of the claim of Mary J. McCall, of Eureka Springs, Ark., administratrix of the estate of James Bridgman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 432) for the relief of William R. Clark, administrator of James W. Clark, deceased, of Benton County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 433) for the relief of Cynthia Baker, of Benton County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 434) to grant a pension to Lavina Smith, widow of Pry Amos Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 435) to grant a pension to Isom Gibson, of Newton County, Ark.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 436) for the relief of Edward A. Scott, of Crawford County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 437) for the relief of John N. Hays, of Benton County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 438) for the relief of Nicholas J. Bigley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 439) for the relief of the heirs of the late Mrs. Catharine P. Culver—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 440) for the relief of Marshall R. Hathaway—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 441) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against William McCutcheon, of Roy, Wash., late private in Company I, Tenth Illinois Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 442) to correct the military record of William J. Floyd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 443) granting an increase of pension to Caroline E. Philbrook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 444) for the relief of A. D. Glover—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 445) for the relief of Robert Williams, sergeant of ordnance, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 446) to place the name of Julia H. H. Crosby, widow of Freeman E. Crosby, late lieutenant, United States Navy, on the pension roll at the rate of $50 per month and her two children each at the rate of $5 per month—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 447) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also. a bill (H. R. 448) for the relief of Peter Runquist—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 449) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William McCutcheon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 450) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against H. R. Calkins, late a private in California Column during late war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 451) for the relief of C. P. Rollins—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 452) for the relief of John W. Wilder—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 453) for the relief of C. W. Kennard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 454) for the relief of Martin Johnson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 455) to promote Lieut. A. B. Wyckoff, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of lieutenant-commander on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 456) for the relief of A. W. Curtis—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 457) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Archibald C. Legg, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 458) for the relief of the legal representatives of Simeon Gilbreath, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 459) for the relief of Thomas Rosbrugh—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 460) for the relief of the estate of Harry I. Todd, deceased, late keeper of the Kentucky penitentiary—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 461) for the relief of G. Dwight Hamilton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 462) for the relief of Hamilton T. Figg—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 463) for the relief of Capt. I. B. Webster, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 464) for the relief of W. J. Tapp & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 465) for the relief of George Lewis Cousens—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 466) for the relief of John Veeley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 467) for the relief of Samuel McKee—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 468) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. H. J. Kiernan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 469) to pay Sewell Coulson for legal services—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 470) to remove the charge of desertion from of Richard Ferguson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 471) for the relief of Ezra S. Havens—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 472) to pension Elizabeth Crane, widow of Nathaniel Crane, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 473) to pension Samuel H. Setzer, late of Company E, Fifty-first Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH: A bill (H. R. 474) granting a pension to Helen M. Jacob—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 475) granting a pension to Elizabeth New, widow of Jethrow New—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 476) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. B. F. Payne—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 477) for the relief of James C. McCartney, of Gardiner, Mont.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 478) for the relief of C. J. Baronett, of Gardiner, Mont.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 479) granting a pension to Malachi Cordeiro—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 480) to reimburse the State of Montana the sum of $120 for fees erroneously expended in certain land selections—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 481) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William H. Hughes, administrator of the estate of David Unsell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 482) granting an increase of pension to Abram W. Blauch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 483) for the relief of Mary Jane Lynn, the daughter of John R. Lynn, a Revolutionary soldier—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 484) for the relief of the Society of the United Brethren in Christ, of Tyrone, Pa.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 485) for the relief of Kate Eberle, an Indian woman—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 486) for the relief of William Henry Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 487) granting increase of pension to John F. Early—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 488) to pay James L. Willett arrears of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 489) to reimburse the State of Nebraska the expenses incurred by that State in repelling a threatened invasion and raid by the Sioux in 1890 and 1891—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 490) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rouse, of Wilber, Nebr.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 491) granting an increase of pension to Francis Walsh, of Stockham, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 492) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of John Cramer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 493) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles A. M. Mead—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 494) granting a pension to Christopher Rupp, of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 495) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John B. Taylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 496) granting a pension to Elias Demus, of Indiana, Pa.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 497) removing the charge of desertion from the record of Azariah Bartholp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 498) for the relief of William H. Allison, of Russellville, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 499) for relief of Mrs. Martha Stiff, of Cherokee County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 500) for relief of Nancy Wood, widow of Peter L. Wood, deceased, late of Comanche County, Tex.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 501) for the relief of Mrs. Caroline Johnson, of Franklin County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 502) for the relief of Margaret M. Harget, of Franklin County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 503) for relief of D. A. Malone, heir of James Malone, deceased, late of Franklin County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 504) for the relief of Elizabeth James, widow of Thomas James, deceased, late of Franklin County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 505) for the relief of Rev. Edwin Warriner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 506) for the relief of Stewart & Co.; A. P. H. Stewart, agent; Weed, Witter & Co., and C. A. Weed & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 507) amending the records of the Missouri United Reserve Corps of Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 508) for the relief of Anthony Connoly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 509) granting a pension to John G. Bruder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 510) for the relief of William P. Buckmaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 511) to remove the charge of desertion against the record of William J. McFalls—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 512) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 513) granting a pension to Joel A. Holdren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 514) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Wear Crawford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 515) granting a pension to William Grose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 516) granting a pension to Hannah Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 517) granting a pension to Sylvester Abrams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 518) for the relief of John C. Nuss—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 519) granting a pension to Ira Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 520) for the relief of the legal representative of Ewing M. Scaggs, deceased, late of Sacramento County, Cal.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 521) for the relief of Christopher Schmidt—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 522) to reimburse the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 523) for the relief of Charles V. Neidlinger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 524) for the relief of the owners of the steamer *Leesburg*—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 525) for the relief of Christian Ubele, administrator of Christian Ubele, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 526) for the relief of William G. Ebbs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 527) for the relief of George Wagner, administrator of H. Mastick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 528) for the relief of Francis Tillman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 529) for the relief of Mary A. Bell, of Emanuel County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 530) for the relief of Jacob Rosenband, etc.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 531) for the relief of William A. Fenwick and Mary J. Moore, administrators of James W. J. Moore, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 532) for relief of Margaret Giebelhouse, administratrix of Philip Giebelhouse, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 533) for the relief of C. M. Gilbert & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 534) granting a pension to Sallie V. F. Brown, Mary J. Brown, Florence D. Brown, and Hutoka H. Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 535) granting a pension to Sarah Spalding McIntosh and Hester Cook McIntosh—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 536) to pay Margaret Doyle, administratrix of James Doyle, for certain captured cotton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD: A bill (H. R. 537) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Bernhard Stueber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 538) for the removal of the charge of desertion now standing against Charles M. Blakeslee, late a private of Company H, Seventh Regiment of Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 539) for the relief of Frank J. Burrows, late postmaster at Williamsport, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 540) for the removal of charge of desertion tion now standing against Francis McGinnis on records of War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 541) to correct the naval history of John C. Dull—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 542) for the relief of Mrs. Salome Sengel, widow—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 543) for the relief of Herbert Cushman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 544) for the relief of the legal representative of Maj. William Kendall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 545) to amend the military record of John H. Lamson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 546) for the relief of Albert J. Pratt, administrator—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 547) granting a pension to Catherine H. Thayer, widow of Daniel Thayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 548) to restore William F. Peck to the rolls of the Navy, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 549) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Downing—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 550) for the relief of Samuel M. Blair—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 551) granting an honorable discharge to Albert Locke, alias Shipley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 552) for the relief of the owners and crew of the Hawaiian bark *Arctic*—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 553) for the relief of the estate of John Poland, deceased, late of Prince William County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 554) for the relief of Everett Wroe—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 555) for the relief of Esther A. Keyser—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 556) for the relief of Everett Wroe—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 557) for the relief of loyal citizens therein named of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 558) for the relief of Amelia A. H. Richards, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 559) for the relief of the heirs of Alexander Poland, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 560) for the relief of the estate of Hannah Burke, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 561) for the relief of the estate of Jane Taylor, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 562) for the relief of Theodore Teed—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 563) for the relief of the estate of William B. Todd, deceased—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A bill (H. R. 564) for the relief of William S. Grant—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 565) for the relief Jean Louis Legare, of Dominion of Canada—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McDEARMON: A bill (H. R. 566) for the relief of Mary R. Rowlett, administratrix of Caleb R. Clement, of Gibson County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 567) for the relief of James A. Bowling, of Haywood County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 568) for the relief of the International Cotton Press Company, of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 569) granting a pension to Sophia J. Hamilton, widow of Charles S. Hamilton, major-general of volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 570) to refund to the city of Milwaukee money expended by said city in paving Wisconsin street in front of United States Government property—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 571) granting a pension to Margaret Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 572) for the relief of James Duke—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 573) for the relief of Frances R. Jack, Elizabeth J. Jack, and Matilda W. Jack—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 574) for the relief of Maj. Charles A. Woodruff—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBBINS (by request): A bill (H. R. 575) for the relief of Charles H. Adams—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 576) for the relief of George F. Brott—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 577) granting a pension to Lydia A. Taft—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 578) granting a pension to Eunice Sherman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 579) making an appropriation for the benefit of the Presbyterian Church at Murfreesboro, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 580) for the relief of William Johnson, administrator of Thomas I. Johnson, deceased, of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 581) for the relief of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Fayetteville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 582) for the relief of Dobson Johnson, of Dekalb County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 583) for the relief of Barclay M. Tillman, of Bedford County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 584) for the relief of Joseph H. Thompson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SORG: A bill (H. R. 585) for the relief of Sophia Hebrigel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 586) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas Mott, Company E, Eighty-first New York Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 587) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Luke McGrath, alias Lewis Ainsworth, Company B, First Massachusetts Cavalry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 588) for the relief of Alexander Stoddart, of New York—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 589) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph G. Marsh, of the U. S. S. *Galena*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCER: A bill (H. R. 590) for the relief of R. T. Cheek—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 591) for the relief of the estate of Bryan Askew, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 592) for the relief of Ann M. Brown, of Claiborne County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 593) for the relief of Sarah G. Clark, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 594) for the relief of John H. Fralick—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 595) for the relief of the State of New York—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 596) for the relief of Ellis H. Roberts—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 597) for the relief of Charles Waterhouse—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 598) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. Æneas Munson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 599) for the relief of Andrew J. Calahan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 600) for the relief of Nancy E. Day, administratrix of the estate of James L. Day, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 601) to place on pension roll the name of Alexander Shepard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 602) for the relief of Henry B. Kretzler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 603) for the relief of John V. Behan, administrator—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 604) for the relief of Laurence Collins and Edward Flanigan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCRANTON: A bill (H. R. 605) for the relief of F. M. Vandling, postmaster at Scranton, Pa.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A bill (H. R. 606) for the relief of Mary Chambers, widow of Thomas Chambers—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 607) for the relief of George Rushburger—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRACY: A bill (H. R. 608) for the relief of E. R. Shipley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 609) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Alfred K. Bailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TURNER of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 610) for the relief of John F. McRae—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 611) for the relief of William Crosby, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 612) for the relief of Edwin A. Wells—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 613) correcting the military record of Darius Fitch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 614) correcting the military record of Daniel Leclear—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 615) to amend the military record of Franklin Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 616) granting a pension to Charles Beckwith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 617) granting a pension to Lovinia Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 618) granting a pension to Mary O'Brien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 619) granting a pension to Martin V. Shears—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 620) granting a pension to Rebecca P. McCullough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 621) granting a pension to Stephen L. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLER: A bill (H. R. 622) granting an honorable discharge to Samuel Johnston—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 623) to authorize payment of commutation to David Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 624) granting an honorable discharge to Philip Kurtz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 625) granting an honorable discharge to Joseph Price—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 626) to correct the muster rolls of Company K, Second Arkansas Cavalry, as concerns Isaac Thompson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 627) to correct the military record of John Tyner, John Chitwood, and T. W. Butts, of Logan County, Ark.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 628) to correct the record and muster of Henry N. Posey, in Company A, Fourth Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and to discharge him from Company I, Second Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 629) for relief of estate of Joshua Hill—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 630) for the relief of Elvy Brewer, of Saline County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of L. J. Lawrence—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 632) for the relief of A. C. Kerr, of Patterson Bluffs, Logan County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 633) for relief of the estate of Charles Labell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 634) for the relief of Samuel Evans—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 635) for the relief of Martha J. Morrison—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 636) for the relief of A. V. Haigh—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 637) for the relief of the estate of Thomas J. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 638) granting a pension to Mrs. Susan Housley, widow of Samuel Housley, veteran of the Florida war, 1836—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 639) for the relief of the estate of Henry W. Long—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 640) for the relief of Reese Pritchard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 641) for the relief of Charles P. Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 642) for the relief of James M. Oliver—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 643) for the relief of James Franklin Wood, of Franklin County, Ark.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 644) for the relief of the estate of John A. McDaniel, of Pulaski County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 645) for the relief of the widow of Patrick P. Burton—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 646) to remove the charge of desertion from David A. Nichols—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 647) for the relief of the administrator of Mr. W. R. Wooten, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 648) for the relief of Mrs. Sallie Brown, of Johnson County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 649) granting a pension to Joseph S. Bunker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 650) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Dardanelle, Yell County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 651) for the relief of the heirs of Davis B. Bonfoey—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 652) for the relief of R. B. Carl Lee, administrator of Charlotte C. Bancroft, deceased, as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 653) for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 654) to construct a road to the national cemetery at Dover, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 655) granting a pension to Martha A. Hughes—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 656) for the relief of the Protestant Episcopal Church of St. Paul, at Franklin, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 657) to correct the military record of James P. McGee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 658) for the relief of D. L. Carmicheal—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 659) to remove the charge of desertion against Perry Ambercrombie, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 660) for the relief of Malinda McClendon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 661) for the relief of Richard Crompton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 662) for the relief of Mrs. Martha B. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 663) for the relief of Mrs. Mary L. Clemens—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 664) for the relief of Nathan L. Williams, administrator of Martha R. Williams, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 665) for the relief of the estate of Mills Jenkins, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 666) for the relief of Mary H. McReynolds and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 667) for the relief of the estate of John Meals, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 668) for the relief of John McMurtry, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 669) for the relief of Bessie McAlester McGuirk—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 670) for the relief of Ann E. Damon, heir of Jessie Blalock, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 672) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of Claiborn Evans, and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 671) for the relief of James T. Dowdy, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 673) for the relief of Jeff Eason, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 674) for the relief of Mary Fowler, widow of Lorensey Fowler, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 675) for the relief of Elizabeth Forney, the widow of William H. Forney—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 676) for the relief of Newton L. Crow—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 677) for the relief of the estate of James Campbell, deceased, late of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 678) for the relief of Mrs. J. J. Flanagan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 679) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. Nathan Fletcher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 680) for the relief of James M. Gullatt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 681) for the relief of T. C. Greenhill—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 682) for the relief of Mrs. Bathsheba Gordon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 683) for the relief of Thomas M. Hobbs & Bro., of Limestone County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 684) for the relief of heirs of John Hogan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 685) for the relief of James M. Hankins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 686) for the relief of Bartley Harris, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 687) for the relief of Calvin S. Hill, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 688) for the relief of E. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 689) for the relief of Elizabeth Jones, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 690) for the relief of Meredith King—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 691) for the relief of Hampton W. Kelley, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 692) for the relief of William Kirckpatrick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 693) to provide for the payment to Hugh G. Kirby, administrator of the estate of R. L. Kirby, deceased, of the amount found due by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 694) for the relief of A. H. Keller—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 695) for the relief of John T. Lehman, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 696) for the relief of the estate of Julis B. Litten, deceased, late of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 697) for the relief of the estate of A. L. Logan, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 698) for the relief of E. E. Mays—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 699) to pension John Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 700) to reimburse James O. Robertson and W. McC. Maples—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 701) granting a pension to Mrs. Rebecca Livingston—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 702) for the relief of Fannie Lowe, one of the heirs of Benjamin Jolly, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 703) for the relief of Mary I. Graham, Belle F. Neill, Caius G. Fennell, and Martha M. Jordan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 704) to correct an error made by the register and receiver of the land office at Huntsville, Ala.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 705) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Samuel M. Weaver, administrator of the estate of George W. Yuckley, deceased—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 706) for the relief of George M. White—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 707) for the relief of M. E. Hooks, heir of Parham K. Myrick, late of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 708) to increase the pension of Albert Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 709) for the relief of Alfred O. Williamson Gurley, Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 710) to remove charge of desertion against James A. Crouch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 711) to increase the pension of Uzziel B. Church—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 712) granting a pension to Susan Hollin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 713) for the relief of Jacob Taylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 714) granting increase of pension to Henry B. Plummer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 715) granting a pension to Aarrilla D. Waggoner—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 716) for the relief of A. W. Wills, administrator—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 717) granting a pension to Mary Ann Lafferty—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 718) for the relief of John S. Watkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 719) for the relief of Payne, James & Co.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 720) for the relief of Mary P. Wade—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 721) for the relief of Nancy J. Watkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 722) for the relief of Cornila Till, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 723) for the relief of T. W. Townsend and wife—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 724) for the relief of the estate of John H. Swift, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 725) for the relief of John C. Thomas, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 726) for the relief of Dr. James W. Stewart—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 727) for the relief of Elias Stutts, St. Florian, Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 728) for the relief of Ami Simmons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 729) for the relief of Sarah J. Snoddy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 730) for the relief of the estate of Gabril M. Smith, late of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 731) for the relief of C. M. Simmons—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 732) for the relief of J. P. Shook—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 733) for the relief of Moses Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 734) for the relief of Mrs. C. L. Robinson, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 735) for the relief of the estate of Eliza J. Rudder, deceased, late of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 736) for the relief of Perry P. Powell, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 737) for the relief of Alonzo H. Richards—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 738) for the relief of Hiram Peters—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 739) for the relief of James G. Porter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 740) to pension Martha Parsons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 741) for the relief of the estate of Alexander F. Perryman, deceased, late of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 742) for the relief of Jasper N. Parker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 743) for the relief of Margaret J. Parks, of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 744) granting a pension to Matthew B. Nale—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 745) for the relief of W. B. Olive, of Florence, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 746) for the relief of Edmond McWilliams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 747) for the relief of Robert D. Nelson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 748) for the relief of Sarah A. Page—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 749) for the relief of James Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 750) for the relief of the trustees of Stewart College, Montgomery County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 751) for the relief of the estate of Andrew J. Duncan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 752) to appoint a commission to report and determine upon certain damages done to citizens of Lauderdale County, Ala., by the building and operation of the Muscle Shoals Canal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 753) for the relief of John C. Howe—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 754) to refer the claim against the United States of the Presbyterian Church of Huntsville, Ala., to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 755) for the relief of Edward Wesner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 756) for the relief of the estate of Presly W. Hardin, deceased, late of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 757) for the relief of George T. Hudson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 758) for the relief of George M. Harraway—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 759) for the relief of Sarah Harris, widow of Emanuel Harris, deceased, late of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 760) for the relief of Mrs. H. H. Cribbs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 761) for the relief of the estate of Elisha B. Clapp, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 762) for the relief of William Cunningham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 763) granting additional pension to James W. Carmody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 764) for the relief of Charles Critton, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 765) for the relief of Peter Branch—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 766) for the relief of Sarah and Katie Bryon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 767) for the relief of Houston L. Bell, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 768) for the relief of Albert A. Baker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 769) for the relief of J. R. Bumpus, heir of R. C. Bumpus, late of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 770) to refer the claim against the United States of Judge R. Burns to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 771) for the relief of A. A. Braden—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 772) for the relief of H. C. Armistead—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 773) granting an extension of letters patent No. 201085, to William H. Avery, inventor—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 774) to grant to the Birmingham, Sheffield and Tennessee River Railway Company a right of way over the public lands traversed by it—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 775) to provide for the settlement of accounts with certain railway companies—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 776) granting a pension to Walker L. Willmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 777) for the relief of John C. Hammonds—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 778) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary A. B. Figg—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 779) for the relief of W. C. Tipton—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 9, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

JAMES DONALD CAMERON, a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, DAVID B. HILL, a Senator from the State of New York, and J. L. M. IRBY, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM LOUISIANA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator-elect from the State of Louisiana, whose credentials have heretofore been presented, is now present. He will please come forward and receive the oath of office.

Mr. Donelson Caffery, chosen by the legislature of Louisiana a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1895, was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. VILAS, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

MARITIME CANAL COMPANY OF NICARAGUA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in compliance with law, the annual report of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua; which was, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, pursuant to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act of March 2, 1895, a review and report upon the conclusions of law reached by the Department of the Interior on account of moneys due the

Cherokee Nation under certain treaties and the laws passed to carry them into effect; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 7) providing for the printing of the Monthly Summary Statement of Imports and Exports of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to give notice that to-morrow, immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business, for the purpose of submitting some remarks thereon, I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 12) to enforce the Monroe doctrine, heretofore introduced by me.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the students and teachers of the Ohio Normal University, of Ada, Ohio, praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Sarah C. Holmes, of Hopewell, Ill., together with sundry affidavits, praying that relief be granted her under the French spoliation act, as one of the heirs of Benjamin Taber, deceased; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Minerva, Ohio, and a petition of sundry teachers and students of the Ohio Normal University, of Ada, Ohio, praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALLEN. I present a petition of the Cozad Grain Company of Cozad, Nebr., signed by J. B. Hogarth, of Cozad, Nebr., and J. B. Hogarth, of Willow Island, Nebr., setting forth that a corporation called the Omaha Elevator Company are engaged in interstate commerce by the purchase of grain and other articles, and that owing to unlawful rebates given them they have been able to crush out all competition at various points. The petitioners pray for an investigation by Congress into the affairs of the elevator company. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition signed by the mayor, the pastors of the several churches, and sundry other citizens of Newport, R. I., praying for the adoption of measures by Congress to prevent the burning and lynching of American citizens; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of the legislature of Wyoming, praying for the enactment of legislation restricting indiscriminate immigration; which was read and referred to the Committee on Immigration, as follows:

STATE OF WYOMING, *Office of the Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Wyoming, ss:*

I, Charles W. Burdick, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 3, of the Third State legislature of Wyoming, has been compared with the original, which is on file in this office, and the same is a true and correct copy of said memorial and of the whole thereof, together with the indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 23d day of February, A. D. 1895.

[SEAL.] CHARLES W. BURDICK,
Secretary of State.

[Third legislature of the State of Wyoming. Enrolled joint memorial No. 3, house of representatives, Wyoming. Memorializing Congress for the restriction of immigration.]

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Wyoming, having in view the welfare and wishes of the people of this State, declare unqualifiedly in favor of the adequate restriction by Congress of the United States of immigration thereto from foreign countries. The interests of the entire people demand a speedy relief, and your memorialists therefore pray and earnestly urge the honorable Congress of the United States to immediately enact such laws as will properly restrict the indiscriminate immigration that now threatens to overwhelm this nation; and, as in duty bound, your memorialists will every pray, etc.

Resolved by the legislature of the State of Wyoming, That an authenticated copy of this memorial and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Senator and to the Representative in Congress from this State, and they are hereby respectfully requested to present the same to the honorable the Senate and the honorable the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, and to urge necessary legislation in the premises.

GEO. W. HOYT,
President of the Senate.
JAY L. TORREY,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 18, A. D. 1895.

WM. A. RICHARDS, *Governor.*

[Indorsements.]

CHEYENNE, WYO., *February 16, 1895.*

I hereby certify that the within memorial originated in the house of representatives.

M. C. BARROW, *Chief Clerk.*

Received from the governor and filed this 19th day of February, 1895.

CHARLES W. BURDICK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. WARREN presented the following petition of the legislature of Wyoming; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

STATE OF WYOMING, *Office of the Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Wyoming, ss:*

I, Charles W. Burdick, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 5, of the Third State legislature of Wyoming, has been compared with the original, which is on file in this office, and the same is a true and correct copy of said memorial and of the whole thereof, together with the indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 23d day of February, A. D. 1895.

[SEAL.] CHARLES W. BURDICK,
Secretary of State.

[Third legislature of the State of Wyoming. Joint memorial No. 5, house of representatives, Wyoming. To the Congress of the United States of America.]

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memoralized and petitioned to grant unto the State of Wyoming the unoccupied and unappropriated public lands within such State.

GEO. W. HOYT,
President of the Senate.
JAY L. TORREY,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 18, A. D. 1895.

WM. A. RICHARDS, *Governor.*

[Indorsements.]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *Cheyenne, February 16, 1895.*

I hereby certify that the within enrolled act originated in the house of representatives.

M. C. BARROW, *Clerk.*

Received from the governor and filed this 19th day of February, 1895.

CHARLES W. BURDICK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. WARREN presented the following petition of the legislature of Wyoming; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

STATE OF WYOMING, *Office of the Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Wyoming, ss:*

I, Charles W. Burdick, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of house joint resolution No. 6, of the Third State legislature of Wyoming, has been carefully compared with the original, which is on file in this office, and the same is a true and correct copy of said resolution and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 23d day of February, A. D. 1895.

[SEAL.] CHARLES W. BURDICK,
Secretary of State.

[Third legislature of the State of Wyoming. Enrolled joint resolution No. 6, house of representatives, Wyoming. To the Congress of the United States.]

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Wyoming, respectfully represent as follows:

First. That there exists in the northeastern portion of the Wind River or Shoshone Indian Reservation, in this State, a number of hot springs, known as the Big Horn Hot Springs, the waters of which contain rare medicinal properties.

Second. That the Big Horn Hot Springs are not used to any appreciable extent by the Shoshone and Arapahoe Indians who are upon that reservation.

Third. That there are magnificent hot springs other than the Big Horn Hot Springs in the vicinity of the agency upon that reservation, which are used by the Indians.

Fourth. That there are not, at or within many miles of these springs, any adequate accommodations for the care and comfort of invalids, and that adequate accommodations can not be prepared under the present laws and regulations.

Fifth. That the rare virtues of the Big Horn Hot Springs have become a matter of public notoriety, and many invalids have visited them and been cured. The number of invalids who have visited these springs during five months of the past summer was over 100 daily.

Resolved, That the legislature, in view of the foregoing facts, respectfully urges the Government to make a treaty with the Shoshone and Arapahoe Indians for the cession to the State of Wyoming of a tract of land 20 miles square, including that upon which the Big Horn Hot Springs are located, in the northeast corner of their reservation.

Resolved further, That upon the adoption of these resolutions the secretary of state is hereby instructed to send an authenticated copy of them to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, with the request that they take the steps necessary to secure the cession of land to the State of Wyoming as herein requested.

GEO. W. HOYT,
President of the Senate.
JAY L. TORREY,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 18, 1895.

WM. A. RICHARDS, *Governor.*

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of many citizens of Skagit County, in the State of Washington, with reference to what is called Swinomish Slough. This is a body of navigable water extending from La Conner, in Skagit County, to the tide flats at the head of what is known as Padilla Bay. The slough is now only navigable for steamers upon the Sound at high tide, and the peti-

tioners pray that an additional appropriation be made for the improvement of this slough, as very great advantage will accrue thereby to the entire nation, particularly all parties navigating the waters of Puget Sound, from the fact that the opening up of the slough will give a direct route from Seattle, Tacoma, and other large cities and towns upon the Sound, thus avoiding the open straits and the dangers from the winds and waves of the ocean in passing through what is known as Deception Pass, which furnishes waterway between Fidalgo and Whidby Island, and which is also dangerous to navigation on account of the narrowness of the channel and the strong and dangerous tidal currents.

There is a class of vessels of moderate draft which now have to go through this pass and out into the open straits on their way to the cities on Bellingham Bay. The opening up of this Swinomish Slough passage will give them a direct inland route between the archipelago and the mainland. Congress has already taken up this improvement and there have been considerable appropriations made for the purpose, but not enough to make the money already spent effective, and it is needful now to obtain sufficient money to complete the improvement. There is an extremely rich and productive region all along the line of this interior channel, which is famous for its crops of cereals, especially oats.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Port Townsend, in the State of Washington, concerning the military reservation known as Fort Townsend, in Jefferson County, in that State, which has been abandoned by the War Department and transferred to the Interior Department. The petitioners pray that in case of any disposition of these lands by the General Government restitution be made for the loss sustained by the locality in which it is situated for the relief of school district No. 1, and in aid of and in furtherance of the free-school system.

I will state that I have personally conferred with citizens and business men of Port Townsend in a large meeting held with a view to consider this question, and I know it to be the unanimous sentiment of the people of that section of the State that the land comprised in this abandoned reservation should be transferred to the authorities of the school district in which the land is situated. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Thirty-second Ward Republican Club, of Chicago, Ill., praying that the United States Government put forth its best efforts to prevent the further massacre of Armenians in the Turkish dominion and insisting that the Government of Turkey guarantee to the Armenians safety of life, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of William Kirbaugh, of Dahlgren, Ill., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 329, to remove the charge of desertion from his record as a soldier; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of J. M. Gale, of Yorkville, Ill., praying for the adoption of a system of Government banking; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted by Gen. George A. McCall Post, No. 31, Grand Army of the Republic, of Westchester, Pa., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted by the board of managers of the Trades League, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an appropriation be made for the removal of the shoals in the Delaware Bay and River beginning at Duck Creek Flats and extending upstream to the head of deep-water navigation; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Council No. 85, American Protective Association, of Harrisburg, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution compelling aliens to reside a number of years in this country before the voting franchise is extended to them; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the system of internal taxation and the imposition of any new tariff tax upon materials which can not be produced at home, and praying that the single ad valorem duties in the present tariff be changed to specific or mixed ad valorem and specific duties, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. VEST presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

USE OF COURT-HOUSES AT SCRANTON AND WILLIAMSPORT, PA.

Mr. PUGH. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 13) granting the State of Pennsyluania permission to use the United States court-houses at Scranton, Pa., and at Williamsport, Pa., to report it with the recommendation that it pass with two amendments. The amendments are, first, in line 9 to strike out the words "time of such occupation shall begin, to wit, in" and insert "first day of," and, second, to strike out the preamble. I am instructed by the committee to ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, in line 9, after the words "from the," to strike out the words "time of such occupation shall begin, to wit, in" and insert "first day of;" so as to read:

In each year, for the period of five years from the 1st day of January, 1896.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us understand this measure. How are the expenses to be paid? Will the Senator from Alabama explain the joint resolution?

Mr. PUGH. The expenses are to be paid by the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. COCKRELL. Janitor service, and everything?

Mr. PUGH. Everything. The United States is freed from any expenses whatever.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the joint resolution as amended be read. It is very brief.

The Secretary read the joint resolution as amended, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That full permission be, and the same is hereby, granted to the State of Pennsylvania and to the superior court of said State to occupy the United States court room and the rooms connected therewith at Scranton, in the county of Lackawanna, during the month of January, and at Williamsport, in the county of Lycoming, during the month of February, in each year, for the period of five years from the 1st day of January, 1896, for the purpose of holding the sessions of said court therein, and that during said period concurrent jurisdiction, so far as is necessary, over said property be, and the same is hereby, ceded to the State of Pennsylvania for said purposes, so that the sessions of said courts in said buildings and rooms may be, during said period, fully legalized: *Provided*, That the commissioners of each of said counties of Lackawanna and Lycoming shall pay to the United States each the sum of $100 per annum for the use of said rooms for the time aforesaid: *And provided further*, That said rooms shall be kept in good repair at the expense of the State of Pennsylvania, and that said commissioners shall further provide necessary light and heat for said rooms at their own expense, and at the end of said period of five years the use of said rooms shall be relinquished to the United States by the said State of Pennsylvania and the said superior court in as good condition as before the occupancy of said rooms by said court.

Provided further, That the sessions of said superior court shall in no way interfere with the sessions of the said circuit and district courts of the United States.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Government is to be paid at the rate of $100 year?

Mr. PUGH. Yes, sir; $100 per annum for five years.

Mr. COCKRELL. The rooms to be occupied one month each year, or two months?

Mr. PUGH. They will occupy the court-house until the State provides rooms for holding the court. The commissioners are required to provide the rooms until the legislature shall make provision for holding the court. It is said that it may take five years' time and it may take less, but during the years the court is held in the United States building the commissioners will pay $100 per annum.

Mr. QUAY. It is really $100 a month that will be paid, for the room is to be occupied but one month in the year under the terms of the joint resolution. I will state, for the information of the Senator from Missouri, the necessity for the passage of the joint resolution. The State of Pennsylvania last year created a new court, for which there are no accommodations. Under the act of assembly the court is required to meet at these specific places, where the United States has buildings with court rooms which are not in use at the time when the State of Pennsylvania will need them for its court; and it is merely desired that the United States shall permit the use of its court rooms for the purpose.

Mr. COCKRELL. I suggest that the joint resolution be so amended as to state what the Senator says, that $100 shall be paid for and during the month of such occupation.

Mr. QUAY. It is really $100 a month that is to be paid.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think that in the way the joint resolution reads it will beyond question be interpreted to be at the rate of $100 a year, which would be a little over $8 for one month.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest, to remove the objection of the Senator from Missouri, which does not strike me with the force it strikes him, that the joint resolution be amended so as to read "shall pay each the sum of $500, to be paid in five yearly payments." That means the same thing.

Mr. QUAY. That amendment is unobjectionable.

Mr. HOAR. Then, in line 18, after the word "each," I move to strike out the words "the sum of $100 per annum" and insert "the sum of $500, to be paid in five yearly payments."

Mr. CULLOM. For the use of the building for one month each year?

Mr. HOAR. Yes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Committee on the Judiciary report to strike out the preamble. The question is on agreeing to the amendment striking out the preamble.

The amendment was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 573) for the relief of James Crutchett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 574) granting a pension to Caroline A. Slocum; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 575) for the relief of George W. Harbaugh; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 576) increasing the pension of those who have lost limbs in the military or naval service of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 577) providing for postal savings banks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 578) for the relief of William Campbell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 579) granting a pension to Ann App; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 580) for the relief of John P. Leitzell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 581) for the relief of the legal representatives of Hiram Somerville; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 582) to amend section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to mining claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also introduced a bill (S. 583) to grant a pension to Eli D. Walker; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 584) to provide a temporary government for that portion of the Indian Territory occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, and to be hereafter known as the Territory of Indianola; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BERRY. I ask that the bill may lie on the table for the present, as I desire at some time hereafter to submit some remarks upon it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 585) granting a pension to Martha R. Hitchcock; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 586) to fix the rank and pay of certain retired officers of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 587) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in them; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 588) for the relief of William H. Hugo; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 589) for the relief of C. B. Bryan & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 590) for the relief of Payne, James & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 591) to authorize the sale of the site of St. Francis Barracks, Fla., the sale or removal of the improvements thereof, and to provide for a new site and the construction of suitable buildings thereon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 592) authorizing the exchange of lot 6 of square 10, known as the old custom-house lot, in the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for lands adjoining that part of the United States military reservation in said city designated as the powder-house lot; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 593) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend chapter 67, volume 23, of the Statutes at Large of the United States," placing enlisted men on the retired list after they shall have served thirty years in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 594) for the relief of Augustus Boyd; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 595) for the relief of Lieut. T. R. Kennedy, Company F, Ninth Pennsylvania Reserves; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 596) for the relief of James Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 597) for the relief of Samuel S. Boyer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 598) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs, or have been totally disabled in them, or have additional disabilities; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 599) to remove the bar of the statute of limitations and give the right of appeal in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also introduced a bill (S. 600) granting a pension to Mrs. Anna Stewart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 601) granting a pension to Clara R. Rodgers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 602) granting a pension to Elias Demus, of Indiana, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 603) for the relief of Robert Brigham, late postmaster at Franklin, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 604) granting an increase of pension to Francis C. McDermitt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 605) relieving the personal representatives of John Sherman, jr., late United States marshal for the Territory of New Mexico, from the requirements of section 833 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BRICE introduced a bill (S. 606) for the relief of Sarah K. McLean, widow of the late Lieut. Col. Nathaniel H. McLean; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 607) to correct the military record of George W. Pilcher; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 608) to amend the military record of John A. Miller; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 609) for the relief of Mary Chambers, widow of Thomas Chambers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 610) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Thomas Owens, late a private of Company I, One hundred and thirty-sixth New York Infantry Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 611) donating condemned cannon and cannon balls to the Michigan Soldiers' Home; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 612) for the relief of William Van Dresser, alias James Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 613) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wilson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 614) for the relief of James G. Reed; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 615) for the relief of Andrew Martin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 616) granting a pension to Matilda Gresham, widow of the late Walter Q. Gresham, at the rate of $200 per month; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 617) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Law; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 618) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah E. Comly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to Florence W. Buskirk; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 620) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who were confined in Confederate prisons; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 621) for the relief of the legal representative of George McDougall, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 622) for the relief of the legal representatives of Nicholas J. Bigley, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LODGE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 623) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Augustus P. Burditt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 624) to pension Mary D. Jackson and Rebecca F. Dinsmore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 625) granting a pension to Nellie L. Groshon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 626) providing for disposal of lands on abandoned portions of the Fort Assinniboine Military Reservation, in Montana, and for the relief of certain settlers thereon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MURPHY introduced a bill (S. 627) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Gould Carr, widow of the late Brig. and Bvt. Maj. Gen. Joseph B. Carr, United States Volunteers, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 628) to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 629) to authorize the erection of post-office buildings, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 630) regulating the procedure in criminal causes in the States of North and South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 631) granting a pension to Lewis L. Ratliff; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 632) granting a pension to Thomas Glynn; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 633) granting a pension to Hannah G. Huff; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 634) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Gabriel Le Breton Deschapelles; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 635) for the relief of Albert E. Redstone; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 636) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Chamberlain, in Brule County, and Lyman County, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title; and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 637) granting a pension to George M. Brooks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (S. 638) granting an increase of pension to John Nichols; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 639) to amend section numbered 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to mining claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also introduced a bill (S. 640) to increase the pension of Joseph W. Fisher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GIBSON introduced a bill (S. 641) to promote Commodore Louis C. Sartori, now on the retired list of the Navy, to be a rear-admiral on said list, in accordance with his original position on the Navy Register; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 642) for the relief of Commodore Oscar C. Badger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 643) for the relief of William R. Steinmetz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 644) to refund certain import duties; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 645) granting a pension to Ezra J. Riggs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 646) for the relief of Francis Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 647) granting a pension to Edmund C. Bailey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 648) for the relief of Albert J. Pratt, administrator; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 649) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore English; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 650) to incorporate the Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 651) granting a pension to Jane L. Buckingham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 652) for the relief of Nancy E. Day, administratrix of the estate of James L. Day, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 653) for the relief of C. W. Michaels; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 654) to prevent citizens of the United States from soliciting or receiving and accepting titles, patents of nobility, or degrees of honor from foreign nations, and for other purposes; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask that the bill be read at length and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The bill was read the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the passage of this act citizens of the United States of America shall be prohibited from soliciting or receiving and accepting titles, patents of nobility, or degrees of honor from any foreign government or representative thereof; and any such citizen who shall solicit or receive and accept any such title, patent of nobility, or degree of honor from any foreign government or representative thereof shall by that fact become disfranchised: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to prevent any ecclesiastical organization from conferring titles or degrees of honor on its members.

SEC. 2. That any citizen of the United States who shall solicit, or receive and accept, any title, patent of nobility, or degree of honor, from any foreign government or representative thereof shall be deemed guilty of a crime, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by disfranchisement, and be deprived of the privilege of holding office under the Government of the United States and under the government of any State or Territory in the United States, and be adjudged to pay a fine of not less than $1,000 nor more than $5,000 and be committed to prison at hard labor for not less than one year nor more than five years and shall pay the costs of prosecution.

SEC. 3. Any person violating the provisions of this act by soliciting, or receiving and accepting any title, patent of nobility, or degree of honor, herein prohibited, from any foreign government or representative thereof may be indicted and tried in any State or United States court of general criminal jurisdiction in any court or district in which the offense may have been committed, or in which he may be found or be arrested.

Mr. CALL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 655) to amend the laws granting patents to inventors and for the condemnation of inventions for the public use; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced a bill (S. 656) appropriating $125,000 for the construction of a light-house tender for the Gulf coast of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 657) to provide for the erection of range lights at St. Josephs Bay, Florida, and at St. Andrews Bay, Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 658) to place the improvement of the harbors of Fernandina, Pensacola, St. Johns River, and other places in Florida under contract, and making appropriations therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 659) to provide for the erection of a public building at Ocala, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 660) to provide for making conduits in Washington and the District of Columbia, and for better and cheaper lights and electric appliances; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 661) to amend section 2880 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, fixing time for vessels to unlade; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 662) for the relief of William S. Grant; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin introduced a bill (S. 663) to remove the charge of desertion against Philip Pflueger, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Wisconsin Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 664) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph Riese, alias Julius Rosier, late of Company D, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 665) to confer the rank and pay of a first lieutenant of infantry upon the director of gymnastics and instructor in swordsmanship at the United States Military Academy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 666) to amend section 4829 of the United States Revised Statutes concerning surgeons, assistant surgeons, and other medical officers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 667) for the relief of Wilbur F. McCue; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WALTHALL introduced a bill (S. 668) for the relief of William T. Robertson, administrator of Ira A. Sprouse, deceased, late of Scott County, State of Mississippi; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 669) for the relief of Henry C. Nichols, of Marshall County, State of Mississippi; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 670) for the relief of John C. Bailey, administrator of Andrew Nichols, of Marshall County, State of Mississippi; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 671) for the relief of John C. Bailey, of Marshall County, Miss.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 672) for the relief of George C. Harper, of Scott County, Miss.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 673) granting a pension to Joseph R. West, brigadier and brevet major general, United States Army Volunteers; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The proposed beneficiary of this bill was long a member of this body and has a most excellent record as a soldier, having been an officer not only in the Mexican war, but in the late war of the rebellion. He is now in very indigent circumstances, and by reason of bodily infirmity he is unable to do any work whatever. For these reasons I ask the Committee on Pensions, when organized, to give the bill early attention.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VILAS introduced a bill (S. 674) for the relief of Jennie M. Hunt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MANTLE introduced a bill (S. 675) to amend section 34 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 676) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1895; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. PASCO introduced a bill (S. 677) to provide American registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 678) for the relief of Agnes and Maria De Leon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SQUIRE. I introduce a bill, and wish to make a brief explanation regarding it. It provides for the establishment of a gun factory on the Pacific Coast for the manufacture of heavy guns and other ordnance for the use of the Army. It also provides for the appointment of a board, to consist of three officers of the Army, to examine and report what is the most suitable site for the erection of such a plant as is provided for by the bill.

I wish to state that a similar bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Coast Defenses several years ago, and that in the fortifications appropriation act of 1892 an appropriation was made of $2,500 for the payment of the expenses of a board, to consist of three officers of the Army and three officers of the Navy, to select a suitable site for a gun factory to be established on the Pacific Coast. Upon inquiry at the War Department I have ascertained that up to this time no such board has been appointed, and it is probable that the appropriation which was made in 1892 is not now available. It is quite possible that the delay has occurred partly on account of the mixed character of the proposed board. At the time of the appropriation it was supposed that the Navy Department might also be interested in the manufacture of large guns on the Pacific Coast. In the present bill the latter is not contemplated, and it is deemed by the officers connected with the War Department that there is now no necessity to have a board to consist partly of officers of the Army and partly of officers of the Navy; that it will be sufficient to have officers of the Army alone on such a board; furthermore, that it is not necessary that there should be a distinct appropriation for this purpose, as the expenses of the board to be created under the terms of this bill, if it become a law, being only traveling expenses, can be paid as usual out of the funds appropriated in the general appropriation bill for the Army for this purpose.

With this explanation I introduce the bill, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

The bill (S. 679) to provide for the establishment of a gun factory for the finishing and assembling of heavy ordnance on the Pacific Coast was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 680) for the relief of James Linskey from the operation of the act restricting the ownership of real estate in the Territories and the District of Columbia to American citizens; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 681) for the relief of William H. Beck, assignee of A. Burwell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. QUAY introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 17) providing for certain surveys in the State of Florida; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. QUAY. I ask that the joint resolution may lie on the table for the present; and I shall request the Senate, by unanimous consent, to pass it at the conclusion of the routine morning business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will lie on the table.

Mr. GIBSON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 18) to authorize the purchase of the painting by Victor Nehlig, representing Pocahontas saving the life of Capt. John Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF RAILROADS.

Mr. BRICE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed of the annual report of the Commissioner of Railroads, for the year 1895, 1,500 extra copies, in paper covers, with appendixes, for the use of the Commissioner of Railroads.

CRIPPLE CREEK DISTRICT, COLORADO.

Mr. TELLER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed at the Government Printing Office, at the earliest day practicable, 5,000 copies in separate form, with paper covers, of the paper entitled "Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado," constituting pages 1 to 209 of part 2 of the Sixteenth Annual Report of the United States Geological Survey, with the accompanying illustrations, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,500 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies for distribution by the Geological Survey.

IMPRISONMENT OF JOHN L. WALLER.

Mr. BAKER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if in his judgment not incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate all information which has been received by him or by the State Department in regard to the arrest and trial of John L. Waller, a citizen of the United States, by French authorities in the Island of Madagascar, and his imprisonment in Paris, in the Republic of France, including all correspond-

ence between Edward Telfair Wetter, United States consul at Madagascar, and Mr. Edwin F. Uhl, of the Department of State, and all records, documents, and evidence in any way touching said matters in his possession or in possession of the State Department.

INDIAN RIVER CANAL, FLORIDA.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is directed to send to the Senate any information the Department may have as to the condition of the canal on Indian River authorized to be built by the State of Florida, and whether it is in the tide waters of the United States, subject to its admiralty jurisdiction; whether any work has been done upon it or is now being done upon it. The Secretary of War is further directed, if such information is not on file in the War Department, to order the officers of the Engineer Corps on duty in Florida to report to him the facts in relation to the subject of this resolution, and submit the same to the Senate as soon as it may be received.

STATUES OF JOHN STARK AND DANIEL WEBSTER.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound of the proceedings in Congress upon the acceptance of the statues of the late John Stark and Daniel Webster 15,000 additional copies, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, concerning this resolution I simply desire to say that the calls for the document referred to are very frequent and pressing. It is a valuable historical document, and I trust that the Committee on Printing, to which I desire the resolution to go, may take a favorable view of the resolution and report it back promptly.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Printing, in the absence of objection.

SPECIAL REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

Mr. MILLS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That 500 copies of Senate Document No. 7, being a special report of the Librarian of Congress, be printed, one-half of said number to be for distribution by the Librarian.

CUSTODY OF MINOR CHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Ordered, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and is hereby, directed to inquire into and ascertain what is the existing law in the District of Columbia in relation to the custody of minor children, and especially to ascertain whether, under the law as it now stands in said District, the father of any minor children may dispose of their custody after his death by provisions in his last will and testament. Said committee is instructed to report the result of its investigation to the Senate, and its conclusions thereupon by bill or otherwise.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I venture to call the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary to the importance of an early investigation into this question. I do not know anything about the facts of the controversy in the courts of the District of Columbia, which has occupied the newspapers for some time past, but I do know that it seems intolerable to me that we should live longer under any system of law or any decision or any common law which authorizes any father of children in his last will and testament to dispose entirely of the custody of those children after he shall have passed from the earth; and I hope the committee will take this subject up at an early day and report its conclusions to the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Maine that questions such as this have heretofore invariably gone to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and not to the Judiciary Committee. Of course I have no pride of opinion about it, nor any particular desire as to where the resolution shall go, but if the precedents of the past are to be followed the resolution ought to be addressed to the Committee on the District of Columbia instead of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE. Neither have I any wish about the matter as to which committee the resolution shall go. It is a pure question of law. It has been claimed in the courts, with considerable asseveration and emphasis, that under the common law, which is applied to this District and government in certain respects, the father of minor children may absolutely dispose of their custody, ousting perhaps their mother after his death. Whether or not that be the law I do not know. I look upon it as a pure matter of law for the law committee of the Senate to investigate. It is true the question appertains to the District of Columbia alone in location, and being simply an investigation into a law question, and not a question of the government of the District, nor the administration of the government in the District, I indicated the Committee on the Judiciary. I am willing that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH], representing those two committees, shall settle as to which committee the resolution shall go. I only wish that it shall be looked into and seen if we have any such relic of barbaric law in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRIS. I certainly am indifferent personally as to where the resolution may go. While it is purely a question of law, it is purely a question of law of this particular locality, of this District. Such questions have uniformly heretofore gone to the District Committee. I shall not make it the subject of a motion. I have fully performed what I conceive to be my duty in making the suggestion I have made to the Senator from Maine and to the Senate.

Mr. HALE. I have no objection to the resolution being so referred.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I think the practice of the Senate has invariably been since I have been here to refer all questions affecting the jurisprudence of the District of Columbia to the Committee on the District, whether they be pure questions of jurisprudence or not. The various codifications of the laws relating to the District, which have been proposed from time to time on particular subjects, have always come from the Committee on the District of Columbia. The members of that committee give hearings, which the Committee on the Judiciary never does, to the citizens of the District of Columbia, who are in the habit of communicating for a thousand purposes with the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the members of that committee are necessarily obliged, in the course of their duties, to have a familiarity with the laws applicable here which the members of the Judiciary Committee never get. So I would suggest the amendment which has been proposed, that the resolution go to the Committee on the District, from whom it is likely to get a quicker report than from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE. Let the resolution be modified by striking out "the Committee on the Judiciary" and inserting "the Committee on the District of Columbia." I am entirely content with that.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, without entering into the discussion of the appropriate committee to which this resolution should be referred, I simply want to state my objection to passing any resolution in regard to a case now pending in the courts of this District. The question as to the right of a father to dispose of the custody or guardianship of his infant or minor children is one of the questions at issue in that case, whether the common law of England applies to this District now in that regard. That case, which has been reported in the newspapers here, excites a vast amount of feeling; it is being litigated now in the courts of the District, and for the Senate of the United States directly or indirectly to take any part in that litigation is bad practice, and I for one must enter my dissent to the passage of such a resolution.

Mr. PUGH. Mr. President, it is a question as to which committee properly has jurisdiction to deal with the subject-matter of the resolution. It is immaterial to either of the committees which shall take charge of the matter, but it seems to me that the judiciary system of this District and the jurisdiction of the courts of this District are matters to be investigated and reported upon by the Committee on the Judiciary.

This is a purely legal question, and I fully concur with what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] has just stated, that any report that either committee should make upon this question would have no legal effect whatever and could not influence the action of the courts now having jurisdiction of this identical question. The question stated in that resolution is a pure matter of law arising in a case pending in the courts, and of which the courts now have jurisdiction. For the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on the District of Columbia now to report the conclusion to which they may come upon that purely abstract question of law would amount to nothing whatever in legal effect. It might be persuasive with the court and it might be that the conclusion of this law committee, made up of Senators whose profession is that of the law, and who had devoted their lives to the study of the law, would have influence with the court, but as an authority merely.

I agree with the Senator from Missouri that such action ought not to be called for on the part of any committee of the Senate, because it can have no other effect than that which I have stated. But if the Senate wants a committee to report upon this purely abstract legal proposition, which is already pending in the courts, and over which they already have jurisdiction, if it is desired to have as an authority the opinion of the Judiciary Committee or of the Committee on the District of Columbia, to be acted upon and sanctioned by the Senate, I do not think that there is any question but that the proper committee to take charge of it is the Judiciary Committee. But I object to any such subject-matter being referred to any committee of the Senate, because, as I have stated, any action upon it can have no legal effect whatever in the courts of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Maine and also the attention of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and of Senators generally to the fact that this very question was before the Judiciary Committee at the last Congress by a bill introduced on the subject, which was partially considered in the Judiciary Committee by a subcommittee, but owing to the fact of its being a short session of Congress and the press of business no final conclusion was reached upon it by the committee.

It is a matter, I agree, of very great importance and one that ought to be considered carefully by some committee. There should be, in my judgment, soms legislation on the subject.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, Senators entirely mistake the scope of the resolution. It is not intended, and ought not to be intended, and could not be intended, as a matter of law to in any way affect any case that is now pending; but Senators know that much valuable and important legislation is frequently passed by legislative bodies because certain cases which have arisen have called attention to the necessity for new laws. I disclaimed in introducing the resolution any knowledge of the case that has been referred to in the courts; I have not even read the reports of the testimony; I know nothing about it and care nothing about it; but I have seen that it is alleged in the presentation of that case that the existing law in the District of Columbia authorizes the father of minor children by his will and testament to absolutely dispose of the custody of those children after his death. I say that is intolerable if that be the law, and the proper law committee, either the District Committee or the Judiciary Committee, ought to inquire and see if it is the law, and, if so, report a new statute, which can in no regard influence the case that is now pending.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Missouri that nothing that we can do can affect the pending case, or ought to affect it; but when we have discovered that there has been slumbering some relic of barbarity in the law applicable to this District I agree with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] that it is so important a matter that any committee might be glad to take charge of it, and whatever the Senate concludes upon a report shall be the law hereafter, can not relate back, refer to, or control in the least the present case. I do not see that anyone ought to object to this resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I have no objection to the resolution, but I wish to reaffirm my dissent from the suggestion of the honorable chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. PUGH].

If it be true that because this is a pure question of law it should go to the Judiciary Committee, it follows that wherever in relation to a subject to be dealt with by any other committee of the Senate a pure question of law arises that also must go to the Judiciary Committee. It is presumed that all the members of this body, whether they have been practicing lawyers or not, understand the laws of the country for which they are to make laws, and whose laws they are to amend and repeal and reenact from time to time; and in the division of subjects among different committees it has been always the custom of the Senate to take it for granted that every committee was able to deal with the legislation which related to its particular subject. If a law be proposed which purely affects the agriculture of the country, the Committee on Agriculture reports it, whether it be purely legal or not. So of the Navy, and so of the Army. If a bill relating to the jurisprudence of the District of Columbia went to the Judiciary Committee last year it was by inadvertence, as I conceive, and not in accordance with the uniform precedents of the Senate.

The District of Columbia is a little government by itself. It has its own special laws, partly coming from laws established from time to time by Congress, and very largely inherited from the State of Maryland, of which the cities of Washington and Georgetown were once a part. Laws relating purely and simply to the punishment of larceny in the District of Columbia, the puishment of offenses in the highway, nuisances in the highway, the regulation of sales by merchants or by peddlers, all that class of laws which require criminal legislation, and all laws relating to the descent of estates in the District of Columbia, which are civil in their nature, have always been the subject of study and investigation by the Committee on the District of Columbia. The members of the Committee on the District of Columbia are learned upon that particular subject, and if this resolution goes to the Committee on the Judiciary, it seems to me, we shall not only be taking from the Committee on the District of Columbia a large part of its proper jurisdiction, but by the same logic we shall have to take from every other committee of the Senate a large part of its proper jurisdiction.

Mr. HALE. I have modified the resolution by striking out "the Committee on the Judiciary" and inserting "the Committee on the District of Columbia."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

BISCAYNE BAY AND PALM BEACH, FLORIDA.

Mr. PASCO. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] this morning introduced a joint resolution with reference to the improvement of Biscayne Bay. That Senator is in his seat, and I ask him if there is any objection to that joint resolution being taken up and acted upon at the present time? It is based upon a report from the War Department; and if there be no objection, I ask that it be immediately considered.

Mr. QUAY. I have no objection, and I should be very glad if the Senator from Florida would call up the joint resolution, as it is properly within his jurisdiction.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution, which will be read for information.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. R. 17) providing for certain surveys in the State of Florida, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of $1,500 be, and the same hereby is, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War for a survey and plans for the improvement of the entrance to Biscayne Bay, Florida, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his letter of February 26, 1895, and for a survey and plans for the construction of a breakwater at Palm Beach, Florida; and the Secretary of War is directed to report the result of such surveys, together with plans and estimates for contemplated improvements, to Congress at the earliest practicable moment.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MONTHLY STATEMENT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the joint resolution from the House of Representatives in relation to the printing of the Monthly Summary Statement of Imports and Exports.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 7) providing for the printing of the Monthly Summary Statement of Imports and Exports of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department, was read twice by its title.

Mr. GALLINGER. A few days ago I introduced a bill similar to the joint resolution which has just been read, and as I desire to ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution, I shall make a very brief statement concerning it.

The difficulty arises from an omission or a mistake in the printing act passed last January. Prior to that time the Departments had authority to order printing done, but that act restricted them to 1,000 copies. I understand that the Treasury Department has used its 1,000 copies of this publication and is in want of more, while no member of the Senate or House of Representatives has a single copy of the document to send to his constituents, and the calls for it are very numerous. It is a very important document, and the action contemplated has been recommended by the Public Printer.

I will state that I have consulted with the leading members of the Finance Committee on both sides of the Chamber, and they think we ought to pass the joint resolution at once. The matter is all stereotyped, and I understand the October statement is now about ready to go to press. As I have stated, there are a great many calls for the document, and I trust there will be no objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether 3,500 is the number which was previously printed?

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand that was the number. However, I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I think the Secretary of the Treasury had authority to have any number printed that he chose to call for.

Mr. COCKRELL. He has not that authority under the present printing act.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that was the number. I know that the Secretary of the Treasury has been consulted in regard to the matter.

Mr. COCKRELL. The power to print beyond a certain number is limited under the general law, and it cuts down the Departments about one-half to two-thirds of the number they were accustomed to have printed theretofore. The only question, in my opinion, is whether 3,500 copies will be sufficient.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I am correct in saying that this is substantially the same number that was formerly printed.

Mr. GORMAN rose.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very likely the Senator from Maryland can give us that information.

Mr. GORMAN. I can not state definitely. I suggest, however, that the delay of a day will not make any material difference, and that the joint resolution had better be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no objection to that course.

Mr. GORMAN. I think there is some merit in this case, but we are constantly appealed to by the Departments for an increase of printing, and it is almost impossible to do it unless we repeal the present law. I trust that the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so referred in the absence of objection.

FUR-SEAL FISHERY CLAIMS.

Mr. MORGAN. If there is no further morning business to be presented I desire to call up the resolution which I submitted last week, and, with the consent of the Senate, will make some remarks on it at this time. I ask that the resolution may be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution heretofore submitted by the Senator from Alabama, which will be read.

The resolution submitted by Mr. MORGAN on the 3d instant was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the message of the President received by the Senate on 13th February, 1895, and his message read in the Senate to-day, relating to the payment by the United States of the claims of Great Britain arising out of the Bering Sea controversy, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instruction that said committee examine into the question of such liability to Great Britain and the amount thereof, if any, and of any liability on the part of Great Britain or Canada arising out of said controversy; and that said committee shall have authority to report by bill or otherwise.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I find that recent events, to which I will refer on this occasion, impose on me the personal duty, as well as the duty that rests upon me as a Senator, a member of the Tribunal of Arbitration which sat in Paris in 1893, and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, to reply to certain statements, strictures, and criticisms sent out through the American press by the British Government touching the attitude of Congress toward what is called the Bering Sea controversy.

I will not undertake to cover the whole ground of this dispute until a complete examination is made necessary by the adoption of the resolution now before the Senate, if it is adopted, but will endeavor to put the Senate in possession of the leading facts involved in the scope of that inquiry, and that should cause us at once to enter upon the proposed investigation.

The questions presented in this dispute are broad enough and plain enough to be decided without resort to hair-splitting analysis or merely artful methods of discussion, and I will endeavor to examine them in that view. The question whether a negotiation respecting the liability of the United States to Great Britain for the seizure of sealing vessels in Bering Sea under the orders of Mr. Cleveland's first Administration shall take place, or should have taken place, under the treaty of February 29, 1892, is still an open question, and has not been closed by any part or feature of the award of the Tribunal of Arbitration. On the contrary, as I shall presently proceed to show, that tribunal expressly refused to make any decision of the question of such liability or that the seizure of the vessels under Mr. Cleveland's order was illegal.

Article VIII of the treaty, relating to the question of damages for those seizures, is as follows:

VIII.

The high contracting parties having found themselves unable to agree upon a reference which shall include the question of the liability of each for the injuries alleged to have been sustained by the other, or by its citizens, in connection with the claims presented and urged by it, and being solicitous that this subordinate question should not interrupt or longer delay the submission and determination of the main questions, do agree that either may submit to the arbitrators any question of fact involved in said claims and ask for a finding thereon, the question of the liability of either Government upon the facts found to be the subject of further negotiations.

Articles VI and VII of the treaty are as follows:

ARTICLE VI.

In deciding the matters submitted to the arbitrators it is agreed that the following five points shall be submitted to them, in order that their award shall embrace a distinct decision upon each of said five points, to wit:

First. What exclusive jurisdiction in the sea now known as the Bering Sea and what exclusive rights in the seal fisheries therein did Russia assert and exercise prior and up to the time of the cession of Alaska to the United States?

Second. How far were these claims of jurisdiction as to the seal fisheries recognized and conceded by Great Britain?

Third. Was the body of water now known as the Bering Sea included in the phrase "Pacific Ocean," as used in the treaty of 1825 between Great Britain and Russia, and what rights, if any, in the Bering Sea were held and exclusively exercised by Russia after said treaty?

Fourth. Did not all the rights of Russia as to jurisdiction and as to the seal fisheries in Bering Sea east of the water boundary in the treaty between the United States and Russia of the 30th March, 1867, pass unimpaired to the United States under that treaty?

Fifth. Has the United States any right—if so, what right of protection or property in the fur seals frequenting the islands of the United States in Bering Sea when such seals are found outside the ordinary 3-mile limit?

ARTICLE VII.

If the determination of the foregoing questions as to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States shall leave the subject in such a position that the concurrence of Great Britain is necessary to the establishment of regulations for the proper protection and preservation of the fur seals in or habitually resorting to the Bering Sea, the arbitrators shall then determine what concurrent regulations outside the jurisdictional limits of the respective Governments are necessary, and over what waters such regulations should extend; and to aid them in that determination the report of a joint commission, to be appointed by the respective Governments, shall be laid before them, with such other evidence as either Government may submit.

The high contracting parties furthermore agree to cooperate in securing the adhesion of other powers to such regulations.

The part of the award which relates to the question of liability for damages in our dealings with those sealing vessels is as follows:

AWARD AND DECLARATIONS.

Findings of fact proposed by the agent of Great Britain and agreed to and approved by the agent for the United States, and submitted to the Tribunal of Arbitration for its consideration.

1. That the several searches and seizures, whether of ships or goods, and the several arrests of masters and crews, respectively mentioned in the Schedule to the British Case, pages 1 to 60, inclusive, were made by the authority of the United States Government. The questions as to the value of the said vessels or their contents, or either of them, and the question as to whether the vessels mentioned in the Schedule to the British Case, or any of them, were wholly or in part the actual property of citizens of the United States, have been withdrawn from and have not been considered by the tribunal, it being understood that it is open to the United States to raise these questions, or any of them, if they think fit, in any future negotiations as to the liability of the United States Government to pay the amounts mentioned in the schedule to the British Case.

2. That the seizures aforesaid, with the exception of the *Pathfinder*, seized at Neah Bay, were made in Bering Sea at the distances from shore mentioned in the schedule annexed hereto, marked C.

3. That the said several searches and seizures of vessels were made by public armed vessels of the United States, the commanders of which had, at the several times when they were made, from the executive department of the Government of the United States, instructions, a copy of one of which is annexed hereto, marked A, and that the others were, in all substantial respects, the same; that in all the instances in which proceedings were had in the district courts of the United States resulting in condemnation, such proceedings were begun by the filing of libels, a copy of one of which is annexed hereto, marked B, and that the libels in the other proceedings were in all substantial respects the same; that the alleged acts or offenses for which said several searches and seizures were made were in each case done or committed in Bering Sea at the distances from shore aforesaid, and that in each case in which sentence of condemnation was passed, except in those cases when the vessels were released after condemnation, the seizure was adopted by the Government of the United States, and in those cases in which the vessels were released the seizure was made by the authority of the United States; that the said fines and imprisonments were for alleged breaches of the municipal laws of the United States, which alleged breaches were wholly committed in Bering Sea at the distances from the shore aforesaid.

4. That the several orders mentioned in the schedule annexed hereto and marked C, warning vessels to leave or not to enter Bering Sea, were made by public armed vessels of the United States, the commanders of which had, at the several times when they were given, like instructions as mentioned in finding 3, and that the vessels so warned were engaged in sealing or prosecuting voyages for that purpose, and that such action was adopted by the Government of the United States.

5. That the district courts of the United States in which any proceedings were had or taken for the purpose of condemning any vessel seized, as mentioned in the schedule to the case of Great Britain, pages 1 to 60, inclusive, had all the jurisdiction and powers of courts of admiralty, including the prize jurisdiction, but that in each case the sentence pronounced by the court was based upon the grounds set forth in the libel.

It is the plain, palpable, and unmistakable fact, of which the text and context of these papers admit of no doubt or sincere question, that the Tribunal of Arbitration did not attempt, directly or indirectly, to consider or decide any question of the liability of the United States for those sealing vessels seized by order of the President, or the amount of damages incurred under such seizures, or whether such damages, if so incurred, were due to British subjects or to American citizens. This fact was stated to our Government in the report of our agent, Hon. John W. Foster, to Secretary Gresham, August 17, 1893, from which I quote:

It will be seen from the decision of the tribunal that a finding of facts, agreed upon by counsel, was rendered in accordance with Article VIII of the treaty. This finding will be found to relate entirely to the facts of the seizures and, as agreed to by counsel, did not in any manner involve the question of liability or the value or ownership of the vessels.

The tribunal obeyed the mandate of the treaty under which it existed, and expressly refused to consider any of those matters, and remanded their consideration to the further negotiations of the treaty powers as original questions, which they never had any right to deal with.

Great Britain, however, contends that the Tribunal of Arbitration considered and decided this question of liability as a necessary inference from one feature in the record, which was itself a collateral question, and did not control or concern the real question before that body, the protection and preservation of the Alaskan seal herd.

If the President had sent to the Senate the diplomatic agreement made by him with Great Britain, in which a committal to the British contention is sought to be apparently avoided by a compromise, but is in fact admitted without reserve or qualification, the vote of this body would have settled the attitude of the country by accepting or rejecting that agreement. If Congress should thereafter appropriate the coveted "lump sum" to satisfy the British demand, we would at least have been free from the humiliating attitude of accepting and indorsing a falsehood as the decision of the Tribunal of Arbitration, and of paying citizens of the United States for criminal wrongs done to their country.

The reassertion by the President of the justice and rightfulness of the demand of the British Government made upon the United States with the insulting arrogance of an ultimatum, requires of Congress that its refusal at its last session to vote the lump sum of $425,000 to satisfy this demand should be defended upon the principles and facts that justified that vote.

For reasons of the gravest character, the Senate has a special duty to perform on this occasion, in the assertion of its rightful and undeniable constitutional power of passing upon and accepting or rejecting all diplomatic agreements with foreign Governments that the President may make.

It is a wise and indispensable provision of the organic law that the President can not act alone, or with any other body except the Senate, in any way to bind the United States in an executory covenant with a foreign power. I will never consent, whatever may be his opinion of or relations to the Senate or to Senators, that the President shall confine the consideration of such matters to the legislative powers of the Senate or Congress, thereby ignoring the treaty-making powers of this body.

It is this palpable departure from the requirements of the Constitution that makes it incumbent on the Senate to make the investigation proposed in the resolution I have offered. The arbitration treaty of February 29, 1892, is the supreme law of the land, and is mandatory upon Congress and the President, and it is his duty and ours to obey and execute it. If Congress votes to execute the agreement between the President and Great Britain by appropriating the $425,000, it will do so merely in the exercise of the power of appropriation, but it can not confirm that executory diplomatic agreement until it has been ratified by the Senate.

I will now proceed to discuss the merits of that agreement and some other matters connected with it.

The controlling fact and the key to the situation which results from the award of the Tribunal of Arbitration made at Paris is this: That Great Britain and the United States agreed that it was to the mutual interest of both nations, and was a mutual duty of humanity, and was for the advantage of legitimate commerce, and a proper subject for the friendly cooperation of all the maritime powers that security and proper protection should be given to the Alaskan seal herd through the exercise of all just powers of government, whether the same might be rightfully exerted by the United States alone or by the concurrent action of the two treaty powers under regulations to be established by a tribunal of arbitration. With this mutual purpose in mind, it at once is obvious that, as to the care to be exercised in the preservation of the Alaskan fur seals, there was no controversy between these nations, and as to the best and most efficient method of preserving them from destruction there was no controversy or dispute, the decision of which could possibly result in an award by the arbitrators in favor of one Government against the other. There was no national dispute whether one method of preserving the seals was wiser or better than another. If a method worse than some other that was suggested had been adopted by the tribunal, both Governments would have had cause to complain that their joint purpose had not been adequately executed.

The Tribunal of Arbitration by the agreement of the treaty powers was discharged from the duty of considering the questions of the damages suffered by either for acts done during the period covered by the modus vivendi of 1891 and that of 1892 incorporated in the treaty of arbitration.

This joint action removed from the tribunal the only questions upon which it was possible that an award could be predicated in favor of one Government against the other.

The questions that remained for the consideration of the arbitrators had no reference to any claim for damages by either Government against the other, or any liability for such damages, if any had been sustained. These matters were expressly excluded by the treaty from the consideration or award of the arbitrators.

This left for the consideration of the arbitrators the question which had been discussed at great length by the two Governments, whether the power and right to protect and preserve the Alaskan seals belonged to the United States exclusively, or whether it was necessary, as between them, that the protection of the seals should be accomplished under regulations in which the two Governments would concur, and would make obligatory upon their citizens or subjects through independent but parallel legislation, and through further joint or concurrent national regulation in execution of the award.

It was the contention of the United States that the separate and exclusive power to protect and preserve the seals of the Alaskan herd existed in that Government, unaided and unobstructed by the subjects or the Government of Great Britain.

This claim of the United States was formulated in five points or propositions in the treaty of arbitration, upon each of which the tribunal was required to render a separate decision.

These five points I have quoted from the treaty.

It is manifest that some of these questions are purely historical, one of them is geographical, and others are either questions of law or mixed questions of law and fact. A variety of functions other than juridical were thus imposed upon the Tribunal of Arbitration, and these separate decisions demanded, each in its turn, the exercise of these distinctive offices by the arbitrators.

The laws of usage, custom, prescription, and of the construction of treaties, as well as public and private international law, and Russia relating to these questions, as well as alleged precedents from other States, were cited, argued, and urged before the Tribunal of Arbitration in support of the opposing contentions on all of these five questions.

These questions were special and were germane only to the particular issues stated in the treaty and submitted to the tribunal. They could have no effect except as between the two Governments, and with reference only to the matters stated in the submission, which fixed the limits of the powers and jurisdiction of the Tribunal of Arbitration. As decisions of principles of justice and equity, or of the law of nations, the awards of the arbitrators have no effect beyond the special matter submitted to them, and no other nation is bound to respect them.

Neither Great Britain nor the United States is bound to adhere to these decisions in a controversy with any other power.

The Tribunal of Arbitration, by a majority vote, decided four of these questions adversely to the contention of the United States. If either of these four questions had been decided in favor of the contention of the United States, the question would have arisen in a form that would have been seriously embarrassing, whether the Tribunal of Arbitration had the power to proceed to establish any concurrent regulations for the protection and preservation of the Alaskan seals, for the reason that such a decision would have established the right of the United States in Bering Sea in the one case and on the Pacific Ocean in the other case to enforce the protection and preservation of the seals through her own sovereign powers without regard to or in defiance of any opposition by Great Britain.

This was the purpose and effect of the contention of the United States, and only this, in the five points stated in Article VI of the treaty.

Those decisions denied to the United States the exclusive right of exercising sovereign power over the Alaskan seals outside the 3-mile limit, and equally to Great Britain, if such a right had been claimed by that Government.

But these decisions did not dispose of the matters submitted to the arbitrators by the treaty.

On the contrary, those decisions made it expressly incumbent and mandatory upon the arbitrators that they should consider and establish (ordain) general concurrent regulations for the proper protection and preservation of the Alaskan seals, binding upon both Governments, to which, also, they should jointly invite the accession of other powers.

In performing this duty it is manifest that no judicial action was required and that no controversy between the treaty powers was submitted to them, or was required to be settled by the Tribunal of Arbitration.

This field of duty was opened to the tribunal by those decisions, and the United States and Great Britain met, without further disagreement, on the common ground of their earnestly professed and proclaimed desire and purpose of providing for the protection and preservation of the Alaskan fur seals.

The questions then remaining for consideration were not formulated in the treaty further than that the regulations must be concurrent—that is, they must bind each country, mutually, to enforce them by legislation and by special regulations—and must be necessary to give proper protection and to secure preservation to the Alaskan fur seals on the high seas (including Bering Sea) outside the 3-mile limit of either country.

These duties of ordination of concurrent regulations, thus free from restrictions as to their form or requirements, were very broad in their scope, and were exceedingly delicate and difficult of satisfactory performance. The function of the Tribunal of Arbitration in this new rôle was not judicial, nor did it include any matter of controversy submitted to them for their award. It was more akin to the powers of diplomacy, supported by authority to make a conclusive agreement and, by a quasi legislative power, to ordain rules that should bind two great sovereign powers; but the tribunal had no power to enforce its award, and it rested alone on the sanctions that constitute the binding force of treaties.

Under such conditions, the concurrent regulations established by that tribunal can only be treated, in any legal or obligatory sense, as if they had been included in the text of the treaty of arbitration, and had been signed and ratified by the treaty powers.

Both Governments are as much bound to enforce the concurrent regulations established by the Tribunal of Arbitration as if they had been incorporated in the treaty, and they are not bound by the award to any other extent.

This view of the matter was discussed by the tribunal, and no dissent to it was expressed during their deliberations.

Thus it appears that the Tribunal of Arbitration had no right or opportunity to consider any question of loss or damage that either Government may have claimed against the other growing out of any incident connected with this protracted fur-seal controversy. If any decision made by the tribunal has any effect upon any such claim for damages, it is not the effect that follows the adjudication of the same question between the same parties, or the establishment

the common law of England and the United States, the civil law, the Code Napoleon, the municipal laws of England and the United States, and of many British provinces, many decisions of courts in England and the United States and other countries, and all the diplomatic correspondence of Great Britain, the United States, of a rule or principle of law by a court of general jurisdiction and of authoritative utterance. At most, the award of the arbitrators, adversely to the United States on either of the five questions stated in Article VI of the treaty can only furnish a remote argument in support of the legal justice of the claim of Great Britain for damages on account of the seizure of vessels in Bering Sea. It is perfectly obvious that there is no reasonable pretension that the liability of the United States is res adjudicata.

It is equally clear that the Tribunal of Arbitration could not and did not attempt to settle any question of law between the two Governments that related to a liability for damages that was not submitted to them, but was expressly withheld from them by the treaty; nor could they establish a principle of law by their decision that related to any other controversy not submitted to them or that could possibly settle by inference a question or controversy by relation back to a period anterior to the time of their existence as a Tribunal of Arbitration. If there is any rule of law that is perfectly settled it is that the award of an arbitrator is not a judgment unless it is made such by statute, and that it is limited to the precise matter contained in the submission and is not authority in any other controversy between the parties to the arbitration.

I am bound by and am faithfully loyal to the award of the tribunal, although I voted with the minority on four of the five questions that were decided adversely to the contention of the United States, and on the first of those questions I voted alone. In its full legal and moral force and effect I adhere to the award, and will so vote, in any emergency, but its effect as law is being conveniently overstated and misapplied by Great Britain, and its moral effect, as well as its positive requirements, are being either ignored or perverted by that Government.

Nothing could be made more certain in statement than the following declarations of the Tribunal of Arbitration, that their award was made without any reference to any question or claim for damages by either Government against the other. I quote from the award:

And whereas, by Article VIII of the said treaty, after reciting that the high contracting parties had found themselves unable to agree upon a reference which would include the question of the liability of each for the injuries alleged to have been sustained by the other, or by its citizens in connection with the claims presented and urged by it, and that "they were solicitous that this subordinate question should not interrupt or longer delay the submission and determination of the main questions," the high contracting parties agreed that "either of them might submit to the arbitrators any question of fact involved in said claims and ask for a finding thereon, the question of the liability of either Government upon the facts found to be the subject of further negotiation."

I quote further from the agreement as to a state of facts made by the Governments and adopted by the Tribunal of Arbitration, as follows:

The questions as to the value of the said vessels or their contents, or either of them, and the question as to whether the vessels mentioned in the Schedule to the British Case, or any of them, were wholly or in part the actual property of citizens of the United States, have been withdrawn from and have not been considered by the tribunal, it being understood that it is open to the United States to raise these questions, or any of them, if they think fit, in any future negotiations as to the liability of the United States Government to pay the amounts mentioned in the Schedule to the British Case.

In further support of the fact that the award of the tribunal excluded, absolutely, all consideration of the question of the legality of the seizure of these twenty fishing vessels, I quote from a paper entitled "Correspondence respecting claims for compensation on account of seizure of British vessels in Bering Sea by United States cruisers, presented to both houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty, September, 1895." This official paper (which I hold in my hand) has been circulated among newspapers in the United States by the British ambassador as a political "flyer" or circular, with the evident purpose of reaching the people, instead of the Congress, in order to get a popular prejudgment which would enable Great Britain to escape from a negotiation respecting these claims that would expose her want of justice and would compel her to prove the alleged facts on which they rest. I will further notice this paper before I yield the floor. In this official document Sir Julian Pauncefote makes the following quotation from a remark made from the bench by Lord Hannen, a distinguished jurist, while sitting in the Tribunal of Arbitration as one of the British arbitrators.

Lord Hannen, addressing Mr. Phelps, said:

We will assume for a moment that the finding [of the tribunal] will be no property.

If that can be tacked onto the finding of facts as to the seizure, then that would meet that which Sir Charles has been asking for, a finding that it was an illegal seizure, and if so, I presume that would satisfy his requirements, as undoubtedly it would meet the view which I intended to indicate in the question I put to you.

This question was put to Mr. Phelps while he was replying to the demand of Sir Charles Russell that the tribunal should rule that the seizure of the twenty vessels was illegal.

The award, which I have just quoted, shows that the tribunal expressly refused to hold that those seizures were illegal. It is needless to produce further evidence to satisfy any impartial mind of the entire absence of a rational or just ground for the position taken by Sir Julian Pauncefote in his dispatch (No. 42) of March 15, 1895, to Earl Kimberley, in which he says:

On these two points I would observe that no admission of liability became necessary from the moment that the Paris Tribunal, by its award, had rejected the legal pretensions of the United States to a special property in the fur seals resorting to the Pribilof Islands. That decision at once proclaimed the illegality of the seizures and the liability of the United States to satisfy the claims. That was the basis of the diplomatic negotiation for the adjustment of the claims, and I am at a loss to conceive what other view could be taken without disputing the Paris award.

I am equally at a loss to conceive how the tribunal should refuse to consider the question of the liability of either Government to the other, being prohibited by the treaty from any such attempt, and how by such refusal they have managed to decide the question and give to their judgment the effect of an estoppel by matter of record. Being urged by the British counsel to decide that the seizure of these vessels was illegal, they expressly refused to consider the request, and yet the British ambassador permits himself to state the absurd conclusion as a fact that "that decision at once proclaimed the illegality of the seizures and the liability of the United States to satisfy the claims." What claims, I ask, were thus finally adjudicated by the refusal of the arbitrators to consider the question of the liability of either Government upon any claims asserted by the other? For the present I will leave Sir Julian at leisure for the repair of his logic, having first aided, as far as I can, his powers of comprehension, of which he justly complains in his diplomatic circular to the people of the United States, from which I quote the following paragraph:

Nor can I comprehend, without further explanation, the meaning of Senator MORGAN'S objection to that negotiation as not having taken place "through the constitutional authorities of the United States."

Referring to the proposed negotiation, if Sir Julian had remembered that there was no negotiation of the question of liability, or as to the rightfulness or justice, or the items of the claims or the amount of them, or whether they belonged to citizens of the United States, he would have comprehended my objection, in part at least, to the diversion of this question from the consideration of the Senate, without which no negotiation can mature into the effect of law. He would have seen, as he doubtless saw, very clearly that a conditional agreement for a "lump sum" of $425,000 in compromise of all claims was a convenient way to avoid a negotiation required by treaty, instead of its being a diplomatic negotiation, which the Senate must ratify by a vote of two-thirds of a quorum before it is an engagement that binds the United States.

The Senate is an essential part of "the constitutional authorities of the United States," without whose consent, as Sir Julian perfectly understands, no executory agreement with a foreign power can be valid under our Constitution. The Senate has constitutional powers to examine and revise negotiations with foreign governments, which are a part of the permanent foundations of the Government of the United States. The arrangement for a "lump sum," provided Congress would consent to vote it, and for a negotiation for a joint commission, if Congress should refuse, was not a diplomatic agreement concluded or negotiated "through the constitutional authorities of the United States" compatible with the dignity of either Government, and its injurious effects are obvious in the irascible and censorious criticisms of our people and their representatives in Congress, with which the intrusive circular of the British ambassador abounds. The failure to drive Congress into making a "lump sum" appropriation as a compromise of these claims, which were neither proven nor discussed, so far as Congress was informed, is made the pretext of the statement of the British ambassador that Congress has refused to meet "the national obligations of the United States." He makes an analysis of the vote in the House of Representatives on the rejection of the "lump sum," and informs Earl Kimberley that it was "Republicans, Populists, and 48 Democrats," and upon that basis he says in his dispatch of February 28, 1895, that—

Strong party feeling would seem alone to account for the rejection of so just and desirable an arrangement, and, as your lordship will have noticed from the inclosures in my dispatch, statements have been made in Congress which are entirely misleading.

It is getting to be a familiar method of arraignment of our national policy when it is disappointing to British demands and interests, however unsatisfactory they may be to our country, to attribute our action to the influence of party politics. In this instance Sir Julian Pauncefote does not hesitate to impute to the action of the House of Representatives, in an unjust and offensive manner, this motive of party antagonism as the reason for the failure of his "lump-sum" adjustment of the claims of his Government. He cites in support of his assertion the fact that the "Republicans, Populists, and 48 Democrats" voted against the appropriation.

The Administration earnestly urged the appropriation, and the inference is wholly unsustained that the 48 Democrats whose votes were necessary to defeat the "lump-sum" appropriation were influenced by party considerations. To the reverse, they feel a deep regret that they could not vote for the recommendation of the President. Not satisfied with this form of accusation, Sir Julian arraigns Senators and Members of the House of Representatives by name, and indulges in offensive comment upon matters uttered in debate, and charges them with ignorance and misstatements of law and facts, and imputes to them discreditable motives and the use of epithets when commenting upon the conduct of American citizens in their unlawful and flagrant violations of duty to their own country, its laws and policy, under the cover of the British flag. In one instance of several in which he assumes the rôle of vindicator of the acts and reputation of these men, in a gratuitous and insulting manner he says in his letter to Earl Kimberley (page 32):

But of all the unfounded objections which have been urged against these claims, that which seems to have made the greatest impression on the public mind is the statement that most of the vessels on behalf of which the claims were made were in fact owned by persons whom Senator MORGAN stigmatized in the Senate as "recalcitrant and rascally Americans who hired themselves out to the British flag to rob the Government of the United States and to violate its laws and dishonor the country." (See my dispatch of the 4th instant.)

These vituperative epithets are quite unmerited, and I will proceed to show that the objection in question is not well founded in fact and apparently is based on a mistaken view of the British navigation laws.

It never occurred to me to examine the British navigation laws to ascertain whether they justified our citizens in violating the laws of the United States. I would as soon think of looking into the Koran for excuses for violating the Christian decalogue. Sir Julian should cite us to higher authority than the British navigation laws for the justification of crime against the laws of the United States. What control has Great Britain in Bering Sea through her navigation laws more than the United States has with her criminal statutes; and how can British statutes in those waters have force and sway to excuse crimes against the United States committed by her own citizens?

He objects to the term "rascally" as it was employed in debate by me to characterize this offense, of close kin to piracy, when I applied it to this surreptitious maraud upon the revenues, property, and laws of the United States. I make due allowance for this irritation of Sir Julian, because he was bound to vindicate this treasonable conduct of our citizens as the only means left to him of excusing the indulgence given to them under the British flag. I am stating this very mildly. I might well say that his Government is particeps criminis. The facts on which my comments are based are stated in the counter case of the United States, submitted to the Tribunal of Arbitration, with full proofs to support them, in part, as follows:

It is further insisted on the part of the United States that the steam schooners *Thornton*, *Grace*, *Anna Beck*, and *Dolphin*, and the schooners *Sayward*, *Carolena Pathfinder*, *Alfred Adams*, *Black Diamond*, and *Lily*, for the seizure of which claims for damage are made, were at the time of their seizure owned, in whole or in part, by citizens of the United States, and that therefore no claim for damages can be urged in their behalf by Great Britain; that the steam schooners *Thornton*, *Grace*, *Anna Beck*, and *Dolphin*, and one-half of the schooner *Sayward* were owned by one Joseph Boscowitz, a citizen of the United States; that James Douglas Warren, in whose name the claim is made as to the steam schooner *Thornton*, had no real interest therein; but that the same was mortgaged to her full value to Joseph Boscowitz, who was in fact the real owner; and that Thomas H. Cooper, in whose name the claims growing out of the seizure of the schooners *Grace*, *Dolphin*, and *Anna Beck* are made, had in fact no interest therein, and has in no respect been damnified or sustained loss by the seizures thereof, either as owner of these schooners and steam schooners, their outfits, or their catches, the same being mortgaged to their full value to Joseph Boscowitz, above referred to, and having been conveyed to Thomas H. Cooper, without consideration, for the sole purpose of giving them a registry as British vessels.

It is also insisted by the United States that the schooners *Carolena* and *Pathfinder* were in fact at the time of their seizure owned by one A. J. Bechtel, then a citizen of the United States, and that William Munsie and Frederick Carne, in whose names the claims for damages growing out of the seizure of these schooners are made, had in fact no interest in the schooners, or their outfits and catches; that the schooners *Alfred Adams*, *Black Diamond*, and *Lily*, for the seizure of which claims are made in the schedule, were in fact at the time they were seized owned by one A. Frank, who was then a citizen of the United States; that Gutman, in whose name the schooner *Alfred Adams* was registered, was not the actual owner of the schooner, her outfit or catch, but, on the contrary, that the said schooner, her outfit, and catch were owned by said Frank; that after the release of the *Alfred Adams* from seizure her name was changed to *Lily*, in behalf of which damages are also claimed in the schedule, she remaining the property of A. Frank, and he alone being interested in her outfit and catch, and not Morris Moss, in whose name the last-mentioned claim is presented; and that said Frank was also the owner of the schooner *Black Diamond*, her outfit and catch, and that he was the real person who sustained damage or loss by reason of the seizures of the *Alfred Adams*, *Lily*, and *Black Diamond*.

All these objections and contentions, thus formally presented by the United States, were withdrawn from the tribunal to be determined by "further negotiations." The British agent selected certain undisputed facts as to the vessels that were seized or warned off from Bering Sea, and agreed with the agent of the United States as to the names of those vessels and the times and places of the seizures and warnings. This agreement was adopted and certified by the tribunal—this and nothing more—and all other facts as to the claims for damages were left undecided and unconsidered by the tribunal, and so was the question of liability.

I will again allude to this subject in a different connection in the course of my remarks. These assertions have not been disproved; on the contrary, they have been established in the mouths of many witnesses. They are too real to give encouragement to Great Britain to enter upon a negotiation that would establish them in fact and in law.

These questions were not decided in the award of the arbitrators, either directly or by any remote inference. The treaty excluded from them expressly the power to decide them. Neither have they been the subject of negotiation, as is expressly required by the treaty, and my objection to the tacit admission of their validity by the Senate took the form of a resolution to have them examined into by a committee, so that Congress could deal with them intelligently. I still demand the evidence at the hazard of giving further offense to the British ambassador and of again being reprimanded by him for doing injustice to our American citizens.

I have no fault to find with the British ambassador for any opinion he may entertain of my conduct as a Senator, or as an arbitrator, nor do I censure him for freely expressing those opinions to his own Government. That is his privilege, and he has the rightful choice of the language best suited to his tastes in making such communications; only that he is still responsible at the bar of public opinion for his motives and for the verity of his statements and the fairness of his deductions.

But the British ambassador has no right to question a member of Congress for words spoken in debate, by printing, under cover of a privileged communication to his own Government, a diatribe of criticism and invective upon his utterances in Congress, and then pursue the extraordinary method of handing out those diplomatic papers to the American press for publication and comment, thus forestalling a reply with an unjust statement.

I do not know whether this paper, which was handed out to the press in Washington by the ambassador, has been sent in to our State Department by the British Government. If it has, it is probable that it will be laid before Congress with some note of approval or disapproval by the President. I do not know, or suppose, that the President will join Great Britain in these severe comments upon the opinions of members of Congress expressed in debate, although they voted against his recommendation of this "lump-sum" appropriation. His criticisms, if he has any to make, will come from a source that is responsible to the country along with the Senate for our treaty relations, and along with Congress for our legislation. It will have none of the intrusive arrogance that has induced the British ambassador to attempt to influence our legislation by harsh denunciation of our votes and arguments, and by taking an appeal to our people against the attitude of their representatives in Congress, and supporting it by flattering allusions to their superior sense of fairness and justice.

His manifest aversion to negotiation and his persistent purpose to escape it will lead the American people, to whom he appeals, to a very careful and sincere inquiry into the motive that causes the concealment of the real merits of these claims from scrutiny, by grouping them into an indistinguishable mass, and covering them with a "lump-sum" appropriation. This policy was clearly indicated in Sir Julian's letter to Mr. Gresham, of June 7, 1894, in which he says:

In view of the decision of the tribunal on the questions submitted to them it only remains to assess the damages. I am accordingly authorized by the Earl of Kimberley to propose that, for the purpose of such assessment, each Government should appoint a duly qualified commissioner, who should be a lawyer, and, if possible, possess some knowledge of the conditions of the seal industry.

The position of the British Government thus formulated excluded all negotiation as to the liability of the United States upon the British claims, in whole or in part. It excluded negotiation and objection in respect of the validity of the claims made on behalf of citizens of the United States. It excused Great Britain from submitting any statement or proof even of the new items injected into their account, and confined the proposed commissioners to an examination and report "as to the amount of the damages." It also reversed the declaration of the treaty and of the Tribunal of Arbitration in making its award, that the question of liability for damages was reserved to be determined by further negotiations between the two Governments.

In reply to the demand of Congress that negotiation should bring to light the facts relating to the merits of each claim, and of our liability for each, Sir Julian, in his letter of March 15, 1895, says:

Senator MORGAN argues that the United States never agreed to arbitrate the question of their liability for damages, nor have they ever admitted their liability. They only agreed to negotiate respecting it, expressly reserving the question of such liability as the subject of such negotiation. The claim of Great Britain is, he states, based on the false assumption that the United States were bound by the award of the tribunal, or by agreement, or by law, justice, or equity to pay any part of the demand.

Sir Julian might have gone further and asserted that I contend, if the principles of the award are binding, as a treaty is binding, that the counter claim of the United States presented to the tribunal would more than set off all the damages claimed by Great Britain.

Sir Julian thus proceeds:

Senator MORGAN also insists that "the further negotiations" provided for by Article VIII of the Bering Sea arbitration treaty should take place "through the constitutional authorities of the United States."

He then comments as follows:

On these two points I would observe that no admission of liability became necessary from the moment that the Paris Tribunal, by its award, had rejected the legal pretensions of the United States to a special property in the fur seals resorting to the Pribilof Islands.

These assertions were obviously intended to disregard with contemptuous silence the requirements of the treaty and the express declarations of the tribunal in making its award, that a further negotiation should be had to determine the question of liability. I repeat, as Lord Hannen stated, and as the record proves, that the tribunal was urged by Sir Charles Russell, then attorney-general of Great Britain, to decide that the seizure of these vessels was illegal, and they refused to do so, or to consider the question.

Unless the seizure of these vessels was illegal, there is no ground for the claim of damages for their seizure, and the United States is not estopped from inquiring into the legality of the seizure by the award made upon the fifth point in Article VI of the treaty, as the question was not submitted to the tribunal whether the seizure was legal or illegal. Neither is it a conclusive inference, or a reasonable deduction from the principles of the law of nations, or of the entire award, or any part of it, that the seizure was illegal.

The tribunal did not attempt the absurd task of declaring that the United States could not, under the laws of nations, seize upon or disperse a fleet of sealing vessels in Bering Sea, and within 4 miles of the seal islands, sufficient in number to destroy the seal herd, and using firearms for that purpose. Nor did they decide that such conduct was made lawful by the fact that the United States, under the laws of nations, "has not any right of protection or property in the fur seals * * * when such seals are found outside the ordinary 3-mile limit." Neither was it decided by the tribunal that, as to Russia or China, or any other nation, the United States had no such right of property or protection. The award in that part, and in respect of each of the other five points submitted in Article VI of the treaty was, properly, a literal and direct answer to the question stated and submitted. It did not establish a rule of law or conduct even between the two Governments as to the right of seizure of vessels in the future or in the past.

"The right of property in the fur seals," which, it is contended by Great Britain, is limited to the distance of 3 miles from the shore and ceases when it is 10 feet beyond that limit, is an utter absurdity, and yet that is the right that the tribunal was called upon to decide, unless we admit that the "3-mile limit" is not applicable, according to the true construction of point 5 in Article VI of the treaty, to the right of property, but to the right "of protection."

The "right of protection" can only mean the right of the United States to protect the seals outside the ordinary 3-mile limit. This right was denied to the United States by the award, as a separate power of sovereignty, to be exercised to the same extent and for the same reasons, outside the 3-mile limit, that it might be exerted inside of that limit, which is the sea limit of its territorial jurisdiction.

The phrasing of this point in the submission is very confused and inaccurate, but the tribunal had to take it and decide it as it was stated in the submission. It was so decided, and the meaning of it is that the sole or exclusive sovereign power of the United States did not exist, outside the 3-mile limit, as to fur seals, so as to give that Government the exclusive right to protect them against the claim by citizens of other countries of the right to capture them.

Inside the 3-mile limit the award was entirely consistent with the idea that the United States had the perfect right of property in the seals found there, in virtue of its sovereignty over the territory in which they were found, or ratione soli; but that point was not submitted to the tribunal, and, consequently, the exclusive right of protecting them there was not decided by the tribunal, so that the award could only mean that the United States, while having the exclusive sovereign right to protect the seals inside the 3-mile limit, and that right was not disputed, had not such an exclusive or sovereign right to protect the seals outside that ocean limit of its territorial boundaries, that right having been decided against them. The question of the right of the United States to seize a vessel near its shores engaged in an immoral or injurious enterprise, as in the wanton destruction of a valuable article of commerce in a manner and to an extent that must result in its extermination, was not submitted to the Tribunal of Arbitration, and was not decided.

That question and that right of seizure arises out of the depravity of the act and its manifest danger to the rights of commerce. It needs no special interest in the article of commerce so exposed to extermination and no exclusive sovereign power in a government to justify it in preventing such destructive work. The principles of private and public justice stand against such illicit conduct, and a nation may prevent it, as a man may prevent a public or private crime, just as piracy, or the slave trade, or mutiny at sea, or the willful wreck of a vessel, or the willful starvation of a ship's crew may be prevented by the seizure of the vessel.

No decision of the Tribunal of Arbitration was made that fixes a liability on the United States without regard to the attendant circumstances for seizing these vessels. It would not be contended by any respectable publicist that a nation or a mob could prevent the coming of immigrants to our shores who were found approaching our country on the high seas if they have the right under our laws to enter our ports. Whether they should come under a flag or without one, we could not permit their capture and their diversion from our shores; yet we could have no right of property in or perhaps no exclusive right of protection of such people. A seizure of a ship so interfering would be an act of public duty that the whole world would applaud.

It is the criminality or innocence of the act as to its dangerous tendency or results, and not the motive of it that justifies interference to prevent its perpetration.

The innocence of the marauds of the sealers is not established by the decision of a question of property in the seals, or of the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States to protect them. The Tribunal of Arbitration not only refused to find that the seizure of men and vessels thus engaged was illegal, but, in determining the essential part of their award, they recognized and virtually incorporated into the treaty principles and binding regulations that are a stern denunciation of the wrongful, inhuman, and destructive acts which compelled the President, as a necessity of national self-defense, to order the seizure of those vessels.

In 1868–1870 the United States adopted and afterwards matured by amendments a code of laws for the protection of fur seals within our dominion in Bering Sea, according to the water boundaries as fixed in our treaty with Russia. The Pribilof Islands were set apart as a special Government reservation for this purpose, and the privilege of killing fur seals was leased to a company at a certain annual rate and a royalty which yielded to the United States an important revenue. Severe penalties are denounced by these statutes against all persons for illegal sealing in Bering Sea. They have not been repealed and are in force unless the award of the Paris Tribunal, and the legislation to enforce it, has repealed or supplemented them. As to other nations than Great Britain, they are in force. The Paris Tribunal certainly did not repeal these laws, nor declare that the seizures made under them were illegal, or that the judgments of our courts rendered upon such seizures are null, or are reversed. Some "further negotiation" is needed to clear up these points, and a "lump sum" of damages is not the golden key that can unlock all these combinations.

Mr. Cleveland, in his first term, rightfully and courageously obeyed these laws, the last of which, and the most important, was approved by him on March 2, 1889. This act extended our laws for the protection of the seals over all the waters of Bering Sea within our dominion. The twenty vessels were seized, or warned, under his first Administration that are now the subject of controversy, and Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State, in August, 1887, informed the British Government of his refusal to suspend the further seizure of guilty vessels pending the discussion of the legality of the seizure, and proceeded to seize others, only three of them having been then seized.

This forceful and patriotic action was justified by Mr. Bayard in notes to Mr. Vignaud and Mr. Phelps. Mr. Bayard's prophecy as to the destruction of the seals to the extent of their extermination is being painfully and rapidly realized.

Dr. Gigliogi, the director of the Zoological Museum, Royal Superior Institute of Florence, Italy, whose statement was laid before the tribunal, gave the following true and impartial account of the cause of the destruction of the Alaskan seals (Phelps's Argument, page 248):

Having conclusively shown that the lamented decrease in the herd of fur seals resorting to the Pribilof Islands can in no way be accounted for by the selective killing of nonbreeding males for commercial purposes which takes place on those islands under special rules and active surveillance, we must look elsewhere for its cause; and I can see it nowhere but in the indiscriminate slaughter, principally practiced on breeding or pregnant females, as most clearly shown in your condensed report, by pelagic sealers.

In any case, all who are competent in the matter will admit that no method of capture could be more uselessly destructive in the case of *Pinnipedia* than that called "pelagic sealing." Not only any kind of selection of the victims is impossible, but it is admitting much to assert that out of three destroyed one is secured and utilized, and this for obvious and well-known reasons. In the case of the North Pacific fur seal this mode of capture and destruction is doubly to be condemned, because the destruction falls nearly exclusively on those, the nursing or pregnant females, which ought on no account to be killed. It is greatly to be deplored that any civilized nation possessing fishery laws and regulations should allow such indiscriminate waste and destruction. The statistical data you give are painfully eloquent, and when we come to the conclusion that the 62,500 skins secured by pelagic sealing in 1891 represent at a minimum one-sixth of the fur seals destroyed, namely, 375,000—that is, calculating one in three secured, and each of the three suckling a pup or big with young—we most undoubtedly need not look elsewhere to account for the rapid decrease in the rookeries on the Pribilof Islands, and I quite agree with you in maintaining that unless the malpractice of pelagic sealing be prevented or greatly checked, both in the North Pacific and in the Bering Sea, the economic extermination of *Callorhinus ursinus* is merely the matter of a few years.

Mr. Phelps, in his argument before the Tribunal of Arbitration, presented tables, carefully calculated upon the lowest possible basis, that 250 female seals in 1,000 were killed each year. These tables show that in eighteen years—the life of a female seal—the killing of 250 female seals out of 1,000 the first year would diminish the herd by 2,117 seals. These statements are moderate estimates of the destruction of seal life by pelagic hunting in Bering Sea with nets and shotguns. The cruelty of this "huntsman's sport," as it is encouragingly stated in the British contention, almost defies description. Thousands upon thousands of the pups of slaughtered mothers have been left to starve on the shore by the wanton violation of the principles of commercial rights so clearly stated by Mr. Bayard and afterwards denounced by Mr. Blaine as a crime against humanity, contra bonos mores.

The tribunal did not decide that the United States had no right to protect the lives of the pups, starving on the shore, by arresting the cruel marauders who assembled outside the 3-mile limit and destroyed the mother seals as they went out for food and as they returned with paps filled with the only food on which they could subsist.

I venture to say, in justice to that honorable body, that such a question would have drawn forth a response that the marauders would never forget, and the Canadian Government would scarcely have quoted under the head of res adjudicata.

This identical question and others of even worse import, involving Canadian officials in the ownership or control of vessels employed in this nefarious work, are left open by the treaty and the award for exposure through negotiation which the treaty makes mandatory upon both Governments.

It is not the eagerness of the great and rich Government of Great Britain to "snap at" and gulp down $425,000 in a "lump sum" that causes this hesitancy and revolt at the negotiation provided for in the treaty. It is the unwillingness of that Government to have the attitude of the Canadians and of the citizens of the United States who furnished the outfit of these heartless sealers laid bare that urges it to close the doors of investigation with a "lump sum."

If the plea of a technical estoppel by the award of the tribunal can not avail Great Britain to close the doors to the truth and to exclude justice, equity, good morals, and friendly dealing from all consideration in the "further negotiations," it will be found that her claim to damages can not be sustained unless there is a principle of international law or morals that probibits a nation from preventing a wrong to its territory, its revenues, its property, and the support and peace of its people, even if it is committed with force and violence within a few yards of its boundaries. I have found no such declaration in the laws of nations, nor any such precedent in the usages of nations.

On the high seas, where every nation is a sovereign, the maxim is more important than it can be elsewhere that "you must so exercise your own rights as not to do injury to the rights of others."

The Canadians and their brokers of the criminal class in the United States are and have been the only enemies of the fur seals yet disclosed in modern history among civilized people; and they began their pelagic invasion of ruthless and indiscriminate slaughter in Bering Sea as soon as it passed from the guardianship of the Russian Bear to that of the American Eagle.

Before the treaty of cession, in 1867, Russia never found it necessary to resist any raid upon her seal herds in Bering Sea. But in 1868, and until we enacted laws in 1869 and 1870 to forbid it, the rush of seal hunters to that sea and upon the Pribilof Islands was so furious that humanity shudders at the sickening massacre that ensued and threatened the immediate extermination of the entire herd. Then was the time and opportunity for Great Britain to adopt the just principles of the concurrent regulations for which Mr. Bayard so urgently pleaded, and which the Paris award finally wrote into the treaty, if her purpose to protect and preserve the seals against her own subjects had been as strong and earnest as her professions were, that were often expressed by Sir Julian Pauncefote. I do not mean to undervalue the fact that the political relations of Great Britain with the people of British Columbia were shaky, and that she was under some difficulty in holding them in cordial allegiance; but it was done at too great expense when she constantly deprecated their conduct toward the United States and as constantly sheltered them under her flag.

Turning to the vital and practical features of the award of the Tribunal of Arbitration, we find, first, that its effect and the sanctions under which it becomes a law to both the treaty powers are the same as if the concurrent regulations had been written into the original text of the treaty of arbitration. On what are these "concurrent regulations," these ordinances, these determinations, based? The answer is, upon justice and equity to the treaty powers, with proper regard to the rights of other nations, and the purpose of providing for the proper protection and preservation of the Alaskan seals. Do not these principles relate back, at least to the time of the seizure of the twenty vessels by the United States, as effectually as the decision as to the right of property or protection in those seals, which is supposed to determine the question of the legality of such seizure? Is there any reason why one part of the award should relate to an anterior period and another part should not, when both relate to the admitted duty of each Government toward the other?

An answer in the present tense to a question in that tense, that the United States has no right of protection or property in fur seals outside the 3-mile limit, has no more reference to a right, at a previous time, than a decree that forbids everybody to hunt or kill fur seals within a zone of 60 miles around the Pribilof Islands has to the right to do this at a previous date. They are both statements of the law of comity, as between the parties, and not of the law of nations, and have their origin and binding force in the same decree, and both relate back to antecedent conditions if either does. They both cover the past and the future if either does, and are both of like authority in controlling the rights of the parties; otherwise the award is not full and complete in its effects. There is no escape from this category except to say that question of illegal seizure of these vessels and liability for such seizure was not submitted to the arbitrators for decision.

As questions of logical deduction they are of equal force, as rulings of law they are equally decisive if they alike entered into the conclusions of the arbitrators. But they did not, for the question of the illegality of the seizure of the vessels was not submitted to the arbitrators, while proper regulations for the protection and preservation of the fur seals, and their enforcement by law, was submitted in the broadest form to the tribunal.

They decided what was the right and duty of pelagic sealers under different conditions, and gave them not merely the force of legal declarations of principle, but the additional force of treaty engagements between the two Governments.

The duties they imposed upon these Governments and their citizens or subjects were founded on principles of justice, equity, and national comity which existed, and existing were obligatory from the time that the first British vessel took any seals within the 60-mile limit, or any seals by the use of guns, nets, or explosives within the dominion of the United States in Bering Sea.

They were not in force until the award put them in force, and neither was the denial of property in seals or the exclusive right of the United States to protect them in force until the award put them in force. In all respects, every part of the award is binding in the same degree and extent under the principles declared, the rights established, and the duties enjoined upon each Government.

When was it wrong in a national or personal sense to take seals within the 60-mile zone? It was always wrong, because it put in peril the existence of animals useful in commerce, and when the two Governments agreed, through the award of the tribunal, that the absolute prohibition was necessary to avert that evil, it was established that the practice was always wrong and not merely that it had become wrong after the date of the award. The award is, that the two Governments shall forbid their citizens and subjects, respectively, to kill, capture, or pursue at any time or in any manner whatever "the fur seals within a zone of 60 miles around the Pribilof Islands, inclusive of the territorial waters." This had been done by the United States under statutes which denounced and punished this practice as a crime.

Those statutes are renewed and Great Britain has promulgated similar laws. This is a concession by Great Britain, as much so as if it had been written in the treaty of arbitration, that the statutes of the United States had not violated any of her just rights of fishery within that zone. But aside from the effect of such an admission, the moral law which underlies all international law and is the foundation of every common national right and duty supports, as it also made necessary and incumbent upon Great Britain the duty of prohibiting pelagic sealing by her subjects within that 60-mile zone.

It can not be denied that these matters are the proper subjects of consideration in determining the question of the liability of the United States in seizing the six or eight ships that were arrested and warned off within the 60-mile zone while hunting for and destroying seals. A "lump-sum" compromise is no answer to the demand for such a negotiation, which is made imperative by the treaty of arbitration. And so of the question of hunting seals with firearms in the Bering Sea, which was never a justifiable pursuit, and was wastefully destructive of seal life, and dangerous to the peace on the high seas.

The concurrent regulations applying to seal hunting in Bering Sea is a codification, in treaty form and effect, of the unquestionable principles of equity, humanity, and national comity that had rightful application to the duties of both Governments, as they have been freely admitted in their correspondence at all times since the Canadian raid on the seals in Bering Sea began.

Mr. Bayard foresaw the real necessity, which, from the start, was unavoidable, of agreeing upon concurrent regulations for pelagic seal hunting, rather than leave such an irritating subject to the exclusive discretion of the United States. Under the broadest

affirmation of such exclusive right, the exercise of the power adequate to its enforcement would have caused a state of semi-belligerency on the high seas, and especially in the Pacific Ocean.

On August 19, 1887, Mr. Bayard said, in an instruction to Mr. Vignaud, of which identical instructions were sent to our minister to Great Britain, Japan, Russia, and Sweden and Norway:

> Without raising any question as to the exceptional measures which the peculiar character of the property in question might justify this Government in taking, and without reference to any exceptional marine jurisdiction that might be claimed for that end, it is deemed advisable—and I am instructed by the President to inform you—to attain the desired end by international cooperation.
>
> It is well known that the unregulated and indiscriminate killing of seals in many parts of the world has driven them from place to place, and by breaking up their habitual resorts has greatly reduced their number.
>
> Under these circumstances, and in view of the common interest of all nations in preventing the indiscriminate destruction and consequent extermination of an animal which contributes so importantly to the commercial wealth and general use of mankind, you are hereby instructed to draw the attention of the Government to which you are accredited to the subject, and to invite it to enter into such an arrangement with the Government of the United States as will prevent the citizens of either country from killing seals in Bering Sea at such times and places and by such methods as at present are pursued, and which threaten the speedy extermination of those animals and consequent serious loss to mankind.

In this instruction Mr. Bayard stated broadly and fully the ground covered by the final award of the Tribunal of Arbitration; yet he proceeded to execute the laws of the United States that are still unrepealed, by the seizure of ships engaged in this destructive work.

On November 11, 1887, Lord Salisbury was interviewed by Mr. Phelps, who wrote to Mr. Bayard that "his lordship promptly acquiesced in this proposal," which was, "that by mutual agreement a code of regulations should be adopted for the preservation of the seals in Bering Sea from destruction at improper times and by improper means by the citizens of either country." The interference of Canada delayed the treaty for this code until February, 1892. In the meantime the Canadians had so far progressed with this work of destruction that the seals have been almost destroyed. They still pursue their prey with unrelenting greed, and there is only too much cause for the belief that they give no heed to the treaty or the award or to British statutes or regulations in their mercenary war upon the fur seals of the Alaskan herd.

This business has become a regular pursuit and is pushed across the Pacific Ocean to the seal islands and coasts of Russia and Japan.

While thus engaged they gain the assistance of the British ambassador in an attempt to collect a "lump sum" of $425,000 from the United States without the presentation of a fact, or a reason, or a principle of law to support their claim for damages, which is based upon their own wrongful warfare upon "an animal which contributes so importantly to the commercial wealth and general uses of mankind," and its "indiscriminate destruction and consequent extermination."

I said in the Senate that not a dollar of this demand was justly due. That is true, unless it is admitted as a principle of law that a man may claim damages for his own wrongful and wicked conduct. It is true, unless the declaration of Mr. Bayard in the letter to Mr. Vignaud, from which I have quoted, is untrue, and unless his letter to Mr. Phelps of February 7, 1888, is untrue, "that so deplorable a thing should not be allowed to occur." When a man is doing a deplorable thing that should not be allowed to occur, I do not know of any rule of moral or positive law that entitles him to damages for being prevented from continuing its perpetration.

The code of regulations finally came to condemn and prohibit this crime against the nations and against humanity, and its foundations were laid upon the declaration of Mr. Bayard and accepted by Lord Salisbury. It simply ordained the truth and justice upon which they placed the right, and they were made the law by international agreement. Truth and justice were not unknown or unfelt by Bayard and Salisbury when they agreed upon the doctrines of this code and defined its scope and purposes, and the action of the tribunal merely affirmed what they declared. It did not create any new rules, either of morals or law. What was true and just when that award was made was equally true and just when the President ordered the ships to be seized, and not a dollar of damages is due for that righteous act.

An interruption of voluntary immigration to America by any power, or any person, or the preventing of a return of mothers to their children, born upon our soil, would be resented by our Government with whatever force might be necessary. The return of the mother seal to her young is as voluntary and as instinctive, if not as intelligent, as that of a human mother to her offspring. Whatever may be the motive for slaying seals, or however lawful it may be as a pursuit on the high seas, if the method of sealing is necessarily indiscriminate, and necessarily results in slaying mother seals while providing food for their pups, nothing could be clearer than is our right to prevent such sealing near our seal islands in order to save the life of the pups upon them.

If we do not own the pups and the mother seals "when found outside the 3-mile limit," we certainly own them, ratione soli, while they are inside that limit, and to deny to us the only possible means of nurturing the young seals, or to render that means so precarious that 20,000 pups are left starving on our soil, is an assertion of a right of pelagic hunting or fishing that is too absurd a proposition to be swallowed even as a "lump sum," and should be too revolting to lie on the Christian stomach of the British ambassador. Such a situation, raising such a question, needs the air of open negotiation. It has not been even the subject of any negotiation.

The resolution of Hon. Mr. HITT, adopted by the House of Representatives on the 15th December, 1894, called upon the Secretary of State for "all correspondence, reports, and other documents, not heretofore made public, touching the payment by the United States of $425,000 to Great Britain for damages growing out of the controversy as to fur seals in Bering Sea or the seizure of British vessels engaged in taking seals in those waters." This resolution developed the fact that no negotiation had taken place touching the damages claimed by Great Britain beyond the presentation of the claim, much increased in items and amounts over the demand of Great Britain in the appendix to the case submitted to the Tribunal of Arbitration, and the virtual admission by the Secretary of State that the entire demand was just and obligatory upon the United States, and that to avoid the delay and expense of having the damages assessed by a joint commission the President offered to pay it in a lump sum of $400,000 provided Congress would make the necessary appropriation.

In Executive Document No. 310, House of Representatives, Fifty-third Congress, third session, this "negotiation" is given out to Congress in a letter of Sir Julian Pauncefote to Mr. Gresham of June 7, 1894, answered by Mr. Gresham August 16, 1894, discussing a proposal for a commission to hear and determine the claims, and a letter of Mr. Gresham of August 21, 1894, proposing a compromise at $425,000, and a letter of Sir Julian Pauncefote of the same date accepting the offer. It was a judgment by default upon each item of the enlarged and distorted claims of Great Britain, in which new and totally inadmissible demands were made, not theretofore presented, rendered on August 21, and accepted in a "lump sum" of damages on the same day.

That is the whole of the correspondence, yet Sir Julian, in a note to Earl Kimberley, February 28, 1895, which he now hands out to the press of the United States, says:

> One speaker (in the House) represented the total amount of the claims to be only $542,000, whereas it was over $700,000. Another concluded, from the fact that the offer of the lump sum and its acceptance was approved in notes of the same date, that the offer was made without previous investigation and was instantly "snapped at" by Her Majesty's Government, whereas the compromise was the result of laborious investigations, which were carried on during the whole summer.

The evidence of laborious investigation submitted by Sir Julian to his own Government relates exclusively to the compromise, and is contained in two letters addressed to Mr. Gresham, in which no allusion is made to any item of the British account, and that submitted to Congress by Mr. Gresham consists of two letters without any objection or allusion to any item of the account. If this is the negotiation to which he refers—and it can be no other—it scarcely deserves the name of a pretext and gives no information as to the facts that constitute the British claims or of any defense to them. I am compelled to say that, upon the facts set forth, there was no negotiation about these claims.

Sir Julian may have labored over and wrestled with these claims in anguish of spirit while he spent a summer in their investigation, but how much time or labor did he or Mr. Gresham devote to negotiation? The record shows that no effort even was made to give to the United States the benefit of a line or word of negotiation. It remains true, upon the record, that Great Britain jumped to the conclusion that it was best to avoid negotiation, if it did not "snap at" the lump sum that was tendered in settlement of claims that had neither justice, law, nor morality to sustain them. If Sir Julian's blue book circular, sent out to the American people to influence public sentiment against Congress is true in its statement of facts, I will inform them that it conveys no impression that any negotiation of these claims was had.

I am reluctantly compelled, also, to state, from the record, that the following statement in the letter of Mr. Gresham to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, dated December 20, 1894, is seriously incorrect and misleading. He says, "Under this article (Article VIII of the treaty) the arbitrators unanimously found that a number of British sealing vessels were seized in Bering Sea or warned therefrom by cruisers of the United States on the days and at the places in the special finding mentioned, leaving for future determination the question as to the value of the said vessels or their contents, or any of them, and the question whether the vessels mentioned in the schedule of the British Case, or any of them, were wholly or in part the actual property of citizens of the United States." This statement and quotation is only a part and the least important part of the finding of the arbitrators.

I must quote it from the text of the award that there may be no mistake about this painfully serious matter. The text reads as follows:

> The questions as to the value of the said vessels or their contents, or either of them, and the question as to whether the vessels mentioned in the Schedule of the British Case, or any of them, were wholly or in part the actual property of citizens of the United States, have been withdrawn from and have not been considered by the tribunal, it being understood that it is open to the United States to raise these questions, or any of them, if they think fit in any future negotiations as to the liability of the United States Government to pay the amounts mentioned in the Schedule to the British Case.

From a comparison of these statements it will be seen that the questions of the ownership of the vessels and the liability of the United States for these claims were not decided by the tribunal, but were left, as the treaty required, open for future negotiation. The information thus given to Congress was misleading and made room for the assumption of the Secretary of State, in full accordance with the pretension of Great Britain, that the Tribunal of Arbitration had fully decided and settled the question of liability for all the British claims, leaving nothing for adjustment except the amount of the damages to be assessed against the United States.

This is not true, as a matter of fact, or according to the intention of the treaty of arbitration, as it expressly states, and it is not true as a deduction or conclusion from any principle of law or comity involved in the award of the tribunal. If the award is entitled to the benefit of the rules of construction that obtain in respect of all agreements, decisions, judgments, treaties, and transactions that dispose of the rights and impose duties on men and nations—that it should be considered in all its parts, as an entire decree—the alleged liability of the United States for these seizures, if it is covered by the principles of the award, must be decided against Great Britain.

That is my contention, and for this reason, and others that I will now proceed to state, I ask that the Senate will cause the facts to be investigated and laid before Congress. We have been asked to vote a lump sum of $425,000 as a placebo to Great Britain without any proof of the justice of the demand, or of its legal obligations beyond the assertion, which is shown to be false on the face of the award and of the treaty of arbitration, that the Paris Tribunal has conclusively fixed and decreed that the United States is liable for the demands set up by Great Britain in its case laid before the arbitrators.

That award can not be wrested and perverted into the approval of a barbarous and wicked line of conduct in the past which it is intended to suppress and punish in the future, nor to mulct the United States in damages for seizing vessels and men engaged in it as the only means that was then available to prevent an evil that seriously threatened the immediate destruction of property inside the 3-mile limit, that was set apart and protected by law as a source of revenue by our Government.

On March 1, 1895, seeing that our Government had not entered upon negotiations with reference to this matter of liability, but had assumed its existence as res adjudicata, I offered a resolution in the Senate, which I am now again presenting for consideration. It went to the Committee on the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as it might cause some expenditures. On the morning of the 4th day of March, when the Fifty-third Congress would expire at noon, that committee reported my resolution to the Senate favorably, with an amendment. The Senator from Delaware objected to its adoption, and it went over under the rules of the Senate.

On the 25th of February the House had voted down this appropriation by a vote, as Sir Julian Pauncefote stated to Earl Kimberley, of "Republicans, Populists, and 48 Democrats." Efforts were made to obtain its recommendation by an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill to be offered by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which failed. While this was going on I was silent as to what I believed was a wrong to the country, because I hoped that some member of Congress who was not a member of the tribunal, and could, therefore, speak more impartially than I might be able to do, would examine into and explain the situation. This had been done in the House in a very satisfactory manner, and resulted in the defeat of the appropriation. I then felt that it was due to the President, to the Tribunal of Arbitration, to Congress, and the country, as well as to Great Britain, that the reasons should be authentically stated that caused the Congress to reject the recommendation of the President that his agreement with Great Britain should be ratified by act of Congress, instead of the proper "constitutional authorities of the United States"—the President and the Senate.

Not supposing that the British ambassador would appeal to our people against this action of Congress, I desired that the negotiation, which failed to materialize, should at least be supplemented by our statement of our reasons for refusing to execute the agreement. And, not having the fear of anybody before my eyes—not even that sense of timidity which must abash any true Democrat who ventures to differ with our President when he has made an agreement with a foreign government—my convictions led me to coincide with the 48 Democrats in the House and the Committee of Appropriations of the Senate in the belief that the President in his zeal for peace had gone too far and too fast in the purchase of that brief moment of repose from the clamorous demand of the mother of the horse leech who still cries, "Give, give," by agreeing to pay a "lump sum" of $425,000, and to confess that we were criminal violators of international law in trying to defend our property inside the 3-mile limit against marauders who warred upon it just across the line of that limit.

In this effort to make a brief statement of my views of these matters on the motion that I repeat to-day for an examination of the British demands, I seem to have given such offense to Sir Julian Pauncefote that he became quite impatient with me, and in representing what I said in the Senate to his Government, and through his Government to the American people, who are so honored with his esteem and confidence, he has omitted to quote me fairly, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows. If he was not the representative of a great foreign Government, or if he was the representative of our Government, I would be bold to say that he had garbled the record in his effort to make good his appeal against me to the American people.

As I attach no value to his opinions of my course as one of the arbitrators or as a Senator, I will not now read what I did say on the occasion he refers to in his letter of February 28, 1895. My remarks are set forth on pages 3139, 3140 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, 1895. When I presented to the Senate, in the closing moments of the Fifty-third Congress, the memorandum of the account, as I state it, and as it should be stated in our negotiation and answer demanded upon each item, after the question of our liability, if any, has been settled, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], for some reason which he considered just, objected to my request to have it printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and I had no time to ask a vote of the Senate on my request.

Sir Julian, finding some comfort in this incident, to which he is heartily welcome, in his circular to the American people, under cover of a letter to Earl Kimberley, thus draws their painful attention to the fact that he, "Mr. MORGAN, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations," as he accentuates my official relation to the Senate, in the same letter, "He requested leave to print this document in the RECORD as part of his speech, but leave was refused," thus placing me and the document under the ban of the Senate's displeasure by its refusal, while the only reprimand I have been conscious of was the objection of a single Senator, who probably felt that he wanted more time to look into the matter.

This paltry fling at me is not worth the time it takes to notice it, only that I again present that statement, and having the time, I will now read it and ask the Senate, through its committee, to have it thoroughly investigated. The President again declines to negotiate, as the treaty of arbitration requires him to do, and again withdraws this subject from diplomatic examination by "the constitutional authorities of the United States." He again asks Congress to ratify a diplomatic agreement made by him with a foreign government which disregards and violates the mandate of the treaty—the supreme law—made by and with the consent of the Senate, according to the Constitution. It only involves $450,000, which may be a cheap bargain, and, it is argued, is as nothing to a people who live on borrowed money, as many rich people do, and this small sum is scarcely worthy of attention when our prosperity, except as to finance and the fur seals, is so brilliant.

Yet I must insist that the maxim de minimis non curat lex does not apply to this case, but that our duty often finds its highest expression in matters that are inconsiderable as to the sum of money involved.

In this case it is a clear duty of the Senate to obstruct the Executive in his twice-repeated effort to ride down its constitutional prerogative to consider and determine whether it will advise and consent, as a Senate, that one treaty shall be set aside and its mandate disregarded, and another shall be made and ratified without its consent, by any other coordinate powers of the United States. In this view of the subject, if the sum involved were $425,000,000, instead of $425,000, the question would be no greater than it is, as a matter of constitutional law.

It is well, indeed it is imperative, as a matter of the preservation of the constitutional distribution of the powers of government among the coordinate departments that the President should not disregard the fact that the Senate is associated with him in every agreement or bargain he may essay to make with a foreign government in virtue of the constitutional powers of the Executive. This association, even if it is disagreeable to him, is still enjoined by the Constitution and can not be avoided by any subterfuge. This provision was placed in the Constitution to give the Senate a veto upon Executive action when dealing with foreign governments, as he possesses the power of veto upon the enactments of Congress. He must submit such agreements to the Senate for their advice and consent, and not to Congress, to be

voted upon a general appropriation bill or ratified by a separate act. He has too much of political interest in such a measure, too much pride of opinion, too much of the lust of power as its motive to use his veto power upon the measure after it has passed both houses, at his own request, even if he should then find, as I insist is true as to this measure, that it is wrong, inexpedient, and unjust to the country, and that it commits us to the approval of demands that are based upon principles that are false in law and in morals, that violate our own declarations of right under the laws of nations, and are derogatory to our history and our honor, and condemns acts, that were right and dutiful in 1887 and are still right, ordered and performed by the first Administration of our President. The case is a very peculiar one, and gravely suggests that the Senate should not be deprived of its constitutional power because it may suit the present views of the President.

There is a matter that demands the consideration of this Government in respect of the amount of the claims presented to the Secretary of State by Sir Julian Pauncefote in his letter to Mr. Gresham, dated June 7, 1894. The claim then presented by Great Britain, including interest, and new claims for the *Henrietta*, *Black Diamond*, and the *Ada*, footed up $542,169.26. The claims set forth in the case of Great Britain submitted to the Tribunal of Arbitration in a "Schedule of claims" appended to said case, with interest, amounted to $439,171.48, an increase between those dates of $102,997.78. In a letter to Earl Kimberley, Sir Julian says the claim of Great Britain is $700,000.

This increase included large sums for "legal expenses" and $62,847.12 for expenses of suit before Supreme Court. The case is a very peculiar one, and gravely suggests that the Senate should not be deprived of its constitutional powers, because it may suit the President's sense of duty, or propriety, to undo what he formerly did, and to admit, in the language of Lord Salisbury, that "the United States Government has inflicted an unwarranted wrong upon the subjects of Great Britain." If the President, who inflicted this alleged wrong, feels that it is his duty to repent of it, or to apologize for it, I must not become the keeper of his conscience, but I will not vote money for the purchase of a pardon from the real wrongdoer, who demands a reward for our preventing her own subjects from perpetrating further wrongs and outrages upon the United States. I hope I shall be excused from reading the "document" that Sir Julian Pauncefote says the Senate refused to allow me to print in the RECORD. I submit it as a part of my remarks.

BERING SEA SEIZURES AND DAMAGES CLAIMED THEREFOR BY GREAT BRITAIN.

Amount claimed by Great Britain with interest	$542,169.26
Amount proposed to be allowed by Secretary of State	425,000.00

The schedule of claims for each vessel contains an item designated variously as "probable catch," "balance of catch," "estimated balance of catch," etc. These are clearly prospective profits or speculative damages, and are all based on future and contingent events forming no basis of fact on which an equitable finding as to amount of damages could be predicated. They should not be allowed.

Similar claims were presented by the United States to the arbitrators of the *Alabama* claims in 1872 at Geneva, and in their decision they say: "And whereas prospective earnings can not properly be made the subject of compensation, inasmuch as they depend in their nature upon future and uncertain contingencies, the tribunal is unanimously of the opinion that there is no ground for awarding to the United States any sum by way of indemnity under this head." (See Alabama Claims, Volume IV, page 53, Congressional publication.)

The amount of speculative damages claimed by Great Britain in the schedule submitted with the letter from the Secretary of State are as follows:

I.		II.	
Carolena	$16,667.00	Onward	$16,667.00
Thornton	16,667.00	Favorite	7,000.00
W. P. Sayward	25,250.00	Ada	15,818.00
Grace	23,100.00	Juanita	9,424.00
Anna Beck	17,325.00	Triumph	19,424.00
Dolphin	24,750.00	Ariel	9,248.00
Alfred Adams	19,250.00	Kate	10,966.00
Pathfinder	15,264.50	Minnie	12,752.00
Black Diamond	16,192.00		101,293.00
Lily	14,136.00	Henrietta	10,098.00
	$188,601.50		111,391.00
			188,601.50
			299,992.50

Amount of British claim	$542,169.42
Amount of speculative damages	299,992.50
Amount of claim less such damages	242,176.92
Amount proposed to be allowed by the Secretary of State	425,000.00
Claim less speculative damages	252,176.92
Excess of proposed amount over actual claim	182,823.08

The above figures and comparisons are based entirely upon the supposition that every vessel included in the schedule of claims submitted by Sir Julian Pauncefote was owned by a British subject.

It appears, however, from the United States Counter Case submitted to the Bering Sea Tribunal of Arbitration at Paris, that the ten vessels appearing in Column I above were owned in fact by citizens of the United States (page 130).

The following vessels, it appears, were owned in fact by one Joseph Boscowitz, and that Thomas H. Cooper, in whose name the vessels stood, had no interest therein. Cooper is a British subject and Boscowitz a citizen of the United States. As to proof of Boscowitz's citizenship, see United States Counter Case, pages 255, 314, 315, and 351; and as to Cooper's interest, see his examination, ibid, pages 321-325.

Vessels.	Amount of claim.
Thornton	$26,817.65
W. P. Sayward	118,957.12
Anna Beck	27,863.04
Dolphin	40,201.50
Amount of Boscowitz's claims	251,981.88

The *Carolena* and *Pathfinder*, as appears by the United States Counter Case, were owned by A. J. Bechtel, a citizen of the United States. As to proof of Bechtel's citizenship, see Counter Case, page 351.

Vessels.	Amount of claim.
Carolena	$24,313.01
Pathfinder, first claim	26,765.00
Pathfinder, second claim	2,000.00
Amount of Bechtel's claims	53,078.01

The *Alfred Adams*, *Black Diamond*, and *Lily* (which was the name given the *Black Diamond* after its seizure) were owned in fact by A. Frank, a citizen of the United States. As to proof of Frank's citizenship and the actual ownership of the vessels, see United States Counter Case, pages 351 and 352.

Vessels.	Amount of claim.
Alfred Adams	$20,433.00
Black Diamond	17,185.00
Lily	17,176.00
	54,794.00

Amounts of claims of citizens of the United States presented by Great Britain.

Boscowitz's claims	$251,981.88
Bechtel's claims	53,078.01
Frank's claims	54,794.00
	359,853.89
Total amount claimed by Great Britain	542,169.42
Total amount of claims of United States citizens presented	359,853.89
Balance resulting, being amount claimed by British owners	182,315.53
But of this amount claimed by British subjects speculative damages are included to the amount of (see Column II above)	111,391.00
Amount claimed by British subjects less speculative damages	70,924.53

The total amount of claims of British subjects which, it thus appears, could possibly be recovered amounts in all to $70,924.53. But even this sum, which is $471,244.89 less than the British claim presented, $354,075.47 less than the amount that the Secretary of State proposes to give in settlement, is undoubtedly excessive. Of that amount $34,635 is "personal claims," and in all probability some of these claimants are citizens of the United States or some other country, which could be established by investigation. Deducting the "personal claims" from $70,924.89, there is left $36,289.89. Sixteen thousand five hundred and sixty dollars of this sum appears as the claim of the *Henrietta* (less speculative damages). The *Henrietta* was seized in Bering Sea in September, 1892, under the provisions of the modus vivendi, and therefore no claim is allowable; but even if allowable it shows its "padded" character from the fact that there is a claim for an "estimated catch" in Bering Sea when sealing was not allowed there and the season was over at the time of the seizure.

Whatever balance remains is made up of the cost of the vessels, outfits, insurance, legal expenses, etc. There are many items undoubtedly excessive and should be absolutely proved before being allowed.

However, on the supposition that the amounts claimed by British subjects are correct in all their items, the schedule of claims appears as follows:

Vessel.	Amount claimed.	Speculative damages.	Claim less such damages.	Total amount of claim, with interest at 7 per cent to July or August, 1895.
Onward	$23,269.71	$16,667.00	$6,602.71	$10,762.42
Favorite	7,000.00	7,000.00		
Ada	26,518.00	15,818.00	10,700.00	16,592.00
Juanita	14,695.00	9,424.00	5,271.00	7,484.32
Triumph	19,674.00	19,424.00	250.00	355.00
Ariel	9,498.00	9,248.00	250.00	355.00
Kate	11,210.00	10,960.00	250.00	355.00
Minnie	16,460.00	12,752.00	4,708.00	6,685.36
	128,324.71	101,293.00	27,031.71	42,589.10
Henrietta (if allowed)	26,658.00	10,098.00	16,560.00	18,878.40
Total	154,982.71	111,391.00	43,591.71	61,467.50

Personal claims (if all claimants are British subjects)	$34,635.00
Amount due, with interest, to probable date of payment	96,102.50
Amount claimed by Great Britain, not including interest	542,169.26
Amount due, including interest	96,102.50
Excess of claim without interest over amount due with interest	446,066.76
Amount proposed to be allowed by the Secretary of State	425,000.00
Amount due, including interest	96,102.50
Excess of Secretary's allowance over amount due with interest	328,897.50

Undoubtedly this excess would be found to be still greater if the claims were thoroughly investigated and examined judicially.

It will be seen from Appendix No. 1 to my remarks that a claim for more than $60,000 is set up for legal expenses in our Supreme Court in the case of the United States in re seizure of *W. P. Sayward*. Unless the award of the Tribunal of Arbitration dealt with and reversed the judgments in these cases rendered by our courts it can not possibly be claimed that such award decided the liability of the United States for these costs and legal expenses. I have not yet heard that anyone has contended for that absurdity as being res adjudicata under the award of the Tribunal of Arbitration. Then, in this new batch of claims that were presented to the Secretary of State in June, 1894, there are many items for "illegal arrest and imprisonment" amounting to $18,000, and others for "sufferings and losses in navigating four vessels from Unalaska to Sitka," amounting to $13,635.

The nature of the sufferings and the items of the losses sustained by these marauders in navigating their vessels 300 miles or less, from Unalaska to Sitka, are not given. Whether they were suffering from overburdened conscience, or wounded national pride, or disappointment at the loss of their prey and their sport in the massacre of the mother seals and the starvation of their 20,000 pups is not stated.

That sort of raiding was solemnly denounced and prohibited by the tribunal, but if, through the misfortune of a misconception of the meaning of the plainest possible language, they decided that conduct to be a lawful claim for damages against the United States, it is at least proper that Congress should put the blame upon the tribunal, and it is indispensable, in view of the new importance that is given to the doctrine of estoppel, that Congress should protest very earnestly against the doctrines which otherwise would be fastened upon us by voting a "lump sum" in payment for these supposed tortures.

The British policy that seeks to escape from the direct force of truth, justice, and right by resorting to the doctrines of estoppel, acquiescence, and prescription, which has grown into a national diplomatic characteristic and is being felt in many quarters of the earth among the weaker nations, needs the vigilance of constant question and protest to prevent its crystallization into determined aggression and assertion of absolute right.

The boundaries of the British Empire have thus eaten into the smaller nationalities, until many of them have been absorbed into the realm; and we need to be cautious and alert on sea and on land in matters that relate to fur seals and gold, and to the observance of treaties and boundaries in Alaska. Inasmuch as the Administration gives us no information on which Congress can give an intelligent vote on the demand for "a lump sum," which is based only upon the ground of estoppel by judgment, we should at least state the reasons that control us in voting for or against the demanded appropriation.

If, as the British ambassador informs the people of the United States, Congress voted down this appropriation under a mistake of facts and principles, and in the heat of party politics, caused in part by my observations in the Senate, which were not made until many days after the House had refused the "lump sum," let us examine into the facts, which are still withheld from us, while our action is persistently demanded, and lay them before the country with the courage of honest conviction. Whether they shall sustain or condemn the course that Congress has seen fit to pursue, we are compelled to take action upon this subject, and we must act intelligently.

Two matters have failed to have the scrutiny of negotiation, and scrutiny is the most essential purpose of negotiation about international claims, that we can not afford to pass over in silent indifference, as has been done by our diplomatic agents.

I refer to the claims of the United States against Great Britain with reference to the fur-seal controversy, and the fact that is scarcely disputed that ten of the twenty vessels seized by the United States belonged to American citizens to the extent that they will receive a very large share of the "lump sum" (at least half of it) for their losses and sufferings in the violation of the laws of the United States under the shelter of the British flag. As to both of these matters, I refer with absolute confidence to the argument of Judge Blodgett submitted to the Tribunal of Arbitration, which I lay before the Senate, and ask to have printed as a part of my remarks. (See Appendix 2.)

It has not been answered by anyone, and can not be successfully answered. When it was presented to the tribunal the British counsel saw that it was not safe to attempt an answer, and they only claimed a finding of facts upon matters that neither party disputed, that is, upon the names of the vessels seized and the times and places of the seizures.

I will, with the leave of the Senate, place it on the record as part of my remarks, that the world may know how the power of truth drove Great Britain from the field of negotiation in respect of these claims, and compelled Sir Julian Pauncefote and Lord Salisbury to intrench themselves behind the plea of estoppel and res adjudicata, which forbid the speaking of the truth in the contentions of men and nations.

I have no need to attempt to strengthen the statements and arguments of Judge Blodgett, that demand the full investigation of the claims, which, if allowed, will pay Americans who demand them, in the names of British subjects, for crimes committed through their infamous conspiracy under the shelter of the British flag.

A full and fair negotiation of these respective claims of the two Governments would have resulted in a large allowance of damages to the lessees of the seal islands, and consequent revenue to the United States, for the wanton waste of seal life by the methods of the British seal hunters, contrary to international duty and comity and the laws that regulate fishing on the high seas, near the shores, and contrary to the principles on which the award of the concurrent regulations is based. But no notice whatever has been taken of this just demand by our Government. It was stated in the case of the United States, but seems to have wilted in the formidable presence of the plea of estoppel as to the ownership and right of protection of the seals outside the 3-mile limit.

That estoppel, if the breadth of its sweep includes the seizure of ships and sanctifies the murder of the mother seals and the starvation of the pups, is quite as comprehensive as the bull's hide of Dido when it was cut into fine strings and was thus expanded to include the site of great Carthage in the location of the purchase of as much land as a bull's hide would cover.

Boscowitz, in whose name no demand is made, was found, by Judge Blodgett, upon the evidence, since then greatly strengthened, to be a citizen of the United States and the owner of the schooner *W. P. Sayward*, on which the sum demanded in the British claim is $90,902.12, besides $2,000 for sufferings, etc., to George P. Fery, the master of that vessel; and also of the steam schooner *Thornton*, for which $26,817.65 is claimed, besides $4,000 to Hans Guttornasen, her master, for "illegal arrest and imprisonment."

And also the steam schooner *Anna Beck*, for which $27,836.04 is claimed, besides $1,000 to Michael Keef, her master, for "sufferings," etc.

And also the steam schooner *Grace*, for which $38,142.57 is claimed, besides $2,000 to W. Petit, her master, for "sufferings," etc.

And also the steam schooner *Dolphin*, for which $40,201.50 is claimed, besides $2,635 to Warren, her master, and $1,000 to John Riley, her mate, for "sufferings," etc.

It is a curious feature found in these claims that the crews of these vessels get nothing for "sufferings," etc. If Boscowitz gets $236,534.88 out of the "lump sum," it will be a fearful price to pay the British Government for his benefit and to reward his criminal violation of our laws. I most respectfully insist that this, at least, is not res adjudicata.

His appearance in Paris, as we were informed, in furtherance of an effort made by the British agent to open the case and allow further proof of his citizenship and to show that he was a subject of Great Britain, which was refused by the Tribunal of Arbitration, is an important fact. This alone was sufficient to compel obedience to the demand of Article VIII of the treaty for further negotiation. But Great Britain preferred the lump-sum arrangement, doubtless because it was conscious that he was a citizen of the United States and had never been a subject of Great Britain. On page 755 of the case of the United States is this dispatch from Levi W. Myers, our consul at Victoria, British Columbia:

> Joseph Boscowitz, for many years last past a resident of Victoria, British Columbia, stated to me on October 24, 1892, that he has been all these years and is now a citizen of the United States of America.
>
> LEVI W. MYERS, *Consul.*

Theodore T. Williams gave his deposition on the 12th of December, 1892, and states as follows:

> Joseph Boscowitz became an American citizen by naturalization, coming to the United States from northern Europe. He was well known on the Pacific Coast as a citizen of the United States before he went to Vancouver to engage in business. He frequently spoke of his American citizenship as if he were proud of it, and spoke of himself as an American in Victoria when doing business there. He always passed as an American in Victoria.

Mr. Williams also proves that Boscowitz "owned the schooners that stood in the name of Captain Warren; but not only did he own an interest in these vessels, but furnished Warren money to obtain his share." Much other evidence is in easy reach to establish these facts and others as to Americans, citizens of the United States, for whom Great Britain is urging these claims. I will append the report of Mr. Foster to my remarks, from which it

will be seen that the claims of Great Britain were greatly exaggerated, and that Boscowitz is the central figure in the case. (See Appendix 3.)

Sir Julian Pauncefote, in his letter to Earl Kimberley, in which he reviews my opinions, a much easier task than it is to meet the facts touching these claims, says: "Moreover, the principal transgressor referred to, whose name is Boscowitz, has denied that he is an American citizen." This mild and tentative answer to the finding of Judge Blodgett and the proof in the case would scarcely exonerate Mr. Boscowitz from the flagrant wrong he has done to the laws of his adopted country. But Sir Julian makes the following point, not of estoppel, but of the laws of nations, which, for ideal reasoning, is delightful. He says, "As regards the vessels themselves"—not the owners—"even if some of them, as contended by Senator MORGAN, were owned, or partly owned, by citizens of the United States (which I have shown could not be the case under our flag), such vessels became liable to be forfeited to the British Crown, and the United States Government, by whom they were wrongfully seized, would be bound to restore them, or their value, to Her Majesty's Government for the purposes of such forfeiture."

If Sir Julian had added this, "so that their value might be restored by Her Majesty's Government to the said violators of British law," he would have completed the circle of his reasoning. That is to say, if the United States seizes a vessel belonging to one of its citizens for the violation of its laws, and that vessel has also violated a law of Great Britain, the United States must surrender the vessel to Great Britain or its value, that it may be returned to the owner, who has violated the laws of both countries.

This interesting puzzle, however, has not been the subject of negotiation, and as it lays at the foundation of at least one-half of the "lump sum," I must insist on having the views of our Government upon this matter before I can support an appropriation for the benefit of Mr. Boscowitz, which hangs on this attenuated thread spun by the British ambassador. But I am not attempting to fully demonstrate the want of legal and moral soundness in the claims urged by Great Britain. I am only supporting my resolution for an investigation into these claims by the Senate, because we are not informed of their merits by any investigation or negotiation, conducted by the constitutional authorities of the United States. Other good reasons and much proof exist in support of this duty of the Senate to which I have not even alluded.

I have characterized the paper I hold in my hand and will print, by leave of the Senate, along with my remarks, as a circular, a political flyer, sent out as an appeal to the people against the vote of Congress at its last session.

Since that vote we are not informed that any negotiation has taken place. Indeed, it has been prevented by the demand of Great Britain, made on the 1st of March, 1895, the day before I was so unfortunate as to comment on a British claim in the Senate.

Earl Kimberley said to the British ambassador, "You should strongly urge the necessity of settling the question at once, either by the payment of a lump sum or by a convention for a claims commission."

That meant, as it did on June 7, 1894, that "it only now remains to assess the damages," and that the "claims commission" should be appointed "for the purpose of such assessment." This ultimatum was not pressed; it may never be pressed. It seems to have been abandoned in favor of the milder method of appealing to the people, and through them to Congress with the aid of the Executive, in the still lingering hope that a "negotiation" can still be avoided by voting a lump sum to Boscowitz and Great Britain.

In furtherance of this campaign of education Lord Salisbury prepared a "memorandum" which, it seems, was handed to the British ambassador while he was in London, on the 31st August, 1895. Sir Julian Pauncefote having exhausted his powers of logic, his discoveries in the law, and his rough criticisms on me in his letters to his Government, Lord Salisbury took up the subject and proceeded to give Sir Julian a "memorandum," in which he suggested some other arguments and caustic criticisms upon me because I ventured to sustain the action of Congress in refusing to vote a lump sum and asked for an investigation of the facts by the Senate, so that we should know what was required of us by honor and duty.

They both give me far greater prominence in their writings than they give to the questions at issue between the two Governments. I do not complain of this. Perhaps I may be unbecomingly careless of their opinions, all things considered; but I have a feeling of resentment that I do not care to conceal, that these great representatives of Her Majesty's Government had not made their complaints of a Senator of the United States to his own Government, or to the Senate, through the President, instead of waiting until Congress was about to assemble and then handing out these papers, so diligently prepared, to the newspaper press in Washington.

On the occasion I have referred to, August 31, 1894, Lord Salisbury, in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote, commented on his dispatches "of the 28th of February last and of the 4th, 5th, 15th, and 19th of March, relative to the claims for compensation from the United States on account of the seizure of the British sealing vessels in Bering Sea, which were duly received and have been read with careful attention."

If these dispatches did not sooner require acknowledgment, it must have been for the reason that the demand for a commission "to assess damages" was no longer urgent, and a new appeal was to be made "before the public in the United States," "both in and outside of Congress," for his lordship, proceeding, says to Sir Julian:

> I need scarcely say that the arguments you bring forward in support of the validity of those claims have the entire approval and concurrence of Her Majesty's Government. The attempt made by Senator MORGAN to dispute them seems to be largely founded on misapprehension, and Her Majesty's Government can not doubt that when the full facts are before the public in the United States the liability of that country to make compensation, which has never been denied by the Government, will generally be recognized both in and outside of Congress.
>
> As your excellency will shortly be returning to your post, I transmit to you herewith, for such use as you may find convenient, a memorandum, setting out at somewhat greater length some of the points in support of the claims to which you have alluded in your dispatches referred to.
>
> I am, etc., SALISBURY.

It was reasonable to suppose that in the six months that had elapsed between March 4, when Sir Julian had buried me under his ponderous logic, and the 31st of August, when Lord Salisbury thought it best to exhume my remains for another airing, that Congress and Mr. HITT and the people would have come to their reason and might be ready to vote the "lump sum" without further inquiry. But Lord Salisbury evidently thought that we needed some further information as to law and precedents, but not as to the facts relating to the starvation of seal pups or Boscowitz, and that we needed the tonic of the British sense of honor to brace us up to our duty in swallowing the lump sum. So his lordship, with thoughtful regard for our national propriety, made his "memorandum" and handed it to Sir Julian "for such use as you may find most convenient."

It ignored but could not suppress some of Sir Julian's most striking assaults, but it was so smooth and gentle in its general approval and concurrence that no one can feel surprised that Sir Julian should hand out the whole correspondence with his Government to the American press, which he did. For the first time within my knowledge the British Government has taken the people of the United States into its sacred confidence and has displayed before them the want of wisdom and knowledge of law and facts that caused the "Republicans, Populists, and 48 Democrats" to vote down the President's recommendation of a "lump sum," and to insist on further negotiation and at least some proof of the justice of the British demand.

We have at least learned something from these great diplomatists about the merits of the British contention, and that it does not appeal to truth or justice for its support, but to the suppression of an inquiry into the facts by a technical estoppel, which cuts off the "further negotiation" as to the question of our liability, for which the treaty expressly provides. The world will never believe that "the assessment of damages" is even in the nature of a negotiation as to the question of liability for damages. It might as well be said that the ships that appeared at Corinto to collect a fine levied by Great Britain were there to negotiate as to the liability of Nicaragua to pay that exaction.

I have not thought it best, in discussing this resolution, to allude to the facts relating to the recent loss of seal life that the President refers to in his annual message to this Congress. When those facts are fully understood I believe it will be manifest that the recent decrease in the seal herd is due to the persistent and illegal violation of the award and the laws to enforce its observance by the pelagic hunters, and that inefficient regulations have contributed largely to their opportunities for doing their destructive work.

APPENDIX No. 1.

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION ON ACCOUNT OF BRITISH VESSELS SEIZED IN BERING SEA BY UNITED STATES CRUISERS.

No. 1.

Colonial office to foreign office.—(Received May 9.)

DOWNING STREET, *May 8, 1895.*

SIR: I am directed by the Marquis of Ripon to transmit to you, to be laid before the Earl of Kimberley, copy of a dispatch and inclosure from the Governor-General of Canada, respecting the claims of British subjects in respect of the illegal seizure of their sealing vessels in Bering Sea by the authorities of the United States.

Now that the legislation for the enforcement of the regulations prescribed by the arbitrators has been completed, Lord Ripon hopes that the arrangements for settling these long outstanding claims will be pressed forward as quickly as possible.

The question raised by the Dominion Government as to the proof which will be required is one which Lord Ripon is disposed to think must be settled by the commission which it is proposed shall adjudicate on the claims, and his lordship would suggest that in negotiating the convention for the appointment of such a commission the British ambassador should obtain a recognition of the principle that compensation when awarded should cover the expense of establishing the right to compensation, though it might be left to the commission to say whether, in any particular case, the claimant should be allowed the costs incurred in proving his claim.

In the meantime I am to suggest that Sir J. Pauncefote should be instructed by telegraph to press the United States Government to begin the negotiation of the convention for the appointment of a commission to adjudicate on the claims, and that he should be desired. as soon as a date has been fixed for commencing the discussion, to telegraph for a Canadian delegate to assist him in case Dr. Dawson is not empowered to discuss the question.

I am, etc.,

JOHN BRAMSTON.

[Inclosure 1 in No. 1.]

The Earl of Aberdeen to the Marquis of Ripon.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, *Ottawa, March 15, 1894.*

MY LORD: With reference to previous correspondence on the subject of the presentation to the United States Government of the claims for damages preferred by the owners of sealing vessels seized in Bering Sea, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of an approved minute of the privy council, embodying a report by the minister of marine and fisheries, in which, referring to the action of the United States Government in disputing the ownership of these vessels before the Bering Sea Tribunal, he discusses the question of the measures to be taken to establish such ownership to the satisfaction of that Government.

Your lordship will observe that my ministers would be glad to learn the opinion of Her Majesty's Government with regard to the methods to be adopted with this end; and, further, to know whether they would insist on the submission of such evidence of ownership and national character as would be necessary to meet the requirements of the merchant shipping act and the mercantile law of Great Britain in these particulars.

I have, etc.,

ABERDEEN.

[Inclosure 2 in No. 1.]

Report of a committee of the honorable the privy council, approved by his excellency the Governor-General in council on the 9th of March, 1894.

On a report, dated the 6th of March, 1894, from the minister of marine and fisheries, stating with reference to the approved minute of council of the 20th of February, 1894, touching the ownership of some of the vessels which suffered losses by reason of seizures and other molestation by the United States Government in Bering Sea, that he has had under further consideration the position taken by the United States Government, as defined in the counter case of the United States before the Tribunal of Arbitration, in disputing the ownership of the vessels in question.

The minister submits that this question can not be satisfactorily dealt with at the present stage of these claims.

The papers relating to it which have come to the possession of your excellency's Government have been submitted for the information of Her Majesty's Government.

Respecting the method to establish the ownership, it appears that the authorities of the United States formerly refused to recognize the proof of ownership as furnished, but they have given no further intimation of what evidence is required. If, however, further proof is to be made a matter of negotiation between the two Governments, instead of considering what further proof can be adduced, it appears that it should be ascertained from the United States Government what further proof it desires.

The minister suggests that it should be ascertained whether the United States desires an oral examination of witnesses, or an inquiry into the state of liens on these vessels, or whether written depositions on these points would be satisfactory.

The minister also suggests that the views of Her Majesty's Government should be sought as to an inquiry of that kind being made. Also, whether it will be insisted by Her Majesty's Government that the ownership and national character of these vessels shall be decided according to the facts which give that character under the merchant shipping act and mercantile law of Great Britain, in so far as it bears on proof of ownership and national character.

These suggestions it is expected may lead to the ascertainment of the views of the United States Government on the further point whether some tribunal or commission is to be established for hearing these claims, and whether the procedure before the tribunal is to be regulated by the convention which is to establish it. If the tribunal is to be established by convention without any order of procedure being settled, it will doubtless be for the tribunal itself to define the nature of the evidence to be admitted and further proof required; also, as to whether such as has already been adduced is considered satisfactory evidence of nationality and ownership.

The committee, on the recommendation of the minister of marine and fisheries, advise that your excellency be moved to forward a certified copy of this minute, if approved, to the right honorable the principal secretary of state for the colonies, for the consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

All of which is respectfully submitted for your excellency's approval.

JOHN J. McGEE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

No. 2.

The Earl of Kimberley to Sir J. Pauncefote.

[Telegraphic.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *May 10, 1894.*

You should urge the United States Government to commence negotiations on the subject of the claims of British sealers seized by the United States cruisers in Bering Sea as soon as you have carried out the instructions contained in my telegram of the 8th instant, authorizing you to exchange notes with Mr. Gresham respecting the sealing regulations.

When you are ready for a Canadian delegate, you can telegraph to the Canadian Government to send one.

No. 3.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received May 10.)

[Telegraphic.]

WASHINGTON, *May 10, 1894.*

Bering Sea. With reference to your lordship's telegram of to-day, I arranged yesterday with Mr. Gresham for the exchange of notes, and discussed with him at the same time the question of the settlement of the British claims, which he is quite ready to take up.

I venture to suggest that the most inexpensive and expeditious process might be to appoint a commissioner on each side to verify the claims at Victoria, British Columbia, and make a joint report, so far as they could agree, assessing the damages on each claim, and, where they failed to agree, stating the grounds of their disagreement. The two Governments could then either refer the points in difference to an umpire, or determine them themselves.

If the above suggestion meets with your lordship's approval, would it not be well, before sending for the Canadian delegate, to consult the Canadian Government and settle the basis of the convention?

No. 4.

Foreign office to colonial office.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *May 10, 1894.*

SIR: The Earl of Kimberley has had under his consideration your letter of the 8th instant, inclosing a dispatch from the Governor-General of Canada respecting the claims of British subjects in respect of the illegal seizure of their sealing vessels in Bering Sea by the authorities of the United States.

I am directed by his lordship to state, in reply, for the information of the Marquis of Ripon, that a telegram has this day been sent to Her Majesty's ambassador at Washington, instructing him to press the United States Government to begin negotiations respecting these claims as soon as the notes relating to the naval regulations and arrangements under articles 4 and 7 of the award shall have been exchanged.

His excellency has at the same time been authorized to telegraph to Canada for a delegate when his services are required.

Lord Kimberley would suggest that the Canadian Government should be asked to communicate to Sir J. Pauncefote the substance of the inclosures to your letter now under reply.

I am, etc.,

H. PERCY ANDERSON.

No. 5.

Foreign office to colonial office.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *May 11, 1894.*

SIR: With reference to my letter of yesterday's date relating to claims arising out of the seizures of British sealers in Bering Sea by the United States authorities, I am directed by the Earl of Kimberley to transmit to you, to be laid before the Marquis of Ripon, the accompanying telegram from Her Majesty's ambassador at Washington,[1] stating that he has arranged with the Secretary of State for the exchange of notes respecting the naval regulations and the articles 4 and 7 of the award, and that the United States Government is quite ready to take up the question of British claims.

Sir Julian Pauncefote suggests a mode of procedure with regard to these claims which he considers would be the most expeditious and inexpensive way of dealing with them, and I am to state that Lord Kimberley would be glad to learn Lord Ripon's views as to his excellency's proposition with as little delay as possible.

I am, etc.,

H. PERCY ANDERSON.

No. 6.

Colonial office to foreign office.—(Received May 16.)

DOWNING STREET, *May 16, 1894.*

SIR: I am directed by the Marquis of Ripon to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of the 10th and 11th instant respecting the claims of British subjects in respect of the illegal seizure of their sealing vessels in Bering Sea by the authorities of the United States.

Lord Ripon desires me to inclose, for the information of the Earl of Kimberley, a copy of a telegram which he has addressed to the Governor-General of Canada on the subject of Sir Julian Pauncefote's telegram of the 10th instant;[1] and he desires me to say that he thinks it will be as well to have the views of the Government of Canada before settling the basis of the proposed convention, and that, as that may give rise to discussion, he thinks it might expedite matters if a Canadian delegate, fully instructed as to the views of the Dominion Government, were to proceed to Washington at once, but before expressing a final opinion Lord Ripon proposes to await the reply from the Governor-General to the telegram inclosed.

I am, etc.,

JOHN BRAMSTON.

[Inclosure in No. 6.]

The Marquis of Ripon to the Earl of Aberdeen.

[Telegraphic.]

DOWNING STREET, *May 11, 1894.*

Referring to your dispatch of 15th March, compensation claims, see Sir J. Pauncefote's telegram of the 10th May. Communicate to him substance of your dispatch, and telegraph views of your ministers as to proposals contained in telegram from him.

No. 7.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received June 1.)

[Telegraphic.]

WASHINGTON, *May 31, 1894.*

I have the honor to report that the Canadian Government have approved the arrangement suggested in my telegram of the 10th instant, and that the United States Government have entertained it favorably.

I should be glad to know whether I may now send in officially to the United States Government the Bering Sea claims, including the additions made to them, and propose a convention on the basis of the arrangement above referred to, for their verification and adjustment.

No. 8.

Foreign office to colonial office.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *June 1, 1894.*

SIR: With reference to my letter of the 11th ultimo relative to the British Bering Sea claims, I am directed by the Earl of Kimberley to transmit to you, to be laid before the Marquis of Ripon, the accompanying telegram from Her Majesty's ambassador at Washington,[2] stating that the arrangement proposed in his excellency's telegram of the 10th ultimo is approved by the Canadian Government and favorably entertained by that of the United States.

Under these circumstances, Sir Julian Pauncefote inquires whether we may officially present the whole of these claims to the United States Government, and propose a convention for their verification and settlement on the basis of the arrangement already proposed by his excellency.

Lord Kimberley proposes to authorize Sir J. Pauncefote to adopt this course should Lord Ripon concur therein.

I am, etc.,

FRANCIS BERTIE.

No. 9.

Colonial office to foreign office.—(Received June 5.)

DOWNING STREET, *June 5, 1894.*

SIR: I am directed by the Marquis of Ripon to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st instant, transmitting a telegram from Her Majesty's ambassador at Washington relative to the Bering Sea claims.

In reply, I am to state, for the information of the Earl of Kimberley, that his lordship concurs in Lord Kimberley's proposal to authorize Sir J. Pauncefote to adopt the course suggested in his telegram.

I am, etc.,

JOHN BRAMSTON.

[1] No. 3. [2] No. 7.

No. 10.

The Earl of Kimberley to Sir J. Pauncefote.

[Telegraphic.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *June 5, 1894.*

You may send in officially to the United States Government the British claims arising out of the seizure of sealing vessels in the Bering Sea, and you may propose the conclusion of a convention for their verification and settlement, as suggested in your telegram of the 31st May.

No. 11.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received June 13.)

[Telegraphic.]

WASHINGTON, *June 12, 1894.*

With reference to your lordship's telegram of the 5th instant respecting Bering Sea, I have the honor to report that I have forwarded to your lordship, in my dispatch of the 8th instant, a copy of my note to Mr. Gresham transmitting the Bering Sea claims, and proposing a mode of settlement.

I have also sent a copy of this note to Lord Aberdeen.

As the President is indisposed, and Mr. Gresham is about to leave Washington for a short period, I do not expect to receive on official reply for ten days or more.

But the Secretary of State tells me that the President approves the proposal, and, in accordance with his request, I am preparing a scheme of convention for consideration before requesting the assistance of a Canadian delegate.

No. 12.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received June 18.)

WASHINGTON, *June 8, 1894.*

MY LORD: On the receipt of your lordship's telegram of the 5th instant, I addressed a note to Mr. Gresham (copy of which I have the honor to inclose) on the Bering Sea claims.

I shall not fail to forward to your lordship a copy of Mr. Gresham's reply to my communication as soon as I receive it.

I have, etc. JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

[Inclosure 1 in No. 12.]

Sir J. Pauncefote to Mr. Gresham.

WASHINGTON, *June 7, 1894.*

SIR: Adverting to the verbal communications which have passed between us respecting the best mode of verifying and adjusting the British claims for compensation for the seizure of British sealing vessels in Bering Sea, I have now the honor to transmit herewith, by direction of Her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, a complete list and summary of those claims, together with memoranda of the additions and amendments made since their original presentation. I am, at the same time, to make the following suggestion, with a view to adjustment of those claims with the least possible expense and delay.

The whole of the claims, excepting that of the *Henrietta* and that of the *Black Diamond* (1886), were laid before the Tribunal of Arbitration at Paris, together with the evidence in support of them. The facts on which they rest were found by the arbitrators as provided by Article VIII of the treaty of arbitration, and formed part of the award. In view of the decision of the tribunal on the questions of law submitted to them, it only now remains to assess the damages. I am, accordingly, authorized by the Earl of Kimberley to propose that for the purpose of such assessment each Government should appoint a duly qualified commissioner, who should be a lawyer and if possible, possess some knowledge of the conditions of the seal industry.

That the two commissioners should sit together at Victoria, British Columbia, where all the evidence in verification of the claims can be obtained on the spot.

That they should make a joint report on all the claims in which they have agreed as to the amount of damages, and separate reports of the cases in which they have failed to agree, fully stating the grounds of such disagreement.

That the assessment of damages by the two commissioners, where they have been able to agree, shall be final.

That in cases where they have been unable to agree, the differences shall be settled by the two Governments within a fixed period, failing which, such differences shall be referred for final adjustment to an umpire to be appointed by the two Governments jointly, or, in case of disagreement, to be nominated by a foreign government.

You informed me some time ago that, in the view of your Government, a convention would be necessary for the adjustment of the claims, and the Earl of Kimberley, to whom I did not fail to communicate that opinion, has instructed me to proceed at once with the negotiation of such a convention, on the basis of the arrangement above proposed, should it be favorably entertained by your Government.

I have, etc., JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

[Inclosure 2 in No. 12.]

List and summary of Bering Sea claims.

CAROLENA.

(Seized by U. S. S. Corwin, August 1, 1886.)

For—	Amount of claim as put forward by owner.
Value of vessel, 32 tons	$4,000.00
Value of outfit (inconsumable)	3,002.89
Insurance	352.50
Wages of crew up to date of seizure	1,832.22
Passage of crew from San Francisco to Victoria	71.72
Passage of mate, Sitka to Victoria, after release from prison	100.00
Personal expenses of owner	250.00
Legal expenses	1,250.00
Estimated seal catch for 1886	16,667.00
	27,526.33
Deduct value consumed during a full voyage	3,213.32
Claim by owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	24,313.01

THORNTON.

(Seized by U. S. S. Corwin, August 1, 1886.)

Value of vessel, 78 tons	$5,000.00
Value of outfit (inconsumable)	2,941.63
Insurance	591.40
Wages paid to date of seizure to crew, etc	1,370.04
Passage money of crew from San Francisco to Victoria	177.16
Passage money of crew and expense of captain and mate after release, Sitka to Victoria	200.00
Personal expenses of owners	1,000.00
Legal expenses	1,250.00
Estimated catch of seals for 1886	16,667.00
	30,197.23
Deduct value consumed on a full voyage	3,379.58
Claim by owners, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	26,817.65

ONWARD.

(Seized by U. S. S. Corwin, August 2, 1886.)

Value of vessel, 94 tons	$4,000.00
Value of outfit (inconsumable)	1,778.69
Insurance	280.00
Wages paid for voyage	1,830.00
Passage, etc., of master and mate	200.00
Personal expenses of owner	250.00
Legal expenses	1,250.00
Estimated catch	16,667.00
	26,225.69
Deduct value consumed during full voyage	2,955.98
Claimed by owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	23,269.71

FAVORITE.

(Warned out of Bering Sea by U. S. S. Corwin August 2, 1886.)

For—	Amount of claim as put forward by owner.
Estimated loss of catch of 1,000 seals	$7,000.00
Claim by owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	7,000.00

W. P. SAYWARD.

(Seized by U. S. S. Richard Rush July 9, 1887.)

Passage of crew, etc	$255.00
Passage of officers	250.00
Legal expenses of owners	850.00
Probable seal catch, 1887, 3,500 seals, at $5.50	19,250.00
Loss by detention, Oct. 1, 1887, to Feb. 1, 1888	1,200.00
Loss of profit in season 1888, Feb. 1 to Oct. 1	6,000.00
Personal expenses of owners	250.00
Claim by owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	28,055.00
Cost of suit before Supreme Court, United States, in re seizure W. P. Sayward	72,847.12
Total	90,902.12

GRACE.

(Seized by U. S. S. Richard Rush July 17, 1887.)

Value of vessel, 182 tons	$12,000.00
Nonconsumable outfit	1,742.57
Passage of master and crew	200.00
Personal expenses of owners	250.00
Legal expenses	850.00
Probable catch, 1887, 4,200 seals, at $5.50	23,100.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	38,142.57

ANNA BECK.

(Seized by U. S. S. Richard Rush June 28, 1887.)

Value of vessel	$8,000.00
Nonconsumable outfit	977.50
Passage of master and crew	460.54
Personal expenses of owner	250.00
Legal expenses	850.00
Probable seal catch, 1887, 3,150, at $5.50	17,325.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	27,863.04

DOLPHIN.

(Seized by U. S. S. Richard Rush July 12, 1887.)

Value of vessel, 174 tons	$12,000.00
Value of nonconsumable outfit	2,051.50
Passage of master and crew	300.00
Personal expenses of owner	250.00
Legal expenses	850.00
Probable catch, 1887, 4,500, at $5.50	24,750.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	40,201.50

ALFRED ADAMS.

(Seized by U. S. S. Richard Rush July 10, 1887.)

Value of outfit seized	$683.00
Personal expenses	200.00
Legal expenses	300.00
Probable catch, 3,500, at $5.50	19,250.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	20,433.00

ADA.

(Seized by U. S. S. Bear August 25, 1887.)

Value of vessel, 68 tons	$7,000.00
Value of nonconsumable outfit	2,500.00
Passage, etc., of master	100.00
Personal expenses	250.00
Legal expenses	850.00
Probable catch, 1887, 2,876, at $5.50	15,818.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	26,518.00

TRIUMPH.

(Ordered not to enter Bering Sea by U. S. S. Richard Rush August 4, 1887.)

For—	Amount of claim as put forward by owner.
Illegal boarding and searching of Triumph, as set forth in affidavit	$2,000.00
1,000 seal skins	8,000.00
Legal and other expenses	250.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	10,250.00

JUANITA.

(Seized by U. S. S. Richard Rush July 31, 1889.)

620 seal skins, at $8	$4,960.00
Balance of estimated catch for 1889, at $8	9,424.00
Spears, etc	36.00
New ship's papers	25.00
Legal and other expenses	250.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	14,695.00
For amended claim, see memoranda	17,697.66

PATHFINDER.

(Seized by U. S. S. Richard Rush July 29, 1889.)

854 skins seized, and estimated balance of catch (1,246), at $12.25 a skin	$25,725.00
Guns, etc., seized	765.00
New papers	25.00
Legal expenses	250.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	26,765.00

TRIUMPH.

(Ordered out of Bering Sea by U. S. S. Richard Rush July 11, 1889.)

Balance of estimated catch of 2,500, at $8 a skin	$19,424.00
Legal and other expenses	250.00
Claim by owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	19,674.00

BLACK DIAMOND.

(Seized by U. S. S. Richard Rush July 11, 1889.)

76 skins seized, at $8	$608.00
2,024 skins, balance of estimated catch, at $8	16,192.00
Rifles, spears, etc., seized	110.00
New ship's papers	25.00
Legal and other expenses	250.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	17,185.00

LILY.

(Seized by U. S. S. Richard Rush August 6, 1889.)

333 skins seized, at $8	$2,664.00
Balance of catch, 1,767, at $8	14,136.00
Spears and salt seized	101.00
New ship's papers	25.00
Legal and other expenses	250.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	17,176.00

ARIEL.

(Ordered out of Bering Sea by U. S. S. Richard Rush July 30, 1889.)

Balance of estimated catch of 2,000 (1,156), at $8	$9,248.00
Legal and other expenses	250.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	9,498.00

KATE.

(Ordered out of Bering Sea by U. S. S. Richard Rush August 13, 1889.)

Balance of catch	$10,960.00
Legal and other expenses	250.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	11,210.00

MINNIE.

(Seized by U. S. S. Richard Rush, July 5, 1889.)

For—	Amount of claim as put forward by owner.
420 skins seized	$3,360.00
Balance of catch	12,752.00
Guns and spears seized	98.00
Legal and other expenses	250.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	16,460.00

PATHFINDER.

(Seized by U. S. S. Thomas Corwin, March 27, 1890.)

Seizure and detention from March 27, 1890, to March 29, 1890	$2,000.00
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	2,000.00

CLAIMS FOR 1886.

Claimed by—	For—	Amount claimed.
David Moore, master of Onward	Illegal arrest and imprisonment.	$4,000.00
Margotich, mate of Onward	do	2,500.00
Hans Guttornasen, master of Thornton	do	4,000.00
Harry Norman, mate of Thornton	do	2,500.00
Jas. Ogilvie, master of Carolena	do	2,500.00
Jas. Black, mate of Carolena	do	2,500.00
Total for 1886		18,000.00

CLAIMS FOR 1887.

Warren, master of Dolphin	Sufferings and losses navigating four vessels from Unalaska to Sitka.	$2,635.00
John Riely, mate of Dolphin	do	1,000.00
Geo. P. Ferey, master of W. P. Sayward	do	2,000.00
A. B. Laing, mate of W. P. Sayward	do	1,000.00
Louis Olsen, master of Anna Beck	do	2,000.00
Michael Keefe, mate of Anna Beck	do	1,000.00
W. Petit, master of Grace	do	2,000.00
C. A. Lundberg, mate of Ada	do	2,000.00
Total for 1887		13,635.00
Total for 1886 and 1887		31,635.00
To be added to 1886, personal claims, Captain Gaudin, of Ada.		3,000.00
Amended total, 1886 and 1887		34,635.00

RECAPITULATION.

Year.	Vessel.	Amount claimed.	Total.
1886	Carolena	$24,313.01	
	Thornton	26,817.65	
	Onward	23,269.71	
	Favorite	7,000.00	
	Personal claims	18,000.00	
			$99,400.37
1887	W. P. Sayward	23,055.00	
	Grace	38,142.57	
	Anna Beck	27,863.04	
	Dolphin	40,201.50	
	Ada	26,518.00	
	Alfred Adams	20,433.00	
	Triumph	10,250.00	
	Personal claims	13,635.00	
			205,098.11
1889	Juanita	14,695.00	
	Pathfinder	26,765.00	
	Triumph	19,674.00	
	Black Diamond	17,185.00	
	Lily	17,176.00	
	Ariel	9,498.00	
	Minnie	16,460.00	
	Kate	11,210.00	
			132,663.00
1890	Pathfinder		2,000.00
	Total claims without interest		439,161.48
	Costs of suit before Supreme Court, United States, in re seizure of W. P. Sayward		62,847.12

TOTAL.

1886:	
Vessels	$81,400.37
Personal claims	18,000.00
1887:	
Vessels	191,463.11
Personal claims	13,635.00
1889:	
Vessels	132,663.00
1890:	
Vessels	$2,000.00
	439,161.48
W. P. Sayward, costs	62,847.12
Total	502,008.60
Extra for Juanita	3,002.66
Extra for Black Diamond (1886)	7,500.00
Extra for Ada	3,000.00
Total	515,511.26
Henrietta	26,658.00
Amended total	542,169.26

[Inclosure 3 in No. 12.]

Memoranda of additions and amendments made since the original presentation of Bering Sea claims.[1]

ADA.

Claim of the master, Captain Gaudin, for personal loss and damage, $3,000.

This claim was, by a mistake on the part of the agent of the owner of the *Ada*, not included when the other claims in connection with this vessel were entered. Captain Gaudin thought that it had been so included, and it was only on seeing the printed list of the British claims that he discovered that such was not the case. He at once requested that the omission might be rectified, and his claim added to the list, and Her Majesty's Government, after causing an inquiry to be made into the circumstances of the case, decided that his application should be granted.

Captain Gaudin's claim has accordingly been added to the schedule of the claims entered with respect to the schooner *Ada*.

HENRIETTA.

Seized by the U. S. S. Yorktown on September 4, 1892.

Value of vessel	$4,000
Value of outfit and equipment	3,000
Value of 420 seal skins, at $18	7,560
Value of balance of estimated full catch for season in Bering Sea for 3 boats and 3 canoes, viz, 561 skins, at $18	10,098
Legal and personal expenses in defending action against vessel and cargo at Sitka and in preparing and forwarding this claim	2,000
Claim of owner, with interest at 7 per cent to date of payment	26,658

In his note, dated the 13th of March last, Mr. Gresham stated that from the date on which the *Henrietta* was handed over to her captain the United States Government ceased to bear any responsibility or to exercise any control with regard to that vessel, and that therefore they were unable to comply with the request of Her Majesty's Government that she should be sent to a British port for trial; but he added that the claim of her owner for compensation would receive due consideration when presented.

The claim in question has therefore been added to the general list of British claims.

BLACK DIAMOND.

Additional claim submitted by the master, Mr. Henry Paxton, for damages alleged to have been sustained by reason of the above schooner having been ordered out of Bering Sea in 1886 by the United States authorities:

Estimated catch for August, 1886, 1,000 skins, at $7.50 each (the price of skins at Victoria during the fall of 1886) $7,500.

This claim was sent in too late for insertion in the general list of British claims. In view of the length of time that had elapsed since the occurrence of the action complained of, Her Majesty's Government deemed it advisable to cause an inquiry to be made as to the reason for the delay in presenting the claim. The reason given was that at the time of the seizure of the vessel the coowners, who were three in number, were doubtful as to how far an appeal to the United States Government for redress would be entertained. In the following year one of the owners was lost at sea and another left the country, and it was only after the publication of the award that the surviving owner consulted his solicitor, and was informed that he had a good and equitable claim for compensation. The claim was then drawn up and presented at once.

Her Majesty's Government also ascertained from the solicitors in question that the fact of the *Black Diamond* being boarded by the revenue officers of the United States and ordered out of Bering Sea in 1886 is entered in the records of the custom-house of Unalaska, and that due protest was made by the master of the vessel on the arrival of the schooner at Victoria.

Under the circumstances, Her Majesty's Government considered that the reasons alleged for the delay were reasonable, and gave instructions that the claim should be presented to the United States Government, together with the other similar claims.

JUANITA.

It will be noticed that the original claim of the owner of the *Juanita*, which was stated at $14,695, has been amended so as to amount to $17,697.66.

The ground upon which this claim was amended was that the owner made his original statement on the basis of $8 per skin, whereas it was ascertained afterwards that the skins had been sold at San Francisco at an average of $9.67 per skin.

No. 13.

Sir Julian Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received July 14.)

[Telegraphic.]

WASHINGTON, *July 13, 1894.*

With reference to my telegram to your lordship of the 12th instant respecting the Bering Sea claims, I have the honor to report that, while discussing with the Secretary of State the terms of the proposed convention, I was requested by him to ascertain whether Her Majesty's Government would be disposed to settle those claims for a lump sum. If so, he was of opinion that there would be no difficulty in obtaining from Congress an appropriation for whatever amount should be agreed upon. Should no agreement be arrived at, the convention would proceed.

If the above course be acceptable, an expert should be sent at once to Washington by the Canadian Government to discuss the amount.

No. 14.

The Earl of Kimberley to Sir J. Pauncefote.

[Telegraphic.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *July 18, 1894.*

In your telegram of the 13th instant you reported that Mr. Gresham had proposed the payment by the United States Government of a lump sum in settlement of the British claims arising out of the seizure of British sealing vessels in Bering Sea.

You should communicate this proposal to the Canadian Government, to whom we are telegraphing for an expression of their views.

No. 15.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received July 19.)

[Telegraphic.]

WASHINGTON, *July 19, 1894.*

Bering Sea claims convention. Your lordship's telegram of yesterday.

I have supplied the Canadian Government with full information. They have accepted proposal, and their delegate is ready to start for this city when required.

No. 16.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received August 4.)

[Telegraphic.]

WASHINGTON, *August 3, 1894.*

Bering Sea claims. My dispatch of the 8th June last.

With interest, I reckon the total amount of the claims sent in at about $700,000. In order to get rid of the convention, with its delay and expense, I have reason to believe that this Government would be willing to pay a lump sum of $400,000 down.

In case I am able to obtain a further sum of $50,000, would that settlement be accepted by Canada and approved by your lordship?

No. 17.

Colonial office to foreign office.—(Received August 6.)

DOWNING STREET, *August 6, 1894.*

SIR: With reference to your letter of the 4th instant,[1] I am directed by the Marquis of Ripon to transmit to you, for the information of the Earl of Kimberley, a copy of a telegram which has been sent to the Governor-General of Canada, inquiring whether his ministers would be disposed to accept the sum of $450,000 in settlement of the Bering Sea claims.

I am, etc.,

JOHN BRAMSTON.

[Inclosure in No. 17.]

The Marquis of Ripon to the Earl of Aberdeen.

[Telegraphic.]

DOWNING STREET, *August 4, 1894*—2.10 p. m.

Total Bering Sea claims, with interest, estimated $700,000. Ambassador at Washington has reason to believe that United States Government would offer $400,000 to avoid delay and expense of convention.

Would ministers accept $450,000, if it can be obtained?

No. 18.

The Earl of Kimberley to Sir J. Pauncefote.

[Telegraphic.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *August 6, 1894.*

I have received your telegram of the 3d instant on the subject of the Bering Sea claims.

The Dominion Government have been consulted by telegraph as to accepting $450,000 in settlement thereof. You shall be informed of their reply as soon as it is received.

No. 19.

Colonial office to foreign office.—(Received August 9.)

DOWNING STREET, *August 9, 1894.*

SIR: With reference to the letter from this department of the 6th instant, I am directed by the Marquis of Ripon to transmit to you, for the information of the Earl of Kimberley, a copy of a telegram from the Governor-General of Canada, stating that his ministers would be prepared to accept the sum of $450,000 in settlement of the Bering Sea claims.

I am, etc.,

JOHN BRAMSTON.

[1] To these will be added the claim on account of the *Winnifred* when the amount has been ascertained.

[1] Forwarding copy of No. 16.

[Inclosure in No. 19.]

The Earl of Aberdeen to the Marquis of Ripon.

[Telegraphic.]

AUGUST 4, 1894.

Your telegram of the 4th August.
I have received following telegram from my prime minister:
"Your excellency's telegram re lump sum.
"I would advise acceptance of $450,000."

No. 20.

The Earl of Kimberley to Sir J. Pauncefote.

[Telegraphic.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *August 10, 1894.*

I have received your telegram of the 3d instant on the subject of the Bering Sea claims, and I authorize you to accept the sum of $450,000 in settlement thereof.

No. 21.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received August 10.)

[Telegraphic.]

WASHINGTON, *August 10, 1894.*

Bering Sea claims convention. Your lordship's telegram of the 9th instant.
I regret to have to report that the President is unwilling to offer more than $400,000. He is anxious that the question should be settled before the adjournment of Congress, and he hopes that, in case Her Majesty's Government should be unable to accept the sum proposed, the convention will be signed at once.

No. 22.

The Earl of Kimberley to Sir J. Pauncefote.

[Telegraphic.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *August 16, 1894.*

Her Majesty's Government have suggested to the Dominion Government, by telegraph, that one of the Canadian ministers should proceed to Washington at once, with a view to completing arrangements with you either for the convention or for a lump sum in settlement of the Bering Sea claims.

No. 23.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received August 17.)

[Telegraphic.]

WASHINGTON, *August 16, 1894.*

Bering Sea claims.
I have to-day succeeded in obtaining from Mr. Gresham an offer of a lump sum of $425,000 in satisfaction of all claims provable under the proposed convention. It was understood that this would include the *Winnifred* claim. Necessary appropriation can be obtained this session if this offer be accepted at once. The Secretary of State urgently requests immediate reply.
If Canada agrees to accept the lump sum which is now offered, will your lordship authorize me to make a settlement on that basis?

No. 24.

Colonial office to foreign office.—(Received August 20.)

DOWNING STREET, *August 18, 1894.*

SIR: With reference to previous correspondence respecting the Bering Sea claims, I am directed by the Marquis of Ripon to transmit to you, for the information of the Earl of Kimberley, a copy of a telegram from the Governor-General of Canada, reporting that Sir C. H. Tupper, minister of marine and fisheries, has gone to Washington to discuss the matter with Her Majesty's ambassador.

I am, etc., JOHN BRAMSTON.

[Inclosure in No. 24.]

The Earl of Aberdeen to the Marquis of Ripon.

[Telegraphic.]

(Received August 17, 1894—5.20 p. m.)

In reply to your lordship's telegram of the 15th instant, I have to-day telegraphed to ambassador at Washington as follows:
"My prime minister, in reply to suggestion of Her Majesty's Government that a minister should proceed to Washington, telegraphed last night as follows: 'I have asked Sir C. H. Tupper to go at once.'"

No. 25.

Colonial office to foreign office.—(Received August 27.)

DOWNING STREET, *August 25, 1894.*

SIR: With reference to the Bering Sea compensation claims, I am directed by the Marquis of Ripon to transmit to you, to be laid before the Earl of Kimberley, a telegram received from the Governor-General of Canada, reporting that Sir C. Tupper had left Washington, and had agreed to accept the sum of $425,000 if paid this year.

I am, etc., JOHN BRAMSTON.

[Inclosure in No. 25.]

The Earl of Aberdeen to the Marquis of Ripon.

[Telegraphic.]

(Received August 22, 1894.)

My prime minister has telegraphed to me to the effect that Sir C. Tupper has left Washington, and has agreed to accept the sum of $425,000 if the amount is paid this year.

No. 26.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received August 29.)

[Extract.]

WASHINGTON, *August 21, 1894.*

I have the honor to report that Sir C. Tupper, the Canadian minister of marine, arrived on Saturday last to discuss with me the position of the pending negotiations respecting the Bering Sea claims.
We called the same day on the Secretary of State, and yesterday morning Sir Charles Tupper, at my request, accompanied me to the State Department, where we had an interview with Mr. Gresham.
We then discussed the question of the lump sum, and Mr. Gresham stated that a week ago the appropriation of the money by Congress could easily have been obtained, but it was too late now owing to the departure of the members and of the impracticability of obtaining a voting quorum.
He added, however, that there would be no difficulty in getting the appropriation voted on the meeting of Congress in December next.
He therefore suggested that the lump sum might be accepted subject to the right of Her Majesty's Government to resume the negotiations for the convention at any time before the appropriation should be actually made.
This proposal, appearing satisfactory to Sir Charles Tupper, was accepted by me, and I have now the honor to inclose copies of the notes exchanged between Mr. Gresham and myself recording the arrangement.
Sir Charles Tupper left for Ottawa this morning.

[Inclosure 1 in No. 26.]

Mr. Gresham to Sir J. Pauncefote.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, August 21, 1894.*

EXCELLENCY: Referring to our verbal communications of a recent date, I have now the honor formally to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 7th of June last, in which you propose, in behalf of Her Majesty's Government, the establishment of a mixed commission for the purpose of verifying and adjusting the British claims for compensation for the seizure of British sealing vessels in Bering Sea.
While no serious difficulty is anticipated in settling and determining the claims by means of a mixed commission, it is a matter of interest to both Governments that they should, if possible, be disposed of in a simpler and less expensive way. Proceedings by a mixed commission, while always more or less formal and cumbersome, are, like all other processes of litigation, necessarily attended with expense, not infrequently considerable in amount, as well as with delay.
In the present case, the award and findings of the Tribunal of Arbitration in Paris have to a great extent determined the facts and the principles on which the claims should be adjusted; and in the course of the negotiations for a mixed commission, they have been subjected by both Governments to a thorough examination both upon the principles and facts which they involve.
Under these circumstances the President, after full consideration of the whole subject, has reached the conclusion that it may be practicable, as well as advantageous, to effect a direct settlement of the claims by the payment of a lump sum in full satisfaction of all demands for damages against the United States growing out of the controversy between the two Governments as to the fur seals in Bering Sea, and to this end I am instructed by the President to propose the sum of $425,000.
This proposition, if it should prove to be acceptable to Her Majesty's Government, is to be understood as having been made subject to the action of Congress on the question of appropriating the money. The President can only undertake to submit the matter to Congress at the beginning of its session in December next, with a recommendation that the money be appropriated and made immediately available for the purpose above expressed; and if at any time before the appropriation is made your Government shall desire, it is understood that the negotiations on which we have for some time been engaged for the establishment of a mixed commission will be renewed.

I have, etc.,

W. Q. GRESHAM.

[Inclosure 2 in No. 26.]

Sir J. Pauncefote to Mr. Gresham.

WASHINGTON, *August 21, 1894.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of this date on the subject of our recent negotiations for the adjustment, by means of a mixed commission, of the claims of Great Britain against the United States in respect of the seizure of British sealing vessels by United States cruisers in Bering Sea. You state that the President, after full consideration, is of opinion that it would be in the interest of both Governments to effect the direct settlement of claims by the payment of a lump sum, in order to avoid the delay and expense of a mixed commission, and that you have been instructed to propose the sum of $425,000.
You also state that the proposal is made subject to the necessary appropriation by Congress, to which it would be submitted at the beginning of its session in December next, with a recommendation that the money be immediately available for the purpose above mentioned.
You add that if at any time before the appropriation is made Her Majesty's Government shall desire it, the negotiations for the establishment of a mixed commission shall be resumed.
I have the honor to state, in reply, that Her Majesty's Government concur in the views of the President as to the expediency of effecting a settlement by the method proposed, and that they are, indeed, so fully sensible of the great advantages presented to both Governments by that course that they are willing to accept the sum offered, coupled with the assurance of prompt payment, although the amount is much below their estimate of the compensation which might fairly be awarded by a mixed commission.
It should be understood, therefore, that if the negotiations for a mixed commission should be resumed, the acceptance of your proposal shall in no way prejudice the claimants in the further prosecution of their demands.
It only remains for me to express my gratification at this amicable solution of the last subject of discussion in the long Bering Sea controversy.

I have, etc.,

JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

No. 27.

The Earl of Kimberley to Mr. Goschen.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *September 8, 1894.*

SIR: I have received Sir Julian Pauncefote's dispatch of the 21st ultimo, forwarding the notes exchanged between his excellency and Mr. Gresham with regard to the settlement by the payment of $425,000 of the claims against the United States in respect of the seizure of British sealing vessels by United States cruisers in Bering Sea.
Her Majesty's Government have learned with much pleasure that this arrangement has been concluded, and desire to express their approval of Sir J. Pauncefote's language and action throughout the negotiations which have led to this satisfactory result.

I am, etc.,

KIMBERLEY.

No. 28.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received December 31.)

WASHINGTON, *December 21, 1894.*

MY LORD: I have the honor to forward herewith an extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 15th instant, containing a resolution brought forward in the House of Representatives by the Hon. Mr. HITT, requesting the publication of all documents touching the payment by the United States of $425,000 to Great Britain for damages growing out of the controversy as to fur seals in Bering Sea.
This resolution, together with a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted, was laid on the table.
I understand from Mr. Gresham that full particulars concerning the arrangements arrived at have been given to the Committee on Foreign Rela-

tions, and that there is no reason to doubt that the money will be appropriated, notwithstanding the attempt made to obstruct the settlement.

I have, etc.,

JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

P. S.—It is stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of to-day that the Secretary of State has transmitted correspondence touching the Bering Sea controversy to the House of Representatives, which has been ordered to be printed. I inclose an extract to that effect from the New York World.

J. P.

[Inclosure 1 in No. 28.]

Extract from the Congressional Record of December 15, 1894.

THE BERING SEA CONTROVERSY.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up a privileged resolution reported to-day from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be requested to communicate to the House of Representatives, if not inconsistent with the interests of the public service, all correspondence, reports, and other documents not heretofore made public, touching the payment by the United States of $425,000 to Great Britain for damages growing out of the controversy as to fur seals in Bering Sea, or the seizure of British vessels engaged in taking seals in those waters."

Mr. HITT. That is a unanimous report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. It is all right.

The resolution was adopted.

On the motion of Mr. HITT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

[Inclosure 2 in No. 28.]

Extract from the New York World of December 21, 1894.

BERING SEA DAMAGES.

WASHINGTON, *December 20, 1894.*

Secretary Gresham sent to the House the correspondence which resulted in the offer of the United States to pay $425,000 as damages for seizures or warnings of British sealers declared by the Paris Tribunal to have been illegal. With it was a statement of the British claims. In his report the Secretary says:

"If the plan of settlement recited by the President in his annual message is not acceptable to Congress, the controverted questions must be determined either by the organization of a joint commission or by negotiations between the two Governments. Experience has shown that international commissions are slow and expensive. Should such a course be resorted to, the evidence would be found mostly on the Pacific Coast, widely scattered, and counsel would be needed to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

"The question of indirect or consequential damages having been withdrawn from the Tribunal of Arbitration, the pending claims are for British vessels actually seized in Bering Sea or warned out of it by cruisers of the United States. It will appear from the submitted correspondence that the agreement to pay a lump sum of $425,000 in full settlement of all demands, authorized to be made under the treaty and award, was proposed by this Government. The amount is considerably below the damages claimed by Great Britain, exclusive of interest for a number of years.

"If this arrangement does not receive the approval of Congress, and the disputed questions are submitted to an international commission, it is believed that the amounts allowed and the expense of the tribunal, including witnesses and the taking of their testimony, will largely exceed $425,000. In view of the facts and what may be reasonably expected as the result of a commission, the undersigned submits that a prompt and final settlement of the vexatious controversy by an appropriation of the lump sum agreed upon is advisable."

No. 29.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received February 1.)

WASHINGTON, *January 21, 1895.*

MY LORD: With reference to my dispatch of the 21st December, I now have the honor to forward herewith to your lordship printed correspondence touching the Bering Sea controversy, which has been laid before the House of Representatives pursuant to the House resolution, dated the 15th December, 1894.

I have, etc.,

JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

[Inclosure in No. 29.]

Fifty-third Congress, third session. Executive Document No. 132. House of Representatives.

BERING SEA CONTROVERSY.

Letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to House resolution dated December 15, the correspondence touching the Bering Sea controversy.

December 21, 1894.—Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives:

The undersigned is directed by the President to respond to the resolution adopted by your honorable body on the 15th instant, requesting the Secretary of State "to communicate to the House of Representatives, if not inconsistent with the interests of the public service, all correspondence, reports, and other documents not heretofore made public touching the payment by the United States of $425,000 to Great Britain for damages growing out of the controversy as to fur seals in Bering Sea, or the seizure of British vessels engaged in taking seals in those waters."

The undersigned accordingly has the honor to communicate to the House of Representatives copies of the correspondence exchanged on the subject covered by the resolution, in which will be found a statement of the claims filed by Great Britain for damages sustained by British subjects by reason of seizure of their sealing vessels in Bering Sea, or of being warned to cease operations therein.

The Paris Tribunal of Arbitration held that the United States had no right of protection or property in the fur seals in Bering Sea outside the ordinary 3-mile limit.

Article VIII of the convention of the 29th February, 1892, whereby the questions which had arisen between the two Governments concerning the jurisdictional rights of the United States in the waters of Bering Sea were submitted to arbitration, recited that the high contracting parties had been unable to agree upon a reference which would include the question of the liability of each for the injuries alleged to have been sustained by the other, or by its citizens, in connection with the claims presented and urged by it, and that, being solicitous that this subordinate question should not interrupt or longer delay the submission and determination of the main questions, they had agreed "that either may submit to the arbitrators any question of fact involved in said claims and ask for a finding thereon, the question of the liability of either Government upon the facts found to be the subject of further negotiation."

Under this article the arbitrators unanimously found that a number of British sealing vessels were seized in Bering Sea, or warned therefrom by cruisers of the United States on the days and at the places in the special finding mentioned, leaving for future determination the questions as to the value "of the said vessels or their contents, or either of them, and the question as to whether the vessels mentioned in the Schedule to the British Case, or any of them, were wholly or in part the actual property of citizens of the United States."

If the plan of settlement recommended by the President in his last annual message is not acceptable to Congress, the remaining controverted questions must be determined either by the organization of a joint commission, or by negotiations between the two Governments.

Experience has shown that international commissions are slow and expensive. Should such a course be resorted to, the evidence would be found mostly on the Pacific Coast, widely scattered, and counsel would be needed to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

The question of indirect or consequential damages having been withdrawn from the Tribunal of Arbitration, the pending claims are for British vessels actually seized in Bering Sea, or warned out of it by cruisers of the United States.

It will appear from the submitted correspondence that the agreement to pay a lump sum of $425,000 in full settlement of all demands authorized to be made under the treaty and award was proposed by this Government. The amount is considerably below the damages claimed by Great Britain, exclusive of interest for a number of years.

If this arrangement does not receive the approval of Congress and the disputed questions are submitted to an international commission, it is believed that the amounts allowed and the expense of the tribunal, including witnesses and the taking of their testimony, will largely exceed $425,000.

In view of all the facts and what may be reasonably expected as the result of a commission, the undersigned submits that a prompt and final settlement of the vexatious controversy by an appropriation of the lump sum agreed upon is advisable.

Respectfully submitted.

W. Q. GRESHAM.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 20, 1894.

No. 30.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received February 26.)

[Telegraphic.]

WASHINGTON, *February 26, 1895.*

Bering Sea: Lump sum.

The House of Representatives, by an adverse vote of 143 against 112, rejected the proposed appropriation for the payment of the lump sum agreed on. In Committee of the Whole House it had previously been adopted by a vote of 94 to 86.

No. 31.

The Earl of Kimberley to Sir J. Pauncefote.

[Telegraphic.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *February 27, 1895.*

In your telegram of yesterday's date you reported the rejection by the House of Representatives of the appropriation of a lump sum of $425,000 in settlement of the Bering Sea claims.

Has this settlement been definitively rejected, or will it be revived in some other form?

No. 32.

Colonial office to foreign office.—(Received March 1.)

DOWNING STREET, *February 28, 1895.*

SIR: I am directed by the Marquis of Ripon to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 26th instant,[1] reporting that the House of Representatives in the United States had rejected the vote for $425,000 in settlement of the Bering Sea claims.

I am to request that you will inform the Earl of Kimberley that Lord Ripon has received this intelligence with much regret, as he had hoped that an end of this controversy had been reached.

It will now be necessary to resume at once the negotiation of the convention, and as Congress will rise at an early date, and the ratification of the convention, if not concluded at once, will be postponed for another year, he would suggest that Her Majesty's ambassador at Washington should be instructed to resume without delay the discussion of that instrument; and Lord Ripon proposes, if Lord Kimberley concurs, to telegraph to the Dominion Government to send someone at once to Washington to assist in the negotiation.

I am, etc.,

EDWARD FAIRFIELD.

No. 33.

The Earl of Kimberley to Sir J. Pauncefote.

[Telegraphic.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 1, 1895.*

I have received your excellency's telegram of the 28th ultimo on the subject of the Bering Sea claims.

You should ask Mr. Gresham whether he will at once resume negotiations for a convention.

Lord Ripon suggests that the Government of Canada should send a delegate to assist at Washington.

You should strongly urge the necessity of settling the question at once, either by the payment of the lump sum or by a convention for a claims commission.

No. 34.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received March 3.)

[Telegraphic.]

WASHINGTON, *March 2, 1895.*

Bering Sea claims: Your lordship's telegram of the 1st.

The Secretary of State informed me that he is quite prepared immediately to resume negotiations for a convention. Present session of Congress, however, closes on the 4th instant, and the convention, when signed, must be submitted for confirmation by a two-thirds majority in the Senate. It can not, therefore be submitted to the Senate unless a special session be called before next December.

I have urged in the strongest language the necessity of a prompt settlement of the claims one way or another, and every effort to effect it has been vainly exhausted by the President and Mr. Gresham. They have even failed in an

[1] Forwarding copy of No. 30.

attempt to obtain from Congress an appropriation for the payment of the claims subject to their examination by a commission to be appointed for that purpose, or for the simple expenses of such a commission.

I received from Mr. Gresham to-day an expression of the deep regret felt by the President and himself at the unexpected situation in which they found themselves placed, and at their inability to prevent the delay which now, most unfortunately, must occur in adjusting these claims and discharging the national obligations of the United States.

No. 35.

The Earl of Kimberley to Sir J. Pauncefote.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 6, 1895.*

SIR: At an interview to-day with Mr. Bayard I expressed to his excellency the great regret with which Her Majesty's Government had learned that Congress had separated without voting the sum for the Bering Sea claims or making any provision for a commission to examine them.

I feared that not only would this failure to execute the award cause much dissatisfaction here and in Canada, but that it would tend to diminish confidence in the principle of arbitration.

It was the more unfortunate, because it was coincident with the proposal made by the United States Government to reopen the whole matter which had so recently been settled by the arbitration.

Mr. Bayard said he shared my regret at the failure of Congress to provide for the payment of the British claims, but that he was certain that the President and Mr. Gresham had done their utmost to induce Congress to vote the money.

I assured his excellency that Her Majesty's Government had no complaint to make of the action of the President or Mr. Gresham, and I informed him of the purport of your excellency's telegram of the 3d instant on this subject.

I am, etc.,

KIMBERLEY.

No. 36.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received March 7.)

WASHINGTON, *February 26, 1895.*

MY LORD: With reference to my telegram of to-day's date, I have the honor to inclose herewith extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, containing an account of the rejection of the proposed appropriation of $425,000 to pay damages arising out of seizures in Bering Sea.

The proposal, after a two hours' debate, was approved in Committee of the Whole House by a vote of 98 to 86, but on a subsequent vote, when the amendment was reported, the House rejected it by a majority of 142 to 113.

I have the honor to append a précis of the debate prepared in this embassy.

I have, etc.,

JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

[Inclosure 1 in No. 36.]

Extract from the Congressional Record of February 25, 1895.

[Not printed.]

[Inclosure 2 in No. 36.]

Précis of debate in House of Representatives February 25, 1895.

The House being in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the general deficiency bill—

Mr. Breckinridge moved an amendment, providing for the payment of $425,000 to Great Britain in full satisfaction of all demands for damages growing out of the controversy between the two Governments as to the fur seals in Bering Sea.

There was no question, he said, that under the decision of the arbitrators the United States should pay something. It was objected that the amount agreed on was excessive, in view of the fact that the claims were in part based on consequential damages, which, in the case of the *Alabama*, were not admitted. But there was a clear difference between the cases. In the case of the *Alabama* the wrong was the indirect act of the Government, and in the present case it was the direct act. And, further, in the present case, a rule was agreed on which allowed consequential damages. Judgment had been given against the United States, and the only question left was the assessment of damages. Leaving out the consequential damages, there would remain a claim, practically undisputed, for $227,000, on which interest would have to be paid for seven years, if the matter was referred to a commission, and in addition there would be the expense of having arbitrators. The bargain was not a bad one, and on broader grounds it did not become the United States to go down to the tavern and denounce the judge, as litigants sometimes do who have lost their case. The right course was to settle the matter at once and remove it as a cause of disagreement between the two peoples.

Mr. CANNON (Republican) was not opposed to the payment unless it reversed a principle already settled. The arbitrators only decided the question of fact as to seizure and warning out; the question of the amount of damage and the ownership of the vessels was left open for future negotiation. As to prospective damages, it had been decided in the case of the *Alabama* that they could not properly be made subject of compensation. As to the question of ownership, it was clear from the evidence (Mr. Foster's statement published in the last Senate document, page 164) that the great majority of the vessels seized were owned by Americans. The most that could fairly be conceded was $103,000.

Mr. HOOKER (Democrat) denied that the analogy with the *Alabama* case held good. The vessels were equipped in Canadian waters for the purpose of prosecuting what was now conceded by both parties to have been a lawful act, and the United States was responsible for whatever damages ensued from their seizure. It was not improbable that if the matter were referred to a commission the United States would have to pay $1,000,000 instead of less than half that sum.

Mr. HENDERSON (Republican) quoted from Mr. Foster's statement, and asked how in the face of it the Secretary of State could have made such an agreement. This large sum should not be paid when there was high authority for the statement that most of the claims were unwarranted and unjust. He advocated the commission provided for in the treaty, in order that if there were any Americans masquerading under British auspices they might be smoked out.

Mr. MCCREARY (Democrat) said that of the two alternatives he thought the payment of a lump sum would be the most economical, and that promptness in paying the claims was in the line of economy, justice, and honor.

Mr. HITT (Republican) said that in the case of ten out of the twenty ships seized the real owners were Americans. These men were not engaged in a "lawful occupation," but one forbidden by the laws of their own country. They were entitled to fine and imprisonment, not to compensation. He quoted the case of Boscowitz, an American, who lent money to a Canadian named Warren on the security of certain ships, foreclosed, and then sold the ships, which thus passed into his hands, to a Canadian named Cooper, for the sum of $1. This man Cooper now appeared among the claimants for the sum of $225,000 for the seizure of ships which really belonged to Boscowitz. Cooper had testified that he did not even know the number or names of the ships, and that he had nothing to do with them. Of the total amount of $542,000 claimed, $360,000 represented the interests of Americans. As to the character of the claims, the great mass was for an estimated catch—$377,000 out of $542,000. It had been decided at Geneva that compensation was not to be paid for prospective earnings. As to the argument that the two Governments had agreed to pay compensation for such losses, it referred only to the claim for damages under the modus vivendi. That portion of the claim had been formerly abandoned by the two Governments. As to the fear expressed that more claims would be presented in case of the appointment of a commission, it was clear from the words of the British ambassador that the claims presented in June, 1894, included all the claims. A commission, as proposed by Sir Julian Pauncefote, would probably cost about $15,000, and would result, perhaps, in the payment by the United States of $50,000, which is about what was due.

Mr. DINGLEY (Republican) would not say with certainty that the claim for prospective damages would be disallowed by the commission. He quoted the case of the Halifax award. It was a case of a choice of two evils, and it was impossible to foresee what would be the decision of a foreign umpire.

Mr. Breckinridge, in reply, said that he agreed with the last speaker. The claims would grow enormously if the payment was put off, and an immediate settlement was preferable.

Mr. LIVINGSTON asked if Congress would not have the supervision of the payments made under the decision of the commission.

Mr. Breckinridge said that if Congress refused to make the payment prescribed by a legally constituted tribunal, it would be a delinquent at the international bar of public honesty and universal integrity. It was not true that Sir Julian Pauncefote had debarred himself from presenting additional claims. Take the case of a man who had died from the effects of imprisonment.

Mr. HITT denied that that claim could go before the commission.

Mr. Breckinridge maintained that it could. He pointed out that these ships had sailed from a British port under the British flag, and the burden was on the United States to overthrow the presumption arising from that fact. He predicted that this could never be accomplished. The United States had gone into the arbitration on the ground that the Bering Sea was United States property, and had lost. They ought now to take the consequences like men. As to the damages claimed, he thought that the prospective catch ought to be paid for. The real capital of these men was their sweat, their risk, their danger, their time. When they were seized and put in Alaskan prisons, without right and without justice, what better criterion of damage was there than what they might have caught, and what everyone but themselves did catch during that year? These were not remote damages. There was a vast difference between remote damages and consequential damages. There are innumerable cases where consequential damages are given where they are the immediate and not the remote consequences of the act. He quoted the statement of Sir E. Grey in Parliament as to the probable payment of the damages, and hoped that the United States would not be posted before the world like a delinquent at a club. He did not advocate this measure because it had been proposed by a Democratic President, but because on the floor of the House of Representatives he represented the entire Imperial Republic of America, and he did not wish the United States to stand before the nations as a nation which did not keep faith.

He appended to his speech, as printed, a calculation showing under several hypotheses the saving to the United States effected by the payment of a lump sum.

On a division there were—for the amendment 94, against 86.

The committee rose, and the House then voted on the appropriation bill as passed by the committee.

A separate vote was taken on the Bering Sea clause, when it appeared that there were—yeas 113, nays 142.

The majority comprised Republicans, Populists, and 48 Democrats.

No. 37.

Colonial office to foreign office.—(Received March 9.)

DOWNING STREET, *March 8, 1895.*

SIR: I am directed by the Marquis of Ripon to acknowledge the receipt of your letters inclosing telegraphic correspondence with Her Majesty's ambassador at Washington regarding the settlement of the Bering Sea claims, and I am to suggest, for the consideration of the Earl of Kimberley, that Sir Julian Pauncefote should be at once instructed to communicate a copy of his telegram of the 2d instant to the Governor-General of Canada, and consult with him as to the date on which it will be convenient to send a Canadian representative to assist in the further negotiations for a convention.

I am, etc.,

R. P. EBDEN,
For Under Secretary of State.

No. 38.

The Earl of Kimberley to Sir J. Pauncefote.

[Telegraphic.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 9, 1895.*

Bering Sea claims.

You should communicate your telegram of the 2d instant to the Government of Canada.

The secretary of state for the colonies suggests that you should arrange with Lord Aberdeen as to the date when the Canadian delegate who is to assist in the negotiations for the convention should be sent to Washington.

No. 39.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberly.—(Received March 11.)

WASHINGTON, *February 28, 1895.*

MY LORD: In my dispatch of the 26th instant I had the honor to report the adverse vote of the House of Representatives on the proposal to appropriate the sum of $425,000 to the payment of the Bering Sea claims, in accordance with the agreement concluded between the two Governments in August last.

The Committee of the Whole House had voted for the appropriation by a small majority, and the adverse majority subsequently obtained on what is termed a "yea-and-nay" vote was a surprise, as well as a grave disappointment.

Strong party feeling would seem alone to account for the rejection of so just and desirable an arrangement, and, as your lordship will have noticed from the inclosures in my dispatch, statements have been made in Congress which are entirely misleading, both as to the law and the facts of the case.

It is urged that the present claims are principally made out of "indirect" damages, because they include, in some cases, the loss of profits of the fishery season by sealing vessels warned out of Bering Sea.

Such damages were allowed when claimed by the United States in the Fortune Bay case on behalf of United States fishermen, whose rights of fishery had been forcibly interfered with by a mob on the coast of Newfoundland in 1878.

Again, it is pretended that a great majority of the sealing vessels on behalf of which the claims are made were the property of United States citizens, whereas there is no evidence whatever of any change of ownership in those vessels, which all carried the British flag and a British register.

One speaker represented the total amount of the claims to be only $542,000, whereas it was over $700,000. Another concluded from the fact that the offer of the lump sum and its acceptance appeared in notes of the same date that the offer was made without previous investigation, and was instantly snapped at by Her Majesty's Government, whereas the compromise recorded in those notes was the result of laborious negotiations, which were carried on during the whole summer.

There can be no doubt that the above inaccuracies were calculated to prejudice the minds of many members of Congress, and also to turn public opinion against a settlement of the question which was both equitable and advantageous to both parties.

The action of Congress is in strange contrast with the assurance given me by Mr. Blaine at the commencement of the negotiations which led to the Bering Sea arbitration, and is recorded in my dispatch of the 1st of November, 1889, "that his Government would not wish that private individuals who had acted bona fide in the belief that they were exercising their lawful rights should be the victims of a grave dispute between two great countries, which had happily been adjusted."

I have, etc., JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

No. 40.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberly.—(Received March 14.)

WASHINGTON, *March 4, 1895.*

MY LORD: I have the honor to transmit to your lordship herewith extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, containing a report of a resolution introduced by Senator MORGAN for the appointment of a committee to examine into the question of the liability of the United States to pay claims arising out of the Bering Sea controversy, and also of the liability of Great Britain and Canada.

Your lordship will observe that Senator MORGAN alludes to a recent proposal made in the House of Commons to pay the claims in advance, as being made with a view to having "a moral claim on the United States for this $425,000, not one shilling of which is due."

Objection was interposed to the immediate consideration of the resolution, and it accordingly went over.

I have, etc., JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

[Inclosure in No. 40.]

Extract from the Congressional Record of March 1, 1895.

BRITISH BERING SEA CLAIMS.

Mr. MORGAN. I offer a resolution, for which I ask present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

Ths Secretary read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the message of the President received by the Senate on the 13th of February, 1895, relating to the payment by the United States of the claims of Great Britain arising out of the Bering Sea controversy, is referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instruction that such committee examine into the question of such liability to Great Britain and the amount thereof, if any, and of any liability on the part of Great Britain or Canada arising out of said controversy, and that said committee shall have authority to report by bill or otherwise; and, in making such examination, may sit in the vacation of the Senate."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama whether it would be wise to pass this resolution pending the controversy between the two Houses with respect to an appropriation of four hundred and some odd thousand dollars?

Mr. MORGAN. There is no such controversy.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think that matter is now in conference between the two Houses.

Mr. MORGAN. No; I beg pardon. There is no report in either House in favor of any money to go to Great Britain, as the case now stands.

Mr. HALE. Such an appropriation was stricken out in the House of Representatives.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; that was stricken out.

Mr. HALE. And the Senate committee has not put it in; so it is not in conference.

Mr. MORGAN. There is no controversy. I wish to make this statement: The British Parliament seems to be acting upon this subject now by anticipation. I see by the morning papers that Sir George Baden-Powell says that he wants to pay to the Canadians and to the recalcitrant and rascally Americans who hired themselves out to the British flag to rob the Government of the United States and to violate its laws and dishonor the country, and to pay them in advance, so as to have a moral claim on the United States for this $425,000, not one shilling of which is due.

I propose that the Committee on Foreign Relations shall investigate that matter. There has been enough of falsehood and misrepresentation about that in official documents and in newspapers to require, for the vindication of the honor of this country, that that investigation should be made; it makes no difference what any committee of this body may do.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to the resolution.

Mr. TURPIE. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama whether the text of this resolution does not propose a revision of the Bering Sea arbitration.

Mr. MORGAN. Not by any means. It is merely to ascertain what are the obligations of the respective Governments under it.

Mr. TURPIE. It seems to me that the text of the resolution, as I heard it read, proposes to review the proceedings of the international arbitration.

Mr. MORGAN. Not at all. It is merely to ascertain what are the liabilities of the respective Governments under it.

Mr. TURPIE. The liabilities spoken of are certainly res adjudicata.

Mr. MORGAN. I quoted from the language of the President of the United States in sending his message to the Senate.

Mr. TURPIE. I ask that the resolution be printed and go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being interposed, the resolution will go over and be printed.

No. 41.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received March 14.)

WASHINGTON, *March 5, 1895.*

MY LORD: With reference to my dispatch of the 4th instant, I have the honor to inclose extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, containing a report of a debate in the Senate relative to the resolution introduced by Mr. MORGAN for the appointment of a commission to examine the question of the liability of the United States and Great Britain to pay claims arising out of the Bering Sea controversy.

Mr. MORGAN supported the resolution in a speech in which he severely criticised the policy pursued by Great Britain. Objection, however, being interposed, the resolution failed to pass. An abstract of the debate is inclosed herewith.

I have, etc., JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

[Inclosure 1 in No. 41.]

Extract from the Congressional Record of March 2, 1895.

[Not printed.]

[Inclosure 2 in No. 41.]

Report of debate in Senate, March 2, 1895.

Mr. MORGAN, in introducing his resolution for the appointment of a committee to investigate the liability of the United States and Great Britain to pay claims arising out of the Bering Sea dispute, said that the question of the liability of the United States to pay damages was withdrawn from the consideration of the arbitrators and reserved for negotiation. The Secretary of State had made an arrangement to pay a lump sum in order to avoid negotiation. If the matter had come before the tribunal, Great Britain could not have recovered one cent. On the strongest point of the claim there could not be due to her more than $96,000; $173,000 had been claimed for three ships which were valued by appraisers at $12,000. He wished the whole question to be investigated by a set of commissioners "who may not perhaps have an embarrassment in a negotiation." It was not the fault of the award regulations that the seal herds were being depleted. The supplementary regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury were to blame, which allowed the sealers to pass through forbidden waters during the close season. Where were the records of the time and place of the catch made by the sealers which were prescribed by the award?

Great Britain had pledged herself to do her best to save the seals. But she had only sent one ship, which had passed the entire summer outside of Bering Sea in port. The United States had sent ten. The administration of the law on the part of the United States had been slack, and on the part of Great Britain absurdly inefficient. No evidence was presented upon which Great Britain could be held responsible for the conduct of her sealers. The Secretary of the Treasury had stated that he had papers in his possession which he had not communicated to the Senate. The whole matter was under a cloud of uncertainty, and therefore he proposed that there should be a fair and impartial but thorough investigation.

Mr. GRAY objected to the consideration of the motion. Mr. MORGAN had himself objected to the consideration of a bill providing for an international commission of inquiry, because he thought that it implied a reflection on the award regulations. No such reflection was implied. The Senator himself, as an arbitrator, had signed a recommendation that the herd should be allowed a rest of three years. There was not a particle of evidence to show lax administration of the law. The slaughter had taken place in the open season. Only one seizure had been made, and that ship was released. As to the lump sum, the settlement had been received with almost universal favor by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. It was far within the estimates made by the British claimants, and the best estimates that could be made by the agents of the United States. That was out of the question now, and the Senate had had the opportunity to provide for the only alternative, that is, a convention between the United States and Great Britain, under which the claims could be adjudicated and the amounts determined. That had been refused. Now the Senator had prevented the Senate considering a proposal for preventing the destruction of the seal herd by a temporary cessation of the slaughter. The responsibility was not a light one. In conclusion, he would say that there was not the slightest ground for the imputation that the Secretary of the Treasury had suppressed the logs of vessels or any other evidence, as a perusal of the letter quoted by the Senator would show.

Mr. MORGAN asked leave to print a statement showing what were the actual liabilities of the United States under the principles contended for by Great Britain.

Objection was made.

Mr. GRAY asked leave to print as part of his remarks the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury referred to.

Mr. MORGAN objected.

P. S.—The letter in question states that the collector of customs at San Francisco had reported that the masters of certain vessels had failed to give the required particulars, having sailed in ignorance of the regulation concerning logs.

No. 42.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received March 25.)

WASHINGTON, *March 15, 1895.*

MY LORD: In my dispatch of the 5th instant I had the honor to transmit to your lordship a report of a debate in the Senate on the subject of the Bering Sea claims, in the course of which Senator MORGAN stated that he had prepared a memorandum on the liability of the United States, under the award of the Paris tribunal, to make compensation for the illegal seizure of British sealing vessels in Bering Sea.

He requested leave to print this document in the RECORD as part of his speech, but leave was refused.

After the adjournment of Congress he communicated this memorandum to the press, and I have now the honor to transmit to your lordship an extract from the "New York Daily Tribune," which purports to contain a summary of it.

Senator MORGAN argues that the United States never agreed to arbitrate the question of their liability for damages, nor have ever admitted their liability. They only agreed to negotiate respecting it, expressly reserving the question of such liability as the subject of such negotiation. He is therefore opposed to the creation by act of Congress of a commission to settle the question without any negotiation. The claim of Great Britain is, he states, based on the false assumption that the United States were bound by the award of the tribunal, or by agreement, or by law, justice, or equity to pay any part of the demand.

Senator MORGAN also insists that the "further negotiations" provided for in regard to these claims by Article VIII of the Bering Sea arbitration treaty should take place "through the constitutional authorities of the United States."

On those two points I would observe that no admission of liability became necessary from the moment that the Paris tribunal, by its award, had rejected the legal pretensions of the United States to a special property in the fur seals resorting to the Pribilof Islands. That decision at once proclaimed the illegality of the seizures, and the liability of the United States to satisfy the claims. That was the basis of the diplomatic negotiation for the adjustment of the claims, and I am at a loss to conceive what other view could be taken without disputing the Paris award. Nor can I comprehend, without further explanation, the meaning of Senator MORGAN'S objection to that negotiation as not having taken place "through the constitutional authorities of the United States."

Having denied the liability of the United States to pay compensation, and also the competency of the United States Secretary of State and of the British ambassador to negotiate on the subject, though fully empowered by their respective Governments to do so, Senator MORGAN proceeds to criticise the arrangement arrived at for the payment of a "lump sum" of $425,000.

With regard to the details of the claims, he states that the total amount claimed by Great Britain, with interest, is $542,169. He urges that the items for loss of profits should not be allowed, and he quotes in support of his contention the decision of the Geneva arbitrators on the subject of prospective earnings. He estimates the excess proposed to be allowed by the Secretary of State as fully $182,000. He states, further, that ten of the ships for which damages are claimed were, in fact, owned by citizens of the United States, and that the amount claimed by British subjects, less speculative damages, is only $70,924.

But even this amount is, he states, excessive. He maintains that the "personal claims" should be deducted, leaving $36,289. Of this sum, $16,500, he says, is claimed for the *Henrietta*, which claim is not allowable, as she was seized under the modus vivendi.

Senator MORGAN'S estimate, therefore, with the last-mentioned deductions, would reduce the indemnity to about $20,000; but that is an improvement on the previous estimate he gave in a recent speech in opposition to the payment of the claims, in which he declared that "not one shilling" was due. (See my dispatch of the 4th instant.)

I will now proceed to show in what respects the distinguished Senator appears to have been misled in his computation of the indemnity.

In the first place, he is mistaken in supposing that the total amount of the claims, with interest, was only $542,169.

It amounted to upward of $786,000, as your lordship will see from the synopsis of the claims which forms inclosure 2 to this dispatch.

The Senator would seem to have taken the total given at page 143 of the Congressional papers on the subject as including interest, but that is not the fact.

Moreover, the case of the *Winnifred* was subsequently added in order that the whole of the claims arising out of the Bering Sea controversy might be disposed of under the "lump sum" arrangement.

The next misapprehension to which I would call attention relates to the measure of damages.

Senator MORGAN takes exception to the inclusion in the statements of claims of the items for loss of profits of the fishery season.

He would allow no compensation whatever for such losses, and he quotes from the judgment of the tribunal in the Geneva arbitration the well-known passage, to the effect that no compensation can be awarded under the head of "prospective earnings," as they depend "upon future and uncertain contingencies." But he omits to mention that the tribunal did, in fact, take such losses into consideration in awarding a gross sum by way of indemnity.

The tribunal allowed a large amount "in lieu of profits." This is shown by the estimate of damages contained in protocol No. 29 of the Geneva conferences, in which the decision to award the gross sum of $15,500,000 is recorded.

In all similar cases "losses of profits" are properly claimed, for although they may not be recoverable "under that head," they form an element of consideration, according to the circumstances of each case, in computing the award of a gross sum by way of indemnity. That was the view on which the United States Government acted in 1879, when they preferred a claim of $120,000 against Great Britain on behalf of twenty-two American fishing vessels whose fishery operations had been interfered with by mob violence at Fortune Bay, in Newfoundland.

Those claims included damages for loss of profits, calculated on the average of preceding years. Sir Edward Thornton, then Her Majesty's representative at Washington, objected "that these losses were in the nature of consequential or indirect damages, which should not be allowed." But it was insisted, on behalf of the United States Government, that compensation should be paid for those losses, and ultimately Her Majesty's Government awarded a "lump sum," amounting to two-thirds of the original claim, thus allowing a large margin for inflated valuations and doubtful items.

In the present case the lump sum of $425,000, agreed on between the two Governments allows a still larger margin, for if the same proportion of two-thirds had been adopted the lump sum of $425,000 would have been increased by $100,000.

The amount of indemnity originally claimed was reduced by no less than $360,000.

The next objection made by Senator MORGAN is to the "personal claims," but he gives no reason for that objection.

It happens, however, that the damages claimed under that head were extremely moderate, having regard to the character of the acts for which redress is sought, and to the humiliation, losses, and sufferings inflicted on innocent persons in pursuit of their lawful industry.

Senator MORGAN concludes by objecting to the claim of the *Henrietta*, on the ground that she was seized under the modus vivendi. But the ground of claim is that she was not handed over after seizure to the British authorities, as prescribed by the modus vivendi, and was detained at Sitka until she became valueless from deterioration.

But of all the unfounded objections which have been urged against the claims, that which seems to have made the greatest impression on the public mind is the statement that most of the vessels on behalf of which the claims are made were in fact owned by persons whom Senator MORGAN stigmatized in the Senate as "recalcitrant and rascally Americans, who hired themselves out to the British flag to rob the Government of the United States and to violate its laws and dishonor the country." (See my dispatch of the 4th instant.)

These vituperative epithets are quite unmerited, and I will proceed to show that the objection in question is not well founded in fact, and apparently is based on a mistaken view of the British navigation laws.

By British law no alien can hold any share in a registered British vessel under penalty of forfeiture of the vessel to the Crown.

The owner of the vessel may mortgage her to an alien, but he does not thereby part with his property in the vessel. He only makes her a security for the loan.

Section 70 of the merchant shipping act provides as follows:

"A mortgagee shall not by reason of his mortgage be deemed to be the owner of a ship or any share therein, nor shall the mortgagor be deemed to have ceased to be the owner of such mortgaged ship or share, except in so far as may be necessary for making such ship or share available as a security for the mortgage debt."

It is not improbable that in some cases the owners of British sealing vessels may have borrowed money from the United States citizens for the purpose of the season's equipment and venture, and that they may have mortgaged their vessels to American citizens as collateral security for the loan.

But they remain liable to the lender for the amount of the loan, though their vessel has been illegally seized and their venture has resulted in a loss, owing to such illegal seizure. On what conceivable ground of justice or reason are they to be deprived of compensation because part of the amount awarded may be applied by them in satisfaction of a loan due by them to an American citizen?

Why should that American citizen be called "a rascal"? What law has he violated by advancing money for the prosecution of a lawful Canadian industry carried on by Canadians in Canadian vessels? In what respect has the United States Government been "robbed," considering that it has no property in the fur seal, as was solemnly adjudged and declared by the Tribunal of Arbitration at Paris?

These are the questions which, I submit, can only be reasonably answered in a sense absolutely fatal to Senator MORGAN'S contentions.

Moreover, the principal alleged transgressor referred to, whose name is Boscowitz, has denied that he is an American citizen.

The British flag and the law of nations have been violated on the high seas, and it appears to me that in assessing the indemnity to the private individuals who were the victims of the great wrong so committed, any inquiry into the sources of the capital invested in the lawful industry pursued by the vessel at the time of seizure is out of place and inadmissible.

As regards the vessels themselves, even if some of them, as contended by Senator MORGAN, were owned or partly owned by citizens of the United States (which I have shown could not be the case under the law of the flag), such vessels became liable to be forfeited to the British Crown, and the United States Government, by whom they were wrongfully seized, would be bound to restore them or their value to Her Majesty's Government for the purposes of such forfeiture.

It will be seen from the above explanations that Senator MORGAN'S objections to the payment of the "lump sum" agreed upon are based in a great measure on misapprehensions of fact, and, I would add with all respect, on an erroneous view of the rights of Great Britain and of the obligations of the United States resulting from the Bering Sea treaty of arbitration and the Paris award.

As your lordship is aware, Senator MORGAN is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and was one of the two members representing the United States Government on the Bering Sea Tribunal of Arbitration.

It is not surprising that persistent denunciations from such a quarter against the diplomatic arrangement concluded between the two Governments should have prejudiced Congress and the public against it. Moreover, the great pressure of business and the strong party feeling which marked the close of the session rendered it impossible to obtain a fair and dispassionate consideration of the question

Much as the delay in the final settlement is to be deplored, I have too much confidence in the great qualities of the American people to doubt that it will be ultimately adjusted on a sound and honorable basis.

In a previous dispatch I reminded your lordship of the assurance given to me by Mr. Blaine at the commencement of the negotiations which led to the Paris arbitration, "that his Government would not wish that private individuals who had acted bona fide in the belief that they were exercising their lawful rights should be the victims of a grave dispute between two great countries which had happily been adjusted."

The President and the Secretary of State adopted the same view, and were animated throughout the negotiations for the settlement of the claims by the highest sentiments of honor and justice. I am not without hope that when the cloud which now obscures the true merits of the case has been dispelled, Congress may yet confirm the arrangement made between the two Governments as an equitable and happy solution of a tedious and irritating controversy.

I have, etc., JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

[Inclosure 1 in No. 42.)

Extract from the New York Tribune of March 9, 1895.

[By telegraph to the Tribune.]

WASHINGTON, *March 8, 1895.*

Chairman MORGAN, of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, was a member of the Bering Sea Tribunal of Arbitration, and there is no man living who possesses a more thorough and accurate knowledge of the matters discussed or the conclusions and awards of the tribunal than he does. It is by no means singular that he should denounce the claims of alleged British subjects on account of damages as "preposterous," in view of the facts which have already been disclosed in the debate in the House of Representatives, as well as in these dispatches. But it is exceedingly significant, to say the least, that Senator MORGAN, a Democrat, should in effect declare that this Administration, and not the Paris Tribunal, is responsible for the slaughter of the seals by poachers during the last two years.

Senator MORGAN'S statement, which is herewith reproduced, strongly suggests either that the Cleveland Administration was hoodwinked by the representatives of Great Britain, whose construction of the decision of the Tribunal of Arbitration was accepted by it, or that it was willing to sacrifice whatever advantage the United States might have gained under that decision for the sake of casting discredit upon the Administration which agreed to submit the matters in controversy to such a tribunal. The statement of Senator MORGAN'S views is as follows:

"A very mistaken view of this matter is entertained. The treaty of arbitration was signed the 29th February, 1892, and the modus vivendi of 1892 was signed on the 18th April of that year. They were ratified by the Senate as parts of the same treaty, and were proclaimed by the President on the same day, the 9th May, 1892. Article VIII of the treaty of February, 1892, says that the high contracting parties, having found themselves unable to agree upon a reference which shall include the question of the liability of each for the injuries alleged to have been sustained by the other, or by its citizens, in connection with the claims presented or made by it, and being solicitous that this subordinate question should not interrupt or longer delay the submission and determination of the main question, do agree that either may submit to the arbitrators any question of fact involved in such claim, and ask for a finding thereon, the question of the liability of either Government upon the facts found to be the subject of further negotiations. Article V of the treaty of April, 1892, stipulates that if the result of the arbitration be to affirm the right of British sealers to take seals in Bering Sea within the bounds claimed by the United States, then compensation shall be made for abstaining from the exercise of that right during the pendency of the arbitration upon the basis of such a regulated and limited catch as in the opinion of the arbitrators might have been taken without an undue diminution of the seal herd. If the result of the arbitration denied the British rights, then compensation was to be made by Great Britain to the United States. The amount awarded, if any, was to be promptly paid.

"It was not questioned and could not be disputed that the two treaties, though they were signed at different times, constituted one entire agreement. Article VIII of the treaty of February, 1892, only bound the two Governments to a 'further negotiation' as to the matters therein referred to, and left 'the question of the liability of either Government on the facts found to be the subject of further negotiation.' In execution of this article, the agents of the two Governments agreed upon a state of facts which the tribunal found to be true, and entered it of record. That statement of facts included only the names of twenty sealing vessels that were seized by the United States. The tribunal had no authority to pass upon any question touching the liability of the United States for having made such seizures. That matter was left where Article VIII of the treaty left it. The United States has not agreed to arbitrate any such claim or demand, and have never admitted any liability to Great Britain connected with any such claim or demand. They have only agreed to negotiate respecting it, expressly reserving the question of such liability as the subject of such negotiation.

"I am only insisting that the negotiations shall take place through the constitutional authorities of the United States, and that it shall not be evaded by

a scheme to create by act of Congress a commission that will settle the question without any negotiation. Judge Blodgett, one of the counsel of the United States, presented an argument before the tribunal to show that upon the widest basis of demand Great Britain had claimed, no decree upon the facts could award Great Britain any damages for alleged wrongs committed by the United States. That argument was not answered, nor was any effort made to answer. It stands to-day as a perfect answer to the claim set up by Great Britain, based upon the false assumption that the United States were bound by the award of the Tribunal of Arbitration, or by agreement, or by law, justice, or equity to pay any part of the demand."

Mr. MORGAN then gave in detail the names of the vessels and the claims made on their behalf, which was the statement he desired to include in the RECORD, but which was shut out by Mr. TURPIE'S objection. The claims showed that the amount claimed by Great Britain with interest was $542,169.26; the amount proposed to be allowed by Secretary Gresham was $425,000. Mr. MORGAN said that the schedule of claims for each vessel contained an item designated variously as "probable catch," "balance of catch," "estimated balance of catch," etc. These were clearly prospective profits or speculative damages, and were all based on future or contingent occurrences, forming no basis of fact on which an equitable finding as to amount of damages could be predicated. They should not be allowed. Similar claims were presented by the United States to the arbitrators of the *Alabama* claims in 1872 at Geneva, and in their decision they say: "And whereas prospective earnings can not properly be made the subject of compensation, inasmuch as they depend in their nature upon future and uncertain contingencies, the tribunal is unanimously of the opinion that there is no ground for awarding to the United States any sum by way of indemnity under this head."

Mr. MORGAN estimated that the excess proposed to be allowed by Secretary Gresham was fully $182,000. He added:

"The above figures and comparisons are based entirely upon the supposition that every vessel included in the schedule of claims submitted by Sir Julian Pauncefote was owned by a British subject. It appears, however, from the United States Counter Case submitted to the Bering Sea Tribunal of Arbitration at Paris, that ten vessels were in fact owned by citizens of the United States."

He figured up the general result as follows:

Total amount claimed by Great Britain, $542,169.42; total amount of claims of United States citizens presented, $359,853.89; balance resulting, being amount claimed by British owners, $182,315.53. But of this amount claimed by British subjects, speculative damages are included to the amount of $111,391, thus leaving the amount claimed by British subjects, less speculative damages, $70,924.53. The total amount of claims of British subjects, which, as Mr. MORGAN contends, could possibly be recovered, amounts in all to $70,924. But even this sum, which is $471,244 less than the British claim presented and $354,075 less than the amount the Secretary of State proposes to give in settlement, is undoubtedly excessive. Of that amount $34,636 is for "personal claims," and in all probability some of these claimants are citizens of the United States or some other country, which fact could be estab lished by investigation. Deducting the "personal claims" from $70,924, there is left, as Mr. MORGAN says, $36,289. Of this sum $16,560 appears as the claim of the *Henrietta* (less speculative damages). The *Henrietta* was seized in Bering Sea in September, 1892, under the provisions of the modus vivendi, and therefore no claim is allowable. But even if allowable it shows its "padded" character, from the fact that there is a claim for an "estimated catch" in Bering Sea when sealing was not allowed there and the season was over at the time of the seizure.

Senator MORGAN therefore concludes that Great Britain claims the sum of $542,169. and that the amount due, with interest, is only $96,102, making an excess in the claims without interest over the amount due with interest of $446,066. The Secretary of State proposed to allow $425,000, which is by this account, according to Senator MORGAN'S figures, $328,897 in excess of the total amount due to British subjects with the interest computed.

"When the Government of the United States," said Mr. MORGAN, in conclusion, "has made no agreement and no admission of any indebtedness to Great Britain on account of any of these claims, and has not admitted any principle on which the claim of Great Britain is based, I must insist that these matters should be discussed in the negotiations that the two Governments are bound to conduct. I could not agree that speculative profits or damages or personal claims should be included in the accounts, unless that is in accordance with the laws of nations. Such a precedent would soon develop into the most bitter and violent contentions between nations.

"Under Article V of the modus vivendi of 1892 nothing was claimed by either party, and the Tribunal of Arbitration made no award upon that article. It was not proposed, and I, at least, understood that it was abandoned. I have said nothing about the causes that have led to the alleged increased destruction of seals in 1894. I do not credit those statements. I am thoroughly satisfied that if such increased destruction has occurred, or if the number of seals killed was not greatly reduced in 1894 below the number killed in 1891 and 1892, the slaughter is due to the inefficient regulations to carry out the concurrent regulations established in the award of the arbitrators."

[Inclosure 2 in No. 42.]

SYNOPSIS OF CLAIMS.

1886.

Claims	$99,400.37
Added claim of Black Diamond	7,500.00
	106,900.37
Interest at 7 per cent to 1894 (eight years)	59,864.20
	166,764.57

1887.

Claims	205,098.11
Additional claim of Ada	3,000.00
	208,098.11
Interest at 7 per cent to 1894 (seven years)	101,968.07
	310,066.18

1889.

Claims	132,663.00
Additional claim of Juanita	3,002.66
	135,665.66
Interest at 7 per cent to 1894 (seven years)	47,482.98
	183,148.64

1890.

Claims	2,000.00
Interest at 7 per cent to 1894 (four years)	560.00
	2,560.00

1892.

Henrietta	$26,658.00
Interest at 7 per cent to 1894 (two years)	3,732.12
	30,390.12

RÉSUMÉ.

1886	166,764.57
1887	310,066.18
1889	183,148.64
1890	2,560.00
1892	30,390.12
	692,929.51
Winnifred	30,390.12
Cost of suit in re W. P. Sayward	62,847.12
Total	786,166.75

The claim of the *Winnifred*, which occurred in 1891, is added, though the particulars were not furnished. It was agreed that it should be covered by the "lump sum," and as the case is similar to that of the *Henrietta*, whose claim amounted to a little over $30,000, it was put down roughly at the same amount.

No. 43.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received March 30.)

WASHINGTON, *March 19, 1895.*

MY LORD: In my dispatch of the 15th instant I had the honor to lay before your lordship my views on the subject of the refusal by Congress to vote the appropriation of $425,000 in satisfaction of the Bering Sea claims and my observations on the objections raised by Senator MORGAN to the "lump-sum" arrangement. I venture to supplement that dispatch with the following additional remarks on the Senator's statement that the United States Government had never admitted their liability to pay those claims.

I observed in that dispatch that the award of the Paris arbitration proclaimed the illegality of the seizures and the liability of the United States to satisfy the claims. But, if any admission of liability were necessary, it is to be found, at least in principle, in Article V of the modus vivendi of 1892, which was signed contemporaneously with the treaty of arbitration.

Under the modus vivendi of 1891 the British sealers were compensated by their own Government for their loss of profits consequent on their abstention from pelagic sealing during that season.

Under the modus vivendi of 1892 (article 5) it was provided that, if the result of the arbitration should be to affirm the right of the British sealers to take seals in Bering Sea, similar compensation as therein defined should be paid to them by the United States Government.

If the British sealers were thus held entitled to compensation for abstaining from the pursuit of their lawful industry under the above voluntary and amicable arrangement, how much greater is their claim to such compensation for the previous deprivation of their just rights by force and violence. The two Governments, at the arbitration, waived their respective claims to compensation under article 5 of the modus vivendi of 1892, for reasons given in the report of the proceedings of the 31st May (pages 1197-1198). But those reasons in no way militate against my present contention; they rather confirm it.

It is true that, as stated in Article VIII of the treaty of arbitration, the high contracting parties found themselves unable to agreee upon a reference which should include the question of their respective liabilities to each other.

But the reason was not that any dispute arose as to the liability of the United States Government to pay compensation for the illegal seizures of British vessels in the event of the decision of the arbitrators being adverse to them on the question of the jurisdictional rights of the United States. The sole reason for which the high contracting parties found themselves unable to agree on the question of liability was that the United States Government claimed, in the event of the award being in their favor, to render Great Britain liable for losses resulting from the wrongful action of persons sailing outside British jurisdiction under the British flag, a doctrine which it would be impossible for Her Majesty's Government to accept. (See Lord Salisbury's telegram of the 12th of August, 1891.[1])

I may add, in conclusion, that during the negotiations for the "lump-sum" arrangement the Secretary of State entirely shared the views above expressed as to the significance of article 5 of the modus vivendi of 1892 in relation to the measure of damages.

I have, etc.,

JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

No. 44.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received April 17, 7 p. m.)

[Telegraphic.]

WASHINGTON, *April 17, 1895.*

Bering Sea claims convention.

Canadian Government, owing to meeting of Dominion Parliament to-morrow, have decided to postpone resumption of negotiations and visit of their delegates to Washington until after prorogation.

No. 45.

Sir J. Pauncefote to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received April 25.)

WASHINGTON, *April 16, 1895.*

MY LORD: With reference to the resumption of negotiations for the Bering Sea claims convention, and to the proposed visit of Canadian delegates to Washington in connection therewith, I have the honor to report that, immediately on receipt of your lordship's telegraphic instructions of the 9th ultimo, I communicated with the Governor-General of Canada as to the date of the visit of the defegates.

On the 18th ultimo the Governor-General replied to the effect that the Canadian Government were most anxious for an early settlement of the Bering Sea claims, and that the ministry were ready to send representatives without delay.

On the 20th ultimo I informed the Governor-General of the readiness of the United States Government to resume negotiations for a treaty to be submitted to the Senate at the next meeting of Congress, but I added that the Secretary of State had not recovered from his recent illness, and that he had been advised to leave Washington for a short time. Nevertheless, Mr. Gresham would proceed at once, if desired, with the negotiations.

I received no further communication from the Governor-General until the 5th instant, when his excellency informed me, by telegram, that his ministers suggested that the conference should take place at once, so as to enable the delegates to return to Ottawa before the meeting of the Dominion Parliament, which would take place on the 18th instant.

Mr. Gresham was then absent from Washington, but I called on him immediately on his return, and I ascertained from him that while the President was quite willing that the negotiations should proceed at once, if such was the desire of the Canadian Government, still, in view of the short time now

[1] See "United States No. 3 (1892)," No. 122.

at the disposal of the delegates before the meeting of Parliament, and of other considerations, he thought it would be of advantage to defer the negotiations to the later period.

I so informed the Governor-General, by telegram, on the 10th instant, and yesterday, the 15th, I received a reply from his excellency, to the effect that, owing to the meeting of the Canadian Parliament on the 18th instant, the Dominion Government prefer to have the visit of their delegates to Washington deferred until after the session.

I have so informed Mr. Gresham.

I have, etc., JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

No. 46.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir J. Pauncefote.

FOREIGN OFFICE, *August 31, 1895.*

SIR: Your excellency's dispatches of the 28th February last and of the 4th, 5th, 15th, and 19th March relative to the claims for compensation from the United States on account of the seizure of British sealing vessels in Bering Sea were duly received, and have been read with careful attention.

I need scarcely say that the arguments which you bring forward in support of the validity of those claims have the entire approval and concurrence of Her Majesty's Government. The attempt made by Senator MORGAN to dispute them seems to be largely founded on misapprehension, and Her Majesty's Government can not doubt that when the full facts are before the public in the United States the liability of that country to make compensation, which has never been denied by the Government, will be generally recognized both in and outside of Congress.

As your excellency will shortly be returning to your post, I transmit to you herewith, for such use as you may find convenient, a memorandum setting out at somewhat greater length some of the points in support of the claims to which you have alluded in your dispatches above referred to.

I am, etc.,

SALISBURY.

[Inclosure in No. 46.]

Memorandum.

The statement communicated to the press by Senator MORGAN entirely ignores the fact that the five questions submitted to the arbitrators in accordance with Article VI of the treaty of the 29th February, 1892, embodied the whole of the grounds urged on behalf of the United States Government in justification of the seizures out of which the claims arise. This is abundantly clear, not only from the correspondence which led to the framing of these questions, but also from the proceedings of the tribunal.

Mr. Blaine, in the course of his first conversation with Sir J. Pauncefote on the subject of the seal fisheries, as reported in the dispatch to Lord Salisbury of the 1st of November, 1889, stated:

"As regards compensation, if an agreement should be arrived at, he felt sure that his Government would not wish that private individuals who had acted bona fide in the belief that they were exercising their lawful rights should be the victims of a grave dispute between two great countries, which had happily been adjusted. He was not without hope, therefore, that the wishes I had expressed might be met, and that all might be arranged in a manner which should involve no humiliation on either side."

In a subsequent conversation on the subject of compensation on the 26th of December Sir J. Pauncefote reports Mr. Blaine to have stated that "on further consideration he had decided to reply to my protest, in order to place on record before the world the precise grounds upon which the United States Government justify the seizure of the Canadian vessels, so that any compensation which may be granted may not be interpreted as an admission of wrong."

These grounds of justification were accordingly set forth in Mr. Blaine's note to Sir J. Pauncefote of the 22d of January, 1890, and amplified and reiterated in his later notes of the 30th of June and the 17th of December in the same year. In the last of these notes he summed them up in the form of questions for arbitration, which were substantially the questions propounded to the arbitrators and decided by them against the United States.

Though on the face of them these questions do not refer to the question of damages, it is obvious that the arbitrators, in deciding that the grounds upon which the United States based its claim to regulate the seal fisheries were unfounded, at the same time decided that the justification for the seizure of British vessels which was based on these grounds was unfounded.

The seizures were, in fact, formal acts of the United States Government in the exercise of the rights and jurisdiction which they claimed, and the tribunal in declaring that they had no title to such rights and jurisdiction necessarily declared that the loss and injury inflicted on British subjects, in pursuance of those rights and jurisdiction, were unwarranted, and as they also found that the seizures "were made by the authority of the United States Government" their decision was a declaration that the United States Government, having inflicted an unwarranted wrong, were liable to pay compensation for such wrong.

That this was the view of the arbitrators and of those engaged in conducting the case on behalf of the United States Government is clear from the proceedings of the tribunal.

The fifth article of the finding of facts submitted to the tribunal by the United States agent as an alternative to the finding proposed by the British agent, as reported at page 1458 of the proceedings, was "that the said several searches, seizures, condemnations, confiscations, fines, imprisonments, and orders were not made, imposed, or given under any claim or assertion of right or jurisdiction except such as is submitted to the decision of the arbitrators in Article IV of the treaty of arbitration."

The findings finally proposed by the agent of Great Britain and agreed to as proved by the agent for the United States, and submitted to the tribunal for its consideration, and found by them unanimously (including Senator MORGAN, therefore), were as follows:

"Finding of facts proposed by the agent of Great Britain, and agreed to as proved by the agent for the United States, and submitted to the Tribunal of Arbitration for its consideration.

"1. That the several searches and seizures, whether of ships or goods, and the several arrests of masters and crews respectively mentioned in the Schedule to the British Case, pages 1 to 60, inclusive, were made by the authority of the United States Government. The questions as to the value of the said vessels or their contents, or either of them, and the question as to whether the vessels mentioned in the schedule to the British case, or any of them, were wholly or in part the actual property of citizens of the United States, have been withdrawn from and have not been considered by the tribunal, it being understood that it is open to the United States to raise these questions, or any of them, if they think fit, in any future negotiations as to the liability of the United States Government to pay the amounts mentioned in the schedule to the British case.

"2. That the seizures aforesaid, with the exception of the *Pathfinder*, seized at Neah Bay, were made in Bering Sea at the distances from shore mentioned in the schedule annexed hereto, marked C.

"3. That the said several searches and seizures of vessels were made by public armed vessels of the United States, the commanders of which had, at the several times when they were made, from the executive department of the Government of the United States instructions, a copy of one of which is annexed hereto, marked A, and that the others were in all substantial respects the same. That in all the instances in which were proceedings were had in the district courts of the United States resulting in condemnation, such proceedings were begun by the filing of libels, a copy of one of which is annexed hereto, marked B, and that the libels in the other proceedings were, in all substantial respects, the same; that the alleged acts or offenses for which said several searches and seizures were made were in each case done or committed in Bering Sea at the distances from shore aforesaid; and that in each case in which sentence of condemnation was passed, except in those cases when the vessels were released after condemnation, the seizure was adopted by the Government of the United States; and in those cases in which the vessels were released the seizure was made by the authority of the United States; that the said fines and imprisonments were for alleged breaches of the municipal laws of the United States, which alleged breaches were wholly committed in Bering Sea at the distances from the shore aforesaid.

"4. That the several orders mentioned in the schedule annexed hereto and marked C, warning vessels to leave or not to enter Bering Sea, were made by public armed vessels of the United States, the commanders of which had, at the several times when they were given, like instructions as mentioned in finding 3, and that the vessels so warned were engaged in sealing or prosecuting voyages for that purpose, and that such action was adopted by the Government of the United States.

"5. That the district courts of the United States in which any proceedings were had or taken for the purpose of condemning any vessel seized as mentioned in the Schedule to the Case of Great Britain, pages 1 to 60, inclusive, had all the jurisdiction and powers of courts of admiralty, including the prize jurisdiction, but that in each case the sentence pronounced by the court was based upon the grounds set forth in the libel."[1]

It will be observed from these findings that the question of justification was regarded as conclusively settled by the decision of the five questions, and that the only negotiations contemplated were "negotiations as to the liability of the United States Government to pay the amounts mentioned in the schedule (C) to the British case," not simply negotiations as to the liability of the United States Government to pay compensation at all; and further, that the only reservations made on behalf of the United States Government were "the questions as to the value of the said vessels or their contents, or either of them, and the question as to whether the vessels mentioned in the schedule to the British case, or any of them, were wholly or in part the actual property of citizens of the United States."

The eminent lawyers and statesmen charged with the conduct of the United States case certainly never contemplated that the decision of the arbitrators would not be accepted as concluding the liability of the United States except in regard to the points expressly reserved in the findings of facts.

Mr. MORGAN is alleged to have stated that the argument submitted to the tribunal by Judge Blodgett, one of the United States counsel, "stands to-day as a perfect answer to the claim set up by Great Britain, based upon the false assumption that the United States were bound by the award of the Tribunal of Arbitration, or by agreement, or by law, justice, or equity to pay any part of the demand." But on the very first page of that argument Mr. Blodgett says: "We, however, preface what we have to submit on this feature of the case by saying that, if it shall be held by this tribunal that these seizures and interferences with British vessels were wrong and unjustifiable under the laws and principles applicable thereto, then it would not be becoming in our nation to contest those claims, so far as they are just and within the fair amount of the damages actually sustained by British subjects," and the whole of his argument is in fact devoted to the two points reserved in the findings of fact: the amount of the claims and the nationality of the claimants.

When the question was discussed during the oral argument before the tribunal the same view was clearly expressed by the United States counsel.

The following extract (pages 778–780) from the report of the oral argument will show this, and furnishes an interesting commentary by the official representatives of the United States Government on the recent action of Congress:

"Mr. Justice HARLAN. Suppose this tribunal should decide under the points in Article VI that the United States had or had not any right of property in the seals, and had or had not any right to protect them on the high seas, you would consider the United States bound by that ruling when the two nations, if the occasion arose, got together in negotiations on the question of damages?

"Mr. PHELPS. I should, sir, if you put that question to me at this time.

"Mr. Justice HARLAN. That is what I understand Lord Hannen's question to embrace.

"Mr. PHELPS. If that is the purport of the inquiry, yes. I do not suppose, for instance, that if this tribunal should decide that the United States had no right of property and no right of protection, and that under the circumstances vessels were seized belonging to British subjects, I do not understand that it would be open to the United States after that to insist that there was a right of seizure and a right of protection, in the face of the decision of the tribunal.

"Lord HANNEN. I am bound to say that, assuming that that may be taken as authoritative, it would meet my question.

"The PRESIDENT. And in that case the liability spoken of in Article VIII would merely refer to the question of indemnity, and then there would be no disagreement.

"Mr. PHELPS. That question, as it seems to me, which was put by his lordship, refers rather to the inference that the United States Government would feel itself bound to draw, in respect of the seizure, from the decision of the points of law in respect to the other branches of the case.

"Lord HANNEN. Yes. The object of my inquiry would be completely met if it can be taken as authoritative. We will assume for a moment that the finding would be no property. If that can be tacked on to the finding of facts as to the seizure, then that would meet that which Sir Charles has been asking for, a finding that it was an illegal seizure; and if so, I presume that would satisfy his requirement, as undoubtedly it would meet the view which I intended to indicate in the question I put to you.

"Mr. PHELPS. Your lordship will see that if you ask the opinion of the counsel of the United States what would be the just and right course for the United States Government to pursue in the future negotiations if such were the finding of the tribunal, our answer might be one way. If you ask us if we are authorized here to bind the United States to any conclusion in future negotiations, we must answer that we have no such authority, and have no right to make a declaration that would bind them.

"Lord HANNEN. That is why I put in the word 'authoritative.'

"Mr. PHELPS. We are not authorized to make any such statement or to give any such assurance. I am free to say, and I believe that to be the view of my associates, that after a finding by the tribunal upon the five questions involved, it would not seem to me becoming on the part of the United States, who have agreed to abide by this award, to contradict the award when the

[1] These grounds were "that the said vessel or schooner was found engaged in killing fur seal within the limits of Alaska Territory and in the waters thereof, in violation of section 1956 of the Revised Statutes of the United States."

question of its propriety arose upon this subordinate matter of seizure; but it must be a question for those who control the diplomatic relations of our Government, and is not a question that we are authorized in reference to.

"The PRESIDENT. That is all very well, Mr. Phelps, but we have here the United States before us in the persons of their agent and counsel, and we have the right to ask them what is the authoritative and official interpretation put by the United States upon one word used in an article of a treaty which limits our powers. We have the right to ask you what is the interpretation put by the United States upon those words 'question of liability.'

"Mr. PHELPS. That question the tribunal is quite entitled to put, and that question we are quite ready to answer. We have endeavored to answer it; that in the discussion of questions under Article VIII the tribunal is invested with no authority whatever except to find the facts, leaving the legal consequences of those facts, so far as these seizures are concerned, for future consideration.

"Then if the tribunal goes further, and asks me what that future consideration on the part of the United States Government would be, I reply in the first place that I have no doubt that it ought to regard the decision of the tribunal as conclusive upon the questions arising under this treaty, but that I am not authorized to go beyond this arbitration and the power with which the tribunal is invested under this article, and give an authoritative assurance as to what those in charge of the United States Government when that time comes may do. The distinction may be a refined one, but it is one that we feel compelled to make.

"The PRESIDENT. We understand that very well. We merely wanted to know what was your interpretation of these words 'questions of liability.' We know the interpretation of the English Government.

"Mr. PHELPS. Our interpretation of that is, as I have said, that Article VIII simply provides for the finding of such facts—material facts, of course—as either party may desire to have found and may offer sufficient evidence in support of. What consequences shall come from that finding is a point that it seems to us is not submitted to this tribunal. It will be for the after consideration of the Government. But I should not seriously doubt, when you ask my opinion, when those points come to be considered hereafter by the United States Government, that the decision of the tribunal upon the first five questions will be respected there as elsewhere."

In his criticisms of the amount of the claims, Mr. MORGAN is alleged to have stated: "The schedule of claims for each vessel contained an item designated variously as 'probable catch,' 'balance of catch,' 'estimated balance of catch,'" etc. These were clearly prospective profits or speculative damages, and were all based on future or contingent occurrences, forming no basis of fact on which an equitable finding as to amount of damages could be predicated. They should not be allowed. Similar claims were presented by the United States to the arbitrators of the *Alabama* claims in 1872 at Geneva, and in their decision they say: "And whereas prospective earnings can not properly be made the subject of compensation, inasmuch as they depend in their nature upon future and uncertain contingencies, the tribunal is unanimously of opinion that there is no ground for awarding to the United States any sum by way of indemnity under this head."

Mr. MORGAN omits, however, to add that in the award of a gross sum to the United States the arbitrators allowed in lieu of the claim for prospective catch one year's wages and 25 per cent on the value of the vessels and their outfits. This is clear from the twenty-ninth protocol of the proceedings of the tribunal, and is shown in detail in the statement inclosed in Lord Tenterden's dispatch of the 9th September, 1872, setting forth how the gross award of $15,500,000 was arrived at. That statement, after setting forth the gross amount of the American claims, thus—

Claims for losses by insurgent cruisers (including the new claims for wages, etc.)	$14,437,143
Prospective catch, if allowed an additional sum of	3,511,035
Claims for pursuit and capture	6,735,063
	24,683,061
With interest at 7 per cent, which, taken for nine years, would amount to	15,550,464
Total	40,233,715

proceeds as follows:

"The tribunal disallowed the claims for pursuit and capture and for prospective catch.

"They further disallowed:

The claims for gross freight	$1,007,153
Double claims	1,682,243
And may further be assumed to have disregarded the new claims to the amount of	1,450,000
Making a further reduction from the American claim of $14,437,144 of	4,139,396
And leaving a balance of	10,297,748
Taking a mean between this and the British estimate of $7,464,784, the result is	8,881,266

"To this must be added two allowances made by the tribunal:

In lieu of prospective catch, one year's wages and 25 per cent on the value of the vessels	988,000
In lieu of the claims for gross freight, 50 per cent of the claims as net freight	503,576
Total	10,372,842
Which, with interest at 6 per cent for about eight years, gives a result of	15,500,000

"As actually arrived at by the tribunal."

The claims in respect of which this "allowance in lieu of prospective catch" was made were on behalf of whalers, whose industry is still more speculative and uncertain than that of the sealers, and the observations of the British arbitrator, Sir A. Cockburn, on that part of the award form a striking contrast to the statements attributed to Senator MORGAN. At page 253 of the reasons for dissenting from the award of the Tribunal of Arbitration, he says: "But, independently of the undeniably exaggerated amount of the claims, a demand for gross prospective earnings, as distinguished from net earnings, is quite incapable of being maintained. This is admitted in the argument of the United States and is clearly demonstrated in the British report. According to the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States the only allowance which ought to be made in respect of prospective catch is in the nature of interest from the time of the destruction of the vessel. I should myself be disposed to adopt a more liberal mode of compensation, and to award for prospective profits a reasonable percentage on the values of the vessels and outfits," etc.

The Fortune Bay claims to which Sir J. Pauncefote alludes in his dispatch of the 28th February were almost entirely claims for prospective damages. Of the total amount of $103,000, claimed by the United States in that case, only $1,400 was for actual destruction of property. (Report of Judge Bennett, page 3 of chapter 3762, 1883.) The American vessels were only interfered with on one day, yet they claimed for the whole season's profits, and the profit claim was based, not, as in the British Bering Sea claims, on the actual results of the season interrupted, but on the profits of previous years, though the season of 1878 was an exceptionally bad one (page 2 of chapter 3762 of 1883). The action which gave rise to the claims was not that of the British Government, but of a mob of fishermen in an outlying part of the colony, enraged at seeing the laws to which they themselves were subject violated by their competitors. The American vessels claiming largely employed natives of Newfoundland in their vessels, and though these as British subjects were unquestionably amenable for violation of the laws of Newfoundland by fishing on Sunday, the British Government took no exception to the American claims on that ground.

But although the American claims were almost entirely for prospective damages, though they arose largely from the violation of British laws by British subjects employed by United States citizens, though they claimed for a whole season when they were only interfered with on one single day, and though, if the claims were valid, the claimants had a legal remedy in the courts of the colony against the perpetrators of the alleged loss and damage, for which the British Government were in no way responsible, yet the British Government, within three years from the date of the claims arising, paid practically the whole sum demanded by the United States Government, amounting to three-fourths of the claims actually put forward by the claimants.

The Bering Sea claims arise out of the direct action of the United States Government—action declared by an international tribunal to be entirely unjustifiable. They are made out, not for profits based on the results of profitable seasons, but on the actual results of the seasons in which they arose. Some of the claimants not only lost their property, but suffered a rigorous imprisonment in a severe climate.

The arrangement made between the two Governments for the payment of a lump sum amounting to little more than half of the claims preferred, without any allowance whatever for interest, can not be regarded as otherwise than a settlement favorable to the United States, bearing in mind that the claims had already been outstanding for ten years and that more than a year had elapsed since the decision of the arbitrators had been given.

It is not easy to believe that if the late Congress had been fully acquainted with the circumstances it would have refused its sanction to so reasonable a proposal, recommended as it was by the Federal Government, or would have declined even an appropriation for the payment of the claims, subject to their examination by a commission to be appointed for that purpose, or for the simple expenses of such a commission.

APPENDIX No. 2.

FIFTH.—CLAIMS FOR COMPENSATION.

I.—DAMAGES CLAIMED BY THE UNITED STATES.

It is provided in Article VIII of the treaty that either party may submit to the arbitrators any question of fact involved in any claim it may have against the other, and ask for a finding thereon, "the question of the liability of either Government upon the facts found to be the subject of further negotiation."

As the undersigned construes this paragraph, it limits the range of inquiry by the tribunal to facts which bear only upon the amount of the claims submitted, as the question of liability is left open to be settled by negotiation.

And in the fifth article of the modus vivendi of May 9, 1892,[1] it is provided that—

"If the result of the arbitration be to affirm the right of British sealers to take seals in the Bering Sea within the bounds claimed by the United States under its purchase from Russia, then compensation shall be made by the United States to Great Britain (for the use of her subjects) for abstaining from the exercise of that right during the pendency of the arbitration, upon the basis of such a regulated and limited catch or catches as in the opinion of the arbitrators might have been taken without an undue diminution of the seal herds; and, on the other hand, if the result of the arbitration shall be to deny the right of British sealers to take seals within said waters, then compensation shall be made by Great Britain to the United States (for its citizens and lessees) for this agreement to limit the island catch to 7,500 a season, upon the basis of the difference between this number and such larger catch as, in the opinion of the arbitrators, may have been taken without an undue diminution of the seal herds."

This leaves the number of seals which might have been taken in the Bering Sea by the British sealers, and upon the Pribilof Islands by the lessees of the United States, without danger of reducing the seal herd, wholly to the judgment of the tribunal under the proofs submitted.

In the printed case submitted on behalf of the United States a claim is presented under the clause last quoted for compensation to the United States for the increased amount of rental which the United States would have received upon an additional number of skins taken, and for a bonus of $9.62½ on each skin, to be paid by the lessees of the islands, over and above the bonus upon the 7,500 skins which are permitted to be taken under the modus vivendi.[2] And a claim is also submitted by the United States in behalf of its lessees for the profit the lessees would have made upon an increased number of seals which might have been taken above the 7,500 but for the modus vivendi.[3]

The case also submits a claim in behalf of the United States and lessees for compensation for the limited number of seals taken under the modus vivendi of 1891.

Frankness requires us, as we think, to say that the proofs which appear in the Counter Case of the United States as to the condition of the seal herd on the Pribilof Islands show that the United States could not have allowed its lessees to have much, if any, exceeded the number of skins allowed by the modus vivendi of 1892 without an undue diminution of the seal herd, and upon this branch of the case we simply call the attention of the tribunal to the proofs and submit the questions to its decision.

As to the claims submitted in behalf of the United States and its lessees under the modus vivendi of 1891, the undersigned also feels constrained to say that, as no provision for the payment of compensation to either party is provided for in that agreement, and as, under the laws of the United States and lease of the islands by the United States to the North American Commercial Company, the United States had the full power, through its Secretary of the Treasury, to limit the catch in any year to such number as in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury might seem proper, we must admit that no right of compensation accrued under that agreement to either the United States or its lessees, for the reason that the agreement was wholly voluntary and such as the two Governments were entirely competent to make, and no right to compensation would accrue to either Government or its citizens unless specially provided for in the modus vivendi.

II.—DAMAGES CLAIMED BY GREAT BRITAIN.

The claims submitted on the part of Great Britain are for damages sustained by certain of its subjects by reason of the seizure by the United States of cer-

[1] Case of the United States, Appendix, Vol. I, p. 7.
[2] Case of the United States, pp. 286–289.
[3] Ibid., pp. 289–291.

tain vessels alleged to belong to such subjects, and warning certain British vessels engaged in sealing not to enter Bering Sea, and notifying certain other British vessels engaged in the capture of seals in Bering Sea to leave said sea, whereby it is insisted that the owners of such vessels sustained losses and damages, as set forth in the respective claims, these claims being stated in detail in the "Schedule of particulars" of said claims appended to the British Case.

The right and authority of the United States to protect the seal herd which has its home in the Pribilof Islands, and in the exercise of such right to make reprisal of seal skins wrongfully taken, and to seize and, if necessary, forfeit the vessels and other property employed in such unlawful and destructive pursuit, is a necessary incident to the right asserted by the United States to an exclusive property interest in said seals and the industry established at the sealeries.

We, however, preface what we have to submit on this feature of the case by saying that if it shall be held by this tribunal that these seizures and interferences with British vessels were wrong and unjustifiable under the laws and principles applicable thereto, then it would not be becoming in our nation to contest those claims, so far as they are just and within the fair amount of the damages actually sustained by British subjects.

And, even if it shall be decided by this tribunal that the United States were not justifiable, under the circumstances and the law, in making such seizures and interfering with British subjects in the pursuit and capture of fur seals in the Bering Sea, still that decision would furnish no ground for claims based on wholly illegal and untenable grounds, nor for extortionate demands.

The actual damages sustained by these British subjects, in behalf of whom these claims are presented by the British Government, must undoubtedly be finally settled, according to the terms of the treaty, by negotiations hereafter to be had; but, as findings of fact in regard to these claims are asked for, our purpose in this part of the argument is to call attention to some of the elements which go to make up these claims, and show, as we think, conclusively, that such elements can not enter into claims for compensation against the United States under the treaty.

And we contend—

First. That only claims properly due to subjects of Great Britain should be submitted on the part of that nation and findings of facts asked in relation thereto; and in the application of this principle we insist that it is shown by the Counter Case of the United States and the appendix thereto that the schooner *W. P. Sayward* and the steam schooners *Thornton*, *Anna Beck*, *Grace*, and *Dolphin*, with all their supplies and outfits, were in fact owned by one Joseph Boscowitz, a citizen of the United States at the time these vessels were respectively seized by the United States officers;[1] that for some time prior to the fall of 1885 said schooner and steam schooners had been engaged in the sealing business in the joint interest of said Boscowitz and one James Douglas Warren; that Warren had no capital, and, although nominally interested in said vessels and their catch as half owner, yet in fact the money representing his share in the vessels was loaned to him by Boscowitz and secured by mortgages to Boscowitz on the vessels; that in the fall of 1885 Warren became insolvent and made an assignment for the benefit of his creditors, and, in order to transfer the title to these vessels, a sale of them was made under the Boscowitz mortgages, and one Thomas H. Cooper bid the vessels off at such sale for the sum of $1, Cooper being a brother-in-law of Warren and a British subject, residing in San Francisco, Cal.; that on becoming such purchaser Cooper executed mortgages to Boscowitz on the vessels for their full value, which mortgages Boscowitz held at the time of the seizures, the whole transaction being had solely for the purpose of securing a British registration for said vessels, and thereby enabling Boscowitz and Warren to carry on the sealing business under the British flag.[2]

The testimony showing Boscowitz was a citizen of the United States is found in the affidavits of T. T. Williams[3] and a report of Levi W. Myers, United States consul at Victoria, British Columbia, dated November 10, 1892.[4] While the proof as to the relations between Boscowitz and Cooper is found in the deposition of Thomas H. Cooper, the alleged owner of the said vessels;[5] and the relations between Boscowitz and Warren are shown in the testimony of Boscowitz and Warren, and the pleadings and decrees in the case of Warren *vs.* Boscowitz and the cross case of Boscowitz *vs.* Warren in the courts of British Columbia.[6]

The proof also shows that the schooners *Carolina* and *Pathfinder*, with their supplies and outfits, were, in fact, owned at the time they were seized by one A. J. Bechtel, a citizen of the United States (see deposition of W. H. Williams,[7] and a report of Levi W. Myers, United States consul at Victoria, British Columbia[8]), although said vessels were registered in the names of British subjects.[9]

And that the schooners *Alfred Adams*, *Black Diamond*, *and Lily* were in fact owned at the time they were respectively seized by one A. Frank, a citizen of the United States (see deposition of T. T. Williams),[10] although registered in the names of British subjects.[11]

It will be seen by looking over the list of vessels alleged to have been seized or interfered with that the list contains twenty vessels, but that two of the vessels named in that list, the *Triumph* and the *Pathfinder*, were seized or interfered with twice[12]; so that, in fact, the schedule contains the names of only eighteen separate vessels in regard to which claims are made, and of these eighteen, ten of them were owned by citizens of the United States.

It is assumed on the part of the United States that if the proof submitted shows that these ten vessels were really the property of citizens of the United States, although they had a nominal registry in the names of British subjects, such demonstration will be sufficient to justify a finding by the tribunal that no citizen of Great Britain has sustained damage by the seizure of the *Sayward*, *Anna Beck*, *Thornton*, *Grace*, *Dolphin*, *Carolina*, *Pathfinder*, *Alfred Adams*, *Black Diamond*, and *Lily*.

We therefore confidently ask and expect the decision and finding of the tribunal that these claims do not belong to British subjects, and for that reason the tribunal can not be called upon to find any facts respecting them.

To justify a finding upon a claim, it must be made to appear affirmatively, by a clear preponderance of proof, that the claim is owned by one of the Governments parties to this arbitration, or to a citizen or subject of such Government.[13]

[1] Counter Case of the United States, page 30; Appendix, pages 255, 351.
[2] Counter Case of the United States, Appendix, pages 321-325.
[3] Ibid., page 351.
[4] Ibid., page 255.
[5] Ibid., pages 320-325.
[6] Ibid., pages 301-320.
[7] Ibid., page 351.
[8] Ibid., 261.
[9] Case of Her Majesty's Government, Schedule of Claims, pages 1, 40; Counter Case of United States, Appendix, page 256.
[10] Counter Case of United States, Appendix, page 352.
[11] Case of Her Majesty's Government, Schedule of Claims, pages 32, 48, 50.
[12] Ibid., page 1.
[13] Article VIII of Treaty of Arbitration.

We insist that we may, with propriety, go farther and say that if there is even doubt that a claimant is a citizen of the nation that presents a claim in his behalf that doubt should of itself be enough to preclude any finding of facts involved in such claim.

The powers and jurisdiction of this tribunal are delegated to it by the treaty, which is in itself but a contract or agreement, and its terms can not be enlarged or amplified by construction.

In taking this ground we do not intend to cast any aspersion upon the good faith of the British Government or its agent for having presented these claims, as we admit that on the face of the claims as presented they appear to be in favor of British subjects. But we do insist that it is right for this tribunal to go behind the face of the papers and ascertain, from proofs furnished, whether or not the persons to be benefited by the allowance or payment of these claims are in fact British subjects, and that no facts should be found involved in any claim where there is even good ground for doubt that such claim belongs to a British subject.

Second. All these claims but two (the *Triumph*, No. 11,[1] and the *Pathfinder*, No. 20,[2] of schedule) contain an item for "loss of probable catch," "loss of estimated catch," "balance of probable catch," "probable catch," etc.[3]

All of which will more fully appear by the following tabulated statement:

No. 1.	Carolina, estimated catch	$16,667
No. 2.	Thornton, estimated catch	16,667
No. 3.	Onward, estimated catch	16,667
No. 4.	Favorite, estimated loss of catch	7,000
No. 5.	Sayward, probable catch of 1887	19,250
No. 6.	Grace, probable catch	23,100
No. 7.	Anna Beck, probable catch	17,323
No. 8.	Dolphin, probable catch	24,750
No. 9.	Alfred Adams, probable catch	19,250
No. 10.	Ada, probable catch	15,818
No. 12.	Juniata, estimated catch	9,424
No. 13.	Pathfinder, estimated catch	15,363
No. 14.	Triumph, estimated catch	19,424
No. 15.	Black Diamond, estimated catch	16,192
No. 16.	Lily, balance of catch	14,136
No. 17.	Ariel, balance of estimated catch	9,248
No. 18.	Kate, balance of catch	10,960
No. 19.	Minnie, balance of catch	16,112
		357,353

All these items are subject to the objection that they are prospective profits, uncertain and contingent in their nature, and can not be made the basis of a claim for compensation to the owners of these vessels.

In Sedgwick, on the "Measure of damages," page 69, sixth American edition, it is said:

"The early cases in both the English and American courts generally concurred in denying profits as any part of the damage to be compensated, whether in cases of contract or tort."

In a case for illegal capture, where one of the items of the claim for damages was the profits on the voyage broken up by the capture, the court said:

"Independent, however, of all authority, I am satisfied upon principle that an allowance of damages upon the basis of a calculation of profits is inadmissible. The rule would be in the highest degree unfavorable to the interests of the community. The subject would be involved in utter uncertainty. The calculation would proceed upon contingencies and would require a knowledge of foreign markets to an exactness in point of time and value, which would sometimes present embarrassing obstacles. Much would depend upon the length of the voyage and the season of the arrival; much upon the vigilance and activity of the master, and much upon the momentary demand. After all, it would be a calculation upon conjecture and not upon facts."[4]

In the case of the *Amiable Nancy*, Mr. Justice Story, speaking for the United States Supreme Court, said:

"Another item is $3,500 for the loss of the supposed profits of the voyage on which the *Amiable Nancy* was originally bound. In the opinion of the court, this item also was properly rejected. The probable or possible benefits of a voyage as yet in fieri can never afford a safe rule by which to estimate damages in cases of a marine trespass. There is so much uncertainty in the rule itself, so many contingencies which may vary or extinguish its application, and so many difficulties in sustaining its legal correctness, that the court can not believe it proper to entertain it. In several cases in this court the claim for profits has been expressly overruled; and in Del Col *vs.* Arnold (3 Dall., 333) and *The Anna Maria* (2 Wheat., 327) it was, after strict consideration, held that the prime cost, or value of the property lost, at the time of the loss, and in case of injury, the diminution in value by reason of the injury, with interest upon such valuation, afforded the true measure for assessing damages. This rule may not secure a complete indemnity for all possible injuries; but it has certainty and general applicability to recommend it, and, in almost all cases, will give a fair and just recompense."[5]

And in Wood's Mayne on Damages,[6] the author, speaking of damages in cases of tort, says:

"In general, however, injuries to property, where unaccompanied by malice, and especially where they take place under a fancied right, are only visited with damages proportionate to the actual pecuniary loss sustained."

While it is conceded that there has been some relaxation of the rigid rule of the early cases in England and the United States in regard to the allowance of profits as an element for the award of damages or compensation, it is undoubtedly still the rule in both countries that profits can only be allowed as damages where they are in the contemplation of parties, in cases arising on contract, and where they are the necessary and proximate result of the injury in cases of tort, and in those latter cases only where they can be proven or established with substantial certainty.[7]

These vessels were all engaged in a hazardous voyage upon the boisterous waters of the North Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea, subject to all the perils of the sea, and the mind can hardly conceive any event more uncertain and contingent than the number of seals they would have captured if they pursued their voyages unmolested. Shipwreck and every other element of uncertainty, including the proverbial uncertainty which is always an element in fishing and hunting expeditions, would seem to attend all such ventures, and the cogent reasoning of Mr. Justice Story in the cases just cited seems unqualifiedly applicable to the items of "probable catch," etc., presented in this schedule of claims.

The tribunal will bear in mind that the United States do not occupy the position of a tort feasor, subject to exemplary or vindictive damages. "The king [sovereign] can do no wrong." The acts in respect to which compensa-

[1] Case of Her Majesty's Government, Schedule of Claims, page 36.
[2] Ibid., page 57.
[3] Ibid., pages 1-56.
[4] The schooner *Lively*, 1 Gallison, 314.
[5] 3 Wheaton's U. S. Repts., 546; see also Smith *vs.* Coudry, 1 How. U. S. Repts., 28-34.
[6] First American edition, from third English edition, p. 56.
[7] Hadley *vs.* Baxendale, 9 Exch., 341; Masterton *vs.* Mayor of Brooklyn, 7 Hill, 62.

tion is asked in behalf of these British subjects were performed by the United States in the exercise of its sovereignty, and the execution of its statutory laws, and no malice or other unjust motive can be imputed to those acts.

Among the claims presented by the United States in behalf of its citizens to the Tribunal of Arbitration upon the *Alabama* claims, which met at Geneva in 1872, under the treaty between Great Britain and the United States, were a large number of claims like those now under consideration, for the prospective earnings of ships destroyed by the rebel cruisers in the late civil war of the United States, and that tribunal, by the unanimous vote of its members, said in regard to such claims:

"And whereas prospective earnings can not properly be made the subject of compensation inasmuch as they depend in their nature upon future and uncertain contingencies, the tribunal is unanimously of opinion that there is no ground for awarding to the United States any sum by way of indemnity under this head."[1]

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rule of decision adopted in the case of the *Alabama* claims is well established in the jurisprudence of the two nations now at the bar of this high tribunal; and in the light of the authorities cited the undersigned respectfully insists that the items in these claims for "probable catch," "estimated catch," etc., which amount in the aggregate to over two-thirds of the grand total of the claims presented, must be considered as wholly speculative and so uncertain that Great Britain is not entitled to any finding as to any fact involved therein, except the fact of their uncertainty, which appears on the face of the claims themselves.

In the claims growing out of the seizures of the *Carolina*, *Thornton*, *Onward*, *Sayward*, *Grace*, *Anna Beck*, *Dolphin*, and *Ada* there are also items for the future earnings of those vessels,[2] namely:

No. 1, Carolina, seized 1886:	
Claims for earnings in 1887	$5,000
Claims for earnings in 1888	5,000
No. 2, Thornton, seized in 1886:	
Claims for estimated loss to owner by detention in 1887	5,000
Claims for estimated loss to owner by detention in 1888	5,000
No. 3, Onward, seized in 1886:	
Claims reasonable profit for season of 1887	5,000
Claims reasonable profit for season of 1888	5,000
No. 5, Sayward, seized in 1887:	
Claims for earnings in coasting trade in fall of 1887	1,200
Earnings for season of 1888	6,000
No. 6, Grace, seized in 1887:	
Claims for probable earnings in fall of 1887	2,000
Claims for probable earnings in season of 1888	7,000
No. 7, Anna Beck, seized in 1887:	
Claims for probable earnings in coasting trade in fall of 1887	2,000
For probable net earnings in season of 1888	6,000
No. 8, Dolphin, seized in 1887:	
Claims for probable earnings in fall of 1887	2,000
Claims for probable net earnings in season of 1888	7,000
No. 10, Ada, seized in 1887:	
Probable earnings in fall of 1887	2,000
Probable earnings for season of 1888	6,000
Total	71,200

These items, it will be noticed, are in addition to the items of "probable catch" or "estimated catch" for the seasons in which the respective vessels were seized.

Nothing can more fully illustrate the wholly speculative character of this class of claims than a consideration of these items in the light of the indisputable facts.

The *Carolina*, *Thornton*, *Onward*, *Grace*, *Anna Beck*, *Dolphin*, and *Ada* were seized and decrees of forfeiture rendered against them by the United States district court for the district of Alaska, and the *Carolina*, *Onward*, and *Thornton* were left to go to pieces in the harbor of Unalaska;[3] and the *Dolphin*, *Grace*, *Anna Beck*, and *Ada* were sold under decrees of that court, while the *Sayward* was released on a bond given by her owners a year or more after the decree of forfeiture was entered.

These seizures were in effect a conversion of these vessels at the time of the seizure, and, with the exception of the *Sayward*, their capacity to earn anything for their owners ended with the seizure. The measure of compensation to the owners was therefore the value of the property taken at the time it was taken, perhaps with interest from the time of taking. The owners were dispossessed by the seizure, and their interest in the property merged in their claim for compensation, if they have any such claim; and no claim can therefore accrue to them for the possible future earnings of the vessels.[4]

In Sutherland on Damages, Volume I, page 173 (now a standard authority in the courts of the United States), the rule is stated as follows:

"The value of the property constitutes the measure or an element of damages in a great variety of cases both of tort and contract; and where there are no such aggravations as call for or justify exemplary damages, in actions in which such damages are recoverable the value is ascertained and adopted as the measure of compensation for being deprived of the property, the same in actions of tort as in actions upon contract. In both cases the value is the legal and fixed measure of damages and not discretionary with the jury. * * * And, moreover, the value is fixed in each instance on similar considerations at the time when, by the defendant's fault, the loss culminates. (Grand Tower Co. *vs.* Phillips, 23 Wall., 471; Owen *vs.* Routh, 14 C. B., 327.)"

To recapitulate: None of the items of these several claims for "estimated catch" or "probable catch" for the season or voyage in which the seizures took place can be considered, because they are in the nature of prospective profits and fall within the rule adopted by the tribunal in the Alabama Claims and the other authorities cited; and all the items for the probable earnings of these arrested vessels subsequent to the seizure fall within the same objection of uncertainty and contingency, and the further objection that the conversion of the property was completed by the seizure and the owners' only remedy was for the value of the property so seized at the time of the seizure.

But if the tribunal for any reasons shall deem itself required to pass upon these items or find any facts involved therein, except that of their invalidity, we then briefly submit that the "estimated" and "probable catches" are altogether overstated and extravagant.

In the declaration of James Douglas Warren, in support of the claims in behalf of the alleged owner of the *Sayward*, *Anna Beck*, *Grace*, and *Dolphin*, he states that the estimate is made on the basis of 350 skins taken by each boat and canoe for the full season.[1]

In the report of the British commissioners, forming part of the British case,[2] it is shown that the average catch per canoe or boat for the British sealers for the same year was 164 seals, or less than one-half of Captain Warren's average; and in the same paragraph the British commissioners say:

"The actual success of individual sealing vessels of course depends so largely upon the good fortune or good judgment which may enable them to fall in with and follow considerable bodies of seals, as well as on the weather experienced, that the figures representing the catch compared to the boats or whole number of men employed constitute a more trustworthy criterion than any general statements."[3]

We may, therefore, safely say that if conjecture, based upon any rule of averages, is to be resorted to for the purpose of attempting to approximate the probable catches of these vessels, the British Commissioners have given far more reliable data than that furnished by these claimants.

The fallacy of these "estimates" is also shown in another way. We open the Schedule of the British Claims at random and take the claim growing out of the seizure of the *Minnie*, No. 19.[4] It seems, from the declaration accompanying the claim that she left Victoria the fore part of May on a sealing voyage in the North Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea. She entered Bering Sea on the 27th of June, at which time she had caught 150 seals. She hunted seals in the Bering Sea until July 15, during which time she had taken 270 skins, which was at the rate of 15 skins per day. She was seized on the 15th of July, leaving her sixteen days of July and sixteen in August, making thirty-two days in all of her sealing season, during which time she would have caught, at the rate of 15 per day, 480 seals, to which adding the 420 she had taken previously, makes a total catch for the sealing season of 900, while her "estimated catch" is 2,500 seals for the season.

Take also the claim of the *Ada*, No. 10.[5] She entered Bering Sea, as is shown by the declaration accompanying the claim, about the 16th day of July, 1887, and continued sealing in the said sea until the 25th day of August, which was beyond the time when skins taken are considered merchantable,[6] and within two weeks of the time when, as the British Commissioners admit,[7] the sealing season closes, and yet her entire catch up to that time was only 1,876 skins, while the "estimated" or "probable catch" is put at 2,876.

The value and tonnage of these vessels are also largely overstated, as is shown by the tables submitted with the Counter Case of the United States,[8] and the value of several of the vessels seized was ascertained by sworn appraisers of the district court of Alaska and shown to be much lower than the value stated in this schedule of claims.[9] That these appraisals were fair and showed the substantial and fair value of the property is evidenced by the fact that, although the owners of the vessels had the privilege of releasing them upon bonds, none of them, except the *Sayward*, were so released, although application was made to have their valuation reduced in order that the owners might give bonds.[10]

We might follow the analysis of different items of these claims and successfully show that they are all very much exaggerated, but do not deem it necessary to do so, because we feel sure the members of this tribunal will take notice of the fact that individuals in making claims against a Government, whether it be their own or a foreign Government, invariably expand these claims to the largest amount their consciences will possibly tolerate.

H. W. BLODGETT.

APPENDIX No. 3.

No. 129.

Mr. Foster to Mr. Gresham.

AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris, August 17, 1893.

SIR: In fulfillment of what I regard as my duty before terminating my services as agent, to wit, to place my Government in possession of all information I have acquired which may be useful in future negotiations or action connected with the fur-seal arbitration, I direct attention to the subject of the British claims for damages on account of the seizure of certain vessels in Bering Sea in 1886, 1887, and 1889.

It will be seen from the decision of the tribunal that a finding of facts, agreed upon by counsel, was rendered in accordance with Article VIII of the treaty. This finding will be found to relate entirely to the facts of the seizures, and, as agreed to by counsel, did not in any manner involve the question of liability or the value or ownership of the vessels. By reference to Protocol XXX, of May 31, it will be seen that the British Government has withdrawn all claim for damages under Article V of the modus vivendi of 1892. In further confirmation of this I inclose the statement of the British consul before the tribunal on the subject.

In view of these facts it would seem that the only question of damages open for the consideration of the two Governments was that arising out of the seizure of vessels in Bering Sea. The claims on this account as presented by the British Government will be found in the schedule of claims annexed to and bound with the British Case, and on page 315 of the British Counter Case.

The defense of the United States, so far as it was thought necessary to make one under Article VIII of the treaty, will be found in the United States Counter Case, pages 129 to 135, and the evidence there cited, contained in the appendix thereto, as also in the printed United States Argument, pages 215 to 227.

The total amount of the British claim, as presented at page 60 of the Schedule of Claims, is $439,171, of which $357,353 consists of a claim for prospective earnings, which I suggest can not be properly asserted, for the reasons set forth in the United States Argument.

It will appear from an examination of the evidence in the case and counter case of the United States that most of the vessels appear in reality to be the property of American citizens. Further and more searching investigation may show that others of the vessels were the property of our citizens. In this connection I refer to a correspondence at Paris had by me with the British agent in reference to the citizenship of Boscowitz, owner or mortgagee of several of these vessels.

I also inclose a memorandum in regard to the value of several of the seized vessels, which may be of service in the further examination of these claims.

---

[1] Geneva Arbitration, Congressional publication, Volume IV, page 53; see also Wheaton's International Law (Boyd's third English edition), section 539 *t*, page 592.

[2] Case of Her Majesty's Government, Schedule of Claims, pages 5, 9, 14, 19, 23, 27, 31, 36.

[3] Declarations of James Douglas Warner, case of Her Majesty's Government, Schedule of Claims, pages 3, 6, 12.

[4] Sedgwick on Measure of Damages, 6th ed., 583; Conrad *vs.* Pacific Insurance Company, 6 Peters U.S., 262-282; The Ann Caroline, 2 Wall., 22 U.S., 538; Smith et al *vs.* Coudry, 1 How. U.S., 28-34; Wood's Mayne on Damages, 3d Eng. and 1st Am. ed., page 486.

[1] Case of Her Majesty's Government, Schedule of Claims, pages 18, 22, 25, 29.

[2] Report of Br. Com., section 407, pages 74.

[3] Report of Br. Com., pages 73, section 407.

[4] Case of Her Majesty's Government, Schedule of Claims, page 56.

[5] Ibid., page 34.

[6] Counter Case of the United States, Appendix, pages 357, 376, 384.

[7] Report of Br. Com., section 212.

[8] Counter Case of the United States, Appendix, pages 339 et seq.

[9] Ibid., pages 329-338.

[10] Senate Document 106, Fiftieth Congress, second session, pages 28, 74.

Mr. Robert Lansing, associate counsel in the arbitration, made a visit in 1892 to Victoria and San Francisco for the purpose of collecting evidence in relation to this branch of the case, and I have no doubt he would cheerfully go to Washington at any time, if you or the person having charge of the Government's interests in this matter should think it desirable to confer with him.

I am, etc.,

JOHN W. FOSTER.

Mr. MORGAN. I am sorry to detain the Senate at such an unreasonable hour, but unless some Senator desires to debate the resolution I ask that it may be now voted on.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. Let it be again read.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to have the resolution read again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will again be read.

The resolution was again read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. I beg leave to place on file the correspondence respecting claims for compensation on account of British vessels seized in Bering Sea by United States cruisers, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so referred in the absence of objection.

Mr. PUGH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 10, 1895, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 9, 1895.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

H. Clay Armstrong, jr., of Alabama, formerly consul at Grenoble, France, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Madrid, Spain, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Stephen Bonsal, appointed second secretary of the legation to Japan.

Stephen Bonsal, of Maryland, formerly secretary of legation to Spain, to be second secretary of the legation of the United States to Japan, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Joseph R. Herod, promoted to be secretary of that legation.

Joseph R. Herod, of Indiana, formerly second secretary of the legation of the United States to Japan, to be secretary of that legation, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Edwin Dun, appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Japan.

Charles Ritchie Simpkins, of Massachusetts, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to Chile, vice Owen McGarr, appointed consul at Cienfuegos, Cuba.

CONSULS.

John T. Barron, of New York, to be consul of the United States at St. Johns, Newfoundland, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Sam Ryan, resigned.

Richard M. Bartleman, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Antigua, West Indies, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice James C. Fox, deceased.

Horatio R. Bigelow, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Rouen, France, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Charles P. Williams, resigned.

James B. Coffin, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at St. Helena, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice H. Christian Borstel, recalled.

James F. Connelly, of New Jersey, to be consul of the United States at Osaka and Hiogo, Japan, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Enoch J. Smithers, deceased.

Andrew F. Fay, of Illinois, to be consul of the United States at Denia, Spain, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Henry R. D. MacIver, resigned.

Frank D. Hill, of Minnesota, to be consul of the United States at La Guayra, Venezuela, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Allen Thomas, appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Venezuela.

Carl Bailey Hurst, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Prague, Bohemia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Charles Jonas, transferred to the consulate at Crefeld, Germany.

Charles Jonas, of Wisconsin, to be consul of the United States at Crefeld, Germany, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Carl Bailey Hurst, appointed consul at Prague, Bohemia.

Owen McGarr, of Tennessee, to be consul of the United States at Cienfuegos, Cuba, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice James H. Dinsmore, resigned.

William E. Mantius, of New York, formerly commercial agent at Turin, Italy, to be consul of the United States at that place, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

R. Dorsey Mohun, of the District of Columbia, formerly commercial agent at Boma, to be consul of the United States at Zanzibar, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill a vacancy.

Albert E. Morlan, of Louisiana, to be consul of the United States at Belize, British Honduras, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Fred. Ellison, resigned.

Otto Munchmeyer, of West Virginia, to be consul of the United States at San Salvador, Salvador, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Frederick Munchmeyer, deceased.

Julius G. Tucker, of Texas, to be consul of the United States at Martinique, West Indies, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John B. Laguaite, resigned.

CHIEF JUSTICE, COURT OF PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS.

Joseph R. Reed, of Iowa, to be chief justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term beginning at the expiration of his present term, on the 31st day of December, A. D. 1895, and expiring on the 31st day of December, A. D. 1897.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICES, COURT OF PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS.

Thomas C. Fuller, of North Carolina, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term beginning at the expiration of his present term, on the 31st day of December, A. D. 1895, and expiring on the 31st day of December, A. D. 1897.

William W. Murray, of Tennessee, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term beginning at the expiration of his present term, on the 31st day of December, A. D. 1895, and expiring on the 31st day of December, A. D. 1897.

Henry C. Sluss, of Kansas, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term beginning at the expiration of his present term, on the 31st day of December, A. D. 1895, and expiring on the 31st day of December, A. D. 1897.

Wilbur F. Stone, of Colorado, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term beginning at the expiration of his present term, on the 31st day of December, A. D. 1895, and expiring on the 31st day of December, A. D. 1897.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 9, 1895.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT.

Rufus W. Peckham, of New York, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

SOLICITOR FOR DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Walter E. Faison, of North Carolina, to be Solicitor for the Department of State.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Elmer B. Adams, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 9, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

SECTION 2601, REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] presents a proposition, which will be read, after which he asks unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, before it is read I desire to make the same inquiry that I made on Friday last in relation to a resolution offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER]. I am wholly unacquainted with the contents of the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Illinois, as I was with the purpose of the one submitted by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I desire to ask the Chair now, as I did in that case, whether the reading of the proposition to the House necessarily carries it into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that this is a business proposition.

Mr. CRISP. I will merely add that my inquiry was directed to the practice and not to the proposition itself.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2601, Revised Statutes, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 2601. There shall be, in the States of Indiana and Illinois, one collection district, as follows: The district of Chicago, to comprise the State of Illinois and the waters and shores of Lake Michigan within the State of Indiana, in which Chicago shall be the port of entry, and Waukegan and Michigan City ports of delivery: *Provided*, That all present ports of delivery in the State of Illinois now a part of the New Orleans district shall be ports of delivery in the new district of Illinois, and shall have all privileges which they have under existing law."

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, that ought to go to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman hear me a moment before he objects?

The SPEAKER. With the consent of the House the gentleman from Illinois can be heard, and then the question of objection can be submitted.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire especially to call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to this section of the statutes as it stands now. It is as follows:

There shall be in the State of Indiana and Illinois one collection district, as follows: The district of Chicago, to comprise all the waters and shores of Lake Michigan within the States of Indiana and Illinois, in which Chicago shall be the port of entry and Waukegan and Michigan City the ports of delivery.

Now, under that statute the district of which Chicago is the port of entry does not comprise the whole State of Illinois, and my reason for offering this bill at the present time is this: The Chicago and Aurora Smelting Company have occasion to import large quantities of ore from Canada and Mexico; their warehouse is at Aurora, 36 miles from Chicago. Under the existing law the collection port for Aurora is New Orleans. The object of this bill is simply that the collection district of which Chicago is the port of entry shall be extended over the State of Illinois, without making any other change whatever. It is not proposed to create any new office or to make any other change in existing law than to permit those people who are smelting and refining at Aurora to pay their collection dues at the city of Chicago. This matter has been brought to the attention of the Treasury Department, and the officials there concur fully in the propriety of passing the bill I have presented. This morning I submitted the matter both to the collection department and also to Mr. Hamlin, who gave me permission to state to the Speaker and to members of the House that the measure meets his full approval.

Mr. McMILLIN. I wish to ask one question, because I was not able to hear very distinctly the gentleman's explanation. Does this bill add to the collection district of which Chicago is the port of entry any other territory than that connected with the smelting works of which the gentleman speaks?

Mr. HOPKINS. It extends the district so as to include within its limits the State of Illinois. This has been done at the suggestion of the Treasury Department, the officers of which thought that this change would be much better for the business of the Department than to attempt to carve out a small piece of territory within the immediate vicinity of the port of Chicago.

Mr. McMILLIN. The portion of territory referred to has been connected heretofore, as I understand, with the New Orleans district?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir. As the gentleman understands, under the law passed many years ago the collection district of New Orleans took in all the territory from that city clear up into Wisconsin; and when the port of Chicago was created its collection district was limited to the waters adjacent to Lake Michigan. Aurora is located some miles away on the Fox River, which empties into the Illinois River, and that into the Mississippi. Under existing circumstances these persons doing business at Aurora must stop their business unless they can have the privilege of paying their dues at Chicago, where their main office is.

Mr. McMILLIN. I will ask the gentleman whether the passage of this bill is likely to necessitate the opening of new offices or to increase the number of officers?

Mr. HOPKINS. Not at all. There will be no increase in the present number of officers.

Mr. COBB of Missouri. I wish to ask whether this bill includes southern Illinois?

Mr. HOPKINS. It takes in the State of Illinois, but it will not interfere with the port of delivery at Cairo.

Mr. COBB of Missouri. It does not interfere with the port of St. Louis?

Mr. HOPKINS. No, not at all. The only change would be that those ports of delivery would be in the new district, instead of the old one. They are not interfered with at all. That was a matter to which the Secretary called my attention specially; and the gentleman will see by the reading of the bill that those ports are to have the same powers and privileges that they have under existing law.

Mr. COBB of Missouri. The bill will not interfere in any respect with the existing ports?

Mr. HOPKINS. None whatever.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 803) was read a first and second time, and ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HOPKINS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

QUALIFICATION OF A MEMBER.

Mr. CRISP. I desire to call attention to the fact that Mr. Price, a member-elect from the State of Louisiana, is now present and would like to take the oath of office.

Mr. Andrew Price, a Representative-elect from the Third district of Louisiana, came forward and was duly qualified by taking the oath of office prescribed by law.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES OF THE GOVERNMENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts and expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

INTERNATIONAL WATER BOUNDARY COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of State, relating to an additional appropriation required by the International Water Boundary Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM OF DANIEL S. LOY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of an appropriation of $210 submitted by the Secretary of the Navy to pay Daniel S. Loy for three 11-inch shot manufactured for the use of the Navy in 1862; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

BOUNDARY LINE BETWEEN ALASKA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of State, submitting an estimate of appropriation for survey of the boundary line between Alaska and British Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the annual report of the Postmaster-General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOLDIERS' HOME.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from Gen. W. B. Franklin, transmitting the annual report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KULP, for this day, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following requests for the withdrawal of papers:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, to take from the files of the House the pension papers in the case of Miss Annie Beach.

By Mr. BURRELL, to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Mrs. Fannie Pemberton.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, before consent is given to withdraw from the files of the House these papers, I wish to ask if there has been any adverse action taken by the committee upon them? I refer more particularly to the second request, the first one being, as I understand it, merely a pension claim.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In the first case, Mr. Speaker, the request I have myself submitted, I understand that the report was favorable, but the bill was not acted upon during the session by the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. How with reference to the second case?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no knowledge with reference to that case.

Mr. DINGLEY. My inquiry was in order that we might have a rule in the beginning of this matter, so that where there is an adverse decision by the committee there should be left copies of the papers when withdrawn. If there has been no adverse decision, or if the report was favorable, there would be no objection, of course, to the withdrawal of papers without leaving copies.

I merely call the attention of the Chair to the matter at this time in order that the same rule may be applied in all such cases.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that these requests are only granted by unanimous consent, and if the gentleman from Maine objects, of course that ends the matter.

Mr. DINGLEY. I do not object. I presume that there has been no adverse decision in either of these cases. My only object was to fix some rule, so that copies may be preserved of all papers where there has been an adverse adjudication on the part of the committees. It is only proper that some such measure of protection should be established on behalf of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The usual form, the Chair is advised, is to add to the request to withdraw papers the words "no adverse report has been made."

Is there objection to the request submitted?

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the second request go over until to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The second request is objected to. Is there objection to the other?

There was no objection?

SALARIES, ASSISTANTS IN DOCUMENT ROOM.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration; and ask to make a brief explanation pending the request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania desires to present a resolution, which will be reported by the Clerk, and then asks permission to explain briefly the object of the resolution before unanimous consent is asked for its consideration. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas under the provisions of section 60 of an act entitled "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, the office of superintendent of the document room and two laborers in the document room under the Clerk of the House have been abolished, and the duties heretofore performed by them have devolved upon the superintendent of the document room, and his assistants under the Doorkeeper, who are unable to perform the additional duties imposed by said act; and

Whereas said sixtieth section of said act directs the Doorkeeper to appoint the necessary number of assistants to the superintendent of the document room; and

Whereas the Doorkeeper deems it necessary to appoint three additional assistants to properly perform the additional duties imposed under said act—one assistant at $1,600 per annum, one at $1,200 per annum, and one at $1,000 per annum, which salaries aggregate the same as those of the officers abolished by said act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House, be and he hereby is, directed to pay the salaries of the said assistants to the superintendent of the document room, as above designated and appointed by the Doorkeeper, out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided for by law.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, prior to the passage of the printing and binding bill of January 12, 1895, there were two document rooms, one under the Clerk of the House and one in the office of the Doorkeeper. The pay of one of the assistants in the office of the Clerk was $2,000 per annum, and there were two laborers or assistants, at $900 each, aggregating $3,800. The document room in the Doorkeeper's department consisted of the superintendent of documents and one assistant.

The bill known as the printing and binding bill, passed in the last Congress, abolished the document room in the office of the Clerk and placed the duties performed theretofore in that office upon the officials in charge of the document room in the Doorkeeper's office, and directed the Doorkeeper to appoint the necessary number of assistants to perform the duties of the office. This act went into effect on the 2d day of December, a week ago to-day.

Mr. DINGLEY. A year ago?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. A week ago to-day, on the 2d of December, 1895; and of course the Doorkeeper of the last House did not appoint these assistants. Consequently the appropriation bill for this part of the fiscal year did not carry any appropriation for the payment of these assistants. Now, the fact is that all the work heretofore performed by both document rooms falls on two men in the Doorkeeper's department, the superintendent and one assistant, and they are utterly unable to perform the duties. The Doorkeeper deems it necessary to appoint three assistants, but there is no provision for their compensation, unless by resolution such as I have sent to the Clerk's desk. Of course you can refer this to the Committee on Accounts, and by virtue of the last legislative bill the Committee on Accounts holds over until a new Committee on Accounts is appointed—and that is probably the proper course to take—but it seems to me that the matter might as well be disposed of now, unless some one is not satisfied with the merits, importance, and necessity of the resolution. Of course I can not object if it is desired to refer the resolution to the Committee on Accounts, but it seems to me it is a matter that ought to pass on its merits.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me to suggest that this question was considered by the subcommittee having in charge the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill at the last session. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], as I remember, paid some attention to it, as I myself did, in connection with other members of that subcommittee, and our purpose was to provide an ample force for the discharge of this public duty. We thought we had done so, and as I recall it, we gave the estimate of the last Doorkeeper. Now, I do not propose to object to anything that may be desired on the other side in the matter of providing a sufficient force for the conduct of the business of the House, but will suggest to the gentleman whether, at this early stage of the session, it would not be better to refer this proposition to a committee, the responsibility of course being on our friends across the aisle.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I will ask the Clerk to read section 60 of the printing and binding bill, which will, perhaps, better explain the situation than I can myself. The force was provided for in that section, but it could not be brought about until now.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 60. There shall be one document room of the Senate and one of the House of Representatives, to be designated, respectively, the "Senate and House document room." Each shall be in charge of a superintendent, who shall be appointed by the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate and the Doorkeeper of the House, respectively, who shall also appoint the necessary number of assistants: *Provided*, That this section shall not take effect until the first day of the first session of the Fifty-fourth Congress.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. You will observe that by this section the Doorkeeper is directed to appoint the necessary number of assistants. Now, of course he could not do that until this bill went into force. It did not go into force until last Monday, and unless additional assistants are appointed the whole of this work that has heretofore been performed by five men will fall upon two men. Undoubtedly, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] says, it was the intention to provide a sufficient force, but in the way that I have indicated, and in the way that I have suggested by this resolution. There is no other way.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the gentleman will allow me, as I understand it, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill appropriates for the House force by name. Now, in every case where there is an appropriation there can be an official without further action by the House; but if I understand the gentleman aright, the printing bill that was passed under the leadership of the economical gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] in the last session of the last Congress makes it necessary to increase the force by the three officials referred to in the resolution, who are to be paid from the contingent fund. Now, I am not advised as to whether that is necessary or not, and while I have every confidence in the judgment and statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE], I should be glad to have the views of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], under whose leadership this economical printing bill was passed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I have been named by the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], I suppose it is necessary that I should say a word. The gentleman from Illinois assumes that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] has said that there has been an increase of three employees made necessary by reason of the economical bill to which he refers. Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] failed to state that that bill abolished the same number of employees as are included in this increase which is now asked. Therefore there is no real increase, and the gentleman must not assume, it seems to me, that the bill has made any increase in appropriations. Now, what I arise for, after mentioning that fact, is to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] if he deems it necessary to increase this force so far as messengers are concerned? The printing bill in the sixtieth section did abolish the Clerk's document room, and transferred whatever duties the superintendent had to the superintendent of the Doorkeeper's document room. Now, it may increase the clerical work of the Doorkeeper's document room, where this extra work is transferred, but I do not see how it increases his messengers.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. This resolution does not increase the messengers.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood the resolution to call for an increase in the messengers.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It does not. Let that part of the resolution be read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the resolution again.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman can state it.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The document room in the Clerk's department consisted of a superintendent at $2,000 and two assistants at $900. The document room in the Doorkeeper's department consisted of a superintendent and one assistant only. This printing and binding bill abolished the Clerk's document room and

abolished these three offices. This resolution asks to pay three assistants designated by the Doorkeeper as assistants to the superintendent of the document room in the Doorkeeper's department at the same salary that the other three had in the Clerk's department. That is all.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The inquiry which I was propounding was whether the gentleman thought that the increase was necessary in the Doorkeeper's document room.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It occurred to me that there was so little work done in the Clerk's document room that it ought never to have been maintained.

Now, I appeal to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], or any gentleman who has had experience with the Clerk's document room, to tell us why it was ever necessary that there should be two document rooms, one under the Clerk and one under the Doorkeeper. I doubt whether members who have had ten years' experience here can tell what documents they have received from the Clerk's document room in contradistinction from those which they have received from the Doorkeeper's document room; and the gentlemen who framed that printing bill—three Senators and three Members of the House—thought that there should be one document room attached to the House, as there is to the Senate, and believing that, we recommended the abolition of the Clerk's document room and the transfer of the work to the Doorkeeper's document room in the interest of economy. I do not think it necessary to keep as many employees under the Doorkeeper as we had under him and the Clerk in the aggregate, but I do admit it to be necessary to make some increase in the Doorkeeper's force in the document room, and that is the object of my inquiry, to know if the gentleman from Pennsylvania thinks these additional assistants are necessary.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do; and I get that from conversation with the present Doorkeeper of the House, with the Doorkeeper of the last House, and with the superintendent, Mr. Hanna. He informs me that these three men are necessary, and that the present force can not possibly do the work without them.

Mr. DINGLEY. If the gentleman will permit me?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. DINGLEY. Of course it is understood that the Clerk's document room was retained for the purpose of distributing documents which came especially to the Clerk, like the Journal. I do not know as to the other general documents sent to members, but my recollection is that the force in the Clerk's document room was reduced in the last legislative appropriation bill in accordance with the printing act somewhat. I appeal to the recollection of the chairman of the subcommittee in the last House.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is true; and we gave, as I remember, the estimate of the Doorkeeper. The estimate was a reduction on account of the operation of the printing bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. I remember the Clerk came before the committee and insisted that the reduction made was greater than it should be, but nevertheless the reduction was made.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. You wiped it out altogether as to these men.

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, what I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania is whether or no, if his resolution should be adopted, it would increase in the aggregate the House force as it was in the last Congress.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It would neither increase it a man nor a dollar, neither in numbers nor compensation. It is the same thing exactly.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman will remember that the printing act transfers a part of the work to the Government Printing Office.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes, sir. It also directs the Doorkeeper to name his assistants, and that is simply what I want to secure by this resolution.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say, with the consent of the gentleman, speaking for myself only in the matter, that I can not consent to the increase of a single official in connection with the House unless there shall be shown to be a necessity for it which has not existed previously. My own judgment is that we have a very large force in connection with this House, and I will not agree to increase the number a single man unless some special necessity shall arise.

Now, if there is no increase of force proposed by this resolution, if it is simply a readjustment, without any increase, then, of course, I have no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It is simply a readjustment.

Mr. DINGLEY. I should, however, prefer to see this resolution go to the Committee on Accounts, in order that the matter might be properly examined and our force adjusted so that we should be certain that there would be no increase, and possibly that there would be some reduction.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Even if there were some increase I should not object; but in the meantime here are only two men to handle all these documents, and they say that they can not do it. There were five employees for this purpose in the last House, while now there are only two. This resolution simply fixes the compensation of three assistants that the Doorkeeper desires to appoint.

Mr. DINGLEY. Has not a part of that work been transferred to the Government Printing Office, so that now there is not so much work to be done by these employees as there was before the passage of the printing bill?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. No, sir; there is just as much work as there was before.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will say to the gentleman from Maine that no transfer of any part of the work was made by the bill.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The printing bill contemplates this action being taken, because it says, "who shall appoint the necessary number of assistants." The bill assumed that there was not a sufficient force in the document department of the Doorkeeper's office.

Mr. DINGLEY. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I accept the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE], that there is no increase of force proposed by this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. As I have already said, there is not the increase of a man or a dollar.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, while I am not going to object if, as I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania to say, there is no increase here proposed, still I do understand that the abolition of force in the Clerk's document room made by the printing act, which was to result in a great saving, amounts to nothing, and that after that act has gone into effect this resolution is found to be necessary, which proposes to provide for precisely the same number of employees that existed there prior to the abolition.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is correct.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to withdraw the statement which he made in his opening remarks, that this resolution would increase expenses. He now concedes, as I understand, that there is no increase.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not know. I have been trying to find that out from my economical friend from Tennessee. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I simply wished to know whether the gentleman did not accept the assurance of his distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE], that the resolution would make no increase.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, yes; and I also accept the assurance of my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] that it makes no increase.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand this matter, the reduction of expenses which was made by the economical printing measure passed by a Democratic House last year is now about to be nullified by this Republican House, at the beginning of this Congress. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

HOUSE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That from and after this date, under direction of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, Isaac R. Hill be authorized to act as an assistant doorkeeper, at a compensation at the rate of $1,500 per annum; that Thomas A. Coakley and George L. Browning be authorized to act as special messengers of the House of Representatives at a compensation at the rate of $1,200 per annum each; and that James F. English be authorized to act as a chief page of the House of Representatives at a compensation at the rate of $900 per annum; the said compensation of said employees to be paid from the contingent fund until otherwise provided.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SAYERS. One moment, Mr. Speaker. I will state to the House that this resolution provides for the same amount of force that was allowed to the minority in the last Congress.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is correct.

Mr. SAYERS. I will add that the intimation was made to the minority in the present House that if they would select their men the majority would accept them and provide for their compensation out of the contingent fund.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will ask the gentleman from Texas whether these are the names that have been agreed upon by the Democratic caucus?

Mr. SAYERS. Yes.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is the proposed compensation the same as before?

Mr. SAYERS. Just the same, I am informed.

Mr. DINGLEY. I notice that in the last House the designation was "special employee," while in this resolution it is "assistant doorkeeper." Does that carry any increase of compensation?

Mr. SAYERS. No, sir. My understanding is that Mr. Hill received $1,500 in the last Congress.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then the change is only in the designation, not in the compensation.

Mr. SAYERS. Not in the compensation. I understand, also, that the compensation was the same in the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this resolution is offered in pursuance of a custom which has prevailed for many years, of allowing the minority a certain number of employees.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I would like to know why the designation is changed to "assistant doorkeeper?"

Mr. SAYERS. Because this gentleman has always performed the duties of that position. By this resolution we are but specifying in this Congress the places which were actually filled by the minority in the Fifty-second Congress, and also by the minority in the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. Was the same designation used in the Fifty-first Congress?

Mr. SAYERS. I so understand.

Mr. DINGLEY. I suggest that the gentleman from Texas adopt the same designation which was used in the resolution adopted by the last House, "special employee," instead of assistant doorkeeper.

Mr. SAYERS. I have no objection to that.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now, I wish to ask a question. Is it understood that Mr. Coakley is to be one of these special employees?

Mr. SAYERS. It is.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Is not Mr. Coakley now upon the annual roll under regular appropriation?

Mr. SAYERS. But my understanding is that he will take his place under this resolution, instead of continuing to hold upon the annual roll. We supposed, of course, that the majority would displace Mr. Coakley as an employee on the annual roll and put one of their own men in that position.

Several MEMBERS. Very likely! [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. As I understand, this is an increase——

Mr. SAYERS. No; this is just the same number of officers that were allowed the minority in the last Congress.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, I have here the resolution of the last Congress, allowing officers to the minority. It names George Jenison, $1,200; E. L. Currier, $1,200, and Bert Kennedy, $900.

Mr. SAYERS. Then Mr. Chancey, as the gentleman will remember, was put on at $1,500.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. But John Chancey has been appropriated for regularly——

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly, but for the benefit of the minority.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. For the last twenty years. He is now on the regular roll.

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly, and always at the request of the minority.

I wish to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I believe it was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] who approached me and said that four places would be allowed the minority, as had been done in the last Congress; and he also assured me that if the minority would select the persons to fill those places, the majority would approve them.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I think I did say that, after talking with some of our "watch dogs of the Treasury" on this side of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I concede the propriety of allowing certain special employees who will be in harmony with the minority. That courtesy has ordinarily been extended; and I do not wish it to be understood that I am now going to object to it. But I do say that the men who are now being paid from the contingent fund under the resolution of the last Congress, which recognized these designations by the minority, are three: Jenison, $1,200; Currier, $1,200; Kennedy, $900.

Mr. SAYERS. No man knows better than the gentleman from Illinois that Mr. Chancey was provided for by the majority in the Fifty-second Congress at the special request of the minority.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am not raising any question about that just at this time. I may speak of that later on. I am not antagonizing the gentleman's proposition; but I want the matter understood.

Mr. SAYERS. I desire to modify my resolution by inserting after the words "twelve hundred dollars" the word "each," so as to read "$1,200 each."

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose the gentleman's resolution in its present form uses the designation "special employees."

Mr. SAYERS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have sent to the Clerk's desk an amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I suggest to the gentleman not to offer his proposition as an amendment to this resolution. If we are going to do a graceful thing toward the minority, let us do it; and then let the proposition of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] come up afterwards.

Mr. TAWNEY. My proposition would not change the terms of the resolution of the gentleman from Texas, but would simply add an amendment. But I withhold it for the present.

Mr. STALLINGS. I desire to offer a resolution.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move the previous question.

Several MEMBERS. Too late.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STALLINGS] has the right to submit his proposition.

The resolution of Mr. STALLINGS was read, as follows:

Resolved, That Henry H. Moler be authorized to act as a second assistant doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, and to receive the same pay as the present assistant doorkeeper until further orders.

The SPEAKER. This resolution is offered, as the Chair understands, as an amendment to that of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS].

Mr. DINGLEY. Does this give an additional officer to the minority?

Mr. SAYERS. This was not asked for by the minority in their caucus.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then let us vote it down; that will end the matter quickly.

The question being taken, the proposed amendment of Mr. STALLINGS was rejected.

The question recurring on the resolution of Mr. SAYERS as modified, it was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SAYERS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. TAWNEY. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That John T. Chancey be, and he is hereby, retained on the roll of the House, in his present position as special employee, at the salary now provided by law.

That Lauritz Olson be, and he is hereby, appointed special employee of the House at a salary of $1,500 per annum, and that E. L. Currier and Arthur Buchanan be, and they are hereby, appointed special employees of the House, at a salary of $1,200 per annum each.

That the salaries of said special employees shall be paid monthly, out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise ordered.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman a question. Does this resolution take from the Doorkeeper of the House the power to appoint or to remove Mr. Chancey?

Mr. TAWNEY. No, it does not. I will say, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois, the resolution does not affect the present status of Mr. Chancey in the House.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Then why include him in the resolution at all?

Mr. TAWNEY. Simply because the Doorkeeper has no power to appoint him. He has been appointed by the House exclusively for many years in this manner, and in order to retain his services the House must make the appointment in this way.

A MEMBER. Is he not on the roll now?

Mr. TAWNEY. He is not on the Doorkeeper's roll, nor on any other roll.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution be again reported. We were unable in the confusion to hear it read here.

The resolution was again reported.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now, Mr. Speaker, my inquiry addressed to the gentleman from Minnesota was this: The resolution provides that these special employees shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House. I asked the gentleman from Minnesota about Mr. Chancey, if he was not now on the regular roll, filling a place appropriated for in the legislative bill of the last Congress. The gentleman replied that he was not. I have no doubt the gentleman was entirely honest in the reply, but he is not informed. I have looked up the matter somewhat carefully, and Mr. Chancey is now on the annual roll at a salary of $1,500 per annum.

If this resolution is adopted it pays him from the contingent fund and leaves the place he now occupies, and already appropriated for, open for the appointment of some other employee. Aye, more, I might add that that is the same case with Mr. Coakley; but that has already been passed upon by the House, and I simply want to call the attention of the members present to the fact that we have not only been courteous by putting him on the contingent fund at the request of our friends on the other side of the House, but have made another place to be filled by the Doorkeeper. That is all. I am perfectly willing that the House may do as it

chooses, but I simply wanted it to understand what it was doing when it did it. We are increasing these places, that is all.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to say in reply to the gentleman from Illinois that the resolution does not provide for the payment of Mr. Chancey's salary.

Mr. McMILLIN. I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is proceeding by unanimous consent. There has been no leave to consider it, as I understand it, given by the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands not.

Mr. TAWNEY. This resolution does not provide for the payment of Mr. Chancey's salary from the contingent fund of the House, but it does provide that it shall be paid as already fixed by the existing law. I understand an appropriation was made during the last session of Congress for this salary; but his retention in the present position depends on this House and not on the last one, because he was appointed by the House and not by any officer of the House, and that is the reason why at every Congress he has secured the passage of a similar resolution retaining him in the position that he occupies at the salary provided for by law. I may say that Mr. Currier has also been on the roll in the same way, and also Mr. Olson.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. McMILLIN. If I remember, it has been the custom of the two sides of the House, as the majority happened to change one way or the other, to extend this courtesy to each other. Whenever one side was in power it has been customary to allow the other side to have a sufficient number of employees on the roll to look after the Hall during caucuses and to attend to the wants of the members. I believe Mr. Chancey has been in the employ of the House ever since I have been here, by some such arrangement as that. But about these other gentlemen—why may not this other question go over until the force is regularly provided for in the organization of the House?

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Currier, I understand, is in the same position in that regard as Mr. Chancey; that is to say, he has been a special employee of the House, and his further services in the House now can be continued only by consent of the House appointing him in some such manner as this.

Mr. McMILLIN. But could not these employees be retained in the regular way, without a special resolution introduced before the organization of the House is completed? It seems to me that we might proceed more systematically by deferring this matter to some period after the organization of the House has been completed. Because, as indicated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], it seems we are about to get into the position of having one man appointed by two authorities and allowed a salary of $1,500 by each one.

Mr. TAWNEY. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentlemen whose names appear in this resolution were selected by the Republicans at their caucus before the organization of the House, and the resolution is presented in accordance with the direction of that caucus.

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not propose to object, but I want to call attention to the effect of the resolution, which is simply to increase the force to the extent of four persons.

Mr. TAWNEY. No, I beg the gentleman's pardon; it does not have that effect.

Mr. DOCKERY. In other words, these were the employees provided by the last Democratic House and given to the minority. You have just adopted the resolution of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], which provides for the minority representation in addition to the regular force. The action proposed, therefore, in reference to Mr. Chancey, who is now on the roll and carried in the regular annual appropriation bill—as also the three employees who were carried in the last House by resolution—will result, as I understand it, in an increase of the force by four persons.

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not so understand it.

Mr. DOCKERY. If that is desired by the other side I shall not object, but I suggest that these matters should go to a committee.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE].

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. As I understand it, Mr. Chancey has been so long a fixture in the House that he is not properly chargeable to either side. I do not think he has any politics. He is a sort of general fixture. Gentlemen on both sides of the House concede that; so that he ought not to be charged to us especially, and I do not think our friends on the other side ought to put us in that position. As to this Mr. Olson, he is a man who had both arms shot off. You have all seen him about the building here. He has been on the special roll for years. As to Mr. Currier, he has been so seriously wounded that he is helpless and crippled. The fourth man, young Mr. Buchanan, is probably the only one against whom any objection could be had, and if our friends are afraid that his recognition as a special employee will increase expenditures too much, why, drop him off and we will find a place for him somewhere else; but I think he might as well stay.

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, I know there is a good deal of pressure and this will somewhat relieve the situation. [Laughter.] There is no question about that; but the responsibility, of course, is with the other side.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Well, we are loading up with helpless, crippled people. We can not help it.

Mr. DOCKERY. I see you are badly crippled. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Question!

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be better to have this go to the Committee on Accounts. I should like to know whether we are increasing the number of employees.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the matter is referred to the Committee on Accounts.

PRESENTATION OF A MEMORIAL.

Mr. DANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to present a memorial from the National Wool Growers' Association of the United States and others, asking the passage of an act providing for protective duties on wool, and for other purposes. I ask that the same may be printed, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means when appointed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio desires to present a memorial of the National Wool Growers' Association, and asks unanimous consent that it be printed.

Mr. DANFORD. And referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I could not hear the gentleman's statement. What is his request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DANFORD] presents a memorial of the National Wool Growers' Association, and asks that the same be printed and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The rules provide that that shall be printed as a document, if it is presented.

Mr. DANFORD. That is all I desire. I do not ask to have it printed in the RECORD, but simply printed as a document.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I was informed that the gentleman's request was that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DANFORD. Oh, no; simply to be printed as a document in the usual course.

Mr. McMILLIN. Does the gentleman propose to have simply the memorial printed, or the accompanying bundle of papers which we see in front of us?

Mr. DANFORD. Just the memorial, and the papers accompanying it.

Mr. McMILLIN. It is a pretty voluminous document, it seems to me, to go into the RECORD.

Mr. DANFORD. I do not ask that it go into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. It is subject to the objection of any member of the House.

Mr. CRISP. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, I do not object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee——

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] objects.

Mr. DANFORD. It is not my purpose to have it printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. DANFORD. Then I withdraw the memorial.

GRANTED LANDS.

Mr. CANNON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the reading of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and thereupon I shall ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah presents a resolution and asks unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution, requesting the Secretary of the Interior to transmit information to the House relating to granted lands, was read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. CRISP. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia objects.

CASE OF EX-CONSUL WALLER.

Mr. WOODMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman presents a resolution and asks for its consideration. The Clerk will report the resolution, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The resolution, requesting the Secretary of State to communicate to Congress the correspondence bearing on the trial, convic-

tion, and incarceration of Mr. John L. Waller, formerly consul of the United States at Tamatave, Madagascar, was read.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I think that resolution should go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I object to its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky objects to the present consideration of the resolution.

PENSIONERS DROPPED FROM THE ROLLS.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent to consider it at this time.

The resolution, calling on the Commissioner of Pensions to report on all pensioners who have ceased to draw pensions in whole or in part during the last three years, was read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this resolution.

Mr. McMILLIN. I will ask for a rereading of the first section of the resolution. I wish to learn whom it calls upon for this information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Commissioner of the Pension Office——

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not usual to call upon the heads of bureaus for information, but on the heads of Departments. I think this resolution ought to go to some committee in order that it may be reported in proper form to the House.

Mr. PAYNE. I presume the gentleman will modify his resolution by substituting the Secretary of the Interior for the Commissioner of Pensions, if that is the only objection.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think it ought to go to the committee and be reported upon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

Mr. CRISP. I demand the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

REPORTS OF BOARD OF MANAGERS OF SOLDIERS' HOME.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, when the reports of the Board of Managers of the Soldiers' Homes were submitted to the House this morning I was not aware that it was done. The law, I believe, provides that 1,600 copies of each report be printed. It has been found that 500 copies of each report will be sufficient. I therefore ask that the order be made for 500 copies of each report and that the usual number of bound copies be furnished for the use of the officers of the Homes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the law provides for the number of copies. If any change be made as to the number of copies, it will have to be made in the law, and consequently a joint resolution would have to be introduced.

Mr. STEELE. Then we have got to print 1,600 copies whether we need them or not, that is all. Then I ask unanimous consent that the usual number of copies be bound for the use of the officers of the Homes, for both the State and the National Homes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana will please put his resolution in writing.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Indiana if the general printing law does not provide for binding these books?

Mr. STEELE. I do not know. Does the gentleman from Tennessee know?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know.

Mr. SAYERS. I will ask the gentleman to let it go over until to-morrow, that he ascertain the facts.

Mr. PAYNE. Is this the economical law that we have heard so much about?

Mr. STEELE. I will ask that the matter go over until to-morrow, until I can ascertain exactly what number is necessary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. CRISP. I demand the regular order. I understand the gentleman has withdrawn his proposition.

Mr. THOMAS. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 780) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle the mutual accounts between the United States and the State of Florida heretofore examined and stated by said Secretary under the authority of the Congress, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 781) to aid the State of South Dakota to support a school of mines—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 782) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon, at Yankton, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 783) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Deadwood, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 784) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of a hospital, to be known as the Sanitarium Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, at Hot Springs, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 785) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Chamberlain, in Brule County and Lyman County, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 786) making an appropriation to enlarge the military post of Fort Meade, near the city of Sturgis, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 787) to provide for building and maintaining an Indian industrial school at or near Chamberlain, in the State of South Dakota, and at or near Rapid City, in the State of South Dakota, and to provide a farm in conjunction therewith—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 788) for the erection of a public building at Harrison, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 789) to repeal section 40 of chapter 4 of Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULING: A bill (H. R. 790) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 791) to reimburse settlers and purchasers on even-numbered sections of the public lands within the limits of Congressional grants in cases of forfeiture of odd-numbered sections—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 792) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Baker City, in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 793) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes,'" approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 794) for the relief of the citizens of the States of Oregon, Idaho, Washington, and Montana who served with the United States troops in the war against the Nez Perces and Bannock and Shoshone Indians, and for the relief of the heirs of those killed in such service, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 795) to provide for the sale of the unsold portion of the Umatilla Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 796) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads, and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 797) authorizing the Secretary of War to exchange with the Oregon National Guard of the State of Oregon Springfield rifles of the pattern of 1884 for the same make of rifles of the pattern of 1873, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 798) granting to the city of Pendleton, in the State of Oregon, the right to lay pipes and conduct water from the Umatilla River across the Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Government school lands, and the lands of the United States near the Umatilla Agency, for municipal purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LATIMER: A bill (H. R. 799) to equalize the several States of the Union in the grant of lands for school purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 800) relating to the distribution of seeds, bulbs, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 801) for the erection of a public building at Meriden, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 802) for the erection of a public building at Waterbury, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 804) establishing a United States mint at Boise City, Idaho—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 805) to provide for licenses to certain officers of seagoing passenger steam vessels—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 806) making provision for repairing or rebuilding the public building recently destroyed by fire at St. Albans, Vt.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 807) to increase the pension of those who have lost a hand or foot, and in certain other cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 808) to repeal sections 3006 and 3007 of the Revised Statutes and amendments thereto—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 809) to amend the customs laws, to provide for a duty on importations of wool, and to secure additional revenue for the support of the Government, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 810) making appropriation for the improvement of the Clearwater River in Idaho, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 811) to amend the laws relating to the naturalization of aliens—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 812) to enable the Secretary of War to continue the reconstruction of the military post at Jefferson Barracks, Mo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NOONAN: A bill (H. R. 813) to increase the revenue and impose a duty upon live stock, wool, mohair, hides, and peltry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 814) to provide for the existing deficiencies in the revenue of the Government—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 815) to equalize the postage on monthly publications when admitted to be carried as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 816) to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 817) to authorize the purchase of the five manuscript volumes of William Vans Murray—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 818) to provide for the care and cure of inebriates in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 819) to provide for a temporary government in the territory occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, to be known as the Territory of Indianola—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CANNON of Utah: A bill (H. R. 820) to provide for the purchase of sites and the erection of public buildings at Salt Lake City and Ogden City, Utah—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 821) to maintain the parity between the coins of the United States, and other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 822) withdrawing the right of the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 823) to create the eastern judicial district of Kentucky, and to change the present judicial district of Kentucky, and fix the times and places for holding courts in said districts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 824) to restore the bimetallic system of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 825) to create the office of foreman of presswork in the Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 826) to provide for the erection of a public building at Bradford, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 827) for the erection of a public building at Tampa, Fla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 828) to secure the separation and independence of the executive and legislative departments—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 829) to erect a public building at Lawrence, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 830) to fix the time for the convening of Congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 831) to provide for the coinage of gold and silver bullion upon equal terms—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 832) to protect the forest on the public domain from destruction by fire—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 833) to amend an act establishing Atlanta, Ga., a port of delivery, approved February 28, 1881—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 834) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Portsmouth, in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A bill (H. R. 835) to amend section 109½ of an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," which became a law August 27, 1894—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 836) to establish wind signal display stations at South Manitou Island, Lake Michigan—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 837) providing for leaves of absence to certain per diem employees of the Government—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 838) to reduce letter postage to 1 cent per one-half ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 839) for the erection of a public building in the city of Hopkinsville, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COBB of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 840) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER of Florida: A bill (H. R. 841) to authorize the sale of the site of St. Francis Barracks, Fla., the sale or removal of the improvements thereof, and to provide for a new site and the construction of suitable buildings thereon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 842) to authorize the exchange of lot 6, square 10, known as the old custom-house lot, in the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for lands adjoining that part of the United States military reservation in said city, designated as the powder-house lot—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 843) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to authorize the purchase of additional ground in Newark, N. J., adjoining the custom-house and post-office building, and for the improvement thereon and the erection of additions thereto," approved March 1, 1888—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 844) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Norfolk, in the State of Virginia," approved January 2, 1891—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 845) for the erection of a public building for the use of the custom-house and post-office at Newport News, in the district of Newport News, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 846) to provide reserve funds for the necessities of certain employees of the Government—to the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 847) to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenues for the Government, and for other purposes," presented to the President of the United States August 15, and not having been returned by him to the House of Congress in which it originated within the time prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, became a law without his approval. In force August 28, 1894—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 848) to provide for the acquisition of additional land and the erection of an addition to the custom-house, post-office, etc., building at Bridgeport, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 849) to increase the circulation of national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LINTON: A bill (H. R. 850) for the construction of a public building at Owosso, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 851) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs, or have been totally disabled in them, or have additional disabilities—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 852) to amend section 9 of an act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railrway Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMICK: A bill (H. R. 853) providing for the erection of a light-house at Orient Point, Long Island, New York, and for the proper lighting of the entrances to Greenport and Sag Harbor and the west shore of Shelter Island—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 854) providing for the erection of a public building at Long Island City, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 855) for the improvement of the harbor of the city of Buffalo—to the Committee on Rivers and Hrabors.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 856) defining the qualifications of chief inspector and deputy inspectors of plumbing in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 857) to include the Enrolled Missouri Militia within the provisions of the act approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 858) for the erection of a public building at the city of Jamestown, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McDEARMON: A bill (H. R. 859) authorizing the Dyersburg and Mississippi River Railway and Improvement Company to bridge the Obion River, in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: A bill (H. R. 860) for the erection of a public building at Norfolk, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McDEARMON: A bill (H. R. 861) for the appropriation of $260,000 for the construction of a levee on the left bank of the Mississippi River between Hickman, Ky., and Tiptonville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 862) for the erection of a public building at the city of Elgin, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 863) to construct a military road from Atlanta to McPherson Barracks, in Georgia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 864) for the erection of a public building at Malden, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 865) to aid and encourage military training and instruction by donation of public lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 866) to provide for a final settlement with the Naalen band of the Tillamook tribe of Indians, of Oregon, in accordance with a certain agreement between the United States and the said Indians dated the 6th day of August, 1851—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 867) for facilitating commerce among the States—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 868) to prevent trusts, monopolies, and combinations in trade—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 869) providing that no pensions for disability, or under the act of June 27, 1890, or to the widows of soldiers, shall be for a less sum than $12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 870) to provide for the relief of certain officers and enlisted men of the volunteer forces—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 871) to amend section 1315 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 872) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to fix and limit the compensation of collectors of customs and surveyors of customs, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 873) to increase the pension of the totally blind—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 874) to provide for filling vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant in the Army and the recognition of extraordinary gallantry and merit of enlisted men—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITT: A bill (H. R. 875) to carry into effect the recommendations of the International American Conference by the incorporation of the International American Bank—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 876) to promote the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. ALLEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 877) to permit the Standard Telephone Company of Washington and Baltimore City to install, maintain, and operate a telephone and telegraph plant and exchange in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 878) to reduce the cases in which the penalty of death may be inflicted—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 879) to remove the bar of the statute of limitation and give the right of appeal in certain cases—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 880) designating Stamford a subport of entry—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TRACY: A bill (H. R. 881) for the relief of persons who made cash entries of lands at a price in excess of that fixed by law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 882) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 883) to extend to the port of Superior, Wis., in the district of Superior, Mich., the privileges of the seventh section of an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LINTON: A bill (H. R. 884) making it unlawful for any person to print, stamp, or impress any words, figures, or designs upon the flag of the United States, or any representation thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 885) to amend section 6 of chapter 376, approved March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 886) relating to the distillation of brandy from prunes, and amending section 3255 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 887) to amend the charter of the District of Columbia Suburban Railway Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 888) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the bonds issued under the contract of the Secretary of the Treasury with August Belmont & Co. et al, bearing date February 8, 1895, interest and principal, in not less than one-half in standard silver dollars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 889) to fix the rank and pay of certain retired officers of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A joint resolution (H. Res. 9) requesting the President of the United States to present a medal to Capt. D. P. Slattery—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LOW: A joint resolution (H. Res. 10) providing for an examination as to the feasibility of a harbor of refuge at Cape Lookout—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LINTON: A joint resolution (H. Res. 11) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALBERT: A joint resolution (H. Res. 12) enjoining the Secretary of the Treasury from the further issue of bonds—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A joint resolution (H. Res. 13) directing the Secretary of War to have made an actual survey of Sabine Lake, in the State of Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TUCKER: A joint resolution (H. Res. 14) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States—to the Select Committee on the Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. POWERS: A resolution relating to the privileges of the floor—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A resolution to place John T. Chancey, Lauritz Olson, E. L. Currier, and Arthur Buchanan on the roll of the House as special employees thereof—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A resolution for the relief of Charles P. Chouteau, survivor of Chouteau, Harrison & Vallé, of St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: A resolution relating to immigration and the inquiry into the laws relating thereto—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CANNON of Utah: A resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to transmit information to the House concerning railroad granted lands—to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A concurrent resolution calling upon the President for certain information regarding the arrest, trial, etc., of John L. Waller, a citizen of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINTON: A resolution relative to the Center Market of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A resolution inquiring of the Secretary of the Treasury why the construction of the post-office building at Paterson, N. J., has not been proceeded with—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARDY: A resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish information as to bonded goods—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE: A resolution of the legislature of Massachusetts, in favor of uniform hours of labor throughout the United States—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A memorial of the legislature of Idaho, praying for an appropriation for the purpose of removing certain obstructions existing in the Clarks Fork of the Columbia River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of Idaho, petitioning for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will require the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A resolution of the Connecticut assembly relating to the transportation of parcels by the post-office—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a resolution of the Connecticut general assembly concerning the constitutional rights of citizens—to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. MONDELL: A memorial of the Third legislature of the State of Wyoming, asking that the unoccupied and unappropriated lands in the State be ceded to the State by the General Government—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a memorial from the legislature of the State of Wyoming to the Congress of the United States, asking that the provision in the act admitting the State to the Union which exempted all lands known as "mineral" in sections 16 and 36 in each county be amended so that the State shall receive the revenue from sale of same for school purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a memorial from the Third legislature of the State of Wyoming to the Congress of the United States, asking that a reduction of the selling price of land ceded to the State under sections 8 and 11 of the act providing for the admission of said State to the Union be granted—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a memorial from the Third legislature of the State of Wyoming to the Congress of the United States, asking that United States Senators be elected by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Wyoming to the Congress of the United States, asking that a tract of land 20 miles square, including the Big Horn Hot Springs, be secured to the State by a treaty with the Shoshone and Arapahoe Indians—to the Committtee on the Public Lands.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Wyoming to the Congress of the United States, asking that indiscriminate foreign immigration be prohibited—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a memorial of the State legislature of the State of Wyoming to the Congress of the United States, asking that township 42 and the region to township 47 and between ranges 113 and 119 west be set aside as a park and put under the control of the State of Wyoming—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 890) for the relief of Matilda H. Reed, of Iuka, Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 891) for relief of Andrew Brown, heir David Brown, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 892) for relief of John W. Williams, heir H. G. Williams, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 893) for relief of George Kimberley, heir of M. P. Kimberley, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 894) for the relief of Mrs. E. A. Hubbard, of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. AITKEN: A bill (H. R. 895) for the relief of Richard H. Marsh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 896) granting a pension to Francisco Romain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 897) for the relief of James Stewart—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 898) for the relief of Ed. S. Carl Lee, administrator of Cora C. Bancroft, deceased, of Woodruff County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BISHOP (by request): A bill (H. R. 899) for the relief of Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. Madison Cutts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 900) to provide for the payment of the claim of William H. Mahoney—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 901) for the relief of the legal representatives of P. M. Craigmiles, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 902) for the relief of Daniel Kaylor, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 903) for the relief of Flora A. Darling—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 904) for the relief of Thomas E. Breckenridge—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 905) for the relief of Mrs. Julia A. Humphries—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 906) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 907) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund Wolf—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 908) for the relief of William Fletcher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 909) granting a pension to Charles E. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 910) granting an honorable discharge to William Mackey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 911) for the relief of William C. Watts, of Boone County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 912) for the relief of Catharine Metz—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 913) for the relief of N. C. Pettit, of Campbell County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 914) for the relief of George D. Nichols, of Providence, R. I.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 915) granting a pension to Margaret McTighe, mother of Michael McTighe, alias John Smith, late boatswain's mate on the U. S. S. *C. P. Williams*—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 916) to remove the charge of desertion against William W. Smith, late a private in Company G, First New York Engineers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 917) to correct the military record of John M. Knowles, Company D, First Rhode Island Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 918) to correct the naval record of and grant an honorable discharge to Thomas H. Holden, of Pawtucket, R. I.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 919) for the relief of Frank Oldis, late of the Fifth Massachusetts Artillery and the Fourth Battery of Rhode Island Artillery Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 920) granting an honorable-discharge certificate to Hugh Kerr, late of Company K, First Battalion, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 921) granting a pension to Ira Ingraham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 922) granting a pension to Mary R. Dean, widow of Amos G. Thomas, late captain in the Eleventh Regiment of Rhode Island Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 923) for the relief of William C. Stewart, late of Company A, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 924) to authorize the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion as to Jasper L. Dodge, late of Company F, First Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 925) granting a pension to Annie J. Corbett, of Providence, R. I.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 926) granting a pension to Rose Doherty, mother of Daniel Doherty, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Rhode Island Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of Lewis Brown—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 928) for relief of Patrick J. Sullivan, John B. Dillon, Jeremiah McCarthy, and Bartholomew Shea, of Newport, R. I.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 929) for the relief of John Dieter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 930) for the relief of William Luchman, of St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 931) to authorize the Third Auditor of the Treasury to audit certain quartermaster's vouchers alleged to belong to John Finn, of St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 932) for the relief of Mrs. Catharine Barry Meeha—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 933) for the relief of the owners of the steamer *Clara Bell*—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 934) for the relief of Edward Cahalan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 935) for the relief of J. E. Gillingwaters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 936) for the relief of Henry Kortzendorfer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 937) for the relief of the officers and crew of the United States steamers *Forest Rose* and *Argosy*—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 938) to permit Anna M. Coleman, a widow, to prosecute a claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 939) for the relief of Cogswell & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 940) for the relief of Luther M. Emerson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 941) for the relief of Phillip T. Butler, of St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 942) for the relief of Conrad Stork, of St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 943) granting a pension to Mrs. Lena Peinemann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 944) for the relief of John Millan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 945) to remove charge of desertion from Hyacinth Clark—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 946) for the relief of Michael Lally—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 947) to remove charge of desertion against Herman M. Lillie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 948) to remove charge of desertion against Jacob M. Hamburger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 949) for the relief of Frank W. Clark—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 950) granting increase of pension to John Coombs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Florida: A bill (H. R. 951) to amend the military record of Dan S. Place, first lieutenant, Eighteenth Indi-Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 952) granting a pension to Susan D. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 953) for the relief of William Gray—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 954) for the relief of J. C. Irwin & Co. and Charles A. Perry & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 955) removing charge of desertion against William I. McAtee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 953) for the relief of Sophia Sparks and Julia C. Sparks, of Annapolis, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 957) for the relief of Milton F. Colburn, administrator of the estate of Gilbert Colburn, deceased, late of Annapolis, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 958) to place Elijah J. M. Button on the retired list, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 959) for the relief of Alexander Moffitt—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 960) for the relief of A. T. Sands—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 961) for the relief of John A. Barr—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 962) for the relief of Mrs. Ann E. Heiskell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 963) for relief of Stephen Duncan Marshall and George M. Miller, executors of the will of Levin R. Marshall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DANFORD: A bill (H. R. 964) to restore William Welsh, late captain, United States Army, to his proper rank and promotion in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 965) to place the name of Fannie Kautz, widow of August V. Kautz, deceased, late brigadier-general, United States Army, retired, on the pension roll at the rate of $175 per month—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 966) for the relief of the workmen employed in the construction of Poverty Island light-house, Lake Michigan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 967) for the relief of Theodore Huesman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 968) for the relief of Henry S. Saunders—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 969) for the relief of Thomas J. Miller, of the State of Washington—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 970) for repayment of purchase money to E. C. Masten, on erroneous entry of public lands—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 971) for the relief of James W. Ralls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 972) for the relief of John W. Lewis, of Oregon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 973) for the relief of Peter Grant Stewart, of Oregon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 974) for the relief of Margaret C. McKay, widow of the late William C. McKay, of Oregon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 975) granting a pension to J. M. Swift, of Baker City, Oreg.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 976) for the relief of John W. Lewis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 977) to pension Mollie Crandall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 978) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 979) granting a pension to Francis E. Helfenstein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 980) for the relief of William H. Sprinkle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER (by request): A bill (H. R. 981) for the relief of William C. Dodge—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULING: A bill (H. R. 982) for the relief of William Coffman, administrator of Samuel Coffman, deceased, late of Greenbrier County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 983) for the relief of Mrs. Rhoda Neal, of Greenbrier County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 984) for the relief of the administrators of Isaac P. Tice, deceased, and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 985) granting an increase of pension to Michael J. Fogerty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 986) for the relief of Hiram P. Pauley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 987) for the relief of Bruno Nohle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 988) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William P. Dodd, deceased, late of Company I, Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 989) to revoke the order of dismissal of Capt. Thomas M. Elliott from the service of the United States and to amend his military record—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 990) granting a pension to Clarissa Carruth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 991) granting a pension to Michael Griffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 992) granting a pension to Wilson S. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 993) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record to George W. Stelts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 994) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Keith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 995) granting a pension to Kate A. Pitman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 996) granting an honorable discharge to Henry P. Cassel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 997) for the relief of Michael Kries—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 998) for the relief of Mira M. Harbin, administratrix of Nathaniel P. Harbin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 999) for the relief of the estate of Leander C. McLellan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1000) for the relief of Benjamin F. Rogers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1001) for the relief of Charles L. Bradwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1002) for the relief of the estate of Needham Bullard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1003) for the relief of the trustees of St. Phillip's Church, of Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1004) for the relief of Edman Green, of Jonesboro, Clayton County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1005) for the relief of Ambrose Chewning—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1006) for the relief of Mark Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1007) for the relief of George T. Reeves—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1008) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah E. Youngblood, of Atlanta, Fulton County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1009) for the relief of Mrs. Emily Evans—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1010) for the relief of John J. Hart—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1011) for the relief of William Ellis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1012) for the relief of Elsas, May & Co., of Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 1013) referring the claim of Robert W. Dunbar to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1014) for the relief of Ames & Detrick, of San Francisco, in the State of California—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1015) for the relief of J. M. Billings—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1016) to place Maurice Kraszynski upon the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 1017) granting a pension to Nancy A. Killough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1018) to increase the pension of Bennett S. Shaug—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1019) granting a pension to Lucinda B. Hull, widow of James E. Darrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1020) granting an increase of pension to Gilman Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1021) granting relief to Albert Augustine for property taken for the Cayuse war—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1022) to increase the pension of Byron Cotton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 1023) for the relief of A. S. Hardin, administrator of Thomas Warfield, deceased, late of Hardin County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1024) for relief of Dr. J. D. Geiser, of Savannah, Hardin County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1025) for the relief of James Anderson, Savannah, Tenn., surviving partner of Anderson & Warfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 1026) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth R. Strother—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1027) for the relief of Arthur L. Payne—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1028) for the relief of Martin Maddux—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1029) for relief of the estate of Charles N. Gregory, late of Alexandria, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1030) to execute the finding of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of John J. Shipman—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1031) for the relief of the heirs of B. H. Jordan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1032) for the relief of the heirs of Mary E. Simpson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1033) for the relief of Mrs. R. C. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1034) for the relief of John H. Redman, a citizen of King George County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1035) for the relief of Mrs. Elvira Moore, executrix of J. L. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of Edgar E. Matthew—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1037) for the relief of H. B. Miller, surviving partner of Miller & Co.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1038) for the relief of L. E. Bowen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1039) for the relief of Virginia E. Ficklin and James W. Ficklin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 1040) granting a pension to Mrs. Nancy T. Eastman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1041) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. L. Eastman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1042) for the relief of Benjamin S. Barnes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1043) granting a pension to Mrs. Hannah Flanders—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1044) granting a pension to Hannah Lyons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1045) for the relief of the Continental Fire Insurance Company and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 1046) for the relief of George Denny, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 1047) for the relief of Harriet A. Phillips—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1048) for the relief of the late Andrew S. Core—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1049) for the relief of John W. Trader—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 1050) to grant an increase of pension to Elizabeth Deshler Whiting, widow of Lieut. Henry Whiting—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEILL: A bill (H. R. 1051) for the relief of F. B. Toms and Sallie T. Harris, of Monroe County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1052) for the relief of Thomas J. Harris and others, heirs of Manning Harris, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1053) for the relief of James Erwin, of McBee Landing, Marion County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1054) for the relief of the estate of Henry C. Toms, deceased, late of Monroe County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1055) for the relief of Charles T. Hyde, of Clarendon, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1056) for the relief of Henry McGill, of Monroe County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1057) for the relief of Pryor D. Chism, administrator of Robert Chism, deceased, late of Monroe County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1058) for the relief of the estate of Nancy Whisenant, deceased, late of White County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1059) for the relief of Henry M. Stone, of White County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1060) for the relief of Margaret E. Watkins, of White County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1061) granting pensions to Gray's Battalion of Arkansas Volunteers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1062) to grant a pension to Armstead M. Rawlings, of Arkansas—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1063) for the relief of the estate of Robert E. Bond, deceased, late of Monroe County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OWENS: A bill (H. R. 1064) for the relief of Henry F. Thornton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1065) for the relief of W. A. Bohannon, of Smithfield, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 1066) granting a pension to Ella Hatfield, invalid daughter of Maj. David Hatfield, First Regiment New Jersey Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1067) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Ellis J. Payne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1068) for the relief of Bvt. Col. Thomas P. O'Reilly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1069) for the relief of John G. Rose—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1070) granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Newman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 1071) for the relief of John Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 1072) for the relief of Thomas V. Brady, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1073) for the relief of Charles C. Burke, administrator of Elizabeth Burke, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1074) for the relief of Arthur Connell, of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1075) for the relief of the estate of Leander Black, deceased, late of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1076) for the relief of George T. Vance and Guy P. Vance, executors of William L. Vance, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1077) for the relief of Alfred B. Carter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1078) for the relief of Charles C. Burke, administrator of Elizabeth Burke, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1079) for the relief of M. A. Gober, administrator of Joseph T. Abernathy, deceased, of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1080) for the relief of Thomas S. Galloway, administrator of Darling Allen, deceased, of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1081) for relief of Martha A. Booth, administratrix—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1082) for the relief of J. J. Bailey, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1083) for the relief of William J. Bishop, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1084) for the relief of the estate of Leander Black, deceased, late of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1085) for the relief of Daniel Butts, of Moscow, Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1086) for the relief of the estate of Nancy J. Carr, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1087) for the relief of S. L. Carpenter, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1088) for the relief of the estate of Andrew B. Conley, deceased, late of Fayette County, Tenn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1089) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church at Grand Junction, Hardeman County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 1090) granting an honorable discharge to Adam Hand—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1091) granting a pension to Ada J. Schwatka, widow of the late Lieut. Frederick Schwatka, as a recognition of his services in Polar and Alaskan explorations—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANEY: A bill (H. R. 1092) for the relief of Capt. John Schwab's company, of Pilot Knob, Mo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 1093) for the relief of Augustus Boyd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROYSE: A bill (H. R. 1094) granting a pension to Francis E. Hoover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 1095) granting a pension to Annie M. Ermer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1096) to correct naval record of John Haggerty—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1097) to remove the charge of desertion against John J. Doyle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1098) for the relief of C. W. Denison—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1099) to pay certain judgments against John C. Bates and Jonathan A. Yeckley, captain and first lieutenant in the United States Army, for acts done by them under orders of their superior officers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1100) granting a pension to Eliza F. Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1101) granting a pension to Mercy Foster Clark—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 1102) for the relief of Thomas Williams, an employee of the Senate folding room, for injuries received while in the discharge of his duties in the year 1892—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 1103) granting a pension to James V. Burch—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1104) granting a pension to Isaac N. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1105) for the relief of Henry L. Fitch—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1106) for the relief of Soloman Lusk—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1107) correcting the record of and granting an honorable discharge to Timothy Ellsworth, late saddler Company M, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1108) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph Slatery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1109) granting a pension to Elizabeth Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1110) for the relief of Alonzo Higley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1111) for the relief of William E. Keene—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1112) for the relief of J. F. Banks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1113) granting a pension to George W. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1114) granting a pension to James Mathews—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 1115) for the relief of Pleasant Bailey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1116) for the relief of Louisa S. Guthrie, widow and executrix of John J. Guthrie, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 1117) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Erskine, deceased—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1118) to increase the pension of Mrs. Elizabeth V. Harman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1119) to authorize the President to place William O'Brien on the retired list with the rank of lieutenant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1120) to reimburse the trustees of the Presbyterian Church at McDowell, State of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 1121) for the relief of C. W. Michaels, postmaster at Yalesville, Conn.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STAHLE: A bill (H. R. 1122) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Edward T. Lewis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1123) for the relief of Jacob B. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 1124) for the relief of Green Penn—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1125) for the relief of E. R. Stephens—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1126) for the relief of P. H. Boisseau, administrator of Thomas B. Doe—to the Committee on War Claims,

Also, a bill (H. R. 1127) for the relief of A. Hogan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1128) for the relief of Noell, Cannaday & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1129) for the relief of William Hodges—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1130) for the relief of A. L. Burwell, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1131) for the relief of B. C. Rorer—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1132) for the relief of Mrs. E. A. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1133) for the relief of Daniel Thomas—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1134) for the relief of John T. Marcell, administrator of Samuel Marcell, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1135) for the relief of W. B. Scales—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPENCER: A bill (H. R. 1136) for the relief of Anna Hunt, administratrix of George F. Hunt, late of Jefferson County, Miss., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A bill (H. R. 1137) for the relief of certain parties, sufferers by the burning of the tug *Mystic* while in Government employ—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1138) for the relief of Walter S. Kimmel—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 1139) granting a pension to Caroline D. Mowatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOVER: A bill (H. R. 1140) for the relief of Eugene Oscar Fechét, late a second lieutenant of the Second Regiment of Artillery, United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1141) granting a pension to Miss Mary E. Hull, dependent sister of John A. Hull, deceased, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of Thomas J. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1143) for the relief of Mariam Goodloe, widow, and Laura Blinn, Richard V. Goodloe, and Joseph A. Goodloe, children, and James H. Goodloe and Mrs. Fannie Hough, grandchildren, of James Goodloe, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1144) granting a pension to Jacob F. Blessing, late a private of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteers, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1145) for the relief of Mrs. Louisa Harrington, widow of Thomas Harrington, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1146) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James W. Cline, alias Eugene L. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1147) to compensate George K. Kirchner for his stock of goods taken and destroyed by Federal soldiers in the year A. D. 1862—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1148) granting a pension to Robert W. Fitch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1149) for the relief of Noah W. Crane, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1150) for the relief of the city of Cairo, in the State of Illinois—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1151) to grant a pension to Blewett Bain, who was a teamster for the United States forces in the war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1152) granting an increase of pension to David Horn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1153) for the relief of Michael Bradley—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1154) granting an honorable discharge to Logan Collins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1155) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Frank Clemens, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Heavy Artillery, colored, Kentucky Volunteers, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1156) granting an increase of pension to Ira A. Milliorn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1157) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Henry Casey, late a private in Company K, Ninth Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1158) granting an increase of pension to Rufus A. Bean—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1159) for the relief of Edward A. Buder—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1160) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Stephen J. Simpson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1161) granting a pension to Thomas Joyce, late drummer in Company D, Second Regiment of New York Infantry, in the Florida war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1162) for the relief of the administrator of the estate of Phebe Leibarger, deceased, widow of Jacob Leibarger, late of Company H, Twenty-seventh Regiment of Illinois Volunteers, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1163) granting a pension to Ceasar Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1164) for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Stapleton Smith, Michael Peter Stapleton, and Mrs. Maggie Stapleton McHale, late widow and heirs of Peter Stapleton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1165) for the relief of Jehu M. McClain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1166) granting a pension to William H. Sharp, late a private in Company K, One hundred and twentieth Regiment of Illinois Infantry Volunteers, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1167) for the relief of James B. Phillips—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1168) to increase the pension of Josiah P. Hill, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteers, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1169) to provide for the construction of a graveled road from the termination of the graveled road and bridge on the north side of Cache River, in Pulaski County, Ill., to the national military cemetery near Mound City, in Pulaski County, Ill., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1170) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth M. Brickell, late widow of John P. Law, as special agent of the Thirteenth district of Illinois, provost-marshal-general's office, United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 1171) to pension Hannah Yazell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1172) to correct the military record of John Boon, late of Company C, Eighty-second Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 1173) for the relief of Theodore D. McCaddon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1174) to remove the charge of desertion in the case of Oliver Armsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1175) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Nicholas Swingle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1176) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Porcella—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1177) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of James A. McElroy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1178) granting a pension to Sarah Weedon—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 1179) referring to the Court of Claims the claims of O. P. Cobb and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1180) for the relief of George F. Roberts, administrator of the estate of William B. Thayer, deceased, surviving partner of Thayer Bros., and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 1181) for the relief of Maria E. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 1182) for the relief of George J. Campbell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 1183) to correct the military record of William Myers, Company F, Eighty-fifth Indiana, and pay him $376.36—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1184) for the relief of Thomas Worden Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1185) granting a pension to Rachel Patton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1186) granting increase of pension to Jane Lister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1187) granting a pension to Rev. J. M. Madding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: Petition of J. N. Cassanova and many other citizens of Philipsburg, Pa., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: Petition of Henry Shonert, of Kentucky, for increased pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Thomas Johnson, for completion of military record to show a date of discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: Petition of Kate Morrison, of Joplin, Mo., widow of Daniel Morrison, of Company I, First Regiment United States Dragoons, service 1835 to 1838—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petition of W. S. Dewing & Sons, asking an appropriation for the improvement of Cheat River, in West Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of F. B. Blue and 49 others, asking the recognition of the belligerent rights of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): Petition of citizens of Windsor, Mo., for recognition of the Cubans as belligerents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Resolution of the commandery of the State of Washington of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion, that the grade of Lieutenant-General of the Army be confirmed in Maj. Gen. Nelson A. Miles, U. S. A.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of Theodore Huseman and others—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: Resolutions of the Workingmen's Protective Tariff League of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: Petition in favor of the passage of a bill to extend to the port of Erie the privilege of the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition to amend the postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HULING: Petitions of Messrs. J. E. Manor, Phil Belreal, and other residents of Kanawha, W. Va., requesting the passage of a bill to inspect immigrants by the United States—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the estate of L. W. Jones, of Fayette County; John W. Walker, of Raleigh County; John G. Settle of Fayette County; Mathew Ramsey, of Greenbrier County; estate of George Masters, of Fayette County; John Rogers, of Fayette County; estate of Mason Coleman, deceased, late of Fayette County; estate of John Gay, deceased, late of Pocahontas County; Rachel Fink, widow of William A. Fink, deceased, late of Raleigh County; Newton Shumate, of Raleigh County; P. O. Caldwell, administrator, of Raleigh County; Elizabeth Riley, of Pocahontas County; estate of Anderson Painter, deceased, late of Fayette County; William O. Gould, of Upshur County; estate of C. D. Slaughter, deceased, late of Kanawha County; Peyton Morton, of Fayette County; R. M. Holliday and George A. Darlington, both of Fayette County; Thomas K. Kerr, of Pocahontas County, and the heirs of Frederick R. Phillips, also of Pocahontas County, and all of West Virginia, praying that their war claims be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the citizens of Charleston, W. Va., asking Congress to take such action as shall result in the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: Resolutions adopted by citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, expressing sympathy with Cuban patriots—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIEFER: Resolution passed by the Commercial Club of the city of Stillwater, Minn., requesting needed improvements on the St. Croix Lake and River, Minnesota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KNOX: Memorial of George J. Carney and others, of Lowell, Mass., praying for the removal of obstructions in the Merrimac River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of Nancy A. Killough for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOW: The Maritime Association of the Port of New York, the Board of Marine Underwriters, insurance companies and owners, underwriters' agents, and masters of vessels engaged in the coasting trade along the Atlantic coast, together with those of Bath, Belfast, and Rockland, State of Maine; Boston, Gloucester, Salem, and Taunton, of the State of Massachusetts; New London and New Haven, of the State of Connecticut; Philadelphia, Pa.; Jersey City, N. J.; Providence, R. I.; Baltimore, Md.; Ocracoke and Beaufort, N. C.; Charleston, S. C.; Savannah and Brunswick, Ga., respectfully represent to the Congress the importance of a harbor of refuge near Cape Lookout—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: Petition for the relief of John W. Trader—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOODY: Petition of Austin Quinby and 25 others, survivors of the crew of the U. S. S. *Kearsarge*, requesting that the Congress of the United States turn over to the survivors of said ship all of its relics—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of John M. Anderson, harbor master of Gloucester, Mass., and 58 others, masters of vessels and merchants, requesting an appropriation by Congress to remove certain specified obstructions to navigation in the harbor of Gloucester, Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Albert H. Rogers and 342 other citizens of the town of Marblehead, Mass., requesting an appropriation to build a sea wall on the southerly side of the isthmus connecting Marblehead Neck with the main body of the town, for the protection of Marblehead Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: Memorial from citizens of Fremont, Nebr., praying for the recognition by this Government of the belligerent rights of the Cubans—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Petition of the heirs of William Ross, deceased; the heirs of Robert A. Smith, deceased; the heirs of E. V. Gordon, deceased; the estate of John W. Hawkins, deceased; the estate of Mary Gwinn, deceased; the estate of J. J. Curtis, deceased, all of Culpeper County, Va., and the estate of Charity Sinclair, deceased, late of Fauquier County, Va., praying for reference of their war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: Resolutions passed by a mass meeting held in Andover, Mass., November 25, 1895, denouncing the Armenian outrages and calling upon the Government of the United States to take action in relation thereto—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS: Petition of William Toley, of Woodford County, Ky., praying that his war claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OTEY: Resolutions adopted by citizens of Roanoke, Va.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of David Vance & Co. and 220 others,

By Mr. PARKER: Petition of James A. Wormley and others, of Newark, N. J., requesting investigation and action as to John L. Waller, ex-consul to Madagascar—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUSK: Petition of Regina Ernst, for the honorable discharge of Antone Ernst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petition of the Groton Monument Association and citizens of Groton and New London, Conn., for the purchase of land adjoining Fort Griswold at Groton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Danielsonville, Conn., asking a pension for Lydia A. Taft—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

asking for the completion of the harbor of refuge at Milwaukee, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. REYBURN: Papers to accompany House bill No. 154—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROYSE: Petitions of the citizens of the different States of the Union, asking Congress to take such action as shall result in the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG: Resolutions and memorial of the students and teachers of the Ohio Normal University, in behalf of the citizens of Cuba who are struggling for liberty—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of William O. Sides and 220 other citizens of Portsmouth, N. H., praying Congress to take such action as shall result in the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Caroline D. Mowatt, for restoration of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Resolutions of a meeting of citizens held at Grand Valley, Warren County, Pa., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the use of public money for sectarian purposes, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of a meeting of citizens of Seneca, Venango County, Pa., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the use of public money for sectarian purposes, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: Petition of the representatives duly accredited by the mass meeting of the Armenian colony of Worcester, Mass., urging that vigorous measures be recommended for putting a stop to the indiscriminate slaughter of Christians by the Turkish Government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a memorial adopted by a meeting of Armenian citizens at Worcester, Mass.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 10, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 3d instant, the report of the Chief of Engineers on the project for further improvement of the harbor at Wilmington, Cal., proposed by W. H. H. Benyaurd, lieutenant-colonel, Corps of Engineers, United States Army; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the year ended June 30, 1895; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

COURT OF CLAIMS REPORT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings and opinion filed by the court in the case of George T. Vance and Guy P. Vance, executors of the estate of William L. Vance, deceased; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 803) to amend section 2601 of the Revised Statutes, relative to ports of entry, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the legislature of Minnesota, praying that the buildings and grounds on which old Fort Snelling is situated be granted to that State in perpetuity for use as a museum for military and other purposes; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Resolved by the legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of the United States be, and the same is hereby, requested to grant to the State of Minnesota, in perpetuity, the old buildings and the ground upon which they stand, which constitute the old and original Fort Snelling in the State of Minnesota, to be forever used by said State, perpetually, as a museum of natural, military, civil, botanical, and archæological history of this State.

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress are requested to urge this measure upon the attention of the Congress of the United States.

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby instructed to forward copies of these resolutions to the Vice-President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Approved March 2, 1895.

STATE OF MINNESOTA, *Department of State:*

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house file No. 99, filed in this office March 2, 1895.

ALBERT BERG, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the legislature of Minnesota, praying for the passage of the Olney arbitration bill or some

ther scheme of arbitration between the railroad companies of the United States and their employees; which was read, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the past year has been characterized by disastrous railroad strikes, bringing untold losses to the business interests of the land and great suffering and losses to the employees upon the railroads, and

Whereas the country will continue to be liable to a recurrence of such losses and suffering so long as the nation is unprovided with some suitable method of settling controversies between the railroad companies of the land and their employees: Therefore be it

Resolved by the legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of the United States be, and the same are, respectfully requested by this memorial to enact into a law the arbitration bill now before Congress and known as the Olney arbitration bill, or enact some other suitable and comprehensible law for the legal and prompt settlement of all controversies between the railroads of the country and their employees.

The secretary of state is hereby requested to forward copies of this memorial and resolution to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Approved March 2, 1895.

STATE OF MINNESOTA, *Department of State:*

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of house file No. 460, filed in this office March 2, 1895.

ALBERT BERG, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. CALL presented a petition, in the form of resolutions, adopted at a mass meeting called by the mayor of the city of West Tampa, Fla.; a petition of Nassau Camp, No. 104, Union Confederate Veterans, of Fernandina, Fla., and a petition of the city council of St. Augustine, Fla., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present a petition of the National Wool Growers' Association and others, with accompanying papers, praying for protective legislation for the sheep industry. As it is the petition of an association of great national importance, I move that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN presented the petition of Francis A. Field, late captain, Eleventh United States Infantry, praying for the enactment of legislation restoring him to the Army and placing him on the retired list thereof; which was referred to the Commttee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOAR. I present the petition of six clubs composed of colored men in Massachusetts, signed by their officers, all of the highest respectability, stating that in some parts of the country daily the lives of American citizens are taken, some burned alive, under circumstances of the grossest cruelty, without any trial by jury or other legal process. The petitioners desire, if there is not now power in Congress to suppress these crimes, that the Constitution may be amended so that proper laws may be made. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PEFFER, from the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during the sessions of Congress, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 242) to require payment of pension money to wives in cases where male pensioners desert or abandon their families, or are habitual drunkards, or for any reason fail and neglect to support their families, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 480) granting a pension to William B. Matchett, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 682) for the relief of the heirs of Sterling T. Austin, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 683) granting restoration of pension to Wallace G. Bone; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 684) granting an increase of pension to Marion McKibben; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 685) granting a pension to Mrs. Alice Martin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MILLS introduced a bill (S. 686) to increase the pension of Francis M. Durham; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PUGH introduced a bill (S. 687) to apply the unexpended balance of the amount heretofore appropriated for the relief of the captain, owners, officers, and crew of the late United States private armed brig *General Armstrong*, their heirs, executors, administrators, agents, or assigns; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PRITCHARD (by request) introduced a bill (S. 688) for the relief of Thomas S. Lutterloh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 689) to equalize the several States of the Union in the grant of lands for school purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (S. 690) for the relief of Fanny B. Randolph and Dora L. Stark; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 691) for the relief of Capt. W. M. Wallace; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 692) for the relief of the legal representatives of James and William Crooks, of Canada; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 693) granting a pension to Joseph U. H. Gill; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 694) for the relief of James R. D. Morrison and William H. Morrison, executor of William M. Morrison and administrator of Charles J. Morrison, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 695) granting an increase of pension to Richard Dobson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 696) granting a pension to Nancy J. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORRILL introduced a bill (S. 697) for the reconstruction of the United States custom-house and post-office building at St. Albans, Vt., destroyed by fire May 19, 1895; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 698) to provide for the erection of an additional fireproof building for the National Museum; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SHERMAN. I introduce, by request, a bill of which I do not approve. I ask that it be read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The bill (S. 699) to aid in regulating the currency was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 700) for the relief of John E. Welch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 701) for the relief of Charles A. M. Mead; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 702) granting a pension to Caroline Stockton Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 703) for the relief of the widow of George C. Foulk, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 704) for the relief of George Rushburger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 705) granting a pension to Emily B. Muncey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 706) for the relief of Eugenia Wood; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 707) to increase the pension of Brig. Gen. Charles A. Heckman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads, and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 709) for the relief of W. L. Adams, of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 710) granting a pension to Ada J. Schwatka, widow of the late Lieut. Frederick Schwatka; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 711) to provide for the construction of a public building at Salem, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 712) to pay the claims of citizens of Oregon for supplies audited by Philo Callender, commissioner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 713) for the relief of the legal representatives of Chauncey M. Lockwood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 714) granting a pension to Benjamin Franklin Dowell, of Oregon, for services with the Oregon Volunteers in the years 1853, 1854, 1855, and 1856; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 715) for the relief of B. F. Dowell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GIBSON introduced a bill (S. 716) to correct the naval history of John C. Dull; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 717) for the erection of a public building at Fergus Falls, Minn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 718) subjecting national banks to the usury laws of the States where they are located; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 719) to restore a pension to Harriet M. Knowlton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 720) for the relief of settlers on second indemnity lands of the Northern Pacific Railway; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FAULKNER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 721) to amend the charter of the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 722) for the relief of Mrs. Rhoda Neal; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 723) for the relief of William M. Coffman, administrator of Samuel Coffman, deceased, late of Greenbrier County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 724) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Mallery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 725) granting a pension to Anna C. Garber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 726) granting an increase of pension to Henry Slaughter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 727) granting increase of pensions to soldiers who have lost an eye; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HILL introduced a bill (S. 728) to compensate Elihu Root for services rendered by direction of the Attorney-General; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 729) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Herrman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 730) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Helen Morrell Carroll; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 731) in amendment of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 732) to regulate the issue and recording of the commissions of officers in several of the Departments; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 733) for the relief of the heirs of S. H. Hill, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 734) for ascertaining the feasibility and probable cost of constructing a canal from the Tennessee River, at or near the city of Chattanooga, in the State of Tennessee, to the navigable waters of the Savannah River, in the State of Georgia, by which there will be furnished adequate water communication by the shortest and most practicable route between the Atlantic Ocean and the navigable waters of the rivers in the Mississippi Valley; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BACON. I ask that the bill may lie on the table, in order that at some future time I may submit some remarks upon it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie on the table for the present.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 736) for the relief of the heirs of Myra Clark Gaines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 735) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy; to increase the usefulness and numbers of the Corps of Naval Engineers; to induce the scientific institutions to provide a naval engineering reserve for time of war; to establish a naval engineering experimental station, and to encourage the study of the mechanic arts and sciences, and particularly that of naval engineering in the technological colleges of the country; which was read twice by its title.

INCREASE OF NAVAL ENGINEERING EFFICIENCY.

Mr. SQUIRE. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in reference to the bill by way of explanation. It provides first for an increase in the number of the Corps of Naval Engineers. On this point we have the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted April 20, 1892, in which they call attention to the fact that the Corps of Naval Engineers then consisted of 189 persons in all, and in the opinion of the committee at that time there were required 303 officers for the Bureau of Engineering. The committee in their report state as follows:

> It will be seen that the total number for supplying effectively the demands of the Navy for sea and shore duty is 303, an increase of 114 over the present list, as stated above.
>
> In view of the increase in the number of war ships, completed and provided for with modern, complicated machinery, propelled almost entirely by steam power, your committee is of opinion that this number added to the Engineer Corps of the Navy is not only not excessive, but necessary to meet the requirements of the service.

In the same report I notice a paragraph from the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, as follows:

> There is still another and very important point that is generally overlooked when considering the Engineer Corps of the Navy, and that is that it is a part of the military organization and second to none in importance. *In the naval battle of the future the engineer staff will have a difficult and important part to perform, and if there is failure in the engine room no amount of skill and bravery on the bridge may suffice to avert disaster. Celerity of movement has decided many a naval battle and will decide many more, and the celerity of movement of a modern ship depends directly on the skill of her engineer officers.*

There are three or four other points to which I wish to refer briefly. The bill proposes to give positive rank and title to the officers of the Corps of Engineers, or the Bureau of Engineering, as it is termed in the bill. The third point is that the command of the engineer force shall be under the authority of the commanding officer of the ship. Fourth, the manner of selecting cadets and filling vacancies in the Engineer Corps should be changed. This is the educational feature of the bill. Fifth, the enlargement of the duties of the Engineer Corps of the Navy in accordance with modern requirements is provided for in the bill.

Mr. President, by the courtesy of Rear-Admiral Beardslee, commanding the United States naval forces on the Pacific coast, I recently visited the flagship *Philadelphia*, and had great satisfaction in examining that splendid cruiser. Going through the vessel below the water line, I observed the vast amount of machinery, the complicated elements that enter into its construction, making the care of a modern vessel of war very important as regards the feature of steam engineering. One passes through compartment after compartment, and is almost lost in bewilderment in the mazes of the complicated machinery around him. It occurred to me that not enough attention has been paid to the personnel of the Navy as respects steam engineering. Truly, the propelling power is the soul of the ship. Without it the ship can not be handled and is totally useless. This power is under the supervision of the engineer officers. Therefore it is needful to have a high order of personnel, a larger number of officers, and those of great attainments and proficiency.

If I am correctly informed, steam power as applied to the propulsion of ships of the Navy has originated so recently as since the year 1845. At first it was so little used that the smokestack was telescoped up in sections for occasional use. This fact will indicate its then comparative unimportance. Since those days steam power has gradually gained in importance until it has become the sole propelling power, and sails are now entirely dis-

carded in the "new Navy.' This fact was distinctly recognized in the British navy when Capt. (now Rear-Admiral, retired) P. H. Colomb, royal navy, said:

What we have to do in the navy is really to welcome the coming, speed the parting guest. The parting guest is the seamanship of the past, that which confined itself to the management of the ship under sail alone. The coming guest is steam, mechanism, and forces of all kinds other than the winds. Now, instead of frankly going out, shaking hands, and bidding good-bye to the parting guest, and wishing him well, and going down to the steps to meet the new one and bring him in, we are holding on to the coat tails of the old one, and trying to shake hands with the coming guest with the left hand, or perhaps with only one finger.

In 1891, Assistant Secretary Soley, of the Navy, said to the graduating class at the United States Naval Academy:

To-day the steel ship, carrying thirty or forty separate engines, cut up into innumerable compartments, lighted by electricity and as fine and complicated in its interior details as the works of a watch, requires for its management a far more advanced training.

What was true a few years ago is still more impressive to-day, when we have one great battle ship in commission, another nearly completed, other battle ships in process of construction, besides several torpedo boats of the highest type now contracted for, and twelve others of the latter class included in the estimates of the Department for the next fiscal year.

In order to provide additional engineer officers, many years ago—I think it was in the year 1879—there was a provision of law enacted authorizing the President to appoint 25 of the officers of this Bureau to give instruction in engineering and marine architecture in the colleges and schools of the land. The State University of Washington has recently made application for such an officer, and I learn that the request has been up to the present time refused or not acted upon, on the ground that there are not enough officers to enable a sufficient number to be detailed for such duty, and that there is actually only one such officer now so employed in the United States. There is no doubt of the fact that the great engineering schools of our principal universities, such as Yale, Harvard, Cornell, and many others that I might mention, have been increased in usefulness by reason of the detail of officers of the Engineer Corps of the Navy.

We are building in this country vessels that were unknown to former times, and we need adepts in the art of engineering and marine architecture. There is no way to obtain a suitable class of men except by preparing them in the various educational schools. Ships can be built, but men can not be built. When war comes, if it should come, unhappily, we will need proper men to handle these great engines of war. The only way to have such men is to educate them in advance. I believe the provisions of the law of 1879 should be carried out, and that the schools and colleges of the land which apply for professors of steam engineering and naval architecture should be accommodated by the detail of officers for such purpose. But that is only one of the features which contribute to the practical merit of this measure.

It is evident, too, that there is great danger of the breaking down of those officers. They are employed in very difficult work. To take care of all this valuable property requires a high degree of skill, and causes an immense strain upon the officers. It is well known that our battle ships cost about $4,000,000 apiece, and they are liable to have something out of order all the time. In fact, one of the officers of this corps told me that there is usually something out of order on a war vessel all the time requiring the attention of an expert. Oftentimes those officers have to submit to very severe physical strains. They have to go down and work in the hold of the ship, where the temperature ranges from 150° to 170° Fahrenheit, and this causes great physical exhaustion. I believe that the number of engineer officers should be increased so as to make provision for these breakdowns, and to enable a sufficient number of officers to be employed on vessels to allow for necessary changes in the supervisory watch.

I am not undertaking to present this matter in full to-day. I wish merely to say enough to call the attention of the Senate to the subject. I believe that this branch of the service of the Navy should be encouraged and dignified and rendered more attractive and popular to the cadets and those naturally fitted to become engineers, and for this and other reasons that the officers should be given positive rank and title, so that a mere officer of the deck, perhaps an ensign, can not control a commodore in the Bureau of Engineering unless such officer shall be in command of the ship. I think, too, that the manner of selecting cadets and filling vacancies in the Engineer Corps should be changed so that Senators shall have the appointment of such cadets. Something must be done or the personnel of the engineering force in the Navy will fall far below the proper standard. In fact, it may be considered relatively below it to-day, as shown by the report of the Naval Committee in 1892. We have in commission in the Navy at this time 42 vessels, with 19 more vessels building, making in all 61. It is useless to undertake to manage this vast interest without having competent men, men thoroughly educated and prepared, and a sufficient number of them to provide for the necessary changes. This branch of the service, as I have stated, should be popularized in every suitable way.

Then, again, I believe that some of the duties of the officers of this Department should be changed. For example, I think that the purchases of coal to be tested for use on our war vessels should be made through the Bureau of Engineering and not through the Bureau of Equipment and Recruiting. The engineers know, or can ascertain, what should be tried in the way of coal, and what kinds of coal are best adapted to the service. On the Pacific Coast we have had occasion to criticise severely the fact that our American vessels of war have not been using the coal of the United States, but have been going to British Columbia for their coal, very much to the disgust of our own American people on that coast. We believe that suitable appliances should be prepared for using American coal. If there is any trouble on account of what is called the forced draft or the too free burning of the coal, then appliances should be arranged and regulated to use American coal, so that when vessels find themselves engaged at some time possibly in the future with a foreign foe they can obtain their coals in the United States, and those coals will be suitable to use in their furnaces. Why should we wait the advent of war before we adapt our war ships to the supplies obtainable in time of war? Therefore I think this question is one of vital importance. I want to see not only the question of experimental tests, but the whole question of coal purchases referred to the Bureau of Engineering. If necessary, this Bureau can adapt their furnaces and appliances to suit the coal to be obtained on any part of our extensive coasts. But I have no doubt that much depends upon proper tact and management in the use of coals in the fast-burning furnaces. The whole responsibility for this should be thrown upon the Bureau of Engineers, where it properly belongs.

How ridiculous for our Navy to depend upon foreign coal when there are vast supplies of American coal within easy reach, suitable for steam purposes, as proved by long use and experience!

Then, too, Mr. President, we have all the electrical appliances to be cared for. The officers of the Bureau of Steam Engineering now have the work of caring for those appliances, putting them in repair; and I believe the whole subject of electrical apparatus should come under the Bureau of Engineering, reorganized as proposed in this bill. In fact, the subject is one that should engage the very early attention of the Senate.

I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and trust we may receive a favorable and prompt report.

The motion was agreed to.

INTRUDERS IN CHEROKEE COUNTRY.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 19) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to suspend the removal of intruders from the Cherokee country until the further action of Congress; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution. Let it be read for information.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to suspend action under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1893 (27 Stats., 641), ratifying the agreement with the Cherokee Nation of December 19, 1891, as to the actual removal from the Cherokee country of persons designated by the authorities as intruders until the appraisal of the value of the improvements of such persons shall have been completed and submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior and until the further action of Congress.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HOAR. Has the joint resolution had the approbation, informally, of the members of the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It has been informally submitted to all the members of the committee who are present, so far as I know, and it meets the approval of all so far as I am informed.

Mr. GRAY. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will give us a brief explanation of the object of the joint resolution.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In the last Indian appropriation act there was a provision almost identical with the terms of the joint resolution. At the end of the provision a proviso was inserted, which I shall read, but I will read the whole paragraph:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to suspend action under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1893, (27 Stats., 641), ratifying the agreement with the Cherokee Nation of December 19, 1891, as to the actual removal from the Cherokee country of persons designated by the authorities as intruders until the appraisal of the value of the improvements of such persons shall have been completed and approved by the Secretary of the Interior and submitted by him to Congress, and the removal of such intruders shall not be made earlier than January 1, 1896: *Provided*, That whenever any intruder shall have been paid or tendered the appraised value of his improvements, if he does not immediately surrender possession of the same to the authorities of the Cherokee

Nation he shall pay rent therefor at the rate usual in the country, but this provision shall not be construed to extend the time for the removal of intruders according to the foregoing agreement beyond the 1st day of January, 1896.

Under this provision it seems to be absolutely necessary that the Secretary of the Interior shall remove these people from the Cherokee country between now and the 1st day of January, 1896. Congress appointed a commission during its last session, generally known as the Dawes Commission, which was sent among those people, and was empowered to arrange with them for a settlement of the questions that are pending. The Commission recommends certain action by Congress. I have the report of the Commission before me, and it is very clear and distinct in its recommendations.

This joint resolution simply provides for the maintenance of the condition of things existing now as to the people called intruders until Congress shall take whatever action it chooses to take under the recommendation of the Dawes Commission. There are several thousand people who are claimed by the Cherokees to be intruders, who claim on their part that they are citizens under the laws of the country, and the object is simply to prevent any action from being taken for the present until these questions are settled under the law that is to be passed by Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to have the joint resolution read again.

The Secretary again read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. PLATT. I introduce a joint resolution for reference eventually to the Committee on Indian Affairs, but I desire that it shall be printed and lie on the table, as some Senators have suggested to me that they would like to make some remarks upon it before its reference, and perhaps I myself may desire to do so.

The joint resolution (S. R. 20) concerning the condition of the Indian Territory as regards population, occupation of land, etc., was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the condition of the Indian Territory as regards population, occupation of land, and the absence of adequate government for the security of life and property has so changed since the making of treaties with the Five Civilized Tribes that the United States is no longer under either legal or moral obligation to guarantee or permit tribal Indian government in said Territory, and should at once take such steps as may be necessary to protect the rights and liberties of all the inhabitants of said territories.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will lie on the table.

STATUE OF GENERAL SHIELDS.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound in one volume the proceedings in Congress upon the acceptance of the statue of James Shields, 16,500 copies, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 each for use and distribution by the governors of Illinois, Minnesota, and Missouri, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to have printed an engraving of said statue to accompany said proceedings, said engraving to be paid for out of the appropriation for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. CULLOM. I suppose the resolution necessarily goes to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under the rule it must be so referred.

Mr. HARRIS. I rose for the purpose of asking the Senator if it must not under the law go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. CULLOM. I so understand it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

ARMENIAN OUTRAGES.

Mr. CALL submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That humanity and religion and the principles on which all civilization rests demand that the civilized Governments shall by peaceful negotiations, or if necessary by force of arms, prevent and suppress the cruelties and massacres inflicted on the Armenian subjects of Turkey by the establishment of a government of their own people, with such guaranties by the civilized powers of its authority and permanence as shall be adequate to that end.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the resolution may lie on the table for the present, and that it be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table and be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 803) to amend section 2601 of the Revised Statutes, relative to ports of entry, was read twice by its title.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the bill may lie on the table for the present, so that I may call it up later and have it considered.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the joint resolution (S. R. 12) to enforce the Monroe doctrine, which I introduced some days ago, and which was laid on the table, may now be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution referred to by the Senator from Illinois, which will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the policy proclaimed by President Monroe in his message of December 2, 1823, and since known as the Monroe doctrine, is by precedent and tradition the recognized rightful policy of the United States, and that this Government will regard the establishment by any European power of any new colonial dependency, or of any protectorate over any existing or future government, or the extension of any territorial possession, or the control or ownership of any interoceanic canal on the continent of America as a dangerous menace to the welfare and prosperity of the United States.

Mr. CULLOM. After I shall have made the remarks which I propose to submit on the joint resolution, unless some other Senator desires to address himself to the subject, I shall ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, the United States is not a government of conquest or of usurpation. Our country is not a country of wars and warfare. Our people are not bred to the business of human slaughter, nor educated in the trade of blood. Our fathers taught us that the empire of happiness was not to be reached by grasping the territory of our neighbors, but rather that the peace and prosperity of our country and the highest enjoyment of our people would be found in wisely caring for the magnificent inheritance which they transmitted to us. The title deeds to this vast estate came to us hallowed by the immortal farewell of Washington, and by the utterances of Jefferson and Madison, Adams and Monroe.

We find ourselves in possession of a land the greatest and best upon the earth; a dominion of which King Solomon in all his glory never dreamed. Those of us who are "native and to the manner born" love our country and our institutions with unbounded devotion; while our brothers from other lands who have joined in citizenship with us here emulate the best of us in patriotism and Americanism.

To what purpose have we reached this high degree in the progress of nations? Shall we see to it that our future shall advance as our past has done; that we take no step backward, but still keep up the march of the Republic?

If we would do this in this world of competition and strife, and maintain our national honor, with our territorial unity and integrity, we must have some affirmative, distinctive idea or policy of such simple and unquestioned propriety that it shall receive the universal sanction of our people. It must possess such elements of right and justice in itself and bear such interpretation in the relation it shall declare between the United States and other nations that no serious objection can lie against it. By the adoption of such a policy, and its public declaration by the Congress of the United States, we ennoble what we all substantially approve as the Monroe doctrine, and it becomes at once and forever thereafter the American doctrine. It becomes, indeed, the utterance of the American people, as supreme and sacred in its authority as that other declaration, headed by John Hancock, which in 1776, in the name and by the authority of the good people of the colonies, solemnly published and declared "that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States."

Mr. President, in my judgment, in view of the history of the past, in view of the position which the United States maintains among the nations of the earth, and in close view of the current events which bear upon our welfare and upon the peace of the world, we can not longer delay the proclamation of the American policy, long known as the Monroe doctrine, without trifling with the interests which are committed to our charge. This much is due to ourselves, that by no laches on our part can it be truly said that we are too long sleeping upon our just rights. And this, too, is due to Europe, that the Governments of the Old World may know that 75,000,000 American citizens, speaking through their representatives in Congress, are a unit in maintaining the American doctrine of James Monroe; and it is also due to the independent Governments of the other America lying to the south of us, whose tenure of existence practically depends upon the honesty of the United States in sustaining the doctrine of the message of 1823.

Mr. President, it may be said that the Monroe doctrine already stands in force as a recognized part of our American policy. That is only true in a limited and qualified sense. It is a rule for the Executive, for the President of the United States, until he shall see fit, because of his own belief, to change it. Any President may abrogate or countermand it. We have already had two illustrations of this. Mr. Calhoun, who was a member of the Cabinet of President Monroe when the message was prepared, and who was afterwards in the Senate, took occasion, twenty-five years later, to greatly qualify, if not to entirely deny, the accepted meaning of the message of President Monroe.

And still later, John M. Clayton, Secretary of State under President Taylor, in making what was called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, consented to the use of such uncertain language that, very soon after it was ratified, Great Britain laid claim of dominion over certain of the territory which was covered by the treaty, and it required ten years of diplomatic negotiation before the United States fully regained what had been endangered by the action of the Taylor Administration.

I maintain, Mr. President, that this Government can not afford to permit any uncertain or equivocal construction to be possible upon so important a subject. The Monroe doctrine is the motto which should be indelibly engraved upon the portals of the Department of State. Instead of remaining as an edict of the Executive, it should bear the definite approval of Congress and become a fixed and permanent ordinance, giving notice to all the world that the United States will not view with favor the erection of any more European colonies on these continents, nor any extension of the European political system upon this hemisphere, nor any European interposition in the affairs of the Spanish-American Republics.

Mr. President, it has been seventy-two years since President Monroe, in his message to the Congress of the United States, declared the doctrine that—

> This Government would consider any attempt on the part of European powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety * * * and that it is impossible that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference.

It has been a little longer since Mr. Canning, representing the British Government, in writing to Mr. Rush, the American minister at the Court of St. James, expressed a desire that Great Britain and the United States should come to an understanding with each other that they would oppose any attempt by European powers to reduce or subjugate the Spanish-American colonies, or any part of them, by cession or conquest. The suggestion of the representative of the British Government looking to the recognition of the Spanish colonies in South and Central America more than seventy-two years ago, and suggesting that his Government and the United States Government should stand together against interference by the Alliance or other European power with the Spanish-American colonies, was followed soon thereafter by the proclamation of President Monroe. I desire to say, Mr. President, that the history of the country and of those times comes very near sustaining the proposition that the representative of the British Government was the first man to suggest to this country the doctrine, to which the American people have adhered ever since, called the Monroe doctrine. The Government has not stood by it with that constancy and force due alike to the people and the dignity of the nation. There has been a degree of weakness and vacillation at times which have been observed by other nations, and a consequent manifestation of disregard of what has long been known as the position of the United States.

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty, entered into between the United States and Great Britain in relation to a canal between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by way of the River San Juan de Nicaragua, etc., contained provisions which were in contravention of the Monroe doctrine, and which were repudiated by the Government since.

Mr. Blaine, while Secretary of State under Presidents Garfield and Arthur, in his instructions to Mr. Lowell, our minister to Great Britain, sets forth with great force and clearness the particulars in which the treaty should be modified. He discussed the treaty as it applied to the rights of parties connected with the proposed canal, but the suggestions applied with equal force to the soundness of the Monroe doctrine as relating to the acquisition of territory on this hemisphere by European powers.

Mr. Frelinghuysen, our Secretary of State when Lord Granville favored the assumption of joint control or a protectorate by several powers in case a canal should be constructed across the Isthmus, said in a letter to the British minister that the President would not consent to or look with indifference upon such an intervention in American affairs; that such a protectorate by European nations over the Isthmus transit would be in conflict with the American doctrine many years asserted by distinguished citizens, believed in by the people, and approved by Great Britain, and that—

> A protectorate over the proposed canal would seriously affect and threaten our political interests.

Mr. President, John Quincy Adams, in his letter to Mr. Middleton, July 23, 1823, in his usual direct and vigorous manner said, that—

> The future peace of the world and the interests of Russia herself can not be promoted by Russian settlements upon any part of the American continent. With the exception of the British establishments north of the United States, the remainder of the American continents must henceforth be left to the management of American hands.

The literature in support of the Monroe doctrine, as applied to the territory on this hemisphere and to interoceanic canals on our southern border, is almost endless; yet other nations seem not to regard it as having any force in guiding the conduct of the Government, and hence they proceed to the accomplishment of their purposes without much reference to it.

In my judgment, the time has come when the nation should put the question beyond cavil; the time has come when the nation, by its Congress, should declare the doctrine which has been so often declared by its Chief Executives and other representative men; the time has come when more positive language should be used than the old and oft-repeated declaration that "this Government can not view with indifference attempts of European Governments to colonize either in North, South, or Central America."

The nation has played diplomacy long enough, and without much effect. Great Britain has been disregarding polite requests, protests, arguments, and suggestions that we can not "look with indifference" upon her policy to reach out farther until she, if let alone, will finally dominate Venezuela, and what else I am not now prepared to say. The time has come for a plain, positive declaration of the Monroe doctrine by Congress, and then, if necessary, plain, positive enforcement of it against all comers.

Whatever European rights existed on this hemisphere in our early history as to ownership of territory must not be disputed. If there is dispute between nations as to boundary lines as they were, then let those lines be agreed upon by arbitration or in some way be fairly and honestly determined. The United States does not seek war with any nation, small or great. The days of wars between civilized nations are passed, certainly in relation to ordinary matters of dispute. We do not attempt to interfere in matters touching interests or controversies in European countries, and we do not intend that European powers shall interfere in political affairs in this Western Continent.

In the personal diary of John Quincy Adams, written when he was Secretary of State in President Monroe's Cabinet, he relates the particulars of a visit to him from Baron Tuyl, the Russian minister to this country. The question then at issue between the United States, Great Britain, and Russia was as to the title to the Northwestern Territory of North America, lying northward of the mouth of the Columbia River. Mr. Adams says (July 17, 1823):

> I told him (Baron Tuyl) specially that we would contest the right of Russia to any territorial establishment on this continent, and that we would assume distinctly the principle that the American continents are no longer subjects for any new European colonial establishments.

Charles Francis Adams says this is the first hint of the policy so well known afterwards as the Monroe doctrine. A few days before this, however, Secretary Adams, in a letter to Mr. Rush, our minister to Great Britain, had said, in speaking of the independent nations of South America and Mexico:

> The American continents henceforth will no longer be subject to colonization. And the Pacific Ocean, in every part of it, will remain open to the navigation of all nations, in like manner with the Atlantic.

The reason for this assertion of the American position is found in the fact that Spain, supported by the Holy Alliance of European nations, was taking preliminary steps to regain by force her former colonial possessions in South America and Mexico. All these colonies had cut loose from Spanish control, and all of them had organized independent Governments for themselves. This was the existing situation, and the United States, through President Monroe and Secretary John Quincy Adams, announced as its policy that no more European colonization would be permitted on this hemisphere. To understand how serious and important to us and to the people of both North and South America this ultimatum was, I will state the nature of the Holy Alliance, which had offered support to Spain in her design to again overrun America.

The Holy Alliance was a league concluded at Paris in 1815 between the sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, signed personally with their own hands without the intervention of their ministers. It was really a league or compact to maintain the power and influence of their existing dynasties, although they made pretension of other reasons. It was presented for acceptance to nearly all European powers. All accepted it except Great Britain. The strong opposition of the Duke of Wellington prevented its adoption by the British Government. That power had conquered and banished Napoleon, and, fresh from victory, they felt equal to any emergency without invoking the aid of European allies.

Among the curious and interesting facts of history is the part taken by Great Britain then, as compared with her position now. England was then as now the great commercial power of the world, while Spain had degenerated to a second or third class power. England was building up a very profitable commerce with the independent States in South America which she did not wish interfered with by Spain or the Holy Alliance. So the British premier, Mr. Canning, proposed that the United States and Great Britain should join in a public declaration opposing the policy of the alli-

ance in regard to American affairs, which I have already referred to, and asserting that the two countries would not view with indifference any foreign intervention in the affairs of Spanish-American governments. The American minister, Mr. Rush, consented to join in the arrangement provided England would acknowledge the independence of these newly formed Republics; but the negotiations went no further. The English Government, however, through Mr. Canning, informed France that Great Britain would not permit any European intervention in Spanish-American affairs, whereupon France disavowed any intention of so interfering; Prince Polignac stating that it was utterly hopeless to reduce Spanish-America to the state of its former relations with Spain.

Here was a practical announcement by England equivalent in meaning and almost in terms with the Monroe doctrine as proclaimed by President Monroe a few weeks after, and with it a practical acquiescence by France, almost simultaneously.

President Monroe addressed letters to the venerable ex-Presidents, Jefferson and Madison, asking their views and advice in regard to the situation which then confronted the Administration. Thomas Jefferson, at 80 years of age, writing from his retirement at Monticello in reply to President Monroe, on June 11, 1823, expressed much indignation at the course of Spain and her European allies in trying to dictate to the independent States of Southern and Central America as to their form of government. The Holy Alliance did not include Great Britain—

But—

Said Jefferson—

its presumption in dictating to an independent nation the form of its government is so arrogant, so atrocious, that indignation, as well as moral sentiment, enlists all our partialities and prayers in favor of one and our equal execrations against the other. I had ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. Their mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their form and principles of government are all foreign to us. They are nations of eternal war. All their energies are expended in the destruction of labor, property, and lives of their people.

Again, on October 24, 1823, Mr. Jefferson, in reply to a letter from President Monroe, uses the following most courageous and impressive language:

DEAR SIR: The question presented by the letter you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation; this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening upon us. And never could we embark upon it under circumstances more auspicious.

Our first and fundamental maxim should be, never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. Our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cisatlantic affairs. America, North and South, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe, and peculiarly her own. She should therefore have a system of her own, separate and apart from that of Europe. While the last is laboring to become the domicile of despotism, our endeavor should surely be to make our hemisphere that of freedom. One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this pursuit; she now offers to lead, aid, and accompany us in it. Great Britain is the nation which can do us the most harm of any one, or all, on earth; and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world.

Mr. Monroe's message of December 2, 1823, is as follows:

The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow-men on the other side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements on this hemisphere we are of necessity more intimately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective Governments. And to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

I can not do better than to present here the eloquent words of Daniel Webster. Referring to this important state paper, in April, 1826, Mr. Webster, in the House of Representatives, said:

I look on the message of December, 1823, as forming a bright page in our history. I will neither help to erase it or tear it out; nor shall it be by any act of mine blurred or blotted. It did honor to the sagacity of the Government, and I will not diminish that honor. It elevated the hopes and gratified the patriotism of the people. Over those hopes I will not bring a mildew; nor will I put that gratified patriotism to shame.

Among the many considerations to which it is but just to refer, not the least important is the penchant of each of the great powers of Europe for the occupation and absorption of the territory of weak foreign nations whose productions are of importance to the trade and commerce of the great powers.

It has been the history of the monarchical countries of Europe for very many years that they have run races with each other in the capture and dismemberment of the smaller governments of the world. They have reduced many of these to the condition of mere satrapies, called colonies, wholly subordinate to their European conquerors. The history of these outrageous acts of nearly every European power of consequence is but a repetition, time after time, of the story of usurpation, tyranny, and bloodshed. A pretext is made, the inhabitants are driven off or enslaved, peacefully if possible, but with fire and sword if necessary; the country is occupied, and its whole material capabilities are made tributary to the conquering nation. Taxes, duties, and imposts of the utmost severity are collected from the helpless inhabitants, and thenceforward there is no more consideration shown toward the colony than the lion shows the lamb.

The only compassion or relenting which is ever manifested is that which will encourage the suffering people to produce a greater revenue for their masters. A hundred and twenty years ago that was the relation this country held toward the British Crown. Our people, our immediate ancestors, in their trade and manufactures, were as completely subjugated by the laws of England, enforced by the war power, as if they were suffering imprisonment under the penal statutes. The commercial and manufacturing interests of the United States, or rather of the colonies, as they were known prior to our Revolution, were wholly and absolutely at the mercy of the English Parliament.

In 1699 it was enacted by the Parliament—

That no wool yarn or woolen manufactures of the American plantations shall be shipped thence, or even laden, in order to be transported, on any pretense whatever.

In 1719 Parliament declared—

The erecting of manufactories in the colonies tends to lessen their dependence upon Great Britain.

In 1742 the British Board of Trade reported to Parliament that the Americans had begun to manufacture paper, which they said—

Interferes with the profits made by the British merchants.

Parliament instituted an inquiry, through the colonial governors, in relation to the progress of American manufactures, which resulted in showing that leather, a little poor iron, and cloths for domestic purposes were manufactured, all of which was considered to be—

Prejudicial to the trade and manufactories of Great Britain.

In response to this same board of trade, Parliament had already, in 1732, prohibited the exportation from the colonies of such articles of manufacture as interfered with like articles produced in England. In 1750 Parliament prohibited the erection of mills for rolling iron in the colonies, and also the making of steel, and if any such mills were found erected in any part of the colonies, the colonial governors were required to treat them as nuisances, and to destroy them under severe penalties for disobedience. The navigation laws prohibited the exportation of articles of colonial manufacture, and forbade any foreign commodity imported except in English ships.

Among the numerous complaints against Great Britain recited in our Declaration of Independence is this: "For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world." And the same policy of repression and subjugation has always been pursued by all the great nations toward their colonies.

The action of England toward the American colonies was the same as that of Spain, France, Holland, Denmark, and other European countries toward their colonial possessions. These remote colonies made subordinate to the home governments are the fields whence the revenues of the nations are collected, and where every sort of device is resorted to to keep the people down, that the home interests may be benefited.

The United States is the first great nation which has declined to establish any sort of protectorate or to maintain distant colonies. This is the first nation to follow a policy of absolute noninterference in the affairs of the other hemisphere. Whatever European countries may do toward each other we leave to them to arrange among themselves. We draw the line exactly where it existed at the time when President Monroe made his memorable declaration, and where we believe it should remain. We have no concern with foreign usurpations in Europe, or in any of the countries of the Eastern Hemisphere, where the welfare of the United States is not immediately affected. But we can not permit that the possessions of the independent Governments of America, either North or South, shall, either by negotiation or conquest, become subject to European domination. We should definitely proclaim, what we have by Executive authority announced, that any such act will be regarded as endangering our system and threatening our just supremacy upon the Western Hemisphere.

The experiment of a republican form of government, now in its second century, is entitled to have, and should have on this conti-

nent, its full development and operation. The American Republic, as the pioneer, and as the typical Government, in which the people are the real and ultimate sovereigns, is entitled to the right to protect itself as against encroachments of adverse and foreign powers in such way as is reasonable and just.

What authority entitles European nations to such a colonial foothold on our borders? They have planted their flags on all the scattering islands and in nearly every spot on earth where they could monopolize trade or control the strategic advantages of location for their own interests. But it is our duty to be always ready to meet any and all attempts they may make to approach unpleasantly near the established danger line. We offer no obstruction to their proper use of any transcontinental channel which may be constructed, but the control and sovereignty of such highway can never be held by any foreign power. Prior to 1823 certain rights had accrued to foreign powers and dominion had been exercised by them over certain territory on our borders, but since that time we have not consented to any extension of such dominion. We have reached the time when it becomes our bounden duty to say to the world, with dignity and firmness, that thus far, but no farther, shall foreign systems of government be permitted to approach. Our policy is the American policy, our doctrine is the protection of American interests, and our motto is "America for Americans."

We do not claim that the world is ours, but we will insist on our right to be consulted upon affairs pertaining to the American continents. We do not, like Don Quixote, go prancing about the world looking for adventures or seeking for some imprisoned princess or struggling nation to set free, but we acknowledge kinship in a degree with all the Republics of America, whose independence, like ours, has long since been acknowledged and recognized by the powers of Europe. The United States can not sit indifferently by when the territorial integrity of any of these neighboring countries is questioned by a foreign nation. We shall always be awake to any such attempt, and it is our business to see to it that their possessions are not curtailed materially from the just line established years ago by treaty stipulations. Anything short of this derogates from our dignity and tends to weaken the influence which the United States, as the mistress of the Western World, should maintain in American affairs.

I desire to submit to the Senate a further reason (if any further reason be needed) why the United States should no longer delay in announcing and proclaiming to the world by an authoritative statement from the legislative branch of the Government of its entire concurrence in the exposition of the American policy so clearly set forth by James Monroe. That reason is to be found in the expressions of the press and the public men of England in recent times. I quote from a cable telegram from London, dated November 15, 1895, as it appears in the Post of this city on that date:

William T. Stead, editor of the Review of Reviews, having seen the interview with Senator LODGE, replied at length to the statements made. England, he said, would never consent to any veto being placed on the freest possible expansion of the Pacific Ocean trade and settlements and the colonization of the Western World. He insisted that it would be absurd to submit the Venezuelan question to arbitration, especially with the example of the termination of the *Alabama* claims as an object lesson. In conclusion, he said he recognized the fact that the Americans were quite in a frame of mind to invent new doctrines if they found that the Monroe doctrine did not apply to Venezuela.

Editorially discussing the interview with HENRY CABOT LODGE on the Monroe doctrine, the London Chronicle says:

"Mr. Chamberlain, secretary of state for the colonies, is not likely to attempt to play the rôle of Napoleon of Venezuela. Unless the United States formally proclaims a protectorate over all of the South American Republics, we are bound to protect our citizens. Failing the establishment of such a protectorate, we do not see how loose policies like those of the Monroe doctrine can stop us from protecting the lives and property of English people in the New World."

There are Governments there, and those Governments can probably protect their citizens without any protectorate being thrown over them by the British Government or any other European power. Is it either politic or right that the press of Great Britain or of any other European country shall have any excuse for so determining or interpreting what the American policy is and what it means?

The people of the United States have already, so far as the Executive could determine it, plainly proclaimed the Monroe doctrine. All that is now demanded is the proclamation of the solemn and deliberate concurrence of the Congress of the United States to make it apparent to every European nation what are the will and temper of the American people. The voice of the United States so expressed will be as potent to settle the matter for future time as if it were thundered from the top of Sinai; and whether or not this Congress passes a declaration proclaiming what the Monroe doctrine is, the people of the United States will demand its enforcement as they understand it.

Conceding to the diplomatic authorities of all European countries at this day a due regard for honesty and propriety, we can not shut our eyes to the sad and miserable history of deceit, dishonesty, and duplicity which characterized so many of their predecessors during the hundred and more years of our national existence. We can not consent to leave open, even to the slightest possibility of misconception, the position of the United States. We can not allow that any European country, under the pretense of aggrandizing its citizens for alleged losses in speculative enterprises in the territories of the struggling States of South America, shall obtain an unrighteous sovereignty over any additional American soil.

I might read extracts by the hour from men like ex-President Polk, Mr. Cass, who was Secretary of State under Mr. Buchanan, and perhaps a hundred others, avowing the same doctrine in those days. Neither will the United States allow that, by diplomatic manipulation, with or without the concurrence of any weak South American government, any additional territory shall, by the assumption of a disputed boundary line, ever become tributary to, or a part of, any European sovereignty.

In addition to the urgent desire of Mr. Canning, as foreign secretary of England, that the United States should join England in an alliance for the compelling of a policy of noninterference by Europe with American territory, we have the eloquent words of another great English statesman in Parliament. Mr. Brougham, afterwards Lord Brougham, said:

The question with regard to South America is now disposed of, or nearly so, for an event has recently happened than which no event has dispersed greater joy, exultation, and gratitude over all the freemen of Europe; that event, which is decisive of the subject in respect to South America, is the message of the President of the United States to the Congress.

What was it? It was that there should not be any foreign interference with the political condition of the South American and Central American countries. And I may repeat here that France also, in view of the possibility that Spanish aggrandizement in America might disarrange the balance of power in Europe, was prompt to admit that the question was practically settled by the message of President Monroe.

Of course there is little doubt that the policy then proposed to us by England was wholly due to the selfish wish that no other European power than Great Britain should possess colonial possessions in America, but, nevertheless, the doctrine she advocated then is pertinent and proper for us now when it has a direct application to the present situation.

So long as the United States continues to maintain the salutary policy of noninterference with the complications and difficulties of Europe, and steadfastly adheres to her wise and just support of the Monroe doctrine, permitting no foreign nation to obtain additional foothold upon either North or South America, we shall have the undivided support of our people and demand the respect of the world. The moment we waver and weaken in our position, that moment we invite trouble. The announcement of President Monroe has sufficed until now as a beacon upon our course, but it is now fully time for the representatives of the people to provide against danger by unmistakable action. Let us put ourselves in a position so that we can say, like Percy—

Out of the nettle, danger, we can pluck the flower, safety.

Let us build so strongly and speak so plainly that the way of the future Executives, prime ministers, and ambassadors of our country shall be undoubted. Let it be so clear that no statesman of the future can find, as Mr. Calhoun did in the Senate, any ingenious theory to weaken its force and value. Let it be so certain and emphatic that no Secretary of State can hereafter become a willing party to a treaty yielding a share of the control and supervision of any interoceanic canal to any European country, as in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. And let it be so straight and practical that no American ambassador to the British court shall feel at liberty to question the policy of his own Government or, possibly, to apologize for the Declaration of Independence and the Monroe doctrine of 1823.

Mr. President, I desire now to call attention to one of the striking facts of the situation which confronts the United States. Probably very few of us have given careful attention to the vast extent of the European dominion upon this hemisphere. We may have casually understood, as a fact of some significance, that the area of the United States, including Alaska, approximates 3,600,000 square miles, but have we at the same time understood that the Dominion of Canada contains a total area of about 3,400,000 square miles?

Now, if we add to this the area of British Guiana, British Honduras, Bermuda, and the British West India Islands, 130,000 square miles more, it will give a total of 3,530,000 square miles of territory over which the British flag floats upon this hemisphere. If we had not purchased Alaska a few years ago, and added thereby a half million square miles to our domain, we should now fall many thousands of square miles short of the British possessions in America.

It would be useless for me to attempt to detail to you the thousand ways in which this close proximity of so vast an area of British territory affects our national well-being. Our entire northern boundary from Puget Sound to the Gulf of St. Lawrence bears the insignia of the British lion, and over the hundreds of islands which compose the West Indian Archipelago the British flag is flying. Not a sail of American commerce enters the Gulf of Mexico except by the tacit consent of foreign powers. With our 65,000,000 people, and their vigorous self-assertion, there has been no danger that such consent would be withheld. Any foreign embargo upon our free approach to the Mexican Gulf would be a blow which would recoil with deadly and terrific force upon those who attempted it. Its recoil would not stop with the naked assertion of the Monroe doctrine, but an American policy would develop into an imperial but honorable command of American affairs.

Look at the map. Between Canada and the United States there exists but an imaginary boundary line, over which a mere step takes us in a moment from a republic to a monarchy. Between the Bahama Islands and the State of Florida a sail of only four or five hours covers the distance. One can almost see the British flag from southern Florida. It floats over numbers of the smaller islands and coral reefs and keys a few miles away from Key West. A cordon of islands under foreign control swings all the way round from a point 50 or 60 miles off Florida nearly to British Guiana, on the South American coast.

But I started to present the striking fact that a great foreign power already possessed, at our very borders, a territorial area nearly equal to ours. No matter whether that power is warlike or peaceful, it is here. Its presence is an actual fact, and our experience with it in the past has been, that so long as we could command peace we could have peace. So long as we were able to protect our own interests, commercial and political, against adverse domination, so long those interests would continue and prosper.

All our diplomatic intercourse with the Government of Great Britain during the years in which we have been at peace has necessarily been characterized by constant watchfulness upon our part. At no time could we permit loose or unmeaning language in our diplomatic correspondence lest it should be taken advantage of. And for a good many years the nations of the world have been chary about leaving any unoccupied territory, or any scattering islands, unprotected overnight, for fear the morning would find them under the paw of the British lion. The United States does not covet what possessions England may have, and we have no desire to establish a protectorate over any others, but we are bound to insist that the status quo of 1823 shall be held inviolate in so far as the territorial limits of European establishments on this side of the Atlantic are concerned.

This Government has already indicated that the control of Cuba by any other European power than Spain would be regarded as inimical to our own welfare, and that the only alternative to which Americans would consent would be the absorption of Cuba by the United States. This policy regarding Cuba is probably well understood by the world, and it is, in fact, nothing more than a reiteration of the Monroe doctrine, as applied to conditions but slightly modified. The policy of the United States regarding Russian territory in America, as has been shown, was determined many years ago, and that was merely another expression of the Monroe doctrine as adapted to the then existing conditions.

How much more important and significant to the United States than in any of the exigencies noted where the Monroe doctrine or its equivalent has been asserted by our statesmen is the existing and now present condition in which our former rival competes with us for the control of North America? I do not mean by this to say that British rivalry for territorial control of America has again reached the physically aggressive stage, nor to say that such rivalry will ever lead to the final arbitrament of the strongest battalion or the heaviest armament; but I want to show to the Senate and to the country what the map of the world presents before us, and to make apparent the magnitude of the English dominion around and about us. This great area of British territory may or may not be a menace to our country. As is sometimes said, that depends. One thing, however, is manifest—that the United States must look after the United States. We are old enough and strong enough to stand alone, to walk alone, and to hold our ground amongst the nations of the earth.

Shall we do it? Shall we always be ready and prepared to meet great questions when they arise; to take every precaution against surprise, and to bear always the American standard at the fore? The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in the last Congress addressed the Senate and called to our attention as among the possibilities and even among the probabilities the speedy advancement of Japan to the rank of a great power militant. The distinguished Senator, as a wise statesman, in his remarks justifies the belief which I entertain, that it is the bounden duty of the legislators of the United States to be on the alert for every indication of the growing power and increasing significance of every foreign nation whose future situation may benefit or injure our own country. We should conduct our foreign affairs so justly, and with such reference to the progress of the world, that surprises will not affect us and that the troubles of other countries will pass us by.

In this connection, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a conversation which I see quoted here as having taken place in China between Mr. Curtis, a very able correspondent, and Mr. Li Hung Chang. Speaking to Mr. Curtis about this Government, Li Hung Chang said:

> Your Government and your people are very unwise, if they are not thinking of such things—

Referring to our naked condition of preparation for war—

> particularly since the events that have occurred in China during the last year. The Japanese are a very aggressive people. They are a warlike people. They like to fight, and they are proud and arrogant. They do not care for the United States except as a market for their silk and tea, and if your Government ever interferes with their plans, either at home or in the Sandwich Islands, you will find that their friendship is only a pretense they keep up to encourage your trade. If President Cleveland had responded to my appeal for intervention during the late war, Japan would have sent her army and her ships from our harbors over to your country and would have taken possession of your Pacific States.

Mr. Curtis says he tried to explain the situation to Li Hung Chang, but "the Viceroy sneered in a contemptuous manner," and said:

> Japan has an army of over 200,000 soldiers, and the best guns in the world.

I suppose he realized that from China's experience in the late war.

> She has a larger and better fleet of warships than the United States. She has ten times as many torpedo boats as your Government, and her sailors know how to use them, while your sailors do not. You have only five ships on the Pacific Coast, with a coast line of 3,000 miles to protect, and several populous and wealthy cities that have no defenses whatever. You have no forts at San Francisco that could keep out the weakest gunboat in the navy of Japan, and a single ship of the Japanese navy could destroy every city on Puget Sound without the slightest difficulty in a week.

I refer to the interview, not that I indorse what Li Hung Chang says, but merely to call attention to the fact, known to everybody, that on the Pacific Coast we are not prepared for defense against hostile fleets; and I may say that the situation on our Atlantic Seaboard is not much better.

The growing industrial power of England in America is of quite as great significance to us as her territorial expansion. The railways of Canada, aided and sustained by government appropriations, have stimulated every branch of enterprise in that Dominion. The competition which has followed between Canada and the United States in regard to various great commercial and industrial undertakings has not been a subject of wholly unalloyed gratification to our people. It remains for us, as representatives of the people of the United States, to decide whether the great territory of Canada, with its sister colonies innumerable in the West Indies and elsewhere surrounding and guarding our own approaches to the Gulf of Mexico and to the delta of the Mississippi, shall be deemed as demanding any further assertion of our own policy. To my mind, the point has been reached and passed when doubt should exist as to the complete maintenance of the Monroe doctrine, broadly construed. Not only so, but the rapidly approaching and pressing question is to be, and is now, what additional declaration and assertion is demanded as a logical step in the progress of the Republic. That is the question of this day, the problem of this age.

Mr. SQUIRE. Before the Senator from Illinois takes his seat I should like to ask him whether he deems the defenses on the Atlantic coast adequate to enable us to withstand any attempt, either to bombard our cities or to exact tribute, which may be made by any foreign power having a respectable navy?

Mr. CULLOM. I stated in the course of my remarks that the Pacific coast is practically defenseless, and that the Atlantic coast is not in a very much better condition.

Mr. HILL. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Illinois what disposition he proposes shall be made of the resolution?

Mr. CULLOM. I stated at the outset of my remarks that unless some Senator desired to discuss the resolution I should ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HILL. I would suggest that the resolution lie on the table for a day or two.

Mr. CULLOM. I am entirely content that that course shall be pursued.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table for the present, in the absence of objection.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 11, 1895, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 10, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

WAR CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Samuel W. Prior, administrator, *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MARINE HOSPITAL SERVICE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Supervising Surgeon-General of the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States for the fiscal year 1894; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

WAR CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the cases of W. W. Perkins, administrator, and sundry other cases, *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of John H. Caldwell, James Carroll, John R. Hornbaker, and W. H. Grimes, administrators, *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM OF THE CHEROKEE NATION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Attorney-General of the United States reviewing and reporting upon certain conclusions of law reached by the Department of the Interior in an account of moneys due the Cherokee Nation; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

WAR CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the finding filed by the court in the cases of J. L. Cochran, administrator, Timothy Foley, and Mrs. Sarah Townsley, administratrix, *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of David Maberry, jr., *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of William T. Robertson, administrator of Ira A. Sprouse, deceased, *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MCRAE, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. SULLOWAY, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. GARDNER, indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. BROWN, for this day, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HANLY, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Charles W. Sentman, no adverse report having been made.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I made objection yesterday to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BURRELL] to withdraw papers in a certain case. I have since ascertained that a favorable report has been made on the case, and no unfavorable report. I therefore renew the request of the gentleman from Illinois to withdraw those papers without leaving copies.

Mr. BURRELL. Mr. Speaker, this claim has been pending in the last four Congresses, in each of which a favorable report has been made. The object of withdrawing the papers at this time is to submit the claim to the Auditor of the War Department, by whom, we think, it can be settled without troubling Congress further.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the request in the form now submitted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURRELL asks unanimous consent to withdraw from the House files, without leaving copies, the papers in the claim of Mrs. Fannie Pemberton, no adverse report having been made thereon.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Joint resolution (S. R. 17) providing for certain surveys in the State of Florida; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 13) granting the State of Pennsylvania permission to use the United States court-house at Scranton, Pa., and at Williamsport, Pa.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next. In making this motion I desire to say that when the House adjourned yesterday until to-day the expectation was that the report of the Secretary of the Treasury would be sent in at this time, but I am informed that it is not expected until Thursday. However, if any gentleman has information that the report will be ready to be presented to-morrow I will withdraw the motion, for I suppose it is the desire of the House that this important report should be laid before it at the earliest possible moment. [A pause.] As I get no response, I now renew my motion that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

THE BATTLE SHIP TEXAS.

Mr. FISCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, when appointed, be directed to investigate the reports that the battle ship *Texas* is faulty in construction. The committee is authorized and directed to inquire into all matters pertaining to the plans, construction, cost, and seaworthiness of said ship.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISCHER] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just read. Is there objection?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I think that ought to be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] objects.

OCCUPANCY OF FEDERAL COURT ROOM, SCRANTON, PA.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Joint resolution granting permission to the Pennsylvania superior court to occupy the Federal court room in Scranton.

Whereas by an act of assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, approved June 24, 1895, an intermediate court of appeals was established, known and styled as the superior court of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas by the third section of said act, it is provided that one session of said court shall be held at Scranton and one at Williamsport in each year; and

Whereas it is further provided in said act that the commissioners of each of said counties shall provide a suitable place for the meeting and business of said court at each of said places, to wit, Scranton and Williamsport, the expense thereof to be paid by the State of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas the commissioners of said counties can not furnish a suitable place for the meeting and business of said superior court without adequate time for that purpose, and said county commissioners are desirous of obtaining the use of the United States court room at Scranton during the month of January in each year for five years, and at Williamsport in the month of February in each year for five years, paying therefor an adequate rental; and

Whereas during the sessions of the circuit and district courts of the United States at Scranton and Williamsport the commissioners of the counties of Lackawanna and Lycoming have furnished a room and facilities for the meeting of the circuit court when the district court was in session and are willing to do so in the future when so requested: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That full permission be, and the same is hereby, granted to the State of Pennsylvania and to the superior court of said State to occupy the United States court room and the rooms connected therewith at Scranton, in the county of Lackawanna, during the month of January, and at Williamsport, in the county of Lycoming, during the month of February, in each year for the period of five years from the time such occupation shall begin, to wit, January, 1896, for the purpose of holding the sessions of said court therein, and that during said period concurrent jurisdiction so far as is necessary over said property be, and the same is hereby, ceded to the State of Pennsylvania for said purposes, so that the sessions of said courts in said buildings and rooms may be, during said period, fully legalized: *Provided*, That the commissioners of each of said counties of Lackawanna and Lycoming shall pay to the United States each the sum of $100 per annum for the use of said rooms for the time aforesaid: *And provided further*, That said rooms shall be kept in good repair at the expense of the State of Pennsylvania, and that said commissioners shall further provide necessary light and heat for said rooms at their own expense, and at the end of said period of five years the use of said rooms shall be relinquished to the United States by the said State of Pennsylvania and the said superior court in as good condition as before the occupancy of said rooms by said court: *Provided further*, That the sessions of said superior court shall in no way interfere with the sessions of the said circuit and district courts of the United States.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have read also the amendments which I have sent to the desk.

The amendments were read, as follows:

In line 9, strike out the words "time such occupation shall begin, to wit" and insert "first day of."

Strike out the preamble.

In line 19, after the word "each," strike out the words "the sum of one hundred dollars per annum" and insert "the sum of five hundred dollars, to be paid in five yearly payments."

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The consideration of this joint resolution at this time requires the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, before that is given I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he has any objection to an amendment in the form of a proviso that the proposed arrangement shall be carried out only if, in the judgment of the Attorney-General, it can be done without injury to the public service. This resolution proposes to provide for the occupancy of a Federal court room jointly by a State court and by the Federal courts, and it seems to me that some difficulty may arise; but if the matter were left entirely under the control of the Attorney-General, that, I think, would remove any liability to conflict which might otherwise exist.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, the only objection I have to the gentleman's suggestion is based upon the necessity for settling this matter without delay. The superior court is to be organized in Scranton early in January. The amendments which I have sent up are simply intended to make the joint resolution conform to the one that was passed by the Senate yesterday, and I fear that an additional amendment might cause further delay. It is not the intention to use this building for the State courts any longer than is absolutely necessary. The accommodations in the present court-houses at Scranton and at Williamsport are quite inadequate. The commissioners are to provide rooms immediately. The term of five years is named in the joint resolution as the limit, but in all probability the occupancy will not continue half that time. I have seen the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury about the matter, and there is no objection in that office.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCRANTON] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which has been read.

Mr. DINGLEY. I will ask the gentleman whether he has conferred with the Attorney-General about this matter.

Mr. SCRANTON. I have conferred with the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. DINGLEY. Suppose the Government should require the occupancy of this entire building for its own purposes, there is no provision in this joint resolution that it can resume entire control.

Mr. SCRANTON. My understanding was that the Secretary of the Treasury is the custodian of these buildings, and not the Attorney-General.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is so as to the custody of the building, but as to the occupation of it for court purposes, I suppose the Attorney-General has control.

Mr. SCRANTON. The gentleman may be right about that.

Mr. DINGLEY. I do not desire to raise any objection, but I can conceive that such joint occupancy as is here proposed, without a proviso that the Attorney-General, or some officer of the Federal Government shall have authority to examine into the matter and ascertain whether the arrangement can be made without detriment to the public service, might give rise to difficulty.

Mr. SCRANTON. There is no difficulty whatever about it. The question has been submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, and I am expecting a letter from him this morning.

Mr. DINGLEY. If the gentleman has investigated the matter and it can be done without injury to the public service, by causing a conflict in the manner I have suggested, I have no objection.

Mr. SCRANTON. The United States court meets in March and this provides for January.

Mr. SAYERS. I think this bill should go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. Without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

There was no objection.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION, HON. THOMAS F. BAYARD.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Thomas F. Bayard, the ambassador of the United States to Great Britain, is reported by the London Times newspaper to have said in a public speech delivered in Boston, England, on the 2d day of August, 1895, "The President stood in the midst of a strong, self-confident, and oftentimes violent people; men who sought to have their own way. It took a real man to govern the people of the United States;" and

Whereas said Bayard is further reported by the press of this country to have said in a public speech delivered in Edinburgh, Scotland, on the 7th day of November, 1895, "In my own country I have witnessed the insatiable growth of a form of socialism styled protection, which has done more to corrupt public life, to banish men of independent mind from public councils, and to lower the tone of national representation than any other single cause. Protection now controlling the sovereign power of taxation has been perverted from its proper function of creating revenue to support the Government into an engine of selfish profit allied with combinations called trusts. It thus has sapped the popular conscience by giving corrupting largesses to special classes, and it throws legislation into the political market where jobbers and chafferers take the place of statesmen;" and

Whereas it is not one of the functions of an ambassador to insult in the country to which he is accredited the people he is supposed to represent, and it is consistent neither with the character of the office nor with the dignity and independence of the people of the United States that their ambassadors abroad should make violent partisan speeches on questions relating to our domestic policy upon foreign soil: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President be, and he hereby is, requested to inform the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public interests, what steps, if any, he has taken to ascertain whether said Bayard made said speeches, and if he has ascertained that he did make said speeches, what steps, if any, he has taken to recall or to censure said Bayard.

The SPEAKER. This resolution requires unanimous consent. The question is, Is there objection?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution should go to some committee, and I therefore object to its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

PROPOSED IMPEACHMENT OF HON. THOMAS F. BAYARD.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a question of privilege. I send to the desk a document which I ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

I do impeach Thomas F. Bayard, United States ambassador to Great Britain, of high crimes and misdemeanors on the following grounds:

Whereas the following report of a speech delivered before the Edinburgh Philosophic Institution by Hon. Thomas F. Bayard, ambassador of the United States of America at the Court of Great Britain, is published in the London News under date of November 8, 1895:

"The opening address of the Edinburgh Philosophic Institution was delivered last night by Mr. Bayard, ambassador of the United States of America, who selected for the subject 'Individual freedom the germ of national progress and permanence.' In his own country, he said, he had witnessed the insatiable growth of that form of state socialism styled 'protection,' which he believed had done more to foster class legislation and create inequality of fortune, to corrupt public life, to banish men of independent mind and character from the public councils, to lower the tone of national representation, blunt public conscience, create false standards in the popular mind, to familiarize it with reliance upon state aid and guardianship in private affairs, divorce ethics from politics, and place politics upon the low level of a mercenary scramble than any other single cause.

"Step by step, and largely owing to the confusion of civic strife, it had succeeded in obtaining control of the sovereign power of taxation, never hesitating at any alliance or to resort to any combination that promised to assist its purpose of perverting the public taxation from its only true justification and function of creating revenue for the support of the whole people into an engine for the selfish private profit of allied beneficiaries and combinations called trusts.

"Under its dictation individual enterprise and independence had been oppressed and the energy of discovery and invention debilitated and discouraged. It had unhesitatingly allied itself with every policy which tended to commercial isolation, dangerously depleted the Treasury, and sapped the popular conscience by schemes of corrupting favor and largesse to special classes, whose support was thereby affected.

"Thus it had done much to throw legislation into the political market, where jobbers and chafferers took the place of statesmen.

"It was incorrect to speak of protection as a national policy, for that it could never be, because it could never be other than the fostering of special interests at the expense of the rest; and this overthrew the great principle of equality before the law, and that resultant sense of justice and equity in the administration of sovereign powers which was the true cause of domestic tranquillities and human contentment.

"The enfeeblement of individual energies and the impairment of manly self-reliance were necessarily involved, and the belief in mysterious powers of the State, and reliance upon them, took the place of individual exertion, fostered the growth of state socialism, and personal liberty ceased to be the great end of the Government."

And whereas such reflections on the Government's policy and people of the United States by an ambassador of the United States to a foreign country and before a foreign audience is manifestly in serious disregard of the proprieties and obligations which should be observed by an official representative of the United States abroad, and calculated to injure our national reputation:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be directed to ascertain whether such statements have been publicly made; and if so, to report to the House such action by impeachment or otherwise as shall be proper in the premises. For the purpose of this inquiry the committee is authorized to send for persons and papers.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary, and upon that I demand the previous question.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HOPKINS. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] will not demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair supposed that the gentleman from Georgia arose to make a point of order. If he does not, the Chair of course will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CRISP. I raise the question as to whether this constitutes a privileged question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Georgia upon the point of order.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear distinctly the resolution which accompanied the preamble. Will the Chair kindly direct the reading of the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again read the resolution.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, at the first session of the Forty-eighth Congress a ruling was made by the Speaker which seems to cover this question. While it is held that propositions to impeach the civil officers of the United States are privileged under the Constitution, yet the ruling in the Forty-eighth Congress, which seems to cover this case, is to the effect that a reference to a committee of charges or allegations against a civil officer, with instructions to that committee to ascertain and report articles of impeachment, or otherwise, as may be necessary, does not constitute a privileged question. Mr. Springer presented, as a question of privilege, the petition of Richard W. Webb, a citizen of the Territory of New Mexico, relating to the impeachment of Samuel Axtell, the chief justice of the Territory, and with it a resolution—

That the petition of Richard W. Webb and accompanying statement of charges against Samuel B. Axtell, the chief justice of the supreme court of the Territory of New Mexico and judge of the First judicial district thereof, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and printed, and that the Committee on the Judiciary be directed to inquire and ascertain whether the allegations contained in the foregoing charges and specifications are true, and whether the conduct of the said chief justice or judge has been such as to render him unfit to discharge the duties of the office of chief justice or judge as aforesaid, and report thereon to the House such action, to be taken by impeachment or otherwise, as they may advise; and in making such examination and investigation the said committee have power to send for persons or papers.

Mr. Kasson made the point of order that a question of privilege was not presented by the said memorial and resolution.

The Speaker sustained the point of order, on the ground that the resolution proposed an investigation of certain charges set forth in said memorial and accompanying papers against the said Axtell, and did not specifically propose articles of impeachment.

That seems to be on all fours with the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the reference made by the gentleman from Georgia I have before me, and I believe it has been correctly stated by him; but I propose to show by a subsequent decision of the same Speaker that the resolution which I have offered is a matter of privilege.

The resolution to which the gentleman has referred was introduced on the 4th day of February, 1884. It was based upon a petition signed by certain citizens of the Territory of New Mexico, and, containing as it did no specific charges of impeachment, the Speaker ruled that it was not a question of privilege. But on the 2d day of December, 1884, being ten months subsequent to the matter to which he has referred, the same Speaker, Mr. Carlisle, of Kentucky, being in the chair, Mr. Follett, of Ohio, offered a resolution beginning in the exact phraseology of the resolution which I have offered, to wit:

I do impeach Lot Wright, United States marshal of the southern district of Ohio, of high crimes and misdemeanors.

The resolution then recited the misdemeanors which were alleged to have been committed by the said Lot Wright, and concluded in a resolution almost identical with the one which I have presented, to wit, that an investigation of the truth or falsity of these charges be made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, with the authority to send for persons and papers, and to report to the House.

Upon that resolution, according to the Journal:

Mr. Keifer made the point of order that the said resolutions were not in order, being a proposition to investigate certain charges against an officer of the United States, and did not specifically propose articles of impeachment against said officer.

Upon which the Speaker overruled the point of order—

Upon the ground that under the established practice of the House all propositions to impeach a public officer who is impeachable under the Constitutino are privileged, and as the proposition submitted by Mr. Follett did specifically contain a proposition to impeach an officer so impeachable, it came within the established rule and practice of the House.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the precedent cited by the gentleman from Georgia does not apply to this case, for this reason: The case to which he refers was the introduction of a petition, upon which no charge of impeachment was made by a member of the House. The resolution which I have presented, following exactly the precedent of December 2, 1884, does make such an impeachment in the words:

I do impeach Thomas F. Bayard, ambassador of the United States at the Court of Great Britain, etc.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the point of order should be overruled.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, this presents a very important question, important as a matter of practice. The gentleman from Massachusetts rises in his place and presents a resolution with a preamble, the recitations of which declare that he impeaches a high civil officer of the United States. The resolution, which of course is the gist of the matter, directs a committee of the House to inquire whether or not it is a suitable case for impeachment. In a case identical with that, in the Forty-eighth Congress, the first case referred to, the Speaker held that it was not privileged, and the effect of that ruling, the Speaker will bear in mind, is not to deprive the House of an opportunity of preferring articles of impeachment, it is not to limit, it is not to embarrass the House in the exercise of that constitutional right, but the effect of it is simply that the resolution shall go to a committee which can examine it and report whether or not articles of impeachment shall be preferred; in other words, it gives to the House the judgment of a committee rather than of an individual member as to whether articles of impeachment should be preferred.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it should be held that on a resolution like this the gentleman presenting it can address the House for one hour as a privileged question, the Chair will at once see the embarrassment that might arise and must arise, whereas if the decision of the Speaker of the Forty-eighth Congress is adopted in the case to which I referred and the resolution is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, that committee can examine and report to the House whether or not other steps should be taken in the case.

I have not had time to carefully examine the case referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have it before me, and I do not see just now the distinction between that case and the case to which I have referred. In the first case it was distinctly held that the matter was not privileged. In this case the Speaker held the resolution to be privileged. There must be some distinction between the two, but exactly what it is, as I say, I have not had opportunity to examine and discover; but it seems to me that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is exactly similar to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer], and on that the Speaker held the point of order well taken. It seems to me, therefore, in this case, as a matter of practice, if there be any doubt, it is better to resolve the doubt in favor of reference without debate to a standing committee of the House in order that the House may be informed, after some sort of an investigation, whether there is anything on which articles of impeachment may be sustained if preferred.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest to the honorable gentleman from Georgia that this is not a question of political policy. It is a question of conforming to the rules and precedents of the House.

I have shown to him that the resolution to which he refers contains no charge of impeachment by any member of the House, but is simply a petition from certain citizens of New Mexico. I have shown to him that, on a subsequent day, by the decision of the same Speaker, being Mr. Carlisle, of Kentucky, on a resolution in exactly the same form in substance as the resolution which I have presented, when a point of order against its being a question of privilege was made, Mr. Carlisle, then Speaker, declared it to be a question of privilege. The distinction is very clear.

In the first case to which the gentleman refers no member of the House made a charge of impeachment; in the second, which I have cited, Mr. Follett of Ohio did make a charge of impeachment, and that language I have literally followed in the resolution which I have submitted.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that there is a great distinction between the two cases. The Chair has examined the decision of the Speaker of the House made on the 2d day of December, 1884, and sees no reason why he should not adopt that opinion. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to consider the resolution I should like to ask the gentleman from Georgia whether he desires any time for debate, and see if an arrangement can be made in this case, so that a vote can be taken at a certain time.

Mr. CRISP. I beg pardon?

Mr. BARRETT. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to ask the gentleman from Georgia whether he desires to debate the resolution which I have offered and, in case he does, to see whether an arrangement can be made by which a vote can be taken at a specified time.

Mr. CRISP. Why, of course, it will depend upon what the gentleman from Massachusetts may state as to whether time will be desired. I think the resolution ought to be referred to the committee having charge of these matters.

Mr. BARRETT. It is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to detain this House many moments in the consideration of the resolution which I have presented. In common, I think I may say, with every right-minded citizen of the United States, I have read with feelings of humiliation the reported insults and excesses in language committed toward this Government and this people by the present ambassador of the United States at the Court of Great Britain.

The resolution offered by my colleague [Mr. MCCALL] recites in epitome not only the more extended report which I have had read, but also another statement made by the ambassador, in which he refers to the American people as an unruly and turbulent people, needing the strong hand of a certain man, to wit, Mr. Grover Cleveland, to keep them in submission.

I am, however, pleased to see, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Cleveland does not accord with that view of his duty. Having left this Congress and the people of the United States during the past four days without the restraint of his overruling hand, he does not, I assume, believe that the statement made by his ambassador is in any way correct. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Speaker, this statement of the ambassador which I have had read is in violation of diplomatic usage, is in violation of the printed instructions given to him by the Department of State when he left these shores, and is in violation of every patriotic impulse which a man who takes the commission of this country in his hands is in honor bound to respect.

The question may be raised on the other side as to a precedent for this proposed action.

I reply, Mr. Speaker, that in all the history of this country there is no precedent. There is no precedent, because no minister of this country in a foreign land, up to the current political year, has ever felt called upon, before a foreign audience and under a foreign flag, to insult the nation whose commission he bore. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There is, however, Mr. Speaker, one precedent, which, while not exactly fitting to this case, does apply in principle so effectively that I shall refer to it on this occasion.

Going back some sixty years, we find that during the Administration of Andrew Jackson, after a prolonged controversy in regard to the composition of the Cabinet as it then existed, the previous Secretary of State, Mr. Martin Van Buren, was nominated by the President to the Senate as our minister to England. When that nomination came up in the Senate a long and bitter debate occurred upon it. It touched so closely the springs of American diplomatic principles that, some time subsequent thereto, the debate (which had occurred in executive session of the Senate) was made public.

The charge alleged against Mr. Van Buren was that as Secretary of State, in dispatching Mr. McLane as minister to Great Britain, he had given him certain objectionable instructions to be used in his negotiations with the British foreign office. The gist of the instructions, to which objection was made, was that the minister should call the attention of the British foreign office to the fact that, by the Presidential election of 1828, the Administration of this Government had passed from one political party to another, and, there having been controversy in the previous Administration of Mr. Adams in regard to certain diplomatic matters relating to our trade with the West India Islands, Mr. McLane was authorized by the instructions given by Mr. Van Buren, as Secretary of State, to call the attention of the British foreign office to the fact of the change of Administration here, and to suggest that negotiations theretofore interrupted might with propriety be resumed, because the Administration of Mr. Jackson, which the minister represented, did not indorse the position taken by the previous Administration of Mr. Adams.

You will bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that in that case the instructions were those of a Secretary of State to a minister. They were given by the Secretary of State of the United States to a minister to Great Britain. They directed him to call attention to an undisputed fact. They merely recited something that was as well known as the rising and the setting of the sun.

But, inasmuch as our minister was thereby authorized to make, in his negotiations with the British foreign office, some reference to the internal affairs of this country and to the changes by which one political party had been raised in the public estimation and another political party lowered, serious objection was taken to the instructions, and, as I have already said, there occurred in the Senate of the United States, in executive session, a debate, which is printed in Gales & Seaton's History of the Debates.

In that debate Daniel Webster, than whom no more patriotic and loyal man ever lived, or one better qualified to discuss such matters, made a speech, the essence of which, written out by himself, is here given.

I will ask the Clerk to read the passages which I have marked, beginning on the third line of page 1333.

The Clerk read from Mr. Webster's speech as follows:

Sir, I would forgive mistakes; I would pardon the want of information; I would pardon almost anything where I saw true patriotism and sound American feeling, but I can not forgive the sacrifice of this feeling to mere party.

I can not concur in sending abroad a public agent who has not conceptions so large and liberal as to feel that, in the presence of foreign courts, amidst the monarchies of Europe, he is to stand up for his country, and his whole country; that no jot nor tittle of her honor is to come to harm in his hands; that he is not to suffer others to reproach either his Government or his country, and far less is he himself to reproach either; that he is to have no objects in his eye but American objects, and no heart in his bosom but an American heart; and that he is to forget self, to forget party, to forget every sinister and narrow feeling in his proud and lofty attachment to the Republic whose commission he bears.

Mr. President, I have discharged an exceedingly unpleasant duty, the most unpleasant of my public life. But I have looked upon it as a duty, and it was not to be shunned. And, sir, however unimportant may be the opinion of so humble an individual as myself, I now only wish that I might be heard by every independent freeman in the United States, by the British minister and the British King, and by every minister and every crowned head in Europe, while standing here in my place I pronounce my rebuke, as solemnly and as decisively as I can, upon this first instance in which an American minister has been sent abroad as the representative of his party and not as the representative of his country.

[Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Florida. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit me one question?

Mr. BARRETT. I can not consent to be interrupted, but when I have finished the course of my remarks——

Mr. COOPER of Florida. My inquiry is pertinent to this question, and I will not detain the gentleman a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida will be in order.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. I understood the gentleman to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida has no right to interrupt a member without his consent.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. I have not undertaken to do it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. If the gentleman will not permit me——

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, those were the words of Daniel Webster, uttered in the secrecy of an executive session of the Senate of the United States.

The importance of that discussion was so great that by the vote of the Senate the proceedings were made public.

Though the feeling in the Senate in those days was much stronger than now that the Executive prerogative should be respected, nevertheless in a Senate so composed, and in spite of personal appeals made to Senators to allow the nomination to be confirmed, Mr. Van Buren, because of a statement which was not one-tenth so open to objection as the one which Mr. Bayard is reported to have made, was rejected. The Senate refused to confirm his nomination on the ground outlined by Mr. Webster.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will ask you how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER. Fifty minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. As there are other gentlemen on this side of the House to whom I desire to yield a portion of my time in this matter, realizing too fully my own inexperience and lack of knowledge of the course of debate on this floor, I now yield the floor, reserving the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. Will the gentleman, before yielding the floor, permit me a question?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts now permit me to ask——

Mr. BARRETT. If the gentleman desires to debate this resolution, I will refer him to the gentleman from Georgia, who will have his own time, and will doubtless allow the gentleman a part of it.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. I do not wish to debate the resolution, but to ask a question. The gentleman from Massachusetts has gotten up here and made an attack upon a distinguished citizen of the United States; and he has read a record here. He said that when he had finished his remarks he would respond to a question. I do not wonder that the gentleman is afraid to answer questions. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman wishes to ask me a question, and not to take up my time in debate, I shall be glad to answer him.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. Then I ask the gentleman whether, after those occurrences in the Senate to which he has referred, the American people did not vindicate Martin Van Buren, largely on account of those attacks in the Senate, by electing him President of the United States, as they will vindicate the views on high protection and McKinleyism of Thomas F. Bayard if you dare to make the issue in the next election? [Applause on the Democratic side, and derisive cries on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman asks me as a matter of historical fact whether or not Martin Van Buren was elected President of the United States after those occurrences, I answer that he was. But I make the additional reply that he was the first representative of his party up to that time who, having served four years in the Presidential chair, was by the voice of this people buried so deep in the election of 1840 that his name has since scarcely been heard of. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I suppose, of course, the House fully understands that the purpose of this resolution is to give gentlemen an opportunity to air their views on the subject of the tariff. I assume there is no man who has ever been elected to the Congress of the United States by any party who could seriously be-

lieve that the allegations in this resolution constitute good ground of impeachment. I acquit the gentleman from Massachusetts of any such idea or thought. My respect for his intelligence demands that I should do so.

Now, on examining these resolutions, it will be found that they criticise our ambassador to Great Britain for remarks made by him on a public occasion in Scotland. The subject of his address was "Individual freedom the germ of national progress and permanence." I have not a copy of the entire address before me, or I should be glad to put it in the RECORD, because I have no doubt, from the extract the gentleman has recited, that it was a clear and able speech against the pernicious doctrine of protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me read to you some of the charges which the gentleman from Massachusetts makes against the ambassador. He claims that he should be impeached because he has said that protection has—

> Done more to foster class legislation and create inequality of fortune, to corrupt public life, to banish men of independent mind and character from the public councils, to lower the tone of national representation, blunt public conscience, create false standards in the popular mind, to familiarize it with reliance upon State aid and guardianship in private affairs, divorce ethics from politics, and place politics upon the low level of a mercenary scramble, than any other single cause.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why, Mr. Speaker, if we impeach all persons who approve the views thus expressed, we must impeach a majority of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side, and derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

Some of the older members on this floor may remember that the Republicans had a majority in the Fifty-first Congress; not, it is true, a large majority at the beginning, but by Republican methods they worked it up considerably. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] That Congress passed what is known as the McKinley tariff bill, the very kind of protection, I have no doubt, the gentleman from Massachusetts approves of. That Congress passed the bill, and we went to the people of the United States on that issue.

Mr. BOUTELLE. When? Last year? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. I suppose one who has served so long with him must pardon the rudeness of the gentleman from Maine. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not know of anyone who will do so with more grace than the gentleman from Georgia who now occupies the floor.

Mr. CRISP. I am sure I will, sincerely.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the two parties went to the country on the issue raised by that bill—on the question of protection—the high protection of the McKinley bill. There was no question at that time fully discussed other than the tariff. The financial question, which more recently has caused so much division, cut at that time small figure comparatively. All over the country the question was the high rates of the McKinley bill against lower rates.

Do you gentlemen remember what took place, or have you in your rejoicing at your great majority to-day forgotten? Having a majority here of from 20 to 30—I do not remember exactly the majority—you passed the McKinley bill. We went to the country on the issue thus presented, and in the next Congress this side had a majority of nearly 150. Therefore it is I say, if you should impeach men who entertain the views expressed by Mr. Bayard you must impeach the majority of the people of the United States.

I want to read you a little more of this preamble.

> It was incorrect to speak of protection as a national policy, for that it could never be, because it could never be other than the fostering of special interests at the expense of the rest, and this overthrew the great principle of equality before the law and that resultant sense of justice and equity in the administration of sovereign powers which was the true cause of domestic tranquillity and human contentment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that side of the House have a very large majority. You can pass any legislation you please by a two-thirds vote. If you believe that the people of this country approve the McKinley bill, or anything like it, you owe it to yourselves, you owe it to the country, to frame a bill and pass it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That side has twitted this side with the Wilson bill. When we were considering the bill you had nothing but criticisms of it. Now, you can make a bill. You say the revenues are short. You say they should be increased on protective lines. Have the manhood to present your bill and pass it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Do not say, as now and then you hear some Republican leader saying, "It is no use for us to pass a bill, because possibly it will not pass the Senate, or if it passes the Senate possibly it will meet with an Executive veto."

My friends, take your own responsibility. Prepare your tariff bill, bring it in, pass it, and go to the country upon it. There is no other way in which you can justify your own position, or in which you can successfully assail the position of this side in the enforcement or passage of the existing law.

From time to time during this session of Congress we shall hear all kinds of speeches assailing the Wilson tariff bill, assailing this side for passing such a law. And yet, I believe now this Congress will adjourn without the passage of any general tariff bill through this House. It is an old plan of the Republicans to evade responsibility.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] precipitates this discussion in an unusual way by preferring, as he says, articles of impeachment. Of course he knows there is nothing in that. Of course he only expected thus to have an opportunity to make his remarks and have them go to the country; but it shows that, so far as that gentleman is concerned, at least, he is thoroughly wedded to the idea of protection. Now, we count upon him as we count upon every man who shall vote for this resolution to insist that his party shall frame a bill which carries out the Republican idea of protection. Let the country see, before the election, what you propose to do. The Republican party has never done that as to the tariff. The majority it acquired in the Fifty-first Congress it acquired on the idea of revising the tariff, correcting inequalities, and reducing the tariff by its friends; but when intrusted with power it elevated the schedules on almost every item, and when the people came to pass upon it, as I said just now, they condemned it.

Now, passing from that, this resolution, in the orderly course of business, ought to be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the law committee of the House.

Here is a proposition to refer articles of impeachment to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That, it seems to me, is itself an unheard-of proposition. The committee which has always charge of matters of impeachment in this House is the Committee on the Judiciary. For that reason this resolution ought not to pass, and I give notice that before the resolution is voted upon I shall make a motion—I would make it now, but perhaps it might cut off debate, which I do not desire—I shall make a motion to refer this resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has five minutes.

Mr. CRISP. I reserve that time.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to my colleague [Mr. MCCALL] of Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCALL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a resolution, which I placed before the House this morning, to carry out a promise I made to my constituents that I would call the matter of Mr. Bayard's speeches to the attention of the House of Representatives. It was not my idea when I presented that resolution that there would be immediate consideration of it, but I thought that it might go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for their consideration and then be referred back to the House for debate. Whether or not Mr. Bayard should be impeached for the speeches he has made, certainly something should be done. He should receive the stamp of the disapproval of this Administration, as he has already received the disapproval of the American people.

Now, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] is altogether too learned not to see that he has confused the question. The question is not whether Mr. Bayard has been upon the right side of one of our domestic questions in the speeches he has delivered in Great Britain. Ever since the 4th day of July, 1776, the place for the discussion of questions of our domestic policy has been within the territory of these United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] Before that time the place where these questions could properly be discussed was in Edinburgh or in London, but the time when that was proper ceased then.

Now, Mr. Bayard has made in Edinburgh what I think everybody will admit to have been a violent partisan speech. I assert that it was an obvious impropriety, a thing unbecoming the office that he held, to submit an address to the people there upon questions that should be presented before the American people. If Mr. Bayard wants to make speeches on free trade or protection for this country, then he should come home. The place for him to do it is not in Great Britain. Mr. Bayard's offense is so astounding that international law has no name for it. We have known of instances where an ambassador has proved to be persona non grata to the country to which he was accredited, but we have yet to learn of an ambassador being persona non grata to his own country. Not very many years ago Mr. Bayard applied this doctrine of persona non grata to the then minister of Great Britain to this country, who in the course of a private and personal letter intimated what was then the palpable but is now the demonstrated truth, that British interests would be subserved by the triumph of the Democratic party in the United States. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Bayard said that Mr. Sackville West should be recalled; and he was right in so saying, although Mr. Sackville West stated nothing but the absolute truth. Mr. Bayard's grave offense as to his Edinburgh speech is that, whether it was right or wrong, it was unbecoming and improper for him to make it there, and I

believe that this House of Representatives, without distinction of party, before we have finished with this subject, will declare that it was unbecoming and improper for him, holding the position as our ambassador, to make the speech he did make in Edinburgh.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bayard made a speech in August last, in old Boston, in England, upon which I notice the gentleman from Georgia does not comment. In that speech he declared that the American people were a "violent people;" that they were "in need of a strong ruler;" and I state when he made that speech he misrepresented not only the American people, but their form of government. The American people have no master. Their President is great because they are great. He is great not because he is their master, but because he is the chief servant of the people of this country. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this matter shall come before the House again, as I trust it will, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or from some other committee, I may indulge in some further observations; but I will add nothing now, except that it seems to me the President of the United States can not feel greatly flattered when his ambassador, who should be our ambassador abroad, in order to praise him found it necessary to abuse and insult the American people. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the orderly conduct of this debate would require that the other side should take their time in alternation with this side. I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if he desires further discussion?

Mr. CRISP. How much time has been used on that side?

Mr. BARRETT. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

And whereas in a public speech delivered in Boston, England, on the 2d day of August, 1895, the said Bayard is reported by the press of this country to have said: "The President stands in the midst of a strong, self-confident, and oftentimes violent people, men who desire to have their own way, and who need to have that way frequently obstructed, and I tell you plainly it takes a real man to govern the people of the United States."

[Laughter.]

Mr. BARRETT. I would like the gentleman from Georgia to take a part of his time as debate proceeds.

Mr. CRISP. How much time has been consumed?

The SPEAKER. Forty-five minutes upon either side.

Mr. BARRETT. I understand, under the rules and practice of this House, that the mover of a resolution is entitled to close debate.

Mr. CRISP. When we have a running debate of five or ten minutes it is usual to alternate, but still the gentleman has forty-five minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. I have just put in a gentleman on this side of the House.

Mr. CRISP. I desire to move at the proper time that the resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not make that motion now, because it would cut off debate.

Mr. BARRETT. If the gentleman does not desire debate I shall close and ask for the previous question.

Mr. CRISP. That is altogether with the House whether they will do this side injustice or not. The gentleman may demand it, but I assure him now, as a new member, that side will not sustain it.

Mr. BARRETT. The debate began with a few remarks by myself, followed by the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], followed by the remarks of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], and I submit to the House whether it is not now the turn of the other side.

Mr. CRISP. But does not the gentleman see that he has forty-five minutes remaining on his side, while we have forty-five minutes on this side, and that therefore it is reasonable that he should use some of his remaining time and let us follow him; he, of course, having the right to conclude the debate, which nobody seeks to take away from him?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in order to show that courtesy which is due at least from a new member to one who has had such long and distinguished service in this House as the gentleman from Georgia, and who certainly ought to be much better versed than myself in the rules and the practice of the House, I now yield ten minutes of my remaining time to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], in the remarks which he has made, has entirely avoided the real point at issue under this resolution. It is not a question as to whether protection or free trade is the appropriate policy of this country. It is not a question whether any citizen of this country, or even any official, upon any stump or any platform in this country, has the right to advocate either side of that issue. The question is whether our ambassador to the Court of St. James, not an ambassador from the Democratic party, not an ambassador from the Republican party, not an ambassador from the Populist party, but the ambassador of the whole people of the United States, charged with the duty of representing the whole people in those matters which relate to the nationality of this country, should, while holding that position and on foreign soil, so far forget the position which he holds, so far forget that he is a representative of the whole United States, as to denounce one-half of the people of this country as men who are in favor of a policy which breeds corruption and leads to selfishness.

Now, I ask the gentleman from Georgia if he, as a fair-minded man, would regard it as appropriate for an ambassador of the United States who chanced in his party relations at home to be a Republican to go upon a platform in a foreign country, while he was holding the position of our ambassador, and make a speech declaring that those of our people who favored free trade, or opposed the policy of protection in this country, were in favor of a system which produced corruption, in favor of a system which destroyed business, and resulted in the complete enervation of the American people? Suppose the case were reversed, I ask the gentleman from Georgia if he would regard an ambassador representing the whole American people as acting properly if he turned aside from his duties as the representative of the whole American people to make such a speech?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, in reply I say to my friend from Maine that I regard this utterance of the American ambassador not as the discussion of a question of municipal policy in the United States, but rather as the discussion of a world-wide policy, a question which is discussed in every university in the world. The question of protection or free trade is not a municipal question confined to any one country.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that my friend from Georgia should thus avoid the issue here, because it is one that may become very practical with reference to the conduct of our ambassadors abroad in the future. Mr. Bayard was discussing protection as a policy in this country, and nowhere else. I ask the gentleman from Georgia again: Suppose the ambassador of the United States, Mr. Bayard, should, during this coming week, appear on a platform in the city of London and denounce gentlemen in this country who advocate the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1 as men who are in favor of destroying the business of the country, as men who practice corruption, would the gentleman regard that as a performance appropriate to the functions of an American minister abroad? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman assumes that I either approve or criticise the conduct or the language of an ambassador, according as I may approve or disapprove of the propositions which he lays down. Surely the gentleman must see that that is hardly fair.

Mr. DINGLEY. But was not the whole tenor of the argument of the gentleman from Georgia to sustain the ambassador in the speech that he made in Edinburgh, denouncing an economic policy which at least half the people of the United States approve, and which had been the continuous policy of this country for thirty-two years?

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman forgets that the question which our ambassador there raised is an academic question, which is discussed everywhere thoughout the world, and why should the gentleman from Delaware who has gone as our ambassador to Great Britain surrender the ideas which he has long entertained as to the wisdom of lower tariff rates?

Mr. DINGLEY. But should Mr. Bayard, occupying the position of an ambassador of the United States in a foreign country, discuss that question from a partisan standpoint, upon a foreign platform, and denounce as corruptionists the people in this country who are in favor of a certain policy?

Mr. CRISP. I do not think the gentleman's criticism is just at all. The ambassador was talking about a general question of fiscal policy. As to the question of what it is proper for an ambassador to do or not to do, to say or not to say, not on a public but on an official occasion, I do not pretend to decide. If the gentleman asks me as an individual whether I think the ambassador was right in what he said on that subject, of course I would approve it. [Laughter.]

Mr. DINGLEY. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a question of much importance with reference to the conduct of our ambassadors abroad. And I should feel just as much disposed to insist upon the criticism which I have made with reference to a foreign ambassador if he had made a speech exactly the reverse of this. If any minister of the United States, being a Republican, had, upon a platform in Great Britain or elsewhere, made a speech denouncing as corruptionists and enemies of the country those in this country who favored free trade and opposed protection, I should have said that such an ambassador should be recalled immediately after making such a speech. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer to the language recited in this resolution. Let us see what is an "academic question."

In his own country—

Said Ambassador Bayard, representing the whole people of this country and not simply one party or one faction of the people—

in his own country he had witnessed the insatiable growth of that form of State socialism called protection, which he believed had done more to foster class legislation and create inequality of fortune, to corrupt public life, to banish men of independent mind and character from the public councils, to lower the tone of national representation, blunt public conscience, create false standards in the popular mind, etc.

Now, I want to know whether the gentleman from Georgia regards such an utterance as this by an ambassador of the whole people of the United States, on a foreign platform, as a mere discussion of an "academic question?"

Mr. CRISP. Is not the statement as quoted a statement that this protective policy tends to breed corruption?

Mr. BOUTELLE. "In his own country."

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, I want to know if the gentleman from Georgia believes that an ambassador of all the people of the United States has a right to go upon a foreign platform and thus denounce one-half or more of the people of this country? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. CRISP. I give the gentleman my own opinion. I am not a diplomat. I do not know anything about international law. But it seems to me that any citizen of the United States, no matter in what capacity he may be acting, has the right, when the discussion of an economic policy arises, to give his honest conviction as to the tendencies and results of its practice in his own country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Speaking on a foreign platform, has an ambassador of the whole people of the United States the right to denounce a policy of the Government which he represents, and especially denounce the citizens who sustain that policy—more than one-half of the people—denounce that policy as one that corrupts public life?

Mr. CRISP. He should always tell the truth. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must say I am surprised at the views expressed by the gentleman from Georgia—not his views as to the point in dispute between the friends of protection and the friends of free trade, for no one on this side is discussing that now—but his views with reference to the correct conduct of a minister of the United States in a foreign country before a foreign audience.

If, as I have already said, the minister of this country to England had gone upon a platform in London and denounced the people in this country who favored the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 as corruptionists, as men seeking to destroy the interests of this country, I am sure that the indignation of the gentleman from Georgia would have been at once aroused, and he would have seen the impropriety of such conduct on the part of an ambassador of the whole people. But the impropriety would have been no more patent in that case than in this. And I think it exceedingly important at this point that no considerable body of the American people should undertake to defend any ambassador of the United States, whatever the party to which he may be attached at home, who goes abroad and, while holding that official position and discharging the duties of ambassador for the whole people of the United States, denounces, upon a foreign platform before a foreign audience, a policy which prevailed in this country from 1861 to 1893, supported by a vast majority of the American people. And I would condemn the ambassador who should go upon a foreign platform while holding that position and denounce those who take a contrary view. I think that the good judgment of the gentleman from Georgia must convince him that any such conduct as this by an ambassador of the whole people of the United States is injurious to the interests of this country and presents an example which should not be sustained by any considerable body of the American people.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DINGLEY. If I can have the time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired; but some other gentleman can take the floor and yield to allow the question to be asked.

Mr. BARRETT. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. CRISP. Now, will the gentleman kindly yield for a question?

Mr. DINGLEY. I will.

Mr. CRISP. I answered at least with candor the question of the gentleman, and I shall expect as much from him. I ask him whether he believes, as a Representative, that the language recited by the gentleman from Massachusetts in his resolution furnishes good ground for the impeachment of Mr. Bayard?

Mr. DINGLEY Although I am not discussing that question, yet may say, if I an answer is desired, that in my judgment this is a case in which perhaps impeachment may not be the most expedient remedy. But that this House, representing the American people, should condemn such action on the part of their ambassador abroad I have no doubt. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. Will my friend let me say in this connection that the gentleman from Massachusetts obtained the right to discuss this question in this House solely on the ground that the language recited constituted ground of impeachment? Without such an allegation or averment the gentleman could not have been enabled to make his speech.

Mr. DINGLEY. I am not responsible for the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has exercised his own judgment in the premises.

Mr. CRISP. Then, as I understand, the allegation that this is an impeachable offense—an offense for which Mr. Bayard should be impeached—does not meet the approval of the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, I want to ask the gentleman, as long as he has asked me the question——

Mr. CRISP. Am I correct about that?

Mr. DINGLEY. I want to ask the gentleman whether——

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman is pursuing the Irish method—answering my question by asking another.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think I have answered the question of the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP. Was I correct in assuming that the gentleman from Maine did not concur with the gentleman from Massachusetts in holding that this language, if correctly reported, furnishes ground for impeachment?

Mr. DINGLEY. My judgment is that such language, denouncing the people of this country, uttered in a foreign country by an ambassador of the United States, is an impeachable offense if the House desires to thus proceed. [Applause on the Republican side.] Whether it is wise to do so is another question.

Mr. CRISP. Oh, well——

Mr. DINGLEY (continuing). I have no doubt an impeachable offense has been committed, if the House desires to apply this remedy, and in any event one which should receive the reprobation and condemnation of this body. If the ambassadors of the United States are to violate the proprieties of their official position in this manner, the time has certainly come when it is the duty of Congress to make an example of the guilty parties, and even by process of impeachment, if nothing else will answer, although in this case I prefer another remedy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say, in conclusion, that I regret that any question of this kind should take any partisan turn whatever. As I have said, it is not a question between the advocates of protection and free trade, but the question is as to the propriety of the conduct of an ambassador of the whole people of the United States in a foreign country. I can not believe that there is a single gentleman on the other side of the House, certainly not the gentleman from Georgia, who would countenance as a principle an ambassador of the United States in going on a foreign stump or a foreign platform and denouncing a policy which is sustained by at least one-half of the people of this country and condemning the citizens of his country as corruptionists.

I think some example should be made of a United States ambassador who persistently violates the proprieties of official life. In my judgment the members of the House should unhesitatingly condemn such a course, even, if necessary, to the extent of asking the President of the United States to recall the ambassador who thus violates the proprieties of official life. I say this, too, without regard to the party of which this gentleman or any other gentleman occupying a similar position may be a member.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question for information.

Mr. DINGLEY. I have no time at my disposal to answer it.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to ask the gentleman if he recollects whether Mr. Schenck, our minister abroad at one time, was impeached——

Mr. BARRETT. Does this come out of my time, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] took the floor to ask a question of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY]. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield him time?

Mr. CRISP. I yield to the gentleman for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman said the Republican party would impeach a Republican ambassador under such circumstances. Did they impeach Mr. Schenck when he was guilty of the offense of cheating the English in mining business?

Mr. MILLIKEN. My friend from Alabama is mistaken; it was cheating at poker. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRISP. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS].

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I can not say whether this resolution is brought in here under a false pretense or not; but I congratulate myself upon knowing that it is brought into the House

based upon a newspaper report of a speech. It is introduced by an editor of a newspaper, the Boston Advertiser. His action is backed by a former editor of the same newspaper. The editor of the Lewiston Journal has also given a favorable expression to the resolution. Mr. Speaker, it seems eminently fitting that a newspaper writer on this side of the House should have something to say on the subject, and I congratulate the correspondents in the gallery that the press is at least speaking for itself on the floor of the House.

I have no particular love for the ambassador of the United States to Great Britain. I have not forgotten that he has not done what he should have done toward securing the release of Irish patriots, citizens of the United States, who I believe are incarcerated unjustly in English prisons to-day.

I have not forgotten that he is a welcome guest in the houses of the Conservative aristocracy there, and that he never appears at banquets given by the friends of home rule in Ireland. But, Mr. Speaker, he should be treated with justice even by his political opponents upon this floor. If I read his remarks, or his alleged remarks, correctly, they resemble remarks that I have heard read frequently in public documents upon this floor. He is only reiterating what has been proclaimed by the President of the United States in messages and letters read in Congress. The ambassador to Great Britain ought not to be impeached for repeating the sentiments and ideas promulgated by the President of the United States. If this resolution is not brought in here under false pretenses, why does not the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] supplant it with a resolution impeaching the President? [Manifestations of derision on the Republican side.]

Go to the fountain head, gentlemen, if you mean what you say. You have been taking similar medicine for nearly eight years from the President of the United States, and not a whimper have we heard of impeachment; yet the instant that an officer of the Government reasserts the sentiments enunciated by the President of the United States in his messages or papers, forthwith there is a great hue and cry for impeachment.

But there is really nothing in this demand, Mr. Speaker. It is only the opening of the tariff debate for the present session of Congress. You are getting in early, my friends. You will have plenty of time later on. If the tariff is to be revised there will be plenty of time for debate, and all the young Congressmen will undoubtedly have an opportunity to participate. I am glad that the rules of the Fifty-first Congress were temporarily adopted by this House. You are working under these rules. They limit this debate here to two hours. Why anticipate the fight? I have taken more than my share of the two hours. I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] for his courtesy. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CRISP. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY].

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, when this Congress assembled it was confronted with grave and important responsibilities. The people had great expectations. They hoped that there would be legislation to ameliorate existing difficulties. They expected that the great majority on the Republican side would give to the country legislation that would benefit the people and improve business. We have now been here one week. The committees have not been announced. The regular organization for business has not been completed, and yet the first step that the Republicans take toward ameliorating the condition of affairs in this country is to bring in a resolution looking to impeachment of an American ambassador on grounds which I am satisfied they regard as insufficient. I take it that no one here doubts the object of the resolution. It is simply that a few gentlemen on the Republican side may air their rhetoric and present to the country their views on a protective tariff. If the Republicans desire to legislate on the tariff question, they should be bold enough to bring in a bill and meet that great question as it should be met.

The people of the United States are watching this Congress with great interest, and, remembering the pledges which have been made, they expect beneficial legislation. If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] desires to benefit this country, let him proceed in some more proper way than to attack our American ambassador, Mr. Bayard, on newspaper reports that are not known to be authentic. That distinguished gentleman needs no defense by me. His record in the Senate of the United States, his record as Secretary of State, speaks more strongly than anything I can say in behalf of his statesmanship, his ability, and his patriotism. This resolution is simply an excuse, a miserable excuse, brought in here that a debate may be started on a subject that the Republicans seem to be afraid to bring up in a regular way.

I do not believe that there is anything in the words which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] has taken from newspapers to authorize impeachment or to justify him in the assault which he has made on a distinguished and worthy officer. Mr. Bayard has said nothing more in the paragraph quoted than the President of the United States has substantially said in his messages. He has said nothing more than has been repeatedly said by members of this House, and he has spoken plain and unvarnished truth. When Mr. Bayard made a speech on the subject of "Individual freedom the germ of national progress and permanence," he was simply doing that which he had a right to do, and I fail to find in anything set forth in the preamble or resolutions proper grounds for impeachment. I do not believe that gentlemen on the other side of the House regard the language recited as sufficient to authorize impeachment.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will my friend allow me a question? Does not my friend distinguish any difference between a message coming from the President of the United States, whose duty or privilege it is, at least, to send a message to this House stating his opinion, or a statement made by a member of this House, where politics are discussed, and a statement made in a foreign country by an American ambassador in regard to his own countrymen?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I am accustomed, Mr. Speaker, to the interruptions of my friend from Maine. I believe they always occur. I do make a distinction between a President's message or the speeches made on this floor and the utterances of a foreign ambassador.

But I say that there is nothing in the reported utterances of Ambassador Bayard set forth in the preamble and resolution which justifies impeachment, and they were used as a flimsy pretext to precipitate a debate on protection and injure a faithful and worthy ambassador.

Mr. MILLIKEN. What can a fellow say to disgrace his country if he has not said it there? [Laughter.]

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. When the gentleman refers to Mr. Bayard in that manner he shows his failure to appreciate the ability and statesmanship of that distinguished gentleman. I decline to be further interrupted.

Mr. Speaker, if we had the complete speech delivered by Mr. Bayard before the Edinburgh Philosophic Institution I have no doubt it would be regarded by impartial and unprejudiced persons as a clean and able argument against protection and in favor of individual freedom and directly in accordance with the sentiments of the President who appointed him, and in line with the views of a majority of the people of that country which the able ambassador of the United States represented at the Court of Great Britain.

I know of no reason, political, social, or diplomatic, to prevent our ambassadors or ministers from upholding and supporting the sentiments or views of the President of the United States or a majority of his countrymen.

Mr. BARRETT. I made the statement in my opening remarks that the statements made by Mr. Bayard were in no sense warranted by but were in distinct defiance of the rules and regulations issued for his conduct by the Department of State. I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], who served in the diplomatic service, as to whether or not my statement is based on the truth, and I yield to him any time he desires to make a statement.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, the instructions that are issued by the State Department to the diplomatic representatives of the United States are partly oral, by the Secretary usually, and partly in a special paper which has been and I believe still is considered confidential: and I would not feel at liberty to read here a paper which was put in my hands as a confidential paper when I undertook such service; but as I subsequently, as Assistant Secretary, sometimes gave the instructions, by the Secretary's direction, to officers departing for diplomatic posts, I may say that the remark of the gentleman from Massachusetts is substantially correct—that all diplomatic representatives who went out were specially enjoined to use the greatest caution in their public utterances, to touch upon no burning or political question in the country to which they were accredited or elsewhere. There is a public document on the subject which answers the gentleman's question with more precision. In the regulations and instructions issued by authority of the President of the United States for the government of all our consular officers throughout the world occur these words:

> They will not give publicity through the press or otherwise to opinions injurious to the public institutions of the country or the persons concerned in their administration.

They—

> Are not allowed to allude in public speeches to any matters in dispute between the United States and any other government; * * * it is a still better rule to avoid public speeches when it can be done without exciting feeling in the community in which the officer resides. They will be particularly careful to refrain from unfavorable comment or criticism upon the institutions or acts of the Government to which they are accredited.

That is sent out as an order and it has this preliminary note:

> The following revised regulations and instructions * * * are hereby prescribed.

That is signed by President Cleveland and accompanied by an order of the Secretary of State, similar in tenor, closing with this strict injunction upon every officer:

> They are to be carefully observed in all respects.
> I am, sir, your obedient servant, T. F. BAYARD.

At the time I was connected with the State Department the Consular Regulations were revised and these paragraphs were put in charge of an experienced and skillful officer, Mr. Wood, to revise. He did so, and brought them to me for approval. In the discussion between us it was stated that they might be enlarged to cover all domestic questions or politics and forbid their discussion. But Mr. Blaine, Secretary of State, said, "No; such instructions are unnecessary. We never have had, and never will have, an officer who will go abroad and talk about our affairs at home." [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY].

Mr. MONEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in the discussion of this resolution the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentlemen on the other side have not acted ingenuously in this assault upon the American ambassador at the Court of St. James in reference to the language which they have quoted as used by Mr. Bayard in the public press. They have asserted here, and it will go to the country in the RECORD and through the public press, that Mr. Bayard used language concerning his compatriots in America that was disparaging to them, and that seems to be the gravamen of the complaint.

I call the attention of this House to the fact that Mr. Bayard in no single instance, or in a word that he used in this speech, in any way has assailed the character of his fellow-citizens of America. He never said that you gentlemen who favor protection were corruptionists. I can debate the question of protection with my friend and my neighbor here, and I can say to him as Mr. Bayard said upon the platform in Great Britain, that the tendency of the policy of protection is to corruption; but I will have at the same time the highest respect for the character of the men with whom I differ. Mr. Bayard could, with perfect respect to the American people, make the statement to that effect in what my distinguished friend here calls an academic discussion, that the tendency of this policy and principle was toward corruption.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asked my friend from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] a while ago what he would have said if Mr. Bayard, our ambassador, had denounced or should denounce the advocates of free silver as corruptionists, whether he would have approved of such a course on the part of our ambassador. Why, Mr. Speaker, even that would not be any ground on which to lodge an impeachment. I would not impeach an ambassador who used that language. I would simply be in favor of locking him up in a private bedlam until he should have a lucid interval. [Laughter.] That would be sufficient punishment for a man who denounced the advocates of the free coinage of silver as corruptionists.

But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that, admitting, which I do not, that the language used by Mr. Bayard about the doctrine of protection was improperly used, there is still no ground for impeachment. An impeachment is a prosecution. Do gentlemen know of any law that authorizes them to prosecute a man for high crimes and misdemeanors upon any such ground as is allaged in this resolution? Where do you find the language used legally defined as a crime or misdemeanor? You say that the language is improper; that it is language open to objection. Well, is that anywhere defined as a crime or a misdemeanor? Can you impeach a man simply for using what you say is improper language?

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished American citizen who is to-day representing this country in Great Britain has seen fit in a public speech there to use language that may not meet the approval of the American Congress; but if it should not be approved by the majority of this House, it seems to me that the proper course would be to frame a resolution of censure and express your opinion on the subject, if that is what you desire to do; and I can not believe that there is a lawyer on that side of the House who thinks that an impeachment will lie upon the ground which is here alleged. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution should be referred to the appropriate committee, the Committee on the Judiciary, that they may coolly and calmly examine the facts of the case and report them back to this House for its sober action.

There is no necessity for a football rush in a matter of this importance. We can very well defer it to a later day, until both sides of the House shall have had an opportunity to examine the circumstances attending the utterance of the language which is here cited against Mr. Bayard. Until we deal with the question in that way we shall not have acted either fairly or ingenuously by a gentleman who has, in the highest degree, represented abroad the character, the intelligence, and the patriotism of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the remainder of our time until we hear further from gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the defense made of our ambassador to England by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] it seemed to me at first that he was going to say that the language attributed to the ambassador was found in a mere newspaper article—not disavowed, it is true, by Mr. Bayard or his friends, but yet not verified by him—and that it might be well to wait and see whether he would not repudiate it. The gentleman from Georgia, however, left no doubt of its authenticity, for he accepted and defended it. I regretted that, because I do not believe that the gentleman from Georgia in his heart is proud of that utterance or that in his mind he approves of it. I listened also, with some amusement, to the apology made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] for the sentences uttered by our ambassador to England. His apology was that this was not near so bad as some other things that the ambassador had done while he was over there. [Laughter.]

As to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I think it should go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, not to the Committee on the Judiciary. If it shall be ascertained beyond doubt that our ambassador did make that speech at Edinburgh, as alleged in the newspapers, I do not believe that there can be found a man upon the other side of the House who will place himself upon his honor and say that he indorses that language or that conduct, and I am quite sure that throughout the country there can not be found a corporal's guard to indorse it. But gentlemen say that the ambassador ought not to be impeached. Well, so far as my opinion is concerned, I doubt if he ought to be impeached as a matter of policy, perhaps not even as a matter of right; but if he made these utterances, then, unless the President of the United States promptly recalls him, I do believe that it is the duty of the American House of Representatives, in an orderly manner, to express, by way of censure, its disapproval of such action and such utterances. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER].

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, without pausing in the brief time allowed me to comment on the apparent motive of this resolution, or the perversion of so small an incident to precipitate the tariff war, I desire to say, what perhaps has not yet been said by any gentleman who has taken part in this discussion, that I believe that the utterance imputed to the American ambassador while speaking at Edinburgh hardly constituted even an impropriety.

The gentleman from Massachusetts called on my veteran friend from Illinois [Mr. HITT], who is an experienced diplomat, having had long connection, both at home and abroad, with our foreign affairs, to produce the regulations of the State Department restricting our ambassadors and foreign ministers in the expression of their sentiments. But the gentleman last named, with all his experience, both in the State Department and in our diplomatic service, could find only restrictive admonitions as to political utterances by our foreign representatives upon the local affairs of the countries to which they are accredited. The citation contained nothing in the way of an instruction to our foreign representatives as to what their conduct should be in regard to existing policies in their own country.

Mr. Speaker, this question of so-called protection is not simply a local issue, nor is it a mere "academic question," as my colleague from Georgia has said. It relates to a policy that runs round the world. It is a part of the common law of humanity. It is a burning question in all our international relations. We have not a representative abroad whose business it is not to discuss and negotiate upon matters affecting protection. Our consuls month by month make their reports, in which they discuss every phase of protection. Our representatives of the higher degree, our ambassadors and ministers at foreign courts, are required by their duty to their country under existing laws to negotiate reciprocal trade relations, and they are certainly at liberty to give their views on the effect and consequences of a policy of commercial restriction and suppression. The largest part of their public duty at this time is to secure the abandonment or mitigation of protective burdens inflicted on our trade.

What, then, becomes of this proposed impeachment of our distinguished minister at London? There is no foundation for it in diplomacy, in politics, or in morals. A man, whether he represents this country in one place or another, is not stripped of his true sentiments, and has a right to speak them respectfully wherever the sun shines if he is in accord with the policy of his own country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The people of Great Britain are not ignorant of the political revolutions that take place in this country. They are aware of the policies of the Administration which our ambassadors are supposed to represent. As they represent the successful party at home, their views upon these policies certainly ought to give no offense at home if they give none abroad. But in any view Mr. Bayard was in Scotland by invitation, and in a philosophical and scholarly way discussed the principle and practical effects of protection. And if gentlemen on the other side of the House are afraid to have that principle discussed with the utmost freedom and latitude in any tribunal where scholars contend, then they would put an embargo on the progressive development of the truth! Here is a good example of the madness of protection! [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BARRETT. I yield five minutes of my remaining time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, after the very vigorous onslaught which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] has made upon our ambassador to England, in which, for the purpose of discrediting the original accusation here, he has seen fit to impeach the veracity of his chosen profession, and has then gone on to supplement the accusation with a recital of other wrongs committed by the ambassador, I hardly feel it necessary that anything further should be submitted on this side of the Chamber.

Passing, however, from the remarks of the gentleman from New York to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], who seems to be the recognized leader on the other side of this Chamber, I trust I may be permitted to say that during the entire time he was speaking I could not but reflect how difficult it is in debate for a man of really great ability to invest a wrong with the appearance of a right.

Now, I am not concerned, as is the gentleman from Georgia, and as is the gentleman from Kentucky, with the question as to the motives of the gentleman from Massachusetts in bringing this question of privilege before the House. I care not whether he did it for the purpose of getting an opportunity by discussion to express his indignation at the conduct of our ambassador, or whether he did it for the bona fide purpose of pressing the matter further and procuring an impeachment of the ambassador. Doubtless if he did it from the first motive, it was because of the refusal of the gentleman from Georgia to permit the consideration of the resolution offered by the other gentleman from Massachusetts, and which made it necessary that some kind of parliamentary device should be resorted to if gentlemen on this floor were to have an opportunity to express their disapproval of the conduct of the ambassador to England.

But the trouble with the gentleman from Georgia is that he has shot wide of the mark; that he seems, as do other gentlemen on that side of the House, to have misapprehended the real point at issue in this matter. The question, sir, is not whether protection is right or whether protection is wrong. The question is not whether the tenets of free trade will best advance the interests of our country or whether they will injure its interests. Nor is the issue whether or not those questions which the gentleman from Georgia has been pleased to call "academic" shall be discussed in the proper forum in this country. Nor is it even a question as to whether a private citizen of this country, being upon a foreign soil, has the right to express his unfavorable opinion either of the policy or the morals of his fellow-Americans at home. But the question is whether a man who is the chosen representative of the people of this country, who bears in his hand the insignia of office, shall on a public occasion, on the soil of the Government to which he is accredited, in the presence of foreigners, not merely speak disparagingly of the tenets of a political party in his country, but also make such a personal application of his remarks to his countrymen as shall impeach their integrity and their honesty.

This, sir, is the question before the House, and the gentleman need not attempt to distract attention from this vital question by undertaking to impute to gentlemen on this side of the Chamber simply a disposition to lug in a debate upon the subject of the tariff.

Mr. Speaker, I undertake to say that whenever an ambassador to a foreign country puts his foot upon a transatlantic steamer to go to his destination to represent us, from that moment he should be a sealed book as to the internal dissensions or diverse views of his countrymen.

From that moment he should see everything, to quote the language of Webster which has just been read upon this floor, solely with American eyes, and he should stand as a representative not of any particular polity or of any particular party of his countrymen, but as the guardian and conservator of all the American people North and South, East and West; I undertake, too, sir, to say that for a foreign ambassador from any country to open his mouth upon the soil of the country to which he is accredited, either in disparagement of its institutions or in the disparagement of the institutions of his own countrymen is a gross impropriety, a breach not simply of official etiquette, but a wrong which should justly call down upon him the impartial censure of all his patriotic countrymen.

Now, as I have said, the gentleman from Georgia has evaded that whole question at issue on this question of privilege, and has seen fit to talk about the result of the election and to discuss the merits of the question of protection or free trade, which are in nowise involved on this occasion. I do not wonder that the gentleman has seen fit to announce to this House that he is not a diplomat. The very awkward manner in which he sought to evade the pertinent question put to him by my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], is of itself a strong confirmation of his declaration, and shows that his opinion of himself is well entertained. He will never again be called upon to make that declaration upon this floor after the experience of to-day, for the House will at once assent hereafter to the truth of his proposition that he knows nothing of diplomacy. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

When the gentleman cites the result of the election of 1892 as proof that Mr. Bayard reflected the views of his countrymen in the language employed by him abroad, which language, I insist, he had no right to make use of in that tribunal, the gentleman is unfortunate and overlooks the fact that the last expression of public opinion at the polls is the one to which most importance should be attached. The gentleman forgets that the voice of the American people ever since they committed the fatal error of putting the Democratic party in power has been in the line of reversing their decision, and that in sackcloth and ashes, regretting their conduct, from the time Mr. Cleveland assumed his office up to the present hour, they never have had an opportunity to reverse their decision at the polls that they have not hastened to do it with patriotism and with alacrity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia need not concern himself with what shall be the policy of the Republican party upon this floor. He need not undertake to challenge us to bring in a tariff bill, and to thus raise the issue and go to the country. He may rely upon it that the Republican majority upon this floor will not present to the country the scene of imbecility and dissension which his own party exhibited in the last two Congresses. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The gentleman will observe before this Congress terminates that the Republicans on this floor have both the capacity and the patriotism to reconcile their individual differences, if any exist, in caucus, and to present a solid front upon some line of legislation which they believe will conduce to the interests of all the people of the country. The gentleman will have occasion, too, I trust, before the session expires, to observe that the Republican party will not follow the example of the gentlemen upon the other side; that no Republican dirty linen is to be washed in the presence of this House and of an indignant and disgusted country, in imitation of the course which has subjected the Democracy to the animadversion of the people of all parties, and of the press, irrespective of its party predilections.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary that I should detain the House further upon this subject. The public press of this country has been heard upon the subject of Mr. Bayard's utterances. Right-minded men, patriotic men, who have regard for the proprieties of official life and for the dignity of the nation have been heard to express their opinion upon this subject. It would be a burning shame which would bring deserved reproach, sir, upon this body, if, with all its powers and prerogatives, it passed by this indiscreet, this indelicate, this ill-timed, this untruthful declaration of our ambassador to England without expressing in some form or other its disapproval of his utterances and its condemnation of the motives which led him to make them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining to this side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has twenty-five minutes.

Mr. CRISP. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE].

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me most unfortunate that this bitter partisan discussion should have proceeded on so flimsy a foundation this morning. This discussion has been precipitated, I fear, not so much with a view to serving the interests of the country at large, as, in a small way, to serve the interests of the Republican party. It seems to me that the time-honored course in such matters might much better have been followed, in view of the fact that there is no man on this floor and probably no man in this country who can say to-day that Thomas F. Bayard ever uttered the language imputed to him and which we have been discussing this morning. It might better have been sent to a committee without debate, and let that committee ascertain, first, whether or not there was any foundation whatever for the assertion that these statements, in the form that we have heard them on the floor of this House to-day, were properly to be attributed to Mr. Bayard, or were ever made by him, and secondly, whether or not, if they were uttered by him, impeachment would be a proper proceeding in the premises.

This debate, sir, has been precipitated on the theory that this is an impeachment proceeding, and therefore privileged. It could not have proceeded upon any other theory; and, I ask, how absurd, how unfortunately ridiculous, would be the position of this House, in its occupation of almost an entire day in the discussion of this matter, if it should transpire upon investigation that the two or three words which give the objectionable character to the statement attributed to Mr. Bayard were not uttered by him at all.

I do not care to discuss the effect of the use of such language by our ambassador abroad, if it was used by him, for that has been ably and sufficiently discussed by ex-Speaker CRISP, Judge TURNER, and other gentlemen who have preceded me.

What foundation have we for all this furious criticism of Mr. Bayard? Simply a newspaper statement coming to us third or fourth hand. A Representative informs us, probably on the authority of some American newspaper, that an English newspaper

has said, upon the authority of a reporter, whose information may have been either direct or indirect, that Mr. Bayard used the language objected to. Yet we proceed to discuss the matter as if we were in full possession of the facts and in a position to vote on the question of impeachment. Now, sir, it is quite as likely that the young man who reported the matter for the London News or the man who telegraphed a synopsis of it to the American press inserted the objectionable words as that Mr. Bayard used them.

It ill becomes the dignity of this House to proceed with the discussion of alleged misconduct on the part of a national representative of this country without the slightest satisfactory knowledge of what he has done. In my opinion the precipitation of this debate, on the theory that it is an impeachment proceeding—a proceeding that ought to be based on knowledge, that ought to be supported by immediate proofs—presents a most unfortunate condition of affairs; and the House can not too speedily refer the whole matter to the Judiciary Committee, without further discussion of the merits, to ascertain the facts and the law upon which alone the House should act, so that the matter may hereafter be intelligently discussed, upon full information as to all of the facts. We are certainly in no position to discuss the case upon its merits at this time.

Mr. BARRETT. I desire to reserve the remainder of my time, and shall, at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia, move the previous question.

Mr. CRISP. I move to refer this resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Massachusetts has indicated a desire to demand the previous question, and the Chair thinks that would be the first question in order.

Mr. CRISP. But I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, in my own right, either for discussion or to make any motion which is pertinent to this question. I could move to adjourn; I could call the previous question at this time. I have the rule before me:

When a question is under debate no motion shall be received but to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question; which motions shall be decided without debate.

Now, neither of these motions has been made. The gentleman from Massachusetts gives notice that when he gets the floor he intends to make that motion; but I have the floor in my own right for any purpose, and I repeat I could demand the previous question myself, or move that the House adjourn, or make any other pertinent motion.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Georgia knows it is customary to recognize first the gentleman in charge of a measure.

Mr. CRISP. Certainly, Mr. Speaker; that would be the case if I were speaking in his time; but I have the floor in my own right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks we can easily reach an understanding in reference to this matter.

Mr. CRISP. It is not capable of a misunderstanding. I simply wish to preserve my right to make the motion I have indicated, which is a proper motion under the rules.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts indicated that he reserved his time and yielded to the gentleman from Georgia for the purpose of making remarks.

Mr. CRISP. But "the gentleman from Georgia" thinks the Chair is entirely mistaken. "The gentleman from Georgia" has twenty minutes in his own right. The Chair announced a few moments since that I had twenty-five minutes, of which I yielded five minutes to the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Georgia insists the Chair will put the question on his motion.

Mr. CRISP. "If the gentleman from Georgia insists!" Why of course he insists. When a proposition like this comes in under the guise of an impeachment, but presented for the purpose of precipitating a political discussion, certainly I insist.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Has the gentleman from Georgia the floor in a manner which gives him a right to move the previous question?

Mr. CRISP. I do not want to move the previous question, nor have I any desire to cut the gentleman from Massachusetts off. I only want to reserve my rights in this matter.

Mr. BARRETT. I think I can settle this matter if the gentleman from Georgia will allow me a moment.

Mr. CRISP. I only want to have my motion pending, so that it can be voted upon by the House.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the gentleman allow me to make a suggestion to him?

Mr. CRISP. If the gentleman insists upon it I will——

Mr. BARRETT. I understand the rules of the House provide that after the previous question is ordered a motion to recommit will be in order and can be entertained. If the gentleman desires to do that after the previous question is ordered I shall favor it.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman desires to make the motion in his own right as a matter of right under the rules.

When a question is under debate no motion shall be received but to adjourn, to lay on the table, or for the previous question (which motions shall be decided without debate), a motion to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or amend, or to postpone indefinitely, which several motions shall have precedence in the foregoing order.

Now, I had no intention whatever to cut off the gentleman's right of debate, but I wanted a motion to refer pending, so that after the previous question had been ordered my motion could be entertained.

Mr. BARRETT. I agree to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts agrees to that.

Mr. BARRETT. Now, I wish to ask the gentleman if he desires further time for debate; if not, I shall ask for the adoption of the previous question, subject to the motion to recommit.

Mr. CRISP. I wish to say just a few words in conclusion. Here is a proposition presented to the House which has never been considered by a committee, of which no one on this side had notice, and of which perhaps few on that side had notice. It is a proposition reciting certain things alleged to have been said by the American ambassador at the Court of St. James, and instructs a committee of the House to proceed to consider and investigate that question and report by impeachment or otherwise.

Now, there is no evidence of any statement excepting, I suppose, the allegation of some paper. I have not the resolution before me, but that perhaps is what it recites. I want to call the attention of the older members of the House to the fact that this is an entirely new departure. The practice has been, in a dignified way, when a gentleman calls attention to any matter like this, to refer it to a committee for consideration. Ordinarily this could only be referred through the petition box. If the gentleman from Massachusetts had introduced a resolution to censure Mr. Bayard he would be required to send it to the Speaker for reference to the proper committee; but by simply putting at the head of his resolution "I hereby impeach Mr. Bayard" he obtains the right to debate his resolution as a matter of privilege. Now, I say that, in my judgment, there are not twenty men on that side of the House who honestly believe that if every word alleged to have been said was said by Mr. Bayard he is guilty of an impeachable offense. I venture the assertion that not half a dozen men on that side would dare stand in their places in the House of Representatives and vote to impeach Mr. Bayard if it were true that he used that language.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, under the guise of impeachment, has obtained the right to make a speech upon the floor, ventilating his views upon this question. It remains to be seen whether this House will determine that that is the right sort of practice. The suggestion made by this side of the House works no hardship, works no delay, works no injustice. The majority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary will be composed of Republican members. They are the friends of the movant of this resolution; they are the friends of those who are interested in condemning, if you please, the action of the ambassador to Great Britain.

Why not wait, in the orderly course of business, until such action can be had? Why vote for the adoption of this resolution and thus, impliedly at least, express an opinion as to the allegations contained in the preamble and thereby establish a practice which, we may rest assured, will return to torment us before this session shall come to an end? If the House wants to establish a wise practice it will refer this resolution to its Judiciary Committee, and we may depend that such committee will act upon it in accordance with justice and right and truth. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BARRETT. How much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has eighteen minutes left.

Mr. BARRETT. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW].

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention to take part in this discussion. I rise simply to recall an historical incident which I think illustrates the spirit that ought to control the actions and the utterances of a representative of the American people at any foreign port. At the outbreak of the war Mr. Charles Francis Adams represented the United States at the Court of St. James. On one occasion he was in conversation with some English gentlemen high in authority, whose sympathies were on the side of the Confederacy. Up to that time success in the field had crowned the Confederate arms, and one of these English gentlemen, thinking, possibly, to annoy Mr. Adams, said to him: "Mr. Adams, these Confederates seem to fight well." Mr. Adams's reply was: "Yes, sir; they are my countrymen." [Loud applause.]

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate I wish to extend the gentleman from Georgia——

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to yield to me a moment. I suggest that in the instruction to the committee contained in the latter part of the resolution submitted by him the words "by impeachment" be omitted, so that the committee may report what, after careful investigation, is deemed best. I offer this as a practical suggestion which will give the committee, to be composed, of course, of gentlemen from

both sides of the House, the amplest jurisdiction to deal with this question without making any implication in advance as to what their report shall be.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Illinois, I will say that the resolution as submitted reads "report by impeachment or otherwise," which, I think, covers practically the point he has suggested; but out of deference to him I gladly consent that the words which he has indicated shall be omitted, leaving the committee full scope to deal with the matter. I ask unanimous consent that that change be made.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, will not that take away the privileged character of the resolution? We understood that those were the words on which the privileged character of the resolution was based.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia will remember that the resolution begins "I do impeach"——

Mr. CRISP. But that is a mere "whereas."

The SPEAKER (continuing). But, independent of that, the gentleman from Georgia will no doubt agree that after the House has had jurisdiction of a question, it may amend it to suit itself.

Mr. CRISP. The Chair thinks not. [Great laughter.] I mean I think not.

The SPEAKER. I am afraid the gentleman from Georgia has got too much in the habit of replying to me in that language. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRISP. But, Mr. Speaker, if jurisdiction, or, rather, if the right of privilege is acquired by a specific allegation and only by that allegation, and then that allegation is stricken from the resolution, is it not a question whether the proposition is still privileged?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the proposition having once become a question of privilege the House has a right to dispose of it.

Mr. CRISP. But the House has not altered it.

The SPEAKER. The House may refuse to alter it.

Mr. CRISP. But the gentleman himself proposes to strike out that language.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman proposes to ask unanimous consent of the House to strike out the words indicated.

Mr. CRISP. Well, I object to that. I want these gentlemen to go on record as voting for impeachment if they wish to.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, is there objection to my request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] asks unanimous consent that the words "by impeachment or otherwise" be omitted from the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. CRISP. I object.

Mr. BARRETT. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] will see that I am desirous of complying with his request and am only prevented at this time by the objection which has been made.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said by the Democratic members on this floor as to the motives which prompted me to introduce this resolution. I desire to say now, in all fairness, that if, on this day, when the time of the House is open for free discussion, when there are no important questions pressing upon us for consideration, they had allowed the resolution offered by my colleague [Mr. MCCALL] to be considered and debated, my resolution would not have been presented.

But when, by the solitary objection of one member, consideration of this question, which comes very near to the hearts of the American people, was summarily denied, I presented the question of privilege which has absorbed the attention of the House during the last two hours.

I have heard the objection raised, sir, that an impeachment of a civil officer of the United States must be for high crimes and misdemeanors. I wish to call the attention of the House to a book on the Constitution which has been just issued from the pen of that eminent authority, Hon. George S. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, who has been speaker of the house of representatives in that State, governor, member of this House, member of the Senate of the United States, one of the impeachment managers in the case of Andrew Johnson, and Secretary of the Treasury. In this book he says:

> All civil officers of the United States may be removed from office upon impeachment for acts which are neither high crimes nor misdemeanors by common law or the statutes of the United States.

Which means that this House may in its wisdom bring an impeachment proceeding against any civil officer upon any state of facts which it deems of sufficient importance.

I wish to say, however, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a resolution of impeachment. It is a resolution directing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to consider this matter, and to report "by impeachment or otherwise," thus leaving to the committee the judgment as to whether the report shall embody an impeachment and censure, or any other form of reprobation. As to the language, I am not particular. Prompt action on the part of the House is all that is desired. I have asked unanimous consent that the words "by impeachment or otherwise" be stricken out. The other side has objected. An amendment to that effect, later, I shall willingly accept.

I thank the gentlemen on the other side—some of them—who have taken the ground, by implication, that the words embodied in the resolution, if correctly reported, constitute an offense on the part of an ambassador of the United States, and accordingly have taken refuge in the assertion that no such statement was ever made.

I tell them that I quoted this extract myself from the London News. It did not come by telegraph; it was not taken from a paper published in this country. It was written down by my own hand from a copy of the London News in a library in the State of Massachusetts.

I wish to say further, for the benefit of the gentleman from Georgia, who has somewhat questioned the validity of this report, that I am informed, on authority which even he will not question, that this speech, in substance, as I have quoted it here, has been printed in pamphlet form in London, and is there being circulated among the aristocracy and the members of the British Government as the best argument why the standing and reputation of this country need not be seriously considered by them. I would that I had a copy of that pamphlet here. If I had had, I should have quoted from it. But I make the statement that it exists and that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will have no trouble in securing a copy of it.

Another question which has been raised is this: Why not refer this subject to the Committee on the Judiciary, which has often considered resolutions of this sort? I answer that in the main impeachment proceedings in this country have been of such a character that the resolutions have very properly been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. But I also assert that there are cases in which resolutions looking to impeachment proceedings have been referred to other committees than that on the Judiciary. For example, on the 2d day of December, 1884, the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice was directed by this House to make such an examination as the one to which I have asked attention in the resolution I have submitted.

I trust that the motion of the gentleman from Georgia will be voted down and that this resolution will go through. This is simply an inquiry, and when the facts are made known to this House I expect to welcome that gentleman's able assistance and magnetic voice in passing such a vote through this body as will put on the records of this country the declaration that an ambassador of the United States at a foreign court can not with impunity insult the people whom he represents. [Applause on the Republican side.]

An attempt has been made to drag the tariff into this question. My friend from Georgia has very kindly suggested to me that I restrain my youthful impatience and speak on that subject.

I will say to him that there are many men on this floor who have acquired, by long years of experience and investigation, exact information upon that question. As a young and new member, however, I can assure him that any tariff bill passed by the Republicans of this House will not be followed in less than twelve months by self-confessed national bankruptcy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MCMILLIN. The one that your party did pass was followed in that way. [Cries of "Oh, no!"]

Mr. BARRETT. This issue has nothing to do with the tariff. The gentleman from Georgia knows that very well. Does he attempt to befog the issue? Let us pass on this matter now. We will discuss the tariff later on.

Mr. Speaker, I had supposed that long before this time the President of the United States would either have demanded a satisfactory explanation from Mr. Bayard or else have recalled him and sent an American to represent us at the Court of St. James. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I do not forget that a few months since, when the representative of a humble Republic, limited to a few little islands in the midst of the Pacific Ocean—a Republic which has sought and desires still further to seek close political connection with this country—when their representative, Mr. Thurston, in a moment of forgetfulness perhaps, accorded to a newspaper man an interview in which he stated some truthful and self-evident propositions concerning the domestic affairs of the land which he represented—propositions supported by the President of his country and his cabinet, which in no way had reference to proceedings in which this Government was involved—our sensitive Department of State, obeying the instructions of the President of the United States, insisted upon and secured the recall of Mr. Thurston because he had made a statement which was absolutely indorsed by the people that he represented.

I propose, if it is possible, to secure the recall of a man who in high public place and in a time of great national exigency has put himself on record in a way to humiliate and disgrace the proudest people of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I am asked, Mr. Speaker, why this resolution was not withheld until a later date in the session.

I will answer that question.

For many months, sir, the foreign relations of this country have been a matter of the most serious consideration to the people of the United States. For many months on hustings, on platforms, in the lyceum arena, wherever the people have been called together to consider public questions, one of the most burning has been the relations of this country with the other nations of the world. tI was well understood by the people in all parts of the country that delicate questions had arisen in regard to the relations between the United States and the Government of Great Britain.

I remember, sir, ten months ago, the House of Representatives, under the personal management of my friend from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] (I trust that after we get better acquainted he will learn to find in me some elements of pleasant relationship which will justify me in using that term)—I remember that under his personal leadership a resolution was passed directing the President of the United States to proffer to Great Britain our offer of mediation between that Government and our little sister Republic of Venezuela, which Government Great Britain, I do not hesitate to say, is preparing to despoil at this time by the mere force of numbers.

The House directed the President of the United States to offer our mediation between Venezuela and Great Britain in the controversy then and now existing. Five months—five whole months, with the time of passage between New York and London reduced to five days—five months elapsed before the ambassador of the United States, that gentleman who is so full of "academic discussion" [laughter on the Republican side], could find time to present that remonstrance to the British foreign office. Five months more elapsed before the foreign office of Great Britain deigned to give the ambassador of the United States the slightest answer. The President waited and waited, and the message he sent to us at the opening of this session was submitted before any response was made. It is alleged that that response has now come; and a message of the utmost importance concerning the well-being and the dignity of this country is lying on some table, I know not where, waiting until the season of duck shooting in some North Carolina lagoon shall expire. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I hope, sir, and I believe, that the vote of this House, showing its interest in our foreign relations, may be found of sufficient volume and importance to waft it down over Virginia and North Carolina, so that it will at last be heard by that impatient public official who is now, I presume, crouching behind some shield to bring down some timorous and fleeting duck [laughter] and bring him back, so that the long-belated reply to our Venezuelan matter may be submitted to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I declare also that the people of the United States are deeply interested in our peaceable possession of Alaska, which is being seriously questioned. That territory on which our flag should reign dominant is being undermined by stealth on the part of the Dominion of Canada, and her agents already, so the public prints state, are exercising governmental functions upon the soil of this country.

I state as a matter of fact that the modus vivendi in regard to our fishery relations, which has been adopted and followed for several years by Great Britain and this country, has been set aside by Canada without proper notice to us. Our fishermen may soon be without the protection which that modus vivendi implied.

Mr. Speaker, galling as such a position of affairs is—unwilling as I am, as a Representative in this House, to agree for one moment that our representative at the Court of Great Britain should so subject himself to the feeling there that his utterances may be construed at that court as affording ground for its regarding lightly the requests of this Government and holding within its possession for more than five months a formal note submitted by our ambassador before making reply, sending its emissaries upon Alaskan soil to belittle the prestige of the United States—yet considering that a national emergency had arisen, I offered this resolution believing that no time could be inopportune for the representatives of the people of the United States to express their opinions of such an attitude taken at such a time by a high public official. I have thus offered these resolutions.

I do not know whether they will result in impeachment or not. I care not for the form of its report. I am glad to leave them to the distinguished committee soon to be appointed, of which I presume—so far as one may know without authority—my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. HITT] will be at the head. I ask from that committee a speedy consideration of the matters submitted, and I ask from this House, even in these early days of the session, an expression which shall be notice to all our diplomatic representatives abroad that, even if they may be in accord with the ideas of the Administration as stated by the gentlemen on the other side, it is not in accord with the opinion of the House of Representatives when they speak in defiance of instructions, in violation of international law, and absolute disregard of the dignity of the people whom they assume to represent.

Let the ambassadors of the United States be instructed that from now on, at least while the composition of the House remains as it is to-day, such utterances, "academic" though they may be, will not be tolerated without a stern rebuke from the House of Representatives. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I desire to offer an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. BARRETT. I understood I had moved the previous question on the main question.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I think the gentleman will accept the amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. I think perhaps I will.

Mr. CRISP. A motion to refer has priority over a motion to amend.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, no.

Mr. CRISP. Oh, yes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the proposed amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the words "by impeachment or otherwise."

Mr. BARRETT. I accept the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRISP. Now, Mr. Speaker, I insist that a motion to refer has priority over a motion to amend, under the rules.

To postpone to a day certain, to refer, and to amend.

The several motions have precedence in the foregoing order.

The SPEAKER. The question of reference might first be put. After that the amendment will be pending.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I suppose we can vote that motion down.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT] moves the previous question.

Mr. BARRETT. On the main question and pending amendments.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is upon the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to refer to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. CRISP) there were—ayes 80, noes 206.

Mr. CRISP. Yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 92, nays 209, not voting 54; as follows:

YEAS—92.

Abbott,	De Armond,	McClellan,	Sayers,
Allen,	Denny,	McCreary, Ky.	Sparkman,
Bailey,	Dinsmore,	McCulloch,	Spencer,
Baker, Kans.	Dockery,	McDearmon,	Stallings,
Bankhead,	Downing.	McKenney,	Stokes,
Bartlett, Ga.	Ellett, Va.	McLaurin,	Strait,
Bell, Colo.	Elliott, S. C.	McMillin,	Strowd, N. C.
Bell, Tex.	Erdman,	McRae,	Swanson,
Berry,	Hall,	Meredith,	Talbert,
Black, Ga.	Hart,	Meyer,	Tarsney,
Buck,	Hendrick,	Miles,	Tate,
Catchings,	Kem,	Miner, N. Y.	Terry,
Clardy,	Kendall,	Money,	Tucker,
Cobb, Ala.	Kyle,	Neill,	Turner, Ga.
Cobb, Mo.	Latimer,	Ogden,	Turner, Va.
Cockrell,	Lawson,	Otey,	Tyler,
Cooper, Fla.	Layton,	Owens,	Underwood,
Cooper, Tex.	Lester,	Patterson,	Walsh,
Cox,	Little,	Price,	Wheeler,
Crain,	Livingston,	Richardson,	Williams,
Crisp,	Lockhart,	Robbins,	Wilson, S. C.
Crowley,	Maddox,	Robertson, La.	Woodard,
Cummings,	Maguire,	Russell, Ga.	Yoakum.

NAYS—209.

Acheson,	Cooke, Ill.	Hager,	Kiefer,
Adams,	Cooper, Wis.	Hainer, Nebr.	Kirkpatrick,
Aitken,	Corliss,	Halterman,	Knox,
Aldrich,	Crowther,	Hanly,	Kulp,
Anderson,	Crump,	Hardy,	Lacey,
Andrews,	Curtis, Iowa	Harmer,	Lefever,
Arnold, Pa.	Curtis, Kans.	Harris,	Leighty,
Avery,	Curtis, N. Y.	Hartman,	Leisenring,
Baker, Md.	Danford,	Hatch,	Leonard,
Baker, N. H.	Daniels,	Heatwole,	Linney,
Barham,	Dayton,	Heiner, Pa.	Linton,
Barney,	De Witt,	Hemenway,	Long,
Barrett,	Dingley,	Henderson,	Loud,
Bartholdt,	Dolliver,	Henry, Conn.	Loudenslager,
Beach,	Dovener,	Henry, Ind.	Low,
Bennett,	Ellis,	Hermann,	Mahany,
Bishop,	Evans,	Hilborn,	Mahon,
Blue,	Fairchild,	Hitt,	Marsh,
Boutelle,	Faris,	Hooker,	McCall, Mass.
Brewster,	Fenton,	Hopkins,	McCall, Tenn.
Broderick,	Fischer,	Howe,	McCleary, Minn.
Bromwell,	Fletcher,	Howell,	McClure,
Brosius,	Foote,	Hubbard,	McLachlan,
Brumm,	Foss,	Huff,	Meiklejohn,
Bull,	Fowler,	Hulick,	Mercer,
Burrell,	Gamble,	Huling,	Miller, Kans.
Burton, Mo.	Gibson,	Hull,	Miller, W. Va.
Calderhead,	Gillet, N. Y.	Hurley,	Milliken,
Cannon,	Gillett, Mass.	Hyde,	Milnes,
Clark, Iowa	Graff,	Jenkins,	Minor, Wis.

Clark, Mo.	Griffin,	Johnson, Cal.	Mondell,
Codding,	Griswold,	Johnson, Ind.	Moody,
Coffin,	Grout,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Morse,
Connolly,	Grow,	Joy,	Mozly,
Cook, Wis.	Hadley,	Kerr,	Murphy,
Noonan,	Reeves,	Stahle,	Van Voorhis,
Northway,	Robinson, Pa.	Steele,	Wadsworth,
Odell,	Royse,	Stephenson,	Walker, Mass.
Otjen,	Russell, Conn.	Stewart, N. J.	Warner,
Overstreet,	Sauerhering,	Stewart, Wis.	Watson, Ind.
Parker,	Scranton,	Stone, C. W.	Watson, Ohio
Payne,	Settle,	Strode, Nebr.	Wellington,
Pearson,	Shafroth,	Strong,	Wilber,
Perkins,	Shannon,	Sulloway,	Willis,
Phillips,	Sherman,	Taft,	Wilson, Idaho
Pickler,	Shuford,	Tawney,	Wilson, Ohio
Pitney,	Simpkins,	Tayler,	Wood,
Poole,	Smith, Mich.	Thomas,	Woodman,
Powers,	Snover,	Towne,	Woomer,
Prince,	Southard,	Tracewell,	Wright.
Pugh,	Southwick,	Tracy,	
Quigg,	Spalding,	Treloar,	
Raney,	Sperry,	Updegraff,	

NOT VOTING—54.

Apsley,	Cousins,	Howard,	Rusk,
Arnold, R. I.	Cowen,	Hunter,	Shaw,
Atwood,	Culberson,	Hutcheson,	Skinner,
Babcock,	Dalzell,	Jones,	Smith, Ill.
Bartlett, N. Y.	Doolittle,	Lewis,	Sorg,
Bingham,	Draper,	Lorimer,	Stone, W. A.
Black, N. Y.	Eddy,	McCormick,	Sulzer,
Boatner,	Fitzgerald,	McEwan,	Walker, Va.
Bowers,	Gardner,	McGann,	Wanger,
Brown,	Grosvenor,	Moses,	Washington,
Burton, Ohio	Harrison,	Newlands,	White,
Chickering,	Hepburn,	Pendleton,	Wilson, N. Y.
Clarke, Ala.	Hicks,	Ray,	
Colson,	Hill,	Reyburn,	

So the motion to refer to the Committee on the Judiciary was rejected.

The following pairs were announced:

For this day:

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. MOSES.

Mr. DOOLITTLE with Mr. WASHINGTON.

Mr. LEISENRING with Mr. JONES.

Mr. CHICKERING with Mr. BARTLETT of New York.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. GROSVENOR with Mr. SORG.

Mr. RAY with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. DRAPER with Mr. BOATNER.

Mr. HARMER with Mr. COWEN.

Mr. COUSINS with Mr. CULBERSON.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT], which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

And whereas, in a public speech delivered in Boston, England, on the 2d day of August, 1895, the said Bayard is reported by the press of this country to have said, "The President stands in the midst of a strong, self-confident, and oftentimes violent people, men who desire to have their own way, and who need their way frequently obstructed, and I tell you plainly it takes a real man to govern the people of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "by impeachment or otherwise."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the adoption of the resolution as amended.

Mr. BAILEY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. In adopting the resolution the House, I suppose, does not adopt the suggestion of the gentleman that he impeaches the ambassador, but the vote is taken simply on the resolution.

Mr. BARRETT. It is not a question whether the House impeaches. I made that statement on my own authority.

Mr. BAILEY. I simply desire to know if we vote to adopt that together with the resolution.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope the Clerk will report the amendment against which the gentleman just voted, for his information—the last amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. I did not vote against the amendment.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The gentleman's colleagues did.

Mr. BAILEY. I did not.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "by impeachment or otherwise."

Mr. BAILEY. I perfectly understand that, and voted for it. My inquiry was, if the question is on all the matter submitted by the gentleman from Massachusetts, including the preamble and impeachment.

The SPEAKER. The resolution itself, if the gentleman from Texas will examine it, will show the other is in the preamble.

Mr. BAILEY. And the vote is simply on the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The vote is on the resolution.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the preamble will be considered as adopted.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. BARRETT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce the appointment of the following members as the Committee on Accounts: Mr. J. F. ALDRICH, of Illinois; Mr. B. B. ODELL, jr., of New York; Mr. J. E. MCCALL, of Tennessee; Mr. J. P. TRACY, of Missouri; Mr. CHESTER I. LONG, of Kansas; Mr. H. W. RUSK, of Maryland, and Mr. ANDREW PRICE, of Louisiana.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. COWEN, for two days, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. COFFIN obtained leave to withdraw from the files, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Theresa B. Walbach, Fifty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday at noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 1188) directing that free envelopes be furnished pensioners for the purpose of returning their quarterly vouchers to pension agents—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 1189) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 1190) to regulate the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 1191) to ratify an act of the Oklahoma legislature approved February 27, 1895, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MCDEARMON: A bill (H. R. 1192) authorizing the coinage of the silver bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, remaining uncoined; and for the issuance of silver dollars arising from such coinage, and silver certificates in substitution for Treasury notes issued by authority of said act, and United States notes commonly called "greenbacks;" and for the cancellation and retirement from circulation of said Treasury notes and United States notes to the extent of the sum of silver dollars coined from said bullion, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. REEVES: A bill (H. R. 1193) to amend section No. 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to mining claims—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. POWERS (by request): A bill (H. R. 1194) for the retirement of employees in the Executive Departments of the Government in the classified service—to the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. COOPER of Florida: A bill (H. R. 1195) to provide for subports of entry and delivery in the State of Florida—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 1196) for the relief of soldiers and sailors and the heirs of soldiers and sailors formerly pensioned under the act approved June 27, 1890, and who have been dropped from the pension roll, or who have been rerated thereon at a lower figure, and establishing a standard of ratings under said act—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 1197) for the reorganization of the Medical Department of the Navy on the basis of the organization of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1198) to amend an act in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes, approved June 10, 1880—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MCRAE: A bill (H. R. 1199) designating the officers before whom preliminary affidavits in entries of public lands may be executed—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1200) for the erection of a public building at the city of East St. Louis, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 1201) to amend the charter of the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WELLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 1202) to provide for the establishment of the Farmers' Wholesale Market Company in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 1203) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1204) to amend section 2289 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 1205) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to contract for the purchase of a lot of land opposite to the Gosport Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HURLEY: A bill (H. R. 1206) for the erection and completion of a monument to the memory of the victims of prison ships at Fort Green, Brooklyn, N. Y.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 1207) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at the city of Eau Claire, in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 1208) fixing the times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1209) making an appropriation for continuing harbor improvement at Sabine Pass, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1210) to provide for the selection of a site for the establishment of a navy-yard and dry dock on or near Sabine Pass, in the State of Texas—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 1211) to encourage the export of American manufactures—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1212) to amend the act entitled "An act to remove certain burdens on the American merchant marine and encourage the American foreign carrying trade, and for other purposes," approved June 26, 1884—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 1213) to do justice to pensioners by quieting their title—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRODE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 1214) appropriating $2,500 for reconstructing and repairing stone sidewalks around and abutting upon the post-office square owned and occupied by the United States Government at Lincoln, Nebr., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1215) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Plattsmouth, Nebr., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1216) appropriating $1,200 for paving First Corso, in paving district No. 2, on the north end of the United States post-office building at Nebraska City, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1217) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the city of Lincoln, Nebr., one-half the cost of constructing pavements in front of the public square owned by the United States Government in said city—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 1218) to establish an assay office at Baker City, in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 1219) to enable the people to name their postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1220) for the erection of a public building at Newport, Vt.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1221) to make oleomargarine and all other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are transported—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1222) for the relief of Union soldiers who were confined in Southern prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1223) providing representation in Congress for Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 1224) to protect the rights of persons who are or who may be pensioned on account of service in the Army or Navy of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 1225) pensioning soldiers who served in Indian wars—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 1226) donating a condemned cannon to the burial lot of the John Campbell Post, No. 204, Grand Army of the Republic, at Harrison, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 1227) to prohibit the payment of advance wages to seamen, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1228) to regulate the construction of seamens' quarters on merchant vessels, to provide for the security and comfort and to prevent the oppression of American seamen employed on merchant vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1229) to amend sections 4581, 4582, 4583, and 4600 of the Revised Statutes, and to repeal sections 19 and 20 of an act entitled "An act to remove certain burdens on the American merchant marine and to encourage the American foreign carrying trade, and for other purposes," approved June 26, 1884—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1230) to amend sections 4520, 4522, 4526, 4530, 4547, 4561, 4564, 4566, 4572, and 4612 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the employment, care, discharge, and payment of seamen employed on merchant vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1231) to amend sections 4596 and 4597 of the Revised Statutes relating to offenses committed by seamen employed on merchant vessels and providing punishments for such offenses—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1232) to repeal sections 4532, 4533, 4534, and to amend sections 4516 and 4529 of the Revised Statutes, all relating to the employment, treatment, and payment of seamen on merchant vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1233) to amend sections 4556, 4557, 4558, and 4559 of the Revised Statutes relating to the inspection, equipment, and repair of merchant vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 1234) to prohibit the malicious intermeddling with pensions and in claims for pensions, and prescribing the punishment therefor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1235) granting and confirming to the patentees, their heirs and assigns, portions of sections 3, 4, 5, and 6, in township 2 south, of range 20 east, of sixth principal meridian—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1236) to increase the rates of duty upon cattle imported from foreign countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1237) making it unlawful to shoot at or into any railway train or at any person thereon, or to throw any rock or other missile at or into any railway train, and providing punishment therefor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 1238) granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College and of the Kansas State Normal School thereon, and for a public park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 1239) to extend the limit of cost for the improvement of the building and grounds of the United States court and post-office at Little Rock, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 1240) fixing times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States, relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 1241) to reduce the postage on fourth-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania (by request): A bill (H. R. 1242) to increase the tax on fermented liquors to $2 per barrel—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 1243) to provide for the register of copyrights—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 1244) to confirm certain cash entries of offered lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 1245) to amend section 4716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 1246) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 1247) to reimburse the State of Kansas for moneys expended in the adjustment and settlement of the claims of citizens of said State for property captured or destroyed by the Confederate forces during the late war, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCRANTON: A joint resolution (H. Res. 15) granting permission to the Pennsylvania superior court to occupy the Federal court room in Scranton—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A joint resolution (H. Res. 16) relative to the medal of honor authorized by the acts of July 12, 1862, and March 3, 1863—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A joint resolution (H. Res. 17) for the erection of a statue of Francis E. Spinner at the Treasury Department building, in Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DENNY: A joint resolution (H. Res. 18) to remove suspension of payment of claim of estate of Roger A. Hiern—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: A joint resolution (H. Res. 19) for filling vacancy on Board of Regents, Smithsonian Institution—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A joint resolution (H. Res. 20) to enable William Umbdenstock and the heirs of William T. Scott, deceased, to sue the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: A resolution requesting the President to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information regarding speeches alleged to have been made by Ambassador Thomas F. Bayard—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A resolution asking the Attorney-General to report why he has not enforced section 73, chapter 349, Supplement to the Revised Statutes of the United States, volume 2, relating to trusts, combines, conspiracies, and agreements—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISCHER: A resolution directing the Committee on Naval Affairs to investigate the condition of the battle ship *Texas*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: A resolution directing the Committee on Appropriations to appoint a suitable person to prepare certain information regarding claims against the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A resolution to appoint George Jennison a special messenger—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CRISP: A resolution for the relief of the widow of J. T. Waterman—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. JENKINS: A resolution calling upon the Commissioner of Pensions for information regarding the dropping of certain pensioners from the roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 1248) for the relief of J. F. Bailey & Co. and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 1249) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of Amos D. Le Fevre, surviving partner—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 1250) for the relief of James R. D. Morrison and William H. Morrison, executor of William M. Morrison, and administrator of Charles J. Morrison, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 1251) for the relief of P. B. Monell, and to have him commissioned a brevet captain and put upon the pension roll at $20 per month, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 1252) to provide a suitable site for a post-office in the city of Providence, R. I.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1253) granting a pension to John Haeley, alias John Haley, late a private in Company D, One hundred and ninetieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1254) granting a pension to Dr. Charles G. McKnight, late lieutenant and assistant surgeon from Rhode Island in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1255) granting a pension to Honora Breslin, widow of Morris Breslin, late a private of Company G, Third Regiment of Rhode Island Heavy Artillery Volunteers—to the Committee on Invaild Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1256) for the relief of Henry A. Webb—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROSIUS (by request): A bill (H. R. 1257) for the relief of the legal owners of the Columbia Bridge, at Columbia, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 1258) extending provisions of an act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors, approved June 27, 1890, to the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Regiments of Kansas Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 1259) for the relief of Howard Bonner, late of Company K, First Regiment United States Colored Troops—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1260) for the relief of Hillery Hopkins, of Chattanooga, Tenn—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 1261) for the relief of John Kehl and to restore him to his former rating—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 1262) granting a pension to Celeste A. Boughton, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Horace Boughton, late of the United States Army, retired—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 1263) to confirm certain cash entries on offered lands—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1264) increasing the pension of Henry G. Bigelow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 1265) to authorize the proper accounting officers of the Treasury Department to examine and audit, according to equity, the claim of Grubb & Robinson, a firm consisting of Alfred B. Grubb and William H. Robinson, and of Alfred B. Grubb, for building material sold and delivered to members of the Prairie band of Pottawatomie Indians in Kansas—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1266) granting a pension to John W. Starr—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1267) to correct the military record of Martin Landes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 1268) for the relief of William Wolfe—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 1269) for the relief of R. A. Shellhous—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1270) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to John McBride, late postmaster at Woodville, Tex., certain money lost in transit by mail—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 1271) to compensate Elihu Root for legal services rendered by direction of the Attorney-General—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1272) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint commissioners to estimate damages done to planted oysters and oyster beds in Raritan Bay and adjoining waters in New York and New Jersey, and to make compensation therefor—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 1273) to remove charge of desertion against Jacob H. Tourje—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 1274) for the relief of Benjamin J. Kilbourn—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 1275) for the relief of Henry C. Nichols, of Marshall County, State of Mississippi—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1276) for the relief of the legal representatives of Ann D. Halsey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1277) for the relief of John C. Bailey, of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1278) for the relief of P. E. Dye and Wylie S. Hoge, administrators of David Shoemaker, deceased, late of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1279) for the relief of John C. Bailey, administrator of Andrew Nichols, deceased, of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1280) for the relief of A. B. Pedigo—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 1281) to authorize the Auditor of the War Department to audit certain quartermasters' vouchers alleged to belong to John Finn, of St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1282) for the relief of Charles P. Chouteau, survivor of Chouteau, Harrison & Valle—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 1283) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Henry Dimler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 1284) for the relief of Theodore J. Gillett, of Rome Township, Lawrence County, Ohio—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1285) for the relief of James Forgey, of Bradrick, Lawrence County, Ohio—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 1286) to perfect the title of the United States to the tract of land lying on the west side of Lake Pepin and the Mississippi River, in the State of Minnesota, which belonged to the half-breeds or mixed bloods of the Dakota or Sioux Nation of Indians—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 1287) to relieve John Friedlin from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 1288) for the relief of the members of Company M, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 1289) for the relief of the heirs of William W. Dougherty, late Indian agent at Warm Springs Agency, Oreg.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 1290) for the relief of Charles F. Sanborn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1291) granting a pension to Martha R. Hitchcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1292) granting a pension to Fanny E. Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1293) for the relief of L. A. Noyes—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1294) granting relief to H. R. Sturtevant, postmaster at Hartland, Vt.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1295) to pension Sophronia Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1296) to correct the military record of Henry L. Franklin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1297) granting a pension to Jesse Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1298) granting a pension to Mary J. Morton, widow of Gilbert Morton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1299) to pension Harriet Woodbury, of Windsor, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1300) granting a pension to Pasiphae J. Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1301) for relief of Julius A. Morrill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1302) granting a pension to Harriet M. Scott, an army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1303) granting a pension to Mary M. Hadley, late Mary M. Crozier, an army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1304) for the relief of George W. Saulpaw—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1305) for relief of Byron Stickney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 1306) to increase the pension of Benjamin F. Douglas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1307) to correct the military record of Monroe Blackburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1308) to pension Franklin McCabe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1309) to increase the pension of Charles McCarty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1310) to correct the military record of James M. McPike—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 1311) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Sentman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 1312) for the relief of Benjamin Peter Bailey, treasurer of the Missouri State Lunatic Asylum—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 1313) to correct the military record of Charles M. Mayberry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1314) to pay the claim of Pacific Paving Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1315) for the relief of Harlow L. Street—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 1316) for the relief of Perrin H. Cardwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1317) to correct the military record of Collin P. Leiter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 1318) for the relief of Richard W. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 1319) granting an honorable discharge to William Weigle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1320) granting an increase of pension to Rowland J. Welsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1321) granting an honorable discharge to John H. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1322) to increase the pension of George A. Breckinridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 1323) for the relief of Ira H. Sweatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWSON: A bill (H. R. 1324) for the relief of Mildred P. Poullain, widow of Dr. Thomas N. Poullain, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 1325) for the relief of John McDermott—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 1326) for the relief of Emmart, Dunbar & Co. —to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1327) for the relief of Septimus Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1328) for the relief of John W. Fairfax—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1329) for the relief of the heirs of the late Mrs. Mary Ann Randolph Custis Lee, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 1330) granting a pension to Mary Jane Debois—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 1331) for the relief of Elizabeth J. Cook—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1332) for the relief of Charles W. Russey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1333) for the relief of Jesse Meeks—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1334) for the relief of the estate of William Moss, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McDEARMON: A bill (H. R. 1335) for the relief of William Crews, of Gibson County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1336) for the relief of Humboldt Female College—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILNES: A bill (H. R. 1337) for the relief of Henry Myers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1338) for the relief of the legal representatives of James and William Crooks, of Canada—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1339) for the relief of Matthew Lynch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McDEARMON: A bill (H. R. 1340) for the relief of John E. Lewis, of Crockett County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1341) for relief of Jesse L. Brandt, of Gibson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1342) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be placed on the volunteer rolls of Company I, Seventh Tennessee Cavalry, of the late war, the name of George W. Gill, with rank of private, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1343) for the relief of the legal representatives of Massalon Whitten, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1344) to perfect the military record of Franklin B. Pope—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1345) to amend the military record of Charles Hentz, late private of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1346) for the relief of A. L. Dunlap, of Gibson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 1347) for the relief of the estate of Elias Wheat, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 1348) for the relief of the board of commissioners of the sinking fund, or the county court of Madison County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1349) for the relief of D. N. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1350) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Joel Embry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1351) for the relief of Merril Denham—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1352) granting a pension to James S. Maratta—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 1353) for the relief of George McAlpin, to repay to him moneys unlawfully collected from him by the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 1354) for the relief of Asa Townsend—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1355) for the relief of the legal representatives of Hiram Somerville—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 1356) for the relief of Raphael Segoura—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1357) for the relief of C. Augusta Urquhart—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1358) for the relief of A. Cusimano & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1359) for the relief of Hillel Marks—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1360) for the relief of the Odd Fellows' Hall Association—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1361) for the relief of certain employees of the United States mint at New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1362) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Shannon, widow of Joseph R. Shannon, deceased, and administratrix of his estate, and to provide for the payment of the value of the steamboat *A. W. Quarrier*—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1363) for the relief of Catherine M. Pritchard or her legal representatives—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1364) for the relief of Mrs. Eliza E. Hebert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1365) for the relief of Cora A. Di Brazza—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1366) for the relief of Mrs. Laura J. Bemiss—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1367) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Gabriel Le Breton Deschapelles—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 1368) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George W. Leland, late a private in Company H, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, in the war of the rebellion, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANEY: A bill (H. R. 1369) for the relief of D. K. Ponder, of Ripley County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1370) for the relief of Henry Rongey, of Van Buren, Carter County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1371) to apply the unexpended balance of the amount heretofore appropriated for the relief of the captain, owners, officers, and crew of the late United States private armed brig *General Armstrong*, their heirs, executors, administrators, agents, or assigns—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1372) for the relief of Barney Morgan, teamster, Quartermaster's Department—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 1373) for the relief of L. D. Sugg—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STRODE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 1374) for the relief of John M. Burks—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAFT: A bill (H. R. 1375) for the relief of Thomas Antisell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TURNER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1376) for the relief of George W. Rosenberger, of New Market, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1377) for the relief of Mrs. F. E. Willis, late of Rappahannock County, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1378) to pension Lucinda Stone, daughter of Revolutionary soldier—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1379) to pension Parmelia Glass, a daughter of a deceased Revolutionary veteran—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1380) to pension Sarah Wharton, a daughter of a deceased Revolutionary veteran—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1381) for the relief of William Weaver, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1382) for the relief of Samuel Good, of Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1383) for the relief of the estate of Henry M. Baker, deceased, late of Frederick County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1384) for the relief of the heirs of Sarah N. Randolph, of Virginia—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1385) for the relief of the estate of Sarah T. Ambler, late of Rappahannock County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1386) for the relief of Henry Neff—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1387) for the relief of Reuben A. Fennell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1388) for the relief of Mrs. Isabella V. Jett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1389) for the relief of estate John Catlett, deceased, late of Warren County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1390) to pension Isabell Noonan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1391) for the relief of the estate of Zebedee Gray, deceased, late of Clarke County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1392) for the relief of the estate of Zeph Turner, late of Rappahannock County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1393) for the relief of M. C. Leach, of Warren County, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1394) for the relief of David Sheetz, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1395) for the relief of the heirs and distributees of Joseph Snapp, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1396) for the relief of David Rudy, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAFT (by request): A bill (H. R. 1397) for the relief of Sarah K. McLean, widow of the late Lieut. Col. Nathaniel H. McLean—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 1398) granting a pension to Hannah Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 1399) granting a pension to Louisa F. Gamron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAFT (by request): A bill (H. R. 1400) granting an honorable discharge to and completing the records of Oscar B. Jolly, late United States Navy Volunteers—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 1401) granting pension to the heirs of James F. Cassatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1402) to pension Robert B. Deem—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1403) for relief of Noah R. Yeargin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1404) for relief of heirs of Alpha A. Leach, for accrued pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 1405) to remove the charge of desertion against Wear Crawford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1406) to remove the charge of desertion against Alonzo Carter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1407) to remove the charge of desertion against Myron H. McMullen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Memorial of the Trades League of Philadelphia, on the improvement of the Delaware River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ALDRICH: Resolutions of the Thirty-second Ward Republican Club, of Chicago, concerning Turkish outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, in favor of the bill to remove the charge of desertion standing against Henry Dimler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COFFIN: Papers to accompany House bill No. 959—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: Memorial and evidence for the relief of William Gray—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Papers to accompany House bill No. 423—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS: Resolutions by the Congregational Missionary Organization of Oregon, asking that Congress, through the proper authorities, protest against the atrocities committed upon and massacre of the Christian Armenians of Turkish Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of Burnett S. Shang, for pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, copy of memorial of Gilman S. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition from Caddo Lodge, No. 13, Odd Fellows, of Arkadelphia, Ark.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEYER: Memorial concerning the condition and needs of the harbor of New Orleans, La., etc.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: Petition for the relief of John W. Trader, late private Company H, Twelth Regiment West Virginia Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: Resolutions of citizens of Bennington, Vt., relating to Turkish atrocities in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUSK: Petition to accompany bill for the relief of Annie M. Ermer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition for completing breakwater and harbor improvements at New Haven, Conn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of J. P. Patton, of the Fifth Ohio Cavalry, for relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of C. R. Branch, secretary of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Marion, Ind., in behalf of that association, for increase of pay, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Commercial Travelers' Republican Club (T. P. Swain, secretary) of Indianapolis, Ind., requesting the reenactment of such amendments to the tariff law as will restore the duty on wool and tin plate and give employment to idle workmen—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mary E. Wallick, widow of William Wallick, captain Company G, Fifty-first Indiana Volunteers, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Lagro, Ind., asking for an increase of pension for Mrs. Catherine Clifford, a destitute and utterly helpless widow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of Hannah Yazell, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of citizens of Delaware, asking for recognition of Cuban belligerency—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 11, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Attorney-General; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of the amounts expended at the United States armory at Springfield, Mass., during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill prepared by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, and for other purposes, together with the report of the Commissioner stating the reasons for the desired legislation; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of Salome Merritt, president of the National Woman Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, and sundry other citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States securing to the women of the several States the exercise of the citizens' right to vote; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. GEAR presented a petition of 149 citizens of Fairfield, Iowa, praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PASCO presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Ocala, Fla., praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal by the United States Government; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FRYE presented certain papers to accompany the bill (S. 178) granting a pension to Betsey J. Webber; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 141) granting a pension to Julia A. Hill, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 737) granting a pension to James Richardson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin introduced a bill (S. 738) authorizing the establishment of a pier-head light at or near South Milwaukee, in the State of Wisconsin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 739) granting an increase of pension to C. E. Philbrook, widow of Alvah Philbrook, major of Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SMITH introduced a bill (S. 740) for the relief of Charles W. Cronk; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GEORGE introduced a bill (S. 741) for the relief of the Baptist church at Corinth, Alcorn County, Miss.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 742) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCMILLAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 743) to regulate fares and transfers upon street-car lines in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 744) providing for a naval training station on the island of Yerba Buena (or Goat Island), in the harbor of San Francisco, Cal., and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 745) donating condemned cannon and cannon balls to the New Hampshire Soldiers' Home; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 746) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Donohue; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 747) to authorize the entry of land for reservoir purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 748) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Dent; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 749) granting a pension to Mary P. Scovel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 750) granting a pension to A. S. Elwood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 751) to aid the State of Colorado to support a school of mines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 752) to increase the pension of Capt. James B. Logan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 753) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 754) in relation to the pay of Rear-Admiral Roger N. Stembel, retired; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 755) for the erection of a suitable building for a post-office on the Government reservation at Hot Springs, Ark.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 756) to correct the military record of William Kiser, of Noble County, Ind.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 757) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Morris; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 758) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust and settle the account of James M. Willbur with the United States, and to pay said Willbur such sum of money as he may be justly and equitably entitled to; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 759) granting a pension to Carrie A. Moody; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 760) granting a pension to Rhoda Chick; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 761) for the relief of George T. Dudley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 762) for the relief of Henry Lane; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 763) for the relief of Col. Jesse H. Strickland, Eighth Tennessee Cavalry, United States Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 764) for the relief of Edward T. Latta; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 765) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Carver; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 766) for the erection of a monument in the city of Washington to the memory of the late Commodore John Paul Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 767) to provide for the greater safety and efficiency of railway service by retiring employees after twenty-five years' continuous service and requiring payment of annuity or pension to be made to them; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 21) for the purchase of a statue of Victor Hugo, to be placed in the new building of the Library of Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 22) authorizing the erection of a statue of President Franklin Pierce upon the grounds of the public building at Concord, N. H.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

ADJUSTMENT OF CLAIMS WITH TENNESSEE.

Mr. HARRIS. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas there has been introduced and is now pending before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs Senate joint resolution No. 2, providing for an adjustment of certain claims and counterclaims of the United States against the State of Tennessee and of the State of Tennessee against the United States in respect of certain railroads in Tennessee held and operated by officers of the State and taken from the possession of the State by the United States Army and operated for the use of the Army of the United States, and certain obligations that the State of Tennessee executed to secure the payment of the purchase money for certain railroad material sold by the military authorities of the United States to the Memphis, Clarksville and Louisville Railroad Company, the Edgefield and Kentucky Railroad Company, and the McMinnville and Manchester Railroad Company subsequent to their release by the said military authorities, and

Whereas it is important that all the facts out of which said claims and counterclaims arose should be laid before the said committee charged with the consideration of said Senate joint resolution No. 2: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish copies of all communications, orders, and correspondence touching the seizure of and operation by the United States of the said Memphis, Clarksville and Louisville Railroad Company, the Edgefield and Kentucky Railroad, and the McMinnville and Manchester Railroad, and the Winchester and Alabama Railroad, and especially all copies of the separate inventories or schedules of the property and rolling stock belonging originally to each of said roads required to be made and furnished by section 3 of Executive order of August 8, 1865, from the War Department, addressed to Maj. Gen. George H. Thomas, commanding Military Division of Tennessee, and copies of all credits to which each of said railroads or the State of Tennessee is entitled on account of military transportation and carrying of United States mails, regardless of whether such credits have or have not been applied to the indebtedness of the said roads or the said State, and all other information, evidence, and facts in the possession of the War Department touching the use, occupation, and conversion by the Government of the United States of each of said roads.

Mr. CULLOM. Is the resolution up for consideration?

Mr. HARRIS. I have asked unanimous consent that it be now considered. At the last Congress I introduced a joint resolution and reintroduced it at the present session and had it referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, authorizing the Attorney-General, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Treasury to meet such commissioners as the State of Tennessee may appoint for the purpose of investigating and adjusting the claims and counterclaims of the State against the Government and of the Government against the State. I have no idea myself how the balance stands. This resolution simply asks the War Department to send to the Senate, in order that the matter may go before the Committee on Military Affairs, the facts so far as they appear of record there.

Mr. CULLOM. What I desired to inquire about especially was whether the resolution had been considered by any committee of the Senate or if it was a resolution to go to a committee for consideration.

Mr. HARRIS. It is a resolution asking the War Department for information for the use of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection to it, then.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

MARKING OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That all public documents and envelopes printed for the use of the Senate shall be marked on the envelope or wrapper in which they are inclosed with the title of the book or document which they contain, so as to avoid the necessity of opening them to ascertain what book or document is contained in the wrapper or envelope.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. DUBOIS. I desire to call up a resolution proposing an amendment to the rules of the Senate, which is lying on the desk, in order to make some remarks upon it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. DUBOIS on the 5th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph 1 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate be amended by striking out the words "All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, except bills making appropriations for rivers and harbors, which shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce," and inserting the following:

"The general appropriation bills shall be referred to committees as follows:

"To the Committee on Appropriations: The bills for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses, for sundry civil expenses, and for all deficiencies;

"To the Committee on Agriculture: The bill for the Agricultural Department;

"To the Committee on Foreign Relations: The consular and diplomatic bill;

"To the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill for the military establishment, including the Military Academy;

"To the Committee on Naval Affairs: The bill for the naval establishment;

"To the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads: The Post-Office appropriation bill;

"To the Committee on Indian Affairs: The bill for Indians and Indian tribes;

"To the Committee on Commerce: The bill for rivers and harbors;

"To the Committee on Coast Defenses: The fortifications bill;

"To the Committee on the District of Columbia: The bill making appropriations for the District; and

"To the Committee on Pensions: The pension appropriation bills."

Mr. HARRIS. Is the resolution called up for action this morning?

Mr. DUBOIS. I desire to submit some remarks upon it.

Mr. HARRIS. Oh, if that is the object, of course there is no objection.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, the proposed amendment to the rules governing this body, which is now before the Senate, contains no new or startling proposition. It provides simply for the distribution of the appropriation bills among the various committees of the Senate. It gives to the committee which, on account of its membership and duties, is most interested in a given subject the power to regulate and determine what amount of money shall be appropriated and how it shall be expended in order to satisfy the necessities and demands of the country as to this particular subject. That is all there is of it.

Facts seem to prove, or at any rate it is the almost unanimous opinion of members of the House, that the interests of the country represented by the various committees have been more carefully looked after and promoted since the division of appropriations by that body than before.

Almost every member of this body who has served in the other branch of Congress during the past ten years will favor the proposed change. This is significant and a powerful argument in itself, especially as a large number of the present Senators have been members of the other branch of Congress during this time.

The question of dividing the Appropriations Committee in the House was debated at different times for a number of years before the change was made. Originally the Ways and Means Committee of that body was also the Appropriations Committee. The growth of the country and its multiplied necessities compelled the creation of the Appropriations Committee. The continued growth and necessities compelled the division of the work of the Appropriations Committee among the various committees of the House. This was accomplished finally in 1885.

In reading the debates on the proposed change in the House anyone can see that the opponents of the reform indulged in prophecies which the result of the change have demonstrated were without foundation. Their main objection was that if so many committees had charge of the appropriations, the expenditures of the Government would be extravagantly and needlessly increased. I anticipate that some such argument will now be used by the opponents of the change in the Senate. No such result has followed in the House, and it seems certain that no such result can follow in the Senate. Of course, the expenditures of the Government have increased since the change was made, but this could not be avoided. The population, business, and necessities of the country have grown steadily, and no matter what method we may adopt for the appropriation of moneys to meet this constantly growing demand, the expenditure of money must keep pace with it.

All appropriations of money originate in the House, and it is an indisputable fact that the Senate Appropriations Committee nearly always increases the amount of the appropriations made by the various appropriation committees of the House. I am aware of the fact that special reasons are urged to explain this, and I do not contend that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate is designedly more extravagant than the several appropriations committees of the House. I do say, however, that there is nothing in a comparison between the appropriation bills of the House and of the Senate to warrant the unsupported statement that one committee will be more wise and economical than several committees in the proper use and distribution of the people's money.

It is very evident that the present system of placing all the appropriations in the hands of one committee in the Senate is neither satisfactory nor suitable. I believe every Senator will admit this. The various committees of the House, such as Indian, Agricultural, Naval, and others, carefully consider and pass such appropriations as are deemed necessary, and send them, one at a time, to the single Appropriation Committee of the Senate. The result, year after year, is that all business in the Senate is clogged during its last days in order that the Senate may pass these various bills. The Senate Appropriations Committee itself can not properly consider them for lack of time, and adequate debate and consideration on the floor of the Senate are out of the question.

Every member of this body who has served in it during even one session will remember that when he wishes to change the report of the Appropriations Committee in relation to any item, no matter what its importance may be, in his judgment, to the country, or when he wishes to discuss any clause of the bill as it is reported to the Senate, he is met with an appeal by some member of the Appropriations Committee not to antagonize the bill, not to discuss it, because time is short and if delays occur the bills can not pass and the President will be driven to the necessity of calling an extra session. The threat of an extra session is hurled at us at the close of every session of Congress, and we are compelled to submissively accept, without argument or debate, the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee in reference to the expenditure of the people's money. It oftentimes happens that a Senator can not conscientiously allow certain items or clauses to remain

in the bill as reported, and he so states emphatically. The Appropriations Committee time and time again meets these proper and just demands for discussion by allowing the changes proposed by the Senator to be made in the bill. After the bill is passed a conference committee of three Senators and three members of the Appropriations Committee of each branch of Congress is appointed, and when the result of their agreement is made known, after the session closes, it is generally found that these changes in the bill which the Senate itself has voted shall be made, and which the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has accepted, have been eliminated.

In the hurry and rush of the closing days it is almost impossible to tell what a conference report includes or means, and it is practically impossible, through fear of an extra session, to prevent the adoption of the report of the conferees. Almost always, at the close of a session, the President and his Cabinet are compelled to come to the Capitol in order to sign bills appropriating millions and millions of dollars which neither the Senate nor the President himself has had an opportunity to carefully and thoroughly examine. Under the present system, which leaves so much to the conferees, there is no means by which the Senate or the country can know what the appropriation bills contain until after Congress adjourns. Most of the Senators will remember a striking illustration of this in connection with the sundry civil bill of the Fiftieth Congress.

A provision was slipped into that bill by the conferees, withdrawing all the public lands which were embraced within the arid region of the country from settlement until certain impossible conditions were complied with. The representatives from that section, and the Congress generally, were not aware of this provision of the law until instructions were received by the various land officers, issued by the Secretary of the Interior, some months later, to carry the law into effect. Immediately upon the meeting of the Fifty-first Congress this provision of the appropriations bill was repealed. The people have a right to know what is being done with their money, and every facility possible should be given them and their representatives in Congress to understand the workings of the appropriations committees. When the Committee on Indian Affairs in the House, for instance, passes a bill appropriating money for the Indian Service, it should be sent to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate—so with the Naval, Military, Agricultural, and other committees. These various committees could then be working at the same time on these bills, and could present them to the consideration of the Senate as fast as they had completed their examination. It seems to me that in this way this undue crowding at the end of the session would, in a great measure, be avoided.

Another fact must be borne in mind, which is, that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate includes the ablest and the leading members of this body. Ordinarily they are on other committees of importance, and in addition to that they are expected by the country and by the Senate to be foremost in all general debates. If they devoted themselves exclusively to the work which devolves upon them, as members of the Appropriations Committee, they could not do full justice to the country in other matters, through lack of time notwithstanding their great ability and industry, which is conceded.

A reference to the personnel of the Appropriations Committee as at present constituted will convince any unprejudiced mind that other duties demand so much of their time and thought that they can not do justice to the country, the Senate, or themselves in attempting to supervise all the appropriations of the Government. They are the foremost men of the Senate, as I have stated, and the country looks to them as leaders in debate. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] or the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] is the chairman. No matter what subject of importance is under consideration, the country and the Senate expect them to participate. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] are universally recognized as among the ablest debaters on this floor, and their attention and services are required at all times. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] are so conspicuous for their ability and eloquence that the country has a right to expect and does receive the benefit of their counsel on all general legislation. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] is conceded to be among the best equipped men in public life, and in addition he is the recognized leader of nearly one-half this side of the Chamber on the currency question, if not of the entire Senate. His judgment is always in demand. And so it is with the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE]; they are expected to and do take an active interest in all general legislation.

It has always been so and always will be. The members of this committee are properly and justly, on account of their learning and qualifications, among the leaders of the Senate. They have tremendous power as members of the Appropriations Committee, which perhaps they are loath to relinquish. This is human nature. They undertake the work of the committee and do as well as any other set of men could who have their responsibilities, but they have neither the time nor the physical ability to discharge with proper care the duties which the Senate has devolved upon them.

Through the customs and traditions of the Senate the younger members of this body in point of service are not expected to take much, if any, part in general debate. This leaves them ample time for committee work. By dividing the appropriations their abilities could be utilized. They would naturally be anxious to make a good record and to report only such bills as they could clearly and successfully defend before the country and the Senate. There is not a very great disparity, I take it, between the older and younger Senators in natural ability or patriotism, and I think that each member of the Senate should perform as much of the work, share as much of the care, enjoy as much of the honor, and be as much of a leader as possible.

Various bills at different times have been introduced in the Senate similar to the one now under consideration. There has never been much debate over them. They have in each instance been referred to the Committee on Rules, and there they slumber. Every Senator has thought of this subject, and I hope this proposed amendment will be fully discussed and that the Senate will express its judgment by a vote.

I trust that the proposed amendment will not be referred to the Committee on Rules until such reference is accompanied with an instruction from the Senate as to the decision of the Senate.

I am sure that no Senator will attribute to me any personal or selfish motive in this matter. My relations with each and every member of the Appropriations Committee are most cordial and pleasant. No one has a greater respect for that great committee individually and collectively than myself. They have treated me personally and the State which I have the honor in part to represent with the utmost consideration. They have taken especial pains, it seems to me, to aid and assist me. They have never refused a just and reasonable request of mine. Individually the change will not benefit me, for I am not a member of any of the committees which will secure the appropriation bills under my amendment, nor do I expect to be. I think it will be better for the country and better for the Senate if the labors of the Appropriations Committee are divided.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, before this subject passes from the consideration of the Senate I wish to say a few words regarding it.

I agree with some of the remarks made by the Senator from Idaho, but do not agree with all. There are certain appropriation bills now sent to the Committee on Appropriations which, I think, ought to be sent to the appropriate committees charged with the subjects-matter. For instance, the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia are selected with a view to care for the interests of the people of this District, who have no other source of legislative power. The people of this city, therefore, go to the members of that committee to seek for such appropriations and for such legislation as they deem necessary for the welfare of the District. They are able probably to obtain general legislation, but the question of the appropriation of their money is not left to the committee to which they always have access, but is referred to a committee with which they have no connection whatever. Many citizens of Washington have complained to me of this matter, and have stated that when they had made their wants known before the committee having charge of the subject, the Committee on the District of Columbia, they were afterwards referred at the heel of a session to the Committee on Appropriations, which at such times is overburdened with work. It seems to be perfectly plain, therefore, that all appropriations in relation to the District of Columbia should be reported to us from the District Committee, so that we may have the benefit of their local knowledge.

Some time ago the river and harbor bill was very properly taken from the Committee on Appropriations, because that bill relates purely to matters of commerce. The members of the Committee on Appropriations are not required to look into the details of new improvements that are proposed and are to be appropriated for. Indeed, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations should be confined to the great Departments of the Government.

I do not agree with my friend from Idaho that the Committee on Military Affairs ought to have charge of the appropriations for the Army, because the Army is provided for by law and the precise amount which each officer and soldier is to receive is fixed. That, therefore, is a proper matter for the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, and the Army appropriation bill ought not to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, because that committee deals with legislation, and not with laws making appropriations. So with the Naval Committee. Undoubtedly the Committee on Appropriations ought to have charge of the appro-

priations for the Navy, because they, too, are limited by law, and the Committee on Naval Affairs, if they desire to have any new appropriations made or any change in the existing law, can propose their proper amendments without having the appropriations referred to them.

I think that all appropriations involved in new legislation should be referred to and decided and reported by the committees having charge of the legislation, leaving the great Committee on Appropriations to report as to the general expenses of the Government. Probably nine-tenths of all the appropriations should be sent to that committee, but the special appropriations, for the reasons I have stated, should be sent to other committees, and the rules ought to be so arranged. I think this could be done without in the slightest degree affecting either the power or the usefulness of the Committee on Appropriations. At the close of a session that committee is overburdened; indeed, it is almost impossible for a Senator to get access to it sufficiently to explain the importance of appropriations he desires to have put into a bill. That committee is pressed with the appropriation bills which come over here, all of which are thrust upon the Senate toward the close of a session. Much faulty legislation has been enacted on appropriation bills in consequence of the necessities of the case at the close of a session.

The Senator referred to one piece of legislation on an appropriation bill. It seems to me our rules ought to be so framed as to exclude all legislation on appropriation bills except such incidental legislation as is necessary to explain the item appropriated for. Any general legislation attached to appropriation bills is necessarily bad, because there is no opportunity to have any discussion in regard to it. Therefore the rule should explicitly require that all legislative provisions, even if they are to be attached to appropriation bills, should be first referred to the appropriate committees and have their sanction before being put upon appropriation bills, which are often hastily passed.

I hope the resolution at the proper time will be referred, and that the Senate, with full knowledge of their experience in the past, will divert some of the appropriation bills to the committees who have charge of the particular subjects-matter.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Ohio allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. In what year was the change made by which the river and harbor bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have forgotten. Probably the Senator from Iowa can tell.

Mr. ALLISON. Many years ago. I do not remember the exact time.

Mr. SHERMAN. It was a number of years ago.

Mr. ALLISON. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate was created in 1867. Prior to that time all the appropriation bills were referred to the Finance Committee, with the exception of the river and harbor bill, which has been referred to the Committee on Commerce ever since 1826.

Mr. SHERMAN. I would say to the Senator from New York that when I was a member of the House of Representatives the Committee on Ways and Means of that body had charge of practically all the legislation of Congress, all the general appropriation bills, all tax bills, all tariff bills, and everything of that kind. Afterwards, as the Senator is probably aware, the House from time to time changed that and made two committees out of the one, one charged with raising revenue and the other charged with expenditures, which was proper. So various committees were authorized from time to time to take charge of the appropriations bearing upon their particular branch of the public service, and I think the Senate—although the Senate is a slow-moving body—after a careful examination will find that some of these appropriations ought to be referred to committees other than the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HILL. I suppose the Senator from Idaho does not desire action on the resolution this morning?

Mr. DUBOIS. No, I do not desire action this morning.

Mr. HILL. I should like to have the resoultion lie on the table for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. QUAY. I was not in the Senate when the resolution for the division of the various appropriation bills among committees was laid before it. I should be glad to have that resolution lie upon the table until I can prepare and offer an amendment, which, it seems to me, if the resolution be passed, ought to be incorporated with it, which shall provide for the establishment of a new Committee on Coinage and Currency, to which shall be referred questions in relation to those subjects, which now go to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table as indicated.

POLICY RESPECTING CUBA, ETC.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Calendar under Rule VIII is now in order, and the first business will be stated.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. ALLEN December 3, 1895, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate—

1. That the Government of the United States of America should promptly recognize the revolutionists of Cuba, who are now honestly struggling to secure their independence of the Spanish Government, as composing an independent nation and possessing the rights thereof, according to the law of nations.
2. That all islands in close proximity to the mainland of the United States of America should, as speedily as possible, by treaties of purchase, be annexed to this Government, as essential to our safety in times of war and the convenience and necessity of our commerce in times of peace.
3. That the wise declaration of President Monroe, known as the Monroe doctrine, is a well-established policy of the Government of the United States, and should be promptly and effectually maintained by the Government in its original purity and purpose.
4. That while the Government of the United States should not needlessly or hastily embroil itself with any foreign power, and should only resort to extreme measures in cases of absolute necessity, a firmer and more prompt policy on the part of this Government in maintaining the rights of American citizens abroad should be introduced and pursued.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I suppose the resolution will probably have to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not know that I can or should say anything in addition to what I have already said in its support. I do hope that the Committee on Foreign Relations, when it comes to consider the different resolutions which have been introduced upon the subject of the Monroe doctrine, will not only take into account the condition of our country with reference to our coast defenses, and recommend to the Senate and to the country the adoption of such measures as will secure the erection of adequate defenses for coast purposes, but that it will recommend to Congress some measure which will secure to this country the control of all the islands and lands adjacent to our shores which will be essential in our commerce and in times of war.

It has been said in this Chamber and out of it that the Populist party was a local organization; that it dealt simply with certain internal grievances; that it was composed of a class of people who had no conception of government beyond their own immediate and pressing personal demands. I desire to correct that opinion, if I can do so, by saying that, in my judgment, the Populist party is as thoroughly committed to the Monroe doctrine as either the Democratic or the Republican party. It occurs to me that there should be no division of sentiment among our people upon the question of the necessity of making ample protection for our country against foreign invasion and in pursuing that course which will strengthen its commerce and carrying trade.

I was delighted yesterday to listen to the eloquent speech of my friend from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], in which he portrayed so vividly the doctrine laid down by President Monroe in his message and pointed out to us the fact that Great Britain is now planting its flag upon every island in the sea, that it is pursuing a policy of aggression, acquiring territory and possessions which are liable to menace the peace and prosperity of our nation, and I felt at that time as though it would be entirely germane to the subject and proper for me to put to the Senator the question whether he did not believe that the time had come when we should not only protect the coasts of this country from foreign invasion, or the possibility of foreign invasion, but when we should protect the country itself from British invasion.

I did not hear the Senator say anything about the millions and billions of dollars of English capital that have been brought into this country. I did not hear him refer to the fact that English money has purchased our great flouring mills, our great railway systems, our breweries, our stock yards, and the great majority of the important industries of this country. I did not hear the distinguished and brilliant Senator from Illinois yesterday discuss the question of the seeming partnership existing between the Democratic and Republican parties in this country and the money lords of Lombard street and of the East. If it is important for us to watch the British flag when it is placed indiscriminately upon the islands of the sea, does it not occur to my distinguished friend that it would be important for us, Mr. President, to watch the financial partnership existing between certain financiers and statesmen of England and other foreign countries and certain financiers and political parties in this country?

I do not believe the time will ever come when this Government will be called upon to defend itself or its territory against British aggression; but I believe the time has come when it is essential to the welfare and well-being of our people that we Americanize instead of anglicize our institutions. It is comparatively a matter of indifference to us whether the boundary line between Venezuela and the British possessions is established upon American or upon British theories; but it is important for us, Mr. President, to preserve the institutions of this country from British aggressions. We realize that Great Britain is in our midst, not with her

armies and her navies, not perhaps with her flag, but she is here for the purpose of dethroning American institutions; she is here for the purpose of anglicizing these States and this country, and controlling the policy of our nation and the policy of our Government in every branch and department. Sir, it has become a popular thing now for an American citizen to become an English lord or the lord of some other country. I was reading in an Eastern newspaper but a few days ago of an American consul, holding a position under this Government at this time, who is to become a baron of Austria. A few years ago his ancestors were common people in this country, working at common and humble occupations, and yet, through a little financial and political success, this gentleman has become ashamed of his native country, and while he holds the important office of consul under the present Administration, he is willing to receive the title of baron from a foreign country.

Mr. President, it occurs to me that that subject should have attracted the attention of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I do not know that it would be improper for me to refer to the spirit of madness which seems to exist in this country, by which even American women are perfectly willing to waste themselves upon titled foreign mendicants. I wish there were some way of providing for that in the legislation which is contemplated by my friend from Illinois.

I hope, however, that this resolution will receive due consideration at the hands of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I move its reference to that committee.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to hear the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLACKBURN in the chair). The resolution will again be read.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator from Nebraska has no objection, I should like to have the resolution remain on the table for a few days, as I desire to submit some remarks on the subject.

Mr. ALLEN. I have no objection to that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska withdraws his motion, and the resolution will lie on the table, in the absence of objection.

AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES.

Mr. HILL. At the last session I submitted three amendments to the rules, which I desire to offer at this time. I ask that the resolutions may lie on the table and be printed.

The resolutions were severally submitted and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

Resolved, That Rule IX be amended by adding thereto the following section:

"SEC. 2. Whenever any bill or resolution is pending before the Senate as unfinished business, and the same shall have been debated on divers days, amounting in all to thirty days, it shall be in order for any Senator at any time to move to fix a time for the taking of a vote upon such bill or resolution, and such motion shall not be amendable or debatable, and shall be immediately put, and if passed by a majority of all the members of the Senate, the vote upon such bill or resolution, with all the amendments thereto which may be pending at the time of such motion, shall be had at the date fixed in such original motion without further debate or amendment, except by unanimous consent; and during the pendency of such motion to fix a date and also at the time fixed by the Senate for voting upon bill or resolution no other motion of any kind or character shall be entertained until such motion or such bill or resolution shall have been finally voted upon."

Resolved, That Rule XII be amended by inserting an additional clause, as follows:

"When upon a vote by yeas and nays it shall appear to the Presiding Officer, upon recapitulation and before the announcement of the result, that a quorum has not voted, he shall call upon Senators present who have not voted by name to vote, and shall direct the Secretary to add to the list of the Senators voting the names of the Senators present not voting, including those announcing pairs or who may or may not be excused from voting, and to enter the same in the Journal; and if the whole number constitute a quorum, and it shall appear that a majority of a quorum (or two-thirds of a quorum where the Constitution prescribes a majority of two-thirds) has voted on either side, the question shall be deemed to have been determined and the result shall be announced the same as if a quorum had voted."

Resolved, That subdivision 2 of Rule V of the standing rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"If at any time during the daily sessions of the Senate a question shall be raised by any Senator as to the presence of a quorum, the Presiding Officer shall forthwith direct the Secretary to call the roll and shall announce the result, and these proceedings shall be without debate; but no Senator while speaking shall be interrupted by any other Senator raising the question of the lack of a quorum, and the question as to the presence of a quorum shall not be raised oftener than once in every hour; but this provision shall not apply where the absence of a quorum is disclosed upon any roll call of the yeas and nays."

ARMENIAN OUTRAGES.

Mr. CALL. I desire to give notice that to-morrow morning, after the order of Senate resolutions shall have been reached, I shall ask the Senate to take up for consideration the concurrent resolution heretofore submitted by me in relation to the outrages in Armenia.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 12, 1895, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 11, 1895.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

General officers.

Brig. Gen. Wesley Merritt, to be major-general, April 25, 1895, vice McCook, retired from active service.

Col. Zenas Randall Bliss, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be brigadier-general, April 25, 1895, vice Ruger, appointed major-general.

Col. John Joseph Coppinger, Twenty-third Infantry, to be brigadier-general, April 25, 1895, vice Merritt, appointed major-general.

Quartermaster's Department.

To be assistant quartermasters with rank of captain:

First Lieut. John Theodore French, jr., Fourth Artillery, April 25, 1895, vice Hathaway, promoted.

First Lieut. James Buchanan Aleshire, First Cavalry, April 25, 1895, vice Jacobs, promoted.

First Lieut. Isaac William Littell, Tenth Infantry, April 25, 1895, vice Bird, promoted.

First Lieut. Gonzalez Sidney Bingham, Ninth Cavalry, May 18, 1895, vice Clem, promoted.

Pay Department.

Col. Thaddeus Harlan Stanton, assistant paymaster-general, to be Paymaster-General with the rank of brigadier-general, March 27, 1895, vice Smith, retired from active service.

Corps of Engineers.

Col. William Price Craighill, to be Chief of Engineers, with the rank of brigadier-general, May 10, 1895, vice Casey, retired from active service.

Ordnance Department.

Second Lieut. Charles Clark Jameson, Fifteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, April 9, 1895, vice Peck, deceased.

Judge-Advocate-General's Department.

Lieut. Col. Thomas Francis Barr, deputy judge-advocate-general, to be assistant judge-advocate-general with the rank of colonel, August 3, 1895, vice Winthrop, retired from active service.

Maj. George Breckenridge Davis, judge-advocate, to be deputy judge-advocate-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, August 3, 1895, vice Barr, promoted.

Quartermaster's Department.

Lieut. Col. George Henry Weeks, deputy quartermaster-general, to be assistant quartermaster-general, with the rank of colonel, May 16, 1895, vice Bingham, retired from active service.

Maj. Gilbert Cole Smith, quartermaster, to be deputy quartermaster-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, May 16, 1895, vice Weeks, promoted.

Capt. John Lincoln Clem, assistant quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major, May 16, 1895, vice Smith, promoted.

Subsistence Department.

Maj. Samuel Tobey Cushing, commissary of subsistence, to be assistant commissary-general of subsistence with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, November 11, 1895, vice Gilman, retired from active service.

Capt. Wells Willard, commissary of subsistence, to be commissary of subsistence with the rank of major, September 18, 1895, vice Penrose, deceased.

Capt. Henry Granville Sharpe, commissary of subsistence, to be commissary of subsistence with the rank of major, November 11, 1895, vice Cushing, promoted.

Medical Department.

Lieut. Col. Dallas Bache, deputy surgeon-general, to be assistant surgeon-general with the rank of colonel, April 18, 1895, vice Smith, retired from active service.

Maj. David Lowe Huntington, surgeon, to be deputy surgeon-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, April 18, 1895, vice Bache, promoted.

Maj. William Elkanah Waters, surgeon, to be deputy surgeon-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, October 1, 1895, vice Billings, retired from active service.

Maj. Justus Morris Brown, surgeon, to be deputy surgeon-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, November 15, 1895, vice Gibson, retired from active service.

Capt. William Cummings Shannon, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major, April 18, 1895, vice Huntington, promoted.

Capt. Louis William Crampton, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major, September 6, 1895, vice Hubbard, deceased.

Capt. Louis Stanislaus Tesson, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major, September 26, 1895, vice Matthews, retired from active service.

Capt. Edwin Fisher Gardner, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major October, 1, 1895, vice Waters, promoted.

Capt. William Henry Corbusier, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major, October 17, 1895, vice Cronkhite, retired from active service.

Capt. Daniel Mitchell Appel, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major, November 15, 1895, vice Brown, promoted.

Pay Department.

Lieut. Col. George Evan Glenn, deputy paymaster-general, to be assistant paymaster-general with the rank of colonel, March 27, 1895, vice Stanton, appointed Paymaster-General.

Maj. Asa Bacon Carey, paymaster, to be deputy paymaster-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, March 27, 1895, vice Glenn, promoted.

Corps of Engineers.

Lieut. Col. John Moulder Wilson, to be colonel, March 31, 1895, vice Elliott, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. John Whitney Barlow, to be colonel, May 10, 1895, vice Craighill, appointed Chief of Engineers.

Lieut. Col. Peter Conover Hains, to be colonel, August 13, 1895, vice Abbot, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. George Lewis Gillespie, to be colonel, October 2, 1895, vice Poe, deceased.

Lieut. Col. Charles Russell Suter, to be colonel, October 12, 1895, vice Mendell, retired from active service.

Maj. Oswald Herbert Ernst, to be lieutenant-colonel, March 31, 1895, vice Wilson, promoted.

Maj. David Porter Heap, to be lieutenant-colonel, May 10, 1895, vice Barlow, promoted.

Maj. William Ludlow, to be lieutenant-colonel, August 13, 1895, vice Hains, promoted.

Maj. William Albert Jones, to be lieutenant-colonel, October 2, 1895, vice Gillespie, promoted.

Maj. Andrew Neaf Damrell, to be lieutenant-colonel, October 12, 1895, vice Suter, promoted.

Capt. Richard Leveridge Hoxie, to be major, March 31, 1895, vice Ernst, promoted.

Capt. William Louis Marshall, to be major, May 10, 1895, vice Heap, promoted.

Capt. Joseph Henry Willard, to be major, August 13, 1895, vice Ludlow, promoted.

Capt. William Herbert Bixby, to be major, October 2, 1895, vice Jones, promoted.

Capt. Eric Bergland, to be major, October 12, 1895, vice Damrell, promoted.

First Lieut. William Campbell Langfitt, to be captain, March 31, 1895, vice Hoxie, promoted.

First Lieut. Henry Ely Waterman, to be captain, May 10, 1895, vice Marshall, promoted.

First Lieut. James Clark Sanford, to be captain, August 13, 1895, vice Willard, promoted.

First Lieut. Hiram Martin Chittenden, to be captain, October 2, 1895, vice Bixby, promoted.

First Lieut. Cassius Eric Gillette, to be captain, October 12, 1895, vice Bergland, promoted.

Second Lieut. William Wright Harts, to be first lieutenant, February 3, 1895, vice Zinn, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert McGregor, to be first lieutenant, March 31, 1895, vice Langfitt, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edgar Jadwin, to be first lieutenant, May 10, 1895, vice Waterman, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles Keller, to be first lieutenant, August 13, 1895, vice Sanford, promoted.

Second Lieut. Herbert Deakyne, to be first lieutenant, October 2, 1895, vice Chittenden, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles Summers Bromwell, to be first lieutenant, October 12, 1895, vice Gillette, promoted.

Cavalry arm.

Maj. Samuel Marmaduke Whitside, Seventh Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel, July 17, 1895, vice Purington, Third Cavalry, retired from active service.

Capt. Henry James Nowlan, Seventh Cavalry, to be major, July 17, 1895, vice Whitside, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Curtis Bushrod Hoppin, regimental quartermaster, Second Cavalry, to be captain, June 10, 1895, vice Rawolle, Second Cavalry, deceased.

First Lieut. Loyd Stone McCormick, Seventh Cavalry, to be captain, July 17, 1895, vice Nowlan, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Henry Lewis Ripley, regimental quartermaster, Third Cavalry, to be captain, August 8, 1895, vice Elting, Third Cavalry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Jacob Garretson Galbraith, First Cavalry, to be captain, August 27, 1895, vice Boutelle, First Cavalry, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. Alexander Lucien Dade, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, June 13, 1895, vice Sargent, Second Cavalry, appointed regimental quartermaster.

Second Lieut. John Sheridan Winn, Second Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, June 14, 1895, vice Backus, First Cavalry, deceased.

Second Lieut. Solomon Pervis Vestal, Fifth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, July 17, 1895, vice McCormick, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles Aloysius Hedekin, Third Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, August 8, 1895, vice Converse, Third Cavalry, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. Francis John Koester, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, August 8, 1895, vice T. R. Rivers, Third Cavalry, appointed regimental quartermaster.

Second Lieut. John Daniel Leinbach Hartman, First Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, August 27, 1895, vice Galbraith, First Cavalry, promoted.

Infantry arm.

Lieut. Col. Jacob Ford Kent, Eighteenth Infantry, to be colonel, April 25, 1895, vice Bliss, Twenty-fourth Infantry, appointed brigadier-general.

Lieut. Col. Samuel Ovenshine, Fifteenth Infantry, to be colonel, April 26, 1895, vice Coppinger, Twenty-third Infantry, appointed brigadier-general.

Lieut. Col. John Henry Page, Twenty-second Infantry, to be colonel, May 31, 1895, vice Mason, Third Infantry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. John Newman Andrews, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be colonel, October 1, 1895, vice Townsend, Twelfth Infantry, retired from active service.

Maj. Clarence Mitchell Bailey, Fifteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, April 25, 1895, vice Kent, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. James William Powell, jr., Twenty-first Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, April 26, 1895, vice Ovenshine, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Loyd Wheaton, Twentieth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, May 31, 1895, vice Page, Twenty-second Infantry, promoted.

Maj. John William French, Fourteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, July 5, 1895, vice Henton, Twenty-third Infantry, deceased.

Maj. Aaron Simon Daggett, Thirteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, October 1, 1895, vice Andrews, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Charles Hobart, Third Infantry, to be major, April 25, 1895, vice Bailey, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. John Nichols Coe, Twentieth Infantry, to be major, April 26, 1895, vice Powell, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

Capt. James Madison Johnson Sanno, Seventh Infantry, to be major, May 12, 1895, vice Crandal, Third Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. William Spencer McCaskey, Twentieth Infantry, to be major, May 31, 1895, vice Wheaton, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Charles Franklin Robe, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be major, July 5, 1895, vice French, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Philip Howard Ellis, Thirteenth Infantry, to be major, October 1, 1895, vice Daggett, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles Grenville Starr, First Infantry, to be captain, April 6, 1895, vice Tisdall, First Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. John James Brereton, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be captain, April 25, 1895, vice Johnson, Twenty-fourth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. William Cathcart Buttler, regimental quartermaster, Third Infantry, to be captain, April 25, 1895, vice Hobart, Third Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. James Seymour Rogers, Twentieth Infantry, to be captain, April 26, 1895, vice Coe, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. George Shaeffer Young, regimental quartermaster, Seventh Infantry, to be captain, May 12, 1895, vice Sanno, Seventh Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles Lee Steele, Eighteenth Infantry, to be captain, May 12, 1895, vice Lloyd, Eighteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Henry Buckman Moon, Twentieth Infantry, to be captain, May 31, 1895, vice McCaskey, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. John Henry Hobart Peshine, Thirteenth Infantry, to be captain, July 5, 1895, vice Waterbury, Thirteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Edwin Forbes Glenn, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be captain, July 5, 1895, vice Robe, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. George Russell Cecil, Thirteenth Infantry, to be captain, October 1, 1895, vice Ellis, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. George Augustine Detchmendy, Sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, April 6, 1895, vice Starr, First Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Earl Clark Carnahan, Twelfth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, April 18, 1895, vice Wilson, Fifth Infantry, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. Archibald Atkinson Cabaniss, Twentieth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, April 25, 1895, vice Brereton, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Thomas Myron Moody, Twenty-second Infantry, to be first lieutenant, April 26, 1895, vice Rogers, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles Edgar Tayman, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, April 30, 1895, vice Druien, Tenth Infantry, resigned.

Second Lieut. Thomas Hugh McGuire (since resigned), Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, April 30, 1895, vice Loveridge, Fourteenth Infantry, dismissed.

Second Lieut. James William McAndrew, Twenty-first Infantry, to be first lieutenant, May 1, 1895, vice McRae, Third Infantry, appointed regimental adjutant.

Second Lieut. John Simon Grisard, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, May 12, 1895, vice Barbour, Seventh Infantry, appointed regimental quartermaster.

Second Lieut. Charles Perren Russ, Eleventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant, May 12, 1895, vice Steele, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward Robert Chrisman, Second Infantry, to be first lieutenant, May 31, 1895, vice Moon, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Peter Charles Harris, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, July 5, 1895, vice Fletcher, Thirteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. Munroe McFarland, Twenty-first Infantry, to be first lieutenant, July 5, 1895, vice Peshine, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William Toliver Wilder, Nineteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, July 5, 1895, vice Glenn, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William Herman Wilhelm, Tenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, July 31, 1895, vice McGuire, Fourteenth Infantry, resigned.

Second Lieut. William Roderick Sample, Fourteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, October 1, 1895, vice Cecil, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.

Medical Department.

To be assistant surgeons with the rank of first lieutenant:

Thomas Jellis Kirkpatrick, jr., of Pennsylvania, November 6, 1895, vice Gardner, promoted.

John Hamilton Stone, of the District of Columbia, November 6, 1895, vice Meriwether, retired from active service.

Irving Wallace Rand, of New Hampshire, November 6, 1895, vice Corbusier, promoted.

Powell Conrad Fauntleroy, of Virginia, November 15, 1895, vice Appel, promoted.

To be chaplain of the Ninth Regiment of Cavalry.

Rev. George W. Prioleau, of Ohio, April 25, 1895, vice Plummer, dismissed.

Infantry arm.

1. Corpl. Lawrence Burton Simonds, Company E, Twenty-first Infantry, to be second lieutenant, October 31, 1895, vice Haney, Eighth Infantry, retired from active service.

2. Corpl. Robert Henry Allen, Troop D, Eighth Cavalry, to be second lieutenant, October 31, 1895, vice Sample, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

3. Q. M. Sergt. Dwight Warren Ryther, Sixth Infantry, to be second lieutenant, November 6, 1895, vice Prince, Second Infantry, deceased.

Corps of Engineers.

To be additional second lieutenants:

1. Cadet Edward Hugh Schulz.
2. Cadet Harry Burgess.

Artillery arm.

To be second lieutenants:

6. Cadet Harry Ernest Smith, vice Wilson, First Artillery, promoted.

9. Cadet Joseph Lippincott Knowlton, vice Zalinski, Second Artillery, promoted.

11. Cadet Thales Lucius Ames, vice March, Third Artillery, promoted.

To be additional second lieutenants:

12. Cadet Conway Hillyer Arnold, jr.
15. Cadet Joseph Wheeler, jr.
16. Cadet Adrian Sebastian Fleming.
17. Cadet Brooke Payne.

Cavalry arm.

To be second lieutenants:

5. Cadet Casper Hauzer Conrad, jr., vice Williamson, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

7. Cadet Harry Howard Stout, vice Beach, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

8. Cadet Herbert Arthur White, vice Gray, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

13. Cadet Nathan King Averill, vice Donaldson, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

14. Cadet Harry La Tourrette Cavenaugh, vice Fuller, Ninth Cavalry, appointed first lieutenant in the Ordnance Department.

To be additional second lieutenants:

18. Cadet Mortimer Osborne Bigelow.
19. Cadet William Gray Sills.
20. Cadet August Carl Nissen.
25. Cadet Clyde Emile Hawkins.
27. Cadet James Southard Parker.
34. Cadet Joseph Sutherland Herron.
35. Cadet Henry Benjamin Dixon.
37. Cadet George Barnard Pritchard, jr.

Infantry arm.

To be second lieutenants:

3. Cadet John Asa Gurney, vice Capron, Fifth Infantry, transferred to the Seventh Cavalry.

4. Cadet Jens Bugge, vice Neary, Third Infantry, promoted.

10. Cadet Charles Herman Paine, vice Grisard, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.

21. Cadet Thomas Walter Darrah, vice Wittenmyer, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

22. Cadet Americus Mitchell, vice Baylies, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

23. Cadet Perry Lester Miles, vice Jones, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

24. Cadet Milton Loomis McGrew, vice Russ, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

26. Cadet Lorrain Thompson Richardson, vice Lenihan, Twentieth Infantry, promoted,

28. Cadet Charles Roscoe Howland, vice Taylor, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

29. Cadet Francis Pierpont Siviter, vice Schenck, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

30. Cadet Morton Fitz Smith, vice Cabaniss, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

31. Cadet Louis Meredith Nuttman, vice McAndrew, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

32. Cadet Glenn Hedges Davis, vice Markland, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

33. Cadet Franklin Swart Hutton, vice Chrisman, Second Infantry, promoted.

36. Cadet Albert Sidney Brookes, vice Smoke, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

38. Cadet Thomas Francis Dwyer, vice Hersey, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

39. Cadet Fine Wilson Smith, vice Carnahan, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

40. Cadet Walter Scott McBroom, vice Evans, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

41. Cadet Louis Hoffman Lewis, vice Albright, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

42. Cadet David Sheridan Stanley, vice Moody, Twenty-second Infantry, promoted.

43. Cadet Benjamin Taylor Simmons, vice Schindel, Sixteenth Infantry, transferred to the Sixth Infantry.

44. Cadet Joseph Numa Augustin, jr., vice Tayman, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

45. Cadet Samuel George Creden, vice McAlexander, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

46. Cadet Girard Sturtevant, vice McGuire, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

To be additional second lieutenants:

47. Cadet Louis Hermann Bash.
48. Cadet Anton Springer, jr.
49. Cadet Frank Bingley Watson.
50. Cadet Oscar Jerome Charles.
51. Cadet Thomas Absalom Pearce.
52. Cadet Daniel Duncan.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Surg. Joseph G. Ayers, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 25th of February, 1895, vice Medical Inspector Frank L. Du Bois, deceased.

P. A. Surg. James C. Byrnes, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 25th of February, 1895, vice Surg. Joseph G. Ayers, promoted.

Medical Inspector William K. Van Reypen, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 30th of March, 1895, vice Medical Director Michael Bradley, retired.

Surg. Abel F. Price, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 30th of March, 1895, vice Medical Inspector William K. Van Reypen, promoted.

P. A. Surg. Samuel H. Griffith, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 30th of March, 1895, vice Surg. Abel F. Price, promoted.

Reginald K. Smith, a citizen of Alabama, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 3d of April, 1895, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

Medical Inspector Thomas C. Walton, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 28th of May, 1895, vice Medical Director Richard C. Dean, retired.

Surg. Michael C. Drennan, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 28th of May, 1895, vice Medical Inspector Thomas C. Walton, promoted.

P. A. Surg. Daniel M. Guiteras, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 28th of May, 1895, vice Surg. Michael C. Drennan, promoted.

Medical Inspector Charles H. White, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 8th of June, 1895, vice Medical Director Albert C. Gorgas, retired.

Surg. James A. Hawke, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 8th of June, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Medical Inspector Charles H. White, promoted.

P. A. Surg. Averly C. H. Russell, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 8th of June, 1895, vice Surg. James A. Hawke, promoted.

Medical Inspector George W. Woods, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 15th of June, 1895, vice Medical Director Adolph A. Hochling, retired.

Surg. Robert A. Marmion, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 15th of June, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Medical Inspector George W. Woods, promoted.

P. A. Surg. Arthur G. Cabell, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 15th of June, 1895, vice Surg. Robert A. Marmion, promoted.

George C. Hubbard, a citizen of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 5th of July, 1895, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

P. A. Surg. Clement Biddle, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 26th of July, 1895, vice Surgeon Benjamin S. Mackie, deceased.

Medical Inspector George H. Cook, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 29th of September, 1895, vice Medical Director Albert L. Gihon, retired.

Surg. Dwight Dickinson, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 29th of September, 1895, vice Medical Inspector George H. Cook, promoted.

P. A. Surg. Henry T. Percy, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 29th of September, 1895, vice Surg. Dwight Dickinson, promoted.

Jacob C. Rosenbleuth, a citizen of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 14th of October, 1895, and Moulton K. Johnson, a citizen of Ohio, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 12th of November, 1895, both to fill vacancies existing in that grade on those dates.

Paymaster William W. Woodhull, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 30th of March, 1895, vice Pay Inspector Robert W. Allen, retired.

P. A. Paymaster Leeds C. Kerr, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 30th of March, 1895, vice Paymaster William W. Woodhull, promoted.

Assistant Paymaster Samuel McGowan, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 30th of March, 1895, vice P. A. Paymaster Leeds C. Kerr, promoted.

Pay Inspector Arthur J. Pritchard, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 10th of April, 1895, vice Pay Director James Fulton, deceased.

Paymaster Henry T. Wright, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 10th of April, 1895, vice Pay Inspector Arthur J. Pritchard, promoted.

P. A. Paymaster Richard T. M. Ball, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 10th of April, 1895, vice Paymaster Henry T. Wright, promoted.

Assistant Paymaster Henry A. Dent, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 10th of April, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice P. A. Paymaster Richard T. M. Ball, promoted.

Barron P. Du Bois, a citizen of New Jersey, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 23d of May, 1895, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

William P. Brawley, a citizen of South Carolina, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 23d of May, 1895, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

P. A. Paymaster Charles S. Williams, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 13th of June, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Paymaster Henry R. Smith, dismissed.

Asst. Paymaster Walter L. Wilson, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 13th of June, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice P. A. Paymaster Charles S. Williams, promoted.

Harry E. Biscoe, a citizen of Michigan, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 28th of August, 1895, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

John Irwin, jr., a citizen of California, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 5th of September, 1895, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

P. A. Paymaster Thomas J. Cowie, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 11th of September, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Paymaster John Furey, retired.

Asst. Paymaster William J. Littell, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 11th of September, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice P. A. Paymaster Thomas J. Cowie, promoted.

P. A. Engineer Henry Herwig, to be a chief engineer in the Navy, from the 21st of March, 1895, vice Chief Engineer Elijah Laws, retired.

Assistant Engineer Ward P. Winchell, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 21st of March, 1895, vice P. A. Engineer Henry Herwig, promoted.

P. A. Engineer George B. Ransom, to be a chief engineer in the Navy, from the 9th of May, 1895, vice Chief Engineer Ezra J. Whitaker, retired.

Assistant Engineer Andrew McAllister, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 9th of May, 1895, vice P. A. Engineer George B. Ransom, promoted.

P. A. Engineer William C. Eaton, to be a chief engineer in the Navy, from the 1st of June, 1895, vice Chief Engineer William W. Heaton, deceased.

Assistant Engineer Charles W. Dyson, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 1st of June, 1895, vice Passed Assistant Engineer William C. Eaton, promoted.

P. A. Engineer Alfred B. Canaga, to be a chief engineer in the Navy, from the 6th of August, 1895, vice Chief Engineer Thom Williamson, retired.

Assistant Engineer William C. Herbert, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 6th of August, 1895, vice P. A. Engineer Alfred B. Canaga, promoted.

P. A. Engineer Abraham V. Zane, to be a chief engineer in the Navy, from the 11th of September, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Chief Engineer Herschal Main, retired.

Assistant Engineer Alexander S. Halstead, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 11th of September, 1895, vice P. A. Engineer Abraham V. Zane, promoted.

Ensign Harry A. Field, to be a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy, from the 23d of April, 1895, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) Randolph H. Miner, promoted and since resigned.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John Hood, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 28th of April, 1895, vice Lieut. Frederick H. Tyler, deceased.

Ensign Chester M. Knepper, to be a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy, from the 28th of April, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) John Hood, promoted.

Capt. Frederick V. McNair, to be a commodore in the Navy, from the 10th of May, 1895, vice Commodore Edward E. Potter, retired.

Commander William Bainbridge Hoff, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 10th of May, 1895, vice Capt. Frederick V. McNair, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Henry N. Manney, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 10th of May, 1895, vice Commander William Bainbridge Hoff, promoted.

Lieut. James W. Carlin, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 10th of May, 1895, vice Lieut. Commander Henry N. Manney, promoted.

Commodore Lester A. Beardslee, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 21st of May, 1895, vice Rear-Admiral Richard W. Meade, retired.

Capt. John A. Bowell, to be a commodore in the Navy, from the 21st of May, 1895, vice Commodore Lester A. Beardslee, promoted.

Assistant naval constructor.

Daniel C. Nutting, jr., a citizen of Kansas, to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy, from the 1st of July, 1895.

Assistant engineers in Navy.

The following-named graduates of the Naval Academy, to be assistant engineers in the Navy, from the 1st of July, 1895, to fill vacancies in that grade: Henry B. Price, Martin E. French, Frank D. Read, John R. Brady, Allen M. Cook, Emmet R. Pollock, and André M. Proctor; and the following-named graduate of the Naval Academy, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 1st of July, 1895, in accordance with the act of March 2, 1889, viz, Louis J. Magill.

Ensigns.

The following-named naval cadets, all graduates of the Naval Academy, to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 1st of July, 1895, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date, viz: Wilfrid

V. Powelson, William S. Montgomery, Frank H. Clark, jr., Henry H. Ward, Eugene L. Bisset, Edward H. Campbell, Charles J. Lang, Walter S. Crosley, William K. Gise, Thomas S. Wilson, Henry A. Pearson, Orton P. Jackson, Frank L. Chadwick, John S. Doddridge, Percy N. Olmsted, Christopher C. Fewel, Frank B. Upham, John L. Sticht, Richard S. Douglas, Alfred A. McKethan, and Alfred A. Pratt.

REGISTER OF WILLS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

J. Nota McGill, of Washington, D. C., who was appointed August 28, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of wills for the District of Columbia, vice Levi P. Wright, resigned.

EXAMINERS IN CHIEF, PATENT OFFICE.

John H. Brickenstein, of Lititz, Pa., who was appointed March 4, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be an examiner in chief in the Patent Office, vice Rufus L. B. Clarke, removed.

Arthur P. Greeley, of Concord, N. H., who was appointed March 4, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be an examiner in chief in the Patent Office, vice Henry H. Bates, resigned.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF MINNESOTA.

Patrick H. Kirwan, of Olivia, Minn., who was appointed November 4, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be surveyor-general of Minnesota, vice James Compton, removed.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

Emory F. Best, of Macon, Ga., who was appointed June 13, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office, vice Edward A. Bowers, resigned.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

James W. Coman, of Alva, Okla., who was appointed November 30, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Alva, Okla., vice Robert H. Allen, deceased.

Elias E. Dorsey, of Del Norte, Colo., who was appointed June 26, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Del Norte, Colo., vice Walter C. Wescott, removed.

Jared S. Dixon, of Natchitoches, La., who was appointed October 21, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Natchitoches, La., vice Thomas J. Flanner, removed.

Albert B. Reeves, of Johnson City, Kans., who was appointed April 10, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Dodge City, Kans., vice George T. Crist, deceased.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

William H. Anderson, of Shelbyville, Ky., who was appointed July 8, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Enid, Okla., vice Robert W. Patterson, deceased.

Albert D. Chamberlin, of Inez, Wyo., who was appointed October 21, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Douglas, Wyo., vice Edward H. French, resigned.

George W. Myers, of Miles City, Mont., who was appointed April 10, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Miles City, Mont., vice Charles S. Wright, deceased.

Robert J. Ray, of Woodward, Okla., who was appointed August 16, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Woodward, Okla., vice Wilson M. Hammock, resigned.

COMMISSIONERS TO NEGOTIATE WITH INDIANS.

Frank C. Armstrong, of Washington, D. C., who was appointed April 13, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be a commissioner to negotiate with the Indians of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Muscogee (or Creek), and Seminole Nations, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1893 (27 Stats., page 645), vice Meredith H. Kidd, resigned.

Thomas B. Cabaniss, of Forsyth, Ga., who was appointed April 13, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be a commissioner to negotiate with the Indians of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Muscogee (or Creek), and Seminole Nations, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1893 (27 Stats., page 645), to fill an original vacancy.

Alexander B. Montgomery, of Elizabethtown, Ky., who was appointed April 13, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be a commissioner to negotiate with the Indians of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Muscogee (or Creek), and Seminole Nations, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1893 (27 Stats., page 645), to fill an original vacancy.

INDIAN AGENTS.

Stanton G. Fisher, of Blackfoot, Idaho, who was appointed May 7, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Nez Perces Agency in Idaho, vice Joseph Robinson, deceased.

Luke C. Hays, of Oacoma, S. Dak., who was appointed August 16, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Fort Belknap Agency, in Montana, vice Maj. Joseph M. Kelley, United States Army, relieved of detail as acting Indian agent at said agency.

John C. Keenan, of Stringtown, Ind., who was appointed June 4, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Neah Bay Agency in Washington, vice W. Leven Powell, deceased.

F. Glenn Mattoon, of Coal Harbor, N. Dak., who was appointed October 18, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Fort Berthold Agency, in North Dakota, vice Capt. William H. Clapp, United States Army, relieved of detail as acting Indian agent at said agency.

POSTMASTERS.

John Y. Henderson, to be postmaster at Jacksonville, in the county of Calhoun and State of Alabama, in the place of Adelia E. Frank, removed.

James M. Archer, to be postmaster at Mammoth Spring, in the county of Fulton and State of Arkansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Edward Atkinson, to be postmaster at Fordyce, in the county of Dallas and State of Arkansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Eugene C. Talbott, to be postmaster at Siloam Springs, in the county of Benton and State of Arkansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Mathew J. Byrnes, to be postmaster at Visalia, in the county of Tulare and State of California, in the place of L. V. Nanscawen, removed.

Joseph Marks, to be postmaster at Oroville, in the county of Butte and State of California, in the place of S. S. Boynton, removed.

Perce C. Montgomery, to be postmaster at Portersville, in the county of Tulare and State of California, in the place of J. Howell, removed.

William S. Staley, to be postmaster at Selma, in the county of Fresno and State of California, in the place of Walter T. Lyon, removed.

Webster Wotkyns, to be postmaster at Pasadena, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, in the place of G. F. Kernaghan, resigned.

Andrew Royal, jr., to be postmaster at Victor, in the county of El Paso and State of Colorado, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Edwin E. Whedon, to be postmaster at Del Norte, in the county of Rio Grande and State of Colorado, in the place of E. P. Jones, resigned.

George W. Benedict, to be postmaster at South Norwalk, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of E. Adams, removed.

Melvin E. Lincoln, to be postmaster at Willimantic, in the county of Windham and State of Connecticut, in the place of J. W. Webb, deceased.

Charles B. Mason, to be postmaster at Danbury, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of John Tweedy, whose commission expired February 28, 1895.

Clifford B. Rogers, to be postmaster at Colchester, in the county of New London and State of Connecticut, in the place of Samuel H. Kellogg, resigned.

Horace Wheeler, to be postmaster at Shelton, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Sidney B. Conner, to be postmaster at Liveoak, in the county of Suwanee and State of Florida, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

George W. Harris, to be postmaster at Wardner, in the county of Shoshone and State of Idaho, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Robert Forester, to be postmaster at Murphysboro, in the county of Jackson and State of Illinois, in the place of Fred. A. C. Kuhle, deceased.

Frank Friede, to be postmaster at Mount Olive, in the county of Macoupin and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

David F. King, to be postmaster at Roodhouse, in the county of Greene and State of Illinois, in the place of R. E. Whitlock, removed.

David C. Marsh, to be postmaster at East St. Louis, in the county of St. Clair and State of Illinois, in the place of F. G. Cockrell, resigned.

Ellis K. Mercer, to be postmaster at Princeton, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois, in the place of C. P. Bascom, whose commission expired February 14, 1895.

William W. Twist, to be postmaster at Toluca, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

John Beard, to be postmaster at Danville, in the county of Vermilion and State of Illinois, in the place of W. R. Jewell, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Henry G. Carter, to be postmaster at Mound City, in the county of Pulaski and State of Illinois, in the place of J. W. Sims, removed.

Charles L. Corneau, to be postmaster at Forrest, in the county of Livingston and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

Addison M. Davis, to be postmaster at Rossville, in the county of Vermilion and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Jerome B. Dunkle, to be postmaster at Veedersburg, in the county of Fountain and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Fred J. Fife, to be postmaster at East Chicago, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

William Richards, to be postmaster at New Harmony, in the county of Posey and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Edgar A. Smith, to be postmaster at Converse, in the county of Miami and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

James W. Weidner, to be postmaster at Delphi, in the county of Carroll and State of Indiana, in the place of R. M. Isherwood, resigned.

Antoine V. Matney, to be postmaster at Claremore, in the county of Cherokee Nation, Ind. T., the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 12, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Turtle Mountain band of Chippewa Indians, in the State of North Dakota, and to make appropriation for carrying the same into effect; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF VISITORS TO WEST POINT.

Mr. VILAS submitted the annual report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., for the year 1895; which was ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. THURSTON presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the citizens of Fremont, Nebr., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of C. P. Huntington, president of the Southern Pacific Railway Company, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement of the harbor at port of Los Angeles, Santa Monica, Cal., in accordance with the plan recommended by William Hood, chief engineer of the Southern Pacific Railway Company; which, with the accompanying papers and maps, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HILL presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Central Congregational Church, of Brooklyn, N. Y., representing nearly a thousand families, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide transports and designate ports where they may be loaded with food and clothes donated by American citizens for the use of destitute Armenians; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented the petition of M. R. Hathaway, of Vancouver, in the State of Washington, praying that he be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BAKER. Some days ago I introduced two bills, a bill (S. 252) for the relief of Stalnaker Marteney, and a bill (S. 254) for the relief of Jerome Kunkel; and they were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Since then I have received some proofs which I think ought to be submitted in connection with the bills. I present the affidavits and move that they be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 404) granting a pension to Samuel Goldwater, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. FAULKNER. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 30) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," approved March 2, 1893, to report it favorably without amendment, and, because of the matter contained in the bill and the peculiar circumstances which render early action desirable, I am instructed to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to put the bill upon its passage.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to amend section 17 of the act approved March 2, 1893, entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," so as to read:

SEC. 17. That said court in special term may certify to the court of appeals of the District of Columbia for decision there, in the first instance, any question of law that shall arise during any proceedings in said court in special term under this act. Any party aggrieved by the final order or decree of said court in special term fixing the amount of damages, or the assessment for benefits as to any parcel of land, may take an appeal to said court of appeals and shall be entitled to a bill of exceptions as in civil cases triable by jury, and said court of appeals may affirm, reverse, or modify the order or decree appealed from: *Provided*, That said court of appeals shall consider only questions of law arising on such appeal. From a final judgment of said court in special term under this act, distributing the damages among contending claimants, any party aggrieved may in like manner take an appeal to the court of appeals, which court in such cases shall consider both questions of law and fact. Any appeal under this act to the court of appeals shall be taken within twenty days after the making of the final order or decree appealed from, and not afterwards, and shall be subject to the laws and rules of court regulating appeals to said court of appeals. Cases arising under this act shall have precedence in said court over all other cases except criminal cases, and the decision of said court of appeals upon any question arising under this act shall be final: *Provided*, That from any judgment or order of said court of appeals involving any question as to the constitutionality of this act or of any part thereof any party aggrieved may within thirty days after such judgment or order shall be entered appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. Said court shall determine only the questions of constitutionality involved in the case, and shall have power to make such special rules and regulations applying to appeals under this act as may be proper to bring such cases to a speedy hearing and determination.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MONTHLY STATEMENT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. GORMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 7) providing for the printing of the Monthly Summary Statement of Imports and Exports of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department, to report it without amendment, and to ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution; which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there shall be printed monthly by the Public Printer 3,500 copies of the Monthly Summary Statement of Imports and Exports and other statistical information prepared by the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department, 500 copies of which shall be for the use of the Senate, 1,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies for the use of the Treasury Department.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland why the number is limited to 3,500 copies. It seems to me that 3,500 copies of a document such as that is a very small number. If I am not mistaken in the importance of the document, a much larger number will be necessary. The Committee on Printing, of course, has considered the matter; but it strikes my mind as being an unusually and an improperly small number of such a document.

Mr. GORMAN. In 1890, I think, the Senate directed the Committee on Printing to make a very thorough investigation as to the number of documents of this character that should be printed for all the Departments. The late Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Manderson, then chairman of the committee, submitted a very thorough and exhaustive report. At that time there were 2,150 copies of this document, the monthly abstract, not the annual, printed by the Department. When the committee considered the matter the officers of the Treasury Department at that time supposed, and so recommended to the committee, that 1,000, which is the usual number in all the Departments limited by the recent printing act, would be sufficient in this case. It appears that

heretofore out of the general fund for printing for the Department the Secretary of the Treasury has had the option to order, when an important publication was in hand, that an extra number should be printed. That he is now prohibited from doing. The passage of this joint resolution providing for 3,500 copies in addition to the 1,000 copies provided for by the printing act makes 4,500 copies—500 more than has ever been printed heretofore. In view of the importance of the document the committee thought it wise to pass the proposed resolution and make an exception in this case.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. CALL. I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from Maryland. Do I understand this to be the annual publication of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department?

Mr. GORMAN. It is the monthly statement, not the annual, and the joint resolution provides for printing 3,500 copies in addition to the 1,000 copies provided for by law.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 768) for the relief of James A. Moore; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 769) to relieve W. H. Cohorn from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 770) for the relief of Lucy Ann Lee and Allen G. Lee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 771) to restore the name of Martha A. Fullerton to the pension roll; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 772) to provide for the purchase of sites for public buildings in the cities of Hastings and Norfolk, in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 773) to amend an act entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes," approved July 1, 1862; also to amend an act approved July 2, 1864, and also an act approved May 7, 1878, both in amendment of said first-mentioned act; and to provide for a settlement of claims growing out of the issue of bonds to aid in the construction of certain of the railroads, and to secure to the United States payment of all indebtedness of certain of the companies therein mentioned; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 774) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry W. Freedley, late major in the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 775) to aid in the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. William Smallwood and the soldiers of the Maryland Line in the war for American independence; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 776) for the purchase of the oil portrait of Maj. Gen. William Smallwood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. GORMAN also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 777) for the relief of William P. Wood, for services rendered the Treasury Department;

A bill (S. 778) for the relief of Alexander Moffitt;

A bill (S. 779) for the relief of Samuel D. Piper, administrator of Elias S. Grove, of Washington County, Md.;

A bill (S. 780) for the relief of Louis Trone, of Washington County, Md.;

A bill (S. 781) for the relief of H. H. Keedy and Charles W. Adams, administrators of John Miller, deceased, late of Washington County, Md.;

A bill (S. 782) for the relief of Mary and Maria Reynolds, administrators of James Reynolds, deceased, late of Allegany County, Md.;

A bill (S. 783) for the relief of Benjamin R. White, of Montgomery County, Md.;

A bill (S. 784) for the relief of Reuben A. Hurley, of Montgomery County, Md., administrator de bonis non of A. F. Hurley, deceased, late of Lyon County, Nev.;

A bill (S. 785) for the relief of A. T. Snouffer, of Frederick County, Md.;

A bill (S. 786) for the relief of P. E. Dye and Willie S. Hoge, administrators of David Shoemaker, deceased, late of the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 787) for the relief of James Legg.

Mr. GORMAN also introduced a bill (S. 788) for the relief of James Hooper; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 789) for the relief of Kate Winter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 790) to aid the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, and South Dakota to support schools of mines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 791) to increase the pension of Isabella Morrow, widow of the late Bvt. Col. Henry A. Morrow, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 792) for the relief of Wells C. McCool; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 793) to establish and maintain a national school of forestry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 794) granting to the State of Nebraska, for the irrigation and reclamation of semiarid lands, and for other purposes, the public lands in said State; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (795) for the relief of John Little and Hobart Williams, of Omaha, Nebr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 796) granting a pension to Charles Sullender; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 797) providing for an additional district judge in the district of Nebraska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 798) to alter and amend the act entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and a telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes," approved July 1, 1862, and also to alter and amend the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864, in amendment of said first-named act, and also to alter and amend the act of Congress approved May 7, 1878, in amendment of said acts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 799) extending relief to Indian citizens, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 800) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William McCormick; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 801) to provide for the transfer of Fort Omaha Military Reservation to the State of Nebraska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 802) increasing all pension allowances authorized under existing statutes of the United States to all officers, soldiers, and sailors of the late war of the rebellion, and to their widows and dependent relatives; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 803) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Grand Island, in the State of Nebraska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 804) granting a pension to Mrs. Eleanor Carroll Poe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 805) to provide for the rank, pay, and emoluments of retired officers of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 806) in regard to that portion of the public domain situated in the State of Kansas known as "sand hills," and unappropriated public domain situated in said State composed of sand lands, and providing for the reclamation and entry thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 807) granting a pension to Charles Williamson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 808) for the relief of Simeon Motz, Nathaniel Robbins, and William J. Sloan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ROACH introduced a bill (S. 809) for the relief of Everett Wroe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 810) to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 811) to provide a district attorney and a marshal for the western judicial district of the State of South Carolina; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 812) to provide for appointment by brevet of active or retired officers of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 813) for the relief of Annie R. Chesley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 814) for the relief of John W. Gummo; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 815) for the relief of David Sides; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 816) for the relief of William A. Cowles; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 817) for the relief of Michael Dittlinger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 818) for the relief of Halvor K. Omlie, of Homen, N. Dak.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 819) granting a pension to Catherine O'Leary; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 820) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Keene, in the State of New Hampshire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CHILTON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 821) to refer the claim of Eli Ayres to the Court of Claims and quiet the title to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 822) to regulate the rates of transportation on railway corporations engaged in interstate commerce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 823) granting an increase of pension to John B. Meigs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 824) to require patents to be issued to land actually settled under the act entitled "An act to provide for the armed occupation and settlement of the unsettled part of the peninsula of Florida," approved August 4, 1842; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 825) for the relief of Henry Marcotte; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 826) granting a pension to Caroline Reed; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 827) for the relief of C. M. Keedy, administrator of J. J. Keedy, of Washington County, Md.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 23) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to use a portion of the appropriation for new iron roof for foundry at navy-yard, Washington, D. C., in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," for repairs to the walls of said foundry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 24) for the return to the State of New Hampshire of the flag of the Eleventh Regiment of New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. GEAR. On the 11th instant I introduced a bill (S. 763) for the relief of Col. Jesse H. Strickland, Eighth Tennessee Cavalry, United States Volunteers, which was referred to the Committee on Claims. I ask that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The change of reference will be made, in the absence of objection.

PRINTING OF COINAGE BILL AS A DOCUMENT.

Mr. CHANDLER. Some days ago I introduced a bill (S. 496) to provide, in connection with other nations, for the unlimited coinage of gold and silver at a ratio of 1 to 15½. I move that the bill be reprinted as a document, with an accompanying letter from Mr. Robert Stein.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. CAMERON. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

ELECTRIC WIRES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GALLINGER. By request I offer a series of resolutions for reference to the Committee on the District of Columbia, for the consideration of the committee. I myself know nothing about the resolutions.

The resolutions were read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, as follows:

Whereas Congress by act approved July 18, 1888, provided that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia should not after the 15th day of September, 1888, permit or authorize any additional telegraph, telephone, electric lighting, or other wires to be erected or maintained on or over any of the streets or avenues of the city of Washington, and further directed said Commissioners to investigate and report to Congress the best method of removing all such electric wires from the air or surface of said streets and interring the same under ground; and

Whereas it was by said last above-mentioned act and the act of Congress approved March 2, 1889, provided that said Commissioners should have power at any time before the expiration of the Fifty-first Congress, and not later, to authorize any such existing overhead wires to be placed under ground; and

Whereas under and by virtue of the provisions of said acts certain companies owning overhead wires within the District of Columbia, acting under permits from said Commissioners, removed a large number of such overhead wires and interred the same under ground, thus establishing an underground system of electric wires; and

Whereas the act of Congress approved August 6, 1890, created an Electrical Commission to investigate and report, through the President, to Congress upon the best method of removing overhead wires and placing the same under ground, which said Commission, upon the 26th day of October, 1891, submitted its report to the President, and which said report was by the President transmitted to Congress December 23, 1891, said report still pending and unacted upon by Congress; and

Whereas by act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, it was provided that the said Commissioners might grant permits for the construction, within certain limitations, of other conduits or subways additional to those already at that date then in existence under previous acts of Congress, under and by virtue of which said act of March 3, 1891, the companies owning such existing underground conduits were granted permits and have constructed certain additions and extensions of previously existing subways; and

Whereas no further or other legislation exists authorizing said Commissioners to permit the erection of additional overhead wires or the construction of other conduits or subways within said District; and

Whereas the obvious intention of Congress, as expressed in all its legislation upon the subject, has been to prohibit the further erection of overhead electric wires in the District of Columbia and the ultimate placing of all electric wires in the District of Columbia under ground, the same to be done only under such regulations and conditions as might be by Congress prescribed: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether, since the 15th day of December, 1888, any permits have been issued for the construction or erection of additional overhead wires in the District of Columbia; and if so, to whom such permits were given and under what authority of law the same purport to have been issued, together with a list of such permits, and whether thereunder any additional overhead wires have been erected in said District; and if so, where and by whom the same has been done. Also whether, under the said act of March 3, 1891, or under any other act, any permits have been issued by said Commissioners for the placing under ground in any of the avenues, streets, alleys, sidewalks, footways, or other public ways in the District of Columbia of any conduits or subways for electric wires which were not an addition to or an extension of a previously existing conduit or subway established under previously existing law; and if so, the names of the persons or corporations to whom such permits have been issued, the avenues, streets, alleys, foot walks, or other passageways covered by such permits, what work, if any, has been done under such permits, and by whom and under what authority of law said permits purport to have been issued and said work performed.

Be it further resolved, That, pending the report hereinbefore called for, and thereafter until action by Congress thereon, the said Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, requested to issue no further permits for the erection of any overhead wires in said District, and if any such permits have been issued to revoke said permits and prevent the erection thereunder of any further overhead wires. Further, that no additional permits be granted for the construction of any further electric conduits or subways in the District of Columbia, and that if any such permits have already been issued the same be revoked, and no further work be permitted thereunder until further action by Congress.

EXCHANGE BETWEEN GOLD AND SILVER STANDARD COUNTRIES.

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be directed to inquire what effect the difference of exchange between gold-standard countries and silver-standard countries has upon the agricultural and manufacturing industries of the United States, and report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. STEWART. I ask that the resolution may lie over, and when it comes up in its order next Monday I give notice that I shall submit some remarks upon the subject.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over under the rule.

PHOSPHATE LANDS.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

Resolved by the Senate, That the Committee on Public Lands be, and are, required to investigate the decision of the Interior Department in the case of Gray and others, deciding that phosphate was not a mineral and phosphate lands not subject to the mining laws, reversing and overruling both the decisions of former Secretaries of the Interior and the decisions of the present Secretary in other cases, and the act of Congress entitled "An act for the protection of actual settlers who made homestead or preemption entries on the public lands of the United States in the State of Florida upon which deposits of phosphates have been discovered since such entries were made," approved October 1, 1890, and report to the Senate whether such decisions are made without authority of law, and also report by bill or otherwise such legislation as may be necessary to secure to the people their rights under the laws relative to mineral lands.

RIGHT OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

Resolved, That the imprisonment of citizens of the United States by a United States court for alleged contempt of its order or process by the exercise of their right of freedom of speech and opinion as to the right of the laboring people of the United States in the employment of railroad or other corporations to organize for the protection of their rights as they regard them is an exercise of power dangerous to the Republic and to the liberty of the people, and the Judiciary Committee of the Senate is hereby instructed to report a bill to the Senate forbidding the exercise of such authority and declaring such imprisonment unlawful.

RAILROAD LANDS IN FLORIDA.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and they are, instructed to inquire and report to the Senate whether the approval of public lands by the Secretary of the Interior to the State of Florida for the benefit of the Florida Central and Peninsula Railroad Company, alleged to be under the provisions of the act of Congress approved the 17th of May, A. D. 1856, and entitled "An act granting land to the States of Alabama and Florida," etc., is not in violation of the said act of Congress, without authority of law, and void and of no effect; also whether such lands are not subject to homestead entry under the laws of the United States.

II. To report, by bill or otherwise, such legislation as may be necessary to protect the rights of homestead settlers on such land, and for the issue of patents to innocent purchasers of land in limited quantities who have bought and paid for such land in good faith.

TEMPORARY DISPLACEMENT OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

Resolved, That the Senate rules be amended by the following as an additional rule:

"RULE —.

"It shall be in order, whenever a bill, resolution, or other proceeding of the Senate is pending, to move that it shall be temporarily laid aside and some other bill, proceeding, or resolution take its place, and the pending bill, resolution, or order be the regular order after the consideration of the bill temporarily taken up shall be concluded. If a majority shall vote in favor of temporarily laying aside the pending bill, the bill, order, resolution, or proceeding designated in the motion shall be temporarily taken up for consideration, subject to such conditions as may be prescribed in the motion, but such motion shall not be in order more than once on the same day in reference to the same bill, order, resolution, or proceeding."

INCREASE OF COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

Resolved, That the Committees on Naval Affairs, Military Affairs, Judiciary, Foreign Relations, Appropriations, Commerce, and Interstate Commerce shall each consist of fifteen members.

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF SEEDS.

Mr. HANSBROUGH submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, instructed and directed to report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, whether or not he has expended the whole or any part of the appropriation for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, and for the printing, publication, and distribution of farmers' bulletins made by the act approved March 2, 1895, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896," and if a part only of said appropriation has been used, to state what part thereof has been expended and for what purpose, specifically stating how much of the appropriation not authorized to be expended for farmers' bulletins has been used, and the items for which it has been expended; also, if any part of the appropriation for the purchase, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds as required by law has not been expended, to state why such seeds have not been purchased under said appropriation in accordance with the existing statutes relating thereto; and also to transmit to the Senate a copy of each bid or offer made to the said Department to furnish it with seeds, bulbs, cuttings, etc., in response to its advertisement dated April 27, 1895, or otherwise submitted for its consideration, together with a copy of each letter sent to the Department relative to or asking any information concerning or modification of the proposals issued and a copy of its reply thereto.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. WHITE submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That Rule XIX be amended by inserting at the end of paragraph 1 thereof the following: "All debate shall be relevant and confined to the subject directly before the Senate."

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the resolution may be printed and lie on the table. I desire to give notice that on Tuesday, after the termination of the routine morning business, I shall offer some remarks to the Senate on the subject-matter of the amendment proposed by me in connection with the amendments proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] yesterday.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table and be printed.

COLLECTION DISTRICT OF CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to call up a little bill, No. 7 on the Calendar, about which there will be no controversy. It lies upon the table, and I wish to have it acted upon. I think there will be no possible objection to it. It is a little bill in reference to a port of entry——

Mr. COCKRELL. Do not let us set the precedent of calling up individual cases. Let us go to the Calendar and take up all similar cases.

Mr. CULLOM. The only reason why I call up the bill is because it is very important to the locality it affects, and no one——

Mr. COCKRELL. It is a private pension bill, and there are a number of them on the Calendar.

Mr. CULLOM. No, it is not a pension bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. No. 7 on the Calendar is certainly a private pension bill.

Mr. CULLOM. It is a bill on the table from the other House.

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh!

Mr. CULLOM. I simply want to have it amended and passed.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator spoke of it as being No. 7 on the Calendar, and No. 7 on the Calendar is a private pension bill.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Illinois refers to a bill lying on the table, I take it, not having been referred.

Mr. CULLOM. It is the bill (H. R. 803) to amend section 2601 of the Revised Statutes relative to ports of entry.

Mr. COCKRELL. That bill is not on the Calendar of General Orders; it is on the table; and on our printed Calendar there should be some distinction made so as not to give "Subjects on the Table" the same numbers that are borne by bills on the regular "Calendar of Business."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the bill called up by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. ALLISON. It is, I understand, a bill coming from the House of Representatives, which has not been referred to a committee.

Mr. CULLOM. Such is the case.

Mr. ALLISON. I shall not object to the consideration of the bill at this time, but I think as a rule all bills that are considered in the Senate should first be referred to a committee and reported from that committee. I merely put in a caveat on the subject of taking up bills from the table.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2601, Revised Statutes, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

SEC. 2601. There shall be in the States of Indiana and Illinois one collection district, as follows:

"The district of Chicago; to comprise the State of Illinois, and the waters and shores of Lake Michigan within the State of Indiana; in which Chicago shall be the port of entry, and Waukegan and Michigan City ports of delivery: *Provided*, That all present ports of delivery in the State of Illinois now a part of the New Orleans district shall be ports of delivery in the new district of Illinois and shall have all privileges which they have under existing law."

Mr. CULLOM. I simply desire to say that this bill really affects nothing but the city of Aurora, 36 miles outside of Chicago. The purpose of it is to avoid the necessity of compelling the people who are shipping ores to a smelting establishment in that city to go clear to New Orleans in order to pay the duty on the ore coming from Canada. That is a matter of great inconvenience to those people, as well as to the smelting company in Aurora. The bill affects nothing else whatever.

I will state to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], so that he may understand it perfectly, that the city of East St. Louis, which is in Illinois, and which would be affected by the bill were it not excepted, is excepted, so that the people there can pay the duties, etc., in the city of St. Louis. The bill leaves East St. Louis in the St. Louis district, and I offer an amendment to it which will make that point perfectly clear.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the bill the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal the provisions of the act approved August 7, 1882, which embraces East St. Louis, Ill., within the limits of the port of St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. CULLOM. The amendment saves that point. I desire to say that this bill really comes from the Treasury Department; that the Department has asked that this arrangement be made so as to avoid the trouble of going to New Orleans in order to settle with the Government.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ARMENIAN OUTRAGES.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the concurrent resolution which I presented some days ago in relation to the atrocities which have been committed upon the Armenians may be laid before the Senate that I may submit some very brief observations regarding it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida, which will be read.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. CALL on the 10th instant, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That humanity and religion and the principles on which all civilization rests demand that the civilized governments shall by peaceful negotiations, or if necessary by force of arms, prevent and suppress the cruelties and massacres inflicted on the Armenian subjects of Turkey by the establishment of a government of their own people, with such guaranties by the civilized powers of its authority and permanence as shall be adequate to that end.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the Secretary read portions of a paper which I have marked and which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

BOSTON, *November 27.*

The following is a condensation of letters received in Boston descriptive of the recent massacre in Erzerum, eastern Turkey.

* * * * * * *

The stories of hairbreadth escapes and thrilling experiences and horrible murder were sickening in the extreme. Two Armenians hidden in some hay witnessed the killing of 11 persons. One man was called to the door by an officer who professed to be friendly and was shot down in cold blood. Others were cruelly murdered.

The death roll must be toward 300. Between 50 and 60 wounded are in the hospital. Two hundred dead were gathered in the Armenian cemetery, some of them most horribly mutilated. There must be many wounded in the different houses. All sorts of rumors are about of another bloody attack being determined on. The people are in an awful state of dread. I did what I could to reassure them. The collection of the dead goes on; 316 collected in the graveyard. The pillaged houses are to be counted by the hundreds. No house that was attacked was left till it was emptied of every movable thing.

One heartrending scene was the following: A battered door was pushed aside, which admitted us to a long passageway; the door at the end of the passageway was in splinters. Passing it, we entered the lower room or kitchen of the house. In the middle of this small room, lying side by side on a mat, were the bodies of two young women, almost naked, and a light covering thrown over their heads. At the other side of the room a grief-stricken woman was trying to make bread from a little flour that had been left. She had to borrow utensils to do it. She left her work and came forward, and answered the first question by removing the covering from their bodies. They were those of young women. A companion of these two had been carried off, and was lying dead in another house. Their lives had been sacrificed in defense of their honor.

The bodies lying in the cemetery are simply wrecks of human beings. Awful cruelty was practiced. The majority have bullet wounds. Nearly all have bayonet, sword, and dagger wounds, some badly mutilated. Two or three were skinned, and some were burned with kerosene. A great many women are missing. Very many dead have been disposed of by the Turks themselves. There are hundreds who have nothing to eat and no means of getting anything. The wounded are being collected. The killed far exceed the wounded. The villages of the plain have suffered awfully. No definite news—only that which columns of smoke told.

The massacre evidently was a prearranged affair. It began all over the city at the same moment. A bugle was sounded, and the soldiers began. They first said, "No harm to women and children," but they soon passed those bounds. A soldier who was on guard says that the order was given by the Porte.

Mr. GALLINGER. In that connection I have a clipping from the New York Sun of December 1 which purports to have been written by an eyewitness of a horrible massacre in Armenia, which I should like to have read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

A MASSACRE IN ARMENIA—ACCOUNT BY AN EYEWITNESS OF THE SLAUGHTER IN BAIBURT VILLAGES.

The following description of scenes accompanying the recent massacres in the villages of Baibурt, in Armenia, is contained in a letter received here from an eyewitness. It was written toward the latter part of October:

"Sunday, October 13, was the first day when the alarm of a general massacre began to spread. Saturday afternoon the dismal news of the advance of 500 armed Lazes reached us. Sunday about a thousand Turks of Baiburt and its vicinity joined the Lazes, and marched from all directions on the Armenian villages. On Monday, October 14, the first attack was made on the village of Lusshonk, 5 or 6 miles from the town of Baiburt. There were about seventy Turkish women with pack horses for carrying away the plunder. The villagers of Lusshonk had taken refuge in the school building, trembling and despairing. The Lazes and others promptly began to seize the cattle and sheep of the Armenians, and after securing them out of harm's way rifled the houses and set on fire the buildings. Then they attacked the schoolhouse. The helpless Armenians inside, men, women, and children, shrieked under a hailstorm of bullets. It was a dark night, and many fell, killed and wounded.

"'For God's sake spare our lives and take all we have.' cried the unfortunate people, but their cries for mercy seemed to more infuriate the butchers. The schoolhouse was set on fire and men, women, and children rushed out, trampling under their feet the fallen dead and wounded.

"A most horrible scene was enacted in front of the schoolhouse. The infuriated Lazes and other marauders, under the lead of the most fanatical chieftains from the city and neighboring villages, surrounded their victims and began to massacre them in cold blood. The son of Haji Khumri, a notorious robber, seized a young man, and, after robbing him of his clothes, ordered the Lazes to fire on him. The young man was shot dead on the spot. Others seized the brother of the first victim, and casting him down on the threshold of the schoolhouse, slaughtered him like a sheep and pierced his dead body with daggers. Moussa, the son of Birinji, from Moushangars, jumped at Nahabed Aslanian, and, taking hold of him, exclaimed:

"'Come here, dog of an infidel; I was looking for you. Come, I will show you how I will kill a dog like you!'

"Saying this, he plunged his kama into his victim and with several turns disemboweled the unfortunate man. Thus the fiendish work of carnage was carried on with heartrending cruelty. At last the leaders of the mob gave the command to separate the men and the women into separate groups under the walls. Five young men, the flower of the village, were selected as victims and burned alive before the eyes of their relatives. Others of the mob robbed the women of all their clothes, committing outrages on them, cutting their hair, spitting in their faces, etc. They were not satisfied with outrages, but killed also Haiganoush, a girl 15 years of age, several women, and three children, from three to five years of age. They killed also Gadariné, the wife of Channers Avakian, who was in an advanced state of pregnancy, and opened her abdomen with a most cruel ferocity. The scenes of horror were repeated in several other places in the same village and in other villages. The Mohammedan women accompanying the hordes of marauders carried away loads of plunder.

"The Armenians had given no provocation for the massacre. The leaders proclaimed openly that they had orders from the Sultan to exterminate the Armenians, and were to have their property as a reward for their services to the Government. It is impossible to give a correct estimate of the loss of life and property, as many villages are now laid waste and the inhabitants are missing. It is not necessary to dwell on the desecrations perpetrated in the churches and the outrages committed on women and young girls. It makes one's heart bleed to see the state of things. The people in the vicinity are in a state of terror, and there are rumors of fresh massacres."

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the traditional policy of this Government is that there shall be no entangling alliances with foreign nations, but I do not understand this to mean that this great people, 75,000,000 of the foremost people of the world, shall take no part in the great efforts that may be made by the civilized nations to suppress outrage, barbarism, and cruelty when it is upon so large a scale that it threatens the civilization and the religions of the world. No record of such barbarity, of massacres so extensive, of cruelties so outraging every sentiment of civilized man is to be found in history as this record of the Turkish massacre of the innocent people of Armenia.

We have proclaimed to the nations of the world that governments are established to preserve the rights of man—the right to liberty, to life, to the pursuit of happiness. We have inscribed that upon the banners of this country, and have proclaimed that we have a Government founded upon this declaration. Now, when all the civilized nations of the world are uniting not only to express their condemnation of this barbarism, but to determine, by force of arms if necessary, to suppress it and to guarantee that civilization shall not be disgraced by its continuance, it is a question for us whether, taking precedence of all others in the advocacy of principles which are for the exaltation of the masses of mankind, we shall refrain from even the expression of encouragement to the civilized powers in the great work which they are undertaking.

This, Mr. President, is no mere ebullition of violence, temporary and transient in its nature. It is a settled purpose on the part of the hordes of Eastern barbarism to suppress the civilization which is based upon the religion and the faith that we profess; and while we have no concern with the religious faith of any people or any individual, we are concerned that the civilization which we represent shall not be overthrown by intolerance, by bigotry, by superstition, by cruelty, and crime of every character. In my judgment, the people of this country can not perform their duty as a civilized nation without taking part in the progress of the human mind toward the suppression of these disorders and these cruelties, which are predicated upon the overthrow of the principles upon which this Government is founded.

If it be true that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, if it be not a falsehood that governments are instituted for these purposes, to preserve and to protect these rights, then when there exists a barbarism based upon principles which destroy and overthrow the very foundations of this Government, it is, in my judgment, the duty of the Senate of the United States and of the House of Representatives, representing the people, to speak in terms of no uncertain meaning as to the purposes and the power and the policy of this Government.

It is a duty we owe to civilization, to religious tolerance, to all the highest and best interests of humanity, to ourselves, and the destiny of the Republic, to aid the progress of the nations toward liberty and fraternity. We should join the powers in breaking the deadlock in Europe and establishing a government over Armenia of her own people strong enough to defend and establish their people in the right and opportunity which our civilization demands. We can not escape the obligation of our duty to the nations of the world, and we should not if we could.

Shall we not join the powers, then, in denouncing and suppressing the cruelties perpetrated on an innocent people in denial of these principles? Shall not the great Republic, speaking the voice of

75,000,000 of the foremost people of the world, speaking the voice of that religion which commands all men to be gentle and easy to be entreated, join the powers in staying the waves of that new barbarism, far greater and crueler than those of the Goths in their invasion of Rome, with which the hordes of the East threaten to invade Christendom and with intolerant bigotry extinguish with torch and dagger and brutal crime and outrage the religion of the Cross—our faith—for that of Mohammed?

Our Republic, which has proclaimed to the nations peace and good will among men, human rights, and the exaltation of the masses, should not withhold its great power when the nations are joining together and asserting their power to suppress the crime and cruelty which brutalizes the race and destroys alike civilization and religion in the fire of superstition and religious intolerance and bigotry, nor refuse agreement with foreign nations to suppress the oppression, the cruelty, and the barbarism of despotic rule over the people of other lands. We made treaty agreements with foreign countries to suppress the African slave trade, and this establishes a precedent which authorizes and demands the like action as to any other equal cruelties and barbarism, and demands that our country, with its great power, should join the civilized nations.

With these observations, I ask that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I hope they will report it favorably. Let us take our place among the nations of the world, if not for entangling alliances, at least for the assertion of the principles which are necessary to protect our civilization itself against the barbarism that threatens it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, in the absence of objection.

CONGRESSIONAL FUNERALS.

Mr. FAULKNER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. PEFFER. If the Senator will withdraw the motion a moment, unless it is the intention of the Senator to have the Senate resume its legislative session, as I want to submit some remarks at some time upon the first bill on the Calendar, and am ready to proceed to-day and shall probably not occupy more than forty minutes at the outside, I may as well do it now as at any other time.

Mr. FAULKNER. If the Senator from Kansas desires to submit his remarks now I will withdraw the motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from West Virginia is withdrawn, and the Chair lays before the Senate the first bill on the Calendar, which is the bill referred to by the Senator from Kansas.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during sessions of Congress.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask that the bill may be read at length.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever, during a session of the Congress of the United States, a member of the Senate or House of Representatives shall die at any place within the District of Columbia, the House of which he was a member shall appoint a special committee of its members to properly prepare and incase the body of the deceased and forward it, in charge of a sergeant-at-arms specially appointed, to the home of the deceased, and deliver it to his family, or to his relatives or friends in case he had no family.

SEC. 2. That no action or proceeding requiring the expenditure of public money, other than is herein provided for, shall be taken or had in case of the death of any Senator or Representative.

SEC. 3. That the expenses necessarily incurred in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be paid, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, on vouchers certified by the chairman of the committee that prepared the remains, and by the sergeant-at-arms who delivered them, and approved by the presiding officer of the proper House.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, my attention was first drawn to the subject of Congressional funerals by criticisms in the newspaper press. Two objections were urged to the custom—one, that it was expensive; the other, that it partook more of the character of joyous excursions than of funeral processions, and hence sometimes lacks that decorum which is regarded as especially appropriate on such occasions.

Since becoming a member of this body I have had opportunities to witness the elaborate preparations and the expensive proceedings incident to these occasions. I was a member of the committee that accompanied the remains of my colleague, Senator Plumb, to the home of his family in Kansas, and had an opportunity to see for myself that such a proceeding, conducted as that was, not only in every respect decorously, but economically, as such things go, is necessarily very expensive. The money paid out of the Treasury on account of Senator Plumb's funeral, and on vouchers that I as chairman of the committee approved, amounted to upward of $3,000, equal to the estimated value of an average American farm.

From that time forward I gave the matter more thought. I found that, although the home of Senator Plumb was about 1,400 miles from Washington, the expense attending his obsequies were much less than the average of similar occasions in recent years. The aggregate seemed very large to be taken out of the public Treasury without some constitutional warrant, and I made up my mind the custom ought to be discontinued.

Some interesting facts will develop as the history of the contingent fund of the Senate is examined. It is out of the contingent fund that these funeral expenses are paid. Every permanent legislative body provides a contingent fund from which to draw in cases of emergency and when it is not practicable to await the slow action of parliamentary procedure in legislation. There are times and occasions when action becomes necessary, and what is done must be done promptly. So, too, there are many things, small in themselves, which legislative bodies require for their comfort or convenience, that can be better provided for as occasions arise than if intrusted to the deliberations of the body when enacting laws.

The furnishing of a committee room is a small matter, but it is one of the necessary adjuncts of a legislature, and an intelligent janitor knows better what to provide than the Senate or House does. There are a great many little details connected with the equipment of a great building that has been erected and partitioned especially for legislative purposes, and these must necessarily be in large measure left to the discretion of officers appointed to look after such things.

It happens, sometimes, that a foreign dignitary visits our country, and when he arrives at the seat of government, if Congress is in session, it is properly expected that some public and official manifestation of respect will be shown. This is attended with expense, and as it was not foreseen, and therefore was not specifically provided for in appropriation bills, it must be paid out of moneys set apart for contingencies. Such an occasion was presented in the case of Louis Kossuth in 1852.

In order to provide in advance for all contingencies that may require the expenditure of money on short notice by legislatures and by the executive departments of States and nations, certain appropriations are made in advance, to be available as occasion may require, and these amounts are known as contingent funds.

The setting apart of public moneys for "contingent expenses" is old, much older than the Government of the United States. It was a custom in the British Parliament, and it descended from that body, through the Continental Congress, to us.

It was ordered August 28, 1777, "That $3,000 be advanced to the President of Congress, he to be accountable," and when President Hancock resigned it was found that there was due him $1,392.32 "for expenditures by him for the use of Congress."

When Henry Laurens was chosen President of the Congress it was ordered, November 19, 1777, "That $1,000 be advanced to the President to pay expresses and other contingent expenses, for which he is to be accountable," etc.

In an appropriation act of the First Congress of the United States, approved by President Washington, is found an item of "contingent expenses for defraying the expenses of the civil list under the late and present Government."

An appropriation act for the support of Government for the year 1793 provided "for the expenses of firewood, stationery, printing work, and all other contingent expenses of the two Houses of Congress, $9,552."

This common appropriation of money for the contingent expenses of the Senate and the House of Representatives was continued until 1831, the amount appropriated gradually increasing. In the "act making appropriations for the support of Government for the year 1831," the appropriation for contingent expenses was divided, as follows:

"For stationery, fuel, printing, and all other incidental and contingent expenses of the Senate, $29,685."

"For stationery, fuel, printing, and all other incidental and contingent expenses of the House of Representatives, $100,000."

"The said two sums last named to be applied to the payment of the ordinary expenditures of the Senate and House of Representatives, severally, and to no other purpose."

It was from the "contingent fund" that Senators, in the early days of the Republic, were supplied, at the public expense, with newspapers of their own selection. "Stationery was supplied them without limit, and they used large quantities of English-laid gilt-edged letter paper at $8 per ream, and of English hot-pressed quarto post paper at $9 per ream. Penknives were purchased every session by the dozen, with silver pencil cases, seals, memorandum books, wafer boxes, and other articles known as stationery, because they are sold by stationers. When committees of the Senate or its Secretary had occasion to wait on the President of the United States their hack hire was paid from the 'contingent money.'"

It appears that a good many articles used by Senators and paid for out of the "contingent fund" were hardly such as would reasonably be regarded necessary aids in legislation. In looking over the many lists from year to year in the early years of the Senate I find wine, brandy, Cognac, almonds, raisins, sirup, soda water, etc.

In calling attention to these charges against the contingent

fund, it is not my object to excite ridicule, but to show that, whatever things were regarded at that time as properly coming within the meaning of contingent expenses, funeral processions extending hundreds and thousands of miles over the country were not among the number. In the early history of Congress there were no public expenses incurred on account of the death of a Senator. Twenty years passed before the first item appears.

Francis Malbone, a Senator from Rhode Island, died at Washington, June, 1809, and his remains were buried in the Congressional Cemetery. Most of the Senators, very properly, attended the funeral services, and the part they took was necessarily attended with some expense. Among the items charged to the account of the contingent fund for such expenses were 16 pounds of crackers, $3, and 11¼ pounds cheese, $2.81. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate allowed the cracker item, but not that of cheese.

The second instance of charge on this account does not appear until the year 1826, although up to that time 22 Senators had died. Three Senators died during the year 1826, and the aggregate public expenditure on account of the three deaths was $877.41. During the next eleven years 10 Senators died, and no charge was made against the contingent fund in any of the cases but one, and that amounted to only $682.75.

Down to the year 1847, 48 Senators had died, and in only 11 cases did their deaths occasion any outlay from the Senate contingent fund.

I have procured from the Secretary of the Senate a list of the names of Senators who died while in office since the organization of the body in April, 1789, and the amounts of money expended by the Senate on account thereof. It was a laborious work to go back through the records of every session of Congress covering one hundred and six years and look up the various items. But the Secretary and his faithful assistants performed it patiently, and I have no doubt they have done it accurately, except as to the case of Mr. Malbone, which was overlooked.

This is the list, showing the names of Senators, the States they represented, the date of their deaths, and, in each case where any public expense was incurred, the amount.

UNITED STATES SENATE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., November 23, 1895.

The following is a list of the Senators who died during their term of service, showing the date of their death and the expenses incurred by the Senate in each case. It is proper to say that many of the Senators died at their home residence and during the recess of Congress:

Date.	Congress.	Session.	Name.	State.	Amount.
Mar. 12, 1790	1	2	William Grayson	Virginia	
July 23, 1793	3	1	Roger Sherman	Connecticut	
July 16, 1798	5	2	Joshua Clayton	Delaware	
Jan. 24, 1799	5	3	Henry Tazewell	Virginia	
Nov. 3, 1802	7	2	John E. Calhoun	South Carolina	
May 10, 1803	8	1	Steven T. Mason	Virginia	
Oct. 29, 1804	8	2	Samuel J. Potter	Rhode Island	
Mar. 19, 1806	9	1	James Jackson	Georgia	
July 19, 1807	10	1	Uriah Tracy	Connecticut	
Mar. 4, 1807	10	1	Abraham Baldwin	Georgia	
Nov. 4, 1809	11	1	Samuel White	Delaware	
May 3, 1814	13	1	Nicholas Gilman	New Hampshire	
Dec. 30, 1814	13	3	Richard Brent	Virginia	
Nov. 23, 1817	15	1	William C. C. Claiborne	Louisiana	
Apr. 23, 1819	16	1	Alexander C. Hanson	Maryland	
Dec. 25, 1820	16	2	James Burrill, jr	Rhode Island	
Dec. 13, 1821	17	1	William A. Trimble	Ohio	
Feb. 25, 1822	17	1	William Pinkney	Maryland	
Oct. 8, 1823	18	1	Elijah Boardman	Connecticut	
Sept. 7, 1824	18	2	Nicholas Ware	Georgia	
Aug. 20, 1824	18	2	John Taylor	Virginia	
Jan. 25, 1826	19	1	Henry Chambers	Alabama	
May 19, 1826	19	1	Nicholas Van-Dyke	Delaware	$877.41
Aug. 19, 1826	19	2	Joseph McIlvaine	New Jersey	
Feb. 26, 1826	19	2	John Gaillard	South Carolina	
Nov. 26, 1829	21	1	Thomas B. Reed	Mississippi	
July 2, 1830	21	1	Robert H. Adams	do	
Oct. 14, 1830	21	2	John McLane	Illinois	
Feb. 26, 1831	21	2	James Noble	Indiana	682.75
May 19, 1833	23	1	Josiah S. Johnstone	Louisiana	
June 15, 1833	23	1	Alexander Buckner	Missouri	
Dec. 6, 1835	24	1	Nathan Smith	Connecticut	
Dec. 11, 1835	24	1	Elias K. Kane	Illinois	
Oct. 5, 1836	24	2	Robert H. Goldsborough	Maryland	
Nov. 24, 1837	25	2	Joseph Kent	do	
Apr. 7, 1840	26	1	Thaddeus Betts	Connecticut	746.12
Oct. 29, 1840	26	1	John S. Spence	Maryland	
Dec. 19, 1840	26	2	Felix Grundy	Tennessee	
Jan. 29, 1842	27	2	Nathan F. Dixon	Rhode Island	758.40
June 26, 1842	27	2	Samuel L. Southard	New Jersey	699.50
Mar. 27, 1843	28	1	Samuel McRoberts	Illinois	
Oct. 3, 1843	28	1	Lewis F. Linn	Missouri	
Aug. 15, 1844	28	2	William S. Fulton	Alabama	
Mar. 16, 1845	29	1	Isaac C. Bates	Massachusetts	406.00
Dec. 29, 1846	29	2	Alexander Barrow	Louisiana	791.65
Jan. 12, 1847	29	2	Isaac S. Pennybacker	Virginia	772.80
May 5, 1847	31	1	Jesse Speight	Mississippi	
Nov. 2, 1847	30	1	Jabez W. Huntington	Connecticut	
Dec. 24, 1847	30	1	John Fairfield	Maine	1,072.25
Apr. 29, 1848	30	1	Chester Ashley	Arkansas	1,505.42
Oct. 25, 1848	30	2	Dixon H. Lewis	Alabama	217.75
Mar. 31, 1850	31	1	John C. Calhoun	South Carolina	3,106.47
May 29, 1850	31	1	Franklin H. Elmore	do	1,726.10
June 29, 1852	32	1	Henry Clay	Kentucky	5,447.02
Oct. 4, 1852	32	2	James Whitcomb	Indiana	171.25
Jan. 14, 1853	32	2	William Upham	Vermont	1,119.50
Nov 15, 1853	33	1	Charles G. Atherton	New Hampshire	
Jan. 11, 1855	33	2	Moses Norris	do	828.83
July 29, 1856	34	1	Thomas J. Rusk	Texas	$4.50
Nov. 9, 1856	34	3	John M. Clayton	Delaware	
May 25, 1857	35	1	Andrew P. Butler	South Carolina	4.50
May 23, 1857	35	1	James Bell	New Hampshire	4.50
May 6, 1858	35	1	Josiah J. Evans	South Carolina	906.02
June 4, 1858	35	1	James P. Henderson	Texas	541.45
Sept. 16, 1859	36	1	David C. Broderick	California	
June 3, 1861	37	1	Stephen A. Douglas	Illinois	
Oct. 5, 1861	37	2	Kingsley S. Bingham	Michigan	
Oct. 21, 1861	37	2	Edward D. Baker	Oregon	902.00
Sept. 12, 1862	37	3	John R. Thomson	New Jersey	
Dec. 20, 1862	37	3	James A. Pearce	Maryland	
Jan. 2, 1864	38	1	Lemuel J. Bowden	Virginia	430.50
Feb. 13, 1865	38	2	Thomas H. Hicks	Maryland	2,235.38
Nov. 8, 1865	39	1	Jacob Collamer	Vermont	
Mar. 28, 1866	39	1	Solomon Foot	do	4,399.57
July 11, 1866	39	1	James H. Lane	Kansas	
Nov. 1, 1866	39	2	William Wright	New Jersey	
Mar. 30, 1867	40	1	George R. Riddle	Delaware	1,021.58
Sept. 8, 1869	41	2	William P. Fessenden	Maine	
July 13, 1870	41	2	Daniel S. Norton	Minnesota	939.49
Sept. 22, 1872	42	3	Garrett Davis	Kentucky	
Mar. 11, 1874	43	1	Charles Sumner	Massachusetts	4,687.99
Feb. 5, 1875	43	2	William A. Buckingham	Connecticut	393.40
July 31, 1875	44	1	Andrew Johnson	Tennessee	
Nov. 21, 1875	44	1	Orris S. Ferry	Connecticut	297.70
July 25, 1876	44	1	Allen T. Caperton	West Virginia	1,286.01
Sept. 20, 1877	45	1	Lewis V. Bogy	Missouri	
Nov. 1, 1877	45	1	Oliver P. Morton	Indiana	750.30
Nov. 1, 1879	46	2	Zachariah Chandler	Michigan	81.80
Dec. 31, 1879	46	2	George S. Houston	Alabama	1,064.67
Feb. 24, 1881	47	1	Matthew H. Carpenter	Wisconsin	3,012.34
Sept. 13, 1881	47	1	Ambrose E. Burnside	Rhode Island	1,176.25
Aug. 16, 1882	47	2	Benjamin H. Hill	Georgia	804.50
Sept. 2, 1884	48	2	Henry B. Anthony	Rhode Island	2,174.13
Mar. 8, 1886	49	1	John F. Miller	California	3,532.34
Oct. 8, 1886	49	2	Austin F. Pike	New Hampshire	1,414.65
Dec. 26, 1886	49	2	John A. Logan	Illinois	1,819.84
May 3, 1890	51	1	James B. Beck	Kentucky	4,453.45
Feb. 28, 1891	51	2	George Hearst	California	21,322.55
Dec. 20, 1891	52	1	Preston B. Plumb	Kansas	3,082.75
Feb. 24, 1892	52	1	Ephraim K. Wilson	Maryland	2,332.84
May 14, 1892	52	1	John S. Barbour	Virginia	759.08
Dec. 15, 1892	52	2	Randall L. Gibson	Louisiana	1,888.44
Jan. 11, 1893	52	2	John E. Kenna	West Virginia	3,117.50
June 21, 1893	53	1	Leland Stanford	California	
Mar. 26, 1894	53	2	Alfred H. Colquitt	Georgia	2,852.98
Apr. 14, 1894	53	2	Zebulon B. Vance	North Carolina	4,438.66
Apr. 30, 1894	53	2	Francis B. Stockbridge	Michigan	1,171.92
Total					100,234.80

The American people are not stingy, and they do not favor a cheeseparing policy in any case. We are a liberal people, and we are intensely patriotic. We have been taught to respect those in authority, and we believe in paying due respect to the memory of the distinguished dead. If we criticise a case of public expenditure on any such occasion it is because of what is useless in the account rather than the amount which is reasonably appropriate. And in what seem to be proper cases we will bear heavy drafts without complaint. On the occasion of Louis Kossuth's visit to the capital of our country, Congress paid him and the cause of Hungary great respect. No objection was made to the expenditure of money on account of his entertainment; but there was a protest against the pernicious application of public moneys to certain scandalous uses. And this is not to be wondered at when we read this bill of items in one account:

J. P. and M. Brown, board of Governor Kossuth and suite, having 10 parlors and 22 chambers, 13½ days, 23 persons	$3,588.00
Champagne, sherry, madeira, postage, cigars, lemonade, bar bill, washing, medicine, post-office stamps, porterage and messengers, hack hire paid at different times, telegraphs, sugar, brandy and whisky in room, porter and ale, envelopes, barber's bill, amounting in all to	658.83
Bill for the carriages engaged for the Governor and suite	319.50
	4,566.33

And in case of the death of a great American, distinguished as a soldier or a civilian, the people expect some official attention paid to it, and that, too, at public expense. In such cases it is only the abuse of discretion and the excessive charges of persons furnishing service or articles of merchandise, that develops unfavorable criticism. When President Garfield was disabled by

an assassin, the country would not have been satisfied with any treatment of the case short of the utmost that could be done not only to save the man's life, but to manifest our appreciation of his great office, and to exhibit our loathing toward the wretch who attempted the taking of his life.

The aggregate expense attending the sickness, death, and burial of the President was $39,793.01. The amount might have been much larger and the people would have approved it had all the charges of persons who were specially benefited by the disbursements appeared to be reasonable.

Here is a list of the items and the several amounts paid for them:

Statement showing expenses incurred on account of the illness, death, and burial of the late James A. Garfield, President of the United States, paid from the United States Treasury in December, 1882.

Name of claimant.	Character of service.	Amount.
D. W. Bliss, M. D	Professional	$6,500.00
D. Hayes Agnew, M. D	do	5,000.00
Frank H. Hamilton, M. D	do	5,000.00
Robert Reyburn, M. D	do	4,000.00
Silas A. Boynton, M. D	do	4,000.00
Susan A. Edson, M. D	do	3,000.00
James W. Walsh	Embalming	75.00
Charles A. Benedict	Undertaker	700.00
Henry S. Little, receiver New Jersey Central R. R.	Laying special track and running special trains.	1,500.00
C. T. Jones	Hotel bill at Elberon	1,162.75
George W. Knox	Transporting baggage	13.00
R. K. Helphenstine	Druggist's supplies	250.00
G. G. C. Sims	do	78.85
W. S. Thompson	do	13.15
George Tiemann & Co	Surgical supplies	85.27
Charles Fischer	Surgical instruments	186.12
Whyte & Overman	Iron trough	16.80
Independent Ice Co	Ice	1,176.00
Milne & Proctor	Furniture	162.55
Singleton & Hoeke	Carpet, etc	122.44
Hooe Bros. & Co	Tarleton	4.06
Louis H. Schneider	Hardware	7.59
W. B. Moses & Son	Draping private residence	40.35
National Capital Telephone Co	Rental of instrument, etc	50.00
H. L. Cranford	Sprinkling grounds	270.00
Ralph S. Jennings	Cooling apparatus	939.08
William T. Crump	Extra services, steward	300.00
O. L. Pruden	Extra services, assistant secretary.	$200.00
William H. Crook	Extra services, clerk	200.00
Charles M. Hendley	do	200.00
Warren S. Young	do	200.00
Henry C. Morton	do	200.00
E. S. Densmore	Extra services, sergeant police.	200.00
H. L. Atchison	Extra services, policeman	200.00
O. L. Judd	Extra services, telegraph operator.	150.00
Joseph Bolway	Extra services, clerk	150.00
Charles Loeffler	Extra services, doorkeeper	150.00
Daniel Sprigg	Extra services, body servant.	150.00
Isaiah Lancaster	Extra services, waiter	150.00
J. T. Rickard	Extra services, doorkeeper	150.00
A. C. Smith	do	150.00
Charles H. Lemos	Extra services, clerk	150.00
George W. Constantine	Extra services, machinist	150.00
B. F. Montgomery	Extra services, telegraph operator.	125.00
Walter R. Duke	Extra services, clerk	100.00
William D. Allen	Extra services, usher	100.00
A. T. Donn	Extra services, doorkeeper	100.00
Thomas Dolan	Extra services, mounted messenger.	100.00
James Sheridan	Extra services, messenger	100.00
Edgar R. Beckley	do	100.00
Arthur Simmons	do	100.00
William H. Bailey	do	100.00
John F. Guy	Extra services, lieutenant police.	100.00
William H. Du Bois	Extra services, policeman	100.00
William H. Lewis	do	100.00
Thomas S. Herbert	Extra services, fireman	75.00
Beverly R. Lemos	Extra services, waiter	75.00
Jeremiah Smith	Extra services, house cleaner	75.00
Abraham W. Dyson	Extra services, messenger	75.00
Fred R. Moore	do	75.00
William S. Dupee	do	75.00
Charles H. Lee	do	75.00
William Gwin	do	75.00
Mary White	Extra services, laundress	75.00
Ella White	do	60.00
William S. Crawford	Extra services, driver	50.00
Samuel H. Collins	Extra services, policeman	50.00
Washington Jones	Extra services, watchman	50.00
William Anderson	Extra services, laborer	50.00
Henry Pfister	Extra services, gardener	30.00
James Wilson	Extra services, waiter	30.00
George Anderson	Extra services, coachman	20.00
James A. Watt	Extra services, gardener	20.00
Noel Steffani	do	20.00
Margaret Nugent	Extra services, cook	20.00
William Willis	Extra services, hostler	15.00
James Simms	do	15.00
William Tillet	Extra services, laborer	15.00
Charles Gottenkieny	do	15.00
Arnold Frye	do	15.00
Patrick Donnelly	do	15.00
Total		39,793.01

And a like liberal policy would be approved if applied in cases of the deaths of Senators and Representatives who had greatly distinguished themselves by long and useful service and who had been long near the people's hearts and close to the public conscience—great men to whom the country, without regard to party or sect, felt indebted. It might be, however, that more or less embarrassment would attend even the most impartial and patriotic selection in such cases. Conditions might exist which partial friends would misconstrue into a public clamor that, in fact, were no more than manifestations of local or partisan pride. To avoid even the appearance of evil, therefore, it is better to make no exceptions and to abolish utterly the custom of Congressional funerals.

It is eminently appropriate that some action be taken by every great constitutional body of large membership in case of the death of one of its members during a session. This is true, because in most if not in all cases the home of the deceased is not near the capital and within constant reach of his family, who could not therefore be always at hand in case of accident or death. The average distance of the homes of Senators from the city of Washington is not less than 1,000 miles. The average in cases of members of the House of Representatives is not so large, because, while there are two Senators from each State, the new as well as the old, Representatives are apportioned according to population, and the most populous States do not lie very far away. Seven hundred miles is about the average distance of Congressmen's homes from the capital. Some prompt and suitable proceedings ought, therefore, in every case be had when a member of either House of Congress dies when that body is in session.

But beyond what is provided for in this bill there is no need of anything. While Senators and Representatives are officers provided for in the Constitution, and are therefore officers of the United States, they are sent here by and for their respective States and Congressional districts therein. Senators are chosen by the legislatures of the States, and Representatives are elected by the people of their respective districts. They are each and all of them selected to represent their local constituencies in bodies that represent the whole country. Most of these representative men, Senators and Congressmen alike, though in general popular at home and held in high esteem by their neighbors and the whole people of their States or districts, are not known far away and never acquire national fame. The demise of such men is in all cases an event of great moment to the people whose representative they were, but the nation at large does not feel the shock and therefore does not take notice of it.

And because of the local reputation of the deceased, and because his worth as a man and the measure of his public and private virtues are best known by those who have honored him with their confidence, it would seem that, if any elaborate ceremonies are to be provided at public expense on the occasion of his death, the State legislature ought to provide a fund for that purpose.

At first the remains of such Senators only as died at the capital during a session of Congress were interred at the public expense. But latterly the custom has been for a committee, if Congress is in session, to be sent to attend the funeral, if a member of either House dies at his home or away from Washington when Congress is in session, and if the death occurs during a recess the Sergeant-at-Arms organizes a party and attends without special order.

Two instances of this kind happened during the year 1894. Senator Stockbridge, of Michigan, died at his home when Congress was in session, and Hon. Myron B. Wright, of Pennsylvania, a member of the House, died during a recess of Congress. A committee was sent, by order of the Senate, to be present at the burial services of Mr. Stockbridge, and a party made up by the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives attended at the interment of the body of Mr. Wright. The public expenditures in these two cases amounted to $2,586.72—Stockbridge, $1,171.92; Wright, $1,414.80.

It will be observed that the custom is growing more expensive. And this not merely because the membership of the Senate and House is larger now than it was formerly and therefore more deaths among the members would naturally take place, but it appears also that the expenses of individual cases are much heavier of late years than they were when the custom was young.

It costs more now to send a party to witness the burial of a deceased Senator or Representative that died at home than it did, not many years ago, to start the funeral procession from Washington and bring it back.

An analysis of the report furnished me by the Secretary of the Senate shows some interesting and instructive facts. It appears that the first Senator who died during his term was William Grayson, of Virginia, whose death occurred March 1, 1790. The whole number of deaths of Senators while in office from the beginning of the Government to the present time is 107. The first time a deceased Senator's funeral expenses were borne by Congress was on the occasion of the death of John Gaillard, of South Carolina, who died February 26, 1826. Two other Senators died that year—Nicholas Van Dyke, of Delaware, May 19, and Joseph McIlvaine, of New Jersey, August 19.

The total number of Senators whose funeral expenses were provided for out of the contingent fund of the Senate is 73, at an aggregate cost of $100,234.80; the average being $1,373.18.

During the first thirty-seven years of the Senate's history 22 of its members died, and no expense was incurred by Congress on account thereof.

Within the next twenty-two years, or from 1826 to 1847, inclusive, 27 Senators died, and the remains of 11 of them were interred at the expense of the Government, at an average cost of $618.80.

The average cost of the first three Senatorial funerals was $292.47, and the homes of the deceased were in Delaware, New Jersey, and South Carolina, respectively.

The first death in the Senate that occasioned an outlay exceeding $1,000 was that of John Fairchild, of Maine, who died December 24, 1847. The total expense in that case was $1,072.25.

From 1848 to 1867, inclusive, 28 Senators died, and 18 of them were buried by Congress, at an average expense of $1,398.46.

The record from 1869 to 1894, inclusive, shows thirty deaths in the Senate, and all but five of these were the occasion of less or more public expenditure, the aggregate being $68,855.57, an average of $2,754.22.

The last ten Senatorial funerals cost $45,420.19, an average of $4,542.02.

The funerals of deceased Senators during the last ten years, from 1885 to 1894, inclusive, cost $2,069.60 more than one-half the entire expense of all such occasions during the whole period of the Senate's existence, and $4,139.20 more than all the rest from 1790 to 1884, inclusive, a period of ninety-five years.

In other words, of the 73 burials from the Senate the last 13 cost $4,139.20 more than all of the other 60.

Three cases, those of Thomas J. Rusk, of Texas, who died July 29, 1856, Andrew P. Butler, of South Carolina, whose death occurred May 25, 1857, and James Bell, of New Hampshire, whose death is recorded as having taken place May 26, 1857, cost the Government $4.50 each. These are the smallest amounts charged to account of deaths of Senators.

The largest amount expended in any one case on this account was on the occasion of the death of George Hearst, of California. The items in that case when collected and footed up show an aggregate of $21,322.55.

Among the curious things which appear from the record of these funeral expenses is that the difference in cost does not appear to be governed by the distance of the home of the deceased Senator from the capital. A few instances may be cited to make this point clear:

1846. Alexander Barrow, of Louisiana	$791.65
1847. Isaac S. Pennybacker, Virginia	772.80
1850. John C. Calhoun, South Carolina	3,106.47
1852. Henry Clay, Kentucky	5,447.02
1858. Josiah J. Evans, South Carolina	906.02
1858. James P. Henderson, Texas	541.45
1874. Charles Sumner, Massachusetts	4,687.94
1879. George S. Houston, Alabama	1,064.67
1886. John F. Miller, California	3,532.34
1891. George Hearst, California	21,322.55
1891. Preston B. Plumb, Kansas	3,082.75
1893. John E. Kenna, West Virginia	3,117.50
1894. Alfred H. Colquitt, Georgia	2,852.98
1894. Zebulon B. Vance, North Carolina	4,438.66

The Clerk of the House of Representatives found that the labor of procuring a complete list of deceased members of that body and an itemized statement of expenditures on account of their deaths was more than he could well spare from the force at his command, and I have only a list of those members who died during the years 1890 to 1894. These are the names and amounts in each case:

CLERK'S OFFICE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., November 21, 1895.

SIR: In compliance with your request for a statement showing the funeral expenses of deceased members of the House of Representatives for some years past, I give you below the amounts of the disbursements made on that account from the contingent fund of the House from December 8, 1891, to this date, that covering the period during which I have served as Clerk of the House, to wit:

Account funeral Hon. James Phelan	$345.80
Account funeral Hon. F. B. Spinola	1,130.42
Account funeral Hon. A. K. Craig	692.35
Account funeral Hon. John G. Warwick	1,181.02
Account funeral Hon. J. W. Kendall	2,156.56
Account funeral Hon. E. T. Stackhouse	1,688.40
Account funeral Hon. W. H. F. Lee	546.50
Account funeral Hon. L. C. Houk	936.70
Account funeral Hon. W. H. Enochs	847.60
Account funeral Hon. J. L. Chipman	2,308.40
Account funeral Hon. William Lilly	978.58
Account funeral Hon. Charles O'Neill	1,005.46
Account funeral Hon. G. W. Houk	1,845.09
Account funeral Hon. William Mutchler	1,161.57
Account funeral Hon. Marcus C. Lisle	1,709.07
Account funeral Hon. George B. Shaw	1,776.76
Account funeral Hon. M. B. Wright	1,414.80
Account funeral Hon. P. S. Post	1,963.77
Account funeral Hon. R. F. Brattan	1,060.38
Account funeral Hon. F. Reman	452.70
Account funeral Hon. William Cogswell	1,590.74

In addition thereto there was paid for expenses incidental to the removal of the remains of Hon. James Gillespie, who died January 11, 1805, from the old Presbyterian Cemetery in Georgetown, to the Congressional Cemetery, and for the erection of a monument, the sum of $357. (This expenditure was made under a resolution of the House of April 11, 1892, and the act of May 23, 1876.)

Respectfully,
JAMES KERR.
Clerk of House of Representatives.

Hon. W. A. PEFFER,
United States Senate.

From this statement the following summary is made:

Deaths of members during the years 1890 to 1894, inclusive, numbered	21
Their obsequies cost the Government a total of	$26,792.67
An average of	$1,275.84
During the same four years 11 Senators died, and the average expense of their funeral ceremonies was	$4,542.02
If the same proportion between the number of deaths and amount of funeral expenses in the two Houses obtains through all the other years of the House's history, the total number of deaths among members of that body must have been about	213
And the number of those whose deaths were the occasion of public expenditures was about	145
The aggregate cost to the Government was about	$49,868.40
An average of	$343.92

This, however, is mere guesswork. In the absence of reliable figures it is impracticable to make even a satisfactory estimate. The actual expense could hardly have been less and may have been much more.

As before stated, there are two objections to Congressional funerals: One is the expense; the other is the manner of conducting them. Concerning the second objection, I have but little to say, though it is urged with more vehemence than the first. It has been frequently charged in the press that these funeral proceedings are not usually conducted reverently and with that outward deportment which, according to the average estimate, ought to characterize the bearing of eminent persons who accompany the remains of a public man and are presumed to be in sympathy with the grief of those to whom the body is to be delivered.

I have not collected, nor attempted to collect, any specific information along this line. It is not my purpose, at this time, to pursue the subject in that direction. It will be time to do that if Congress refuses to abolish the custom after its attention is called to facts of record which show how extravagant the charges are for articles used and service employed on these funeral occasions, and how fast the aggregate expense thereof is increasing.

I have examined the report of the Secretary of the Senate so far as it shows the items of expense attending the funeral services of Senator Plumb, of Kansas, and Senator Kenna, of West Virginia, and also the report of the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the cases of Messrs. Houk, of Ohio, and Chipman, of Michigan, members of the House. The aggregate expenditures in each case of the two Senators named is more than a thousand dollars less than the average in such cases during the last ten years, as will be found on comparison of totals in the list before presented.

As to the two members of the House, the average between the totals of expense in their cases is 80 per cent above the House average since 1890.

These four cases are enough to show the range of expenditures usually allowed on these funeral occasions. I shall first take up the case of the late Senator Plumb, of Kansas.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF PRESTON B. PLUMB, OF KANSAS, DECEASED DECEMBER 30, 1891.

[From Report on Expenditures of Senate, 1892 and 1893.]

Jan. 12, 1892. C. B. Reade:

Jan. 11, 1892.

For expenses incurred as assistant sergeant-at-arms of the Senate in accompanying the remains of Preston B. Plumb, late a Senator from the State of Kansas, from Washington, D. C., to Emporia, Kans., under resolution of December 21, 1891, from December 21, 1891, to January 1, 1892, viz—	
Paid for meals and lunches en route for Congressional committee and attendants	$144.50
Paid for telegrams and papers	16.67
Paid for hotel bill at Emporia, Kans	52.50
Paid for hotel bill at St. Louis	15.00
Paid for Pullman fares, Kansas City to St. Louis	24.00
Paid for carriage hire for committee	10.25
Paid for expenses of self from Emporia, Kans., to Washington, D. C., including railroad and Pullman fares and meals en route	35.50

Jan. 12, 1892. C. B. Reade—Continued.
Jan. 11, 1892.
For expenses incurred as assistant sergeant-at-arms of the Senate, etc.—Continued.

Paid to reimburse Senator PEFFER his expenses from Emporia to Washington, D. C	$43.75
Paid to reimburse Senator Dolph his expenses from Emporia to Washington, D. C	12.50
Paid to reimburse Senator Paddock his expenses from Emporia to Washington, D. C	44.75
Paid to reimburse Senator PALMER his expenses from Emporia to Washington, D. C	18.40
Paid to reimburse Hon. E. H. Funston his expenses	47.60
Paid to reimburse Hon. S. W. Peel his expenses	49.45
Paid to reimburse Hon. CASE BRODERICK his expenses	43.00
Paid to reimburse Hon. P. S. Post his expenses	48.24
Paid to reimburse Hon. W. H. Cate his expenses	29.25
Paid to reimburse Hon. H. M. Youmans his expenses	45.90
Paid to reimburse Hon. C. E. Stueven, messenger, his expenses	16.00
	697.26

Jan. 12, 1892. Charles B. Reade:
Jan. 12, 1892.
For expenses incurred as assistant sergeant-at-arms of the Senate, viz—
Cash paid for carriage hire, December 20 and 21, 1891, for the use of the Sergeant-at-Arms's office, on account of the funeral of Preston B. Plumb, late a Senator from the State of Kansas 24.00

Jan. 28, 1892. B. F. Flenniken:
Jan. 27, 1892.
For expenses incurred in accompanying the committee attending the remains of Preston B. Plumb, late a Senator from the State of Kansas, from Washington, D. C., to Emporia, Kans., under resolution of December 21, 1891, viz—
Railroad and Pullman fares, meals, lunches, and carriages en route from Emporia, Kans., to Washington, D. C 45.00

Jan. 28, 1892. Robert A. Parkes, agent Pennsylvania Railroad:
Dec. 21, 1891.
For transportation furnished Senate committee accompanying the remains of the late Senator Plumb from Washington, D. C., to Emporia, Kans, viz—

Transportation of 2 special cars, 18 fares each, 36 tickets, at $21, Washington to St. Louis, Mo	756.00
Transportation of 2 special cars, 18 fares each, 30 tickets. at $9.35, St. Louis to Emporia	280.50
Three fares, Emporia to Washington, D. C., at $29.30	87.90
Twelve fares, Emporia to Kansas City, at $3.75	40.20
Three fares, Kansas City to St. Louis, at $7.50	22.50
One fare, St. Louis to Chicago	7.50
Service of Pullman car, Washington to Emporia	200.00
Commissary supplies en route	153.41
	1,548.01

May 19, 1892. C. Strauss & Co.:
Dec. 21, 1891.
For floral decorations in United States Senate Chamber during funeral obsequies over remains of Preston B. Plumb, late a Senator from the State of Kansas 100.00

Feb. 11, 1892. John R. Wright:
Dec. 21, 1891.
For professional services and materials furnished as undertaker in preparing and embalming the body of Preston B. Plumb, late a Senator from the State of Kansas, viz—

Fine black cloth Judge casket, cedar, full silk lined, oxidized extension handles and polished chestnut box, with plate	400.00
Use of hearse	12.00
Embalming, shaving, and preparing body	55.00
	467.00

Feb. 8, 1892. George B. Palmer:
Dec. 24, 1891.
For professional services and material furnished in reembalming the body of Preston B. Plumb, late a Senator from Kansas, and supervision of remains from arrival at Kansas City, December 23, 1891, until burial at Emporia, December 24, 1891 ..... $150.00

July 12, 1892. Lansburgh & Bro.:
Dec. 21, 1891.
For 1 dozen silk sashes for use of committee attending funeral of late Senator Plumb 46.48
For 2 dozen silk gloves, at $2.50 ..... 5.00
51.48

Total 3,082.75

I have called attention to these items for the purpose of showing in general the character of the supplies that are purchased and the services that are furnished on the average Congressional funeral trip.

Looking over the list of forty-three items in this case, a stranger could not but wonder at not only the array, but the charges. Yet there is not one thing charged for here that is not common on all such occasions, and the charges are none in excess of what is usual. It is not the case of a private citizen who died at his home and whose remains are being disposed of by his neighbors and friends. This is an occasion when a Senator has fallen, and his countrymen, through a committee of Congress, are supposed to be paying homage at the shrine of death. All things must therefore be done elaborately, no matter at what expense, because the people are rich as well as loyal. Charges are in harmony with the other features of the proceedings. Barbers, undertakers, florists, hotel keepers, railroad managers, all perform their work and make their charges on the same grand scale. The public Treasury is, by common usage, treated as a legitimate subject of plunder for all who wish to prey upon it.

I cite the case of Senator Plumb first, because he was my colleague, and because I looked carefully over every item in the list before approving it. One charge of $500 was cut to $150. While as a whole the bill is high, and while the charges for many of the items are excessive, the custom has been so long in vogue that one would be regarded boorish if he objected to bills that are not higher than is usual on such occasions. The best way to get rid of this sort of business is to stop it.

I now present the bill of items in the case of Senator Kenna.

The items will be found to be practically the same as those in the case of Senator Plumb.

The only comment I have to make is that Emporia, Kans., the home of Senator Plumb, is more than a thousand miles farther from Washington than is Charleston, W. Va., the home of Senator Kenna. But, as has happened in many other cases, distance does not count in Congressional funerals. It is nearly 1,400 miles to Emporia, and not to exceed 300 miles to Charleston, and yet the aggregate expense of Senator Plumb's funeral ($3,082.75) was $34.75 less than the cost in the case of Senator Kenna.

ITEMIZED STATEMENT OF FUNERAL EXPENSES OF SENATOR JOHN E. KENNA, OF WEST VIRGINIA, DECEASED JANUARY 11, 1893.

[From Report on Expenditures for United States Senate, 1893.]

Jan. 17, 1893. E. K. Valentine:
For expenses incurred as Sergeant-at-Arms of United States Senate in charge of committee having superintendence of funeral of John E. Kenna, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia, under resolution of January 16, 1893:

Jan. 13, 1893.	
Breakfast for committee at Alderson	$29.75
Use of hearse at Charleston, W. Va	10.00
Use of 26 carriages, depot to hotel, State house, etc	104.00
Jan. 14, 1893.	
Use of hearse	10.00
Use of 30 carriages in attending funeral, and hotel to depot	150.00
Service of undertaker at Charleston, W. Va	56.00
Amount paid Farish & Peyton for rooms and board of committee at Hotel Ruffner	76.50
Porterage and telegrams	10.32
	446.57

Feb. 11, 1893. George P. Zurhorst:
Jan. 13, 1893.
For black broadcloth draped casket, with extension handles 350.00
solid oak shipping case, with copper corners, and plate 50.00
door sash 2.00
embalming and preparing remains 60.00

Feb. 11, 1893. George P. Zurhorst—Continued.	
Jan. 13, 1893.	
personal services to Charleston, W. Va	$45.00
hearse to Capitol and depot	14.00
17 carriages to Capitol and depot, at $3.50	59.50
6 carriages from depot, at $3.50	21.00
	601.50
Mar. 22, 1893. John T. Price & Sons:	
Jan. 12, 1893.	
5 carriages for the use of the committee appointed to attend the funeral of the late Senator Kenna, at $10 each	50.00
Mar. 27, 1893. George M. Bond, city passenger agent Chesapeake and Ohio R. R. Co.:	
Jan. 16, 1893.	
For services rendered joint committee having superintendence of funeral of John E. Kenna, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia, under resolution of January 16, 1893:	
Transportation of three Pullman cars and one combination car, from Washington, D. C., to Charleston, W. Va., and return	1,164.00
Draping car	55.00
Use of Pullman cars Esdras, Adour, and Marlborough, from Washington to Charleston and return	330.00
Commissary supplies, meals, and lunches furnished in cars, including porterage	432.48
	1,981.48
Total	3,079.55

Official statement is $3,117.50.

I present itemized statements of charges on account of the funerals of two members of the House—Messrs. Houk and Chipman—which I referred to some time ago. Here are the items and charges in the case of Mr. Houk, of the House of Representatives, amounting to $1,845.09, though on personal examination I found enough to foot up $1,810.59.

MR. HOUK.

Transportation, Pullman service, and meals to Dayton, Ohio, and return		$937.24
Casket	$350.00	
Copper lining	100.00	
Silver plate	25.00	
Hearse	7.00	
Embalming	50.00	
Cedar case	75.00	
Laying out remains	10.00	
		617.00
8 carriages	64.00	
Funeral car and services	25.00	
Brick grave and marble slab	55.00	
Sexton's services	5.00	
5 carriages	20.50	
Railroad fare and sleeper for Byron F. Ritchie	12.25	
		181.75
Carriage hire, meals en route for Congressional committee, other than buffet service		74.60
Total		1,810.59

Official report, $1,845.09.

In the case of Mr. Chipman, of the House, the Clerk's statement of the aggregate is $2,308.41. The recorded items as I have found them make a total of $2,344.40, or $36 more. At this point I think it is due to the Clerk of the House of Representatives to call attention to the fact that these various items are never found in one place in the report he makes to the body of which he is an officer, and the reason of it is that the bills are presented at different times. The bills of expense which have been incurred by different persons or different companies or different institutions are not presented at the same time or on the same date. Hence in making up the accounts the entries are necessarily made on different days, and between the presenting of the different bills other items occur, so that the following up and the accurate collecting of the various items is an enormous labor, especially when we would carry it through the whole period of our Congressional history. It is no wonder that an occasional error occurs. I make this explanation because I find in one case an item that the Clerk's assistants overlooked. The itemized statement in the case of Mr. Chipman is as follows:

MR. CHIPMAN, MICHIGAN.

One-half dozen glasses	$18.00
Special car	669.39
Pullman service and commissary supplies	492.51
Carriages	$20.00
Room, board, porters' fees, and transportation	145.75
Casket	550.00
Embalming	50.00
24 coaches	75.75
6 professional bearers	18.00
Floral decorations	75.00
Name plate	10.00
Hearse	12.00
Hearse	10.00
Hearse	5.00
Shaving	5.00
Sexton's fees	10.00
Printing	5.00
Pallbearers' invitations	5.00
Canopy at grave	10.00
Grave and decorating	18.00
Soloist and male quartette	35.00
Four clergymen's fees	40.00
Surpliced choir and organist	40.00
Personal services and attendance of undertaker	25.00
Total	2,344.40

Official report, $2,308.40.

If there be any items in this account which more than others will excite wonder, they are probably the charges of a soloist and a male quartette, $35; four clergymen's fees, $40, and a surpliced choir and organist, $40.

Without going further into details, I have shown enough to satisfy everyone who cares to consider the subject at all that the custom of Congressional funerals has grown into an abuse. It is not generally respected as a serious proceeding by the people at large. Indeed, it is hardly ever referred to in respectful terms in any case of public criticism.

But I place my objection on the broad ground that it is not a proper object of public expenditure. Nor ought the contingent fund of either House of Congress be drawn upon for such outlays. Whatever may be, and ought to be, appropriately done on the occasion of the death of a Senator or Member of the House ought to be done as a matter of public decency, and the expenses should be paid out of the public Treasury.

As to those cases where the death occurs at home or away from the capital, or when Congress is not in session, they are not matters that concern the nation so much as to justify any expenditure of public money. Whatever is proper to be done in such cases is for the people at home to do, and Congress ought not to interfere in any manner with that. If members of this or of the other House of Congress wish to attend and participate in the obsequies, at their own expense, nobody will be found to object. Such a personal sacrifice would be good evidence of a devoted friendship. Nothing better illustrates the depth of a man's convictions than that he show his faith by his works. Friendship, if sincere, does not need artificial stimulus to bring it to the surface. Grief comes from the heart—one's own heart; it does not originate in the pockets of other people. The average Congressional funeral, so it is commonly charged, is nothing more than a party of good-natured gentlemen having a good time at the public expense.

I ask the Senate to discontinue this useless and expensive proceeding by the passage of the bill now before the Senate. Since it became known that such a bill was to be introduced I have received many letters and newspaper comments in great number, all concurring in the object sought to be accomplished.

The bill is short, plain in its provisions, and it provides for everything that ought to be done to treat respectfully and reverently every case that merits the attention of Congress.

Unless some other Senator desires to speak to the bill, I ask that it may retain its place on the Calendar as the unfinished business.

Mr. FAULKNER. I understand that the Senator from Kansas does not ask for action on the bill to-day.

Mr. PEFFER. No; I do not. I understand there are several Senators who wish to speak on the subject, and I do not know that they desire to do so at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). In the absence of objection, the bill will retain its place on the Calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. FAULKNER. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 16, 1895, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 12, 1895.

POSTMASTERS.

Mary A. Potter, to be postmaster at South McAlester, in the county of Choctaw Nation, Indian Territory, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Alice H. Groves, to be postmaster at Afton, in the county of Union and State of Iowa, her commission having expired February 14, 1891.

Richard W. Lloyd, to be postmaster at Lake Mills, in the county of Winnebago and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

William W. Merritt, to be postmaster at Red Oak, in the county of Montgomery and State of Iowa, in the place of R. B. Hall, removed.

George F. Parker, to be postmaster at Gladbrook, in the county of Tama and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

William Schneck, to be postmaster at Pomeroy, in the county of Calhoun and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

William W. Shanks, to be postmaster at Odebolt, in the county of Sac and State of Iowa, in the place of Annie B. Matthews, resigned.

John Stirling, to be postmaster at Corydon, in the county of Wayne and State of Iowa, in the place of C. F. Le Compte, removed.

Joseph E. Thorne, to be postmaster at Rockwell City, in the county of Calhoun and State of Iowa, in the place of William T. Condron, resigned.

Enos F. Wenger, to be postmaster at Lisbon, in the county of Linn and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Charles P. Baldwin, to be postmaster at Belleville, in the county of Republic and State of Kansas, in the place of W. A. Brock, whose commission expired February 28, 1895.

Larkin B. Davidson, to be postmaster at Girard, in the county of Crawford and State of Kansas, in the place of Elias A. Wasser, whose commission expired February 14, 1895.

John C. Haskett, to be postmaster at Baxter Springs, in the county of Cherokee and State of Kansas, in the place of A. B. Urick, removed.

Robert Kennedy, to be postmaster at Pleasanton, in the county of Linn and State of Kansas, in the place of Louisa Holmes, removed.

George W. H. Lucas, to be postmaster at Cherokee, in the county of Crawford and State of Kansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Joseph L. Mattingly, to be postmaster at Sedan, in the county of Chautauqua and State of Kansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Albert G. Patrick, to be postmaster at Oskaloosa, in the county of Jefferson and State of Kansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Abner V. C. Grant, to be postmaster at Ludlow, in the county of Kenton and State of Kentucky, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Fletcher A. Jones, to be postmaster at Millersburg, in the county of Bourbon and State of Kentucky, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Frank W. Joplin, to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, in the county of Hardin and State of Kentucky, in the place of Emily T. Helm, whose commission expired January 9, 1895.

Edward W. Weathers, to be postmaster at Elkton, in the county of Todd and State of Kentucky, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Josiah B. Willis, to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Madison and State of Kentucky, in the place of W. A. Powell, removed.

John R. Grinage, to be postmaster at Houma, in the parish of Terrebonne and State of Louisiana, in the place of Morley H. Willis, whose commission expired October 1, 1894.

Benjamin F. Blagdon, to be postmaster at Wiscasset, in the county of Lincoln and State of Maine, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Edgar R. Dow, to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Carrol C. Homer, to be postmaster at Bucksport, in the county of Hancock and State of Maine, in the place of Harry B. Parker, deceased.

Edwin T. Mayberry, to be postmaster at Westbrook, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine, in the place of Nicholas A. Swett, deceased.

Charles Walker, to be postmaster at Lewiston, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine, in the place of William T. Smart, whose commission expired February 14, 1895.

Mary D. Ellegood, to be postmaster at Salisbury, in the county of Wicomico and State of Maryland, in the place of R. D. Ellegood, deceased.

Blanchard Emory, jr., to be postmaster at Centerville, in the county of Queen Anne and State of Maryland, in the place of M. Keating, whose commission expired March 29, 1895.

John C. Hindman, to be postmaster at Rising Sun, in the county of Cecil and State of Maryland, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Daniel E. Kean, to be postmaster at Cumberland, in the county of Allegany and State of Maryland, in the place of J. Schiller, removed.

Alphonso Latchford, to be postmaster at Annapolis Junction, in the county of Howard and State of Maryland, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Charles F. Blodgett, to be postmaster at Stoneham, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of W. A. Bartlett, whose commission expired February 27, 1895.

John E. Doran, to be postmaster at Attleboro Falls, in the county of Bristol and State of Massachusetts, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Lawrence W. Dower, to be postmaster at Easthampton, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Edwin E. Janes, resigned.

John P. Herlihy, jr., to be postmaster at Monson, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts, in the place of G. W. Farrington, deceased.

Alfred D. Hoitt, to be postmaster at Arlington, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of F. E. Fowle, whose commission expired February 14, 1895.

Timothy Howard, to be postmaster at North Brookfield, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in the place of John Rusk, deceased.

John Kirkpatrick, to be postmaster at South Hadley Falls, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts, his commission having expired May 14, 1894.

Thomas H. Mann, to be postmaster at Fitchburg, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in the place of C. E. Wallace, whose commission expired February 14, 1895.

Charles A. Pilling, to be postmaster at North Andover Depot, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Agnes J. Smith, to be postmaster at Stockbridge, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts, her commission having expired January 19, 1895.

John B. Turner, to be postmaster at Newtonville, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, his commission having expired February 14, 1894.

George W. Wales, to be postmaster at Randolph, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, in the place of M. W. Baker, whose commission expired April 19, 1894.

William B. Wickes, to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1894.

Ernest Winsor, to be postmaster at Chestnut Hill, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Maggie Breece, to be postmaster at Three Oaks, in the county of Berrien and State of Michigan, in the place of R. S. Breece, deceased.

Darius R. Crampton, to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Monroe and State of Michigan, in the place of H. R. Austin, whose commission expired February 9, 1895.

Walter S. Goodland, to be postmaster at Ironwood, in the county of Gogebic and State of Michigan, in the place of F. A. Healey, removed.

John Murray, to be postmaster at Port Huron, in the county of St. Clair and State of Michigan, in the place of A. R. Avery, removed.

William E. Powers, to be postmaster at Hastings, in the county of Barry and State of Michigan, in the place of P. A. Sheldon, whose commission expired February 9, 1895.

Fred H. Potter, to be postmaster at Saginaw West Side, in the county of Saginaw and State of Michigan, in the place of Neri B. Kinsey, whose commission expired June 10, 1894.

Alfonzo J. Southard, to be postmaster at Harbor Springs, in the county of Emmet and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

William J. Tully, to be postmaster at Crystal Falls, in the county of Iron and State of Michigan, in the place of S. D. Hollister, jr., resigned.

Warren E. Watson, to be postmaster at Mancelona, in the county of Antrim and State of Michigan, in the place of L. E. Slusser, resigned.

Robert Andrews, to be postmaster at Wells, in the county of Faribault and State of Minnesota, in the place of A. Eaton, whose commission expired January 19, 1895.

William Cordiner, to be postmaster at Princeton, in the county of Millelacs and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

William O. P. Hilsdale, to be postmaster at Sauk Center, in the county of Stearns and State of Minnesota, in the place of J. M. Thompson, whose commission expired December 23, 1894.

Julius Thorson, to be postmaster at Benson, in the county of Swift and State of Minnesota, in the place of Lillie Harter, whose commission expired January 16, 1895.

Abner K. Northrop, to be postmaster at Pass Christian, in the county of Harrison and State of Mississippi, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12, 1895.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

John F. Baker, of Minnesota, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Managua, Nicaragua.

Charles Ritchie Simpkins, of Massachusetts, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to Chile.

PROBATE JUDGES.

F. A. Hammond, of Utah Territory, to be judge of probate in the county of San Juan, in the Territory of Utah.

Joseph Houston, of Utah Territory, to be judge of probate in the county of Garfield, in the Territory of Utah.

George H. Fennemore, of Utah Territory, to be judge of probate in the county of Beaver, in the Territory of Utah.

TERRITORIAL JUDGES.

Yancey Lewis, of Indian Territory, to be judge of the United States court of the central district in the Indian Territory.

William M. Springer, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States court of the northern district in the Indian Territory.

Constantine B. Kilgore, of Texas, to be judge of the United States court of the southern district in the Indian Territory.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Michael Devanney, of Ohio, to be marshal of the United States for the southern district of Ohio.

James M. Martin, of Louisiana, to be marshal of the United States for the western district of Louisiana.

Samuel M. Rutherford, of Indian Territory, to be marshal of the United States court of the northern district in the Indian Territory.

Charles L. Stowe, of Indian Territory, to be marshal of the United States court for the southern district in the Indian Territory.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Andrew C. Cruce, of Indian Territory, to be attorney of the United States court of the southern district in the Indian Territory.

Samuel D. Dodge, of Ohio, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of Ohio.

William J. Horton, of Indian Territory, to be attorney of the United States court for the central district in the Indian Territory.

REGISTER OF WILLS.

J. Nota McGill, of Washington, D. C., to be register of wills for the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 12, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last was read and approved.

REPORTS, ETC., REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following documents; which were severally referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Cape Fear River above Fayetteville, N. C.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Yaquina Bay, Oregon.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Tarpaulin Cove, Naushon Island, Massachusetts.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Great Salt Pond, Block Island, R. I.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Pawcatuck River, Rhode Island.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of San Joaquin River, California.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, with a report of the survey of the harbor of Bridgeport, Conn.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers inclosing a report of surveys of Norwalk Harbor, Connecticut, with accompanying map.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, together with a report of the survey of New Bedford Harbor, Massachusetts.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a communication from the Chief of Engineers, with a report of the survey for determining the cause of the erosion of the easterly end of Galveston Island, Texas.

REPORT OF FREEDMAN'S SAVINGS AND TRUST COMPANY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Commissioner of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company, transmitting his annual report for the year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

EXPENDITURES AT SPRINGFIELD ARMORY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of the expenditures at the Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass., and of the arms fabricated and repaired during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

ARMY DISBURSEMENTS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting reports of inspections of disbursements of officers of the United States Army for the last fiscal year, together with a letter from the Acting Inspector-General relating thereto; which were referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

SINKING FUND OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the annual report of the Treasurer of the United States on the sinking fund and funded debt of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, WAR DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of the receipts and expenditures on account of the appropriation for the contingent expenses of the War Department for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1894 and 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR, UNITED STATES NAVY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the annual report of the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair to the Secretary of the Navy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

WAR DEPARTMENT LIBRARY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the report of the officer in supervisory charge of the War Department library for part of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, of the distribution of Government publications received at the Department; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

PENSIONS AND PENSION APPEALS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the report of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior on pensions and pension appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the annual report of the Treasurer of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

SURVEY OF DUNKIRK HARBOR, NEW YORK.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, a report of the survey of Dunkirk Harbor, New York; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

SURVEY OF WESTPORT HARBOR, CONNECTICUT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, a report of the survey of Westport Harbor, Connecticut; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

SURVEY OF WILMINGTON HARBOR, ETC., DELAWARE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Sec retary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, the report of examination and survey of the harbor at Wilmington and Christiana River, Delaware; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

PAYMENT OF BOILER INSPECTORS, ETC.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a bill for the payment of certain inspectors of boilers and hulls of steam vessels under the Treasury Department; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the work of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey for the year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SALE OF INTOXICATING DRINKS TO INDIANS, ETC.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draft of a bill prepared by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, "to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, and for other purposes;" which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT TESTS OF IRON, STEEL, ETC.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the commanding officer of the Watertown Arsenal of tests of iron, steel, and other materials for industrial purposes made with the United States testing machines during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

WAR CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the cases of L. L. Wallace, administrator, William F. Perry, Tobias Tenpenny, and Luke Lee against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT TILL MONDAY.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution for filling a vacancy in the Board of Regents, Smithsonian Institution.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than members of Congress, shall be filled by the appointment of William L. Wilson, of West Virginia, in place of Henry Coppée, deceased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. ADAMS. I object.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman will allow me to state that it is very essential that there should be no delay in filling this vacancy. As the gentleman is aware, Professor Coppée was a member of the executive committee, and his death many months since left a vacancy which it is very important should be promptly filled. The Secretary of the Institution is very much interested in this matter, and regards it as very important that this resolution be acted upon at once. It is absolutely essential to have an executive committee all the members of which are in easy access to Washington. It is the intention for Mr. Wilson to fill this vacancy in the committee, and it is important that it should be full at this time, so that the reports may be prepared for the annual meeting. I regret that any member of this Congress should interpose an objection to deprive the Smithsonian of the services of so valuable a man as we all know Mr. Wilson to be, and I regret that objection should be interposed in a case of a member of Congress whose services has been so long and distinguished, and whom we all so much respect.

Mr. HOPKINS. Let the resolution go over until to-morrow.

Mr. DINGLEY. Monday.

Mr. ADAMS. This is too important a matter to be allowed to pass without reference to a committee. Propositions of this kind have always been referred to the Library Committee, which acts jointly with the corresponding committee of the Senate. Questions of this kind have always been discussed in the joint committee. The appointment of a regent is a serious matter, not a thing to be done hastily; and while I am willing to concede the high character of the gentleman named in this resolution, still I must object to a proceeding not in the regular course.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to say to the gentleman that resolutions of this character have frequently been passed without reference to a committee, even though committees were organized at the time. Especially has this been the case in the Senate. Right before me, page 228 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Fifty-second Congress, second session, is an instance I will read:

Mr. MORRILL. I introduce a joint resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was to appoint a regent, and it was immediately passed, without discussion or the slightest objection. I hope the gentleman will not insist, as we have no session to-morrow and it will have to go over until Monday.

Mr. ADAMS. I must insist, Mr. Speaker, on my objection. I differ with the gentleman as to the practice of which he speaks.

SCHOONER HENRY CROSBY.

Mr. FISCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the schooner *Henry Crosby*, a vessel duly enrolled under the laws of the United States, and commanded by Abel T. Stubbs, a citizen thereof, was fired upon by troops of the Republic of Santo Domingo, while at anchor, flying the American flag, at Azua, in said Republic of Santo Domingo, on the 10th day of December, 1893, and members of its crew shot and seriously wounded, and property belonging to the vessel destroyed; and

Whereas the owners, officers, and crew of said vessel have petitioned the Department of State for indemnity for such injury and loss and have received no relief:

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate to the House of Representatives, if not in his opinion incompatible with the public interests, the diplomatic and consular correspondence and the correspondence between the Government of the United States and the owners, officers, or crew, their agents or attorneys, and all other reports or correspondence relating to said attack and claim demanded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I think that should go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I must object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be, and is hereby, requested to furnish for the information of the House of Representatives a report for the last fiscal year of the expense and emolument accounts rendered by the following officers:

Clerks of circuit and district courts of the various districts in the States and Territories; also of the courts of appeals of the various circuits and of the District of Columbia.

Also fee, salary, and emolument accounts of United States commissioners, marshals, district attorneys, and assistant district attorneys; said report to give the names of said officials and the gross amount of the emolument account returned or reported by each of said officers.

Also the total amount paid deputy marshals in each district separately, and the number of deputies in each district.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, before unanimous consent is given I desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa if it is his purpose to use the information which the resolution seeks in considering legislation looking to the salaried compensation of the clerks, the district attorneys, and the marshals of the United States?

Mr. LACEY. The purpose is to give to the Committee on the Judiciary the necessary information on which such legislation can be framed. And I may say, also, that in consultation with the officials in the Attorney-General's Office on yesterday, and with the Attorney-General himself, I find that the information called for and in the form called for has been prepared already, and can be furnished without delay or difficulty.

Mr. BAILEY. If that is the only purpose, I have no objection to the resolution.

Mr. LACEY. That is all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was adopted.

RAILROAD LAND GRANTS.

Mr. CANNON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration for the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested to inform the House of the total acreage of lands granted each to the Union Pacific and Central Pacific Railway companies; the total acreage patented to each, and the total acreage selected by each but not yet patented; with information as to whether (and if so, upon what ground) he has suspended the work of the General Land Office in forwarding to the Interior Department the lists of land selected; and also, as nearly as possible, what proportion of land not yet patented, but selected by said companies for patents, has been purchased from said companies by settlers.

The SPEAKER. This is subject to objection. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution which has just been reported to the House?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO MILITARY ACADEMY.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit the report of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy for the year 1895. I desire to state that the members of the board appointed by the House, in conjunction with those appointed by the President of the United States and the President of the Senate, have performed the duties devolved upon them by virtue of their appointments. The report which I sent to the Clerk's desk is the result of their labors and investigation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] presents the report of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy for the year 1895, which will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with that report I wish to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution providing for the printing of 2,500 extra copies. I will state that very frequently this additional number has been printed, and if it is not done now the printing of it afterwards will cause an additional expense. Last year the Senate printed 2,500 additional copies for their own use, giving us none of them. I provide in this resolution that of the 2,500 copies to be printed 700 shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,800 for the use of the House. I will also state that this report contains information regarding the military academies and colleges of the principal nations of Europe—very valuable information, which has never before been printed in this country. It takes up each nation separately, describes its military institutions of learning, states the requirements of entrance, the course of study, and the character of appointments given to the graduates. It will be interesting and valuable to educators everywhere. I think this extra number of copies should be printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 21) for printing extra copies of the report of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy at West Point.

Resolved, etc., That there be printed, in paper covers, 2,500 extra copies of the annual report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy at West Point for the year 1895, of which 700 shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,800 for the use of the House.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER]——

The SPEAKER. Pending the question of unanimous consent the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOPKINS. I should like to ask the gentleman from Alabama how many copies are provided for under existing law?

Mr. WHEELER. I think only 500.

Mr. HOPKINS. What is the object of having these extra copies printed?

Mr. WHEELER. Well, it has frequently, I think, been done, and sometimes done by resolution introduced afterwards, which involves more expense. Last year the Senate passed a resolution printing 2,500 copies for their use, and we got none of them. Now, I think it would be economy to print the requisite number now, instead of printing only 500.

Mr. HOPKINS. But the gentleman limits the Senate to 700 copies, does he not?

Mr. WHEELER. Well, that is about their proportion of the number.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WHEELER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

EXTRA MONTH'S PAY TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read; and pending that I desire to make a short explanation.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution giving one month's pay to certain employees of the House of Representatives.

Resolved, etc., That all officers and employees of the House, including the Capitol police, who were employed on the 2d day of December, 1895, and who have ceased or who shall, prior to the 1st day of February, 1896, cease to be so employed, shall be paid a sum equal to one month's pay at the rate they were severally receiving on the 2d day of December, 1895; and an amount sufficient for this purpose is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the same to be immediately available, and to be paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives. This resolution shall also include the special employees of the House, E. L. Currier and George Jenison.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I desire to offer a few words of explanation. Mr. Speaker, I agreed with Mr. Kerr, the Clerk of the House in the Fifty-third Congress, to offer this resolution. I was informed and believed, at the time I so agreed, that it had been the general custom of the incoming House to extend this courtesy to the employees of the outgoing House. In connection with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] we have been looking up the record, and I find that it has not been so done since the Forty-seventh Congress. Therefore I think perhaps that resolution ought to go to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. But I desire to make this explanation because I promised to introduce the resolution, and to ask for unanimous consent. I now ask that it be referred to the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. How does that go to the Committee on Accounts? It proposes legislation.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I suppose that is the appropriate committee. If not, the Speaker will make the necessary correction.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will consider it as introduced in the regular way, and refer it to the appropriate committee.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the resolution provide that this amount shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House?

Mr. CRISP. The Committee on Accounts deals with disbursements out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It is proposed to make this payment out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. DALZELL. I will state to my colleague that the resolution does not so read. It makes an appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I think the provision is to pay this out of the contingent fund of the House; but let the latter part of the resolution be read again. I may be in error.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

And that an amount sufficient for this purpose is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the same to be immediately available, and to be paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DALZELL. That ought to go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Well, let it go to the Committee on Appropriations. I was in error.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There was no objection.

LEASE OF BUILDING FOR USE OF THE DOORKEEPER.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit another resolution, and ask its immediate consideration. I do not think anybody can object to it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and is hereby, directed to continue, for the use of the folding room of the House, the lease of the brick stable owned by the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company, the rent, $100 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House from and after January 1, 1896, and until other provision is made therefor.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I desire, in a word, to explain the purpose of the resolution. This brick stable has been occupied during two or three Congresses as a storeroom for public documents. The lease has expired. The building is necessary to the document room, and the Doorkeeper desires authority to rerent it.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. SAYERS. If I remember correctly, a resolution was passed at the last session of the last Congress directing the officers to remove all these books that had accumulated in the basement rooms of the Capitol, amounting to several thousand in number; and my recollection is it was stated if that were done there would be ample room for the books that are being published every month during the year. I would like to have some information on that point.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. There was such a resolution passed, but I do not understand that that has made unnecessary the continuance of the lease of this stable. The fact is, the books are there, and unless the Doorkeeper has authority to rent the building he will be bound for the rent himself.

Mr. SAYERS. I would suggest that the gentleman let the resolution lie over until we can inquire into it.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Very well.

Mr. SAYERS. Better let it go to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Certainly. I withdraw my request for unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be so referred.

There was no objection.

ARMENIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. WILSON of New York. Mr. Speaker, by request of the Central Congregational Church of Brooklyn, N. Y., one of the largest and most influential churches of that city, I send to the Speaker's desk a memorial and resolution relative to the Armenian atrocities, and ask unanimous consent that it be read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the reading of a memorial and resolution, and that they be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CRISP. Before that is done—of course we are in complete ignorance of what it is—the question arises, if that memorial is read will it be printed in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman asks permission to have it read and printed in the RECORD. If consent is refused it will not be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CRISP. What is it about?

Mr. WILSON of New York. It refers to the atrocities in Armenia.

The memorial and resolution were read at length for information.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the request for unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the memorial and resolution which have been read to the House. Is there objection?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, what is the request?

The SPEAKER. The request is that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Is it a mere memorial? I did not hear what action is proposed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is under the impression that it is a memorial with a resolution attached.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I have no objection to the reference of the memorial to the proper committee of the House, but I object to its being printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and it will not be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 7) providing for the printing of the Monthly Summary Statement of Imports and Exports of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department.

Also, a joint resolution (S. R. 19) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to suspend the removal of intruders from the Cherokee country until the further action of Congress.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] desires to address the House upon some topic in the President's message; and I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the President's message.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HOPKINS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the President's message.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, I desire the Clerk to read a paragraph from the President's message which I have marked in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

By command of the people a customs-revenue system, designed for the protection and benefit of favored classes at the expense of the great mass of our countrymen, and which, while inefficient for the purpose of revenue, curtailed our trade relations and impeded our entrance to the markets of the world, has been superseded by a tariff policy which in principle is based upon a denial of the right of the Government to obstruct the avenues to our people's cheap living or lessen their comfort and contentment for the sake of according especial advantages to favorites, and which, while encouraging our intercourse and trade with other nations, recognizes the fact that American self-reliance, thrift, and ingenuity can build up our country's industries and develop its resources more surely than enervating paternalism.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, the President, in his annual message to this Congress, says:

By command of the people a customs-revenue system, designed for the protection and benefit of favored classes at the expense of the great mass of our countrymen, and which, while inefficient for the purpose of revenue, curtailed our trade relations and impeded our entrance to the markets of the world, has been superseded by a tariff policy which in principle is based upon a denial of the right of the Government to obstruct the avenues to our people's cheap living or lessen their comfort and contentment.

When stated concisely, this paragraph means simply that a protective tariff has been superseded by a free trade one, called by its friends a tariff for revenue only. The President gives us no information as to the practical operations or result of this new system which has superseded the old one. Disregarding the uniform custom in annual messages, he fails to state the amount of the receipts and expenditures of the Treasury for the last fiscal year, or in fact for any year. He contents himself with the declaration contained in this paragraph, which is the only reference in his message to the revenue system now in force, or as to the receipts and expenditures of the Government. He merely asserts that a "system of customs revenue inefficient for the purpose of revenue," which "impeded our entrance to the markets of the world" and "obstructed the avenues to our people's cheap living," has been superseded by command of the people.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

Congress is left, therefore, to ascertain for itself as best it can the real condition of the Treasury—its receipts and expenditures—since the close of the fiscal year 1894. The President in his annual message in December, 1894, informed Congress that the deficit in the Treasury for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, was $69,803,-260.58. The report of the Bureau of Statistics for 1895 shows that the deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, was $42,805,-223.18. The daily statements issued by the Secretary of the Treasury show that since July 1, 1895, to December 10 the deficit is $18,545,720.04. So the receipts of the Treasury from all ordinary sources since June 30, 1893, have been $131,354,203.80 less than its expenditures, including nothing of what may be appropriated in deficiency bills to be passed this session. By the daily statements as to the condition of the Treasury the deficit continues at the average rate of about $4,000,000 per month. In these two years of deficit there was paid each year in pensions $18,000,000 less than in 1893. The President informs us in this message that "the bonded indebtedness" of the Government has been increased $162,315,400. So it would seem that this new system of finance is not a great success, though claimed by its friends to be one for revenue only.

PROTECTIVE AND REVENUE TARIFFS.

What is the history of the old one that has been thus superseded. It began with the passage, in February, 1861, of what is known as the Morrill tariff. That was framed avowedly upon the principle that while raising the revenue necessary for the support of the Government, duties should be so adjusted as to protect American labor in its competition with the poorly paid labor of the world, and to secure as far as possible the supplying of the home market by home labor in all cases where climate, soil, and business facilities would admit of its being done to advantage.

This principle controlled in all the tariff legislation from that time until March 4, 1893. Every year after 1865—that being the close of the war—the receipts have exceeded the expenditures, and in addition to paying the current expenses of the Government two-thirds of the national debt of $2,700,000,000 in 1867 has been paid, and no money was borrowed save the $95,500,000 for the purpose of resumption of specie payments in 1879. This is a financial record unsurpassed in the history of any nation. The following table shows the excess of receipts and expenditures of the Government from 1858 to 1895 inclusive, and the amount of customs revenue each year from 1865—the close of the war period:

Year ended June 30—	Customs revenue.	Excess of revenue over expenditure.	Excess of expenditure over revenue.
1858			$27,529,904.43
1859			15,584,511.10
1860			7,065,990.56
1861			25,036,714.50
1862			422,774,363.48
1863			602,043,434.22
1864			600,695,870.37
1865			963,840,619.33
1866	$179,046,651.58	$37,223,203.07	
1867	176,417,810.88	133,091,335.11	
1868	164,464,599.56	28,297,798.46	
1869	180,048,426.63	48,078,469.41	
1870	194,538,374.44	101,601,916.88	
1871	206,270,408.05	91,146,756.64	
1872	216,370,286.77	96,588,904.89	
1873	188,089,522.70	43,392,959.34	
1874	163,103,833.69	2,344,882.30	
1875	157,167,722.35	13,376,658.26	
1876	148,071,984.61	29,022,241.83	
1877	130,956,493.07	30,340,577.69	
1878	130,170,680.20	20,799,551.90	
1879	137,250,047.70	6,879,300.93	
1880	186,522,064.60	65,883,653.20	
1881	198,159,676.02	100,069,404.98	
1882	220,410,730.25	145,543,810.71	
1883	214,706,496.93	132,879,444.41	
1884	195,067,489.76	104,393,625.59	
1885	181,471,939.34	63,463,771.27	
1886	192,905,023.44	93,956,588.56	
1887	217,286,893.13	103,471,097.69	
1888	219,091,173.63	111,341,273.63	
1889	223,832,741.69	87,761,080.59	
1890	229,668,584.57	85,040,271.97	
1891	219,522,205.23	26,838,541.96	
1892	177,452,964.15	9,914,453.66	
1893	203,355,016.73	2,341,674.29	
1894	131,818,530.62		$69,803,260.58
1895	152,158,617.45		42,805,223.18

Previous to 1861 the tariff of 1846 had been substantially in force, though some changes in it were made in 1852 or 1853 and again in 1857. Mr. Buchanan's Administration closed March 4, 1861, with a deficit in the Treasury every year, amounting at the end of the four years to $75,217,120. Resort was had at that time by the Democratic party to borrowing money for current expenses in time of peace. Mr. Buchanan's Administration was the last Democratic Administration in full control of the executive and legislative departments of the Government until Mr. Cleveland's, and his Administration seems to begin where Mr. Buchanan's left off. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

The Morrill tariff passed by Congress in 1861 was signed by Mr. Buchanan. The leaders of the present Democratic party are loud in denouncing all protective tariffs as unconstitutional, and especially the one passed in 1890, known as the McKinley tariff, notwithstanding the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in a unanimous opinion, declaring that act to be constitutional. The period from 1880 to 1892 under these two protective tariff systems was one of unexampled prosperity, and for development of material resources and growth of industries unequaled in any like period in the history of nations. The receipts into the Treasury for these thirteen fiscal years from the ordinary sources of revenue over and above expenditures were $1,130,557,018, and the exports of merchandise over the imports were $1,139,613,971, and the importation of gold over its export was $96,401,216. The gold in the Treasury every year of this period exceeded the $100,000,000 reserve and all gold certificates issued. For the three years 1888, 1889, and 1890 the average excess was over $90,000,000.

GROWTH OF INDUSTRIES.

The growth of the mechanical and manufacturing industries, as shown by the census of 1880 and of 1890, was more than doubled in the capital invested and the amount paid to labor, and almost double in the value of the products produced. The abstract of the census of 1890 shows in detail that the capital invested in 1890 was $3,734,202,699 more than in 1879, and there was paid to labor in these same industries $1,335,262,734 more in 1889 than in 1879, and the value of the products in these industries was $4,002,858,092 more in 1889 than in 1879. The farm mortgages created between 1880 and 1890 had been, January 1, 1890, reduced more than one-half.

CUSTOMS REVENUE.

The customs receipts during this period were $177,452,964.15 in the year 1892, being the lowest, and $229,668,584.57 in the year 1890.

The following table shows the customs revenue for each year from 1888 to 1895, inclusive, and the excess of total receipts into the Treasury over expenditures:

Year.	Customs.	Excess of revenue over expenditures.
1888	$219,091,173.63	$111,341,273.63
1889	223,832,741.69	87,761,080.59
1890	229,668,584.57	85,040,271.97
1891	219,522,205.23	26,838,541.96
1892	177,452,964.15	9,914,453.66
1893	203,355,016.73	2,341,674.29
1894	131,818,530.62	*69,803,260.58
1895	152,158,617.45	*42,805,223.18

*Expenditures in excess of revenue.

Though the McKinley tariff was in force until August, 1894, yet the business of the country was so disturbed by the result of the election in November, 1892, in anticipation of the change in tariff policy, that importations for the fiscal year 1894 were greatly restricted and the home production of everything was greatly lessened. So that in all fairness in comparing the operations of tariffs the fiscal year 1893 should be regarded as the last year of the McKinley tariff. The average receipts from duties in the fiscal years 1891, 1892, and 1893 were $200,110,062.03.

FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The foreign commerce of the country under these two protective tariff laws beginning in 1861, which the President claims impeded our entrance into the markets of the world, expanded from $1,503,593,404 in 1880 to $1,857,680,610 in 1892, the largest of any year in our history. The next largest year was $1,729,397,206, in 1891—showing that there was no trouble in our entering the markets of the world. But the world has no market better than the American market. [Applause.] We have a people of 70,000,000 to-day that consume per capita more than any other people on the earth, and which doubles in numbers every thirty years. Ere the close of this century of national existence 500,000,000 of people will be dwellers upon the soil over which to-day floats the flag of our fathers—about one-third of the present population of the globe. Why should we open such a market to the products of the poverty-stricken labor of the world, thereby excluding our own labor from employment in supplying it?

BUY CHEAPEST WHERE PAY EASIEST.

One of the President's objections to a protective system is that it obstructs the "avenues to our people's cheap living." A man in the poorhouse realizes the President's ideal of cheap living, for he lives cheaper than anybody else. [Laughter.] Cheapness in articles of consumption is not always desirable. Shall cheapness to the consumer be weighed in the balance against the comfort of the home and the happiness of the fireside of the producer? Anything sells too cheap that sells for a price that will not give to the producer living wages. [Applause.] If articles of consumption can be furnished to the consumer cheaply only by reducing the wages of the laborer who produces them to the rate paid his competitors in other lands, where penury sits at their fireside and sorrowing want surrounds their deathbed, then cheapness is not a desirable object. [Applause.]

Strike from the tariff all its protective features, and the labor of this country must then stand unaided and alone in its competition with that labor of the world where homeless poverty is the sole heritage of the sons of toil. The consumer in all cases buys cheapest where he pays easiest. The state of things that gives steady employment to the laborer at the highest attainable wages enables him to pay easier, and thereby he buys cheapest, no matter what the nominal price of the article may be. Without employment he could not buy at all, and with scant employment he must buy scant. The country that produces for itself the articles consumed by its people has both the article produced and the money paid for its production, instead of having but one of these values, as would be the case in buying abroad.

COMFORT AND CONTENTMENT.

Upon the comfort of the home depends the happiness of its fireside; and by that fireside is reared the generations who are to control the destinies of the nation. [Applause.] In despotic or monarchical governments the great interest in its children is that they become good soldiers; but in a free constitutional government the great interest in its children is that they become good citizens, for upon the wisdom of their ballots rests the pillars of the Republic. [Applause.] Tariff laws affect directly the condition and well-being of labor, and if wisely adjusted will secure to it the supplying of the home market as far as possible.

Mr. Chairman, there would be no need of protection in arranging the duty on foreign imports if the laborers of this country were willing to live in the same way and to receive the same compensation as their competitors in other lands. But they are not willing to do that, and the patriotism of the country is unwilling that they should. That is the only reason why in tariff legislation it becomes necessary to guard the American producer against unequal competition with foreign products in their labor cost.

With the single paragraph I have read from the message, the President dismisses all reference to revenue or to the receipts and expenditures of the Treasury. His only recommendation for Congressional action is to convert five or six hundred millions of noninterest-bearing debt into an interest-bearing debt of the same amount on long-time bonds. [Applause on the Republican side.] A year ago his recommendation for Congressional action for the ills of the country was to allow State banks to issue a part of the circulating medium. There is no reference now to that remedy. I have no idea that this Congress or the next, or any other Congress, unless it is as overwhelmingly Democratic as this one is Republican, will retire what is known as the greenbacks into an interest-bearing debt. [Applause on the Republican side.] We have substantially the same currency to-day that has existed for years past, and so long as the receipts exceeded expenditures no inconvenience or serious trouble was experienced.

AMEND NATIONAL BANK ACT.

But it would be well to retire the Treasury notes of 1890 and the silver certificates in some way that would not contract the currency. My plan to do that is embraced in a bill offered in the last Congress and again introduced in this, the outlines of which are embraced in the following sections:

That all acts or parts of acts which require or authorize the deposit of United States bonds to secure circulating bank notes issued by national banking associations be, and the same are hereby, amended so that said associations now organized, or that may hereafter be organized, and any other association duly organized and incorporated under the laws of any State for doing exclusively a banking business, may deposit with the Treasurer of the United States, as security for circulating bank notes, in lieu of bonds, Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, or silver certificates issued under the acts of February 28, 1878, and August 4, 1886, and March 3, 1887. The association making such deposit shall be entitled to receive for each and every $100 of the par value of the Treasury notes or certificates hereinbefore described $110 in circulating bank notes of the same kind, form, and description as is now, or may be hereafter, provided in the national-bank act for circulating bank notes. On the face of each and every note there shall be engraved and printed: "Secured by a deposit of money in the Treasury of the United States."

SEC. 2. That all the Treasury notes or certificates, as aforesaid, deposited as security for circulating bank notes, and upon which bank notes shall have been issued, the Treasurer of the United States shall cause said notes and certificates to be canceled and destroyed, giving to the association making such deposit a receipt for the same, specifying the kind of Treasury notes or certificates deposited.

SEC. 5. That all circulating bank notes issued as aforesaid shall be exempt from taxation by or under Federal, State, or municipal authority.

SEC. 6. That the circulating bank notes issued under this act shall have all the legal qualities of the circulating bank notes issued under the national-bank act, and their redemption shall be made in like manner.

By this method some five or six hundred millions of Treasury notes and certificates could be converted into a noninterest-bearing debt with an indefinite time to pay and without any contraction of the currency or increasing the interest-bearing debt of the nation. By the report of the Comptroller of the Currency for October, 1895, there were 3,715 national banks in existence, with an authorized capital of $664,136,915, and 5,066 State banks, with a capital of $422,052,618, making a total banking capital of both kinds of $1,086,189,533. This plan would allow a State bank to receive circulating notes the same as the national banks do on making like deposits in the Treasury. I need not take the time of the committee in advocating the system of uniform currency and circulating medium as it exists to-day. There is no system of State bank issues, I care not how arranged, that can be made a uniform, safe circulating medium without a deposit in the United States Treasury. The present law requires every national bank to receive the issues of every other national bank throughout the country in payment of any debt due the bank. Can you pass a law requiring the State banks to thus receive the issues of any and all other State banks throughout the country without some such deposit?

This plan would leave the present national banking law just as it is, except that this kind of paper could be deposited instead of bonds for security of payment and final redemption of circulating notes. The Government would be responsible the same as now for the redemption of the currency in the hands of the people. The currency would be as now uniform everywhere, and of equal value wherever received, and would be based upon a system which would allow of necessary expansion. The character of the nationl-bank circulation would remain the same as now, except that State banks could participate in it. The advantage of one uniform rule and law against counterfeiting as it exists now saves millions of money to the people. Having given my views at the last session of Congress, somewhat at length, as to the desirability of thus amending the national-bank act I will not take up the time of the committee in its further discussion now.

GOLD RESERVE AND ENDLESS CHAIN.

The gold reserve that the President regards as a weakness in the financial management of the Government will continue such as long as money must be borrowed for the current expenses of the Government.

This "endless chain" that we hear so much about began with what appears to be an endless deficit [applause on the Republican side], and it will continue until the revenues of the Government exceed its expenditures. When that is the case why should there be any more trouble than there was for fifteen years before? As long as the revenue is less than the receipts I know of no way to keep gold in the Treasury. I know of no way in which a man can pay his debts without taking the money out of his pocket, as long as it lasts, and giving it to his creditors. If there is not enough there to pay his debts, then either he is a bankrupt or his creditor is a loser. There has been nothing in the Treasury except gold for the payment of the deficit in revenue. What was left to pay out? Treasury notes and greenbacks. That is a regular Micawber system of finance. [Laughter.] He counted his own notes as a fund for the redemption of his debts, and we are doing the same thing. Issue promissory paper to-day and say our debt is paid. It comes back for what that paper represents, and unless we have it we must go into bankruptcy.

Our paper money, substantially as we have it to-day, was no trouble to the Treasury of the United States during the time the Republican party controlled its administration. It only began with this new system, introduced with the incoming of this Administration, the same kind tried by our fathers, and it has always proved a failure. From the beginning of the Government we never have had what is called a free-trade tariff, a tariff for revenue only, that did not have the same result. Buchanan's Administration went to wreck in its finances on the same rock. Now its successor is trying the same experiment, and claims that it has done so because of a command by the people.

COMMANDS OF THE PEOPLE.

The people after two years of experience of an administration with a foreign policy of dishonor to the nation and a home policy of ruin to its industries have issued through the ballot box a new mandate with an energy and far-sweeping result that I trust the President in his official acts will not disregard, though he entirely ignored it in his message. Thirteen representatives of this once great Democratic party from 30 States of the Union are all that can speak for that party on this floor to-day. One only to speak for all New England. One for all the Pacific States. The other eleven speak for the remaining States which lie north of what used to be the old sectional Mason and Dixon's line. Thirty members sit upon this floor to-day to speak for the lion-hearted, unconquerable Republican party of the heretofore solid Democratic South. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Congressional district of the home of every Democratic Senator in the Senate of the United States from either of the 30 States referred to is represented on this floor by a Republican. What was tried in the elections of 1894?

The Democrats say the election of 1892 was a condemnation of the McKinley bill. Then was the election of 1894 a condemnation of this new bill, christened the Wilson-Gorman bill, but which the President declared was a child of perfidy and dishonor when it was laid on the steps of the Executive Mansion? [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] Solid Republican delegations are now here from a greater number of States than ever before. If these so emphatic and sweeping elections were not a condemnation by the people of the legislation of the last Congress, then it was a condemnation of the Democratic party itself, and that is what I think it was. It was the Democratic party itself on trial in the late elections. For it made no difference what kind of a Democrat it was, whether a zealous or lukewarm advocate of this new system of customs revenue, or a Democrat who had opposed it, the political cyclone swept away all kinds of Democrats alike.

The Democratic party was on trial in the elections of last year, and the people issued a new mandate. Before the election leading Democrats, including the President, proclaimed that their legislative acts in the last Congress were only steps in the right direction, which they proposed to continue until the last vestige of protection was swept from the statute book. The new command of the people comes to-day: "Not another step in that direction." [Applause on the Republican side.] It is a fair warning for the Democratic party to retire and make repairs for the future. Hoping that the President in his official acts will not disregard this new command, though he entirely ignored it in his message, I trust when he has leisure to attend to public affairs he will give heed to it. [Laughter and loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the

Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the annual message of the President of the United States, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 16, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 1408) supplementary to an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor and providing pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1409) authorizing the purchase of additional lots of ground adjoining or adjacent to the post-office building in the city of Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1410) to amend the act approved February 14, 1885, entitled "An act to authorize a retired list for privates and noncommissioned officers of the United States Army who have served for a period of thirty years and upward"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1411) authorizing the establishment of a range-lights station at Maurice River, Delaware Bay—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1412) for a steam light vessel at Overfalls Shoal, New Jersey—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1413) for a relief vessel for the Fourth light-house district—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1414) to establish the Mahon River light station, Delaware River, on a new site—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1415) to authorize postmasters at money-order offices to redeem postage stamps—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1416) raising the Christiana light station, Delaware, to the fourth order, and authorizing a post light—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1417) to prevent the establishment of letter boxes for the receipt or delivery of certain mail matter in premises not occupied by post-offices or branch offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1418) regulating rates of postage on second-class mail matter at letter-carrier offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1419) to allow the Postmaster-General to grant leave of absence with full pay (in addition to the leave now granted by law) to any letter carrier or clerk in a post-office who shall be disabled by any casualty while in the performance of his duty, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1420) to amend section 3829 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1421) to reduce the postage on fourth-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1422) to extend the free-delivery system of the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1423) to allow postmasters in first and second class post-offices to suspend clerks and employees therein without pay, not exceeding thirty days, for neglect of duty, and for other reasons, and to furlough clerks and letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1424) to reduce the postage on books transmitted by mail—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1425) fixing the rates of duty on importations of wool and manufactures of wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1426) to increase the circulation of national-bank currency and to reduce the taxes thereon—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1427) for the construction and completion of a dry dock at navy-yard, League Island, Pa.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1428) fixing the rates of duty on importations of pearl and shell buttons—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1429) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in them—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1430) directing the issue of a check, in lieu of a lost check drawn by the Chief of the Ordnance Department of the United States Army, in favor of the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1431) to refund the outstanding United States and Treasury notes with bonds bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1432) making appropriation for site and pedestal of a statue of the late Maj. Gen. George G. Meade in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1433) appropriating $25,000 to the Franklin Institute, of Philadelphia, and the Purdue University, of Lafayette, Ind., for the purpose of determining the quantity of the so-called "hammer blows," "centrifugal lift, and tangential throw" of locomotive driving wheels in use on American railroads—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 1434) to amend Title LX, chapter 3, of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to copyrights—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 1435) to increase the limit of cost for the erection of a public building in Camden, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 1436) to quiet title to lands in persons who purchased the same in good faith without notice and for a valuable consideration, and to enable the Government to issue patents on such lands and that commutations of homestead entries shall take effect from date of settlement and not from date of entry—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 1437) to provide for the erection of a monument at Fort Recovery, Mercer County, Ohio—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1438) for the erection of a monument at Greenville, Ohio, to commemorate the treaty of peace made on the 3d day of August, A. D. 1795, at Fort Greenville (built on the site of said Greenville, Ohio), by Gen. Anthony Wayne, on behalf of the United States and various Indian tribes occupying the territory northwest of the Ohio River, and to perpetuate the memory of General Wayne and his gallant army—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 1439) to amend the tariff act by increasing the duty on osier or willow—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1440) to amend the tariff act of August 27, 1894, by restoring the duty on salt—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLETT of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1441) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Richmond, in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 1442) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 1443) to amend the pension law so as to remove the disability of such persons as enlisted in the Confederate service to escape military prisons, etc.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1444) to amend the pension law so as to remove the disability of persons conscripted into the Confederate service, etc.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 1445) for the erection of a public building at Fergus Falls, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ELLETT of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1446) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reexamine and resettle the accounts of certain States and the city of Baltimore growing out of moneys expended by said States and the city of Baltimore for military purposes during the war of 1812—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 1447) for the erection of a monument in the city of Washington to the memory of the late Commodore John Paul Jones—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McKENNEY: A bill (H. R. 1448) to appropriate $15,000 to enlarge and otherwise improve the post-office building in the city of Petersburg, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 1449) to increase the efficiency of the infantry and to improve the infantry organization—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 1450) to provide for a public building at New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. AVERY: A bill (H. R. 1451) for the erection of additional buildings for the Indian school at Mount Pleasant, Mich.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 1452) providing for a popular loan by the issue of 3 per cent bonds of small denominations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 1453) requiring all duties on imported goods after March 1, 1896, shall be paid in gold coin, and repealing all acts inconsistent, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: A bill (H. R. 1454) to prevent discrimination in the shipment and transportation of live stock on vessels to foreign countries and to provide penalties for its violation—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 1455) to provide for the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 1456) to extend the limits and laws of the Territory of Oklahoma, and to enable the people thereof to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 1457) regulating the compensation of district attorneys, assistant district attorneys, marshals, and deputy marshals—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 1458) to amend the act authorizing the Washington and Marlboro Electric Railway Company, of Maryland, to extend its lines into and within the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 1459) for the erection of a public building at Creston, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 1460) providing for a naval training station on the Pacific Coast—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SORG: A bill (H. R. 1461) amending section 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, relating to invalid pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1462) amending section 2 of the act of June 27, 1890, relating to invalid pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of telegraph operators during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 1465) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Alameda, in the State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1466) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Oakland, in the State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1467) to provide for the erection and equipment of a gun factory at Benicia, Cal., for finishing and assembling ordnance for the Army and Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 1468) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Comanche, Kiowa, and Apache tribes of Indians in Oklahoma Territory, and to make appropriations for carrying the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 1469) amendatory of and supplementary to an act entitled "An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes," approved September 29, 1890—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 1470) to provide for the securing of plans and for the erection of the public buildings of the United States—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A joint resolution (H. Res. 22) providing for a uniform system of numbering public documents—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A joint resolution (H. Res. 23) for extra month's pay to officers and employees of Fifty-third Congress—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HILL: A joint resolution (H. Res. 24) providing for immediate destruction of income-tax returns, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALDRICH: A joint resolution (H. Res. 25) to extend the time for making an assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A concurrent resolution providing for an extra edition of the second special report of the Commissioner of Labor—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FISCHER: A resolution requesting of the President certain papers and information regarding the firing into of the American schooner *Henry Crosby* by the Republic of Santo Domingo—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A resolution of inquiry concerning construction of new mint building at Philadelphia—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A resolution authorizing the Doorkeeper of the House to continue the lease of the brick stable of the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company for the use of the folding room—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the eighth special report of the Commissioner of Labor—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SPERRY: A memorial of the State of Connecticut relating to the transportation of parcels by the post-office—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a memorial of the State of Connecticut asking Congress to investigate concerning the case of Dorence Atwater—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a resolution of the joint assembly of the State of Connecticut concerning the constitutional rights of citizens—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TOWNE: A memorial from the legislature of the State of Minnesota requesting Congress to grant to said State the buildings and grounds of old Fort Snelling, to be used as a museum—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Minnesota requesting the enactment of an arbitration law—to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1471) to correct the military record of Godlieb Best—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1472) to correct the military record of Henry McKitchen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 1473) increasing the pension of Joseph McCune—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1474) granting a pension to John J. Copley—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 1475) for the relief of Basil Moreland—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 1476) for the relief of H. N. Roberts—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1477) for the relief of W. S. Beck, administrator of Joshua Beck, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 1478) for the benefit of Alice Smith, of Newport, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1479) for the benefit of Anna M. Wehe, mother of William Wehe, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 1480) for the relief of Cumberland Female College, of McMinnville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1481) for the relief of Julius C. Kloenne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1482) for the relief of H. N. Roberts, administrator of Henry C. Roberts, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1483) for the relief of Mary Sharp College, of Winchester, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 1484) for the correction of muster of Adolph von Haake, late major Sixty-eighth Regiment Veteran Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1485) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph B. Hull, late commodore, United States Navy, retired—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1486) for the relief of the Corn Exchange National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 1487) for the relief of the estate of Daniel H. Avery, of Tuscaloosa, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1488) for the relief of Alfred B. Chum, of Jefferson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1489) for the relief of the estate of John R. Carpenter, deceased, late of Greene County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 1490) to increase the pension of Ann Catherine Hull—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1491) to promote Commodore Louis C. Sartori, now on the retired list of the Navy, to be a rear-admiral on said list, in accordance with his original position on the Navy Register—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of Medical Director Francis M. Gunnell—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1493) for the relief of Hannah B. Crosman, executrix—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1494) for the relief of the legal representatives and devisees of James W. Schaumburg—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1495) for the relief of William Brice & Co. and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 1496) for the relief of William H. Hugo—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 1497) for the relief of Col. and Bvt. Brig. Gen. Henry L. Abbot, United States Army, and brevet major-general United States Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 1498) directing the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge to William M. Dalzell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1499) to correct the muster of Lieut. Gilman L. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1500) granting a pension to George W. Bagley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 1501) for the relief of John Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1502) for the benefit of J. C. Rudd—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COBB of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 1503) for the relief of A. W. Davis, of Autauga County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 1504) for the relief of Elizabeth E. Tyson, of Howard County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1505) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah A. Aspold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 1506) for the relief of Charles Gallagher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1507) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust and settle the account of James M. Willbur with the United States, and to pay said Willbur such sum of money as he may be justly and equitably entitled to—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1508) granting a pension to the widow of Gen. John Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1509) for the relief of William P. Wood for services rendered the Treasury Department—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 1510) for the relief of Franklin Lee and Charles F. Dunbar—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1511) for the relief of Lydia Boynton Ferris—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLETT of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1512) for the relief of John M. Blankenship—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1513) granting a pension to Caroline Wilkinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1514) for the relief of Richmond College, located at Richmond, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ERDMAN: A bill (H. R. 1515) for the relief of Hugh McLaughlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1516) for the relief of Herman Von Marsdorf, late a lieutenant of Company D, First Maryland Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 1517) for the relief of Rudolphus Minton, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1518) granting a pension to George Sutton, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1519) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Crawford, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1520) granting a pension to John J. Tully—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 1521) for an act to refer certain claims for Indian depredations to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 1522) for the relief of John J. Driscoll—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 1523) for the relief of Mary B. T. Randolph, A. M. Randolph, Beverly Randolph, B. M. Randolph, and E. C. Turner, of Fauquier County, Va., and W. F. Randolph, of Washington County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLETT of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1524) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of William B. Isaacs & Co.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1525) for the relief of Mrs. C. N. Graves—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1526) for the relief of Richard Fox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1527) for the relief of Isaac Davenport and others, citizens of Virginia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1528) for the relief of Loftin D. Allen, of Henrico County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 1529) for the relief of William Gregory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 1530) to correct the military record of Michael Keegan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 1531) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Wightman, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 1532) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George Weisel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 1533) granting a pension to Bridget Turley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1534) granting a pension to Ida Wiederhold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWE: A bill (H. R. 1535) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jeremiah Cleary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 1536) to pension Gilead Simpson, of Leon, Iowa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1537) granting a pension to David A. Wiles, of Page County, Iowa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1538) increasing the pension to Arlington Harrington—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1539) for the relief of William E. Fenton, a resident of Milledgeville, Iowa—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 1540) to relieve Joseph S. Hurst from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1541) granting a pension to Henry Schnetberg, of Indiana, Pa.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1542) granting a pension to Mrs. Jane Kennedy Anderson, of Parkers Landing, Pa.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 1543) to increase the pension of Carey H. Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1544) for the relief of William H. Feaster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1545) to correct military record of Robert McIntire and remove charge of desertion therefrom—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1546) for the relief of John W. Gummo, and the payment to him of his military bounty—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1547) for the relief of Andrew Shoenfelt for supplies furnished United States troops during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1548) for the relief of James Bookhamer, of Altoona, Pa., for carrying mail between Hopewell and Curryville, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1549) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Amey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1550) to relieve Isaac Gonser from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1551) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to place the name of John Houpt on muster roll of Company M, Twenty-first Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1552) granting a pension to Henry Stickler, a teamster in the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1553) to correct military record of Aaron Youngkin and remove the charge of desertion therefrom—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1554) to correct the military record of Arthur A. Snyder and remove the charge of desertion therefrom—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1555) granting a pension to Mary L. Dibert, as mother of Isaac N. Dibert, of One hundred and forty-second Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1556) granting a pension to William Houpt, as the father of John Houpt of Company M, Twenty-first Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1557) to increase the pension of James Defibaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 1558) for the relief of Capt. Edward O'Shea—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONEY: A bill (H. R. 1559) for the relief of the estate of William Robinson, deceased, late of Noxubee County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1560) for the relief of J. C. Fitzgerald, of Chickasaw County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 1561) for the relief of H. W. Throckmorton, of Fairfax County, Va., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1562) for the relief of the estate of William Smallwood, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1563) for the relief of Edward J. Underwood, of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1564) for the relief of Samuel F. Engs, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1565) for the relief of John Compher, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 1566) for the relief of C. M. Hall, of Walker County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 1567) authorizing the President of the United States to place Col. David Stewart Gordon, Sixth United States Cavalry, a brigadier-general, on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILNES: A bill (H. R. 1568) for the relief of William H. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1569) for the relief of William H. Buck, of Company M, First Michigan Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 1570) for the relief of John J. Govan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1571) for the relief of the estate of Richard Higgins, late of Phillips County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1572) for the relief of Martha A. Lanford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1573) for the relief of Mary E. Whitehead—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1574) for relief of Mary F. Pollan, administratrix of William H. Pollan, deceased, late of Crittenden County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 1575) for the relief of estate of H. S. Simmons—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1576) for the relief of Frederick Webb, of Madison County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1577) for the relief of Hiram Johnson, of Madison County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1578) for the relief of J. W. Elston, of Madison County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOZLY: A bill (H. R. 1579) to correct the military record of Jeremiah C. Lemar—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1580) to correct the military record of George W. Smyth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 1581) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Casey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 1582) for the relief of Freeman Hall Seely—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1583) for the relief of Benjamin F. Bennett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1584) for the relief of Hiram Johnson and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1585) for the relief of Archibald Thomas, of Madison County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1586) for the relief of Edward Burke, administrator of Peter Kelly, deceased, of Madison County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 1587) for the relief of Major E. Davis, of Rome, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLETT of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1588) granting a pension to Gen. Dabney H. Maury—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 1589) for the relief of the estate of Martin Fraliex, deceased, late of Walker County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1590) for the relief of J. S. McLain, of Whitfield County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1591) for the relief of William B. Quinn, of Whitfield County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1592) for the relief of George W. Hendricks, administrator of John Weitinger, deceased, late of Bartow County, Ga., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1593) for the relief of Joel Cross, of Dade County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1594) for the relief of Rebecca Thomas, of Whitfield County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: A bill (H. R. 1595) for the relief of the widow and heirs of Charles Baker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1596) to place on the pension roll the name of Marion Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1597) to remove the charge of dishonorable dismissal from the military service of the United States of W. H. Castle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 1598) for the relief of A. G. White, postmaster at Beaver, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 1599) granting a pension to Phœbe M. Woolley Palmeter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1600) granting a pension to Helen M. Chapin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 1601) to amend the military record of John S. Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1602) for the relief of A. P. Brown, late postmaster at Le Mars, Iowa—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPENCER: A bill (H. R. 1603) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. C. L. Shaifer, of Jefferson County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1604) for relief of estate of Warren R. Dent—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 1605) granting a pension to Anna Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STAHLE: A bill (H. R. 1606) granting a pension to J. G. Spangenberg, Company A, Thirtieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 1607) to correct the military record of Benjamin Sharp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1608) to grant a pension to Eliza Tait, a dependent sister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1609) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter Fleming, of Battery E, Third United States Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 1610) granting a pension to Jane L. Buckingham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1611) to remove the charge of desertion against Peter S. Beauchamp, Company A, One hundred and sixty-fifth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 1612) for the relief of Margaret J. Braman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 1613) for the relief of Milo Loomis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McEWAN: A bill (H. R. 1614) for the relief of Mary H. Noonan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEIGHTY: A bill (H. R. 1615) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary McEachron, of Cromwell, Noble County, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1616) to pension Michael E. Bricker, of Edgerton, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEONARD: A bill (H. R. 1617) to remove charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Flower—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 1618) for the relief of J. J. McCowan, of Lincoln County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1619) for the relief of James C. Hoover, of Rutherford County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1620) for the relief of James G. Wooten—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1621) for the relief of John Leiper—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1622) for the relief of estate of H. S. Simmons—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1623) for the relief of William Whittaker, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 1624) for the relief of Anna W. Osborne—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1625) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to determine and pay certain claims against the Fond du Lac Indians—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 1626) for the relief of James Healy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1627) to pension Mrs. Eliza T. Palmatier—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1628) for therelief of Dewitt Eastman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOAKUM (by request): A bill (H. R. 1629) to refer the claim of Eli Ayres to the Court of Claims and quiet the title to certain lands in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 1630) to remove the charge of desertion in the case of Oliver Armsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1631) for the relief of Nicholas Krier and others—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1632) granting a pension to Mary J. Fouts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 1633) granting an increase of pension to William O. Martin, of Brocton, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1634) to grant pension to William F. Good, Company L, Tenth Indiana Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 1635) for the relief of the Bolivar Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WELLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 1636) for the relief of A. T. Snouffer, of Frederick County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1637) for the relief of Mary and Maria Reynolds, administratrixes of James Reynolds, deceased, late of Allegany County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1638) for the relief of H. H. Keedy and Charles W. Adams, administrators of John Miller, deceased, late of Washington County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1639) for the relief of C. M. Keedy, administrator of J. J. Keedy, of Washington County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1640) for the relief of Reuben A. Hurley, of Montgomery County, Md., administrator de bonis non of A. F. Hurley, deceased, late of Lyon County, Nev.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1641) for the relief of Louis Trone, of Washington County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1642) to authorize the payment to Rear-Admiral John H. Russell of the highest pay of his grade—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1643) for the relief of Benjamin R. White, of Montgomery County, State of Maryland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1644) for the relief of Samuel D. Piper, administrator of Elias S. Grove, of Washington County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 1645) for the relief of John F. Alsup—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILBER: A bill (H. R. 1646) for the relief of Dolly S. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Petition of Alice Smith for restoration of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Memorial of the Trades League of Philadelphia, urging the improvement of the Delaware River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROWN: Papers to accompany House bill No. 6835 of the Fifty-first Congress—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 11644 of the Fifty-first Congress—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition relative to the Paris Exposition of 1900—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Petition of J. M. Crosby, for the improvement of the Little Salkehatchie River, South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: Petition of Rachel Wooding Blystone, of Crawford County, Pa., for a special act of Congress granting her a pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Petition of P. E. Cox, G. L. Browning, and Richard Dalton, clerks in the folding room—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of Francis Varga and other citizens of Decatur County, Iowa, asking that a pension be granted to Gilead Simpson, of Leon, Iowa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of David A. Wiles, a resident of Page County, Iowa, asking that his name be placed on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULICK: Petition of Prof. Alfred Holbrook and 162 other citizens of Lebanon, Warren County, Ohio, asking Congress to take such action as shall result in the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cubans in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HULING: Petition of citizens of Big Sandy district, Kanawha County, W. Va., asking for the passage of a bill for the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of J. F. Burgess and 120 other citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, asking the passage of a law restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Petitions of six clubs of the city of Boston, Mass., against lynch law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: Petition of J. L. Cochran, administrator of William Brooks, deceased, late of Henderson County, Tenn., for reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Resolution of the Mankato (Minn.) Board of Trade, requesting Congress to grant belligerent rights to the people of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McEWEN: Petition of A. S. Franklin, alleging inefficiency and corruption in the offices of the United States district attorney of New York City and the Ellis Island officials—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition asking the Government of the United States to take action with reference to the Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petitions of citizens of Des Moines, Castana, and Ida Grove, all of Iowa, asking Congress to take such action as shall result in the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Edward Riorden and other railway postal clerks, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 8987—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of Encampment No. 90, Union Veteran Legion, duly attested by Capt. Alfred Boley, adjutant, to have secured the battlefield of Appomattox for a national park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Anna Kelly, widow of Charles T. Kelly, alias Charles J. Kelly, Company C, Fourth New Hampshire Infantry Volunteers, and United States steamers *Ohio* and *Macedonia*, in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELLINGTON: Petition of Joseph H. Snyder, the heirs of George W. Nichols, deceased; the estate of Thomas Bevans, deceased; Jacob Snively, and Elizabeth Murray, all of Washington County, Md., praying that their war claims be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Mrs. R. T. Veirs and Frederick S. Poole, both of Montgomery County, Md., praying that their war claims be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 16, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting five volumes of French parliamentary documents received by the United States ambassador at Paris from the Senate of France for transmission to the United States Senate; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two copies each of the acts and resolutions as well as of the journals of the third session of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Oklahoma, as required by section 3 of the act to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Oklahoma, approved March 2, 1890; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two copies each of the acts, resolutions, and memorials as well as of the journals of the thirty-first session of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, as required by section 1844 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two copies each of the acts, resolutions, and memorials as well as of the journals of the Eighteenth legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, as required by section 1844 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Territories.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND FISHERIES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, transmitting, in compliance with the act of March 3, 1887, a statement showing expenditures under all appropriations for propagation of food fishes during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a

joint resolution (H. Res. 21) for printing extra copies of the report of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy at West Point for the year 1895; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition, in the form of a resolution adopted at a Statehood convention held at Shawnee, Okla., praying that Congress at its present session pass an enabling act providing for the admission of Oklahoma Territory as a State; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 87, of Houston, Tex., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PEFFER presented the petition of Joseph Moore and sundry other citizens of Saline County, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation granting an honorable discharge to Michael McGrath, of that county; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of St. Paul, Minn., praying that the President and Congress of the United States take immediate, definite, and vigorous actions on behalf of the Armenian survivors; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN presented the petition of Rachel A. Redd, of Claridon, Ohio, praying for the return of $300, commutation paid by her husband, Andrew J. Redd, for release from service in the late war; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY. I present the petition of a number of merchants of the city of Philadelphia, organized as the Philadelphia Wool Merchants' Association, praying for a reenactment of that portion of the tariff law of 1890 which relates to wool and woolens. These gentlemen ask me to request the Senate that the petition be read at length and printed in the RECORD. I shall be glad to have that done if there is no objection in the Senate. If there is objection, I shall merely mention briefly, under the rule, the contents of the petition.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the petition be read?

Mr. SHERMAN. I am afraid it is setting a bad precedent. What is the subject-matter?

Mr. QUAY. It is a petition praying for the reenactment of Schedule K of the late tariff act.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The petition was read, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, *December 11, 1895.*

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

The Philadelphia Wool Merchants' Association earnestly petitions your honorable bodies that without delay you reenact that portion of the tariff law of 1890 with respect to wool and woolens called Schedule K:

In order that the revenue therefrom may provide the Treasury against the deficiency which threatens the Government's financial position;

In order that the great number of farmers and woolgrowers may obtain fairly remunerative prices for their product and preserve their already depleted flocks from destruction;

In order that this country, so well adapted for raising all descriptions of wool, may produce at least a fair proportion of that needed for our home industries;

In order that the great number of toilers in our woolen factories may obtain a fair wage for their labor such as will permit them to live better than the impoverished workmen of Europe; and

In order that the mill owners may have a fair return for their capital and preserve plants from bankruptcy which have so far tided over the depression of the past two years in the hope of some return of the day of prosperity.

This petition is respectfully presented by an association of wool merchants of Philadelphia, who beg your honorable bodies, and the Executive, who has so lately assured the Congress that he is "prepared to cooperate with them in perfecting any measure promising thorough and practical relief" in what he has so aptly termed "our critical financial plight," and that he "will gladly labor with them in every patriotic endeavor to further the interests and guard the welfare of our countrymen," to thus relieve the gravity of the situation both with regard to the national finances and with respect to the great wool and woolen interests, so that both may immediately have relief and some return of prosperity.

JOHN A. LESLIE, *President.*
PAUL JAGODE, *Secretary.*

In the presence of the undersigned wool merchants of Philadelphia, who earnestly join in the foregoing petition.

COATES BROTHERS,
JUSTICE BATEMAN & CO.,
PHILIP JAGODE & CO.,
And many others.

Mr. CAFFERY presented the following petition of the legislature of Louisiana; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

[House concurrent resolution.]

Whereas the streams known as the River Bœuf and Bayou Macon, in the northeastern portion of this State, are important water courses and can be made great feeders to our commerce, being already navigable a considerable distance a good portion of each year; and

Whereas there is large and important territory drained and to be benefited by the improvement of said stream, comprising large portions of the parishes of East Carroll, West Carroll, Morehouse, Richland, Franklin, Madison, Tensas, and Catahoula: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the general assembly of the State of Louisiana, That we hereby memorialize Congress for relief in the premises and urge upon our Senators and Representatives at Washington to use their influence and utmost endeavors in securing an adequate appropriation for the purpose of improving the navigation of the aforesaid rivers, Macon and Bœuf, by cleaning out, dredging the shoals, and the construction of suitable locks by which deep water may be secured the year round as far up as the line of the State of Arkansas, thereby affording better drainage and increasing facilities for commerce.

Resolved further, That we deem $85,000 sufficient for this purpose, and would respectfully ask and urge the immediate appropriation of the said amount as indicated, $50,000 to be used in the improvement of Bayou Macon and $35,000 for the improvement of Bœuf River.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to forward a copy of this resolution to each of our Senators and Representatives in Washington instanter, so that this appropriation may be made and included in the budget of appropriations for rivers and harbors.

G. W. BOLTON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
H. R. LOTT,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

Approved July 12, 1894.

MURPHY J. FOSTER,
Governor of the State of Louisiana.

A true copy.

T. S. ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CAFFERY presented a petition of sundry citizens of the United States resident in the State of Louisiana, praying the refund of certain moneys collected by the United States; which, with the accompanying exhibits, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented the petition of Lavinia E. Buchanan, of Bakersville, N. C., widow of William A. Buchanan, deceased, late private of Company E, Third Regiment of North Carolina Mounted Infantry Volunteers, praying that she be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of James H. Tolly, of Bakersville, N. C., late of Company L, Twelfth Regiment Tennessee Cavalry, praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Martha C. Ollis, of Mitchell County, N. C., widow of John Ollis, deceased, late of Company D, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteers, praying that she be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR presented a resolution of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, reiterating its former resolutions favoring the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HAWLEY presented a memorial of the legislative assembly of Connecticut; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, GENERAL ASSEMBLY, JANUARY SESSION, A. D. 1895.

[Senate joint resolution No. 210.]

Resolution requesting our Senators and Representatives in Congress to investigate concerning the case of Dorence Atwater.

Whereas there has just been brought to the knowledge of the people of the town of Plymouth, in this State, the case of Dorence Atwater, a former citizen of that town, deservedly and universally held in high estimation for his character and his conduct as a soldier in the late civil war and, under appointment by the United States, having discharged for many years acceptably to the Government all the duties of a consul at the Seychelles Islands and at Tahiti; and

Whereas it now appears that said Atwater, after having rendered services especially dangerous and highly meritorious in the late civil war, services considered at the time particularly valuable in their results to the Union cause and a matter of pride to his fellow-citizens for the patriotic sagacity, skill, and perseverance shown and success achieved by him, was pronounced guilty of a crime by a court-martial and sentenced to State prison at hard labor and confined as a felon in Auburn State Prison, from which he was discharged after two months' confinement without pardon and without any reason given in the premises: Therefore,

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in the general assembly of the State of Connecticut convened, That the Senators and Representatives of this State in the Fifty-fourth Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to cause the case of Dorence Atwater to be inquired into by the Fifty-fourth Congress, through a committee or otherwise, to the end that the finding and sentence in said case be annulled, and that what pertains to justice in said case may at last be done, that his name and memory may be forever relieved of the disgrace and dishonor now resting upon it.

House passed July 1, 1895.
Senate passed July 1, 1895.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, *ss:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said State, at Hartford, this 9th day of July, A. D. 1895.

WILLIAM C. MOWRY, *Secretary.*

Mr. HAWLEY presented the petition of Charles E. White, secretary of the Groton Monument Association, and 91 other citizens of Groton, Mass., and New London, Conn., praying for the purchase by the United States of certain lots adjoining old Fort Griswold, Groton Heights, Groton, Mass.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition, in the form of resolutions, adopted by the Wholesale Grocers' Association of Quincy, Ill., praying for a reduction of letter postage to 1 cent; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Portland, Me., praying that an investigation be made into the condi-

tion of our merchant marine with a view to legislation for its revival; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of the legislative assembly of California; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 13.

Introduced by committee on Federal relations February 6, 1895. Read, adopted, and transmitted to senate.

Assembly substitute for senate joint resolution No. 2, relative to the free coinage of silver.

Whereas we recognize the fact that by the demonetization of silver, and by refusal to give it equal standing in the coinage system of the United States, the material interest of the nation is dangerously impaired; and

Whereas it is recognized to be a fact that the opposition to silver coinage emanates from speculative syndicates and moneyed classes who seek to embarrass the people of the nation for the advancement of their own selfish ends; and

Whereas we entertain the firm belief that the full measure of national prosperity will never be restored until the coinage of silver is resumed in accordance with the true intent and spirit of the Constitution of the United States, and having unbounded faith in the power and ability of this nation to restore and maintain silver in its proper position alongside of gold; and

Whereas we believe that the issue of United States bonds for the purpose of maintaining a single gold standard, or any standard that does not contemplate the free and unlimited coinage of silver, is a practice fraught with the greatest danger to the stability of our institutions and the maintenance of national credit: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives be requested to earnestly and urgently advocate the immediate enactment of such laws as may be necessary to provide for the immediate resumption of the free and unlimited coinage of silver in the ratio of 16 to 1; and

Be it further resolved, That our Senators be instructed and our Representatives be requested to actively advocate the enactment of such laws as may be necessary to prevent the issue of United States bonds for the sole purpose of maintaining a single gold standard of money; and

Be it further resolved, That the governor be requested to immediately transmit a copy of these resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Fruit Growers' Association of California, praying for the construction and ownership by the Government of the Nicaragua Canal; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented the following memorial of the legislature of Minnesota; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Joint resolution of the legislature of Minnesota, recommending that provision be made by act of Congress for the appointment by the President of Lieut. Col. Josias R. King, late an officer of the First Minnesota Infantry and of the Regular Army, to be first lieutenant in the Army, and to be placed on the retired list with that rank.

Whereas Lieut. Col. Josias R. King, of this State, enlisted as a volunteer in Company A of the First Minnesota Infantry on the evening of April 14, 1861, and was thereafterwards, on the 29th day of April of the same year, mustered into the military service of the United States as an enlisted man, in which service he remained, with the exception of six months after the termination of the war of the rebellion, until the expiration of the year 1870, during which period he held the rank of first sergeant of Company A, First Minnesota Infantry, second lieutenant in the same regiment, first lieutenant and captain of the same regiment, lieutenant-colonel of United States Infantry Volunteers, second lieutenant United States Infantry, and first lieutenant of the same regiment, and while so in the service participated in the first and second battles of Bull Run, in the battle of Edwards Ferry, in the siege of Yorktown, in the battles of Fair Oaks, Nelson's Farm, Savage Station, White Oak Swamp, Peach Orchard, Malvern Hill (first and second battle), Fredericksburg, Vienna, Antietam, South Mountain, Charlestown, and Chancellorsville, and in the Indian campaigns on the Arkansas and Upper Missouri rivers in the summer of 1865, and in all these battles and campaigns served with credit to himself and with such gallantry as to attract the attention of his superiors, who, for his distinguished services, recommended him for a commission in the Regular Army, which was accordingly granted in the month of May, 1866, as second lieutenant, and was afterwards promoted to first lieutenant, and served in the Regular Army in such manner as to meet the approval of all his superiors, and solely on account of the location to which he was assigned was compelled to leave the Army or sacrifice his wife to the debilitating and malarial influences of the climate, and has now reached the age of 64 years, without income or any means for the support of himself and his family: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Minnesota, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and the same are hereby, respectfully requested to use all honorable means to pass such an act as will enable the President of the United States to appoint said Lieut. Col. Josias R. King first lieutenant in the Regular Army, and place his name upon the retired list of the Army, with the pay and emoluments of that rank.

Approved March 2, 1895.

STATE OF MINNESOTA, *Department of State.*

I, Albert Berg, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house file No. 339, filed in this office March 2, 1895.

ALBERT BERG.

Mr. CALL. I present a communication from citizens of the United States in the Island of Cuba, accompanied by a request that it be laid before the Senate. It is in the nature of a petition, but I suppose the names of the writers should not be communicated. It relates to the unreliability of the intelligence conveyed in the press dispatches in regard to Cuban affairs, and asserts the complete organization and success of the revolution there. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN presented the following memorial of the legislature of Wyoming; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

STATE OF WYOMING, *Office of the Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Wyoming, ss:*

I, Charles W. Burdick, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 1, of the Third State legislature of Wyoming, has been compared with the original which is on file in this office, and the same is a true and correct copy of said memorial and of the whole thereof, together with the indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming. Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 23d day of February, A. D. 1895.

CHARLES W. BURDICK,
Secretary of State.

THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WYOMING.

Senate joint memorial No. 1, State of Wyoming.

Memorializing Congress to allow and pay to the State the amount of money realized by the United States from the sale of sections 16 and 36, which are sold by the Government as coal lands.

Whereas by the act of admission to the State of Wyoming sections 16 and 36 in every township in the State of Wyoming were granted to the State for the support of the common schools, and by section 13 of said act of admission all mineral lands are exempted from such grant, said State being authorized and empowered to select in lieu thereof an equal amount of other unappropriated lands for the use and benefit of the common schools thereof:

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

That instead of the selection of lands in lieu of any of said sections 16 and 36, or any portion thereof, which shall, by reason of being coal lands, be exempted from the grant of such sections to the State, the United States allow and pay to the State of Wyoming, the same to constitute a part of the permanent fund for the benefit of the common schools of said State, any and all moneys realized and received by the United States from the sale of such coal lands located in sections 16 and 36 in any township within said State, whether the same shall be received by the United States at any time hereafter, or at any time heretofore, since the admission of Wyoming as a State.

Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Senator and to the Representative in Congress from this State, and they are hereby respectfully requested to urge the necessary legislation in the premises.

GEO. W. HOYT,
President of the Senate.
JAY L. TORREY,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 16, A. D. 1895.

WM. A. RICHARDS, *Governor.*

Mr. BRICE presented petitions of 60 citizens of Hannibal; of 60 citizens of Melrose; of 50 citizens of Holmesville; of 171 citizens of Massillon; of 40 citizens of Lykens; of 214 citizens of Marion; of 62 citizens of Green Spring; of 130 citizens of Osnaburg; of 150 citizens of Dayton, and of 70 citizens of Andover, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the appropriation of moneys for sectarian purposes; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of 112 citizens of Youngstown; of 150 citizens of Dayton; of 70 citizens of Andover; of 53 citizens of Beach City; of 40 citizens of McCutchenville; of 40 citizens of Lykens; of 62 citizens of Green Spring; of 54 citizens of Cincinnati; of 125 citizens of Dayton, and of 46 citizens of Mount Eaton, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that no State shall grant the right of franchise to any person who is not a citizen of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Union Veteran Legion, Encampment No. 35, of Mount Vernon, Ohio, praying that the battlefield of Appomattox be secured for the purposes of a national park; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented two petitions of sundry publishers of newspapers in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the proposed Covert amendment to the copyright law; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of Lodge No. 169, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Newark, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to ameliorate the condition of American seamen; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of 136 citizens of Putnam County, Ohio, praying for the construction of a ship canal connecting Lake Erie with the Ohio River along the line of the Miami and Erie Canal, and connecting Lake Erie at or near Defiance, Ohio, with another canal to Lake Michigan; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Harvery Rice Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cleveland, Ohio, and a petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls at the ports of embarkation; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Ohio Valley Trades and Labor Assembly, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the exclusion and deportation of alien anarchists; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation reorganizing the consular and diplomatic service of the Government; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the teachers and students of the Ohio Normal University of Ada, Ohio, praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WHITE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Monterey, Cal., praying for the speedy construction of the Nicaraguan

Canal by the Government; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SPECIAL REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

Mr. GORMAN. I am instructed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred a resolution, submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] on the 9th instant, to print 500 copies of the special report of the Librarian of Congress, to report it favorably without amendment. I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 500 copies of Senate Document No. 7, being a special report of the Librarian of Congress, be printed, one-half of said number to be for distribution by the Librarian.

Mr. GORMAN. I submit a report to accompany the resolution, which I ask may be printed as a document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be printed under the rule.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 828) granting a pension to Anna M. Newton, widow of Maj. Gen. John Newton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 829) for the relief of Lydia T. Hadlock, administratrix of E. C. Hadlock, deceased, of Vermont; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 830) granting a pension to Mary Allard, widow of John Allard, formerly of Company E, Seventh Connecticut Volunteer Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 831) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary E. Woodworth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 832) to authorize the construction of an addition to the public building at Hartford, Conn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 833) to promote the efficiency of the militia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 834) to establish a naval experiment station at New London, Conn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 835) making an appropriation to survey the lands of the Five Civilized Tribes, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 836) for the relief of William J. Murray; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 837) making an appropriation for the benefit of the estate of William Moss, deceased;

A bill (S. 838) for the relief of Margaret E. Watkins;

A bill (S. 839) for the relief of Henry M. Stone;

A bill (S. 840) for the relief of the board of trustees of the Old School Presbyterian Church, of Helena, Phillips County, Ark.;

A bill (S. 841) for the relief of James R. Lafferty;

A bill (S. 842) for the relief of the estate of Holliday S. Ravell;

A bill (by request) (S. 843) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth L. Traweek, of Sebastian County, Ark.;

A bill (S. 844) for the relief of James A. Mitchell, of Sebastian County, Ark.;

A bill (S. 845) for the relief of William W. Burns;

A bill (S. 846) for the relief of the estate of J. H. Moseby, deceased;

A bill (S. 847) for the relief of the estate of Albert L. Berry, deceased;

A bill (S. 848) for the relief of Charles W. Russey;

A bill (S. 849) for the relief of the estate of Samuel J. Jones, deceased;

A bill (S. 850) for the relief of the estate of William B. Pool, late of Jefferson County, Ark.;

A bill (S. 851) for the relief of the firm of Bertram & Scull, late of Arkansas; and

A bill (S. 852) for the relief of the estate of James Scull, late of Arkansas.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 853) for the relief of W. Jasper Blackburn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also introduced a bill (S. 854) to provide for reimbursement of the expense of constructing a sewer upon the permanent reservation at Hot Springs, Ark.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 855) to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 856) granting a pension to Philip T. Greely; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 857) for relief of heirs of Philip C. Rowe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 858) granting a pension to George W. Emery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 859) for the relief of James B. Russell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 860) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 861) for the relief of John Rhodes and wife; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 862) for the relief of the receivers of the Towboat Association of New Orleans, La.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 863) for the relief of James J. Person and Isabella M. Person; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 864) to remove charge of desertion against the name of James E. Cotter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 865) granting a pension to John O'Connor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 866) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Church; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 867) for the relief of Henry Dimler; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 868) providing for the relief of First Sergt. Bernard W. Hopper, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 869) for the relief of David B. Zorger and Hannah C. Fitzgerald; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 870) for the relief of John K. Betson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 871) granting an increase of pension to John De Haven; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 872) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Conneaut Lake Exposition Company, in Pennsylvania, two condemned pieces of field ordnance, etc.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 873) granting an increase of pension to Chambers C. Mullin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 874) granting a pension to D. W. C. McCloskey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 875) granting a pension to H. S. McGown; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 876) to provide for telegraphic communication between the United States of America, the Hawaiian Islands, and Japan, and to promote commerce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 877) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Silvey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 878) granting a pension to Jared S. Chamberlain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHILTON introduced a bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 880) striking out and annulling sec-

tion 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 881) for the relief of the administrators of Isaac P. Tice, deceased, and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 882) for the better protection of the public service by excluding aliens from Government employment; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also introduced a bill (S. 883) to increase pensions for loss of the sight of both eyes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 884) for the relief of pensioners permanently disabled in the line of duty whose pensions have been reduced and afterwards restored; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 885) to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that an accompanying letter from the Secretary of the Interior, recommending this proposed legislation, be referred, with the bill, to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 886) to provide a home for aged and infirm colored people; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PEFFER subsequently said: I wish to ask a change of reference of a bill introduced by me this morning (S. 886) to provide a home for aged and infirm colored people. I asked that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. After talking the matter over, it has occurred to me that perhaps it had better go to the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask that the change of reference be made.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest to the Senator from Kansas that the Committee on the District of Columbia, I think, have heretofore had charge of that bill, which is for the establishment of a home in the District. I am very positive, in the absence of the chairman of the committee, that I am justified in saying that such matters ordinarily go to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I have no personal preference in the matter.

Mr. PEFFER. I had some difficulty in my mind in determining what committee properly had jurisdiction of the subject-matter, and I conferred with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], who, I believe, is the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and his suggestion was similar to that of the Senator from New Hampshire; but in conferring with the friends of the bill upon the outside I find they think, it being a national measure and one that should be more clearly and more systematically investigated, that perhaps it had better go to a committee specially interested in the subject. If it will not be offensive to the committee—and I am sure I do not intend anything of that kind to the Committee on the District of Columbia—I still ask that the bill may go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which committee I am a member, and upon the statement of the Senator from Kansas that the chairman of that committee claims that it has properly jurisdiction of this bill, I certainly am unwilling to have the reference changed, except by a vote of the Senate.

Mr. PEFFER. Very well. Let the bill remain where it is for the present.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 887) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge to Michael McGrath; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WALTHALL introduced a bill (S. 888) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Capital Railway Company," approved March 2, 1895; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 889) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Josias R. King; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 890) granting a pension to John N. Landon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 891) to amend section 1315 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 892) for the relief of John Millan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 893) for the relief of Mrs. Mary B. Hulings; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 894) granting a pension to Nancy G. Allabach; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 895) for the relief of Christopher Ellis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 896) granting an increase of pension to John Shannon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 897) granting a pension to Neil McNeil; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 898) granting a pension of $50 a month to C. L. Alden; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 899) to prevent the unlawful killing of game by Indians, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 900) restoring Capt. E. W. Ward to active service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 901) amending section 4716 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 902) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Moscow, in the State of Idaho; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 903) to increase the pension of Caroline A. Hough, widow of Brig. Gen. John Hough; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 904) to finally adjust the swamp-land grants, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 905) granting a pension to Mary W. Keefe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PROCTOR (by request) introduced a bill (S. 906) to amend the charter of the Brightwood Railway Company of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 907) granting an honorable discharge to John Walsh, Company F, Tenth Regiment Michigan Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 908) granting a pension to William Shunk; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 909) granting a pension to Alexander Hines; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 910) granting a pension to Elisha B. Seaman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 911) to relieve Peter Callaghan from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HARRIS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 912) to amend sections 720, 721, 722, and 723 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the District of Columbia, in relation to marriages; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 913) to provide for the incorporation and regulation of medical colleges in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 914) to protect public forest reservations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on Forest Reservations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 915) for the relief of Sarah R. Dresser; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 916) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Cornelia I. Skiles; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 917) for the relief of William S. Peabody; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 918) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Kate Ezekiel; which was read twice by its title, and, with

the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 919) granting a pension to Christian White; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 920) granting a pension to T. R. Le Tellier; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 921) removing the charge of desertion in the case of John Holderby; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 922) to increase the pension of Graham McClossen; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 923) for the relief of Irving W. Stanton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 924) to provide for the erection of a bridge across the Detroit River at Detroit, in the State of Michigan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 925) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 926) to amend section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 927) for the relief of Chester B. Sweet, of California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 928) for the relief of John Williams, of California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 929) to declare land containing phosphate deposits to be mineral land and subject to disposal under the mining laws of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 930) to require the auditing and payment of the volunteer soldiers who served in the Seminole Indian wars in Florida, and for horses and equipments lost in the service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 931) to authorize the sale of the site of St. Francis Barracks, Fla., the sale or removal of the improvements thereof, and to provide for a new site and the construction of suitable buildings thereon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 932) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a public building at Fernandina, in the State of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 933) making an appropriation for the purchase of a site and the construction of a light and fog signal at St. Andrews Bay, Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 934) for the relief of Capt. Thomas W. Lund; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 935) to require patents to be issued to land actually settled under the act entitled "An act to provide for the armed occupation and settlement of the unsettled part of the peninsula of Florida," approved August 4, 1842; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 936) for the relief of John S. Sammis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 937) granting a pension to Sarah Comly, widow of Maj. Clifton Comly; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 938) for the relief of Jane Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 939) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Loudon, Loudon County, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PROCTOR (by request) introduced a bill (S. 940) providing for the retirement of employees in the Executive Departments of Government of the classified service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 941) granting to the Atchison and Nebraska Railroad Company and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, its lessee in perpetuity, the right of way over a part of the Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian Reservation in the States of Kansas and Nebraska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 942) granting a pension to John Hatcher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 943) granting a pension to Samuel B. Hurlbut, Company G, Ninth Iowa Veteran Volunteer Infantry, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 944) granting a pension to Robert Gamble; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 945) granting a pension to Susan Kent; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 946) granting a pension to Emily Hawkins, widow of George S. Hawkins, a soldier of the Florida Seminole Indian war; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 947) granting a pension to Margaret Stone, widow of Benoni Stone, a soldier of Florida Seminole Indian war; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 948) for the construction of a breakwater and harbor of refuge at or near Cape Canaveral, State of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GIBSON introduced a bill (S. 949) to incorporate the East Washington Heights Traction Railway Company of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 950) granting increase of pension to Franklin C. Plantz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 951) granting increase of pension to John F. Early; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 952) granting an increase of pension to Francis Walsh, of Stockham, Nebr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 953) to pay James L. Willett arrears of pension; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 954) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rouse, of Wilber, Nebr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 955) for the relief of William Henry Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 956) to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 957) to transfer the Bureau of the United States Geological Survey and the United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries to the Department of Agriculture; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 958) to amend paragraph 1 of section 1 of an act approved August 30, 1890, entitled "An act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 959) to amend "An act to provide for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof which are the subjects of interstate commerce, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 960) to reimburse the State of Nebraska the expenses incurred by that State in repelling a threatened invasion and raid by the Sioux in 1890 and 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 961) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 962) to establish an assay office in the city of Omaha, Nebr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 963) to establish a branch mint of the United States at Omaha, in the state of Nebraska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 964) authorizing the pay of officers of customs performing duty after the expiration of their terms; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 965) for the relief of Theodore L. Van Dorn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 966) for the relief of W. W. Lowe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 967) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hazlip; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 968) to reimburse the city of Omaha, Nebr., for money expended in the construction of pavement adjacent to Government property, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 969) for the relief of Thomas F. O'Reilly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 970) to remove the charge of desertion standing against John Daley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 971) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jeremiah F. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 972) to provide for the continuance in office of customs officers and assistant treasurers until successors shall have been appointed and qualified; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 973) granting a pension to Benjamin Cental, of Blair, Nebr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 974) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of site and the erection of a public building at Omaha, Nebr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 975) to authorize the location of a branch home for volunteer disabled soldiers and sailors at or near the city of Blair, Nebr., and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 976) to amend sections 140 and 145 and repealing sections 143 and 144 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to Presidential elections; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 977) for the retirement of John Tempany, senior veterinary surgeon of the Ninth Regiment of Cavalry, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ROACH (by request) introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 25) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant permits for the use of the White Lot and part of the Monument Grounds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 26) directing issue of Sioux scrip in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 27) granting permission for the erection of a monument in Washington, D. C., for the ornamentation of the national capital and in honor of Samuel Hahnemann; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. FRYE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 28) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMPLOYEES OF THE POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. PEFFER. I offer a resolution, and before it is read, inasmuch as I desire to have it referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, I wish to make a very brief statement concerning it.

It is a resolution instructing the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads to inquire whether and by what authority the Postmaster-General levies money fines against the pay of employees in that Department, and also whether and by what authority employees of the Department are prohibited from conferring with members of Congress and suggesting legislation, etc.

This is a very important matter, and I wish to suggest to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, now that we are all together, that it involves the personal rights of a very worthy and very hard-working class of the American people. I have a letter in my hand which I received this morning; I have received a number of similar letters, and also have had a number of interviews with persons who are particularly interested in this resolution. I hope that the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads will take the matter seriously and act upon it with promptness. I ask that the letter and resolution be referred to that committee.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads be, and it is hereby, instructed to inquire whether and by what authority the Postmaster-General levies fines against the pay of employees of the Post-Office Department for mistakes and errors in work; and whether and by what authority employees of that Department are prohibited from suggesting legislation in their interest and conferring thereabout with members of Congress, and the committee will report by bill or otherwise.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution, with the accompanying letter, will be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, in the absence of objection.

PAYMENT OF SUGAR BOUNTY.

Mr. CAFFERY submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to report to the Senate what action has been taken in regard to the payment of the appropriation contained in the sundry civil bill, section 1, amendment 107, approved March 2, 1895, for the bounty on sugar. And if no payment has been made of said appropriation, and if the law granting said bounty has not been executed, to give to the Senate the reasons therefor.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Postmaster-General, and the Attorney-General are hereby directed to cause a careful and thorough inquiry to be made regarding the employment of aliens in their respective Departments and to communicate the result of said inquiry to the Senate at the earliest practicable day.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 21) for printing extra copies of the report of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy at West Point was read twice by its title.

Mr. VILAS. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. GORMAN. Under the law all such resolutions must go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. VILAS. The joint resolution comes from the House of Representatives, and presumably was reported from the Committee on Printing of that House. Is it necessary that it should also go to the Committee on Printing of the Senate?

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, sir. I will say to the Senator that the committee will promptly report the joint resolution.

Mr. VILAS. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

THE PUBLIC LANDS AND THEIR WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. GORMAN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, under the direction of the Department of the Interior, 6,000 copies of a paper contained in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Director of the United States Geological Survey, entitled "The public lands and their water supply," together with the accompanying maps and illustrations, of which number 1,500 copies shall be for the use of members of the Senate, 3,000 for the use of members of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 for the use of the Geological Survey.

EXCHANGE BETWEEN GOLD AND SILVER STANDARD COUNTRIES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution heretofore submitted by the Senator from Nevada, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. STEWART on the 12th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be directed to inquire what effect the difference of exchange between gold-standard countries and silver-standard countries has upon the agricultural and manufacturing industries of the United States, and report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I offered that resolution to bring before the Senate and the country a grave and serious situation. There has been, for causes which I shall consider later on, an awakening in the Orient to manufacturing and other industrial pursuits, which brings into competition with the Western world from 500,000,000 to 1,000,000,000 people who have been trained to industry for thousands of years and who can subsist on one-fourth of the cost of the food that Europeans can in performing the same amount of labor. Their industries, their manufactures, have at last come in direct conflict with the manufacturing industries of the Western world.

There has been much debate and much argument in the United States to show the necessity of protecting the people of this country against competition with their own race, but never until recently has the question been presented between the Anglo-Saxon and Celtic races and the Asiatics. We have in this country made

most strenuous efforts to exclude the Chinese, and have so far succeeded in doing it that there are but few left; but the invasion by the Chinese themselves, with whom it has been amply shown we can not compete, is a small matter compared with the invasion of this country by their products.

The attention of the country has been recently called to the fact that Japanese agents were here offering to sell almost every description of manufactured articles below the cost of production in this country. An article was published in the Stock Report of San Francisco, a journal of repute, and extracts from it were sent East by telegraph. In order to verify the statements it contained, I sent a telegram to the editor of that journal, William M. Bunker, and received from him a telegram giving details of the operations of a Japanese agent there, and reciting the low price at which Japanese commodities were being offered in the American market. It seems to me, however, that some of the prices are lower than it is possible for the Japanese to sell commodities here. For instance, it is stated that they are offering bicycles of the first class for $12 apiece, which would be $24 in their money. I have seen publications from the manufacturers of bicycles, who say it is impossible to manufacture them at that price; but that is mere detail. The fact that a Japanese agent for large manufactories in that country is in the United States making contracts at figures below those at which Americans can manufacture the same article is the reason why I call attention to this dispatch, which I shall print in my remarks, if there be no objection.

I also hold in my hand an editorial from the Philadelphia Item purporting to be an interview with the Japanese consul-general at New York, which sets forth the operations of manufacturing establishments in Japan and their ability and purpose to undersell the manufacturers in this country.

Mr. CALL. If the Senator will allow, I should be glad to hear the dispatch he referred to read.

Mr. STEWART. At the request of the Senator from Florida, I will have the dispatch read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., *November 30, 1895.*

Hon. WILLIAM M. STEWART, *Washington, D. C.:*

The Daily Report of November 23 gave details of a Japanese invasion of the American markets. Articles of Japanese manufacture since the close of their war are being received of equal quality with American manufactured goods, and at prices so low that our manufactories of these articles must close unless relieved by Congressional action. Report stated that H. E. Reynell, of Kobe, Japan, established an agency in San Francisco, in the Crocker Building, Mr. Edward O. Burns being their agent, for the sale of Japanese manufactured goods for the purpose of underselling American products. Similar agencies are being established East and West now by representatives of Japanese houses. The agency here is now selling the best parlor matches in tin-lined box, in box and case lots of 50 gross in a case, delivered to the merchant freight and duty paid, at 30 cents per gross. He also sells doors, sashes, blinds, and all articles of wooden ware, cooperage stock, etc., of Japanese manufacture at from 30 to 50 per cent less than they can be manufactured for in this country, with all freight and duty paid by the Japanese importers; also clocks, watches, bicycles, boots, shoes, clothing, hats, caps, gloves, fancy goods, and notions on similar terms. Their agents are buying cotton-mill machinery and shipping to Japan and will take our cotton from here to Japan and send it back manufactured for less than it can possibly be manufactured in this country. They also take cargoes of Pacific Coast lumber, manufacture the same in Japan into wooden ware, etc., and return same here manufactured at 50 per cent less than our manufacturers' wholesale prices.

A meeting has been called in San Francisco for the Chamber of Commerce, Board of Trade, and Manufacturers' Association to memorialize Congress for relief. The appraiser of the port of San Francisco, in an interview with the editor of the Report, speaks of largely increased importations of Japanese goods of all kinds. He also notes a change in silk goods. They were formerly all white, but are now colored to beat the coloring of France or America.

* * * * * * *

WM. M. BUNKER,
Editor Daily Report.

Mr. STEWART. The extract from the Philadelphia Item to which I have referred is as follows:

WHAT NONFREE SILVER IS DOING.

[The Item, Philadelphia, Pa., December 14, 1895.]

The Japanese consul-general of New York says that he thinks Japan is on the eve of building up a large trade of Japanese products in the United States. He says Japan has an ample supply of low-cost coal and is buying and making the best machinery for a large export trade.

He adds that hemp and cotton carpets, wall paper, copper and bronze ware, crystal ware, silk handkerchiefs, raw silk, pongee, umbrellas, rags, beer, tobacco, coal, and matches are among the leaders.

Besides these, Japanese agents are now offering bicycles at $12.50, sashes, doors, and blinds and wool carpets at astonishingly low prices, in fact no line is now drawn limiting what that country proposes to do in selling to the United States as well as to all gold-basis countries so long as silver continues depreciated.

Take the above bicycle as an example for all the other goods. It is claimed equal to the best in this country, and at the price mentioned is delivered duty and freight free in San Francisco.

The $12.50 received for each bicycle is in gold. This is sold for silver, equaling $20 to the Japanese manufacturer. He pays $15 of his silver dollars for making, freight, duties, etc., and clears a net profit of $5 in silver.

This same method of profit is available to the Japanese for everything they are able to produce, as well as selling coal in the San Francisco market.

The consul-general says that coal would be so sold now if the ships had a return cargo.

The evidence that this movement on the part of the Asiatics is very extensive and that it will revolutionize the manufacturing of the world is abundant. Our consul at Shanghai, Mr. T. R. Jernigan, has made a report on the subject, from which I will read a portion. The report is dated August 26, 1895. The Japanese war has done much to wake up the Asiatics and produce a new industrial era. The most important clause in the treaty of April 17, 1895, between China and Japan, is the provision opening all the treaty ports of China to the Japanese for manufacturing purposes. The sixth article of that treaty reads as follows:

Japanese subjects shall be free to engage in all kinds of manufacturing industries in all of the open cities, towns, and ports of China, and shall be at liberty to import into China all kinds of machinery, paying only the stipulated import duties thereon.

The Japanese have since that time been taking occasion to establish manufactures; their agents are in China now examining the situation and preparing to go ahead. But that is not all. The Chinese are a very able people when their attention is concentrated on a subject and their energies are aroused. For patient industry they have no superior; and in any kind of industry which requires skill and patience I think they are probably superior to any other race on earth. Our consul-general gives an account of the growth of manufacturing in China and their exports of cotton. He also refers to their capacity to grow cotton, and says:

The import of Indian yarns during the past four years at Shanghai annually averages over 195,000 bales of 3 piculs each (1 picul = 133⅓ pounds), while the principal ports in the south of China have taken during the same period an average of 136,000 bales.

In the calculation there does not seem to be any apprehension as to a sufficient supply of raw material for the mills. In 1886 the export of cotton from Shanghai to Japan was 47,600 piculs, and the total export 278,600 piculs. In 1894 Japan took 576,000 piculs, and the total amount of cotton which left Shanghai was 930,400 piculs. It may be noted that the large increase in the exportation did not increase the price of cotton, and this may confirm the opinion among business men here that the Chinese are prepared to extend the area of the cultivation of cotton in proportion as the demand arises. Along the Yangtse Valley the soil available for cotton cultivation appears as limitless as the supply of labor in China appears inexhaustible. It is seen, after supplying the local demand, what a large quantity of cotton was exported during the past year, and it is estimated that this exported cotton would run 360,000 spindles in addition to those already at work.

There are 3 cotton mills now at work here, with, in all, 66,200 spindles, and 3 more, with 49,000 spindles, about to begin operations. Adding these to the 3 the plans or outline of which are now before the public, and which have been referred to, there will, ere a great while, be 9 cotton mills in full operation, with a total spinning capacity of 265,200 spindles.

That is in Shanghai alone, but Japan began before China, and the development in Japan is much more remarkable. China, with a capacity to produce an unlimited supply of cotton, is just waking up. After reviewing the history and growth of manufacturing in Japan, our consul-general says in regard to the cotton industry in that country:

The rapid progress of the industry is evidenced by the fact that there are in operation and in course of construction 48 factories, aggregating 819,115 spindles, of which 580,564 are in actual operation. Consular Report for November.

In a dispatch from London, which was printed in the New York Sun of the 14th instant, I find that they have largely increased their manufactures since that date. A deputation of people from India petitioned the secretary for India to have the duties on imports removed, but they got no encouragement, and were very much discouraged. The dispatch from London goes on to say:

When the members of the deputation opened their newspapers the next morning—

After this interview—

they had the further discomfort of finding cheek by jowl with the report of their own despairing speeches to the secretary of state, a statement respecting Japan's cotton trade made to a Manchester reporter by Mr. Sugihara, the European representative of the famous Imperial Spinning and Weaving Company of Japan. This gentleman, who is fully qualified to talk on the subject, bubbled over with cheerfulness, and with good reason, for the trade of Japan is extremely busy, and money is being made rapidly. It seems that there are at present 57 cotton mills, representing 838,000 spindles, working in Japan, and it is expected that in about fifteen months from now there will be 700,000 additional spindles going. A good many Lancashire people have found some comfort in the fact that the exports of cotton yarn from England to Japan increased from 5,316,582 yen in 1892 to 7,288,699 yen last year. But these figures are evidently delusive, for the yarn in question, according to Mr. Sugihara, consisted chiefly of the higher grades, which the Japanese are not yet able to manufacture in sufficiently large quantities. But evidently they intend to supply themselves just as soon as they possibly can.

Here is something for Americans which, it appears, will not be so cheerful when the facts are known with regard to China:

American cotton growers may find comfort in the admission that all attempts to grow cotton in Japan so far have been unsuccessful. The native-grown cotton is of a very poor quality and not long in staple, and even unfit for mixing with American cotton.

The consular report from which I have read states that the soil for growing any kind of cotton there is as good as any in the world, and that the only difficulty with Chinese cotton is that they place the plants too near together, so that the staple is not so strong as the American staple. But whenever they learn the mode of raising cotton and plant it sufficiently far apart to allow it to mature, it is absolutely certain, according to these reports, that they have an unlimited area of country upon which to produce it.

Although this question has not attracted the attention of the American people to any great extent, it has been considered at large by the English, and I presume that many of the Senators have seen the volume containing the prize essay which was written

at the suggestion of Sir Henry M. Meysey-Thompson, who himself wrote an article.

The essay of Consul-General Jamieson, at Shanghai, took the prize, and it is so instructive that it ought to be read by every American. It is too lengthy for me to read the whole of it in the hearing of the Senate, but I ask that the prize essay, which is Mr. Jamieson's, be printed as a part of my remarks.

BIMETALLIC PRIZE COMPETITION.

[Paper submitted by George Jamieson, H. B. M. consul-general, Shanghai, China. Winner of the prize.]

Viewing the world as a whole, the observed facts during the past twenty years may be stated as follows:

1. Prices (wholesale) of nearly all commodities have fallen in gold-using countries. This fall coincided roughly, step by step, with the fall in the gold value of silver up to the end of 1892. Since that date silver has fallen more rapidly than commodities, but the latter appear to be still falling.*

2. Wages, rents, and taxes in gold-using countries have not varied, or have varied only within narrow limits, due to temporary and local causes. Agricultural rents should perhaps be excepted, but these are subject only to periodical revision.

3. Retail prices (into which wages, rent, and taxes enter largely) have not fallen to the same extent as wholesale prices; in many cases they have not fallen at all.

4. Prices (wholesale) of all commodities in silver-using countries have remained approximately steady during the period, and this whether the articles were produced in the country itself or imported. In the case of articles imported from gold-using countries, however, there has been, since the middle of 1893, a rise in silver prices corresponding to the divergence between silver and commodities noted in No. 1.

5. Wages, rent, and taxes have not varied in silver-using countries, or have varied only within narrow limits, and from causes unconnected with the relation of gold to silver.

6. Retail prices in those countries have not varied, except in the case of articles purchased retail in gold-using countries, which have risen in proportion to the rise in gold.

In so far as these propositions refer to facts observable in England, it is unnecessary to offer any remark. With regard to prices and wages in silver-using countries, especially the Asiatic countries, which are by far of the greatest importance to us, I would refer to the following publications:

Prices and Wages in India. Statistical Department, Calcutta, 1893.

Prices of Commodities in China. Consular reports. Miscellaneous series, No. 305, 1893.

The various statistical publications of the Chinese and Japanese Governments. It is impossible in this short paper to do more than indicate the data.

The first question is, In what way and to what extent have producers in England suffered loss by the demonetization of silver?

The loss to producers is the lowered value of their produce, while wages, rents, and all outgoings remain the same as before.

What, then, are the causes which have contributed to lower the prices of commodities in England and other gold-using countries, especially of agricultural produce?

Any alteration of prices must be due to causes affecting the demand, or to causes affecting the supply, or to changes in the currency itself.

It will readily be admitted that there is no falling off in the demand. The world, generally, is growing in wealth and population, and so far as demand alone is concerned prices should be rising. The cause or causes must therefore be sought in the other two elements.

The causes are, I would submit, the following, and I enumerate them in what I consider the order of importance as affecting agricultural produce, beginning with the one which has the least effect:

1. The first is cheap ocean freights and a lessening of cost of production through improvements in machinery, new chemical discoveries, and other scientific advances.

2. The appreciation of gold, consequent upon the demonetization of silver.

3. An enlarged area of supply consequent on the relative cheapness of silver to gold. As silver prices in Asiatic countries have not risen, the produce of these countries can be laid down in England at almost Asiatic prices.

I shall briefly remark on each of these in order.

1. Lowered cost of transport and production. This cause is often put forward as being the principal element in the case and it is necessary to notice it, as it has doubtless had some effect. But it may be pointed out that this cause, or set of causes, rather, had been in operation long before 1873, and did not prevent a great rise of prices between 1850 and 1873. Had these been the only agents working for a fall, all other things being equal, though in some commodities the fall might have been considerable, it is very improbable that prices all over would have been reduced more than a few points, possibly 3 to 5 per cent.

2. The appreciation of gold. It will readily be admitted that if gold were the only currency in the world a sudden augmentation or diminution of the mass by, say, one-half would raise or lower prices in nearly the same proportion. Now, when gold and silver circulated side by side at a fixed ratio maintained by the open mints of the Latin Union the metallic medium may be deemed to have been, for all practical purposes, either all gold or all silver. For example, suppose there are x ounces of gold in circulation as currency in in the world and y ounces of silver, and that 1 ounce of gold exchanges for 16 ounces of silver; then the metallic medium, in terms of gold, would be $\left(x+\frac{y}{16}\right)$ ounces, and in silver would be $(16x+y)$ ounces. The two terms would be perfectly interchangeable and the world might be said in effect to be monometallic. Prices in gold would adjust themselves in relation to the mass $\left(x+\frac{y}{16}\right)$, and prices in silver in relation to the mass $(16x+y)$, and how much was x and how much was y would be perfectly immaterial. Relatively to one another the volume of either might vary indefinitely without having any effect upon prices, which would vary only in relation to the mass of the two.

Such in effect was the state of the world up to 1873. The value of the whole of x was then, as we know, approximately equal to the whole of y; but that was quite accidental, and had not always been so.

By the breaking of the bimetallic link, the silver-using and the gold-using portions of the world parted company. In the gold-using portion prices began to adjust themselves in relation to the mass x, and in the silver-using portion in relation to the mass y, or, to speak more correctly, in relation to that mass of y which, for the time being, entered into their currency.

Now, had the two halves of the world been approximately equal in wealth, population, and extent of commerce, the adjustment might have been effected without any great disturbance of prices. One would have parted with its gold and the other with its silver, as a fair exchange, and no harm would have been done to anybody.

As a matter of fact, however, the two halves were very unequal, the gold-using half being immensely superior, and, moreover, this half was owner of a great part of the floating silver and of the silver-producing mines. Anxious as gold countries might be to get rid of their surplus silver, they would not part with it for nothing; and ready and anxious as silver-using countries might be to get silver, they could only get it for value of some sort, either by way of loans or in settlement of the annual balance of trade. This is a process that takes time. Silver-using countries for the most part are making additions to their stock of silver year by year, but they are absorbing it only slowly. Consequently prices in those countries conform themselves not to the whole mass of y in the world, but only to that part of it which has found its way into their circulation.

I may remark here in passing that this seems to explain quite satisfactorily how it is that prices and wages have risen so little in those countries, contrary to what was generally expected. In India, where the additions to the currency have been considerable, there has been some rise in the price of food and wages, particularly in those classes of skilled labor which the new industries have called into existence. So in Japan the same thing may be observed in a smaller degree. In China, on the contrary, there has been no import of silver to speak of, and no change whatever in prices and wages. Nor is there likely to be any material change in this respect, whatever the relative value of gold and silver may be; though, of course, the lower silver goes the easier in a way will it be for China and the other silver countries named to get it.

In gold-using countries, on the other hand, which have voluntarily restricted their circulation to gold, inasmuch as the mass x is manifestly insufficient to carry the commerce and industries formerly borne by x plus a considerable portion of y, prices, of course, have fallen. The quantity x has to be spread over a greater area, and as the annual additions are only sufficient to repair waste and to meet the increased demand due to the natural growth of trade, the value necessarily appreciates.

What the exact percentage due to this cause may be I do not venture to attempt to estimate. Whatever it may be, it ought to affect all commodities alike, and also, though more slowly, wages.

3°. The other cause which I have named has been and continues to be the principal factor in cheapening the prices of produce, especially produce of the cereal class.

A very few words will suffice to make this clear. In the years preceding 1873, when the rupee was at 2s. nearly, the price of Indian wheat in Bombay was approximately 10s. per hundredweight, and the Gazette price of English wheat in London was about 54s. per quarter, equal to 12s. 4d. per hundredweight. Allowing for quality and costs of transport, these prices may be deemed equivalents. When the rupee exchange fell to 1s. 6d., Indian wheat, the silver price of which in Bombay has with temporary fluctuations, remained constant,* would cost in Bombay about 7s. per hundredweight and could be laid down in London for something like 8s. 6d. All the other sources of supply remained open as before, the supply for the time being was greater than the demand, and consequently the price fell to the level of the lowest market. Again the exchange value of the rupee falls to, say, 1s. 1d. Indian wheat can now be laid down in London at nearly half the sterling price of 1873 (costs of transport having also in the meantime been greatly reduced), and consequently the price of wheat all over falls to a corresponding point.

This is a fair illustration of what has been going on all over the world. We draw our supplies from all countries wherever they can be procured most cheaply. By each successive drop in the gold value of silver, a greater and greater amount of produce has been admitted from India and other silver countries, and always at a cheaper rate. Had the rupee retained its old value of 2s., it is perfectly certain that no wheat could be imported from India at present rates. There is no reason to suppose that the rupee price in Bombay would have been materially different from what it has been. Had the gold value of the rupee not fallen, the area of grain supply would never have widened as it has done; demand and supply would have been more evenly balanced, and the variations in price would have been confined within small limits.

The same reasoning that applies to grain applies to every other article that can be supplied freely from silver-standard countries. The silver prices in those countries have, as the experience of twenty years has shown us, remained approximately steady, and necessarily the gold price has fallen. In no article, however, has the correspondence between the price of silver and the price of the article been so complete as in grain. In 1873, when the price of silver was 60d., wheat stood at 54s. To-day silver is 28¼d. and wheat 24s., being a drop in the one case of 52.5 per cent, and in the other of 55.6 per cent.

It is simply the old law of supply and demand. Increase the area of supply, and you have, for the time being, the supply outrunning the demand. With an excessive supply the cost of production in the cheapest area must determine the price of the whole. So long as Indian wheat can be laid down at 23s. a quarter it is impossible for English farmers to get a higher price, quality for quality. India by itself, of course, could not provide enough wheat to supply the whole English demand, but that is not the point. All the other sources whence England drew her supplies before the fall in silver still continue to send wheat forward, and it is the cheap rate at which the excess supply from India and other silver countries is offered that governs the market. The lower silver goes the cheaper and cheaper does this excess supply become. And there is no help for it, until either silver begins to rise again or until some portions of the earth are thrown out of wheat cultivation and the demand again overtakes the supply.

But it may be said, granting that the cheapening of produce is hard on the agriculturist, it must be a very good thing for the country at large, especially for the manufacturing portion, who get the same wages, and therefore can live so much better. This seeming prosperity, however, can be but short-lived, for—

II. The rise in the value of gold holds out an immense temptation to the capitalists of silver countries to develop their coal mines, and to erect machinery for the purpose of supplying themselves and other silver countries with the manufactured articles which this country has long been in the habit of supplying them with.

The inducement to this lies in the fact that wages in all silver-using countries, formerly cheap, have now, by the fall in silver, become 50 per cent cheaper relatively to gold wages, or, to put it in a different form, that wages in goldusing countries have, through the appreciation of gold, become 100 per cent dearer than they were relatively to silver wages.

Prices of commodities regulate themselves automatically and from day to day. Given an equilibrium of prices at any moment between a silver-using and a gold-using country any subsequent fall in silver must have one or other of two results—either the gold price must fall, or the silver price must rise. The exchangeable value of any article is, within a certain limit, representing costs of transport, necessarily the same all the world over. A bale of cotton, for example, has the same exchangeable value in Liverpool, Bombay, or New Orleans, allowing for a certain fixed margin, representing costs of transport, merchants' profit, and duty, if any. In bulky articles this margin is, of course, considerable, but that does not affect the principle. Whenever the

* Index No. —, 1892: Silver, 65.4; commodities, 68. Sauerbeck's Tables (appendix), 1894: Silver, 46.8; commodities, 63.

* Official quotation: Wheat No. 1, soft, per candy, 1873, R., 34, 8s; wheat No. 1, soft, per candy, 1893, R., 32, 11s 1d.—*Prices and Wages in India.*

article for any reason becomes cheaper in one place than in another, there is a profit in exporting it. A flow sets in from the cheaper to the dearer until the ordinary equilibrium is restored.

With wages, however, it is different. The price of a day's labor in Bombay bears no relation to the price in Liverpool, even assuming the quality to be equal. If, indeed, we could import a cargo of coolies as easily as we import a bale or cargo of cotton, the adjustment would be rapid. But the standard of wages in any country is regulated on very different principles. The law of supply and demand, which governs wages, is not international, like the law for commodities, but national, or even provincial. And in England, where the rights of labor are so well guarded by trades-unionism and a sympathetic legislature, even the law of supply and demand has not free scope. An employer of labor must pay the recognized wages or close his mill. Adjustments in the direction of a fall can only be brought about by concerted action, and usually after a strike or lockout, or other painful and expensive process.

Let us see now how these principles work out in our trade with silver, using countries, say China, to take a familiar example.

The result of a fall in silver must be, as I have said, that either the silver price in China must rise or the gold price in England must fall, or else it must be partly the one and partly the other. An English merchant who ships cotton manufactures to China can only do so on terms that pay in the long run. If the buying price in Manchester keeps firm, he must get such a higher silver price in China as will counteract the fall in exchange. If silver falls 10 per cent he must demand a 10 per cent higher silver rate, other things being equal; if the Manchester market falls 10 per cent he will be able to sell at the old silver rate, or if the Manchester market falls 5 per cent he will be content with a 5 per cent rise.

The observed course of prices during the twenty years up to the end of 1892 has been that gold prices have fallen and silver prices have remained steady. Since the beginning of 1893, however, there has been a change. The Manchester price has been steadier, and consequently the silver price has risen. The following table, compiled from the published market reports in Shanghai, shows the variations in silver prices of Manchester goods for the last fourteen years. The prices of 1882 are taken as 100:

1882	100	1889	100
1883	98	1890	95
1884	99	1891	97
1885	99	1892	99
1886	99	1893, June	115
1887	103	1893, December	139
1888	108	1894, June	138

The rise, as will be seen, was as much as 38 per cent. Possibly this will not be maintained, but undoubtedly a very considerable rise, which looks like being permanent, has been established.

Let us consider, first, the effects when the gold price falls, and by consequence the silver price is steady.

Suppose two cotton mills working, the one in England and the other in Japan or China, and competing with one another for the sale of their productions, and contrast the position of the two in 1873 and in 1893. Let us assume that in 1873 they were competing on even terms—that is, that each realized to the owners the same profit. In 1894 each employs the same amount of labor as it did in 1873, which the English pays for in gold at the old rates and the Japanese in silver, also at the old rates. The Japanese mill owner still pays for his men, as he used to, 18 to 20 cents a day, and for his women 8 to 10 cents a day. In 1873 that meant 9d. to 10d. per day for men and 4d. to 5d. for women. Now, it means just one-half—that is, 4d. to 5d. and 2d. to 2½d. Multiply this over 2,000 mill hands and see what the saving will be on labor alone. But this is not all. The same advantage accrues on the coal bill. Japanese coals cost them, say, $4 to $5 a ton, which meant 16s. to 20s. They still can be got at $4 to $5 a ton, but that now only means 8s. to 10s. The same thing applies to rent, wages, taxes, and all fixed charges whatsoever. They are all payable in silver and have nowise varied with the rise in gold. Only in the single item of raw material is the old equality maintained. Both are free to buy that wherever they can find it cheapest on the world's market, the only advantage being proximity to the best source of supply and consequently economy of transport.

Now, so long as the gold price went on falling and the silver price consequently kept steady, there was no great manifest advantage resulting to the Japanese manufacturer from a fall in exchange. He continued to get the same prices for his products, and his outlay was the same, year by year, both being in silver. Any improvement he could effect by economy of management or by getting his raw material cheaper would be so much extra profit; otherwise his position was unaffected. In any case exchange fluctuations would not trouble him.

The English manufacturer, on the other hand, has to meet the same fixed expenditure from ever-decreasing returns. He is able to buy his raw material cheaper, owing to the general fall in commodities, but his wages bill, his rent, his interest on borrowed capital, his rates and taxes, have all to be met as before. His profits begin to dwindle. It is only by the greatest economy of management that he can keep open at all. The best mills only manage to pay a fair profit; the worst struggle to the verge of bankruptcy, always hoping for a turn of the tide, and finally are forced to close.

Suppose, in the second place, that the silver price rises, and, as a consequence, the gold price remains steady.

The gold manufacturer is, for the time being, in an easier position. His returns do not fall off, and, though his expenses are the same, he is in a position to profit by any economy of manufacture or management.

But the silver manufacturer is, so to speak, on clover. All his working expenses are on the old scale, and he is thus a clear gainer by the extra price he gets for his products. If silver prices have risen, say, 10 per cent, his profits will be increased by just 10 per cent on his turnover. The natural result of this will be to attract more capital, more mills will be built, and the output will increase. Competition will lower prices, and the gold manufacturer will again be driven into a corner.

Whatever happens, the manufacturer in the silver-standard country has a great advantage, and simply for this reason, that he can obtain his labor at half the cost relatively to gold wages, which he formerly paid. And this advantage must remain to him (unless silver can in the meantime be brought back to something like its old value) until either wages in gold countries have fallen 50 per cent or till they have risen 100 per cent in silver-using countries, or till some common meeting ground has been found between the two. In other words, the old equilibrium will not be restored until the standard of living and comfort among the working classes in England has greatly fallen, or till the standard in silver-using countries has greatly risen.

There is only one item that militates against the manufacturer in silver countries, and that is the enhanced cost of his new machinery. It so happens that at present all, or nearly all, manufacturing machinery has to be procured from England or Europe, and the lower silver goes the more of it do Eastern manufacturers require to purchase this portion of their plant. As to this I would only make two remarks. In the first place, the gold price of machinery has itself greatly fallen with the general fall in prices. In the second place, the dearer machinery is the better will it pay silver capitalists to make that, too, in their own country.

In the foregoing discussion the form of industry specially in view was the manufacture of textiles; but it will be apparent that the same argument applies to the making of machinery and, indeed, of almost every article which we have been in the habit of supplying silver countries with. In all industries where rough mechanical labor forms a principal ingredient there is an obvious advantage. The building and repairing of ships might be quoted as an instance, and it is worthy of note that at the last annual meeting of one of our steamboat companies the chairman informed his shareholders that a large saving had been effected by having their ships docked in the East instead of in England.

The same stimulus is given to open coal mines and to develop the natural resources of those countries. If native and foreign coal, twenty years ago, sold at about equivalent rates, the former would be to-day some 50 per cent cheaper, simply through currency changes. And, as a matter of fact, it is now well known that the whole trade of the East is supplied by Japanese and Chinese coal. The former, indeed, is being sent to San Francisco and Bombay, and the time may not be far distant when it will be sent through the canal and even to England itself.

III. The result of all this must be that in the competitive manufacturing industries of the world the divergence of value between gold and silver will inevitably lead to a gradual transfer of the seat of all the great manufactures from gold-using to silver-using countries, and, if England persists in excluding herself from the benefits of an abundant supply of the international media of exchange, to the ruin of our national industries.

As competitors with one another for the sale of their products on the world's market, the nations that can for any reason produce most cheaply are bound to win in the long run. Hitherto we have been able to do this from a combination of causes. Cheap iron, cheap coal, scientific improvements in machinery, skilled workmen, and economy in the combination of labor have for a long time enabled us to maintain an industrial supremacy and yet to pay our workmen higher wages than were paid in any other country; and had this currency trouble never arisen, there is not the least doubt but that we should easily have held our own.

But the momentous economic change implied in the divergence of the old value of gold and silver by as much as 50 per cent has entirely altered the conditions. Coal is not any longer relatively cheap in England, nor is iron. Labor is 100 per cent dearer in relation to silver wages than it was. We have no monopoly of scientific machinery. Oriental nations can buy the best that is produced, and they can engage skilled workmen to teach the natives how to beat us at our own trade.

And though I have insisted on the element of wages as being, as I believe it is, the most important factor in the case, it is not the only advantage that silver-using countries have. Rents, taxes, rates, and all fixed obligations whatever are light and easily discharged, whereas in gold countries they are heavy, and tend to become heavier with every further appreciation of the metal.

The consequence of all this is what might be expected—while old-established industries in England are in many cases barely paying expenses, new and rival industries in the far East are springing up broadcast, and, in spite of inexperience and extravagance of management, are paying handsome returns to their owners.

In the report of the Yokohama Chamber of Commerce, dated May 5, 1894, the following statistics are given:

The first spinning mill in Japan was erected in 1863, with 5,456 spindles.
At the end of 1883 there were 16 mills, with 43,700 spindles.
At the end of 1888 there were 24 mills, with 88,140 spindles.
At the end of 1892 there were 39 mills, with 403,314 spindles.
At the end of 1893 there were 46 mills, with about 600,000 spindles.

The same report adds, as still more rapid increase is expected in the near future, large orders, it is known, have been placed for more machinery, some for yarns of the finer qualities.

In the consular report on trade at Kobe, for 1892, a return is given of the dividends paid during the preceding twelve months by 21 mills in Osaka, the average dividend was 18 per cent, the highest being 28 per cent and the lowest 8 per cent. The dividends for 1893 as reported from time to time, in the Japan newspapers, appear to have been equally good or better. According to a recent number of the Japan Gazette, 11 mills, whose names are given, paid an average dividend of 16 per cent for the first six months of 1894, as compared with 12 per cent for the corresponding period of 1893.

Compare this with the account of the cotton trade in England, as given in the Economist of February 17 of this year. I can not afford room to quote passages, but, briefly, the balance sheets of 93 spinning companies in Oldham show a net total loss of £72,768 in 1893, against a like net loss of £104,664 in 1892. At the end of 1890 only 8 of these companies had adverse balances, and these amounted to only £8,412; at the close of 1891, 49 companies had adverse balances, amounting to £142,767; and at the close of 1893, 63 companies had realized a total loss of £366,800 on their working account.

Surely there is something seriously alarming in these figures. Have our manufacturers, with all their accumulated wealth of experience, become so effete that they allow themselves to be beaten at their own trade by amateur spinners in Japan? Or is it not that there is some enormous difference in the economic conditions of the two countries, which enables the Eastern manufacturer to win without effort, while the Western is struggling his hardest to get even a place in the race.

It has not unfrequently been said that it is some consolation to us, in the midst of all our depression of trade, to find that other countries, such as Germany and the United States, are in an equally bad condition. But I would venture to suggest that this exactly emphasizes the present contention, viz, that the countries that are suffering by reason of the fall in silver are the gold-standard countries, and those that are reaping the benefit are the silver countries.

If India is pointed to as a silver country that is in an embarrassed condition, I would reply that the whole of her trouble comes from the fact of her owing a large foreign debt in gold, which is quite accidental. Had her debt been payable in silver, as it might have been, and but for her relation to England probably would have been, she would now be in an excellent position. Taxation, in that case, would have been light; trade and manufactures would have been increasing, as they are, and all circumstances would have been favorable to the rapid accumulation of wealth.

China, which has long lagged behind in the industrial race, is also waking up to the situation. At the present moment three large factories are being erected at the port from which I write, covering many acres of ground, and before another year is out two or three hundred thousand spindles will be at work. That the ordinary Chinese coolie can be readily converted into an efficient mill hand has been abundantly proved. His patient endurance of labor is well known, as also his frugal habits. The present rate of wages, with which he is well content, may be put, in English money, at from 3d. to 5d. per day. The supply of labor is so enormous and the extent of the country is so vast that many years must elapse before there can be any material rise in wages.

But it may be urged, granting that India and other Eastern nations can make their own coarser and commoner yarns and cloths, the competition is after all confined to these grades, and they can not touch us in the finer qualities. It is no doubt true that hitherto the competition has been mainly in

the class of goods mentioned, but there is no reason whatever why it should be confined to that. If there is any force at all in the argument adduced it extends to all industrial operations whatever. The only reason why Eastern mills have hitherto devoted themselves to the lower counts of spinnings is that native cotton is most suited for this quality and that the greatest profit was to be made in this branch of the industry. But there is no reason why American and Egyptian cotton should not be imported when required, as it is imported into England. No doubt a good many years will elapse before these Eastern mills can oust us from the position we now occupy as manufacturers of the medium and finer fabrics, but that things are tending that way there can be no doubt. Mr. O'Conor, assistant secretary to the Government of India, in his review of the trade for 1892-93, says:

"The influences that affected the market for yarns affected also the market for piece goods, which continue to exhibit a nonprogressive character. The trade in unbleached goods is smaller than it has been since 1883, and in neither white nor colored goods is any advance apparent for many years. It must be inferred that, as suggested in the Review of Trade for 1890-91, imported piece goods are gradually being superseded by local manufactures."

And again, page 36—

"There is no doubt, looking at the course of trade over a series of years, the competition of Indian mills is telling on the import of Manchester goods. The mills are gradually beginning to make the medium class of goods, which form the bulk of the imports, and they are also beginning to bleach and dye their goods."

The process described by Mr. O'Conor will be hastened by the development of yarn spinning in the far East. The principal outlet for Bombay yarns has been China and Japan. As these markets are closed to them, as they will be in a few years by the progress of local mills, the Bombay mill owners must devote themselves more and more to the medium and finer kinds of cloth, which in turn will oust the Manchester products.

But the object of this paper is not to show the rate of speed at which these changes may be expected to arrive, but to show the tendency and drift of things as the inevitable consequence of the monetary disturbance. There are, of course, other elements that count, and which may for a period postpone the catastrophe or mitigate its effects. Intelligence, organization, abundant supply of capital may enable a manufacturer to hold his own or even to succeed against economic advantages favoring his competitor. England has all these on her side, and doubtless will make a good fight for it.

But our manufacturers are fighting against odds. They are handicapped in the race, and many changes and adjustments are inevitable. Many forms of industry will have to be abandoned altogether, and though new forms may take their place, much capital will be lost and much suffering entailed.

But why should our people be handicapped? What national advantage can be shown at all commensurate to the great evils that are evident? It has, unfortunately, become ingrained in the English mind that gold monometallism is inseparable from our national prosperity. But should we not have prospered all the same up to 1873 had we been bimetallic, as France was? We should have enjoyed all the advantages of a fixed par of exchange none the less by being ourselves a party to the league. And has the nation prospered so much since 1873 that we are justified in glorying in monometallism? Some individuals have prospered, no doubt. All those who have a realized capital in gold have benefited. But for the bulk of the nation, for the industries which are the life and soul of the country, the change has been almost an unmixed evil.

GEO. JAMIESON.

At the conclusion of my remarks I shall ask the permission of the Senate that the entire volume, of which Mr. Jamieson's essay is a part, may be printed as a document, so that we all may see it, because it is a work of great research. It contains articles by two very able English consular officers, Mr. George Jamieson, at Shanghai, and Mr. Thomas Holyoke Box, at Yokohama, besides other articles from men eminently qualified to speak, and who know whereof they speak.

Mr. Jamieson and the other English consul go at length into the reasons why this awakening has taken place. They say that from time immemorial the Asiatics were in the habit of buying European goods with their regular trade-marks, and paying a fixed price therefor. They were satisfied; they did not think of manufacturing themselves, and probably they would have gone on in the same way for hundreds of years to come but for the difference in exchange. After silver was demonetized the silver price of goods went up. The European and American manufacturers were compelled to mark up the price of their goods in China and Japan in order to make a profit. If it costs a hundred dollars here to manufacture certain goods, they had to charge $150 or $200 in China and Japan in silver in order to get their money back.

When the price of goods commenced to go up, it was regarded by the Chinese and the Japanese as a great hardship. They were unable to pay the advanced price, and they commenced in a crude way to manufacture the goods themselves. They soon found that they could do it very well. They sent agents to this country and to England to examine the machinery, and they commenced to import it. When they got the machinery they found that they could manufacture just as well as anybody else. I am told that in the last year there has been a great boom in England in manufacturing machinery for the Orient; that the English have received for such machinery about $50,000,000 in one year. I am advised that the only boom England has had for years is in the manufacture of machinery for China and Japan, and it has only just begun.

Now, these consuls say that this can be checked by equalizing exchange. If it is not equalized they all predict and figure it out and make a demonstration to show that the manufacturing of the world will be transferred from the Occident to the Orient, that Europe and America can not manufacture in competition with the millions of Asia, because they are already trained. You do not have to train them to manufacture. They see it done, and they can do it. They can do any kind of manufacturing.

The French consul at Yokohama bears testimony to the same fact that the English consul does. He says they can not stand the competition. Here is an extract from the report of the French consul at Yokohama, M. Klobukowski. He reports as follows to this Government:

There is no country in the extreme East which will not be invaded by goods made in Japan in imitation of European wares. Some of them are still inferior in quality; the greater number, thanks to modern machinery, are quite equal to ours. Both are of a cheapness which the high price of our labor will never permit us to attain. Then, again, our trade-marks are unprotected in Japan. The natives have only to imitate or copy your articles without necessarily acknowledging their obligation. Their amour propre does not brook the accusation of being mere imitators; they introduce, therefore, some trifling alteration in our machinery, and thereupon, with an easy conscience, take out themselves a fresh patent in their own country.

Finally, the depreciation in other countries of their silver money gives Japanese and Asiatics generally an enormous advantage. For them silver has lost none of its value. Their manufactures and exportation are thus favored in an extraordinary degree, while the rise in the value of gold, which is the money of Europe, becomes every day a more and more serious obstacle to the importation of our goods.

For these reasons, says the French consul in conclusion, foreign competition in Japan will have before it a very heavy task, we will not say to keep itself alive, but to escape annihilation.

If there is any series of facts upon any subject established beyond controversy it is that the Asiatics, with 50 cents advantage in the difference of exchange, can undersell both Europe and America on all manufactured articles. It has been a question whether it would extend to the coal trade and to the iron trade. For example, about twenty years ago the Japanese found immense coal fields in that country, and I remember very well the excitement created thereby. Coal mines were opened, but at the surface the coal was not so good as it was deeper down, and the Japanese got into competition with coal from England, which was taken there in ballast, and they could not make it pay.

The Government tried to work the coal mines and it lost money and quit. But when the silver price of coal went up 20 or 30 per cent the Japanese started on those coal mines again, and they are now practically supplying the great Pacific with coal. From Bombay to San Francisco you will find the Japanese, with their lines of steamships, furnishing the country with coal. The English authorities say that it is hopeless to attempt to mine coal in Australia or to send coal from England in competition with the Japanese, and that the Japanese have the coal trade of the Pacific. It is the conclusion to which they have all arrived. Australia is right there with all the advantage of distance, but she is on a gold basis, and her people, being of European descent, can not work on a level with the Asiatics under any circumstances, and particularly when the difference of exchange is 50 per cent against them.

The world was startled at the exhibition of power which Japan made in the late war. War now requires mechanical skill and genius, without which bravery, tactics, and everything else are a failure. But Japan showed mechanical skill and genius equal to the highest class of European or American skill. She has her iron works. She has an abundance of iron and coal. China, likewise, has an abundance of both iron and coal, with unlimited cotton fields. There is nothing that we can raise that they can not produce; and with an advantage of 50 per cent in exchange, we can not compete with them.

The farmers and planters first felt this competition. While the equilibrium of exchange was maintained the United States had almost a monopoly of the market of Europe for cotton and wheat. No effort was made, nor could any be made, to introduce Asiatic products. Our advantage in proximity and our superior skill in farming more than equalized the cheap labor of Asia, and there was no trouble as to wheat and cotton. But when gold prices went down they had that advantage. To illustrate it, I may state that for the last one hundred or one hundred and fifty years the average price of a bushel of wheat in Liverpool has been an ounce of silver. The parity between a bushel of wheat and an ounce of silver in value has been most remarkable. The fluctuations have been slight. Sometimes when there was a short crop of wheat there would be a little difference between the price of an ounce of silver and a bushel of wheat, but taking it right along for any ten years the average price of a bushel of wheat and the average price of an ounce of silver have been the same.

Let us see how it works. The Asiatic sends his bushel of wheat to Liverpool and sells it for an ounce of silver. He coins that silver at home into more than $1.30 of our money. In India it is $1.37. In Japan it is about $1.30, depending upon the ratio between gold and silver. Before the demonetization of silver the American farmer took his bushel of wheat to Liverpool and got his ounce of silver, and at home he could have it coined into $1.29. So the equilibrium of exchange kept things as they were, in farming as well as in manufacturing. But after gold prices had gone down silver prices remained stationary, and the Asiatic continued to take his bushel of wheat to Liverpool and sell it for an ounce of silver and get his $1.30 or $1.37, as the case might be.

But by and by the American took his bushel of wheat there and got his ounce of silver, and he could get for it only $1, then 75 cents, now only 50 cents. The American farmer with his 50 cents was unable, and is unable, to produce wheat in competition with the Asiatic farmer. We have told the manufacturers that all the time, and I sometimes fancied that it was not unpleasant to them,

because it gave them cheap wheat. The same is also true of cotton. Before the demonetization of silver, and before there was this difference of exchange, India exported no cotton. She now exports between fifty and sixty million dollars' worth of raw cotton besides what she uses at home. Then, Egypt is producing a large amount of cotton. There it is produced under the British lash. They whip the laborers to make them work. It is necessary to whip them in order to get enough labor out of them to pay interest upon the English debt, or the Rothschild debt, which, by the way, will not bear examination as to its honesty.

Then comes China with unlimited cotton fields and with all these advantages. Something must be done, because, as all those officers say, and the proof is piled up beyond contradiction, if things remain as they are Western civilization must yield. The labor of this country is not only going to be put on a plane with Asiatic labor, but the Asiatic is going to have 50 cents advantage in the difference of exchange in selling his products here. Already the products of the Western world are being excluded from the East, and the products of the East are coming to the West.

Here is an article published in the London Times on the 28th of October. The London Times can tell the truth when it talks about India. Of course it can not tell the truth with respect to conditions here, because it can never see on this side of the Atlantic. It can not tell anything that it can not find out. But it tells the truth about India. I ask the Secretary to read the portion I have marked, in order to show the anxiety of the London Times with respect to India. Since India's hands have been tied by suspending coinage, she is gradually being blotted out. Her interests are in danger from her own race by English laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CULLOM in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

When lately the chairman of the Peninsular and Oriental Company looked forward to the time when its steamers might be built on the Yangtse Kiang and its head offices transferred to Tokyo, people smiled at the prediction as a piece of amusing hyperbole. But Sir Thomas Sutherland knew perfectly well what he was saying. The leading organs of British commerce in India have for weeks been speaking in the same tone, and with a gravity that excludes any sense of humor. We have from time to time narrated the steps by which Japan is trying to capture the markets of the far East. The new treaties which recognized her equality with the Western trading countries as a civilized mercantile power, her establishment of a consul-general at Bombay, the creation of steamer lines which shall defy Western competition by the aid of State subsidies, the dismissal of foreign employees in her factories, arsenals, and railway workshops, and the development of her mill and engineering productions on an enormous scale, form the industrial side of that long-prepared advance of which the military aspects recently startled Europe. As European statesmen are now compelled to recognize in Japan a predominant factor in Eastern politics, so British capitalists and Indian mill owners are being forced to acknowledge her successes in the great commercial struggle of the nations.

The apprehensions of the Indian manufacturers have a more serious basis than those of their British competitors. The Indian mills trust for their profits to exactly the same class of goods as the Japanese mills are mainly constructed to produce. The chief market for the Indian manufactures by steam power is the market which Japan is resolutely determined to dominate, and for the command of which she has geographical advantages that India does not possess. The Indian producers, moreover, have a cause of apprehension quite apart from the natural tendencies of trade. Japan regulates her currency solely with a view to her own needs; the Indian currency is regulated only in part with an eye to Indian economic requirements. The overruling compulsion in Indian finance is the obligation to pay in silver a sum of about twenty millions a year to England in gold. India, in fact, stands half way between the gold-using countries of the West and the silver-using countries of the East, and she runs a risk of being crushed between the two. She has to compete in production with the cheap silver currencies of the far East, and she has to compete with them under the necessity of manipulating her currency to suit the chief gold-using country of the West.

India enters on the struggle with her mints closed and with the mints of Japan open. The avowed object of the closing of the Indian mints is to create an artificial scarcity of coin in India and to give to the rupee an artificial value. We have from the first pointed out the economic dangers incident to this experiment. It may be extremely convenient to Indian financiers to discharge their gold debt to England with the help of an appreciated rupee, but it is extremely inconvenient to Indian producers to pay in a scarce rupee the cost of manufactures for which they have to take exchange payment in the nonappreciated silver currency of the farther East. In proportion as the artificial appreciation of the rupee affords permanent relief to Indian official finance in regard to gold obligations, it lays a permanent burden upon Indian production in the competition with silver-using countries.

It is this combination of artificial and natural difficulties which intensifies the anxieties of the Indian mill owners at present. The Calcutta and Bombay newspapers state the case with perfect clearness. "Manufacturing supremacy," says the Bombay Gazette, "is not an inalienable property; it can be transferred from one country to another. We recently made reference to the fact that one of the Chinese viceroys has erected not only a great cotton mill, covering 6 acres, but iron and steel works on an immense scale. What one viceroy has done on his own initiative the Japanese propose to do systematically throughout China." The territorial ambitions of Japan in regard to China have for the moment received a check. But the industrial exploitation of China forms a fixed principle in Japan's international programme. The Japanese are quite willing to allow other nations to share with them in the commercial benefits to be derived from the opening up of China to foreign trade, for they know when once this opening up has been effected their geographical position will give them predominant advantages in the competition with Western producers. They believe that they can command in China a cheaper and more disciplined labor than can be obtained either in Europe or in India. When the last mail left Bombay two Japanese missions of inquiry from the Cotton Spinners' Association and the Chamber of Commerce at Tokyo were at Shanghai, with instructions to travel inland and to report on localities for erecting cotton mills to be worked by Chinese labor, but under Japanese supervision and with Japanese capital.

Meanwhile Japan has determined to supply her own wants. It is stated that only one-fourth of her requirements are now imported, as against 67 per cent six years ago. Even more striking is her determination to get rid of European help in the actual work of production. "Since the date, now four years ago," says the Bombay Gazette, "when the foreign mill managers all received notice on one day that their services would no longer be required after the expiry of the notice, not a single man of Western birth has been engaged in the cotton mills, and the half million odd spindles at work are entirely under indigenous direction. There are 2,100 miles of railway open and 400 miles more under construction; but the only foreign assistance in their working is that of a solitary Scotchman, whose ties to the country have been strengthened by his marrying a Japanese girl." Even in the arsenals, with their rapid turn-out of arms of precision, only two or three Europeans now remain. The coasting trade has passed entirely into the hands of Japanese shippers and engineers. A similar process is going on throughout the whole merchant navy of Japan, and is only retarded by the expediency of having captains and chief engineers who hold English certificates, with a view to securing favorable insurance rates. But at any moment the Japanese Government may organize a system of marine insurance which will oust the British employees from this last foothold in Japanese enterprise. The results already attained justify Sir Alfred Lyall's forecast of the new era when the industrial inventions by which Europe has hitherto prevailed over Asia will be turned against their inventors.

Mr. STEWART. I desire to call particular attention to one sentence from the article which has been read by the Secretary:

India enters on the struggle with her mints closed and with the mints of Japan open.

That tells the whole story. It tells the story that was told to English statesmen when they proposed to cut off the competition with English manufacturers by putting India on a gold basis. The textile fabric associations of England demonstrated to Parliament that they could not compete in manufacturing with India, their own province; that the difference of exchange was more prohibitory than the McKinley act, and they furnished the tables to show the fact. And they asked that the difference of exchange be equalized by the restoration of silver. The British Government would not do it. They said, "We will equalize it by putting India on a gold basis," and they carried out their purpose. They suspended coinage and put a duty of 5 per cent on silver.

When England did that it was said to them that China and Japan would come into the field and be just as formidable rivals as India; that they had unlimited resources of every sort, material, and labor to supply the world with all kinds of manufactures. The English laughed at the statement, and said China and Japan were too slow; that they would never wake up, because they had been asleep for hundreds of years. They sent a commission to Japan to induce that Government to join with them in adopting the gold standard. The commission started while our Congress was in extra session. While we were engaged in repealing the last law that provided for silver money that commission went to Japan. Japan sent a commission here. I myself spent weeks with the members of it. They went to England and to India, and they resolved to stand by the money of their fathers, and have good times. It was impossible for England to deceive the Japanese.

But what occurred? After the late Chinese-Japanese war was over, the powers united with Russia to deny to Japan the fruits of her victory. I inquired of a very intelligent Englishman why they did that. I asked him what was the relation between Japan and Russia. "Ah," he said, "Russia will not injure us, but Japan will." I asked him, "How will Japan injure you?" He replied that "Japan is our most dangerous rival in manufactures. Europe recognizes that fact, and that is what makes Europe a unit against Japan." If they could have found any excuse to crush Japan by arms, they would have enslaved the Japanese, and the only danger which threatens those people is the combination of Europe to subjugate them and destroy their industrial capacity.

The grave question is presented, Will the American people be as wise as the Japanese? Will they have a policy of their own? Will they have a financial and political and commercial policy of their own as Japan has, or will they allow the creditor combination in Great Britain to govern and impoverish them? What a spectacle we present compared with Japan. Twenty years ago we mocked her as a barbarous country. She was not allowed to have treaties with the civilized nations of the world on equal terms. To-day she is recognized by all, and feared by all Europe. To-day she is prosperous beyond anything in her history, and equal to anything in the history of modern nations.

Twenty years ago we were the richest and proudest nation on earth. Our credit was the best in the world. Nay, it was a shorter time ago. Only a few years ago United States bonds bearing 4 per cent, running eighteen years, sold for 27 premium. Last February the same character of bonds, running thirty years, sold for 4½ premium, and this, too, after the gold combination had been at work for twenty years to improve the currency of the country. Before they improved the credit by putting us on a gold basis there was no limit to the credit of the country, and no limit to the respect of mankind for us. Twenty years ago, before we submitted to the rule of the British syndicate of gold gamblers, we were an independent and self-respecting people. Twenty years ago we were not spending hundreds of millions per annum to buy aristocratic husbands for our daughters. Twenty years ago we

were not aping foreign manners as we are now doing. Twenty years ago we could pay as we went without taxing the people beyond endurance. Twenty years ago the people were at work. Now millions in this favored land are in enforced idleness, starving for bread. With all this, produced by destroying the money of the Constitution, by cutting in two our metallic money, we hear from the other end of the avenue—what? We hear a command from the Executive to destroy the greenback and cause $500,000,000 more of contraction. That is the remedy which is proposed to us!

Why can not the United States take a step forward? Why can we not have some of the patriotism that made this country independent? We are told that we can not do it because we do not want to be in company with half-civilized nations. We are told that the most civilized nations in the world have gold alone for their money and if we are to be more civilized we must do as they do. Do not the civilized nations of the world do some things that we do not want to do? Must we have war and revolution because other civilized nations have them? Civilized nations have monarchies, despotisms, classes. Do we want them? There is just as much reason for inaugurating a monarchy here as there is in indorsing the financial policy of the gold syndicate of London. Ah, aristocracy and the gold standard are one. They have sprung from the same source. The leading financial journals of Great Britain say that property must rule, and the only way to give property supremacy is by contraction to the gold standard. They say that it is dangerous to let the people prosper, for that produces democracy. Every crowned head in Europe is a servant of this gold combination. The crowned heads of Europe rest for security upon the gold combination of London. They make peace or war as dictated by the Rothschilds combination. Monarchy and the gold standard have joined hands to enslave mankind.

I am for a new Declaration of Independence. I am for an American policy. I am for the money of the Constitution. I am for the use of both silver and gold to stop falling prices. I am for more money to make enterprise possible. I am for more money to set the masses to work. The labor of the country reproduces the wealth of the country every few years. The enforced idleness of the last three years has destroyed four times as much property as the war between the sections. There is nothing so destructive to civilization, to prosperity, to law and order, to good government as enforced idleness. But the powers that govern want enforced idleness and poverty, so that they can govern. You see that condition everywhere in our country. Go where you will, you hear people say, "If I had money I would go into conventions; I would pay attention to political matters; but these times are so hard that I can not get time to read a newspaper. All I can do is to get bread for my family." And that is the situation in which it is proposed to keep them. It is a mockery to call this a free Government when the money powers control everything. What office in the gift of the present Administration has not been at the disposal of Wall street? What favors are there for the man who rebels against Wall street, I do not care what party he is in? What can he get from this Administration, or what can his constituents get, and what favors could he get from the last Administration?

The gold-standard combination appoints all your officers. They go further; they are in your conventions and they furnish the money for the two parties. It is time, I say, that the American people took this matter in their own hands. I tell you, my fellow-Senators, if the powers that are congregated here should continue to be the servants of the money powers of Europe, the time is not far distant when the American people will take this matter in hand, and there will be a political revolution at the ballot box before the chains of slavery are permanently fastened upon the limbs of enterprise in this country.

Another year or two will make times much worse. Another year or two will bring Asiatic goods into every town and village in this country. Another year or two will put millions out of employment. Who can contemplate such a result? Everyone who knows anything knows that the misery in this country must be attributed to bad legislation and maladministration. Everyone who knows anything knows that twenty years of profound peace and abundant harvests in a country of unlimited resources can not be the cause of hard times; and no man can suggest any other disturbing cause but the money question. In no other department has there been a revolution. In that department there has been a revolution that has destroyed half the world's money. In that department there has been a revolution that has converted silver obligations into gold obligations. In that department the laws of Congress have been treated as chaff. In that department gold gamblers and money changers have been supreme, and the result is before you. Will you continue it? If you will, you will hear a voice from the great people when they understand, as they are getting to understand, what is being done, and who did it, that will make the bravest man tremble.

I hope that this question will be examined by every Senator, that he may know we have an industrial rival at our doors with whom we can not compete, and that there must be some remedial legislation or the times in this country will be so sad as to make the heart of man bleed. Such a time is coming, and I think it is the duty of every Senator to examine the situation and learn for himself what the trouble is. Cease to take the mandates of foreign syndicates. Cease to treat Wall street as the only part of this country. Cease to deny that the operations of Wall street disturb the business of the country. The business of the country is disturbed as bad as it can be. You can not make it worse. Nothing can be worse than taking the people's money away from them. There can be no prosperity without money. You have taken away from the people their money. You say they shall have nothing but gold as a circulating medium. Gold never did circulate among the masses of the people and never can, and to-day you are discussing the propriety of depriving them of all money, for when all money but gold is destroyed the people will have no money.

It may be suggested that we allow private corporations to issue money and speculate among the people and expand and contract the currency at their pleasure. That would be worse than no money. When you take from the Government its sovereign authority to create money and give it to private speculators, you abdicate everything that is good in government; you destroy all that government was made for. Here you punish individuals criminally for making money or counterfeiting money because it is such a sacred right; but you propose to destroy all money except gold and set the speculators to robbing the people.

I am opposed to bank rule. I want them to get out of the governing business. They have governed badly; they have brought misery upon the people. We have had bank government for twenty years, and it has produced more misery than was ever in this country before. We want them to attend to the banking business and to get out of the governing business. The idea that it is the business of banks to create money is what I oppose. The only connection the Government now has with the banking business is the creation of the office of the Comptroller of the Currency; a department to help them run the banks. We do not need it. We do not want to pay interest on money for the benefit of the bankers. I am in favor of getting out of the banking business altogether and going into the governing business. No country can prosper without going into the governing business, and such governing business is the creation of money.

Look what Governments have done when they have been in the governing business. Take the Roman Republic for two hundred years and you find that it made conquests and brought in the gold of other countries. Rome had metal pieces stamped and she regulated the quantity, and during that time she got power enough to conquer the world. Venice made her credit full legal tender and exempted it from execution, and during the Dark Ages she maintained a position as the great commercial nation of the world. For six hundred years her paper was good in every part of the world because it paid debts and taxes at home. She exercised her governing functions. England went into the governing business during the Napoleonic wars and suspended specie payments and created money that not only conquered Napoleon, but extended the commerce of England more than it had been extended for one hundred years preceding.

We went into the governing business in part during the war. We should go into the governing business absolutely. Thaddeus Stevens brought in a bill to create money, greenbacks, but Wall street came here and mutilated it so as to deprive it of its functions of paying duties on imports. But still, with that paper crippled to that extent, the Government was in the governing business, and it was the greenback, crippled as it was, that furnished the means of carrying on the war. The greenback cost no interest; it saved us from destruction. But bankers, in order to get the Government out of the banking business, had the national banks created and then retired the greenbacks largely and issued bonds to retire them and paid interest on the bonds to enable the banks to issue circulation which was no better than the greenbacks. It was no better because it was redeemable in greenbacks. It was not as good; but it made money for the bankers and gave them power to expand and contract the currency; and that was the beginning of the bank rule which has brought misery to every household in the land. That was the first step.

The next step was to get rid of silver, to make money scarce, to give the bankers a monopoly of the circulation, and to give the bondholders and money changers 2 for 1. These steps have gone on until they are considered the established policy of the Government.

See where we are now. We are unable to pay current expenses. We are increasing our foreign debts from $200,000,000 to $500,000,000 annually, and we are borrowing money to pay interest on borrowed money. We have to sell our products in the gold markets of Europe. We can not get enough for them to pay for our imports this year. Last year we did have a surplus to apply on our

debts. This year our imports are added to the debt, and the President of the United States says that he is borrowing money to maintain the gold standard. For whom? For the people? No; for the creditors; and he is borrowing money to pay them. There is no other way to pay them according to the fixed policy of carrying on the Government. Are we to be told that 70,000,000 people can not conduct a profitable business in time of peace? That is the situation produced by the gold policy.

Then they propose to increase taxation, to destroy more money; to make money scarcer and times harder. Some propose tariff and other forms of taxation. You have the people taxed to death now. People can not stand taxation when they are out of business. The tax they are paying now is four times as hard to pay as it would be to pay double the tax if they were doing business. That is what ails the country; the people can not stand the present taxation.

But the President tells us in his bland language that although prices are falling it is a blessing, because we have to buy as well as to sell. The fixed charges upon the people of this country for taxes, for interest, for educating the children, and for other matters that have to be provided for in money, take all the proceeds of labor, and leave little or nothing with which to buy. The fact that prices are so low means bankruptcy. There is no compensation in low prices to the producer when he has nothing with which to buy.

Take the manufacturers of the East. Protection will do them no good while the West and the producing sections are impoverished by low prices, made low by the contraction of the currency and by competition with the Asiatics. You can not get relief in that direction. Pile up your tariff and it will do no good. A tariff on manufactured articles will not protect us against Asia. You may have a tariff on raw material and everything else, and you may pile it up, and you can not keep out Asiatic products with the present rate of exchange. As long as the difference in exchange gives them 50 cents advantage you have got to build a Chinese wall around the country to keep them out.

But a tariff on manufactured articles is unfair under those circumstances, because the farmers have been impoverished by this competition, and you can not raise the price of manufactured articles artificially, because the farmer can not pay it unless you will allow him to prosper. Give him more money, give him prosperity, and he will buy your goods. Senators talk about overproduction as the cause. It is underconsumption. Nobody's wants are supplied. Everyone who will reflect for a moment will know that the wants of man grow faster than he can supply them. If he has money with which to buy he will buy everything that conduces to his happiness. That gives employment and makes employment. There will always be overproduction, because there can be no consumption to equal the production with only one kind of money. It is underconsumption that is the trouble in this country.

I hope that this question will be examined, and that the American people will realize wherein they have been robbed by the rule of the banks, and see if they will not contend for the rule of the people under the Constitution as it was ordained by the fathers.

I ask to have the papers to which I referred, on "The silver question: Injury to British trade and manufactures," printed as a document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HANSBROUGH in the chair). If there be no objection, it will be so ordered. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not desire to address the Senate at this time; but in the line of the remarks made by the Senator from Nevada I send to the desk a paper that I should like to have printed as a public document. It is an article by Mr. H. Kopsch, a fellow of the Royal Geographical Society of Great Britain, who is, I understand, connected with the diplomatic service at Shanghai. It is a very conservative and well-written article on the precise subject upon which the Senator from Nevada has been addressing the Senate. I ask to have it printed as a document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. SHERMAN. Let it be read.

Mr. STEWART. I ask that the resolution may lie over. Other Senators may wish to submit some remarks upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution for the printing of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Soldiers' Home, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the joint resolution (H. Res. 7) providing for the printing of the Monthly Summary Statement of Imports and Exports of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department; and it was signed by the Vice-President.

CONGRESSIONAL FUNERALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HANSBROUGH). The first order of business on the Calendar under Rule IX will be announced.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during sessions of Congress.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask that that bill be made the unfinished business to be taken up at 2 o'clock every day until disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the bill stands as the unfinished business.

Mr. PEFFER. Then I ask that it be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and the bill will be temporarily passed over.

NATIONAL AND STATE SOLDIERS' HOMES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *December 16, 1895.*

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 500 copies of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Soldiers' Home and 500 copies of the report of the Assistant Inspector-General of State Homes for the use of the officers of said National and State Homes; 150 copies of each of said reports to be bound in the usual form.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 17, 1895, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 16, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

REPORTS, ETC., REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following documents; which were severally referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of project and estimate of cost for the improvement of Pine River, at St. Clair City, Mich.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, final report of Col. George H. Elliot on improvement of Dalecarlia reservoir.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of plan and estimate for improving Belle River, Michigan.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of plan and estimate for the improvement of Sebewaing River, Michigan.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REMOVAL OF TURTLE MOUNTAIN INDIANS, NORTH DAKOTA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a communication from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relating to the removal of the Turtle Mountain Indians, in North Dakota, and a copy of a bill ratifying an agreement with the Indians, and making appropriation for carrying the same into effect; which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILROADS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the annual report of the Commissioner of Railroads to the Secretary of the Interior for the year 1895; which was referred to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROPAGATION OF FOOD FISHES DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1895.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Chief Clerk and Acting Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries transmitting a statement showing expenditures under all appropriations for propagation of food fishes during the fiscal year ended June

30, 1895, and also under certain other appropriations; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

WAR CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Mrs. Rowena Clark and Annie Lawrence against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a list of cases wherein claimants for recompense for stores and supplies alleged to have been furnished the Government have failed to prove loyalty; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

RULES.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] a moment, to see if we can agree upon an order for to-morrow touching consideration of Rules X and XI. It is desirable, as I believe, that the rules of the Fifty-first Congress, which are the rules of this Congress, in view of the increase in the membership of the House, should provide substantially for the membership of the committees as they were in the last Congress; and that would require an amendment. I would say, also, that it is in the minds of the majority, or at least some of them, to present for the consideration of the House the creation of additional Elections Committees, with jurisdiction similar to the election committee in former Congresses; and I have drawn this resolution.

Resolved, That on Tuesday, December 17, immediately after the reading of the Journal, it shall be in order to consider amendments to Rules X and XI of the House.

These are the rules that create the committees and fix their jurisdiction; and I would be glad, if it meets the approval of this side and the other side, by unanimous consent, that order might be adopted.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, of course I can only speak for myself. As I understand the purpose of the majority, it is to increase the standing committees from the number provided for by the rules of the Fifty-first Congress substantially to the number provided for in the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses, which were made after the last apportionment and after the increase in the membership of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. CRISP. To that proposition I am very sure, so far as I have heard an expression, there would be absolutely no objection upon this side, and the gentleman, I think, can now take that order without any postponement of the question at all—that he will simply take such an order as he desires to increase the committees as suggested. To the other proposition of the gentleman from Illinois, looking to the multiplication of the Committee on Elections, I am equally sure that on this side there will be some objection. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection at all to agreeing to take up the question whenever it suits the majority to present it. I understand very well, and only mention it because those gentlemen who are not familiar with the old rules must understand, that this request is made because there is no Committee on Rules. If there were a Committee on Rules, that committee could make a report, which would be privileged, and the matter could come up; but there being no Committee on Rules, it requires unanimous consent to bring this matter up for discussion. I say that so far as I am concerned, I have no objection whatever, and I do not think this side has, to the order increasing the number and membership of the standing committees. As to the other proposition, to take it up to-morrow and debate it, I have no objection to that. Of course, I can but speak for myself. I have no objection to taking it up to debate it, but I have objection to the proposition after it comes up.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The resolution makes it in order to offer amendments to these two rules to-morrow. Then, of course, the whole subject is in the possession of the House on the several propositions that probably would be offered by way of amendments, increasing the number of Elections committees. I have made this announcement, so that both sides of the House might be informed as to the amendments that probably would be offered. Of course it would be considered under the ordinary rules of the House, if this resolution is agreed to, and would be for the House to take such order as it saw proper. I will ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the adoption of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That on Tuesday, December 17, immediately after the reading of the Journal, it shall be in order to consider amendments to Rules X and XI of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to agreeing to the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none; accordingly the resolution is agreed to.

PROCEEDINGS OF BOARD OF MANAGERS OF SOLDIERS' HOME.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 500 copies of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Soldiers' Home and 500 copies of the report of the Assistant Inspector-General of State Homes for the use of the officers of said National and State Homes, 150 copies of each of said reports to be bound in the usual form.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution just read?

Mr. STEELE. I desire to state, Mr. Speaker, that the standing rule for printing does not provide any copies for the use of the officers of the Homes, who, of course, require these proceedings for practical purposes, and therefore this resolution is offered. The binding of the 150 copies specified in the resolution will cost, I am informed, about 25 cents a volume. I have conferred with the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. RICHARDSON, and he tells me that this is the usual course to pursue in such cases.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am not inclined to object, Mr. Speaker, but I simply want to say again that it is perfectly evident that from the beginning to the end of this Congress we are to have special provisions of this kind all along the line, growing largely out of the legislation of the last Congress in relation to printing. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEELE. This is certainly a very inexpensive matter, and it is absolutely necessary that the officers of the Homes should have copies of their own proceedings for their guidance. As I have already said, no provision is made for the printing of copies for their use, and therefore this resolution is necessary.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Has the gentleman from Indiana any information as to what it will cost to print these copies?

Mr. STEELE. No, sir; but the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], who is more familiar with these matters than I am, can probably give the gentleman the information.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. STEELE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF SALARIES FOR DECEMBER.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a resolution for which I shall ask immediate consideration. After the resolution is read I will also ask permission to make a brief statement in connection with the request.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 26) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1895, on the 20th day of said month.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized and instructed to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the Capitol police, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1895, on the 20th day of said month.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution simply conforms to the precedents in such cases. Such a resolution has been regularly passed at this season of the year, and unless there is objection to the resolution I will ask now for its immediate consideration.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe the resolution is the ordinary one, and very proper generally, but I do not recollect just what the precedents have been in this respect at the organization of a new House. For instance, take an outgoing employee who went out of office, say, on the 1st, 2d, or 3d day of this session; does this resolution pay him a month's salary?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. No, sir.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Or an incoming employee who comes in at some time during this month, say to-day; does this resolution pay him a month's salary?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It does not pay him a month's salary. It simply pays him for the portion of the month for which he is entitled to compensation, beginning on the day of his appointment. It provides for paying the employees that are on the roster on the 20th of December what is due them for the month, the same as they would be paid ordinarily on the 31st of the month.

Mr. BAILEY. In other words, it simply substitutes the 20th day of this month for the regular pay day.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is all.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. That is, it pays these employees ten days in advance.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It pays in advance for ten days. The same thing has been done by every Congress. I have here

references to the similar resolutions that have been adopted by every Congress.

A MEMBER. Would it not be better to make it the 19th instead of the 20th?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. In response to the inquiry of my friend on the other side, I will say that the date as originally named has been changed from the 19th to the 20th upon the suggestion of Mr. Snyder, the disbursing clerk of the last House. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution; which was read twice, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LAND ALLOTMENTS IN OKLAHOMA, ETC.

Mr. FLYNN. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution of inquiry which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas by act of Congress approved March 2, 1895, an agreement between the Wichita and affiliated bands of Indians in Oklahoma and United States commissioners was duly ratified and provision made for the allotment of lands therein to the Wichita Indians, and providing for the opening of the surplus lands after allotment to homestead settlement; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has wholly failed to appoint agents to allot said lands as provided in said act: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to report to this House, first, the reasons and causes operating, if any, to delay the appointment of allotting agents and the allotting of said lands to said Indians; second, whether any of his connections or relations by blood or marriage are acting as attorneys for said Indians, or any party or parties interested in delaying the opening of the same to settlement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. MCMILLIN. This resolution does not conform to the ordinary language of resolutions of inquiry calling on Departments for such information——

Mr. FLYNN. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I ask the Clerk to pass me the resolution for a moment. I think I am correct in the statement I made.

Mr. FLYNN. The resolution does not allude to anybody that the gentleman from Tennessee has had imported into Oklahoma.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I do not import.

Mr. FLYNN. No; but Hoke Smith does for you.

Mr. MCMILLIN. As to that, I do not seek any controversy. I am not here in any spirit of levity or captiousness. But resolutions of this kind calling on heads of Departments or other executive officers for information usually leave a discretion with those officers. This resolution does not. I think, therefore, it ought to be referred to the appropriate committee when appointed.

Mr. FLYNN. I hope the gentleman will not object to the House knowing whether or not Hoke Smith's relatives are being employed—whether Indian treaties and the opening up of lands are being held up by men claiming to be his friends.

Mr. MCMILLIN. If the gentleman will put his resolution in the ordinary form——

Mr. FLYNN. It is.

Mr. MCMILLIN. We will pass it without a stump speech.

Mr. FLYNN. I submit that it is in the ordinary form. This is not the first resolution I have introduced into this House.

Mr. MCMILLIN. If the gentleman has no desire to put his resolution in the usual form, I will ask that it go to the appropriate committee.

Mr. FLYNN. I will ask that the resolution be amended in compliance with the gentleman's request by inserting "if not incompatible with the public service."

Mr. MCMILLIN. I thought the gentleman had it in the usual form.

Mr. FLYNN. I am accepting the proposed amendment.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I did not offer it. I am glad the gentleman has got information as to the proper form.

Mr. FLYNN. I will offer the resolution, then, in a form to suit the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The first question is, Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution as amended?

Mr. MADDOX. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX] objects.

Mr. FLYNN. I understand the objection was to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia objected to the consideration of the resolution as amended.

Mr. MADDOX. I withdraw my objection. I did not understand the proposition.

The SPEAKER. The objection of the gentleman from Georgia being withdrawn, is there further objection to the consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

Mr. FLYNN. I merely desire to say that I appreciate the kindness of the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Tennessee. The last Congress provided for the allotment of certain lands in Oklahoma, and it appropriated money for that purpose. A provision was inserted in that bill compelling the Secretary to open those lands to settlement within a year after the allotments were made. It was thought that that would be sufficient to cause those lands to be thrown open. Prior to that he waited two years after allotting lands in the Kickapoo matter before it suited his sweet will to declare them open for settlement. The proviso in that last bill compelled him to open the lands within a year after the allotments were made. Now, to take advantage of the House and defeat the intention of the act he has refused to appoint the allotting agents. This resolution asks him why he has done so and whether or not it is a fact that his relatives are being employed in this case as attorneys for the Indians. I think this will be answered conclusively by the Secretary. It is a well-known fact—nobody will deny it, so report says—that Hoke Smith has got a lot of relatives hanging around here who hold up men who want treaties or contracts ratified. One contract was handed me this morning under which a man claiming to be a relative of Hoke Smith was to get $2,700 provided he got the Secretary to ratify a certain agreement. It is time that we ought to know about these things.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time, but will yield to the gentleman from Florida if he wishes to ask a question.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to ask the gentleman a question and do not desire that he should yield to me any of his time. I propose to make a few remarks of my own, called forth by the extraordinary speech of the gentleman from Oklahoma, to which we have just listened.

Mr. FLYNN. I am glad I have succeeded in stirring up the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Florida. The gentleman from Oklahoma will please take his seat. I have the floor. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. All gentlemen will take their seats, and order must be preserved on the floor. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma has used language in the House to-day which induces me to take the floor for the purpose of submitting a few remarks in reply.

I had the honor, sir, of sitting over in the "Cherokee Strip" for a whole Congress in the very near vicinity of the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I have been very much surprised this morning to hear a gentleman who is usually courteous and should be possessed with a proper idea of the ordinary usages of deportment as practiced in this House, the requirements of a proper and respectful demeanor in addressing the House on public subjects, and the proper observance of due courtesy to any Department of the Government; I say that I am surprised that he should have indulged in language this morning which I think, when he comes to reflect upon it after the House shall have adjourned to-day, he will himself very greatly regret.

Mr. Speaker, no member of this House, even though he happens to be a Republican—a member of that large majority now in power upon this floor upon a temporary wave of public sentiment—[laughter on the Republican side] the force of which wave gentlemen are liable very greatly to overestimate, and the duration of which they might have learned by former experience, and very bitter former experience, too, is not to be absolutely counted upon—I say that no member of this House should refer to a member of the Cabinet of the President, the Secretary of one of the great Departments of the Government, in such terms as the gentleman from Oklahoma has seen proper to employ this morning. If he has any criticism to make, if there are any facts relating to the conduct of public officials which he deems it desirable the House should be in possession of, there is a proper and a customary manner in which to apply for such information, and not in language which will shock the sense of all gentlemen who have due regard for what should be the conduct of business in the House.

I did not object to the consideration of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma (although it struck me it might be objectionable, although I did not hear it very well) for the reason that it sought information pertaining to local affairs of the Territory represented by the gentleman himself. But when he uses language of personal disrespect of a high official of the Government and of a man who deservedly stands as high before the people of this country as any man who sits on this floor, I submit that he abuses the unanimous consent for which he is indebted to the courtesy of this side of the House.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that any remarks of mine should have hurt the tender feelings of the gentleman from the magnolia State, but let me say, sir, that I came 1,700 miles last summer for the purpose of trying to see the President of the United States and ask him in regard to this very question—the dereliction of the Secretary of the Interior in executing the law of Congress.

When I called there I was notified by his private secretary, Mr. Thurber, to wait and write him a note, and he said he would see

the President and see whether or not it would be agreeable for him to see me. I wrote the note in compliance with Mr. Thurber's request and waited a week, but never heard from him. Then I wrote a personal note to the President, asking for five minutes in which to lay certain matters concerning Oklahoma before him, saying that I did not expect if that letter went into the hands of his private secretary that I would ever get to see him, because I knew that he did not want me to; and then, never hearing a reply from that, I wrote to the Secretary of the Interior and asked him if he would not kindly advise me why the allotting agents, in conformity to this law, had not been appointed. Not receiving a reply to the first communication, I directed a second one to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. He stated in his letter to me that the matter had been called to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior, and that he had not been requested to act in the matter. I sent to the Secretary of the Interior that answer of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, with another request, asking for some information in relation to the matter, but never have received any reply.

If the facts which I have stated concerning the Secretary of the Interior are objectionable to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. COOPER] he should go and coach the gentleman who is placed there to preside over the destinies of a branch of the nation the magnitude of which was unknown to the gentleman from Georgia, except in the school district in which he resided, until he was discovered by Grover Cleveland. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Territory of Oklahoma, where 300,000 American citizens reside, has received nothing but calumny, vituperation, and abuse at the hands of this gentleman whom the gentleman from Florida [Mr. COOPER] undertakes to defend. If there has ever been a good deed for which Hoke Smith has received credit, if the gentleman will examine into the record, he will find that it was performed by some of his subordinates in the Department, who had more good American horse sense than he had. I have some feeling in this matter.

Mr. MCMILLIN. You appear to have.

Mr. FLYNN. The people of Oklahoma have a right to have some feeling. They have been mistreated, not at the hands of this Congress, and, I will say freely to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. COOPER], not at the hands of the last Congress, although it was Democratic. The people of Oklahoma were honorably treated by the last Congress, and they are going to be treated in the same way by this Congress, and I trust that the country will know whether or not a man is allowed to preside over the destinies of our Territory (Hoke Smith virtually does), in the person of the Secretary of the Interior, who will allow private communications to remain on his desk unanswered when a poor homesteader in a dugout and his children are going around barefoot for nine months because the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Hoke Smith, has not sufficient time to give the matter consideration. [Applause on the Republican side.] I have no sympathy with Hoke Smith. There never has been a Secretary of the Interior since the foundation of the Government who has devoted less time to his public duties than this gentleman does, who is parading around the country saying he has changed his mind on the money question. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPRINT OF DOCUMENT RELATING TO VENEZUELA BOUNDARY.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a reprint shall be made of Senate Document No. 226, first session Fiftieth Congress, relating to the Venezuela boundary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that, pending the right to object, the gentleman will make a statement in regard to it. This document is probably out of print, and we know nothing about it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman will state for the information of the House what the document is.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, this document is out of print. A very great demand for it has arisen. It is a document covering perhaps 200 or 225 pages. It is stereotyped, and can be readily furnished to the House. As we are expecting, since the return of the President from North Carolina, to hear something from Venezuela, we should like, of course, to have this preliminary information accessible to the present Congress. It is not now attainable, excepting in the hall library, and even there the volume in which this document is bound has been withdrawn from the files by somebody who is studying the question.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. SAYERS. Can the gentleman tell us the exact number of copies that would be printed under this resolution?

Mr. LACEY. That will be fixed by the printing statute. I do not remember the number.

Mr. SAYERS. I wish to say to the gentleman that I heartily approve of the resolution. This is a very important document, and should be in the hands of every member of the House; but I doubt very much whether, under that resolution, a sufficient number will be printed to supply members with such copies as they need.

Mr. LACEY. I will ask if the gentleman has any suggestion to make as to the number that should be printed?

Mr. SAYERS. I would suggest that 500 copies be printed for the use of the House.

Mr. LACEY. I think there would be 2,000 copies under the statute, and that that will be a sufficient number.

Mr. SAYERS. All right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman a question. How many copies do you propose to print?

Mr. LACEY. The number fixed by the statute. I think it is 2,000, but I am not sure.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Is it 2,000 or 1,000?

Mr. LACEY. My idea was that whatever number the statute fixes is supposed to be ample.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Does the gentleman think that there ought to be more printed than the number necessary for distribution among Members and Senators?

Mr. LACEY. If there is to be any change, I think it should be an increase rather than a diminution, for the reason that the country is very desirous to get this information. A great many requests have been made to Members of the House and Senators for this document, and they can not be supplied.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I would like to ask the gentleman if it would not be better to put in the resolution 5,000 copies. You will not have more than enough then. If it was a dissertation on the stomach of grasshoppers we would probably get 10,000. [Laughter.]

Mr. LACEY. I am informed by gentlemen familiar with the statute that this resolution would only give 2,000 copies. If that should prove to be insufficient, another reprint could be made. We are liable to have some other matter relative to the Venezuelan question to print later in the session.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Has the gentleman examined the document in question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Will you state what its contents are?

Mr. LACEY. It contains all the correspondence up to 1887 upon the Venezuelan question, giving the statement of the English Government on their side and of the Venezuelan Government upon the other, and the correspondence of Mr. Baker and other officials representing the United States in Venezuela. It is a document that will be of very great utility in the consideration of that question.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. How far does the correspondence go back?

Mr. LACEY. It goes back to the beginning of the question. There are about 40 or 50 communications embraced in the document, which comprises about 250 pages.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Does it go back to the transfer?

Mr. LACEY. It purports to give the history of the entire transaction, including the original claim of Venezuela, of Spain, of Holland, and of England—the official claims. There is a map also embraced in the document.

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Does it define the line in dispute?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution be again reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the resolution.

The resolution was again reported.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I only rise to say to the gentleman from Iowa that it strikes me that the resolution ought to make some disposition of this document when printed. If the document is simply printed, it is sent to the various document rooms and into the various files of the House, and only a few copies will be left for the use of the members of the House and also for the use of members of the Senate under this resolution of the gentleman. It seems to me he ought to have his resolution provide for the distribution of this document if he wants it for the use of the members of the House, to be distributed to members of the House, and then it would not go to the various document and files rooms. If an amendment is made to print a certain number of copies for the use of the Senate and House, then there will be a proper distribution by the officers, and members will get several copies.

Mr. LACEY. The purpose was to have this document go to the

files, so that such members as desire to consult them could go there and examine them.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the reprint is made under the gentleman's resolution the distribution will take place under the rules, and copies will go to the various document and files rooms, and members would not get copies of it for their use and distribution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I only wish to say, Mr. Speaker, in addition to what I have said, that if the document is printed under this resolution there will be very few copies for members—only about one copy to each member—while if the whole number is printed for the use of the House it will be divided by the number of members, and we will all get two or three copies.

Mr. LACEY. I would ask the gentleman if he has any suggestion to make as to the number. The gentleman is familiar with the demands.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The resolution as it stands will call for the printing of 1,682 copies, and those copies will be sent to the various document rooms and the file rooms, so that there will be only about one copy left for each member. Therefore, if the gentleman desires these copies for the use of members he would do well to change the resolution.

Mr. LACEY. Then I will modify the resolution by adding the words "for the use of members of the House."

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that a provision reading "to be distributed among the members of the House, for the use of the House," might possibly send the documents in the same direction in which they ordinarily go, into the document rooms.

Mr. LACEY. I accept the amendment suggested and will ask the Clerk to report it again.

The amendment was read, as follows:

To be distributed among the members of the House, for the use of the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was then adopted.

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES, BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, if it be in order, I desire to call up a joint resolution which I believe lies on the Speaker's table, in regard to the miscellaneous expenses of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that will require unanimous consent. If there be no objection, the resolution will be read.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 27) ratifying the use of the appropriation for materials and miscellaneous expenses for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the fiscal year 1896 for the purchase of articles provided for in the appropriation for the miscellaneous expenses of the Treasury Department, and authorizing the continued use of the same for the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1896.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the use by the Secretary of the Treasury of the appropriation for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in the act of March 2, 1895, chapter 189, acts Fifty-third Congress, third session, "for engravers', printers', and other materials, except distinctive paper, and for miscellaneous expenses, $190,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury," for the purchase of articles and the performance of services, for the payment of which an appropriation was made in the act of March 2, 1895, chapter 177, Laws of the Fifty-third Congress, third session, under the following caption "For contingent expenses of the Treasury Department, including all buildings under control of the Treasury, in Washington, D. C.," be, and the same is hereby, ratified and confirmed, and the accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow to the disbursing agent of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing all items disallowed because of the use of said appropriation in the manner above specified, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to continue the use of said appropriation for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in the manner in which said appropriation has heretofore been used, as above specified, for similar expenditures for said Bureau during the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1896, and no part of said appropriation shall be subject to the provisions of sections 240 and 3683 of the Revised Statutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair will submit a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury relating to this resolution.

The letter of the Secretary of the Treasury was read, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1895.

SIR: The Comptroller of the Treasury has recently rendered a decision to the effect that certain expenditures of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for items that are enumerated in the appropriation for contingent expenses of the Treasury Department, "including all buildings under control of the Treasury in Washington, D. C.," as set forth on page 781, volume 28, Statutes at Large, are contingent expenses of the Treasury Department, and that therefore the appropriation for "material and miscellaneous expenses of engraving and printing," provided for under the head of "Engraving and printing," at page 920, volume 28, Statutes at Large, is not available for their payment; but that all such expenditures must be made from the appropriation for contingent expenses above referred to.

Unless relief be given by Congress, this decision will necessitate a suspension of the work of engraving and printing long before the expiration of the fiscal year, as the appropriation for contingent expenses is not sufficient to pay the additional burden thus placed upon it. The expenditures of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for items similar to those covered by the appropriation for contingent expenses, and by the decision of the Comptroller, amounted during the last fiscal year to $51,765.27, while the appropriation for these items of contingent expenses for the current fiscal year is only $58,470. It will thus be seen that if these items are paid from the appropriations for contingent expenses, they will absorb nearly all of the appropriation.

The items of expenditures covered by the decision in the work of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing were included in the estimates submitted by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the expenses of engraving and printing the securities and obligations of the United States. If, therefore, the expenditures are made in accordance with the decision of the Comptroller there will be a surplus in the appropriation for that Bureau and a deficit in the appropriation for contingent expenses of the Treasury Department.

To avoid this, and to prevent a suspension of the work of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, I have the honor to submit herewith a draft of a joint resolution, authorizing the use by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the money appropriated "for materials and miscellaneous expenses of engraving and printing," and beg to urge its immediate passage.

Very respectfully, yours,

J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*

HON. THOMAS B. REED,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I will state for the information of the House that the resolution does not involve any appropriation. The last Congress, like other Congresses preceding, made appropriation for the miscellaneous expenses of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and also for the contingent expenses of the Treasury Department. Up to the present time these items of appropriation have been expended as they appear upon the appropriation bills, but the present Comptroller of the Treasury has ruled that under the law a portion of the expenses coming under the head of miscellaneous expenses of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing must be paid out of the contingent fund of the Treasury.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand from the communication of the Secretary of the Treasury exactly on what ground that decision of the Comptroller has been made. The last appropriation bill is very distinct in providing that the appropriation shall be for these very purposes, and I can not quite understand how such a construction of the law has been made by the Comptroller.

Mr. SAYERS. The Secretary of the Treasury does not state the ground on which the Comptroller made his decision; but the purpose of this resolution is to suspend the law upon which the decision is made for the present fiscal year.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then this resolution is in entire accord with the intention of the last appropriation bill?

Mr. SAYERS. It is.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Let me see whether I understand the gentleman from Texas accurately. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing is a bureau under the Treasury Department?

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. There is an appropriation for contingent expenses of the Treasury Department for this fiscal year, as there has been for many years past. And there is always an appropriation for supplies and miscellaneous expenses to be disbursed under the direction of the head of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And under the uniform construction given to the law in years past by various Comptrollers the expenditures have always been made for the miscellaneous expenses of that Bureau?

Mr. SAYERS. I believe so.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. But this Comptroller comes in and says that, notwithstanding such uniform construction, this appropriation for miscellaneous expenses shall not be used, but the expenditures for such purpose shall be thrown upon the regular appropriation for contingent expenses of the Treasury Department proper?

Mr. SAYERS. That is my understanding of the situation.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And as there is not money enough for the purpose in the contingent appropriation for the Department, the object of this resolution is to cure that technical ruling of the present Comptroller?

Mr. SAYERS. That is the purpose of the resolution as I understand it.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Then it seems to me that it is proper enough to pass this resolution if we must do so; but in giving my assent, as one member of the House, to its enactment, I want to say that this is not by any means the first time that technical rulings of the Comptroller have had to be overcome by legislation, the result being consumption of time without any profit or saving to the Treasury. It reminds me of an experience which happened in my boyhood. My father was coming up the Mississippi River on a little stern-wheel steamboat, when out there came from the bank two boys in a skiff, pulling for dear life and hallooing with all their might. Finally the steamboat was stopped. "What's the matter?" cried the mate. The little fellows turned around and started back to the bank exclaiming, "Stopped a steamboat, by jingo!" [Laughter.] So this Comptroller seems to have stopped a steamboat in this case, and no doubt he will keep on at it. I believe he stopped a very big one for you down in Louisiana. [Laughter.]

Mr. LOUD. May I ask the gentleman from Texas a question?

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly.

Mr. LOUD. Has the gentleman any assurance that the Comptroller will not set aside this resolution if passed?

Mr. SAYERS. None at all. It would not be proper for me to go to the Comptroller of the Treasury as to his future rulings.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SAYERS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COURT-ROOM ACCOMMODATIONS FOR SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. SCRANTON. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for present consideration Senate joint resolution No. 13. In this connection, I wish to have read a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, and when the resolution is taken up I desire to offer an amendment to it.

The joint resolution (S. R. 13) granting the State of Pennsylvania permission to use the United States court-houses at Scranton, Pa., and at Williamsport, Pa., was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That full permission be, and the same is hereby, granted to the State of Pennsylvania and to the superior court of said State to occupy the United States court room and the rooms connected therewith at Scranton, in the county of Lackawanna, during the month of January, and at Williamsport, in the county of Lycoming, during the month of February, in each year, for the period of five years from the 1st day of January, 1896, for the purpose of holding the sessions of said court therein, and that during said period concurrent jurisdiction, so far as is necessary, over said property be, and the same is hereby, ceded to the State of Pennsylvania for said purposes, so that the sessions of said courts in said buildings and rooms may be, during said period, fully legalized: *Provided*, That the commissioners of each of said counties of Lackawanna and Lycoming shall pay to the United States each the sum of $500, to be made in five yearly payments, for the use of said rooms for the time aforesaid: *And provided further*, That said rooms shall be kept in good repair at the expense of the State of Pennsylvania, and that said commissioners shall further provide necessary light and heat for said rooms at their own expense, and at the end of said period of five years the use of said rooms shall be relinquished to the United States by the said State of Pennsylvania and the said superior court in as good condition as before the occupancy of said rooms by said court: *Provided further*, That the sessions of said superior court shall in no way interfere with the sessions of the said circuit and district courts of the United States.

Mr. SCRANTON. I desire to have a letter of the Secretary of the Treasury read, and also a proposed amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon granting unanimous consent for the consideration of this resolution, pending which the gentleman from Pennsylvania asks that a communication be read from the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *December 12, 1895.*

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 11th instant, inclosing a draft of House resolution No. 8, relative to the use of the United States court room in the public building at Scranton and Williamsport, Pa., by the superior court of the State of Pennsylvania during certain months of each year, and requesting that the Department give its sanction to said measure. In reply I have the honor to advise you that, for reasons which you must appreciate, the Department can only express an opinion upon the merits of proposed bill or resolution at request of the Senate or the House, or the chairman of the committee to which it is referred. I have the honor to suggest, however, that the joint resolution be amended by the addition of a clause providing that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized to terminate the permission granted upon thirty days' notice to the commissioners, in the event that the United States should need the premises, or in event of failure on the part of the commissioners or the State of Pennsylvania to comply with any of the conditions named in said resolution.

Respectfully, yours,

S. WIKE, *Acting Secretary.*

Hon. J. A. SCRANTON,
House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the amendment which the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires to offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the bill the following:

"*Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, in his discretion, at any time to terminate this permit and the possession thereby granted of either or both of said premises upon thirty days' notice to the commissioners of the county wherein the same is situated; and on such termination all further payment therefor shall cease."

Mr. SAYERS. Allow me to state that a few days ago, when a similar resolution was offered, I objected to its consideration. The amendment which the gentleman from Pennsylvania proposes to offer to this Senate resolution obviates, I think, any objection. Therefore I do not object.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The amendment as previously read was agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to a third reading, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SCRANTON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. COX, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 803) to amend section 2601 of the Revised Statutes relative to ports of entry; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 30) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," approved March 2, 1893; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

PORTS OF ENTRY, INDIANA AND ILLINOIS.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up from the Speaker's table, if permissible at this time, the House bill No. 803, with reference to certain ports of entry, which came over from the Senate this morning, with an amendment, and move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks this would require unanimous consent, inasmuch as under the rule it would necessarily go over until to-morrow morning.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Then, I would like to call it up by unanimous consent. This matter is one in which my colleague, Mr. HOPKINS, is interested, but he is absent from the House to-day, and asks me to call it up for him.

The SPEAKER. The title of the bill will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 803) to amend section 2601 of the Revised Statutes relative to ports of entry.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the amendment of the Senate to the House bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend in line 14, after the word "law," by inserting "*Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal the provisions of the act approved August 7, 1882, which embraces East St. Louis, Ill., within the limits of the port of St. Louis, Mo."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate amendment to this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague, as I was not able to hear very well in this part of the Hall the reading of the amendment, if the bill, or the amendment of the Senate, would in any manner affect the existing status of the port of Cairo, Ill.?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. No; it would not, as I am informed.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Then, that port would still exist as now under the general statutes, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to it at the present time?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, my understanding is, that although it attaches the State of Illinois, with the exception of East St. Louis, to the Chicago collection district, it makes no other change and does not interfere with Cairo as a port of delivery.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Well, this is a port of delivery. If my colleague can assure me of the fact that it is not interfered with under the operation of this bill I have no objection to the present consideration of it. Inasmuch as this is in my district, I would like to look carefully into the matter before consent is given, unless he can give me that assurance.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am informed that it does not make any change, excepting that to which I have referred. Our colleague, Mr. HOPKINS, passed it through the House by unanimous consent last week, as the gentleman will remember.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Yes; I happened to be out at the time, and do not know the exact conditions of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Where are the duties that may be collected at Cairo payable now?

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. The surveyor of the port attends to the duties pertaining to the office of the surveyor of a port of that character, and receives fees and a salary for performing the duties.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. It does not change anything in the State of Illinois, except, as I understand it, collections made in the State of Illinois hereafter, which are now payable in New Orleans, will be payable in Chicago.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Will you not allow this to rest until to-morrow, so that I may have an opportunity of looking into it?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Very well; I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made to the bill and it will go over.

STORING AND CLEANSING OF RICE.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a bill and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration, and pending that I desire to offer an explanation to the House, which I think will lead to the granting of the consent and the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. Let the bill be reported first.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1647) to amend an act approved March 24, 1874, entitled "An act establishing bonded warehouses for storing and cleansing of rice intended for exportation."

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. That the act of Congress approved March 24, 1874, entitled "An act to provide bonded warehouses for the storing and cleansing of rice in-

tended for exportation," be, and hereby is, amended by adding after the words "imported rice," the following words: "and for the curing and repacking of fish," so that the act will read as follows:

"That from and after the passage of this act importers' bonded warehouses, to be used for the storing and cleansing of imported rice, and for the curing and repacking of fish intended for exportation to foreign countries, may be established at any port of entry in the United States under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe."

Mr. MOODY. Allow me to say, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is presented to the House at the request of the Treasury Department. If it were intended to introduce any new practice in the Department in respect to the subject with which the bill deals, I would not ask present consideration; but I am informed that the practice which the bill seeks to legalize has been in existence in the Treasury Department for more than fifteen years, and it is only within a few weeks past that it has been discovered to be in violation of the existing law. The bill was intrusted to my care because of the fact that it affects almost exclusively the district in Massachusetts which I have the honor to represent on this floor.

There are at present, under the guidance and control of the Treasury Department, bonded warehouses for the precise purpose which this bill is intended to authorize, and, as I say, it is intended only to legalize a practice which has prevailed during several Administrations and for nearly a fifth of a century. The only reason why it can not take its ordinary course of reference to a committee is that it interrupts business which has been built up upon the faith of the legality of this practice, in which many men are employed and much capital is invested. The bill which has been introduced is word for word in accordance with a suggestion drawn in the Treasury Department and handed to me personally by Mr. Hamlin, one of the Assistant Secretaries. I trust that this explanation will be sufficient to permit the present consideration and passage of the bill which I offer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LESTER. I shall be obliged to object to the consideration of this bill at present. It seems to involve matters which require consideration, and therefore I object.

Some time subsequently,

Mr. MOODY said: Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by the gentleman from Georgia that the objection which he interposed to the consideration of the bill relating to warehouses for fish was made under a misapprehension, and that he is prepared to withdraw it. I therefore still ask for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. LESTER. Mr. Speaker, I have examined the bill, and withdraw my objection to its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The objection having been withdrawn, the bill having been read will not be reported again unless requested. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, before that is done I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, as I understand it to be the case, in order that the House may fully understand what they are doing, has the Secretary of the Treasury recommended the passage of this bill?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury not only recommends the passage of the bill, but the bill as presented is a draft, word for word, of a measure recommended by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. DINGLEY. I understand that the sole object of this bill is to continue a practice which had prevailed under former constructions of importing from Canada certain kinds of fish, particularly herring, and preparing them in a bonded warehouse for the purpose of export simply. It only extends the law as it exists now with reference to bonded warehouses, and gives as a right a practice which has been carried on in fact for a great many years.

Mr. MOODY. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that is an exact statement of the case, with the exception of the nature of the fish, which I believe to be cod instead of herring.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think it is largely composed of herring, but it may also be cod. The larger proportion of it, as I was informed by Mr. Hamlin, was herring. I think this legislation is entirely proper, and is simply extending a principle which has existed under all tariff laws for the last fifty years. I think the bill ought to pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. DINGLEY. One word. I noticed when the Clerk read the bill that it referred to the act of 1894 as the act of 1874. Was that simply an error in the reading, or is the bill incorrect? Is it the act of 1894 that is referred to?

The SPEAKER. The title reads 1874.

Mr. MOODY. Eighteen hundred and seventy-four is right. The act to which this is offered as an amendment is the act approved March 24, 1874.

Mr. DINGLEY. I had the impression it was the act of 1894 that it was desired to amend. But the gentleman has examined the matter, I suppose, and is correct.

The question was taken on the passage of the bill; and it was accordingly passed.

On motion of Mr. MOODY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PROPOSED SURVEYS, GREAT LAKES.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas the subsidence of the waters of the Great Lakes of the North has reached an alarming stage, reducing the depth of the water in the channels and harbors of said lakes to such a degree as to seriously interfere with navigation; and

Whereas great loss to those who are engaged in the carrying trade on these lakes is caused thereby, endangering their vessels and the lives of those who navigate them; and

Whereas the subsidence of the water has never been so great as at the present time, being a total of some 5 feet below the normal height; and

Whereas it has been proposed that a series of dams or jetties, constructed and maintained at or near the outlet of these several lakes, would necessarily raise the surface of said lakes: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the House of Representatives any and all information that he may have bearing upon this subject.

Resolved, that he be directed to give an estimate of the cost of making a survey of the outlet of Lake Erie at the head of Niagara River, of the outlet of Lake St. Clair at the head of the Detroit River, and of the outlet of Lake Huron at the head of the St. Clair River, with a view to the construction of such dams, jetties, locks, and such other work as may be necessary for the proper carrying out of the object aimed at in these resolutions, it being understood that these surveys shall take into consideration the feasibility of such constructions, and whether they would accomplish the desired object of increasing the depth of water in the lakes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I submit that it would be better to have that go to a committee. It seems to me—living as I do near one of these great inland seas—that this resolution is so important, for mischief or for good, as the case may be, that it would be better to have it receive the consideration of the usual committee.

Mr. McMILLIN. I do not rise for the purpose of objecting, Mr. Speaker, but I rise to suggest to the gentleman introducing it that it would be better to change the form so as to request, if not incompatible with the public service, instead of direct. That is the usual form. It is questionable whether a simple resolution can direct. It can request.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that I was in consultation with General Craighill, Chief of Engineers, I believe, in the War Department, who has these matters in charge, and he suggested the word "direct." That was the reason I used it.

Mr. McMILLIN. I only make the suggestion because it is the usual form in these resolutions to request, instead of to direct, and I think it is well to conform to the custom.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I have no objection to that.

Mr. McMILLIN. It is questionable whether anything short of a law can "direct" an officer of the Government. One branch of Congress can request, but the direction comes by law, and not by a simple resolution.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I will state to the gentleman that General Craighill explicitly stated that we have the power to direct the Secretary of War to furnish this information.

Mr. McMILLIN. Congress has the power to direct, and I am not going to abrogate any power I have as a member of the House, but it is the usual form. I shall not be captious about it, but I think the gentleman ought to put it in the usual form.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I will send up this letter from General Craighill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has objected. Does he withdraw his objection for that purpose?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I think it is a resolution that may well receive the consideration of the proper committee. I do not think I will withdraw my objection, because on a mere reading of the resolution I would be required to make up my opinion about the propriety of entering upon this expenditure. It may be, and I presume is, very proper, but the rules are made for the reference of resolutions of this kind, in order to enable us to obtain the full information of one of the committees of the House. It seems to me that there is nothing to be gained by passing this resolution now rather than in January.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

CUBA.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I send a paper to the desk which I ask to have read, and that, by unanimous consent, I then have an opportunity to make a few remarks.

The SPEAKER. What is the paper?

Mr. WILLIS. It is a petition from the Peace Society of Delaware touching the Cuban question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Delaware asks to have a memorial from the Peace Society of Delaware read, and that he be permitted to make some remarks on the subject. The memorial will be read.

The memorial was read.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I would like the Speaker to state what the question is. I have just come in.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that there is no question.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I understand that the gentleman who has the floor sent up something to be read and that he desires then to address the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understood.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I am informed, also, that the paper read refers to Cuba. I think that at the proper time we should take that up in the regular way.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky objects.

BELLIGERENT RIGHTS TO CUBANS.

Mr. DOVENER. Mr. Speaker, by request, I send to the Clerk's desk a memorial and resolution adopted at a mass meeting in the city of Washington, and ask unanimous consent that it be read, and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the reading of the resolution and printing in the RECORD?

Mr. RICHARDSON. We do not know what it is.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman state what the subject is?

Mr. DOVENER. It is in favor of the recognition of and giving belligerent rights to the Cubans.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I could not hear the gentleman——

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. But I suggest that the matter had better take the regular course.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

ARMENIAN TROUBLES.

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read and printed in the RECORD memorials and resolutions from two Brooklyn churches relative to the barbarities in Armenia, as practiced by the Turks. These resolutions come from two of the most prominent churches in Brooklyn, one from Christ's Church, with a membership of nearly 2,000, one of the oldest churches of that denomination, and the other from the South Third Street Presbyterian Church, the senior pastor of which is the honored president of the Foreign Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church of the United States.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from New York propose—the consideration of the matter?

Mr. HOWE. I would like to have the petitions read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. And referred?

Mr. HOWE. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to have the memorials presented by him read, printed in the RECORD, and referred. Is there objection?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. To what subject do the memorials refer, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. They relate to the Armenian question.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I think they had better be referred without reading.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The memorials will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word with regard to this matter. I look upon these not as resolutions, but as petitions coming up from the people——

The SPEAKER. Objection is made and the gentleman is not in order.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Pending that motion, the Chair desires to lay before the House certain requests of members.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. OGDEN, until after the holidays.

To Mr. COWEN, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. COBB of Alabama, to January 1 next, on account of important business.

To Mr. TALBERT, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. LAWSON, indefinitely, on account of very important business.

To Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana, until after the holidays, on account of important business.

To Mr. WALKER of Virginia, for ten days, on account of important business.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask indefinite leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. WOOMER, on account of sickness.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. EVANS, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 967) for the relief of Theodore Huseman, and it was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

On motion of Mr. JOY, the Committee on Claims was discharged from further consideration of the bill for the relief of William P. Buckmaster, and it was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. KEM, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of John Tempany, Fifty-third Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair in appointing the Committee on Accounts was misinformed as to the number, and will add to the committee Mr. BULL of Rhode Island and Mr. COBB of Missouri.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A joint resolution of the following title, having been duly enrolled, was signed by the Speaker:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 7) providing for the printing of the Monthly Summary Statement of Imports and Exports of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department.

The motion of Mr. DINGLEY was then agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 1648) to provide for terms of the circuit and district courts of the western judicial district of the State of Texas to be held at the city of Laredo, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 1649) for the establishment of home or homes for the indigent colored people and colored orphans in the South—to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1650) to provide for the erection of a public building at Elizabeth City, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 1651) to define "train wrecking with the intent to rob," and to provide the penalty of death therefor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1652) for the erection of a public building at Fulton, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 1653) to amend section 4766 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 1654) to levy and collect duties on barley and the products thereof—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 1655) to extend to the port of Superior, Wis., in the district of Superior, Mich., the privileges of the seventh section of an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 1656) to provide for the coinage of all the silver bullion the product of the mines of the United States and the Territories thereof—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. AVERY: A bill (H. R. 1657) to amend section 3 of the act of June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1658) for the improvement of Charlevoix Harbor, at Charlevoix, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CRUMP: A bill (H. R. 1659) to amend section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 1660) to increase the revenue for the support of the Government—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOUTHARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 1661) to aid in regulating the currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRISP (by request): A bill (H. R. 1662) to amend an act entitled "An act to organize the Hospital Corps of the Army of the United States, to define its duty, and fix its pay," approved March 1, 1887—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1663) providing for the appointment of pharmacists in the United States Marine-Hospital Service and fixing their pay and allowances—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, (by request) a bill (H. R. 1664) giving apothecaries of the United States Navy and naval hospitals the title of naval pharmacists and the rank and pay of warrant officers—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 1665) providing for the election of a Delegate to represent the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1666) to change the day for the first annual meeting of Congress from the first Monday in December to the first Tuesday after the 4th day of March, and to the first Monday after the 1st day of January for the second annual session, and to provide for a meeting of Congress to count the electoral vote for President and Vice-President and to transact no other business, and for other purposes—to the Select Committee on the Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1667) to authorize the Corpus Christi and Padre Island Harbor Company to import free of duty certain materials for the construction of an outer harbor on the coast of Texas—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 1668) to construe an act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 1669) providing for the acquisition of certain land in Webb County, Tex., in lieu of the site of Fort McIntosh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1670) for the erection of a public building at Laredo, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 1671) to aid State schools of mines and mining departments of State universities—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1672) granting to the State of North Dakota certain portions of the abandoned Fort Abraham Lincoln Military Reservation, together with the buildings thereon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 1673) relating to the compensation and duties of United States attorneys, clerks, marshals, and other court officials, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 1674) for the issue of ordnance, stores, and supplies to the State of Nebraska, to replace similar stores destroyed by fire—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 1675) to provide for the registration of trade-marks on bottles, siphons, butts, hogsheads, barrels, half barrels, casks, half casks, quarter casks, kegs, boxes, tins, and other receptacles and vessels used in commerce with foreign nations, or among the several States, or with the Indian tribes, or among or in the Territories of the United States, or with or in the District of Columbia, and to prevent the fraudulent use of the same in such commerce—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 1676) to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 1677) to reimburse certain States for the proceeds, in part, of unclaimed, captured, and abandoned property—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1678) to restore a part of captured and abandoned property—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ATWOOD: A bill (H. R. 1679) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Quincy, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (1680) to authorize a survey of the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1681) to widen, deepen, and improve the channel of Elizabeth River, Virginia, from Hampton Roads to the Norfolk Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1682) providing for the building of a road to the national cemetery at Yorktown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 1683) granting to the State of Kansas the entire remaining portion of the abandoned Fort Dodge Military Reservation in said State, as an addition to and for the use of the State Soldiers' Home—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 1684) to restore the duty on wool and manufactures of wool, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1685) amending "Schedule F—Tobacco and manufactures thereof," of an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation," etc., in effect August 28, 1894—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRACY: A bill (H. R. 1686) to amend the act approved June 27, 1890, relative to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1687) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to examine vouchers filed, or to be filed, by the State of Missouri in certain cases since April 22, 1882—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1688) for the relief of certain homestead settlers—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 1689) to provide for the erection of a public building at Washington, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1690) to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 1691) to authorize the St. Louis and Oklahoma City Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WELLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 1692) to amend an act to provide for terms of the United States circuit and district courts at Cumberland, Md., approved March 21, 1892, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 1693) authorizing the purchase by the United States, and the making free, of the toll roads passing over the Yosemite National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 1694) for the relief of certain State militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1695) to establish a naval experiment station at New London, Conn.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 1696) to mark the boundaries of mining claims by stakes 100 feet apart—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 1697) to provide for the erection of a public building at Kansas City, Kans.—to the Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PEARSON: A bill (H. R. 1698) to repeal section 4716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 1699) appropriating $50,000 for the erection of a statue of Maj. Gen. Henry W. Slocum—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 1700) to promote the efficiency of discipline in penal institutions—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 1701) providing that all pensioners who receive less than $12 per month who have attained an age of 75 years shall receive $12 per month from the date of their arriving at such age—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROYSE: A bill (H. R. 1702) providing for the erection and construction of a post-office building at South Bend, Ind., and making an additional appropriation therefor—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 1703) to establish a military post at or near Des Moines, Iowa—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 1704) concerning delivery of letters in rural towns—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 1705) to prevent the unlawful killing of game by Indians, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 1706) to provide an American register for the steamer *Kahului*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 1707) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 1708) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the appointment of receivers of national banks, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1876, as amended by an act approved August 3, 1892—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1709) to extend the time for the construction of railways to railway corporations to whom rights of way have been previously granted to construct and operate railways, telegraph and telephone lines through the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 1710) amending Schedule F, "Tobacco and manufactures thereof," of an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation," etc., in effect August 28, 1894—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 1711) for the erection of a statue of the late Robert Dale Owen, of Indiana, to be placed in the grounds of the Smithsonian Institution—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WOODARD: A bill (H. R. 1712) granting to the First Regiment North Carolina State Guard two condemned cannon—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 1713) to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORSE: A joint resolution (H. Res. 28) proposing an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all power and authority in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler of Nations, and His revealed will as authority in civil affairs—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAIN: A joint resolution (H. Res. 29) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize Congress to levy a direct tax in proportion to the assessed valuation of all property subject to taxation in the several States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a joint resolution (H. Res. 30) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the President to veto separate items in appropriation bills—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A joint resolution (H. Res. 31) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1895, on the 20th day of said month—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FISCHER: A joint resolution (H. Res. 32) directing the Secretary of War to prepare and submit plans and estimates for continuing the work upon Gowanus Canal, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HATCH: A joint resolution (H. Res. 33) for the appointment of a commission to make survey of a ship canal from the southern shore of Lake Michigan to the waters of the Wabash River—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A resolution directing the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to inquire as to the difference in exchange, if any, between gold and silver standard countries, and what effect, if any, it has upon agricultural and manufacturing interests—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BROWN: A resolution to pay out of the contingent fund of the House a sum equal to six months' salary and burial expenses of M. F. Wadkin, late an employee of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FISCHER: A resolution referring to navy-yard dismissals in the civil service—to the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. McLAURIN: A resolution to pay William J. Assman the difference between the pay of laborer and that of messenger of the Hall library—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. TRACY: A resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish information to the House as to the pensioners dropped from the pension rolls, and whose pensions have been reduced—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a concurrent resolution for the appointment of a committee to revise and codify the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ATWOOD: A memorial from the legislature of the State of Massachusetts relating to uniform hours of labor—to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 1714) granting a pension to Taylor McFarland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1715) to correct the military record of Allen Hyatt, of Connellsville, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 1716) for the relief of Alfred T. Moreland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1717) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Ann E. Timberlake—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1718) for the relief of William M. Henry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1719) for the relief of Col. S. K. N. Patton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 1720) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Corinth, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1721) for the relief of the estate of James Roach, deceased, of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1722) for the relief of Isabella Rowsey, of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1723) for the relief of Thomas P. Young, of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1724) to correct the military record of John B. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 1725) for relief of estate of Francis Whitfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1726) for the relief of Shelby Newman, of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1727) for the relief of the trustees of Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Corinth, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 1728) for the relief of L. B. Hearrell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 1729) granting a pension to Eliza Horning, widow of Jacob Horning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 1730) to remove the charge of desertion against Mason W. Presby—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 1731) for the relief of Michael Dittlinger—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill H. R. (1732) to correct the military record of Oliver Caesar—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1733) for the relief of Augustus Boyd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1734) to increase the pension of Ann Catharine Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 1735) for the relief of Hugh J. Brady—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1736) for the relief of John Isles, late of Company I, Second Regiment of Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1737) for the relief of Jane Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1738) for the relief of John Redden, late of Company D, Tenth Tennessee Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 1739) granting a pension to Emily M. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 1740) for the relief of Eberhard Giebler—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 1741) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 1742) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Tumy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1743) for the relief of the legal representatives of Thomas L. Young—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 1744) for the relief of Allie V. Askew, administratrix of W. W. Neeley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1745) for the relief of the estate of D. B. Downing, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1746) for the relief of Red Bone Methodist Episcopal Church, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1747) for relief of Marcella M. Davis and Mary A. Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1748) for the relief of P. T. O'Shea, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1749) for the relief of Hixey Parker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1750) for the relief of James Murphy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1751) for the relief of Bettie Stafford, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1752) for the relief of Elijah Vandiver, of Leflore County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1753) for the relief of the estate of D. B. Downing, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1754) for the relief of Margaret Summer, of Washington County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1755) for the relief of the estate of Edward B. Willis, deceased, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1756) for the relief of the estate of Madison Stephenson, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1757) for the relief of Alfred Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1758) for the relief of Samuel Scott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1759) for the relief of Adeline L. Hebron, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1760) for the relief of Mary T. Leake, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1761) for the relief of N. B. Lanier, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1762) for the relief of Margaret Young, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1763) for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Moore, of Bolivar County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1764) for relief of the estate of Jacob Oates, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1765) for the relief of the estate of W. S. Hyland, deceased, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1766) for the relief of Mrs. H. O. Fitzhugh, of Vicksburg, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1767) for the relief of Mrs. Adam Haver, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1768) for the relief of the estate of B. S. Hallum, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1769) for the relief of Joel Hallum, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 1770) for the relief of Jerome Kunkel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1771) granting pension to Martha Allen and children, the widow and children of Robert A. Allen, of Company I, Second Regiment Kansas State Militia Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1772) granting a pension to Joseph E. Baldwin, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1773) for the relief of D. W. Boutwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1774) to increase the pension of Mary C. Tozier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1775) granting a pension to James L. Scott, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1776) granting a pension to Anthony Christy, of Osage City, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1777) granting a pension to Ezekiel Marple, of North Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1778) granting a pension to Fannie A. Ham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1779) granting a pension to Mary Frost—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1780) granting a pension to Samuel Myers, of Topeka, Kans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1781) granting a pension to Richard Brookins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1782) granting a pension to Mrs. Fannie Strain—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1783) granting a pension to George W. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1784) granting a pension to Susannah M. Weymouth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1785) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to W. H. Wallace Post, No. 66, Grand Army of the Republic, of Eldorado, Kans., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1786) granting an increase of pension to John W. Owens, of Toronto, Kans.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1787) for the relief of Wallace McGrath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1788) for the relief of Peter D. Staats, of Troop I of the Second Regiment United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1789) for the relief of Daniel W. Boutwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1790) granting a pension to Michael Knauber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 1791) granting a pension to Sarah V. Lothrop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1792) to restore to the pension roll the name of Lydia H. Bilto—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 1793) for the relief of Michael Bassett—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 1794) to remove limitation from claims of Henry L. Potter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1795) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust and settle the account of the heirs of Alfred G. Benson with the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLSON: A bill (H. R. 1796) for the relief of those suffering from the destruction of the salt works near Manchester, Ky., pursuant to the orders of Maj. Gen. Carlos Buell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 1797) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the heirs of Peter Johnson certain money due him for carrying the mail—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1798) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to refund certain duties paid by James J. Haynes—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of George F. Horton—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 1800) for the relief of Francis Millet—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1801) for the relief of the estate of Mary H. S. Robertson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 1802) for the relief of James Clarkson, of Company C, Sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 1803) for the relief of Nathan Plummer—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1804) authorizing the restoration of the name of Thomas Hynes, late first lieutenant, First Infantry, to the rolls of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 1805) for the relief of the trustees of Tuscarora Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Martinsburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 1806) for the relief of William R. Boag—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1807) for the relief of the Berdan Firearms Manufacturing Company—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 1808) for the relief of Agnes and Maria De Leon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 1809) for the relief of the Protestant Orphan Asylum, of Natchez, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 1810) directing the Secretary of the Interior to place Sarah E. Comly on the pension roll, etc.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 1811) for the relief of Catharine L. Chaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 1812) granting an increase of pension to Newton H. Gaar, Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1813) granting a pension to Ellen Knox, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1814) for the relief of Dr. John R. Hall, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 1815) for the relief of the legal representative of George McDougall, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 1816) for the relief of Michael Ryan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1817) granting a pension of $50 a month to C. L. Alden—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1818) granting an increase of pension to John Shannon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1819) for the relief of William A. Cowles—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1820) granting a pension to Neil McNeil—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1821) to reopen and adjust the account for service of Lieut. Col. W. A. Jones, Corps of Engineers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1822) for the relief of Christopher Ellis—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 1823) for the relief of Henry Grebe—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 1824) to do justice to the National Guard of east Tennessee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 1825) granting a pension to Mary Prince, widow of Ellis Prince—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1826) granting a pension to Henry Prince—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1827) granting a pension to Nancy B. Prince, widow of Elbert Prince—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 1828) for the relief of William Armstrong—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 1829) granting a pension to James A. Padgett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 1830) for the relief of Augustus Boyd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 1831) for the relief of Joseph Tousaint—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 1832) granting a pension to Hannah E. Rodgers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWE: A bill (H. R. 1833) for the relief of Thomas Stack—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1834) to remove the charge of desertion from

the military record of Charles F. Mapes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 1835) to amend the record of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, by including the name of John H. Thruston therein, with the date of his enlistment and date of his discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 1836) granting an honorable discharge to Wilson Kale—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1837) to pay for certain paving in the city of Des Moines, Iowa—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1838) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Corigan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1839) granting a pension to Clarinda Reeve—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1840) for the relief of heirs of Mrs. Telisse W. Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1841) authorizing the restoration of the name of Thomas H. Carpenter, late captain Seventeenth United States Infantry, to the rolls of the Army, and providing that he be placed on the list of retired officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 1842) for the relief of John A. Bates—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COLSON (for Mr. HUNTER): A bill (H. R. 1843) for the relief of Fannie E. Neale, heir of J. F. Brennon, deceased, late of Todd County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 1844) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1845) for the relief of George H. Plant, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 1846) for the relief of Robert M. Gardner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1847) for the relief of Hiram K. Hazlett—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1848) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Kulage, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1849) for the relief of William P. Buckmaster—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1850) to correct the military record of James Tracy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEFEVER: A bill (H. R. 1851) for the relief of Rachel Davis—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 1852) to restore John F. Lewis to the United States Army with the rank of captain of infantry, and place him upon the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1853) for the relief of Stalnaker Marteney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1854) granting a pension to Richard Pool—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1855) granting a pension to Thomas W. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1856) granting a pension to Elizabeth Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1857) for the relief of Johnson Adams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1858) granting a pension to Frank W. Hickox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1859) granting a pension to James M. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1860) for the relief of G. F. Mecklen—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1861) for the relief of James Linskey from the operation of the act restricting the ownership of real estate in the Territories and the District of Columbia to American citizens—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEIGHTY: A bill (H. R. 1862) to pension Andrew W. Dunlop, of Fort Wayne, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 1863) granting an honorable discharge to Ferdinand Tobe—to the Committee on Military Affairs

Also, a bill (H. R. 1864) for the relief of George W. Mannix—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1865) for the relief of John M. Laughlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 1866) authorizing a reappraisement of the steam transport boat *Planter*, captured by Robert Smalls, and for a distribution of proceeds thereof—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEIGHTY: A bill (H. R. 1867) to pension John P. Hetzel, of Kendallville, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 1868) to increase the pension of Samuel T. Derry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1869) for the relief of Job O. C. Rathbun—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1870) for the relief of John I. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1871) to increase the pension of John E. Maddux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1872) for the relief of Hugh Fortner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1873) for the relief of John C. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 1874) to place the name of Robert Smalls on the pension rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 1875) for the relief of Charles Winters, a quartermaster, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 1876) for the relief of the estate of Michael Knight—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOZLY: A bill (H. R. 1877) to correct the military record of Henry W. Martin, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1878) to pension John Cumpston for services in the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 1879) to increase the pension of Joel G. Floyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 1880) for the retirement of John Tempany, senior veterinary surgeon of the Ninth Regiment of Cavalry, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 1881) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church at Bethel Springs, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1882) for the relief of John Ruhm, sr., of Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1883) for the relief of David Vickers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1884) for the relief of Henderson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 1885) for the relief of Northrup & Chick—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1886) for the relief of Silas P. Keller—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1887) for the relief of John M. Giffen—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 1888) to further amend an act entitled "An act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia," approved the 3d day of March, A. D., 1893—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 1889) granting an honorable discharge to F. L. Taylor from December 2, 1864—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PITNEY: A bill (H. R. 1890) granting a pension to Mary Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PENDLETON: A bill (H. R. 1891) granting a pension to Celestia R. Barry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 1892) granting a pension to Catharine Darragh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 1893) granting an honorable discharge to Robert Henry McNeal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1894) granting a pension to Sophia D. Clendenin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1895) granting a pension to Elizabeth Carman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1896) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hoadley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1897) for the relief of Julius A. Kaiser—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1898) granting a pension to Lydia A. Tibbits—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 1899) for the relief of the legal representative of William Ward, of Carteret County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1900) for the relief of Mary E. Hughes, heir of D. L. Pritchard, deceased, late of Camden County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1901) for the relief of Josiah L. Bell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STAHLE: A bill (H. R. 1902) granting a pension to Jacob J. Morningstar, Company D, Seventy-sixth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 1903) for the relief of the National New Haven Bank of the State of Connecticut—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 1904) to amend the records of the War Department in case of Curtis C. Hutcheson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1905) for the relief of James B. Fowler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1906) for the relief of Sanford A. Pinyan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1907) for the relief of Robert McCutchen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1908) for the relief of Samuel Garner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1909) for the relief of George R. Mullins—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1910) for the relief of Wesley Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1911) for the relief of Margaret S. Fain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1912) to pension Synthia Ann Mason, widow of Austin Mason—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1913) for the relief of Benjamin Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1914) for the relief of William N. Hammontree—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1915) for the relief of Walter R. W. Atkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1916) to amend the records of the War Department in case of Jesse Elliott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1917) to increase the pension of E. Presley, of Pickens County, Ga.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1918) to increase the pension of Bedney F. McDonald, of Hall County, Ga.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1919) for the relief of John M. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1920) granting a pension to John J. Prewit—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1921) for the relief of Stephen M. Honeycutt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1922) for the relief of George W. Hansard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1923) to pay Mrs. Mary J. Hix certain money—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1924) for the relief of Hiram A. Darnell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1925) for the relief of Martha Mitchell, widow of Thomas W. Mitchell, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1926) for the relief of William T. Edwards—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1927) for relief of Jasper N. Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 1928) to restore a pension to Harriet Knowlton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRELOAR: A bill (H. R. 1929) for the relief St. Charles College—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1930) for the relief of Edwin F. Mathews—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAFT (by request): A bill (H. R. 1931) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Annie Colwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 1932) to remove the charge of desertion against Addison C. Stanton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1933) granting a pension to Mrs. Catherine G. Lee—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRACY: A bill (H. R. 1934) to provide for the payment of the claim of Edward Hurley for paving Second street, in Sedalia, Mo., in front of the Sedalia post-office building—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 1935) for the relief of Irwin Tucker, postmaster at Newport News, Va.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1936) to remove the charge of desertion standing against David Mosten—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 1937) for the relief of Robert McFarland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1938) for the relief of the heirs of Sterling T. Austin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 1939) for the relief of the estate of Rev. Edward McMeans, deceased, of Jefferson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1940) for the relief of the personal representatives of James Rhodes, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 1941) for the relief of Emily E. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1942) for the relief of Charlotte L. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 1943) for the relief of John Sachs and Frederick Rhine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1944) to pension Catharine C. Goodrich according to the military rank of her husband—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1945) to pension Amanda A. Morse according to the rank of her husband—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 1946) to increase the pension of Harrison Kilburn, Company H, Thirty-eighth Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1947) to grant a pension to Margaret Wolverton, child of Jacob Wolverton, Company K, Seventy-seventh Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1948) to grant a pension to Uriah Andricks, Fifty-fourth Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILBER: A bill (H. R. 1949) for the relief of Austin A. Yates—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Brisbin, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Select Committe on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARHAM: Memorial of fruit growers of California, urging the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Petition asking action toward the recognition of Cuba as a belligerent—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petitions of the heirs of William Schaeffer, deceased; the estate of Tabitha Nicewaner, deceased; James W. Engle; the estate of Kate S. Lucas, deceased; the estate of John Hess, deceased; the estate of Henry Currance, deceased; the estate of Adam Crawford, deceased; Henry F. Needy, and Richard Jackson, all of Jefferson County, W. Va., praying reference of their war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of the heirs of Isaac W. White, deceased; the heirs of John A. Hutton, deceased; the estate of Moses Harper, deceased; the estate of W. H. Currence, deceased; Bryson Hamilton, Jacob C. Harper, and C. L. Earle, all of Randolph County, W. Va., praying reference of their war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of the heirs of James W. Bird, deceased; the estate of Cyrus Hopkins, deceased, both of Pendleton County, W. Va., together with that of the estate of James Moore, deceased, late of Tucker County, W. Va., praying reference of their war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Petition of citizens of Goodell, Iowa, for the recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Petition of the mayor and citizens of Charleston, S. C., for the transfer to the city of Charleston of the old post-office building and lot—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: Petition for amendment to postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HARMER: Two petitions of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., Fifth Congressional district, in favor of the passage of an act for the inspection of immigrants by the United States consuls and against unrestricted immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HILBORN: Memorial of the fruit growers of California to Congress in favor of the Nicaragua Canal, and asking that it be worked, owned, and controlled by the United States in the interest of commerce—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOOKER: Memorial of Louisa Hall for pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Hannah E. Rodgers for pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWE: Petition of the members of the South Third Presbyterian Church, of the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., for the legislation of such laws as, in fitting terms, would express the indignation of the American people of the most barbarous and inhuman treatment of the Armenian subjects of the Turkish Government—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Christ Protestant Episcopal Church, of Brooklyn, unanimously condemning the long-continued Turkish atrocities in Armenia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES: Petition of citizens of Dunnsville, Va., for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolutions expressing sympathy for Cuba at a meeting of citizens of Des Moines, Iowa—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: Memorial of California State board of horticulture praying for the completion of the Nicaragua Canal by the United States Government—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LOW: Petition of the owners, underwriters, agents, and masters of vessels of Wilmington, N. C., engaged in the coasting trade along the Atlantic coast, respectfully representing to the Congress the importance of a harbor of refuge near Cape Lookout—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Resolution of the general court of Massachusetts in favor of uniform hours of labor throughout the United States—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of the Presbytery of Baltimore, denouncing the Armenian outrages and calling on the Government of the United States to interfere—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of citizens of Rock Valley, Sioux County, Iowa, asking that Congress take such action as shall result in the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Memorial from the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Resolution by the Ministerial Association of Harrisburg, Pa., indorsing the Cuban cause—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Three petitions of business firms of Utica, N. Y., asking for the passage of House bill No. 13, to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKINNER: Petition of Reuben Nixon, of Gates County, N. C., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEELE: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Benjamin Sharp, of Company E, Fifty-fifth Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 5402—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Thomas J. Pearson, of Marion, Ind., for relief in returning to him his traveling expenses and subsistence while recruiting men for the service—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Thomas J. Pearson, of Marion, Ind., for pension unjustly deprived of—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany application of Mrs. Sarah E. McConn, Wabash, Ind., praying a pension for her sister, Eliza Tate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLER: Memorial of the citizens of Leetonia, Ohio, praying for the recognition of the belligerent rights of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for liberty—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: Resolutions by the Delaware Peace Society, Howard S. England, president, together with a public meeting of the citizens of Wilmington, Del., William W. Campbell, chairman, urging the recognition of the belligerent rights of the Cuban patriots—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 17, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Public Printer, transmitting, in compliance with law, the annual report of the operations of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a resolution (H. Res. 26) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1895, on the 20th day of said month; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry of the United States, praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at the fifth annual convention of the American International Association of Railway Superintendents of Bridges and Buildings, held at New Orleans, La., October 15, 1895, praying that an appropriation be made for the continuance of the investigations into the properties of wood and tests of the strength of our commercial timbers, which have been carried on in the division of forestry, Department of Agriculture; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BLACKBURN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kentucky, praying that steps be taken by Congress to prevent the companies operating the Etna and Sarah blast furnaces at Ironton, Ohio, from throwing furnace cinders over the north bank of the Ohio River, thereby diverting the flow of water of that river against the Kentucky shore; and also that provision be made for the construction of piers or wing dams at the upper end of the town of Russell, Ky.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. KYLE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Madison, S. Dak., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CHANDLER. I present the petition of the church of Dartmouth College, authenticated by Charles F. Emerson, clerk pro tempore of the church, in reference to the outrages in the Turkish Empire. The petitioners pray that Congress will take such prompt and resolute action as the occasion requires to protect the lives and property of all American citizens, whether native born or naturalized, resident in Turkey; to employ every legitimate influence and agency for the immediate arrest of the massacre and plunder of the Armenian race, and demand such reparation as the case may admit; and demand that henceforth the profession of Christianity shall in no case subject the professor to death, imprisonment, exile, or persecution, whether by the direction, permission, or neglect of the Turkish Government or its officials in any part of the Empire. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SEWELL presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Newark, N. J., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DAVIS. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of Minnesota, praying for the relief of Josiah R. King. As a duplicate of this resolution was presented yesterday and entered in the RECORD it need not be reread. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of St. Paul, Minn., praying that the President and the Congress of the United States take immediate, definite, and vigorous action on behalf of the Armenian survivors; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GRAY presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by citizens of Wilmington, Del., praying Congress to inaugurate peaceful measures and send ambassadors of peace to those now engaged in bloody warfare in, and with reference to, the Island of Cuba, and to use their utmost endeavors to compose by peaceful consultation and arbitrament the existing dispute; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO WEST POINT.

Mr. GORMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 21) for printing extra copies of the report of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy at West Point, to report a concurrent resolution in the nature of a substitute, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, in paper covers, 6,000 extra copies of the annual report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy at West Point for the year 1895, of which 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

PROFESSOR WOODBRIDGE'S REPORT ON HEATING AND VENTILATION.

Mr. GORMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed of the report of Prof. L. H. Woodbridge, made to the Committee on Rules of the Senate, on the heating and ventilation of the Senate, with the accompanying illustrations, dated December 14, 1895, 500 copies for the use of the Senate; but the usual number shall not be printed.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GORMAN. This is a report made by Professor Woodbridge, who was selected by the Committee on Rules under a resolution offered, I think, by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] in the last Congress. The committee are not yet ready to report, but they think that this report of Professor Woodbridge is so valuable and contains so much information that it ought to be printed in advance for the use of the Senate. I think every Senator will not only be interested in the matter, but instructed by it, and he will find that it is probably the most valuable report that has ever been made upon the subject of the ventilation of these Halls.

Mr. HOAR. I have seen the plan which accompanies the report and I heard the eminent scientific man before the committee generally stating his theory. I would suggest that there ought to be enough copies of the report printed to send at least one to every member of the other House, because, although the investi-

gation is confined to the Senate wing of the Capitol, it relates as intimately to the comfort and health of members of the other House, and if the plan shall be adopted here, undoubtedly it will be adopted there. I suggest that the number of copies be increased to 1,000, so that the report may be generally understood. Besides, of course any appropriation which is made for this purpose will require the assent of the other House.

Mr. GORMAN. The only trouble is that under the law neither House can order the printing of additional copies when the cost exceeds $500 without concurrent action. We have had a general estimate made of the cost in this case, which may not be exactly accurate, but as soon as the Committee on Rules reports the usual number will be ordered printed by both Houses.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; as this is a Senate resolution and comes under the $500 limit, I shall not insist.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 26) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1895, on the 20th day of said month, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 978) for the relief of William T. Crump; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 979) to provide for the appointment of a commission to prepare a code of laws for the consular courts of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 980) granting a pension to John Sirrine; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORRILL introduced a bill (S. 981) relating to the testimony of physicians in the courts of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 982) to grant medals to survivors and heirs of volunteers of the Port Hudson (La.) forlornhope storming column; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 983) to consolidate mail matter of the third and fourth classes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 984) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Jacksonville, in the State of Illinois; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 985) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Joliet, in the State of Illinois; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 986) for the erection of a public building at the city of East St. Louis, Ill.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 987) granting a pension to Mary Ann Hooper, mother of Samuel Hooper, alias Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 988) to invest the United States circuit courts with jurisdiction to try all questions of law and fact which affect the right of any individual to enter and acquire Government lands under the land laws of the United States when the land in question is of the value of $500 or more, said jurisdiction to be concurrent with the jurisdiction of the Land Department of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 989) to place the name of Fannie Kautz, widow of August V. Kautz, deceased, late brigadier-general, United States Army, retired, on the pension roll at the rate of $175 per month; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 990) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 991) for the relief of Frederick Carlisle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 992) granting a pension to Jane S. Tuttle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 993) for the relief of the estate of Pearce Noland, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 994) for the relief of Henry F. Thornton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 995) to appoint Lieut. T. J. Clay, United States Army, now on the retired list, to the rank and pay of captain, retired; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 996) to increase the pension of Capt. Isaac D. Toll; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 997) granting a pension to Ella D. Cross; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 998) for the relief of Anne Buckley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 999) granting a pension to Capt. Dennis A. Dolan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1000) granting a pension to Esther C. Hardee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1001) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war," approved July 27, 1892; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1002) for the relief of William Mickler; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1003) to provide for the coinage of gold and silver bullion in the mints of the United States, and for the exchange therefor of legal-tender United States Treasury notes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1004) for the relief of Mrs. Alice M. Walsh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1005) for the relief of Edward M. Agee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1006) for the relief of Mary A. McLeron, and for the issue of a land warrant for 500 acres of land; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1007) requiring a patent to be issued to Edward A. Lorbeer of certain land in Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1008) to remit the penalties on unpaid taxes in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1009) to regulate the wages of conductors and drivers and other employees of the street-railway corporations of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1010) for the relief of the owners and crew of the Hawaiian bark *Arctic;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GEAR (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1011) for the relief of Capt. James Regan, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 1012) to prevent the desecration of the national flag; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. That is a redraft of a bill which I introduced at the opening of the session and which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I now move that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of that bill, being the bill (S. 255) to prevent desecration of the national flag, and that it be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 1013) to change and fix the time for holding the district and circuit courts of the United States for the northern division of the eastern district of Tennessee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH introduced a bill (S. 1014) granting a pension to Ella Hatfield, invalid daughter of Maj. David Hatfield, First Regiment New Jersey Infantry Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1015) granting a pension to Robert A. Stuart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1016) to place the name of Francis E. Hoover, late a private in Company I of the Sixty-fourth Ohio Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of $72 per month; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BRICE introduced a bill (S. 1017) granting a pension to Robert Kiracofe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1018) for the relief of Joseph Eager, Charles Gallagher, and A. A. McGaffey, to repay to them moneys unlawfully collected from them by the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1019) to change the boundaries of the collection district of Key West, Fla., and make Punta Gorda a port of entry and create a new collection district; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1020) to confirm the John H. McIntosh grant in the State of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1021) to refund to the county of Duval, in the State of Florida, the money expended in the improvement of the St. Johns River, Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1022) providing for the opening of a passage through San Carlos Bay and the improvement of the Caloosahatchie River, Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1023) for the improvement of the Suwanee River, Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1024) for continuing the work on the channel between Cumberland and Amelia islands, Florida, and the entrance to Fernandina, Fla., and St. Marys, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1025) for the relief of William Mickler; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1026) for the relief of the widow and heirs of Cyprian T. Jenkins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1027) for a survey and estimate for a railroad from the mainland to Key West, Fla., and for a canal connecting the same with the St. Johns River, for military and naval purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1028) granting land warrants to soldiers and sailors in the United States service in the Seminole Indian war of 1856, and their widows and orphans; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1029) confirming titles to certain lands in Columbia County, State of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1030) to require preference to be given to citizens of the States and localities where the mails are to be carried in all mail lettings; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1031) for the relief of Jane Latham Donelly, only surviving daughter and heir of Amos Latham, a soldier of the Revolutionary war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1032) to regulate the natural laws of supply and demand, and to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of revenue; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1033) for the relief of the legal representatives of Hampton L. Lee, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CALL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 29) to print, with certain additions, the last map of the United States published by the Interior Department; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 30) concerning scrip location on the Fort Jupiter Reservation, in Florida, etc.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 31) concerning swamp and overflowed land in Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

PAPERS WITHDRAWN AND REFERRED.

On motion of Mr. HILL, it was

Ordered, That the petition and papers in the case of James Riley be taken from the files of the Senate and referred to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. BRICE, it was

Ordered, That Philip Hawk be permitted to withdraw any papers of his on file in the office of the Secretary of the Senate not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate, and that the Secretary be directed to forward them to his address at Canton, Ohio.

REPRINT OF DOCUMENT ON THE VENEZUELAN BOUNDARY.

Mr. HALE. I submit a resolve, and ask for action upon it.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a reprint shall be made of Senate Document No. 226, first session Fiftieth Congress, relating to the Venezuela boundary, to be distributed among the members of the Senate for the use of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. This is an old document touching the Venezuela boundary question, and it is out of print. The object of the reprint is that the number fixed by statute may be given to the Senate for distribution here. It will not go in the ordinary way to the Departments, but follows the action of another branch of Congress on the same subject yesterday.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

LOANS, CURRENCY, AND COINAGE.

Mr. PEFFER. I submit a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Printing cause to have printed as miscellaneous documents the following matter:

First. A paper entitled "National loans of the United States from 1776 to 1881," compiled by Raphael A. Bayley, and published in the reports of the Tenth Census.

Second. Laws relating to loans, currency, and coinage of the United States, heretofore printed by direction of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to have the last part of the resolution again read. It would require the publication of a large volume——

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the request?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which will again be read for information.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think the Senator from Kansas will see that it is necessary to refer the resolution to the Committee on Printing, because it would require the publication of a large volume, which was ordered printed last year and which is, I believe, accessible to anyone. At any rate, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. PEFFER. Before the reference is made I wish to state that I think the Senator from Ohio is probably in error as to the quantity of matter contained in the second item referred to.

Mr. SHERMAN. It embraces all the loan laws and all laws relating to currency and coinage.

Mr. PEFFER. That is true, but I wish to say to the Senator that the volume referred to is but a small one; probably it does not exceed 100 pages. But there was another volume which included a great deal of extraneous matter, matter that I do not care about including in this resolution. This volume does not, I think, exceed 100 pages.

The first item referred to is one of the most valuable documents in our financial history. It was prepared, under the direction of the Superintendent of the Tenth Census, by a gentleman of eminent qualifications, Mr. Bayley, and was printed in the reports of the census for 1880, but is wholly out of print, except, perhaps, a very few copies that may be found with some officers of the Treasury Department. I have a great many requests for both of these documents. I have no objection to the resolutiou being referred to the Committee on Printing for its report.

Mr. COCKRELL. In connection with this matter I desire to express the hope that the committee will not order simply a reprint of the history of loans. It ought to be complete before it is published again, and it is not now complete. It ought to bring the loans down to date. The document heretofore printed does not bring them down to date. It ought to contain the disposition of the loans, at what rate and when they were disposed of, and such data. All that information is in the Treasury Department, and it should be put in this volume. It can be added to this compilation of the Senate. In addition, the document should contain the coinage laws, and all the laws in regard to loans and currency. There is one volume published that brings down the laws relating to loans, currency, banking, etc., until 1878 or 1879. They ought to be brought down to date. The coinage laws alone are embraced in the publication of 1894, entitled "The coinage laws," but there is a great mass in that volume which is of no service, while that publication does not contain the laws in regard to loans and currency. All ought to be embraced in one volume. I hope the Committee on Printing will take hold of this matter and order all the laws to be printed in one volume, bringing them down to the existing date, and then the book will be worth something.

Mr. PEFFER. I think the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri a very good one.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

CORPORATE INFLUENCE IN POLITICAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. CALL. I submit a resolution which I ask may be read, printed, and lie over under the rule until to-morrow morning.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be charged with the duty of investigating the subject of organized efforts of corporations, or of the president and directors thereof, to control the election of members of Congress or to influence the legislation of Congress; also to investigate and report to the Senate whether corrupt means, bribery, or free transportation has been or is being used to influence such elections; also to inquire and report to the Senate whether the use of such influences or means is consistent with the preservation of the Republic of the United States and the rights and liberties of the people, and to report a bill for the punishment or suppression of such practices.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over and be printed.

THE BOARD OF IRRIGATION.

Mr. KYLE. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, directed to transmit to the Senate a report of progress of the Board of Irrigation, Executive Departments, including a statement of its organization, the existing legislation relative to irrigation, the operations of the various subdivisions, the principles which should govern subdivision, and list of official publications on irrigation.

Mr. KYLE. I understand this document is already prepared by the Department of the Interior, and it will be a very valuable one indeed for the Committee on Irrigation in its deliberations upon the subject during the session.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

VENEZUELAN BOUNDARY CONTROVERSY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States; which was read, as follows:

To the Congress:

In my annual message addressed to the Congress on the 3d instant I called attention to the pending boundary controversy between Great Britain and the Republic of Venezuela, and recited the substance of a representation made by this Government to Her Britannic Majesty's Government suggesting reasons why such dispute should be submitted to arbitration for settlement and inquiring whether it would be so submitted.

The answer of the British Government, which was then awaited, has since been received, and, together with the dispatch to which it is a reply, is hereto appended.

Such reply is embodied in two communications addressed by the British prime minister to Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British ambassador at this capital. It will be seen that one of these communications is devoted exclusively to observations upon the Monroe doctrine, and claims that in the present instance a new and strange extension and development of this doctrine is insisted on by the United States, that the reasons justifying an appeal to the doctrine enunciated by President Monroe are generally inapplicable "to the state of things in which we live at the present day," and especially inapplicable to a controversy involving the boundary line between Great Britain and Venezuela.

Without attempting extended argument in reply to these positions, it may not be amiss to suggest that the doctrine upon which we stand is strong and sound because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a nation, and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions and the tranquil maintenance of our distinctive form of government. It was intended to apply to every stage of our national life, and can not become obsolete while our Republic endures. If the balance of power is justly a cause for jealous anxiety among the Governments of the Old World and a subject for our absolute noninterference, none the less is an observance of the Monroe doctrine of vital concern to our people and their Government.

Assuming, therefore, that we may properly insist upon this doctrine without regard to "the state of things in which we live," or any changed conditions here or elsewhere, it is not apparent why its application may not be invoked in the present controversy.

If a European power, by an extension of its boundaries, takes possession of the territory of one of our neighboring Republics against its will and in derogation of its rights, it is difficult to see why, to that extent, such European power does not thereby attempt to extend its system of government to that portion of this continent which is thus taken. This is the precise action which President Monroe declared to be "dangerous to our peace and safety," and it can make no difference whether the European system is extended by an advance of frontier or otherwise.

It is also suggested in the British reply that we should not seek to apply the Monroe doctrine to the pending dispute because it does not embody any principle of international law which "is founded on the general consent of nations," and that "no statesman, however eminent, and no nation, however powerful, are competent to insert into the code of international law a novel principle which was never recognized before, and which has not since been accepted by the Government of any other country."

Practically, the principle for which we contend has peculiar, if not exclusive, relation to the United States. It may not have been admitted in so many words to the code of international law, but since in international councils every nation is entitled to the rights belonging to it, if the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine is something we may justly claim, it has its place in the code of international law as certainly and as securely as if it were specifically mentioned, and when the United States is a suitor before the high tribunal that administers international law the question to be determined is whether or not we present claims which the justice of that code of law can find to be right and valid.

The Monroe doctrine finds its recognition in those principles of international law which are based upon the theory that every nation shall have its rights protected and its just claims enforced.

Of course this Government is entirely confident that under the sanction of this doctrine we have clear rights and undoubted claims. Nor is this ignored in the British reply. The prime minister, while not admitting that the Monroe doctrine is applicable to present conditions, states: "In declaring that the United States would resist any such enterprise if it was contemplated President Monroe adopted a policy which received the entire sympathy of the English Government of that date." He further declares: "Though the language of President Monroe is directed to the attainment of objects which most Englishmen would agree to be salutary, it is impossible to admit that they have been inscribed by any adequate authority in the code of international law."

Again he says: "They (Her Majesty's Government) fully concur with the view which President Monroe apparently entertained, that any disturbance of the existing territorial distribution in that hemisphere by any fresh acquisitions on the part of any European State would be a highly inexpedient change."

In the belief that the doctrine for which we contend was clear and definite, that it was founded upon substantial considerations and involved our safety and welfare, that it was fully applicable to our present conditions and to the state of the world's progress, and that it was directly related to the pending controversy, and without any conviction as to the final merits of the dispute, but anxious to learn in a satisfactory and conclusive manner whether Great Britain sought, under a claim of boundary, to extend her possessions on this continent without right, or whether she merely sought possession of territory fairly included within her lines of ownership, this Government proposed to the Government of Great Britain a resort to arbitration as the proper means of settling the question, to the end that a vexatious boundary dispute between the two contestants might be determined and our exact standing and relation in respect to the controversy might be made clear.

It will be seen from the correspondence herewith submitted that this proposition has been declined by the British Government, upon grounds which, in the circumstances, seem to me to be far from satisfactory. It is deeply disappointing that such an appeal, actuated by the most friendly feelings toward both nations directly concerned, addressed to the sense of justice and to the magnanimity of one of the great powers of the world and touching its relations to one comparatively weak and small, should have produced no better results.

The course to be pursued by this Government, in view of the present condition, does not appear to admit of serious doubt. Having labored faithfully for many years to induce Great Britain to submit this dispute to impartial arbitration, and having been now finally apprised of her refusal to do so, nothing remains but to accept the situation, to recognize its plain requirements, and deal with it accordingly. Great Britain's present proposition has never thus far been regarded as admissible by Venezuela, though any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage and may enter into of her own free will can not of course be objected to by the United States.

Assuming, however, that the attitude of Venezuela will remain unchanged, the dispute has reached such a stage as to make it now incumbent upon the United States to take measures to determine with sufficient certainty for its justification what is the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana. The inquiry to that end should of course be conducted carefully and judicially, and due weight should be given to all available evidence, records, and facts in support of the claims of both parties.

In order that such an examination should be prosecuted in a thorough and satisfactory manner, I suggest that the Congress make an adequate appropriation for the expenses of a commission, to be appointed by the Executive, who shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay. When such report is made and accepted it will, in my opinion, be the duty of the United States to resist, by every means in its power, as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests, the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which, after investigation, we have determined of right belongs to Venezuela.

In making these recommendations I am fully alive to the responsibility incurred, and keenly realize all the consequences that may follow.

I am, nevertheless, firm in my conviction that while it is a grievous thing to contemplate the two great English-speaking peoples of the world as being otherwise than friendly competitors in the onward march of civilization and strenuous and worthy rivals in all the arts of peace, there is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows a supine submission to wrong and injustice and the consequent loss of national self-respect and honor, beneath which are shielded and defended a people's safety and greatness.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *December 17, 1895.*

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The Vice-President rapped to order.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the message, with the accompanying documents, be printed. I shall not move a reference until after the message and accompanying documents shall have been printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that accompanying the message is the correspondence, and if not too long, I think it would be well if that could be read, or spread upon the records at once.

Mr. GRAY and Mr. VILAS. Let it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have it printed in the RECORD, so that we may read Secretary Olney's dispatch of last July and Lord Salisbury's reply. I think we ought to be in a position to understand this matter.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let the accompanying correspondence also be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

The following are the documents accompanying the message of the President:

MR. OLNEY TO MR. BAYARD.

No. 804.] DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 20, 1895.

His Excellency THOMAS F. BAYARD, *etc., London.*

SIR: I am directed by the President to communicate to you his views upon a subject to which he has given much anxious thought and respecting which he has not reached a conclusion without a lively sense of its great importance as well as of the serious responsibility involved in any action now to be taken.

It is not proposed, and for present purposes is not necessary, to enter into any detailed account of the controversy between Great Britain and Venezuela respecting the western frontier of the colony of British Guiana. The dispute is of ancient date and began at least as early as the time when Great Britain acquired by the treaty with the Netherlands of 1814 "the establishments of Demerara, Essequibo, and Berbice." From that time to the present the dividing line between these "establishments" (now called British Guiana)

and Venezuela has never ceased to be a subject of contention. The claims of both parties, it must be conceded, are of a somewhat indefinite nature. On the one hand Venezuela, in every constitution of government since she became an independent State, has declared her territorial limits to be those of the Captaincy General of Venezuela in 1810. Yet, out of "moderation and prudence," it is said, she has contented herself with claiming the Essequibo line—the line of the Essequibo River, that is—to be the true boundary between Venezuela and British Guiana. On the other hand, at least an equal degree of indefiniteness distinguishes the claim of Great Britain.

It does not seem to be asserted, for instance, that in 1814 the "establishments" then acquired by Great Britain had any clearly defined western limits which can now be identified and which are either the limits insisted upon to-day, or, being the original limits, have been the basis of legitimate territorial extensions. On the contrary, having the actual possession of a district called the Pomaron district, she apparently remained indifferent as to the exact area of the colony until 1840, when she commissioned an engineer, Sir Robert Schomburgk, to examine and lay down its boundaries. The result was the Schomburgk line, which was fixed by metes and bounds, was delineated on maps, and was at first indicated on the face of the country itself by posts, monograms, and other like symbols.

If it was expected that Venezuela would acquiesce in this line, the expectation was doomed to speedy disappointment. Venezuela at once protested, and with such vigor and to such purpose that the line was explained to be only tentative—part of a general boundary scheme concerning Brazil and the Netherlands as well as Venezuela—and the monuments of the line set up by Schomburgk were removed by the express order of Lord Aberdeen. Under these circumstances it seems impossible to treat the Schomburgk line as being the boundary claimed by Great Britain as matter of right, or as anything but a line originating in considerations of convenience and expediency. Since 1840 various other boundary lines have from time to time been indicated by Great Britain, but all as conventional lines—lines to which Venezuela's assent has been desired, but which in no instance, it is believed, have been demanded as matter of right. Thus neither of the parties is to-day standing for the boundary line predicated upon strict legal right—Great Britain having formulated no such claim at all, while Venezuela insists upon the Essequibo line only as a liberal concession to her antagonist.

Several other features of the situation remain to be briefly noticed—the continuous growth of the undefined British claim, the fate of the various attempts at arbitration of the controversy, and the part in the matter heretofore taken by the United States. As already seen, the exploitation of the Schomburgk line in 1840 was at once followed by the protest of Venezuela and by proceedings on the part of Great Britain which could fairly be interpreted only as a disavowal of that line. Indeed, in addition to the facts already noticed, Lord Aberdeen himself in 1844 proposed a line beginning at the River Moroco, a distinct abandonment of the Schomburgk line.

Notwithstanding this, however, every change in the British claim since that time has moved the frontier of British Guiana farther and farther to the westward of the line thus proposed. The Granville line of 1881 placed the starting point at a distance of 29 miles from the Moroco in the direction of Punta Barima. The Rosebery line of 1886 placed it west of the Guaima River, and about that time, if the British authority known as the Statesman's Year Book is to be relied upon, the area of British Guiana was suddenly enlarged by some 33,000 square miles—being stated as 76,000 square miles in 1885 and 109,000 square miles in 1887. The Salisbury line of 1890 fixed the starting point of the line in the mouth of the Amacuro west of the Punta Barima on the Orinoco. And finally, in 1893, a second Rosebery line carried the boundary from a point to the west of the Amacuro as far as the source of the Cumano River and the Sierra of Usupamo. Nor have the various claims thus enumerated been claims on paper merely. An exercise of jurisdiction corresponding more or less to such claims has accompanied or followed closely upon each and has been the more irritating and unjustifiable if, as is alleged, an agreement made in the year 1850 bound both parties to refrain from such occupation pending the settlement of the dispute.

While the British claim has been developing in the manner above described, Venezuela has made earnest and repeated efforts to have the question of boundary settled. Indeed, allowance being made for the distractions of a war of independence and for frequent internal revolutions, it may be fairly said that Venezuela has never ceased to strive for its adjustment. It could, of course, do so only through peaceful methods, any resort to force as against its powerful adversary being out of the question. Accordingly, shortly after the drawing of the Schomburgk line, an effort was made to settle the boundary by treaty and was apparently progressing toward a successful issue when the negotiations were brought to an end in 1844 by the death of the Venezuelan plenipotentiary.

In 1848 Venezuela entered upon a period of civil commotions which lasted for more than a quarter of a century, and the negotiations thus interrupted in 1844 were not resumed until 1876. In that year Venezuela offered to close the dispute by accepting the Moroco line proposed by Lord Aberdeen. But, without giving reasons for his refusal, Lord Granville rejected the proposal and suggested a new line comprehending a large tract of territory all pretension to which seemed to have been abandoned by the previous action of Lord Aberdeen. Venezuela refused to assent to it, and negotiations dragged along without result until 1882, when Venezuela concluded that the only course open to her was arbitration of the controversy. Before she had made any definite proposition, however, Great Britain took the initiative by suggesting the making of a treaty which should determine various other questions as well as that of the disputed boundary. The result was that a treaty was practically agreed upon with the Gladstone government in 1886 containing a general arbitration clause under which the parties might have submitted the boundary dispute to the decision of a third power or of several powers in amity with both.

Before the actual signing of the treaty, however, the administration of Mr. Gladstone was superseded by that of Lord Salisbury, which declined to accede to the arbitration clause of the treaty notwithstanding the reasonable expectations of Venezuela to the contrary, based upon the premier's emphatic declaration in the House of Lords that no serious government would think of not respecting the engagements of its predecessor. Since then Venezuela on the one side has been offering and calling for arbitration, while Great Britain on the other has responded by insisting upon the condition that any arbitration should relate only to such of the disputed territory as lies west of a line designated by herself. As this condition seemed inadmissible to Venezuela, and as, while the negotiations were pending, new appropriations of what is claimed to be Venezuelan territory continued to be made, Venezuela in 1887 suspended diplomatic relations with Great Britain, protesting "before Her British Majesty's Government, before all civilized nations, and before the world in general, against the acts of spoliation committed to her detriment by the Government of Great Britain, which she at no time and on no account will recognize as capable of altering in the least the rights which she has inherited from Spain and respecting which she will ever be willing to submit to the decision of a third power."

Diplomatic relations have not since been restored, though what is claimed to be new and flagrant British aggressions forced Venezuela to resume negotiations on the boundary question—in 1890, through its minister in Paris and a special envoy on that subject; and in 1893, through a confidential agent, Señor Michelena. These negotiations, however, met with the fate of other like previous negotiations, Great Britain refusing to arbitrate except as to territory west of an arbitrary line drawn by herself. All attempts in that direction definitely terminated in October, 1893, when Señor Michelena filed with the foreign office the following declaration:

"I perform a most strict duty in raising again, in the name of the Government of Venezuela, a most solemn protest against the proceedings of the Colony of British Guiana, constituting encroachments upon the territory of the Republic, and against the declaration contained in your excellency's communication that Her Britannic Majesty's Government considers that part of the territory as pertaining to British Guiana and admits no claim to it on the part of Venezuela. In support of this protest I reproduce all the arguments presented to your excellency in my note of 29th of last September and those which have been exhibited by the Government of Venezuela on the various occasions they have raised the same protest.

"I lay on Her Britannic Majesty's Government the entire responsibility of the incidents that may arise in the future from the necessity to which Venezuela has been driven to oppose by all possible means the dispossession of a part of her territory, for by disregarding her just representation to put an end to this violent state of affairs through the decision of arbiters Her Majesty's Government ignores her rights and imposes upon her the painful though peremptory duty of providing for her own legitimate defense."

To the territorial controversy between Great Britain and the Republic of Venezuela, thus briefly outlined, the United States has not been and, indeed, in view of its traditional policy, could not be indifferent. The note to the British foreign office by which Venezuela opened negotiations in 1876 was at once communicated to this Government. In January, 1881, a letter of the Venezuelan minister at Washington, respecting certain alleged demonstrations at the mouth of the Orinoco, was thus answered by Mr. Evarts, then Secretary of State:

"In reply I have to inform you that in view of the deep interest which the Government of the United States takes in all transactions tending to attempted encroachments of foreign powers upon the territory of any of the Republics of this continent, this Government could not look with indifference to the forcible acquisition of such territory by England if the mission of the vessels now at the mouth of the Orinoco should be found to be for that end. This Government awaits, therefore, with natural concern the more particular statements promised by the Government of Venezuela, which it hopes will not be long delayed."

In the February following Mr. Evarts wrote again on the same subject, as follows:

"Referring to your note of the 21st of December last, touching the operations of certain British war vessels in and near the mouth of the Orinoco River and to my reply thereto of the 31st ultimo, as well as to the recent occasions in which the subject has been mentioned in our conferences concerning the business of your mission, I take it to be fitting now at the close of my incumbency of the office I hold to advert to the interest with which the Government of the United States can not fail to regard any such purpose with respect to the control of American territory as is stated to be contemplated by the Government of Great Britain, and to express my regret that the further information promised in your note with regard to such designs had not reached me in season to receive the attention which, notwithstanding the severe pressure of public business at the end of an administrative term, I should have taken pleasure in bestowing upon it. I doubt not, however, that your representations in fulfillment of the awaited additional orders of your Government will have like earnest and solicitous consideration at the hands of my successor."

In November, 1882, the then state of negotiations with Great Britain, together with a copy of an intended note suggesting recourse to arbitration, was communicated to the Secretary of State by the President of Venezuela with the expression of the hope that the United States would give him its opinion and advice and such support as it deemed possible to offer Venezuela in order that justice should be done her. Mr. Frelinghuysen replied in a dispatch to the United States minister at Caracas as follows:

"This Government has already expressed its view that arbitration of such disputes is a convenient resort in the case of failure to come to a mutual understanding, and intimated its willingness, if Venezuela should so desire, to propose to Great Britain such a mode of settlement. It is felt that the tender of good offices would not be so profitable if the United States were to approach Great Britain as the advocate of any prejudged solution in favor of Venezuela. So far as the United States can counsel and assist Venezuela it believes it best to confine its reply to the renewal of the suggestion of arbitration and the offer of all its good offices in that direction. This suggestion is the more easily made, since it appears, from the instruction sent by Señor Seijas to the Venezuelan minister in London on the same 15th of July, 1882, that the President of Venezuela proposed to the British Government the submission of the dispute to arbitration by a third power.

"You will take an early occasion to present the foregoing considerations to Señor Seijas, saying to him that, while trusting that the direct proposal for arbitration already made to Great Britain may bear good fruit (if, indeed, it has not already done so by its acceptance in principle), the Government of the United States will cheerfully lend any needful aid to press upon Great Britain in a friendly way the proposition so made, and at the same time you will say to Señor Seijas (in personal conference, and not with the formality of a written communication) that the United States, while advocating strongly the recourse of arbitration for the adjustment of international disputes affecting the States of America, does not seek to put itself forward as their arbiter; that, viewing all such questions impartially and with no intent or desire to prejudge their merits, the United States will not refuse its arbitration if asked by both parties, and that, regarding all such questions as essentially and distinctively American, the United States would always prefer to see such contentions adjusted through the arbitrament of an American rather than an European power."

In 1884 Gen. Guzman Blanco, the Venezuelan minister to England, appointed with special reference to pending negotiations for a general treaty with Great Britain, visited Washington on his way to London and, after several conferences with the Secretary of State respecting the objects of his mission, was thus commended to the good offices of Mr. Lowell, our minister at St. James's:

"It will necessarily be somewhat within your discretion how far your good offices may be profitably employed with Her Majesty's Government to these ends, and at any rate you may take proper occasion to let Lord Granville know that we are not without concern as to whatever may affect the interests of a sister Republic of the American Continent and its position in the family of nations.

"If General Guzman should apply to you for advice or assistance in realizing the purposes of his mission you will show him proper consideration, and, without committing the United States to any determinate political solution, you will endeavor to carry out the views of this instruction."

The progress of General Guzman's negotiations did not fail to be observed by this Government, and in December, 1886, with a view to preventing the rupture of diplomatic relations—which actually took place in February following—the then Secretary of State, Mr. Bayard, instructed our minister to Great Britain to tender the arbitration of the United States, in the following terms:

"It does not appear that at any time heretofore the good offices of this

Government have been actually tendered to avert a rupture between Great Britain and Venezuela. As intimated in my No. 58, our inaction in this regard would seem to be due to the reluctance of Venezuela to have the Government of the United States take any steps having relation to the action of the British Government which might, in appearance even, prejudice the resort to further arbitration or mediation which Venezuela desired. Nevertheless, the records abundantly testify our friendly concern in the adjustment of the dispute; and the intelligence now received warrants me in tendering through you to Her Majesty's Government the good offices of the United States to promote an amicable settlement of the respective claims of Great Britain and Venezuela in the premises.

"As proof of the impartiality with which we view the question, we offer our arbitration, if acceptable to both countries. We do this with the less hesitancy as the dispute turns upon simple and readily ascertainable historical facts.

"Her Majesty's Government will readily understand that this attitude of friendly neutrality and entire impartiality touching the merits of the controversy, consisting wholly in a difference of facts between our friends and neighbors, is entirely consistent and compatible with the sense of responsibility that rests upon the United States in relation to the South American Republics. The doctrines we announced two generations ago, at the instance and with the moral support and approval of the British Government, have lost none of their force or importance in the progress of time, and the Governments of Great Britain and the United States are equally interested in conserving a status the wisdom of which has been demonstrated by the experience of more than half a century.

"It is proper, therefore, that you should convey to Lord Iddesleigh, in such sufficiently guarded terms as your discretion may dictate, the satisfaction that would be felt by the Government of the United States in perceiving that its wishes in this regard were permitted to have influence with Her Majesty's Government."

This offer of mediation was declined by Great Britain, with the statement that a similar offer had already been received from another quarter, and that the Queen's Government were still not without hope of a settlement by direct diplomatic negotiations. In February, 1888, having been informed that the governor of British Guiana had by formal decree laid claim to the territory traversed by the route of a proposed railway from Ciudad Bolivar to Guacipati, Mr. Bayard addressed a note to our minister to England, from which the following extracts are taken:

"The claim now stated to have been put forth by the authorities of British Guiana necessarily gives rise to grave disquietude, and creates an apprehension that the territorial claim does not follow historical traditions or evidence, but is apparently indefinite. At no time hitherto does it appear that the district of which Guacipati is the center has been claimed as British territory or that such jurisdiction has ever been asserted over its inhabitants, and if the reported decree of the governor of British Guiana be indeed genuine it is not apparent how any line of railway from Ciudad Bolivar to Guacipati could enter or traverse territory within the control of Great Britain.

"It is true that the line claimed by Great Britain as the western boundary of British Guiana is uncertain and vague. It is only necessary to examine the British Colonial Office List for a few years back to perceive this. In the issue for 1877, for instance, the line runs nearly southwardly from the mouth of the Amacuro to the junction of the Cotinga and Takutu rivers. In the issue of 1887, ten years later, it makes a wide detour to the westward, following the Yuruari. Guacipati lies considerably to the westward of the line officially claimed in 1887, and it may perhaps be instructive to compare with it the map which doubtless will be found in the Colonial Office List for the present year.

"It may be well for you to express anew to Lord Salisbury the great gratification it would afford this Government to see the Venezuelan dispute amicably and honorably settled by arbitration or otherwise and our readiness to do anything we properly can to assist to that end.

"In the course of your conversation you may refer to the publication in the London Financier, of January 24 (a copy of which you can procure and exhibit to Lord Salisbury), and express apprehension lest the widening pretensions of British Guiana to possess territory over which Venezuela's jurisdiction has never heretofore been disputed may not diminish the chances for a practical settlement.

"If, indeed, it should appear that there is no fixed limit to the British boundary claim, our good disposition to aid in a settlement might not only be defeated, but be obliged to give place to a feeling of grave concern."

In 1889, information having been received that Barima, at the mouth of the Orinoco, had been declared a British port, Mr. Blaine, then Secretary of State, authorized Mr. White to confer with Lord Salisbury for the reestablishment of diplomatic relations between Great Britain and Venezuela on the basis of a temporary restoration of the status quo, and May 1 and May 6, 1890, sent the following telegrams to our minister to England, Mr. Lincoln:

(May 1, 1890)—

"Mr. Lincoln is instructed to use his good offices with Lord Salisbury to bring about the resumption of diplomatic intercourse between Great Britain and Venezuela as a preliminary step toward the settlement of the boundary dispute by arbitration. The joint proposals of Great Britain and the United States toward Portugal, which have just been brought about, would seem to make the present time propitious for submitting this question to an international arbitration. He is requested to propose to Lord Salisbury, with a view to an accommodation, that an informal conference be had in Washington or in London of representatives of the three powers. In such conference the position of the United States is one solely of impartial friendship toward both litigants.

"(May 6, 1890)—

"It is nevertheless desired that you shall do all you can consistently with our attitude of impartial friendship to induce some accord between the contestants by which the merits of the controversy may be fairly ascertained and the rights of each party justly confirmed. The neutral position of this Government does not comport with any expression of opinion on the part of this Department as to what these rights are, but it is confident that the shifting footing on which the British boundary question has rested for several years past is an obstacle to such a correct appreciation of the nature and grounds of her claim as would alone warrant the formation of any opinion."

In the course of the same year, 1890, Venezuela sent to London a special envoy to bring about the resumption of diplomatic relations with Great Britain through the good offices of the United States minister. But the mission failed because a condition of such resumption, steadily adhered to by Venezuela, was the reference of the boundary dispute to arbitration. Since the close of the negotiations initiated by Señor Michelena in 1893 Venezuela has repeatedly brought the controversy to the notice of the United States, has insisted upon its importance to the United States, as well as to Venezuela, has represented it to have reached an acute stage—making definite action by the United States imperative—and has not ceased to solicit the services and support of the United States in aid of its final adjustment. These appeals have not been received with indifference, and our ambassador to Great Britain has been uniformly instructed to exert all his influence in the direction of the reestablishment of diplomatic relations between Great Britain and Venezuela and in favor of arbitration of the boundary controversy. The Secretary of State in a communication to Mr. Bayard, bearing date July 13, 1894, used the following language:

"The President is inspired by a desire for a peaceable and honorable settlement of the existing difficulties between an American State and a powerful transatlantic nation, and would be glad to see the reestablishment of such diplomatic relations between them as would promote that end.

"I can discern but two equitable solutions of the present controversy. One is the arbitral determination of the rights of the disputants as the respective successors to the historical rights of Holland and Spain over the region in question. The other is to create a new boundary line in accordance with the dictates of mutual expediency and consideration. The two Governments having so far been unable to agree on a conventional line, the consistent and conspicuous advocacy by the United States and England of the principle of arbitration and their recourse thereto in settlement of important questions arising between them, makes such a mode of adjustment especially appropriate in the present instance, and this Government will gladly do what it can to further a determination in that sense."

Subsequent communications to Mr. Bayard direct him to ascertain whether a minister from Venezuela would be received by Great Britain. In the annual message to Congress, of December 3 last, the President used the following language:

"The boundary of British Guiana still remains in dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela. Believing that its early settlement, on some just basis alike honorable to both parties, is in the line of our established policy to remove from this hemisphere all causes of difference with powers beyond the sea, I shall renew the efforts heretofore made to bring about a restoration of diplomatic relations between the disputants and to induce a reference to arbitration, a resort which Great Britain so conspicuously favors in principle and respects in practice, and which is earnestly sought by her weaker adversary."

And February 22, 1895, a joint resolution of Congress declared—

"That the President's suggestion * * * that Great Britain and Venezuela refer their dispute as to boundaries to friendly arbitration be earnestly recommended to the favorable consideration of both parties in interest."

The important features of the existing situation, as shown by the foregoing recital, may be briefly stated.

1. The title to territory of indefinite but confessedly very large extent is in dispute between Great Britain on the one hand and the South American Republic of Venezuela on the other.

2. The disparity in the strength of the claimants is such that Venezuela can hope to establish her claim only through peaceful methods—through an agreement with her adversary either upon the subject itself or upon an arbitration.

3. The controversy, with varying claims on the part of Great Britain, has existed for more than half a century, during which period many earnest and persistent efforts of Venezuela to establish a boundary by agreement have proved unsuccessful.

4. The futility of the endeavor to obtain a conventional line being recognized, Venezuela for a quarter of a century has asked and striven for arbitration.

5. Great Britain, however, has always and continuously refused to arbitrate, except upon the condition of a renunciation of a large part of the Venezuelan claim and of a concession to herself of a large share of the territory in controversy.

6. By the frequent interposition of its good offices at the instance of Venezuela, by constantly urging and promoting the restoration of diplomatic relations between the two countries, by pressing for arbitration of the disputed boundary, by offering to act as arbitrator, by expressing its grave concern whenever new alleged instances of British aggression upon Venezuelan territory have been brought to its notice, the Government of the United States has made it clear to Great Britain and to the world that the controversy is one in which both its honor and its interests are involved and the continuance of which it can not regard with indifference.

The accuracy of the foregoing analysis of the existing status can not, it is believed, be challenged. It shows that status to be such that those charged with the interests of the United States are now forced to determine exactly what those interests are and what course of action they require. It compels them to decide to what extent, if any, the United States may and should intervene in a controversy between and primarily concerning only Great Britain and Venezuela, and to decide how far it is bound to see that the integrity of Venezuelan territory is not impaired by the pretensions of its powerful antagonist. Are any such right and duty devolved upon the United States? If not, the United States has already done all, if not more than all, that a purely sentimental interest in the affairs of the two countries justifies, and to push its interposition further would be unbecoming and undignified, and might well subject it to the charge of impertinent intermeddling with affairs with which it has no rightful concern. On the other hand, if any such right and duty exist, their due exercise and discharge will not permit of any action that shall not be efficient and that, if the power of the United States is adequate, shall not result in the accomplishment of the end in view. The question thus presented, as matter of principle, and regard being had to the settled national policy, does not seem difficult of solution. Yet the momentous practical consequences dependent upon its determination require that it should be carefully considered and that the grounds of the conclusion arrived at should be fully and frankly stated.

That there are circumstances under which a nation may justly interpose in a controversy to which two or more other nations are the direct and immediate parties is an admitted canon of international law. The doctrine is ordinarily expressed in terms of the most general character, and is perhaps incapable of more specific statement. It is declared in substance that a nation may avail itself of this right whenever what is done or proposed by any of the parties primarily concerned is a serious and direct menace to its own integrity, tranquillity, or welfare. The propriety of the rule, when applied in good faith, will not be questioned in any quarter. On the other hand, it is an inevitable though unfortunate consequence of the wide scope of the rule that it has only too often been made a cloak for schemes of wanton spoliation and aggrandizement. We are concerned at this time, however, not so much with the general rule as with a form of it which is peculiarly and distinctively American. Washington, in the solemn admonitions of the Farewell Address, explicitly warned his countrymen against entanglements with the politics or the controversies of European powers.

"Europe," he said, "has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities. Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course."

During the Administration of President Monroe this doctrine of the Farewell Address was first considered in all its aspects and with a view to all its practical consequences. The Farewell Address, while it took America out of the field of European politics, was silent as to the part Europe might be permitted to play in America. Doubtless it was thought the latest addition to

the family of nations should not make haste to prescribe rules for the guidance of its older members, and the expediency and propriety of serving the powers of Europe with notice of a complete and distinctive American policy excluding them from interference with American political affairs might well seem dubious to a generation to whom the French alliance, with its manifold advantages to the cause of American independence, was fresh in mind.

Twenty years later, however, the situation had changed. The lately born nation had greatly increased in power and resources, had demonstrated its strength on land and sea and as well in the conflicts of arms as in the pursuits of peace, and had begun to realize the commanding position on this continent which the character of its people, their free institutions, and their remoteness from the chief scene of European contentions combined to give to it. The Monroe Administration therefore did not hesitate to accept and apply the logic of the Farewell Address by declaring in effect that American nonintervention in European affairs necessarily implied and meant European nonintervention in American affairs. Conceiving unquestionably that complete European noninterference in American concerns would be cheaply purchased by complete American noninterference in European concerns, President Monroe, in the celebrated message of December 2, 1823, used the following language:

"In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparations for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. And to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

"With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. * * * Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the Government de facto as the legitimate Government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting, in all instances, the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none. But in regard to these continents, circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition, in any form, with indifference."

The Monroe Administration, however, did not content itself with formulating a correct rule for the regulation of the relations between Europe and America. It aimed at also securing the practical benefits to result from the application of the rule. Hence the message just quoted declared that the American continents were fully occupied and were not the subjects for future colonization by European powers. To this spirit and this purpose also are to be attributed the passages of the same message which treat any infringement of the rule against interference in American affairs on the part of the powers of Europe as an act of unfriendliness to the United States. It was realized that it was futile to lay down such a rule unless its observance could be enforced. It was manifest that the United States was the only power in this hemisphere capable of enforcing it. It was therefore courageously declared not merely that Europe ought not to interfere in American affairs, but that any European power doing so would be regarded as antagonizing the interests and inviting the opposition of the United States.

That America is in no part open to colonization, though the proposition was not universally admitted at the time of its first enunciation, has long been universally conceded. We are now concerned, therefore, only with that other practical application of the Monroe doctrine, the disregard of which by an European power is to be deemed an act of unfriendliness toward the United States. The precise scope and limitations of this rule can not be too clearly apprehended. It does not establish any general protectorate by the United States over other American States. It does not relieve any American State from its obligations as fixed by international law nor prevent any European power directly interested from enforcing such obligations or from inflicting merited punishment for the breach of them. It does not contemplate any interference in the internal affairs of any American State or in the relations between it and other American States. It does not justify any attempt on our part to change the established form of government of any American State or to prevent the people of such State from altering that form according to their own will and pleasure. The rule in question has but a single purpose and object. It is that no European power or combination of European powers shall forcibly deprive an American State of the right and power of self-government and of shaping for itself its own political fortunes and destinies.

That the rule thus defined has been the accepted public law of this country ever since its promulgation can not fairly be denied. Its pronouncement by the Monroe Administration at that particular time was unquestionably due to the inspiration of Great Britain, who at once gave to it an open and unqualified adhesion which has never been withdrawn. But the rule was decided upon and formulated by the Monroe Administration as a distinctively American doctrine of great import to the safety and welfare of the United States, after the most careful consideration by a Cabinet which numbered among its members John Quincy Adams, Calhoun, Crawford, and Wirt, and which, before acting, took both Jefferson and Madison into its counsels. Its promulgation was received with acclaim by the entire people of the country, irrespective of party. Three years after, Webster declared that the doctrine involved the honor of the country. "I look upon it," he said, "as part of its treasures of reputation, and for one I intend to guard it," and he added:

"I look on the message of December, 1823, as forming a bright page in our history. I will help neither to erase it nor to tear it out; nor shall it be by any act of mine blurred or blotted. It did honor to the sagacity of the Government, and I will not diminish that honor."

Though the rule thus highly eulogized by Webster has never been formally affirmed by Congress, the House in 1864 declared against the Mexican monarchy sought to be set up by the French as not in accord with the policy of the United States, and in 1889 the Senate expressed its disapproval of the connection of any European power with a canal across the Isthmus of Darien or Central America. It is manifest that if a rule has been openly and uniformly declared and acted upon by the executive branch of the Government for more than seventy years without express repudiation by Congress, it must be conclusively presumed to have its sanction. Yet it is certainly no more than the exact truth to say that every Administration since President Monroe's has had occasion, and sometimes more occasions than one, to examine and consider the Monroe doctrine, and has in each instance given it emphatic indorsement. Presidents have dwelt upon it in messages to Congress and Secretaries of State have time after time made it the theme of diplomatic representation. Nor, if the practical results of the rule be sought for, is the record either meager or obscure.

Its first and immediate effect was indeed most momentous and far reaching. It was the controlling factor in the emancipation of South America and to it the independent States which now divide that region between them are largely indebted for their very existence. Since then the most striking single achievement to be credited to the rule is the evacuation of Mexico by the French upon the termination of the civil war. But we are also indebted to it for the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which both neutralized any interoceanic canal across Central America and expressly excluded Great Britain from occupying or exercising any dominion over any part of Central America. It has been used in the case of Cuba as if justifying the position that, while the sovereignty of Spain will be respected, the island will not be permitted to become the possession of any other European power. It has been influential in bringing about the definite relinquishment of any supposed protectorate by Great Britain over the Mosquito Coast.

President Polk, in the case of Yucatan and the proposed voluntary transfer of that country to Great Britain or Spain, relied upon the Monroe doctrine, though perhaps erroneously, when he declared in a special message to Congress on the subject that the United States could not consent to any such transfer. Yet, in somewhat the same spirit, Secretary Fish affirmed in 1870 that President Grant had but followed "the teachings of all our history" in declaring in his annual message of that year that existing dependencies were no longer regarded as subject to transfer from one European power to another, and that when the present relation of colonies ceases they are to become independent powers. Another development of the rule, though apparently not necessarily required by either its letter or its spirit, is found in the objection to arbitration of South American controversies by an European power. American questions, it is said, are for American decision, and on that ground the United States went so far as to refuse to mediate in the war between Chile and Peru jointly with Great Britain and France. Finally, on the ground, among others, that the authority of the Monroe doctrine and the prestige of the United States as its exponent and sponsor would be seriously impaired, Secretary Bayard strenuously resisted the enforcement of the Pelletier claim against Haiti.

"The United States," he said, "has proclaimed herself the protector of this Western World, in which she is by far the stronger power, from the intrusion of European sovereignties. She can point with proud satisfaction to the fact that over and over again has she declared effectively that serious indeed would be the consequences if European hostile foot should, without just cause, tread those States in the New World which have emancipated themselves from European control. She has announced that she would cherish as it becomes her the territorial rights of the feeblest of those States, regarding them not merely as in the eye of the law equal to even the greatest of nationalities, but in view of her distinctive policy as entitled to be regarded by her as the objects of a peculiarly gracious care. I feel bound to say that if we should sanction by reprisals in Haiti the ruthless invasion of her territory and insult to her sovereignty which the facts now before us disclose, if we approve by solemn Executive action and Congressional assent that invasion, it will be difficult for us hereafter to assert that in the New World, of whose rights we are the peculiar guardians, these rights have never been invaded by ourselves."

The foregoing enumeration not only shows the many instances wherein the rule in question has been affirmed and applied, but also demonstrates that the Venezuelan boundary controversy is in any view far within the scope and spirit of the rule as uniformly accepted and acted upon. A doctrine of American public law thus long and firmly established and supported could not easily be ignored in a proper case for its application, even were the considerations upon which it is founded obscure or questionable. No such objection can be made, however, to the Monroe doctrine understood and defined in the manner already stated. It rests, on the contrary, upon facts and principles that are both intelligible and incontrovertible. That distance and 3,000 miles of intervening ocean make any permanent political union between an European and an American State unnatural and inexpedient will hardly be denied. But physical and geographical considerations are the least of the objections to such a union. Europe, as Washington observed, has a set of primary interests which are peculiar to herself. America is not interested in them and ought not to be vexed or complicated with them.

Each great European power, for instance, to-day maintains enormous armies and fleets in self-defense and for protection against any other European power or powers. What have the States of America to do with that condition of things, or why should they be impoverished by wars or preparations for wars with whose causes or results they can have no direct concern? If all Europe were to suddenly fly to arms over the fate of Turkey, would it not be preposterous that any American State should find itself inextricably involved in the miseries and burdens of the contest? If it were, it would prove to be a partnership in the cost and losses of the struggle, but not in any ensuing benefits.

What is true of the material is no less true of what may be termed the moral interests involved. Those pertaining to Europe are peculiar to her and are entirely diverse from those pertaining and peculiar to America. Europe as a whole is monarchical, and, with the single important exception of the Republic of France, is committed to the monarchical principle. America, on the other hand, is devoted to the exactly opposite principle—to the idea that every people has an inalienable right of self-government—and in the United States of America has furnished to the world the most conspicuous and conclusive example and proof of the excellence of free institutions, whether from the standpoint of national greatness or of individual happiness. It can not be necessary, however, to enlarge upon this phase of the subject. Whether moral or material interests be considered, it can not but be universally conceded that those of Europe are irreconcilably diverse from those of America, and that any European control of the latter is necessarily both incongruous and injurious. If, however, for the reasons stated the forcible intrusion of European powers into American politics is to be deprecated—if, as it is to be deprecated, it should be resisted and prevented—such resistance and prevention must come from the United States. They would come from it, of course, were it made the point of attack. But if they come at all, they must also come from it when any other American State is attacked, since only the United States has the strength adequate to the exigency.

Is it true, then, that the safety and welfare of the United States are so concerned with the maintenance of the independence of every American State as against any European power as to justify and require the interposition of the United States whenever that independence is endangered? The question can

be candidly answered in but one way. The States of America, South as well as North, by geographical proximity, by natural sympathy, by similarity of governmental constitutions, are friends and allies, commercially and politically, of the United States. To allow the subjugation of any of them by an European power is, of course, to completely reverse that situation and signifies the loss of all the advantages incident to their natural relations to us. But that is not all. The people of the United States have a vital interest in the cause of popular self-government. They have secured the right for themselves and their posterity at the cost of infinite blood and treasure. They have realized and exemplified its beneficent operation by a career unexampled in point of national greatness or individual felicity. They believe it to be for the healing of all nations, and that civilization must either advance or retrograde accordingly as its supremacy is extended or curtailed. Imbued with these sentiments, the people of the United States might not impossibly be wrought up to an active propaganda in favor of a cause so highly valued both for themselves and for mankind. But the age of the Crusades has passed, and they are content with such assertion and defense of the right of popular self-government as their own security and welfare demand. It is in that view more than in any other that they believe it not to be tolerated that the political control of an American State shall be forcibly assumed by an European power.

The mischiefs apprehended from such a source are none the less real because not immediately imminent in any specific case, and are none the less to be guarded against because the combination of circumstances that will bring them upon us can not be predicted. The civilized States of Christendom deal with each other on substantially the same principles that regulate the conduct of individuals. The greater its enlightenment, the more surely every State perceives that its permanent interests require it to be governed by the immutable principles of right and justice. Each, nevertheless, is only too liable to succumb to the temptations offered by seeming special opportunities for its own aggrandizement, and each would rashly imperil its own safety were it not to remember that for the regard and respect of other States it must be largely dependent upon its own strength and power. To-day the United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition. Why? It is not because of the the pure friendship or good will felt for it. It is not simply by reason of its high character as a civilized State, nor because wisdom and justice and equity are the invariable characteristics of the dealings of the United States. It is because, in addition to all other grounds, its infinite resources, combined with its isolated position, render it master of the situation and practically invulnerable as against any or all other powers.

All the advantages of this superiority are at once imperiled if the principle be admitted that European powers may convert American States into colonies or provinces of their own. The principle would be eagerly availed of, and every power doing so would immediately acquire a base of military operations against us. What one power was permitted to do could not be denied to another, and it is not inconceivable that the struggle now going on for the acquisition of Africa might be transferred to South America. If it were, the weaker countries would unquestionably be soon absorbed, while the ultimate result might be the partition of all South America between the various European powers. The disastrous consequences to the United States of such a condition of things are obvious. The loss of prestige, of authority, and of weight in the councils of the family of nations would be among the least of them. Our only real rivals in peace as well as enemies in war would be found located at our very doors. Thus far in our history we have been spared the burdens and evils of immense standing armies and all the other accessories of huge warlike establishments, and the exemption has largely contributed to our national greatness and wealth as well as to the happiness of every citizen. But, with the powers of Europe permanently encamped on American soil, the ideal conditions we have thus far enjoyed can not be expected to continue. We, too, must be armed to the teeth; we, too, must convert the flower of our male population into soldiers and sailors, and by withdrawing them from the various pursuits of peaceful industry we, too, must pratically annihilate a large share of the productive energy of the nation.

How a greater calamity than this could overtake us it is difficult to see. Nor are our just apprehensions to be allayed by suggestions of the friendliness of European powers—of their good will toward us—of their disposition, should they be our neighbors, to dwell with us in peace and harmony. The people of the United States have learned in the school of experience to what extent the relations of States to each other depend not upon sentiment nor principle, but upon selfish interest. They will not soon forget that, in their hour of distress, all their anxieties and burdens were aggravated by the possibility of demonstrations against their national life on the part of powers with whom they had long maintained the most harmonious relations. They have yet in mind that France seized upon the apparent opportunity of our civil war to set up a monarchy in the adjoining State of Mexico. They realize that had France and Great Britain held important South American possessions to work from and to benefit, the temptation to destroy the predominance of the great Republic in this hemisphere by furthering its dismemberment might have been irresistible. From that grave peril they have been saved in the past and may be saved again in the future through the operation of the sure but silent force of the doctrine proclaimed by President Monroe. To abandon it, on the other hand, disregarding both the logic of the situation and the facts of our past experience, would be to renounce a policy which has proved both an easy defense against foreign aggression and a prolific source of internal progress and prosperity.

There is, then, a doctrine of American public law, well founded in principle and abundantly sanctioned by precedent, which entitles and requires the United States to treat as an injury to itself the forcible assumption by an European power of political control over an American State. The application of the doctrine to the boundary dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela remains to be made and presents no real difficulty. Though the dispute relates to a boundary line, yet, as it is between States, it necessarily imports political control to be lost by one party and gained by the other. The political control at stake, too, is of no mean importance, but concerns a domain of great extent—the British claim, it will be remembered, apparently expanded in two years some 33,000 square miles—and, if it also directly involves the command of the mouth of the Orinoco, is of immense consequence in connection with the whole river navigation of the interior of South America. It has been intimated, indeed, that in respect of these South American possessions Great Britain is herself an American State like any other, so that a controversy between her and Venezuela is to be settled between themselves as if it were between Venezuela and Brazil or between Venezuela and Colombia, and does not call for or justify United States intervention. If this view be tenable at all, the logical sequence is plain.

Great Britain as a South American State is to be entirely differentiated from Great Britain generally, and if the boundary question can not be settled otherwise than by force, British Guiana, with her own independent resources, and not those of the British Empire, should be left to settle the matter with Venezuela—an arrangement which very possibly Venezuela might not object to. But the proposition that an European power with an American dependency is, for the purposes of the Monroe doctrine, to be classed not as an European but as an American State will not admit of serious discussion. If it were to be adopted, the Monroe doctrine would be too valueless to be worth asserting. Not only would every European power now having a South American colony be enabled to extend its possessions on this continent indefinitely, but any other European power might also do the same by first taking pains to procure a fraction of South American soil by voluntary cession.

The declaration of the Monroe message—that existing colonies or dependencies of an European power would not be interfered with by the United States—means colonies or dependencies then existing, with their limits as then existing. So it has been invariably construed, and so it must continue to be construed unless it is to be deprived of all vital force. Great Britain can not be deemed a South American State within the purview of the Monroe doctrine, nor, if she is appropriating Venezuelan territory, is it material that she does so by advancing the frontier of an old colony instead of by the planting of a new colony. The difference is matter of form and not of substance, and the doctrine, if pertinent in the one case, must be in the other also. It is not admitted, however, and therefore can not be assumed, that Great Britain is in fact usurping dominion over Venezuelan territory. While Venezuela charges such usurpation, Great Britain denies it, and the United States, until the merits are authoritatively ascertained, can take sides with neither. But while this is so—while the United States may not, under existing circumstances at least, take upon itself to say which of the two parties is right and which wrong—it is certainly within its right to demand that the truth shall be ascertained. Being entitled to resent and resist any sequestration of Venezuelan soil by Great Britain, it is necessarily entitled to know whether such sequestration has occurred or is now going on. Otherwise, if the United States is without the right to know and have it determined whether there is or is not British aggression upon Venezuelan territory, its right to protest against or repel such aggression may be dismissed from consideration.

The right to act upon a fact the existence of which there is no right to have ascertained is simply illusory. It being clear, therefore, that the United States may legitimately insist upon the merits of the boundary question being determined, it is equally clear that there is but one feasible mode of determining them, viz, peaceful arbitration. The impracticability of any conventional adjustment has been often and thoroughly demonstrated. Even more impossible of consideration is an appeal to arms—a mode of settling national pretensions unhappily not yet wholly obsolete. If, however, it were not condemnable as a relic of barbarism and a crime in itself, so one-sided a contest could not be invited nor even accepted by Great Britain without distinct disparagement to her character as a civilized State. Great Britain, however, assumes no such attitude. On the contrary, she both admits that there is a controversy and that arbitration should be resorted to for its adjustment. But, while up to that point her attitude leaves nothing to be desired, its practical effect is completely nullified by her insistence that the submission shall cover but a part of the controversy—that, as a condition of arbitrating her right to a part of the disputed territory, the remainder shall be turned over to her. If it were possible to point to a boundary which both parties had ever agreed or assumed to be such either expressly or tacitly, the demand that territory conceded by such line to British Guiana should be held not to be in dispute might rest upon a reasonable basis. But there is no such line. The territory which Great Britain insists shall be ceded to her as a condition of arbitrating her claim to other territory has never been admitted to belong to her. It has always and consistently been claimed by Venezuela.

Upon what principle—except her feebleness as a nation—is she to be denied the right of having the claim heard and passed upon by an impartial tribunal? No reason nor shadow of reason appears in all the voluminous literature of the subject. "It is to be so because I will it to be so" seems to be the only justification Great Britain offers. It is, indeed, intimated that the British claim to this particular territory rests upon an occupation which, whether acquiesced in or not, has ripened into a perfect title by long continuance. But what prescription affecting territorial rights can be said to exist as between sovereign States? Or, if there is any, what is the legitimate consequence? It is not that all arbitration should be denied, but only that the submission should embrace an additional topic, namely, the validity of the asserted prescriptive title either in point of law or in point of fact. No different result follows from the contention that as matter of principle Great Britain can not be asked to submit and ought not to submit to arbitration her political and sovereign rights over territory. This contention, if applied to the whole or to a vital part of the possessions of a sovereign State, need not be controverted. To hold otherwise might be equivalent to holding that a sovereign State was bound to arbitrate its very existence.

But Great Britain has herself shown in various instances that the principle has no pertinency when either the interests or the territorial area involved are not of controlling magnitude and her loss of them as the result of an arbitration can not appreciably affect her honor or her power. Thus, she has arbitrated the extent of her colonial possessions twice with the United States, twice with Portugal, and once with Germany, and perhaps in other instances. The northwest water boundary arbitration of 1872 between her and this country is an example in point and well illustrates both the effect to be given to long-continued use and enjoyment and the fact that a truly great power sacrifices neither prestige nor dignity by reconsidering the most emphatic rejection of a proposition, when satisfied of the obvious and intrinsic justice of the case. By the award of the Emperor of Germany, the arbitrator in that case, the United States acquired San Juan and a number of smaller islands near the coast of Vancouver as a consequence of the decision that the term "the channel which separates the continent from Vancouver Island," as used in the treaty of Washington of 1846, meant the Haro channel and not the Rosario channel. Yet a leading contention of Great Britain before the arbitrator was that equity required a judgment in her favor because a decision in favor of the United States would deprive British subjects of rights of navigation of which they had had the habitual enjoyment from the time when the Rosario Strait was first explored and surveyed in 1798. So, though by virtue of the award the United States acquired San Juan and the other islands of the group to which it belongs, the British foreign secretary had in 1859 instructed the British minister at Washington as follows:

"Her Majesty's Government must, therefore, under any circumstances, maintain the right of the British Crown to the Island of San Juan. The interests at stake in connection with the retention of that island are too important to admit of compromise, and your lordship will consequently bear in mind that, whatever arrangement as to the boundary line is finally arrived at, no settlement of the question will be accepted by Her Majesty's Government which does not provide for the Island of San Juan being reserved to the British Crown."

Thus, as already intimated, the British demand that her right to a portion of the disputed territory shall be acknowledged before she will consent to an arbitration as to the rest seems to stand upon nothing but her own ipse dixit. She says to Venezuela, in substance: "You can get none of the debatable land by force, because you are not strong enough; you can get none by treaty, because I will not agree; and you can take your chance of getting a portion by arbitration only if you first agree to abandon to me such other portion as I may designate." It is not perceived how such an attitude can be defended nor how it is reconcilable with that love of justice and fair play so eminently characteristic of the English race. It in effect deprives Venezuela of her free agency and puts her under virtual duress. Territory acquired by reason of it will be as much wrested from her by the strong hand as if

occupied by British troops or covered by British fleets. It seems, therefore, quite impossible that this position of Great Britain should be assented to by the United States, or that, if such position be adhered to with the result of enlarging the bounds of British Guiana, it should not be regarded as amounting, in substance, to an invasion and conquest of Venezuelan territory.

In these circumstances the duty of the President appears to him unmistakable and imperative. Great Britain's assertion of title to the disputed territory, combined with her refusal to have that title investigated, being a substantial appropriation of the territory to her own use, not to protest and give warning that the transaction will be regarded as injurious to the interests of the people of the United States, as well as oppressive in itself, would be to ignore an established policy with which the honor and welfare of this country are closely identified. While the measures necessary or proper for the vindication of that policy are to be determined by another branch of the Government, it is clearly for the Executive to leave nothing undone which may tend to render such determination unnecessary.

You are instructed, therefore, to present the foregoing views to Lord Salisbury by reading to him this communication (leaving with him a copy should he so desire), and to reenforce them by such pertinent considerations as will doubtless occur to you. They call for a definite decision upon the point whether Great Britain will consent or will decline to submit the Venezuelan boundary question in its entirety to impartial arbitration. It is the earnest hope of the President that the conclusion will be on the side of arbitration, and that Great Britain will add one more to the conspicuous precedents she has already furnished in favor of that wise and just mode of adjusting international disputes. If he is to be disappointed in that hope, however—a result not to be anticipated and in his judgment calculated to greatly embarrass the future relations between this country and Great Britain—it is his wish to be made acquainted with the fact at such early date as will enable him to lay the whole subject before Congress in his next annual message.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

RICHARD OLNEY.

—

MR. ADEE TO MR. BAYARD.

No. 806.] DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 24, 1895.

His Excellency THOMAS F. BAYARD, *etc., London.*

SIR: In Mr. Olney's instruction No. 804, of the 20th instant, in relation to the Anglo-Venezuelan boundary dispute, you will note a reference to the sudden increase of the area claimed for British Guiana, amounting to 33,000 square miles, between 1884 and 1886. This statement is made on the authority of the British publication entitled the Statesman's Year Book.

I add for your better information that the same statement is found in the British Colonial Office List, a Government publication.

In the issue for 1885 the following passage occurs, on page 24, under the head of British Guiana:

"It is impossible to specify the exact area of the colony, as its precise boundaries between Venezuela and Brazil, respectively, are undetermined, but it has been computed to be 76,000 square miles."

In the issue of the same list for 1886 the same statement occurs, on page 33, with the change of area to "about 109,000 square miles."

The official maps in the two volumes mentioned are identical, so that the increase of 33,000 square miles claimed for British Guiana is not thereby explained, but later Colonial Office List maps show a varying sweep of the boundary westward into what previously figured as Venezuelan territory, while no change is noted on the Brazilian frontier.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

ALVEY A. ADEE, *Acting Secretary.*

—

LORD SALISBURY TO SIR JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

No. 189.] FOREIGN OFFICE, *November 26, 1895.*

SIR: On the 7th of August I transmitted to Lord Gough a copy of the dispatch from Mr. Olney which Mr. Bayard had left with me that day, and of which he had read portions to me. I informed him at the time that it could not be answered until it had been carefully considered by the law officers of the Crown. I have therefore deferred replying to it till after the recess.

I will not now deal with those portions of it which are concerned exclusively with the controversy that has for some time past existed between the Republic of Venezuela and Her Majesty's Government in regard to the boundary which separates their dominions. I take a very different view from Mr. Olney of various matters upon which he touches in that part of the dispatch; but I will defer for the present all observations upon it, as it concerns matters which are not in themselves of first-rate importance, and do not directly concern the relations between Great Britain and the United States.

The latter part, however, of the dispatch, turning from the question of the frontiers of Venezuela, proceeds to deal with principles of a far wider character, and to advance doctrines of international law which are of considerable interest to all the nations whose dominions include any portion of the Western Hemisphere.

The contentions set forth by Mr. Olney in this part of his dispatch are represented by him as being an application of the political maxims which are well known in American discussion under the name of the Monroe doctrine. As far as I am aware, this doctrine has never been before advanced on behalf of the United States in any written communication addressed to the Government of another nation; but it has been generally adopted and assumed as true by many eminent writers and politicians in the United States. It is said to have largely influenced the Government of that country in the conduct of its foreign affairs; though Mr. Clayton, who was Secretary of State under President Taylor, expressly stated that that Administration had in no way adopted it. But during the period that has elapsed since the message of President Monroe was delivered in 1823 the doctrine has undergone a very notable development, and the aspect which it now presents in the hands of Mr. Olney differs widely from its character when it first issued from the pen of its author. The two propositions which in effect President Monroe laid down were, first, that America was no longer to be looked upon as a field for European colonization; and, secondly, that Europe must not attempt to extend its political system to America, or to control the political condition of any of the American communities who had recently declared their independence.

The dangers against which President Monroe thought it right to guard were not as imaginary as they would seem at the present day. The formation of the Holy Alliance; the congresses of Laybach and Verona; the invasion of Spain by France for the purpose of forcing upon the Spanish people a form of government which seemed likely to disappear, unless it was sustained by external aid, were incidents fresh in the mind of President Monroe when he penned his celebrated message. The system of which he speaks, and of which he so resolutely deprecates the application to the American Continent, was the system then adopted by certain powerful States upon the Continent of Europe of combining to prevent by force of arms the adoption in other countries of political institutions which they disliked, and to uphold by external pressure those which they approved. Various portions of South America had recently declared their independence, and that independence had not been recognized by the Governments of Spain and Portugal, to which, with small exception, the whole of Central and South America were nominally subject. It was not an imaginary danger that he foresaw, if he feared that the same spirit which had dictated the French expedition into Spain might inspire the more powerful Governments of Europe with the idea of imposing, by the force of European arms, upon the South American communities the form of government and the political connection which they had thrown off. In declaring that the United States would resist any such enterprise if it was contemplated, President Monroe adopted a policy which received the entire sympathy of the English Government of that date.

The dangers which were apprehended by President Monroe have no relation to the state of things in which we live at the present day. There is no danger of any Holy Alliance imposing its system upon any portion of the American Continent, and there is no danger of any European State treating any part of the American Continent as a fit object for European colonization. It is intelligible that Mr. Olney should invoke, in defense of the views on which he is now insisting, an authority which enjoys so high a popularity with his own fellow-countrymen. But the circumstances with which President Monroe was dealing, and those to which the present American Government is addressing itself, have very few features in common. Great Britain is imposing no "system" upon Venezuela, and is not concerning herself in any way with the nature of the political institutions under which the Venezuelans may prefer to live. But the British Empire and the Republic of Venezuela are neighbors, and they have differed for some time past, and continue to differ, as to the line by which the dominions are separated. It is a controversy with which the United States have no apparent practical concern. It is difficult, indeed, to see how it can materially affect any State or community outside those primarily interested, except perhaps other parts of Her Majesty's dominions, such as Trinidad. The disputed frontier of Venezuela has nothing to do with any of the questions dealt with by President Monroe. It is not a question of the colonization by a European power of any portion of America. It is not a question of the imposition upon the communities of South America of any system of government devised in Europe. It is simply the determination of the frontier of a British possession which belonged to the Throne of England long before the Republic of Venezuela came into existence. But even if the interests of Venezuela were so far linked to those of the United States as to give to the latter a locus standi in this controversy, their Government apparently have not formed, and certainly do not express, any opinion upon the actual merits of the dispute.

The Government of the United States do not say that Great Britain, or that Venezuela, is in the right in the matters that are in issue. But they lay down that the doctrine of President Monroe, when he opposed the imposition of European systems, or the renewal of European colonization, confers upon them the right of demanding that when a European power has a frontier difference with a South American community the European power shall consent to refer that controversy to arbitration; and Mr. Olney states that unless Her Majesty's Government accede to this demand it will "greatly embarrass the future relations between Great Britain and the United States."

Whatever may be the authority of the doctrine laid down by President Monroe, there is nothing in his language to show that he ever thought of claiming this novel prerogative for the United States. It is admitted that he did not seek to assert a protectorate over Mexico or the States of Central and South America. Such a claim would have imposed upon the United States the duty of answering for the conduct of these States, and consequently the responsibility of controlling it. His sagacious foresight would have led him energetically to deprecate the addition of so serious a burden to those which the rulers of the United States have to bear. It follows of necessity that if the Government of the United States will not control the conduct of these communities neither can it undertake to protect them from the consequences attaching to any misconduct of which they may be guilty toward other nations. If they violate in any way the rights of another State, or of its subjects, it is not alleged that the Monroe doctrine will assure them the assistance of the United States in escaping from any reparation which they may be bound by international law to give. Mr. Olney expressly disclaims such an inference from the principles he lays down.

But the claim which he founds upon them is that if any independent American State advances a demand for territory of which its neighbor claims to be the owner, and that neighbor is the colony of a European State, the United States have a right to insist that the European State shall submit the demand and its own impugned rights to arbitration.

I will not now enter into a discussion of the merits of this method of terminating international differences. It has proved itself valuable in many cases; but it is not free from defects, which often operate as a serious drawback on its value. It is not always easy to find an arbitrator who is competent and who, at the same time, is wholly free from bias; and the task of insuring compliance with the award when it is made not exempt from difficulty. It is a mode of settlement of which the value varies much according to the nature of the controversy to which it is applied and the character of the litigants who appeal to it. Whether, in any particular case, it is a suitable method of procedure is generally a delicate and difficult question. The only parties who are competent to decide that question are the two parties whose rival contentions are in issue. The claim of a third nation, which is unaffected by the controversy, to impose this particular procedure on either of the two others can not be reasonably justified, and has no foundation in the law of nations.

In the remarks which I have made, I have argued on the theory that the Monroe doctrine in itself is sound. I must not, however, be understood as expressing any acceptance of it on the part of Her Majesty's Government. It must always be mentioned with respect, on account of the distinguished statesman to whom it is due and the great nation who have generally adopted it. But international law is founded on the general consent of nations; and no statesman, however eminent, and no nation, however powerful, are competent to insert into the code of international law a novel principle which was never recognized before and which has not since been accepted by the Government of any other country. The United States have a right, like any other nation, to interpose in any controversy by which their own interests are affected; and they are the judge whether those interests are touched, and in what measure they should be sustained. But their rights are in no way strengthened or extended by the fact that the controversy affects some territory which is called American. Mr. Olney quotes the case of the recent Chilean war, in which the United States declined to join with France and England in an effort to bring hostilities to a close, on account of the Monroe doctrine. The United States were entirely in their right in declining to join in an attempt at pacification if they thought fit; but Mr. Olney's principle that "American questions are for American decision," even if it receive any countenance from the language of President Monroe (which it does not), can not be sustained by any reasoning drawn from the law of nations.

The Government of the United States is not entitled to affirm as a universal proposition, with reference to a number of independent States for whose conduct it assumes no responsibility, that its interests are necessarily concerned in whatever may befall those States simply because they are situated

in the Western Hemisphere. It may well be that the interests of the United States are affected by something that happens to Chile or to Peru, and that that circumstance may give them the right of interference; but such a contingency may equally happen in the case of China or Japan, and the right of interference is not more extensive or more assured in the one case than in the other.

Though the language of President Monroe is directed to the attainment of objects which most Englishmen would agree to be salutary, it is impossible to admit that they have been inscribed by any adequate authority in the code of international law; and the danger which such admission would involve is sufficiently exhibited both by the strange development which the doctrine has received at Mr. Olney's hands and the arguments by which it is supported in the dispatch under reply. In defense of it he says:

"That distance and 3,000 miles of intervening ocean make any permanent political union between a European and an American State unnatural and inexpedient will hardly be denied. But physicial and geographical considerations are the least of the objections to such a union. Europe has a set of primary interests which are peculiar to herself; America is not interested in them, and ought not to be vexed or complicated with them."

And, again:

"Thus far in our history we have been spared the burdens and evils of immense standing armies and all the other accessories of huge warlike establishments; and the exemption has highly contributed to our national greatness and wealth, as well as to the happiness of every citizen. But with the powers of Europe permanently encamped on American soil, the ideal conditions we have thus far enjoyed can not be expected to continue."

The necessary meaning of these words is that the union between Great Britain and Canada; between Great Britain and Jamaica and Trinidad; between Great Britain and British Honduras or British Guiana are "inexpedient and unnatural." President Monroe disclaims any such inference from his doctrine; but in this, as in other respects, Mr. Olney develops it. He lays down that the inexpedient and unnatural character of the union between a European and American State is so obvious that it "will hardly be denied."

Her Majesty's Government are prepared emphatically to deny it on behalf of both the British and American people who are subject to her Crown. They maintain that the union between Great Britain and her territories in the Western Hemisphere is both natural and expedient. They fully concur with the view which President Monroe apparently entertained, that any disturbance of the existing territorial distribution in that hemisphere by any fresh acquisitions on the part of any European State would be a highly inexpedient change. But they are not prepared to admit that the recognition of that expediency is clothed with the sanction which belongs to a doctrine of international law. They are not prepared to admit that the interests of the United States are necessarily concerned in every frontier dispute which may arise between any two of the States who possess dominion in the Western Hemisphere, and still less can they accept the doctrine that the United States are entitled to claim that the process of arbitration shall be applied to any demand for the surrender of territory which one of those States may make against another.

I have commented in the above remarks only upon the general aspect of Mr. Olney's doctrines, apart from the special considerations which attach to the controversy between the United Kingdom and Venezuela in its present phase. This controversy has undoubtedly been made more difficult by the inconsiderate action of the Venezuelan Government in breaking off relations with Her Majesty's Government, and its settlement has been correspondingly delayed; but Her Majesty's Government have not surrendered the hope that it will be adjusted by a reasonable arrangement at an early date.

I request that you will read the substance of the above dispatch to Mr. Olney, and leave him a copy if he desires it. S.

—

LORD SALISBURY TO SIR JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

No. 190.] FOREIGN OFFICE, *November 26, 1895.*

SIR: In my preceding dispatch of to-day's date I have replied only to the latter portion of Mr. Olney's dispatch of the 20th July last, which treats of the application of the Monroe doctrine to the question of the boundary dispute between Venezuela and the colony of British Guiana. But it seems desirable, in order to remove some evident misapprehensions as to the main features of the question, that the statement of it contained in the earlier portion of Mr. Olney's dispatch should not be left without reply. Such a course will be the more convenient, because, in consequence of the suspension of diplomatic relations, I shall not have the opportunity of setting right misconceptions of this kind in the ordinary way in a dispatch addressed to the Venezuelan Government itself.

Her Majesty's Government, while they have never avoided or declined argument on the subject with the Government of Venezuela, have always held that the question was one which had no direct bearing on the material interests of any other country, and have consequently refrained hitherto from presenting any detailed statement of their case either to the United States or to other foreign Governments.

It is perhaps a natural consequence of this circumstance that Mr. Olney's narration of what has passed bears the impress of being mainly, if not entirely, founded on ex parte statements emanating from Venezuela, and gives, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, an erroneous view of many material facts.

Mr. Olney commences his observations by remarking that "the dispute is of ancient date, and began at least as early as the time when Great Britain acquired by the treaty with the Netherlands in 1814 the establishments of Demerara, Essequibo, and Berbice. From that time to the present the dividing line between these establishments, now called British Guiana, and Venezuela has never ceased to be subject of contention."

This statement is founded on misconception. The dispute on the subject of the frontier did not, in fact, commence till after the year 1840.

The title of Great Britain to the territory in question is derived, in the first place, from conquest and military occupation of the Dutch settlements in 1796. Both on this occasion and at the time of a previous occupation of those settlements in 1781 the British authorities marked the western boundary of their possessions as beginning some distance up the Orinoco beyond Point Barima, in accordance with the limits claimed and actually held by the Dutch, and this has always since remained the frontier claimed by Great Britain. The definitive cession of the Dutch settlements to England was, as Mr. Olney states, placed on record by the treaty of 1814, and although the Spanish Government were parties to the negotiations which led to that treaty they did not at any stage of them raise objection to the frontiers claimed by Great Britain, though these were perfectly well known to them. At that time the Government of Venezuela had not been recognized even by the United States, though the province was already in revolt against the Spanish Government, and had declared its independence. No question of frontier was raised with Great Britain either by it or by the Government of the United States of Colombia, in which it became merged in 1819. That Government, indeed, on repeated occasions, acknowledged its indebtedness to Great Britain for her friendly attitude. When in 1830 the Republic of Venezuela assumed a separate existence its Government was equally warm in its expressions of gratitude and friendship, and there was not at the time any indication of an intention to raise such claims as have been urged by it during the latter portion of this century.

It is true, as stated by Mr. Olney, that in the Venezuelan constitution of 1830 article 5 lays down that "the territory of Venezuela comprises all that which previously to the political changes of 1810 was denominated the Captaincy-General of Venezuela." Similar declarations had been made in the fundamental laws promulgated in 1819 and 1821.

I need not point out that a declaration of this kind made by a newly self-constituted State can have no valid force as against international arrangements previously concluded by the nation from which it has separated itself.

But the present difficulty would never have arisen if the Government of Venezuela had been content to claim only those territories which could be proved or even reasonably asserted to have been practically in the possession and under the effective jurisdiction of the Captaincy-General of Venezuela.

There is no authoritative statement by the Spanish Government of those territories for a decree which the Venezuelan Government allege to have been issued by the King of Spain in 1768, describing the Province of Guiana as bordered on the south by the Amazon and on the east by the Atlantic, certainly can not be regarded as such. It absolutely ignores the Dutch settlements, which not only existed in fact, but had been formally recognized by the treaty of Munster of 1648, and it would, if now considered valid, transfer to Venezuela the whole of the British, Dutch, and French Guianas, and an enormous tract of territory belonging to Brazil.

But of the territories claimed and actually occupied by the Dutch, which were those acquired from them by Great Britain, there exist the most authentic declarations. In 1759, and again in 1769, the States General of Holland addressed formal remonstrances to the Court of Madrid against the incursions of the Spaniards into their posts and settlements in the basin of the Cuyuni. In these remonstrances they distinctly claimed all the branches of the Essequibo River, and especially the Cuyuni River, as lying within Dutch territory. They demanded immediate reparation for the proceedings of the Spaniards and reinstatement of the posts said to have been injured by them, and suggested that a proper delineation between the colony of Essequibo and the Rio Orinoco should be laid down by authority.

To this claim the Spanish Government never attempted to make any reply. But it is evident from the archieves which are preserved in Spain and to which, by the courtesy of the Spanish Government, reference has been made, that the council of state did not consider that they had the means of rebutting it, and that neither they nor the governor of Cumana were prepared seriously to maintain the claims which were suggested in reports from his subordinate officer, the commandant of Guiana. These reports were characterized by the Spanish ministers as insufficient and unsatisfactory, as "professing to show the Province of Guiana under too favorable a light," and finally by the council of state as appearing from other information to be "very improbable." They form, however, with a map which accompanied them, the evidence on which the Venezuelan Government appear most to rely, though it may be observed that among other documents which have from time to time been produced or referred to by them in the course of the discussions is a bull of Pope Alexander VI in 1493, which, if it is to be considered as having any present validity, would take from the Government of the United States all title to jurisdiction on the continent of North America.

The fundamental principle underlying the Venezuelan argument is, in fact, that, inasmuch as Spain was originally entitled of right to the whole of the American Continent, any territory on that continent which she can not be shown to have acknowledged in positive and specific terms to have passed to another power can only have been acquired by wrongful usurpation, and if situated to the north of the Amazon and west of the Atlantic must necessarily belong to Venezuela, as her self-constituted inheritor in those regions. It may reasonably be asked whether Mr. Olney would consent to refer to the arbitration of another power pretensions raised by the Government of Mexico on such a foundation to large tracts of territory which had long been comprised in the Federation.

The circumstances connected with the marking of what is called the "Schomburgk" line are as follows:

In 1835 a grant was made by the British Government for the exploration of the interior of the British colony, and Mr. (afterwards Sir Robert) Schomburgk, who was employed on this service, on his return to the capital of the colony in July, 1839, called the attention of the Government to the necessity for an early demarcation of its boundaries. He was in consequence appointed in November, 1840, special commissioner for provisionally surveying and delimiting the boundaries of British Guiana, and notice of the appointment was given to the Governments concerned, including that of Venezuela.

The intention of Her Majesty's Government at that time was, when the work of the commissioner had been completed, to communicate to the other Governments their views as to the true boundary of the British colony, and then to settle any details to which those Governments might take objection.

It is important to notice that Sir R. Schomburgk did not discover or invent any new boundaries. He took particular care to fortify himself with the history of the case. He had further, from actual exploration and information obtained from the Indians, and from the evidence of local remains, as at Barima, and local traditions, as on the Cuyuni, fixed the limits of the Dutch possessions, and the zone from which all trace of Spanish influence was absent. On such data he based his reports.

At the very outset of his mission he surveyed Point Barima, where the remains of a Dutch fort still existed, and placed there and at the mouth of the Amacura two boundary posts. At the urgent entreaty of the Venezuelan Government these two posts were afterwards removed, as stated by Mr. Olney, but this concession was made on the distinct understanding that Great Britain did not thereby in any way abandon her claim to that position.

In submitting the maps of his survey, on which he indicated the line which he would propose to Her Majesty's Government for adoption, Sir R. Schomburgk called attention to the fact that Her Majesty's Government might justly claim the whole basin of the Cuyuni and Yuruari, on the ground that the natural boundary of the colony included any territory through which flow rivers which fall into the Essequibo. "Upon this principle," he wrote, "the boundary line would run from the sources of the Carumani toward the sources of the Cuyuni proper, and from thence toward its far more northern tributaries, the rivers Iruary (Yuruari) and Iruang (Yuruan), and thus approach the very heart of Venezuelan Guiana." But, on grounds of complaisance toward Venezuela, he proposed that Great Britain should consent to surrender her claim to a more extended frontier inland in return for the formal recognition of her right to Point Barima. It was on this principle that he drew the boundary line which has since been called by his name.

Undoubtedly, therefore, Mr. Olney is right when he states that "it seems impossible to treat the Schomburgk line as being the boundary claimed by Great Britain as a matter of right, or as anything but a line originating in considerations of convenience and expediency." The Schomburgk line was in fact a great reduction of the boundary claimed by Great Britain as matter of right, and its proposal originated in a desire to come to a speedy and friendly arrangement with a weaker power with whom Great Britain was at the time, and desired to remain, in cordial relations.

The following are the main facts of the discussions that ensued with the Venezuelan Government:

While Mr. Schomburgk was engaged on his survey the Venezuelan minister in London had urged Her Majesty's Government to enter into a treaty of limits, but received the answer that, if it should be necessary to enter into such a treaty, a survey was, at any rate, the necessary preliminary, and that this was proceeding.

As soon as Her Majesty's Government were in possession of Mr. Schomburgk's reports, the Venezuelan minister was informed that they were in a position to commence negotiations, and in January, 1844, M. Fortique commenced by stating the claim of his Government.

This claim, starting from such obsolete grounds as the original discovery by Spain of the American Continent, and mainly supported by quotations of a more or less vague character from the writings of travelers and geographers, but adducing no substantial evidence of actual conquest or occupation of the territory claimed, demanded the Essequibo itself as the boundary of Venezuela.

A reply was returned by Lord Aberdeen, then secretary of state for foreign affairs, pointing out that it would be impossible to arrive at any agreement if both sides brought forward pretensions of so extreme a character, but stating that the British Government would not imitate M. Fortique in putting forward a claim which it could not be intended seriously to maintain. Lord Aberdeen then proceeded to announce the concessions which, "out of friendly regard to Venezuela," Her Majesty's Government were prepared to make, and proposed a line starting from the mouth of the Moroco to the junction of the River Barima with the Waini, thence up the Barima to the point at which that stream approached nearest to the Acarabisi, and thence following Sir R. Schomburgk's line from the source of the Acarabisi onward.

A condition was attached to the proffered cession, viz, that the Venezuelan Government should enter into an engagement that no portion of the territory proposed to be ceded should be alienated at any time to a foreign power, and that the Indian tribes residing in it should be protected from oppression.

No answer to the note was ever received from the Venezuelan Government, and in 1850 Her Majesty's Government informed Her Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Carácas that as the proposal had remained for more than six years unaccepted, it must be considered as having lapsed, and authorized him to make a communication to the Venezuelan Government to that effect.

A report having at the time become current in Venezuela that Great Britain intended to seize Venezuelan Guiana, the British Government distinctly disclaimed such an intention, but inasmuch as the Government of Venezuela subsequently permitted projects to be set on foot for the occupation of Point Barima and certain other positions in dispute, the British chargé d'affaires was instructed, in June, 1850, to call the serious attention of the President and Government of Venezuela to the question, and to declare to them "that whilst, on the one hand, Great Britain had no intention to occupy or encroach on the disputed territory, she would not, on the other hand, view with indifference aggressions on that territory by Venezuela."

The Venezuelan Government replied in December of the same year that Venezuela had no intention of occupying or encroaching upon any part of the territory the dominion of which was in dispute, and that orders would be issued to the authorities in Guiana to abstain from taking any steps contrary to this engagement.

This constitutes what has been termed the "agreement of 1850," to which the Government of Venezuela have frequently appealed, but which the Venezuelans have repeatedly violated in succeeding years.

Their first acts of this nature consisted in the occupation of fresh positions to the east of their previous settlements, and the founding in 1858 of the town of Nueva Providencia on the right bank of the Yuruari, all previous settlements being on the left bank. The British Government, however, considering that these settlements were so near positions which they had not wished to claim, considering also the difficulty of controlling the movements of mining populations, overlooked this breach of the agreement.

The governor of the colony was in 1857 sent to Caracas to negotiate for a settlement of the boundary, but he found the Venezuelan State in so disturbed a condition that it was impossible to commence negotiations, and eventually he came away without having effected anything.

For the next nineteen years, as stated by Mr. Olney, the civil commotions in Venezuela prevented any resumption of negotiations.

In 1876 it was reported that the Venezuelan Government had, for the second time, broken "the agreement of 1850" by granting licenses to trade and cut wood in Barima and eastward. Later in the same year that Government once more made an overture for the settlement of the boundary. Various delays interposed before negotiations actually commenced; and it was not till 1879 that Señor Rojaz began them with a renewal of the claim to the Essequibo as the eastern boundary of Venezuelan Guiana. At the same time he stated that his Government wished "to obtain, by means of a treaty, a definitive settlement of the question, and was disposed to proceed to the demarcation of the divisional line between the two Guianas in a spirit of conciliation and true friendship toward Her Majesty's Government."

In reply to this communication a note was addressed to Señor Rojaz on the 10th of January, 1880, reminding him that the boundary which Her Majesty's Government claimed, as a matter of strict right on grounds of conquest and concession by treaty, commenced at a point at the mouth of the Orinoco, westward of Point Barima, that it proceeded thence in a southerly direction to the Imataca Mountains, the line of which it followed to the northwest, passing from thence by the high land of Santa Maria just south of the town of Upata until it struck a range of hills on the eastern bank of the Caroni River, following these southward until it struck the great backbone of the Guiana district, the Barima Mountains of British Guiana, and thence southward to the Pacaraima Mountains. On the other hand, the claim which had been put forward on behalf of Venezuela by Gen. Guzman Blanco in his message to the National Congress of the 20th of February, 1877, would involve the surrender of a province now inhabited by 40,000 British subjects, and which had been in the uninterrupted possession of Holland and of Great Britain successively for two centuries.

The difference between these two claims being so great, it was pointed out to Señor Rojaz that, in order to arrive at a satisfactory arrangement, each party must be prepared to make very considerable concessions to the other, and he was assured that, although the claim of Venezuela to the Essequibo River boundary could not, under any circumstances, be entertained, yet that Her Majesty's Government were anxious to meet the Venezuelan Government in a spirit of conciliation, and would be willing, in the event of a renewal of negotiations for the general settlement of boundaries, to waive a portion of what they considered to be their strict rights if Venezuela were really disposed to make corresponding concessions on her part.

The Venezuelan minister replied in February, 1881, by proposing a line which commenced on the coast a mile to the north of the Moroco River, and followed certain parallels and meridians inland, bearing a general resemblance to the proposal made by Lord Aberdeen in 1844.

Señor Rojaz's proposal was referred to the lieutenant-general and attorney-general of British Guiana, who were then in England, and they presented an elaborate report, showing that in the thirty-five years which had elapsed since Lord Aberdeen's proposed concession natives and others had settled in the territory under the belief that they would enjoy the benefits of British rule, and that it was impossible to assent to any such concessions as Señor Rojaz's line would involve. They, however, proposed an alternative line which involved considerable reductions of that laid down by Sir R. Schomburgk.

This boundary was proposed to the Venezuelan Government by Lord Granville in September, 1881, but no answer was ever returned by that Government to the proposal.

While, however, the Venezuelan minister constantly stated that the matter was under active consideration, it was found that in the same year a concession had been given by his Government to General Pulgar which included a large portion of the territory in dispute. This was the third breach by Venezuela of the agreement of 1850.

Early in 1884 news arrived of a fourth breach by Venezuela of the agreement of 1850 through two different grants which covered the whole of the territory in dispute, and as this was followed by actual attempts to settle on the disputed territory, the British Government could no longer remain inactive.

Warning was therefore given to the Venezuelan Government and to the concessionnaires, and a British magistrate was sent into the threatened district to assert the British rights.

Meanwhile the negotiations for a settlement of the boundary had continued, but the only replies that could be obtained from Señor Guzman Blanco, the Venezuelan minister, were proposals for arbitration in different forms, all of which Her Majesty's Government were compelled to decline as involving a submission to the arbitrator of the claim advanced by Venezuela in 1844 to all territory up to the left bank of the Essequibo.

As the progress of settlement by British subjects made a decision of some kind absolutely necessary, and as the Venezuelan Government refused to come to any reasonable arrangement, Her Majesty's Government decided not to repeat the offer of concessions which had not been reciprocated, but to assert their undoubted right to the territory within the Schomburgk line, while still consenting to hold open for further negotiation, and even for arbitration, the unsettled lands between that line and what they considered to be the rightful boundary, as stated in the note to Señor Rojaz of the 10th of January, 1880.

The execution of this decision was deferred for a time, owing to the return of Señor Guzman Blanco to London, and the desire of Lord Rosebery, then secretary of state for foreign affairs, to settle all pending questions between the two Governments. Mr. Olney is mistaken in supposing that in 1886 "a treaty was practically agreed upon containing a general arbitration clause, under which the parties might have submitted the boundary dispute to the decision of a third power, or of several powers in amity with both." It is true that Gen. Guzman Blanco proposed that the commercial treaty between the two countries should contain a clause of this nature, but it had reference to future disputes only. Her Majesty's Government have always insisted on a separate discussion of the frontier question, and have considered its settlement to be a necessary preliminary to other arrangements. Lord Rosebery's proposal, made in July, 1886, was "that the two Governments should agree to consider the territory lying between the boundary lines respectively proposed in the eighth paragraph of Señor Rojaz's note of the 21st of February, 1881, and in Lord Granville's note of the 15th of September, 1881, as the territory in dispute between the two countries, and that a boundary line within the limits of this territory should be traced either by an arbitrator or by a joint commission on the basis of an equal division of this territory, due regard being had to natural boundaries."

Señor Guzman Blanco replied declining the proposal, and repeating that arbitration on the whole claim of Venezuela was the only method of solution which he could suggest. This pretension is hardly less exorbitant than would be a refusal by Great Britain to agree to an arbitration on the boundary of British Columbia and Alaska unless the United States would consent to bring into question one-half of the whole area of the latter territory. He shortly afterwards left England, and as there seemed no hope of arriving at an agreement by further discussions, the Schomburgk line was proclaimed as the irreducible boundary of the colony in October, 1886. It must be borne in mind that in taking this step Her Majesty's Government did not assert anything approaching their extreme claim, but confined themselves within the limits of what had, as early as 1840, been suggested as a concession out of friendly regard and complaisance.

When Señor Guzman Blanco, having returned to Venezuela, announced his intention of erecting a light-house at Point Barima, the British Government expressed their readiness to permit this if he would enter into a formal written agreement that its erection would not be held to prejudice their claim to the site.

In the meanwhile the Venezuelan Government had sent commissioners into the territory to the east of the Schomburgk line, and on their return two notes were addressed to the British minister at Caracas, dated, respectively, the 26th and 31st January, 1887, demanding the evacuation of the whole territory held by Great Britain from the mouth of the Orinoco to the Pomeroon River, and adding that should this not be done by the 20th February, and should the evacuation not be accompanied by the acceptance of arbitration as the means of deciding the pending frontier question, diplomatic relations would be broken off. In pursuance of this decision the British representative at Caracas received his passports, and relations were declared by the Venezuelan Government to be suspended on the 21st February, 1887.

In December of that year, as a matter of precaution, and in order that the claims of Great Britain beyond the Schomburgk line might not be considered to have been abandoned, a notice was issued by the governor of British Guiana formally reserving those claims. No steps have, however, at any time been taken by the British authorities to exercise jurisdiction beyond the Schomburgk line, nor to interfere with the proceedings of the Venezuelans in the territory outside of it, although, pending a settlement of the dispute, Great Britain can not recognize those proceedings as valid, or as conferring any legitimate title.

The question has remained in this position ever since. The bases on which Her Majesty's Government were prepared to negotiate for its settlement were clearly indicated to the Venezuelan plenipotentiaries who were successively dispatched to London in 1890, 1891, and 1893 to negotiate for a renewal of diplomatic relations; but as on those occasions the only solutions which the Venezuelan Government professed themselves ready to accept would still have involved the submission to arbitration of the Venezuelan claim to a large portion of the British colony, no progress has yet been made toward a settlement.

It will be seen from the preceding statement that the Government of Great Britain have from the first held the same view as to the extent of territory which they are entitled to claim as a matter of right. It comprised the coast line up to the River Amacura and the whole basin of the Essequibo River and its tributaries. A portion of that claim, however, they have always been willing to waive altogether; in regard to another portion, they have been and continue to be perfectly ready to submit the question of their title to arbitration. As regards the rest, that which lies within the so-called Schomburgk line, they do not consider that the rights of Great Britain are open to question. Even within that line they have, on various occasions, offered to Venezuela considerable concessions as a matter of friendship and conciliation, and for the purpose of securing an amicable settlement of the dispute. If as time has gone on the concessions thus offered diminished in extent, and have now been withdrawn, this has been the necessary conseqence of the

gradual spread over the country of British settlements, which Her Majesty's Government can not in justice to the inhabitants offer to surrender to foreign rule, and the justice of such withdrawal is amply borne out by the researches in the national archives of Holland and Spain, which have furnished further and more convincing evidence in support of the British claims.

The discrepancies in the frontiers assigned to the British colony in various maps published in England, and erroneously assumed to be founded on official information, are easily accounted for by the circumstances which I have mentioned. Her Majesty's Government can not, of course, be responsible for such publications made without their authority.

Although the negotiations in 1890, 1891, and 1893 did not lead to any result, Her Majesty's Government have not abandoned the hope that they may be resumed with better success, and that when the internal politics of Venezuela are settled on a more durable basis than has lately appeared to be the case her Government may be enabled to adopt a more moderate and conciliatory course in regard to this question than that of their predecessors. Her Majesty's Government are sincerely desirous of being on friendly relations with Venezuela, and certainly have no design to seize territory that properly belongs to her, or forcibly to extend sovereignty over any portion of her population.

They have, on the contrary, repeatedly expressed their readiness to submit to arbitration the conflicting claims of Great Britain and Venezuela to large tracts of territory which from their auriferous nature are known to be of the almost untold value. But they can not consent to entertain, or to submit to arbitration of another power or of foreign jurists, however eminent, claims based on the extravagant pretensions of Spanish officials in the last century, and involving the transfer of large numbers of British subjects, who have for many years enjoyed the settled rule of a British colony, to a nation of different race and language, whose political system is subject to frequent disturbance, and whose institutions as yet too often afford very inadequate protection to life and property. No issue of this description has ever been involved in the questions which Great Britain and the United States have consented to submit to arbitration, and Her Majesty's Government are convinced that in similar circumstances the Government of the United States would be equally firm in declining to entertain proposals of such a nature.

Your excellency is authorized to state the substance of this dispatch to Mr. Olney, and to leave him a copy of it if he should desire it.

Mr. MORGAN. I move the reference of the message which has just been read, with the accompanying documents, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask that the Committee on Foreign Relations may have leave to sit during any recess of Congress that may occur.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SHERMAN. As there is no special business pending, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 18, 1895, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 17, 1895.

SUPERINTENDENT OF MINT.

Herman Kretz, of Pennsylvania, to be superintendent of the United States mint at Philadelphia, Pa., to succeed Eugene Townsend, resigned.

ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY.

Edward A. Bowers, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Comptroller of the Treasury, in place of Charles H. Mansur, deceased.

AUDITOR FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

William H. Pugh, of Ohio, to be Auditor for the Navy Department, to succeed Charles B. Morton, removed.

COINER OF THE MINT.

William E. Morgan, of Pennsylvania, to be coiner of the United States mint at Philadelphia, Pa., to succeed W. S. Steele, resigned.

INTERNAL REVENUE COLLECTORS.

Fitzhugh Lee, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Virginia, in place of Hambleton Shepperd, deceased.

John C. Kelley, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of New York, in place of A. Augustus Healey, whose nomination was rejected by the Senate.

Samuel L. Rogers, of North Carolina, to be collector of internal revenue for the Fifth district of North Carolina, in place of M. E. Carter, deceased.

William D. Rutan, of New Jersey, to be collector of internal revenue for the Fifth district of New Jersey, to succeed James F. Connelly, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Philip R. Bradley, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Dunkirk, in the State of New York, to succeed J. C. Haggett, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

David G. Browne. of Montana, to be collector of customs for the district of Montana and Idaho, in the States of Montana and Idaho; reappointment.

Cornelius B. Crandall, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for the district of Stonington, in the State of Connecticut, to succeed Charles T. Stanton, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

Dorsey Clagett, of the District of Columbia, to be collector of customs for the district of Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, to succeed William H. Manogue, resigned.

John Desmond, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Fall River, in the State of Massachusetts, to succeed James Brady, jr., whose term of office has expired by limitation.

George W. Drisko, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Machias, in the State of Maine, to succeed Eldridge H. Bryant, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

Albert H. Mickler, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of St. Augustine, in the State of Florida, to succeed William Mickler, removed.

James E. Otis, of New Jersey, to be collector of customs for the district of Little Egg Harbor, in the State of New Jersey, to succeed Samuel P. Bartlett, resigned.

Frank C. Richardson, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Gloucester, in the State of Massachusetts, to succeed William A. Pew, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

Sidney R. Riggin, of Maryland, to be collector of customs for the eastern district in the State of Maryland, in place of H. H. Dashiel, deceased.

SPECIAL EXAMINER OF DRUGS, ETC.

J. Thomas Leary, of Massachusetts, to be special examiner of drugs, medicines, and chemicals in the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts, to succeed Andrew H. Ward, removed.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Albert B. Stearns, of Massachusetts, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts, to succeed Lewis A. Dodge, removed.

ASSISTANT APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

Thomas H. Craven, of New York, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York, to succeed Eben Demarest, removed.

Henry P. Kitfield, of Massachusetts, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts, to succeed Thomas Dunham, removed.

Joseph J. Morrison, of New York, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York, in place of Perry T. Cumberson, deceased.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

William A. Bray, of Indiana, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Michigan City, in the State of Indiana, to succeed Charles J. Robb, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

George S. Cleaves, of New York, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Greenport, in the State of New York, to succeed E. S. Havens, resigned.

James H. Collins, of Tennessee, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Nashville, in the State of Tennessee, to succeed Herman A. Hasslock, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

POSTMASTERS.

Thomas J. Cole, to be postmaster at Platte City, in the county of Platte and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

William D. Crow, to be postmaster at Clarence, in the county of Shelby and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

Joseph A. Mintrup, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Franklin and State of Missouri, in the place of James I. Jones, resigned.

Garry A. Pratt, to be postmaster at Appleton City, in the county of St. Clair and State of Missouri, in the place of Charles C. Hilton, whose commission expired January 27, 1895.

Elmer C. Trueblood, to be postmaster at Maryville, in the county of Nodaway and State of Missouri, in the place of James Todd, resigned.

Thomas H. Walker, to be postmaster at Bonneterre, in the county of St. François and State of Missouri, in the place of R. C. Deggendorf, whose commission expired January 6, 1895.

Henry P. White, to be postmaster at West Plains, in the county of Howell and State of Missouri, in the place of J. A. Truex, whose commission expired April 12, 1894.

Allen P. Bowie, to be postmaster at Philipsburg, in the county of Granite and State of Montana, in the place of E. L. Proebsting, resigned.

Jerome H. Bradley, to be postmaster at Hamilton, in the county of Ravalli and State of Montana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

Willis E. Dowell, to be postmaster at Missoula, in the county of Missoula and State of Montana, in the place of H. C. Meyers, whose commission expired March 3, 1895.

John F. Bradshaw, to be postmaster at Superior, in the county of Nuckolls and State of Nebraska, in the place of Johnathan T. Miller, resigned.

Katharine Du Bois, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Saunders and State of Nebraska, in the place of T. J. Pickett, jr., resigned.

John F. Early, to be postmaster at Wilber, in the county of Saline and State of Nebraska, in the place of William H. Mann, whose commission expired February 9, 1895.

Michael M. Huck, to be postmaster at Schuyler, in the county of Colfax and State of Nebraska, in the place of G. H. Wells, whose commission expired March 3, 1895.

Ida B. Morse, to be postmaster at Atkinson, in the county of Holt and State of Nebraska, in the place of A. L. Morse, deceased.

Orlando S. Parmelee, to be postmaster at Tekamah, in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, in the place of W. H. Korns, resigned.

John T. Amey, to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Coos and State of New Hampshire, in place of E. V. Cobleigh, whose commission expired January 27, 1895.

Rufus E. Bean, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

John O'Loughlin, to be postmaster at Laconia, in the county of Belknap and State of New Hampshire, in the place of J. G. Jewett, whose commission expired February 27, 1895.

Luther Clarke, to be postmaster at Eureka, in the county of Eureka and State of Nevada, in the place of W. J. Smith, whose commission expired February 9, 1895.

Isaac N. Sherwood, to be postmaster at Elko, in the county of Elko and State of Nevada, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Patrick Burns, to be postmaster at Raritan, in the county of Somerset and State of New Jersey, in the place of C. Ehni, whose commission expired October 1, 1894.

D. Lane Conover, to be postmaster at Atlantic Highlands, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey, in the place of James M. Leonard, deceased.

Milton Cowperthwaite, to be postmaster at Riverton, in the county of Burlington and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

J. Elwood Harvey, to be postmaster at Little Silver, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Joseph E. Haynes, to be postmaster at Newark, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in the place of William D. Rutan, resigned.

Alfred Jarvis, to be postmaster at Tenafly, in the county of Bergen and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Edward O'Farrell, to be postmaster at Bayonne, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey, in the place of Frederick Boorman, whose commission expired January 9, 1895.

James R. Pitcher, to be postmaster at Short Hills, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in the place of Albert A. Manda, removed.

Benjamin F. Sweeten, to be postmaster at Glassboro, in the county of Gloucester and State of New Jersey, in the place of John Gandy, whose commission expired January 6, 1895.

Mary A. Van Cleve, to be postmaster at Irvington, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Stephen Van Order, to be postmaster at Caldwell, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Albert F. Ries, to be postmaster at Gallup, in the county of Bernalillo and Territory of New Mexico, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

Jerome E. Baker, to be postmaster at Mexico, in the county of Oswego and State of New York, in the place of W. A. Robbins, resigned.

Augustus Blood, to be postmaster at Brockton, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

John S. Brooks, to be postmaster at Tuxedo Park, in the county of Orange and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

George L. Brown, to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, in the county of Essex and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Disbrow Budd, to be postmaster at Rye, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in the place of Daniel Budd, deceased.

Joseph H. Damon, to be postmaster at East Syracuse, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Ernest T. Fletcher, to be postmaster at Tupper Lake, in the county of Franklin and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Myron W. Gurnee, to be postmaster at Sodus, in the county of Wayne and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

William W. Henry, to be postmaster at Little Valley, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Edward Kernan, to be postmaster at Whitesboro, in the county of Oneida and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

John Laubenthal, to be postmaster at Allegany, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York, in the place of William Spraker, removed.

William E. McDonell, to be postmaster at Alexandria Bay, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York, in the place of F. W. Barker, removed.

Arthur R. Moore, to be postmaster at Fredonia, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York, in the place of W. B. Barker, removed.

John R. Murray, to be postmaster at Oceanus, in the county of Queens and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Lillian I. Pearsall, to be postmaster at Sea Cliff, in the county of Queens and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Willard Peck, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Columbia and State of New York, in the place of J. M. Johnson, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

John Reidy, to be postmaster at Morrisville, in the county of Madison and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

George A. Richmond, to be postmaster at Springville, in the county of Erie and State of New York, in the place of G. H. Barker, whose commission expired February 2, 1895.

Asaph W. Shurtleff, to be postmaster at Weedsport, in the county of Cayuga and State of New York, in the place of W. H. Stickle, deceased.

William P. Smith, to be postmaster at Castleton, in the county of Rensselaer and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

Henry Stowell, to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, in the county of Seneca and State of New York, in the place of C. T. Andrews, removed.

Charles E. Vanorsdale, to be postmaster at Windsor, in the county of Broome and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Charles S. Ware, to be postmaster at Mount Kisco, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in the place of W. I. Halstead, whose commission expired January 9, 1895.

John Wiss, to be postmaster at Le Roy, in the county of Genesee and State of New York, in the place of Samuel T. Howard, removed.

William S. Wright, to be postmaster at Marlboro, in the county of Ulster and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Joseph J. Barrow, to be postmaster at Louisburg, in the county of Franklin and State of North Carolina, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

James M. Brookshire, to be postmaster at Biltmore, in the county of Buncombe and State of North Carolina, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Benjamin H. Bunn, to be postmaster at Rocky Mount, in the

county of Edgecombe and State of North Carolina, in the place of Bennett Bunn, deceased.

Joseph S. Hunt, to be postmaster at Oxford, in the county of Granville and State of North Carolina, in the place of George W. Knott, resigned.

George B. King, to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Pitt and State of North Carolina, in the place of J. J. Perkins, removed.

William F. Marshall, to be postmaster at Gastonia, in the county of Gaston and State of North Carolina, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

William Ray, to be postmaster at Dickinson, in the county of Stark and State of North Dakota, in the place of J. C. Thompson, removed.

Frank Reed, to be postmaster at Bismarck, in the county of Burleigh and State of North Dakota, in the place of Israel P. Hunt, deceased.

James D. Robertson, to be postmaster at Grafton, in the county of Walsh and State of North Dakota, in the place of Edward L. Bretnor, removed.

Mary Beyersdorfer, to be postmaster at Ripley, in the county of Brown and State of Ohio, in the place of J. C. Newcomb, whose commission expired February 9, 1895.

William Bleckner, to be postmaster at Oakharbor, in the county of Ottawa and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Charles Edgar Brown, to be postmaster at Cincinnati, in the county of Hamilton and State of Ohio, in the place of John Zumstein, whose commission expired February 9, 1895.

Edgar L. Cory, to be postmaster at Degraff, in the county of Logan and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

Adolph F. Greenbaum, to be postmaster at Waverly, in the county of Pike and State of Ohio, in the place of E. Spencer, removed.

John C. Hutchins, to be postmaster at Cleveland, in the county of Cuyahoga and State of Ohio, in the place of A. T. Anderson, whose commission expired March 3, 1895.

Mary J. Jacobs, to be postmaster at Pawnee, in the county of Pawnee and Territory of Oklahoma, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

William H. Padon, to be postmaster at Blackwell, in the county of "K" and Territory of Oklahoma, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

William R. Swartout, to be postmaster at North Enid, in the county of Garfield and Territory of Oklahoma, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

William S. Thomas, to be postmaster at New Ponca, in the county of K and Territory of Oklahoma, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 17, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under Rule XXIV, clause 2, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of the acts, resolutions, and journals of the Oklahoma legislature, together with copies of the compiled statutes of the Territory; which was referred to the Committee on the Territories.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, relating to the annual report of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of the acts, resolutions, memorials, and journals of the Territorial legislature of New Mexico; which was referred to the Committee on the Territories.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of the acts, memorials, resolutions, and journals of the Eighteenth legislative assembly of Arizona; which was referred to the Committee on the Territories.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination as to the sum of money necessary to acquire by purchase the locks and dams on the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania, and also as to the value, etc., of said improvements; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President, in writing, was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. GARRETT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, in paper covers, 6,000 extra copies of the annual report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy at West Point for the year 1895, of which 2,000 shall be for use of the Senate and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

PORTS OF ENTRY, INDIANA AND ILLINOIS.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire to move to concur in a Senate amendment to a House bill that was passed here the other day on the motion of my colleague, Mr. HOPKINS, who is absent at this time. The matter was brought up yesterday and at the request of my colleague, Mr. SMITH, it went over. He has since examined the bill and is quite content with the proposed action.

The bill (H. R. 808) was read.

The amendment of the Senate was read, as follows:

Amend in line 14, after the word "law," by inserting "*Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal the provisions of the act approved August 7, 1882, which embraces East St. Louis, Ill., within the limits of the port of St. Louis, Mo."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the question will be on concurring in the Senate amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, when my colleague, Mr. CANNON, called up this bill, I did not rise for the purpose of objecting to its consideration, but as there is a port within my district, I desired to ascertain whether the passage of this bill would in any manner affect the status of that port. I have since examined the question and find that it does not, and therefore I have no objection to the passage of the bill with this amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

AMENDMENT OF HOUSE RULES.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire now to offer an amendment, which I send to the desk, to clause 1 of Rule X, and also to Rule XI.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House be amended as follows, namely:

"That clause 1 of Rule X read as follows:

"'1. Unless otherwise specially ordered by the House, the Speaker shall appoint, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees, viz:

"'On Elections, three committees, to consist of nine members each, to be called number one (1), two (2), and three (3), respectively.
"'On Ways and Means, to consist of seventeen members.
"'On Appropriations, to consist of seventeen members.
"'On the Judiciary, to consist of seventeen members.
"'On Banking and Currency, to consist of seventeen members.
"'On Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to consist of seventeen members.
"'On Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consist of seventeen members.
"'On Rivers and Harbors, to consist of seventeen members.
"'On the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Agriculture, to consist of seventeen members.
"'On Foreign Affairs, to consist of fifteen members.
"'On Military Affairs, to consist of fifteen members.
"'On Naval Affairs, to consist of fifteen members.
"'On the Post-Office and Post-Roads, to consist of seventeen members.
"'On the Public Lands, to consist of fifteen members.
"'On Indian Affairs, to consist of seventeen members.
"'On the Territories, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Railways and Canals, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Manufactures, to consist of eleven members.
"'On Mines and Mining, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Public Buildings and Grounds, to consist of fifteen members.
"'On Pacific Railroads, to consist of fifteen members.
"'On Levees and Improvement of the Mississippi River, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Education, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Labor, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On the Militia, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Patents, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Invalid Pensions, to consist of fifteen members.
"'On Pensions, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Claims, to consist of fifteen members.
"'On War Claims, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Private Land Claims, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On the District of Columbia, to consist of fifteen members.
"'On Revision of the Laws, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Reform in the Civil Service, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress, to consist of thirteen members.
"'On Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, to consist of eleven members.
"'On Irrigation of Arid Lands, to consist of eleven members.
"'On Immigration and Naturalization, to consist of eleven members.
"'On Ventilation and Acoustics, to consist of seven members.
"'On Expenditures in the State Department, to consist of seven members.

"'On Expenditures in the Treasury Department, to consist of seven members.
"'On Expenditures in the War Department, to consist of seven members.
"'On Expenditures in the Navy Department, to consist of seven members.
"'On Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, to consist of seven members.
"'On Expenditures in the Interior Department, to consist of seven members.
"'On Expenditures in the Department of Justice, to consist of seven members.
"'On Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, to consist of seven members.
"'On Expenditures on Public Buildings, to consist of seven members.
"'On Rules, to consist of five members.
"'On Accounts, to consist of nine members.
"'On Mileage, to consist of five members.'
"Also the following joint standing committees, viz:
"'On the Library, to consist of three members.
"'On Printing, to consist of three members.
"'On Enrolled Bills, to consist of seven members.'
"That clause 1 of Rule XI read as follows:
"'1. To the election of members: to the respective committees on elections.'
"In clause 7 of Rule XI, strike out the words 'Committee on Commerce' and insert the words 'Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.'
"After clause 34 of Rule XI, insert the following:
"'35. To reform the civil service: to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service;
"'36. To the election of the President, Vice-President, or Representatives in Congress: to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress;
"'37. To alcoholic liquor traffic: to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic;
"'38. To the irrigation of arid lands: to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands;
"'39. To immigration or naturalization: to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization;
"'40. To ventilation and acoustics: to the Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics.'
"That the numbering of clauses 35 to 52, inclusive, of Rule XI, be changed to conform to the foregoing amendment."

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If I have the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], I suggest that the amendment here proposed be adopted by unanimous consent except (if he so desires) that the clause touching the Committee on Elections—the amendments proposed to clause 1 of Rule X and clause 1 of Rule X — be left undisposed of. The other amendments, about which, as I understand from the gentleman from Georgia, there is no contest, might, by unanimous consent, be considered at once and adopted.

Mr. CRISP. The other amendments which the gentleman asks be adopted by unanimous consent relate simply to increasing the number of members on various committees. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRISP. I think there is no objection to that.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Then, I ask that by unanimous consent this amendment, except as to the clauses indicated, be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The proposition is that this proposed amendment, except those parts relating to clause 1 of Rule X and clause 1 of Rule XI, be adopted by unanimous consent. Is there objection?

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The question is now upon agreeing to the remainder of the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The action just taken by the House renders it unnecessary for me to refer to the matters covered by such action. Of the amendments remaining undisposed of, the first provides—

That clause 1 of Rule X read as follows:
"On elections, three committees, to consist of nine members each, to be numbered one, two, and three, respectively."

The amendment, as will be seen, proposes to create three committees of nine members each.

A MEMBER. Two new committees?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, it will create three committees of nine members each in lieu of the single committee authorized by the rules now.

Then, in Rule XI, clause 1 shall read as follows:

In making assignments of election cases:
To the elections of members: To the respective committees on elections.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, both of these amendments should be adopted. The last necessarily would be if the first is, so that the only question presented by the amendment is whether or not the rule of the Fifty-first Congress—or the rule of this Congress already adopted—providing for one Committee on Elections, to consist of 15 members, shall be so amended as to strike out "one" and "fifteen" and make it read "three Committees on Elections of nine members each." The necessity, in my judgment, for the adoption of the amendment arises from the peculiar condition of the business touching contests before this House.

Perhaps, with one exception, there never has been so great a number of contests as are now pending for the decision of the House. As gentlemen are aware, the House is the only judge of the election and qualifications of its members. The law provides the manner in which contests shall be made.

I hold in my hand a report from the Clerk touching these cases, and I beg the attention of the members present while I speak of these thirty-two cases and the amount of work their consideration will involve. Four of these cases come from the State of Alabama, one from the State of Georgia, two from the State of Kentucky, three from the State of Louisiana, one from Maryland, one from Missouri, one from Mississippi, three from North Carolina, four from South Carolina, three from the State of Texas, and four from the State of Virginia, making twenty-seven of the thirty-two contests coming from the so-called Southern States. A mere statement of this fact will convince gentlemen who are familiar with the proceedings of former Congresses in connection with election contests that the lifetime of this Congress will pass before one-half of these cases could be considered by one Committee on Elections and reported to the House and considered by it.

But let us look for a moment to the amount of work involved. The printed record in these cases averages 530 pages of testimony, and the brief added thereto would make 625 pages, that being the average of the printed record in each case. With reference to the politics involved in these cases, if I may speak for a moment of that branch of the subject connected with the contests pending, all of the contestees are Democrats. Twenty-two of the 32 contestants are Republicans, 8 are Populists, 1 is an Independent Democrat, and 1 a Fusionist.

In the Forty-first Congress there were about the same number of cases pending. Eleven had been disposed of by the House, leaving twenty-four pending, if I recollect aright, or about that number, with an average record, not of 600 pages, but of 420 pages; and the Committee on Rules unanimously reported an order that the Committee on Elections be increased to fifteen members, that it be divided into subcommittees of three, that these subcommittees should report to the House on the cases presented to them, thus practically making five Elections Committees, although there was but one in name. That rule brought the House to the consideration of cases on the report of three of the members of the Committee on Elections, the cases never having received the consideration or report of the full committee. The amendment proposed here does not suggest such a method as that. It was thought best that the subcommittees should review the cases, go through the records, and report to the full committee, so that the House would have the opinion of nine members of the House acting as a Committee of Elections upon each one of the contested cases. In the Forty-first Congress the order to which I have referred, and which was adopted, was reported by Mr. Garfield. Mr. Cox and Mr. Brooks, on the minority of the Committee on Rules, cordially indorsed the order, because it was evident then, as it is evident now, that under the ordinary machinery the cases could not be reached and heard at all.

Let me refer for a moment to the disposition of cases in former Congresses for the benefit of gentlemen who have not personal recollection touching them. In the Forty-eighth Congress there were fourteen cases of contested elections—eleven of them were acted upon in the House. In the Forty-ninth Congress there were ten cases, and only four, I think, were acted upon by the House. In the Fiftieth Congress there were eight contests, and seven of them were acted upon by the House. In the Fifty-first Congress seventeen contests were made, and twelve were disposed of in the House. In the Fifty-second Congress there were six contests, and only four were disposed of in the House; and in the Fifty-third Congress, eleven contests, and only seven were acted upon by the House.

So it will be seen that each one of these proposed three committees will have before it more work than the average work that has been cast upon one committee heretofore. Now, gentlemen will recollect that in former Congresses, toward the end of a Congress, the public business has pressed to that degree that the House could not find time to dispose of election cases, and there has frequently been a denial of justice to contestants or of vindication to contestees. Early in the first session of a Congress the House has its greatest leisure, and it is hoped that if these three committees are created they will give such proper consideration to these cases and make such early report that the House, before it is overwhelmed by other public business, can in an orderly manner dispose of the cases upon their merits.

It may be objected—I do not know that it will be—that this is unduly hurrying the consideration of election cases. That objection will not lie upon the merits. I wish that we had enough of the attributes of the Deity in this House to know the very right touching each one of these cases, so that we could know in fact which one, the contestant or the contestee, was elected, and that we could settle it in the twinkling of an eye. Because then the constituency would be truly represented. In the absence of that knowledge the best we can do is to settle them as early as they can be settled upon the law of the fact.

One other remark. We have upon this side of the House 20 more members now than two-thirds of the House. We are rich in membership; and I may say, in passing, to this side of the House—it is not entirely pertinent—as I get acquainted with the membership it seems to me that we are rich in quality as well as in numbers. Whatever may have been the case in former Con-

gresses, I apprehend if there have been abuses touching election cases, that honors are easy. There is no purpose and no temptation at this time to do anything else except to decide cases according to the very right; and so far as I have knowledge or belief, no contestant has been led to believe for a moment that he can have any standing in the House of Representatives unless he has a standing upon the facts; and I believe, aye, more, while I am not a prophet, I am willing to prophesy here and now that in the decision of these election cases the record of the Fifty-fourth Congress will stand out as a good example in the decision of these cases according to the very right. I care not what the man's politics may be, he is not entitled to have a seat in this House unless the people chose him. I care not what his politics may be, he is entitled to a seat in this House if a majority or plurality of his people said so.

It is apt that we inquire a minute as to the sound policy, at this time especially, of disposing of these cases as rapidly as they can be readily disposed of. It is wonderful, when I restate it, that twenty-seven of these cases come from the Southland and only five come from the North.

Now, I am not here to make any charges against the South, but I apprehend there is a condition of affairs there that, in justice to Republicans, in justice to Populists, in justice to Democrats as well, these contests should be disposed of. I have no desire here to arouse anything like partisan feeling or to talk of one section of the country at the expense of the other. But men of middle age understand what has been taking place for the last thirty years in the United States. All of us recollect something of the civil war and of the great contest for reconstruction—of the clothing with citizenship of a whole race of people who had been in bondage. All of us understand the complaints that were made by large sections of the Southern people, somewhat at times, no doubt, through prejudice, and somewhat at times, perhaps, upon the merits, that they were largely left at the mercy of those who had lately been in bondage and who were without, on the average, sufficient intelligence to rule over their localities.

I do not desire to go into that subject; but suffice it to say, it will not be contested upon either side of the House that throughout the southern portion of the so-called South, especially, through these years, first by force the lately enfranchised citizens were deprived of the ballot. Later on by fraud they were deprived of the ballot, and the men who deprived them, when taxed with it, proclaimed that that was the only alternative, as they claimed, that stood between them and local destruction. The years rolled by, and with the Federal election laws upon the statute book, laws that in my judgment were unduly criticised, they were enabled, first by violence and then by manipulation, to make their section substantially solid, and substantially solid in favor of one party. In the fullness of time, as we got more knowledge North, and as they got more knowledge South, and as the prejudices faded away, wisely or unwisely as the case may be, whatever there was of Federal legislation touching Federal elections, whether good or bad, was swept from the statute book and the late elections were held throughout the length and breadth of the country without the aid of the Federal election laws. What was the result? They had the condition in the South which they had long proclaimed that they wanted, namely, that under the operation of State laws and a local sentiment that had, as they claimed, its foothold in righteousness and justice, they would regulate their own local affairs and send to the National Congress their representatives, and that they would send them according to the will of the majority.

Now, it is alleged that in this, the first election, I believe—if not the first, the second—since the repeal of the Federal election laws, it is alleged by many people whose footsteps are rooted in the soil of the South, who were born there, who love her institutions, who are native to the section—it is alleged by them, not by ones, by tens, or by thousands, but by multiplied thousands, that with this change there was no longer power in the former dominant party to draw the color line and frighten the white people there, threatening them with colored domination; and at last it was claimed in the late canvass that white men stood looking white men in the face and said, "We will not divide and we can not divide upon the color line, but we will divide and vote touching the proper economic policies that will bring the greatest good to the greatest number, North and South, East and West." It is alleged that they did so divide. Now, there are large blocks of people in the State of Alabama, in the State of Tennessee, in the States of South and North Carolina, and other Southern States, that proclaim and say, whatever the truth may be (I am speaking of what they allege), that while force did not dominate in the last elections, frauds still continued, and that the dominant party, which had justified this action of many years' standing to turn down the colored vote, turned its hand, clothed with fraud, upon their white brethren and fraudulently turned them down.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to me one moment?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman tell me a single instance in Tennessee where that state of affairs has occurred?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I intended to come to that; but I will answer it right here, as I am challenged.

Mr. COX. I challenge you.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will ask the Clerk to read as marked.

Mr. COX. That is in a newspaper.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. It will speak for itself, and then I will ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. COX. All right.

The Clerk read as follows:

"What of the political outlook in Tennessee?"

"It will be a miracle if the Democrats are successful in electing their State ticket next year. In common with thousands of other Democrats who voted for Governor Turney, I condemned the counting out of H. Clay Evans. Whatever may have been done in the past, there is no longer any excuse for carrying elections by fraud. The time has come when absolute fairness and justice must prevail in the choice of public officials. There isn't a shadow of danger of negro domination in Tennessee. We have the Australian ballot law, which excludes the ignorant voter, and so the intelligence of the State will dominate just as it has in the past.

"But the fair-minded and honorable men, who constitute the great majority of the Democratic party in the State, are sick and tired of the machine methods and devious practices that have been so long in use by a political ring at Nashville, and the prospects are bright for the permanent turning down of this office-holding clique. The election of the Republican ticket next year will be the answer to the counting out of Evans, and no doubt many Democrats will contribute to this result."

Mr. COX. What paper is that in?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In a moment. The Clerk will please send me the slip.

Mr. COX. Let me see what paper that is from?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will give the gentleman exactly the source it comes from.

Mr. COX. That is right; let us be fair now. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am going to.

This is from an interview in the Washington Post of this morning with Mr. A. B. Pickett, editor of the Memphis Scimitar, as I am informed, a Democratic paper of long standing, and while I am not acquainted with this gentleman, he is said to be a man of character. I do not know him personally.

Mr. COX. Now you are basing your argument upon what a correspondent says to a newspaper.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will answer further; I have not made any charge against Tennessee, Alabama, or any other State. I took care not to precipitate a partisan debate by making any claim as to what the facts were. I said "it was alleged" by multiplied thousands of white people of character, born and reared in Tennessee and elsewhere throughout the Southern country, that in the late elections fraud was resorted to against white people that did not agree with them, as it had frequently been resorted to against the colored people upon the plea that it had to be resorted to there in local self-defense.

Now, then, in further answer to the gentleman, as a matter of common history, I do know that H. Clay Evans was reported to have been elected governor of the State of Tennessee. I do not know whether he was elected or not; but I do know that from time to time, so far as I am informed, the Republicans unanimously claimed that he was elected, and that a very large per cent of the Democracy denounced his counting out and seating his opponent as fraudulent. I will ask the gentleman, as he is from Tennessee, whether that per cent of his own party that so proclaimed are men of character?

Mr. COX. I will answer the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I just want a brief answer.

Mr. COX. I will make it as brief as I can. Do not curtail me.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, well, I will not yield to the gentleman for a speech.

Mr. COX. All right; but when you put a question to me I am not going to answer it except in my own way.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The gentleman will have an opportunity in his own time to answer.

Mr. COX. Oh, well, if the gentleman determines to exclude me, that is all right.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I desire to make a suggestion to the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman tell me what this has to do——

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Let me suggest that the Nashville Banner and the Chattanooga Times are Democratic newspapers, and I will ask whether they did not constantly and do not now insist that Mr. Evans was elected governor?

Mr. COX. I will say to the gentleman that neither one of the papers is a Democratic paper.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN]. What was his question?

Mr. McMILLIN. What I wanted to know was this: My friend from Illinois is generally pointed in our discussions here and sticks

to the question, but I want to ask him what an election in Tennessee has to do with his proposition to make a three-headed Committee on Elections for the consideration of the thirty-odd cases that are pending here? The gubernatorial contest in Tennessee which was finally determined by the kind of investigation that was provided for in the State constitution of 1870 has nothing to do with this question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. There is not a single contest from Tennessee.

Mr. McMILLIN. There is not a single contest from the State of Tennessee, and if the gentleman from Illinois will keep his own linen clean he will do exceedingly well. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I had not referred to his State, as I recollect, until his colleague [Mr. COX] challenged me.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman is in error.

Mr. COX (to Mr. CANNON). You made the assault first.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not yield.

Mr. COX. Pardon me one moment. I——

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. No, sir; I do not yield.

Mr. COX. Now, you ought to concede that you made the assault before I opened my mouth. You ought to let me make that point. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Not just now.

Mr. COX. All right. Do not jump, though, until you know what you are doing. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I again say that I commenced my remarks by stating that twenty-seven of the thirty-two contests now pending came from Southern States, and only five from the so-called Northern States. I do not know, nor do I charge, that there have been unfair elections recently in any State in the South, but I do know that in former years I heard gentlemen standing on this floor defend frauds in elections, alleging that they were necessary in self-defense to escape the control of the colored vote. I do know, further, that, with the Federal election laws repealed, and with only the local laws of the various States to rely upon, with the division in the white vote down South which has come at last, thank God, great numbers of gentlemen from Alabama and from other places in the South allege that fraud was committed in the late elections. Some of these gentlemen say they are Populists; some say they are Republicans; and they allege that frauds have been committed against them.

I repeat, I do not know what the facts may be, but if I were to go into the domain of speculation I would guess that where fraud had formerly been legalized and justified, from any standpoint or under any necessity, it would take time after the alleged necessity had passed away to recover from the effects of such abuses and to avoid a repetition of them. What the facts may be I do not know, but I am confronted with this fact, unprecedented, that there come here 27 contestants alleging that they were elected, and demanding, what they have a right to demand, that their cases shall be heard and decided fairly and promptly, and that the people of their respective districts—aye, the white people as well as the colored—who exercise the right of suffrage there, shall be truly represented and voiced upon this floor.

If the facts do not throw stones, then I throw none. If there have been abuses there I feel quite sure that both the gentlemen from Tennessee ought to, and I believe that if they will divest themselves of partisanship they will, run swiftfooted along with this side of the House to do exact justice to the people of those election districts.

Mr. Speaker, I desire——

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In a moment.

Mr. COX. In the last election in Tennessee your side of the House gained two members, and I want to ask you whether there is a single contest from that State, either by a Democrat or a Republican, in regard to the election of members to this House?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, is the gentleman sorry for that?

Mr. COX. I am glad of it.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. So am I.

Mr. COX. Well, then, we are together, and what are you bothering about? [Laughter.] Until you can put your finger upon the point where you say unfairness was committed you ought not to charge it.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. COX. "Oh"—that is no answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Gentlemen who have heard me will bear me out in saying that I have been careful, in language, in manner, and in statement, not to allege fraud against anybody. But let me say this to the gentleman: If I can not discuss in this careful manner what is alleged by gentlemen from Alabama, from the Carolinas, and from other States in the South—if I can not mention these allegations, without even indorsing their truth—the allegations of men who are the gentleman's peers and my peers—if I can not repeat what they allege as a basis to gain a standing in the National House of Representatives by way of a contest that will afford them the privilege of demonstrating the facts which they allege, or of having their falsity demonstrated—if I can not speak of these things without the gentlemen growing thick in the blood vessels of the neck and turning upon me with flashing eyes and saying that I am abusing the people of his State, what does it all mean? I am proud of my people and of his people, and he can not find, in my service as a member of the House in the twenty years that I have served here, an instance where I have brought an untrue allegation or have spoken in malice against them at any time.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman pardon me one moment? I do not know how the blood is running in his veins——

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. What is your question, my friend?

Mr. COX. Hold on. [Laughter.] I have seen your blood run to the top of your head many times——

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. What is your question?

Mr. COX. Hold on. Do not make insinuations without having any foundation for them. I challenge you to show that there is any contest in this House in regard to a single election of a member of this House from Tennessee. There is not one.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I am glad of it.

Mr. COX. So am I.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Very well; we agree, then.

Mr. COX. Then, why do you make your imputations against us?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh——

Mr. COX. "Oh." Now, you credit us with acting fairly until you can show that we do otherwise.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not yield.

Mr. COX. All right. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not yield to the gentleman further.

Mr. COX. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I would not interrupt him; but he stretched his blanket until it broke the seams.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I always try, as I have said, to be courteous in this House. The gentleman says there is no contest from Tennessee. I am glad of it. He challenged me to know what of unfairness had been done in the late elections in Tennessee. Without alleging unfairness I said it was alleged by Republicans—and unanimously conceded by a great majority of the Democratic party—that the man who is now governor of Tennessee sits clothed with fraud, as a representative of the minority and not of the majority. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman think he has got anything to do with that?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not yield further.

Mr. COX. All right.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not know whether that allegation is true or not. I pray God it may not be true. But I think I know—at least I believe—one thing. At last the passions, the prejudices, the divisions throughout the length and breadth of this country, North and South, growing out of the civil war with all that it included, have faded away until finally, thank God, there come into this House from the Southland Republicans with their feet in the soil and with character and ability second to none, North or South. [Applause.] I am glad to know and believe that even down in the so-called "black States" the beginning of the end has come, and with that a division between Anglo-Saxons, so that where there is abuse, if there be abuse now, there will be correction of it a little later on. And it is our duty in this House of Representatives, as to these twenty-seven election cases brought here under the circumstances I have spoken of and appealing for an honest, square hearing, to devise the machinery which will determine these cases according to the very fact, and justify the contestants in their accusation or relieve the contestee from the accusation, as the facts may warrant.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I reserve that time.

Mr. CRISP addressed the Chair. (A pause.)

Mr. CRISP. I addressed the Chair some time ago, but have not yet been recognized.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to yield his time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and consequently did not look in the direction of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Later on, I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He does not desire to be heard at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Illinois, and I am opposed to it because whatever may be the design or purpose of those who propose it, its effect and operation will be injustice to the contestees who are sitting members of this House.

It is all very well to talk about a judicial investigation. The

gentleman from Illinois has been a member of this House for twenty years and more, I believe. He protests when on his feet that he only wants justice; and yet he is unable to discuss a proposition which he says is in the interest of fairness and justice without taking counsel of his bitter partisanship. [Applause.] The gentleman says he is not a partisan. I beg to differ with him. We are not always the best judges of the character we have in the estimation of our fellow-men. The gentleman from Illinois, in presenting a proposition which he says is in the interest of fairness and justice, has gone out of his way to excite prejudice against sections of this country. And he has not confined himself to the fact when he did it.

We may just as well talk plainly about this proposition. For the first time in our history we are invited to appoint three Committees on Election. Although there have been more contests heretofore than now, never before has such a suggestion been made. What is the purpose? Gentlemen say it is to give a fair and honest investigation of each case. What is there—I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the majority of this House—what is there in the history of the Republican party or in its practice respecting contested elections, to warrant us or anyone in believing that we shall have in this Congress a fair and impartial investigation of an election contest? Think about it, you older members! I suppose a new member coming to this Congress thinks—I know I did when I first came here—that inasmuch as the Constitution provides that each House shall be the judge of the elections of its members, that provision means something—that this House proposes to consider these questions as judges. But however individual members on the other side may desire to consider such questions, let me tell them now they will be swept away by the common sentiment on that side, and they will give in their adhesion to the principle that was announced, or is said to have been announced, many years ago in this House by a distinguished Republican. It was told of him that he came in when the House was about to vote on an election contest; he had not heard the argument, and had not read the report; and he inquired of somebody, "Which is our damned rascal? Which is our man?" And he voted for "our man."

Perhaps some of you gentlemen who are new to these Halls may think that this criticism of Republican practices is harsh. I will send to the Clerk's desk and have read a part of the proceedings of the Fifty-first Congress to show how a Republican majority treats an election contest. I do not think we should assume that you are any better than your predecessors, and I will show you how that body treated an election contest. I could show you how the gentleman from Illinois in that body made a technical objection to a call for a division which was sought to show whether there was a quorum present.

This gentleman of a judicial cast of mind [laughter], this nonpartisan gentleman, cites the fact, as he says, that there are a large number of cases pending from the South and only five from the North. Does the gentleman know that there are only thirteen Democratic members from the North? Does he know that the five contests from the North are very largely more in proportion to the members from the North than the twenty-four from the South? Does he know that of the thirty-two pending contests every sitting member is a Democrat? Does he know that there were inaugurated forty-five contests in this Congress? The gentleman reads newspaper extracts. I have seen somewhere in some newspaper a statement that the Republican candidates everywhere were invited to make a contest when the majority against them did not exceed 1,000. They made these contests, they inaugurated forty-five in all, and I ask, Mr. Speaker, why should they not do so? Why should they not have inaugurated a hundred and three or a hundred and five contests, just as many as there are members on this side of the House?

But perhaps I had better have this Republican method of trying contested-election cases read to the House, so that gentlemen who are not familiar with the methods of the majority party in disposing of contested-election cases may see how that majority acted on a similar occasion when judging as to the merits of contested-election cases; and for that purpose I send to the desk, and ask to have read, parts of the proceedings of the Fifty-first Congress bearing directly on the subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTION CONTEST—MILLER VS. ELLIOTT.

Mr. ROWELL. I call up the case of Miller *vs.* Elliott.

The Clerk read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That William Elliott was not elected a Representative in the Fifty-first Congress from the Seventh Congressional district of South Carolina, and is not entitled to retain a seat therein.

"*Resolved*, That Thomas E. Miller was duly elected a Representative in the Fifty-first Congress from the Seventh Congressional district of South Carolina, and is entitled to his seat as such Representative."

Mr. ROWELL. I demand the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. O'FERRALL. And upon that I raise the question of consideration.

The question was taken on consideration, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. O'FERRALL. Division.

The House divided; and the Speaker announced that the ayes were 155.

Mr. O'FERRALL. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point. There is a quorum present. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. O'FERRALL. Does 155 constitute a quorum of this House?

The SPEAKER. Not at all; but there are other members present besides those voting.

Mr. O'FERRALL. I say that no quorum has voted and no quorum is present, as disclosed by the vote.

Mr. MCCOMAS. There is a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Some other gentlemen have come in since the vote was announced.

Mr. O'FERRALL. Fair play is fair play, and that is all I want of any man upon this question as to the consideration of this case.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. O'FERRALL. Does the Speaker decline to hear me?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does. The gentleman is here for delay.

Mr. O'FERRALL. I am not here for delay. This case has just been called up. [Derisive applause on the Republican side.] I have appeared before howling mobs before, and this does not deter me from standing here and demanding my rights. This case has been sprung upon this House without any notice whatever.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the previous question.

The question was put; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. O'FERRALL. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 154.

Mr. O'FERRALL. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Those opposed will rise. [After a pause.] Gentlemen not voting will please rise.

Mr. CONGER. I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. Flood] did not vote.

The SPEAKER. Twelve not voting. One hundred and sixty-six members are present. So the previous question is ordered.

Mr. PAYSON. Regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolutions. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. KERR of Iowa. Mr. Speaker—— [Cries of "Regular order!" on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. KERR of Iowa. I understand that twenty minutes for debate are allowed. I would like to hear a statement of the reasons for the seating of this man.

Mr. ROWELL. I do not desire debate. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" on the Republican side.] The report of the Committee on Elections has been printed.

The question was taken on the adoption of the resolutions; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. O'FERRALL. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 156.

Mr. O'FERRALL. No quorum, Mr. Speaker, is either voting or present.

A MEMBER. One more in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. On this question the ayes are 157, 1 no, and 9 not voting. So the resolutions are adopted.

Mr. ROWELL moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolutions were adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

[Cries of "Next case!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. That is the way, Mr. Speaker, election cases were tried by the Republican party in the Fifty-first Congress. I venture the assertion that in all the history of parliamentary bodies everywhere throughout the world no case can be found where there was action taken by a deliberative body on an election contest to parallel this; and not only did these "judicial-minded" gentlemen dispose of the cases in that manner—not only did they dispose of a case involving the right of a member to a seat on this floor in five minutes, as the RECORD shows, but when they got through with that these judicial-minded gentlemen called out in chorus, "Next case!" "Next case!" [Applause on the Democratic side.] And, Mr. Speaker, if the cases had been upon the Calendar, so that they might have been reached, judging by the way they acted in that case, it is safe to assume that every member on this side of the House would have been excluded from the seat he occupied.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Is it not a fact that it is unparalleled again in the history of legislative bodies, but which the RECORD does not show in the case to which he has alluded, that all the members of one party, in order to avoid being placed on record, should go out of the House and disorganize the House in the consideration of a contested-election case? And further, is it not true that if the members of the Democratic minority had been in their places consideration of the case could have proceeded in an orderly and proper manner? In other words, was it not a disorderly proceeding, in the language of the gentleman, simply because the Democratic party refused to perform their duty, in leaving the House in a body?

Mr. CRISP. Why, Mr. Speaker, a Republican member of the House, Mr. Kerr of Iowa, was not guilty of any disorder and did not leave the House, but he rose in his place and asked the gentleman from Illinois in charge of the bill, Mr. Rowell, to make some explanation of the case and show why Mr. ELLIOTT should be turned out, and Mr. Rowell said, "I do not desire to make any explanation." That was entirely satisfactory to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], I suppose. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] For I suppose that gentleman voted with his party and unseated Mr. ELLIOTT; and I will venture the assertion now that the gentleman from Massachusetts can not tell or give any reasons why he turned Mr. ELLIOTT out.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Are you willing that I should make a statement in reference to that case now?

Mr. CRISP. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts know the points involved?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I did at the time. They were public property in the House, in the reports of the Committee on Elections, which I examined.

Mr. CRISP. Did you read the reports?

Mr. WHEELER. Did the gentleman from Massachusetts read the report?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I did read the reports.

Mr. CRISP. Well, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that the gentleman from Massachusetts is a very diligent member and attends to his business better than many of us. He read the report; but I will venture the assertion that nine-tenths of his associates on that side of the House did not.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Will you yield to me for another question, and I will not again interrupt you? Is it not true that it had become a matter of custom in the Fifty-first Congress whenever election contests came up on this floor for the Democratic members to leave this Hall in a body for the purpose of breaking a quorum, and thereby prevent consideration and completion of the cases from first to last in that Congress; and is that not the reason the RECORD reads as it does?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, of course it is hardly worth while to revive the discussion that we had in the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I think it is unfortunate, but you have revived it. You are thrashing over the old straw of the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. CRISP. I can remind the gentleman, and inform those gentlemen who are not acquainted with the facts, that in the Fifty-first Congress this body remained from the first Monday in December until the 29th day of January without any rules. We were being treated to general parliamentary law.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Are not the rules found in "general parliamentary law?"

Mr. CRISP. That general parliamentary law enabled the presiding officer to hold in order that which he desired to be in order and to hold out of order that which he did not want to consider. We went on in that condition until the 29th day of January, and then we had an election case. The Republican majority had not been made satisfactory by the people, and the House undertook to correct the mistake of the people and to make a Republican majority here. On the 29th day of January we had up an election contest without any rules. Without any authority, the presiding officer of the House counted men who did not vote, and we had an appeal to the House. It was extensively debated, and finally, by the vigorous exercise of the party whip, the Speaker was sustained in his decision, and then they made a rule authorizing the ascertaining of a quorum outside of the roll call. There was no authority on the part of the Speaker to count a quorum. Nobody on earth had authorized him to do any such thing, but he did it of his own will, and then, by the exercise of the party whip, his people were forced to sustain him or to present the spectacle of dividing from him or with him on a contested-election case, which that side has always treated as a party question.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me one further question?

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I regret as much as you do that partisanship should have come into this question. I do not think it is necessary that there should be criminations and recriminations, but I want to ask you one question here now as a nonpartisan, which goes to the substance of the whole thing; do you claim that the treatment of election cases in this House in the last five Congresses has been any more prejudiced and unfair, and wanting in judicial accuracy and fairness, upon the part of the Republicans than upon the part of the Democrats?

Mr. CRISP. I do.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. CRISP. I claim that there is not a case in the history of this Government, or the English Government, or the French or the German Governments, or any other where they have a parliamentary body, where a contested-election case on which the committee were divided, as they were in the case of Miller *vs.* Elliott, was conducted in the manner in which that case was conducted.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. What about the Joy case, from the State of Missouri, in the last Congress?

Mr. CRISP. But that case was debated, Mr. Speaker; it was here for a great length of time. This case that I speak of was not debated; and when a Republican asked the chairman of the Committee on Elections to give them some little reason for turning out Mr. ELLIOTT, that gentleman replied, "I do not want to debate," and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] did not want to debate, and he, with the rest of his party, voted to unseat Mr. ELLIOTT.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CRISP. With pleasure.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is there anywhere in the history of contested-election cases in this country, other than in the Fifty-second Congress and possibly in the Fifty-third, a case where a partisan majority voted down a majority report of their own committee favoring the seating of the sitting member and turned him out and seated the contestant, who was a member of their own party?

Mr. CRISP. I do not know. I could not answer that. I have not looked.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is not that probably an exhibition of partisanship greater than the mere absence of debate when there was nobody to debate except upon one side?

Mr. CRISP. No; the gentleman misapprehends this case. Where there has been full debate, or opportunity for debate, then of course each member can vote intelligently; but the criticism I make on this case is that there was no opportunity for debate.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am speaking of the Joy case.

Mr. CRISP. Well, I am speaking of the case of Elliott versus Miller.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am aware of that, and if the gentleman had been present, as I was, he would know more about that case.

Mr. CRISP. I do not recollect the details, but my impression is that on the case which the gentleman mentions the Democrats divided. Some spoke for Mr. Joy and many voted for Mr. Joy; but in the case to which I refer, where the Republicans were compelled blindly to vote to turn out a Democrat, there was no division. They all voted to turn out that gentleman without knowing why.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will yield to me a moment, I will state that my point is, that in the Joy case a committee of this House, constituted by Democratic authority, was either unanimous, or practically unanimous, in favor of the sitting member, and the longer the debate the more the light came; unfortunately the House voted, not blindly, but in my judgment wickedly, to turn Joy out.

Mr. CRISP. My information, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio, is that the majority report was against Joy.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Possibly it was.

Mr. CRISP. So that, perhaps, removes a little of the foundation of the argument of the gentleman.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But certainly not so in the Rockwell case, and the Rockwell case is one of the cases to which I refer.

Mr. CRISP. My recollection about that is, although not very distinct, that Mr. O'Ferrall, the chairman of the committee, was in favor of the Republican.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly he was; and yet he was overturned by a partisan vote; and that after a debate, too.

Mr. CRISP. But the gentleman misapprehends the point I make, Mr. Speaker. That was overturned after debate and consideration. The point I make is that the Republican majority, without debate, without consideration, and without information, turned out a Democrat.

Mr. SETTLE. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me a question?

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. SETTLE. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a matter of common history that this district in South Carolina, over which this contest of Miller against ELLIOTT rose in the Fifty-first Congress, and which he has quoted in the discussion—I will ask him if in the apportionment of that State that district was not set aside expressly as a colored Republican district, having not less than 25,000 Republican majority, and if for two elections the Democratic party did not fail and refuse to nominate a candidate for Congress in that district, but kept faith, and after that, under the machinery, they did not then decide to take it away; and I will ask him, further, if these facts were not common knowledge, and thus made it too plain to have any discussion in the Fifty-first Congress?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina—my friend from North Carolina—by his question has indicated and made plain the method and manner in which Republicans dispose of contested-election cases. "Common history; common rumor." That gentleman would take a census of any district in the South and find that so many were white people and so many were colored; and if the majority were colored he would say that is a Republican district, and he would presume if a Democrat came here he came by fraud; and he is not singular in that. That is the way with nearly all on that side.

Mr. SETTLE. The gentleman may make that as an argument, but as applied to me individually it is unjust.

Mr. CRISP. I would not be unjust to the gentleman—our side would not be. That gentleman was a spared monument in the last Congress. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] He had a contest here. A Democrat contested his seat, but he retained it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will ask the gentleman if he does not recollect that in ten out of the seventeen contests in the Fifty-first Congress the Democrat retained his seat?

Mr. CRISP. No; "the gentleman" does not recollect that. "The gentleman" recollects that there were seventeen contests in the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I should have said eight out of seventeen.

Mr. CRISP. Yes; well, in eight of these cases there were reports unseating Democrats, in four cases there were reports in favor of Democrats, and the others do not seem to have been disposed of. They may have been reported upon by the committee; I do not know.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But the gentleman does not deny that in eight out of seventeen cases the Democrat retained his seat?

Mr. CRISP. No; I think that is correct.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman yield to another question?

Mr. CRISP. I will.

Mr. LACEY. Is it not true that of the nine you referred to, in the case in which Miller was seated and ELLIOTT unseated, that the Democratic members had withdrawn bodily from the Hall, leaving Governor O'Ferrall alone on guard, so that there was nobody to debate the question but the bare seats on that side of the House?

Mr. CRISP. But let me call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to this. Does the gentleman know of a gentleman named Kerr from Iowa? Mr. Kerr was a member from Iowa, and the gentleman must have known of him, as he is from his own State. He was a Republican. He said: "I understand that twenty minutes' debate are allowed. I would like to hear a statement of the reasons for the seating of this man." And he was right. The rules allowed twenty minutes, and Mr. Rowell said, "I do not desire debate." Rowell was chairman of the Committee on Elections, and the Republican side cried, "Vote!" "Vote!"

Mr. PAYNE. Of that time, thirty minutes, was not the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. O'Ferrall, the leading Democrat on the committee, entitled to occupy fifteen?

Mr. CRISP. He was, under the rule; but I think he was entitled also to some other things that he did not get here. He was entitled to a division on the preceding case, but he did not get it.

Mr. PAYNE. Keep to this case. Did Mr. O'Ferrall ask for fifteen minutes for debate on that case?

Mr. CRISP. A Republican asked for it.

Mr. PAYNE. But did Mr. O'Ferrall ask for it?

Mr. CRISP. No; but I suppose a Republican had a right to ask for some explanation of the case. The point I make is that your side does not want any explanation in such cases. All you want is to "vote, vote," when it is a question of turning out a Democrat and seating a Republican.

Mr. PAYNE. Our side had had an opportunity to read the report, and they understood the case. If Mr. O'Ferrall thought that they did not understand his side of the case, I suppose it was his duty to try to have it understood, and not merely to make delay.

Mr. CRISP. I infer from the remarks of the gentleman from New York that his side, when it is in the majority, reads only the majority report in a contested-election case. He says they had read the report on that side and understood the case. Now, my understanding is—the gentleman from New York may not be familiar with this idea—my understanding is that a judge ought to hear both sides.

Mr. PAYNE. I agree with the gentleman that a judge ought to hear both sides. I was one of the judges in that case. I understood the presentation of the case made in the report on the Republican side, and I had read the "views of the minority" on the Democratic side, but Mr. O'Ferrall seemed to be the only man representing the minority on the floor, and I was prepared to hear him for the fifteen minutes to which he was entitled, and it was his duty, if he supposed that our side did not understand the case, to occupy that fifteen minutes—unless he was left here by his colleagues simply for the purpose of prolonging the delay that had already gone on for a week in election cases. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. Then the gentleman's idea is that because of something that this side of the House did his side was justified in blindly turning a Democrat out. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Now, I do not care what this side did; you gentlemen had sworn to support the Constitution, and the Constitution told you that you should judge of the election of members of the House; but now the gentleman from New York says that because we on this side went out, therefore his side had a right to turn out Mr. ELLIOTT. That is his argument.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRISP. I yield to my judicial friend from Maine. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope that while I put my question the gentleman from Georgia will maintain that same calm equipoise which characterized his service in the Chair. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The gentleman has referred to the Constitution. I want to ask him if in his judicial view the gentlemen on the other side were performing their duty under the Constitution when in a body they left their places in this Hall in order to obstruct the progress of public business? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. I think so. I think the gentlemen on this side were justified in resisting by every method possible the outrage which was then being perpetrated by the Republican majority in the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I will say to my friend from Maine, that the country seems to have entertained the same view, because at the next election they reversed your majority and gave us nearly 150 majority in the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. But the gentleman from Georgia seems to have forgotten that later than that, after the people of the country had seen the gentleman and his party make a countermarch and officially indorse the action that the Republicans had taken, the rules and the methods of procedure adopted in the Fifty-first Congress, declaring on this floor publicly by their vote that our course was absolutely essential to the transaction of public business—the gentleman, I say, forgets that after seeing that performance public sentiment, in its sober second thought, manifested itself in the personnel of this House of Representatives sitting here to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.] And, Mr. Speaker, I know of no man who ought to realize the effect of the verdict of the American people in that controversy more fully and emphatically than the gentleman from Georgia himself. [Renewed applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I have a very high regard for my friend from Maine——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I am glad to know it.

Mr. CRISP (continuing). But I have very little regard for his opinion on political questions. [Laughter.] I recollect having seen a statement, I do not remember where, to the effect that the gentleman from Maine thought that the Republican party had been indorsed in the last election by reason of his position on the Hawaiian question. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I am very certain that the gentleman from Georgia has not been indorsed by reason of his position on the Hawaiian question. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. The older members here will recollect the performances of the gentleman from Maine on the Hawaiian question. They will recollect how he thundered in the index, how he proposed day after day to make a vigorous assault, and they will also recollect, when the opportunity was afforded him, how tame and flat and unprofitable it all was. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Unprofitable for the Democratic party of this country, I admit. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman's idea, no doubt, is that that speech destroyed the Democratic party. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Now, my friend from Maine—because he is my friend and I would not say anything to hurt his feelings—is a fair type of the judicial character of a Republican when he passes upon an election contest. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. The gentleman has paid me the highest compliment that can be paid to any man in this country. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRISP. If I could put my friend on the stand and ask him a question or two, I think I would like to do so.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The gentleman does not know that I would be as comfortable a witness as he thinks I would.

Mr. CRISP. If I could put the gentleman on the stand and ask him a question or two, I think I could disclose that he never read the views of the majority and the minority in an election case in his life.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The gentleman certainly does not know anything about my condition in regard to those cases. He must be predicating his remark upon his own individual action. That is the only possible explanation I can put upon it.

Mr. CRISP. Now, Mr. Speaker, my objection to this proposition is——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will my friend, before he goes on, allow me a moment to say one word in regard to that Hawaiian matter? [Loud laughter.]

Mr. CRISP. I hope my friend will get time from some other gentleman.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I only want about a minute.

Mr. CRISP. I hope the Speaker will recognize the gentleman from Maine, so that he may have an hour.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope he will.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BOUTELLE. On the whole, I think perhaps I may get

recognition. The experience of the past might cause me to have some doubt about it, if I did not recall the great change there has been in regard to free debate in this House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman from Maine is in the house of his friends, and I hope he will get recognition.

My objection, Mr. Speaker, to this proposition is that whatever may be the views of gentlemen presenting it the effect is going to be—I predict it now and I shall be delighted if my prediction does not come true—the effect of it is going to be to turn summarily out of this House a large number of gentlemen on this side without regard to the merits of their cases. I mean just what I say, and history justifies me in saying it. I cite to gentlemen a case in this House in the Fifty-first Congress that was determined—I can not say in how many minutes, probably five—without one word being said in explanation of the report; and although a Republican member asked the chairman or some member of the Committee on Elections to give some reason for unseating the gentleman who held the certificate of the governor of his State, they would not give him a reason, but they turned the Representative out.

My opinion is that this scheme will operate simply to make speedy judgment against members on this side of the House. Heretofore a man whose right to a seat was contested had the question considered by fifteen members. Now you propose that such questions shall be considered by nine members, the committee being broken up into "part 1," "part 2," "part 3." "Part 1" may have a view of the law which "part 2" may not share. "Part 3" may be composed of gentlemen who will give fair consideration to the evidence; "part 1" may not be. So that a man's right to a seat in the House will not so much depend upon the merits of his case as on the "part" of the committee to which the Speaker may refer it. "Part 1" may follow a State law; "part 2" may not. It may be said that the House will correct any such discrepancy. My reply is, judging of what the House did in the Fifty-first Congress, it does not correct anything, but accepts blindly what the committee does. Thus, as I say, you will have one branch of the committee reporting one view of the law, and another branch of it another view. And all this is for what? To railroad men on this side out of this House and seat Republicans.

But the gentleman says there is no temptation to do anything wrong. I have heard that suggestion. The reply is that the Republican party has never lost an opportunity, so far as I know, to seat its own members when it could get any plausible excuse for doing so. It has not always done it; but it has wherever a plausible excuse could be found. I have not looked up the cases, but I have some knowledge of them for the past ten or twelve years, and if time were allowed I could present them. But I do present this one case upon which I have already commented, and I ask gentlemen to explain it or reply to it if they can.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this proposition. I believe that these contests ought to be tried in an orderly manner; there has never before been a proposition to make three Election Committees. I do not see any advantage in such an arrangement except to make three chairmen and three clerks. It affords a good opportunity to provide for gentlemen by making additional chairmen and additional clerks. When you had a large number of contests before, they were decided by subcommittees of a single committee. Now you propose to have three Committees on Elections where heretofore you have had but one. You propose to have three chairmen, with three clerks at $2,000 each, and three committee rooms. I do not see any reason for this. The tendency ought to be to reduce rather than increase the committees of the House. I do not see that anything is to be accomplished by this proposition except it may be some partisan purpose. We ought to stand by the old method. I do not expect you to do it. I expect you to vote in this case as your predecessors did in voting to turn out ELLIOTT—vote as you are told to do. I want, however, to put on record my protest.

Mr. HULICK. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CRISP. With pleasure.

Mr. HULICK. If we should have under this proposition an early determination of these election contests, would it not save large expense in the pay and mileage of the twenty-seven gentlemen who are contesting?

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman assumes that we are going to turn out the men who are in and put in the others.

Mr. HULICK. I am only going on the assumption which the gentleman makes, that they will all be turned out, though I do not agree with him in that. I concur with him in the belief that there should be a careful adjudication of these matters; we should act understandingly and judicially. But would there not be a saving in the expenditure of public money by avoiding such delays in deciding these contests as there were in many cases in the last Congress?

Mr. CRISP. Well, I do not know about that. I have views myself about the expenses of a contestant in election cases. It was never intended by the law that as a matter of right a contestant should be allowed $2,000 for his contest. Wherever a man honestly believes that he has a good case for contest, then the law says he ought to be paid his expenses, not exceeding the sum of $2,000. The Committee on Elections ought to set an example as to this, and in those cases where a man has evidently no case on investigation by that committee no part of the expense should be allowed him.

Now, there are four cases—three or four—where the contests were inaugurated in this Congress and the contestant has taken no testimony. They have abandoned their cases. Certainly no allowance should be made in such cases.

Mr. HULICK. I agree with the gentleman in that respect.

Mr. CRISP. There were forty-five contests inaugurated in this House from all over the country, the Republican candidates being told that all they had to do was to appear and be seated. Forty-five cases, I am told, were begun.

Mr. HULICK. Will the gentleman allow another question?

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. HULICK. I want to make a suggestion on the political point, or partisan point, to which allusion has been made. The gentleman from Georgia assumes, if I understood him, and if I did not understand him correctly I hope he will set me right—he assumes that these contestants, the Republicans, will be seated and that the Democratic contestees will be unseated.

Mr. CRISP. No doubt, if a plausible excuse can be found.

Mr. HULICK. But I understood the gentleman to say that that action would be followed by the increased membership on his side of the House, the Democratic side, in future elections. That being the case, if that is the gentleman's conviction, then, from a partisan standpoint, does not the gentleman think he ought to favor this measure?

Mr. CRISP. I did not make any predictions about that.

Mr. HULICK. Then I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP (continuing). Although I have no doubt it is true that such would be the result.

But I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the question of economy cuts very little figure in this matter; and I hope I will not be considered as offensive when I say that is, in my judgment, merely an excuse for the action proposed to be taken.

Now, sir, this Congress has been in session for more than two weeks. On the Speaker's table there is lying a message from the President of the United States involving a very important question, relating to Venezuela, and yet the Republican Congress can not take time to have read a matter of important and pressing public business, but must consume the time of the House with a mere partisan discussion inaugurated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. HULICK. Was not that "public business" to which the gentleman refers delayed by duck hunting down in North Carolina; and is it not true that the delay is in no wise due to the Congress of the United States? [Applause on the Republican side.] Have we had the opportunity to see that message until now?

Mr. CRISP. I can furnish it to the gentleman if he wants it. It is on the table, and it is a frank, open, manly defense of the Monroe doctrine, and when it is read I have no doubt my friend from Ohio will applaud it himself. But we can not read it—we can not do anything until we can induce this "judicial majority" to get away from the question of partisan politics long enough to take up important public matters.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I can furnish the gentleman from Georgia with several copies, if he wishes me to do so, in advance of the reading from the desk.

Mr. CRISP. I have a copy and am glad my friend from Ohio has one. I would be glad to have it read from the desk, but I suppose there is no hope of anything of that kind, or of any patriotic business being transacted until you get through with your partisan propositions.

I reserve the remainder of my time. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recognized in my own time.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] presented to the House to-day a resolution which proposes, in the first place, to increase the number of members of certain committees of the House, and in the second place to appoint three Committees on Elections instead of one as heretofore. So far as the first proposition is concerned, it simply follows the precedent established by the two preceding Congresses, and that proposition has been already accepted by the House without a dissenting voice. The only question now before the House is ought we to have three Elections Committees instead of one, and with reference to that particular question I am unable to see, sir, how any partisanship can possibly be connected therewith or in any manner involved.

I am unable to see where the line should be drawn between the gentleman on that side of the Chamber and the gentleman on this

side of the Chamber in the consideration of that question. There are some things about which we can not possibly have any controversy. There can be no possible dissent to the proposition that the highest function of this House and its most imperative duty are to determine its own membership. The Constitution of the United States makes this House—unwisely, I think—the ultimate judge of the election and qualifications of its own members, and the very first question that meets us on the threshold of an incoming Congress is the question who constitutes the House of Representatives as chosen by the people of the United States. No man who has not been legally chosen has any right to sit in this House for a single moment beyond the time when, by the exercise of the utmost expedition, the House of Representatives shall have had an opportunity to pass upon his title. No man entitled to his seat in this House, no man rightfully holding the commission of his people, has any right to be hanging around the doors of these Halls or loitering on the floor of this House with his title undetermined a single moment longer than when the House, by the exercise of the utmost expedition, shall have had the opportunity to pass upon that title. [Applause on the Republican side.] Those are propositions to which all gentlemen here will assent. Justice to the contestant, justice to the contestee, justice to the people that they respectively represent, demand at the hands of this House an impartial and early determination of all questions as to membership.

There are some incidental matters—some matters outside of these—that pertain to our duty that ought also to influence us. This crowded Chamber, with scarcely room enough for the members who rightfully occupy it, ought not to have on its floor, as it has now every day, 30 additional interested parties. We ought not to be put in the possible situation of paying out of the National Treasury, now largely depleted, salaries to two gentlemen, both claiming to represent the same Congressional district.

You will agree with me, therefore, I think, whatever may have been the merits or demerits of the Fifty-first Congress, that a duty stares us in the face demanding immediate performance.

Now, let me ask what is our situation with respect to the performance of that duty? There are, let us say, thirty election contests pending. I think the precise number is thirty-four, but some three or four will be disposed of without real contests. There are, we will say, in round numbers, thirty contests, which you will agree with me we ought to determine as expeditiously as possible. The records in those thirty contests make 15,627 pages of text of the sort which I hold in my hand. My friend in front of me [Mr. HEPBURN] made a calculation, which he was kind enough to furnish to me, and I find that, assigning 8 pages of those records for perusal by the members of an election committee to an hour—which certainly is as much as any man can read carefully in an hour—it would take nineteen hundred and fifty-three hours to read the bare records in these cases, and it would take, at eight hours a day, which I think is a tolerably good day's work, especially at work of this sort—it would take a member of that committee two hundred and forty-four days to read simply the records in these thirty contested-election cases. In addition to that, these cases must be heard. Counsel upon both sides are entitled to be heard. These cases must then be discussed in committee, reports must be written, and the cases brought in and put on the Calendar of the House.

Now, I ask you the question, do you believe it possible that justice can be done in these thirty cases by a single Election Committee? Why, any man who will throw aside his partisanship—and I renew what I said at the outset, I am unable to comprehend how partisanship should enter into the determination of this question at all—any man who will throw aside his partisanship and look this matter fairly in the face will agree with me that something must be done. Something must be done, and what? Can you gentlemen suggest any better arrangement than the arrangement that is suggested in this resolution? I venture to say for the membership on this side of the Chamber that we are not hidebound about this matter. We want to attain a result. We are willing to accept any proposition that looks to the attainment of that result. Have you any other proposition to offer? Has the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], who so exhaustively discussed the Fifty-first Congress, and so exhaustively neglected the question before the House—has he any proposition to advance? Now, what are we to do?

This is not the first time, Mr. Speaker, that a question of this character has faced the House of Representatives. In the Forty-first Congress, as my colleague from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] advised you, there were some thirty-five election contests. The Committee on Elections, fifteen in number, was subdivided into five sections, and, by a rule adopted by the House, each of these subdivisions was authorized to report directly to the House of Representatives. That method had the indorsement of such distinguished men as General Garfield on this side of the Chamber and S. S. Cox on the other side of the Chamber. Do you want to adopt that method? Why, gentlemen, that was simply having five election committees, constituted of three members each, and the contestant and contestee came with their cases into this House without the judgment of the committee as a whole. It seems to us, in the discussion of this question, that that is objectionable; that all the parties to the contest are entitled to have not only the judgment of a subcommittee in the first instance, but the judgment of the whole committee, to be revised by the judgment of this House; and so we do not advocate that method. In the Forty-sixth Congress Mr. MILLS, now Senator MILLS, a member of that House, suggested that each election contest should be sent to an independent committee, each committee, of course, dealing with only one contest. He proposed that that committee should be small in numbers, and the same objection, therefore, lies to that proposition that lies to the method adopted in the Forty-first Congress.

If, then, we have a difficulty to meet, and there is no way pointed out by experience of meeting it, why not adopt the suggestion made—that we shall have three independent committees, coordinate in authority, each of which shall act as a judicial body and pass upon these contests?

Now, I do not intend to be led into any discussion as to the character of election committees. I do not believe that all virtue, knowledge, and law belong on the Democratic side of this House; nor do I believe, either, that they belong on this side of the House. The objection made by the gentleman from Georgia to what is proposed is, first, that this will work an injustice to parties to election contests. Well, if the gentleman assumes, as he has no right to assume, that this side of the House is going unjustly to determine as to the titles of those parties to contests, I submit to him that upon that single proposition the honor and dignity and convenience of the House demand that that decision shall be made right away. Every motive to convenience demands that if these gentlemen are to be turned out, as assumed by the gentleman from Georgia, they shall be turned out promptly, and that can only be done by three committees instead of by one.

I will not follow the gentleman into his partisan discussion of this question any further than to say that so far as the Miller and Elliott case is concerned, no Democrat in the Fifty-first Congress who honestly examined that case ever believed for a single solitary moment that Colonel ELLIOTT had any title, even the remotest, to the seat he occupied, and none of them so voted. Why, when the case of Miller and Elliott was called up, and when Colonel ELLIOTT ought to have been backed by the entire Democratic side of the House in his demand for justice, there was not a single solitary Democrat on this floor, except Governor O'Ferrall, and his aim and purpose at that time in being here was to prevent this House from performing its constitutional functions.

Now, what else does the gentleman say? His only argument that I recollect against this proposition to hasten the determination of these election contests is this: He says it is not in the interest of economy; that we would have to have three clerks. Why, not at all. There is no necessity for three clerks. One clerk can perform the necessary functions for all three committees. He says we would have to have another committee room. Why, not at all. One committee room will accommodate three election committees and leave it unoccupied still three days in the week. So, not to impose longer in an argument of what seems to me so plain a proposition, I submit to you, first, that the imperative duty rests upon us to determine these contests; second, that they should be determined speedily, and that no other method has been suggested than this method, which is a reasonable one, in the interest of justice, of economy, and attention to the public business.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, representing as I do, in part, the city of New York, and the city of New York being interested in two of the election contests, I will venture to address the House for a few minutes from the standpoint of a lawyer.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] says there is no partisan question involved, and yet at the same time proclaims that it is the bounden duty of the majority to take some of the few seats remaining to this side of the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says that it is a purely academic question; that it is a question entirely divorced from party politics and partisanship.

Now, I believe, and in that I am in accord with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the provision contained in the fifth section of the first article of the Federal Constitution, that each House shall be the judge of the election, qualifications, and returns of its own members, is a very unwise provision; and it is about the only unwise provision which can be found in that immortal instrument. The reason why it is wrong is that it allows the House of Representatives to go back of the returns, and to inquire into the motives alleged to have been entertained by the elector. It allows the House of Representatives to declare a ballot cast by one man was in reality intended for another man; that when a citizen votes

for James Smith his vote shall be counted in favor of Joseph Smith. These are instances which show the lack of wisdom in that provision of the Federal Constitution. But still so it remains.

Now, what is the proposition? If we regard this purely from an academic standpoint, I am unable to see any argument in its favor. But one argument thus far has been urged. We have had a great deal of discussion as to the conduct of election contests in previous Congresses. We have heard a great deal said by the gentlemen on the other side of the House as to the conduct of the majority of the different political parties in the history of this country, but I have listened in vain to hear one argument urged why this change should be adopted. There is only one argument that has thus far been adduced, and that is, the need of haste. The proposition is advanced that the majority, the overwhelming majority, should make haste to take some seats away from the Democratic party.

Now, I say to you gentlemen on that side, stop; think well before you hasten to deprive us of seats to which we are entitled. If I were prominent on the other side of the House and could dictate, as your leaders doubtless can, the true policy of your party, I should urge upon you one and all to make haste slowly in this matter. Do not change the existing procedure or law. Has it not worked well enough in the past? Why should it be changed now, when you come in under the banner of victory? Would any such proposition have found favor on your side of the House during the Fifty-third Congress? I for one am in favor of absolute fair play in every election case. I do not think that any election case should be decided from a partisan standpoint, and I refer to my record in the last Congress to show that my vote was cast, on at least one occasion, for the Republican contestee. And I think that principle should be observed by all the members on either side of the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, human nature is so constituted that it is absolutely impossible in any large representative body to have election cases considered with strict judicial fairness, so it must be presumed that you will take from us just as many of these seats as you may decide to deprive us of, no more and no less. It seems to me, gentlemen, that there are two good reasons why this proposed change should not be made. We have had in the past committees on elections consisting of 13 or 15 members, and now, under the pending proposition, we are to have three committees consisting of 9 members each. The first objection to this change is that all delegated power is in itself objectionable, and therefore no body should deliberately go to work to lessen the number of the members of the body to whom power is to be delegated. If you have a committee on elections consisting of 15 members and you abridge or lessen its membership to 9, it is manifest that every man whose seat is contested is deprived of a valuable right. When he was elected a Representative in Congress he had a right to assume that the Committee on Elections before whom, if his seat was contested, the contest would be brought would consist of as large a number of members as it had consisted of up to the present time. No man could have imagined that when the Republican party came into power here it would proceed at once, in pursuance of a desire for undue haste, to lessen or to cut up the Committee on Elections.

There is another objection, and that is, that our whole system of procedure is here proposed to be changed. It is well known that the Committee on Elections is one of the great committees of this House, and it is now proposed by gentlemen on the other side to cut up that committee so as to have three Elections Committees of coincident and concurrent jurisdiction. We now have a court consisting of fifteen members, instead of which it is proposed to have three courts, or three parts of one court, consisting of nine members each. That proposition is at variance with the system which obtains in the House of Representatives with reference to the consideration of every other subject. Why not have three Committees on Foreign Affairs? Why not refer to one of those subcommittees or parts of the committee the question of the Alaskan boundary, to another the Venezuelan question, and to a third the question of the recognition of the belligerent rights of Cuba?

This illustration fairly shows the absurdity of the proposed change unless there be something in the argument of haste. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] tells us that it is absolutely impossible for all the fifteen members of the Committee on Elections to read the records in these election cases. He says it would be necessary that a man should sit down for two hundred and forty-four days, and that that would be impossible, and for this reason he proposes to divide up the work. I see no force in that argument. That argument merely serves to bring out the fact that only a few members of this House on the other side—and your votes are important, gentlemen on the other side, because these contests are to be determined by your votes and not by ours—this argument, I say, simply serves to bring out the fact that it will be impossible for more than a comparatively small number of the 250 members on the Republican side of the House to read the records in these contested-election cases, although they will all be called upon to vote on them.

This alone shows that the procedure can not be like that of a judicial tribunal. It can not be a fair court for the trial of these issues of fact. It is a court clothed with extraordinary powers, a court not of law, but also of equity, or alleged equity; a court with power to go back of the returns and to decide each contested case just as suits the pleasure of the majority. And yet one of the leaders on the Republican side tells us to-day that it is impossible for members to read the statements of facts, although those statements are the only basis upon which judgment should be rendered. I say, then, in view of this fact, gentlemen of the majority, for your own sakes and for the sake of your party, you ought not to change any preexisting rule or law in regard to this matter of determining contested-election cases. It is not only in the interest of gentlemen on this side of the House, but it is in the interest of your own side, it is in the interest of the whole country, that we should stick to the old system of procedure. Is it so necessary that you should add thirty or thirty-two more Representatives to your long roll on that side of the House?

I for one believe that when we come to the question of feasibility or practicability it will be found perfectly easy for a Committee on Elections consisting of thirteen or fifteen members to read all the evidence and to decide these cases within a reasonable time. Was there any undue zeal for speed shown on this side of the House in the Fifty-third Congress? Did we dispose hurriedly or unfairly of the North Carolina case of the gentleman who has spoken to-day, Mr. SETTLE? Did we not virtually decide that case in his favor without pressing it to the test of a vote? Did we not delay, day after day, week after week, the consideration of other election cases? Did any leader on our side rise up and say that it was essential to have haste in those matters, that it was objectionable to have extra Representatives or alleged Representatives walking around this Hall, and that for that reason the Calendar must be cleared and more Democrats must take their seats in this House?

I appeal to you, gentlemen, in common fairness, was not the course of the Democratic majority in the Fifty-third Congress honorable and fair? Did you not often find members on this side of the House casting their votes in favor of Republicans when the seats of those Republicans were contested by Democrats? Was there not throughout the whole of that Congress a fair spirit shown by the majority? I think the record bears me out in the statement that such was the course of our party in that Congress. But, leaving that question aside, why is not some strong and salient reason given for the proposed change? Haste appears to be the only object. There are thirty-two of these contested-election cases in all. The record in thirty of them has been filed in the Clerk's office. The papers are printed, and I know that with only a fair amount of industry I could in two or three days read the whole of the record in any one of those cases, and I believe that any gentleman on the Committee on Elections, if it is to consist of thirteen, or fifteen, or seventeen members, can very readily master all the statements of fact in any given case, and if he be a lawyer, all the law applicable to such a state of facts, within a very short time, probably long before this House in the ordinary course of business will be ready to take up for consideration any contested-election case on the Calendar.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I confess I always enjoy seeing the monotony of the proceedings of this House enlivened by a flash of humor, but I could not but feel during the earlier part of this debate that a little too much merriment was being indulged in, considering the importance of the question under discussion; nor could I avoid thinking that crimination and recrimination from a partisan standpoint were somewhat aside the real question which we are called upon to discuss and determine. I was, therefore, glad when the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] brought the debate into what I conceived to be a proper channel, and discussed the pending proposition upon the high ground on which I think it ought to be discussed and decided by this body.

Mr. Speaker, the right of a member to his seat in a legislative body is a question of the highest parliamentary privilege. Indeed, there can scarcely come before a legislative body a question of higher privilege than this. This proposition, I undertake to say, is laid down in every reputable work on parliamentary law that has ever been written. A question of this kind is therefore one which this body should promptly meet at the very threshold if it can possibly do so, and dispose of it before passing to the enactment of legislation.

The fact that the name of a man appears on the roll of this House is merely prima facie evidence that he has been duly elected and is entitled to a seat in this body. Examination may show—indeed, examination frequently does show—that he is not entitled to a seat and ought to be turned out, in order that the Representative that really was elected may be installed in his place.

Mr. Speaker, this parliamentary privilege is an important thing—

not only to parties who may contest here for a seat, but also to the people. It is important to the member who, being rightfully elected, is wrongfully kept out of his seat, to the end that he may promptly come into the possession of the heritage which is his own. It is important to the people, to the end that the sitting member, if he is not rightfully elected, shall yield up that which does not properly belong to him. It is important to the people, to the end that at the earliest possible moment they may be represented in this legislative body by the man whom they have elected, who bears their true commission, and whom they desire shall represent them. Particularly in a government constituted as ours—a government in which the people are the source of all power—a government which is representative in its character is this parliamentary privilege to which I have adverted of the highest significance and value.

Now, I think it will be agreed, Mr. Speaker, by all members who have given the subject anything more than a purely superficial examination, that the old method of determining the right of a member to his seat through the medium of simply one committee consisting of fifteen members can not possibly do justice in the condition of affairs in which this House now finds itself. The bare statement of statistics made by the distinguished gentleman who opened this debate shows the absolute impossibility of this committee being able to determine during the lifetime of the present Congress the thirty-two election contests which are pending before it. Any member who has had experience as a member of the Committee on Elections—aye, any member who has had anything like a reasonable experience in this House—knows that such a thing is entirely unattainable.

Why, sir, Congress after Congress, in which there has been pending only one-half the number of contested elections that we now have pending before this House, has adjourned without all the election contests having been passed upon. If, then, the old, or rather the present, method is not sufficient, what is the plain duty of this House? It is to obey the constitutional provision, which is couched in imperative and not in permissive language, that "the House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members." I am frank to confess, Mr. Speaker, that in common with other gentlemen I lament the practice, which has prevailed in Congress from time immemorial, of permitting passion to take the place of reason and prejudice to take the place of justice in the discussion and decision of these questions of contested elections.

I wish it were possible to refer these matters to some outside, some judicial, tribunal which could pass on them impartially in the first instance, and, after such a careful examination of the facts and the law, refer them back to Congress, to the end that Congress, with such decision before it, might come to a correct and final conclusion in the cases. But in the necessity which confronts us it is impossible to devise a complete remedy. For the time being we must meet this emergency as best we may. We are not without precedent, sir, for the action here proposed. The Forty-first Congress, as has been pointed out, devised a system whereby it sought to accelerate the hearing of contested-election cases when it was in much the same dilemma as is now present here.

While I approve, generally, of the system then adopted, I do not approve of the provision in that system which required the chairman of the Committee on Elections to refer individual cases coming before it to three members constituting a subcommittee and giving them the exclusive right to consider such cases and the right to report directly to the House. In this particular I confess that I think the rule adopted by the Forty-first Congress was wrong. I believe that every man who has a contested-election case pending here is entitled to have it receive the careful consideration of the entire Elections Committee. The proposed rule now pending will, if adopted, cause this very thing to be done. I am here to advocate it as being in every respect superior to the precedent which we have been invited here to follow.

One other consideration in this matter: The adoption of the pending proposition will save expense. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] tells us that he does not think economy cuts any figure in this matter. This is in the nature of a departure for the gentleman. He was not talking that way when he was inveighing against what he was pleased to style the extravagant appropriations of "the billion-dollar Congress." He was not talking that way when his own party in this House was passing niggardly appropriation bills which were crippling the administration of the Government in its most vital parts. He was not talking this way when his own party was in power, and was, under the inspiration of false economic theories, passing a revenue bill which has since created only a deficit. But the truth about the matter is that it will be a great saving of public expense. Add up the amount that it will cost for an extra clerk to each committee, if you please, and then compare it with the amount of money that will necessarily be saved by an honest and lawful decision of these contested cases, in which sitting members who are not entitled to their seats will be ousted from them, as they ought to be, at an early day, and then observe, if you please, the saving of money that will be accomplished, and you will find at once that this pending proposition is not only right in principle, but is also in the interest of a just and proper economy.

Why is it that gentlemen oppose the adoption of this proposed rule? Why do they offer objections to it? They should remember that it is not the mere manual possession of a seat upon this floor that gives honor. It is rather the honesty of its acquisition, and the integrity and ability with which it is filled. They should remember that there is a broad distinction between the man who comes into this House crawling through the sewer, bespattered with mud, reaching out his avaricious and dishonest hands to seize that which properly belongs to another, and the man who enters that door clothed with the livery of the public service, confident in the possession of the title which the people have voluntarily conferred upon him.

Every moment, sir, that a member who is not rightfully elected is allowed to sit on this floor it is an insult to the members of this House and a wrong done to the people. Such a member never can expect to rise to usefulness, or even to influence, in this body. His very presence here is a reproach to the members who surround him and a contagion to the atmosphere in which they dwell.

Mr. Speaker, no gentleman who is conscious that his title is invulnerable need object to the passage of this proposed rule. Nobody is going to do anyone injustice, I apprehend, upon this floor.

Gentlemen who imagine that harm is to result from the adoption of this rule seem to think there is something in the past precedents of their party which will justify retaliation here. They appear to dread danger in the carrying out of the adage "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." They seem to forget that the doctrine of retaliation is founded in barbarism and is a base and unworthy one, and is not likely to find lodgment on this side of the Chamber. I have sufficient confidence, sir, in the majority on this floor to believe that not a single member will be mean and vindictive enough to be guided by it. I believe that they are all inspired by a sincere desire to let bygones be bygones and to decide these contested-election cases on the law and on their merits. If there has ever been a time in the history of the American Congress when contested-election cases could not be fairly decided, let us rather exult that the opportunity now offers when we may abandon that line of conduct, and when we may establish a new precedent which will justly be followed in all future Congresses.

This opportunity presents itself to this Republican majority now. Neither a due regard for principle nor party policy can be subserved here by the commission of wrong. I think I know something of the temper of the Republicans upon this floor. I think I can safely say—and I assume to speak principally for myself—that there will not be a solitary man who is really entitled to a seat upon this floor, no difference what is his political affiliation, no difference from what section of the country he hails, who will not be confirmed in his seat, whether he presents himself at the doors of this House with a good title in his hand, or whether he is already, by invulnerable title, placed upon this roll of the body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to advert briefly to some things that were said by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] before he took his seat, and then I will no longer trespass upon the attention of the House. He has asked what there is in the record of the Republican party to justify the belief that it will be fair. If the gentleman asks that question simply in the nature of an exclamation, by way of rhetorical flourish, then I have nothing to say. If, however, he asks it seriously, I can only say that in so doing he pays but a meager tribute to his own intelligence, and that if he will read the history of his country carefully he will be able, in the light of Republican manliness and fidelity there disclosed, to obtain an ample and satisfactory reply.

All the arguments that have been made, Mr. Speaker, on that side of the Chamber concerning the question under discussion savor of apprehension, and may justly be characterized as arguments by way of anticipation. They are all based on the presumption that a wrong is to be committed; and we are told by the gentleman from Georgia that this House will be swept away by a common sentiment of injustice in the decision of contested-election cases. The position of the gentleman from Georgia is simply this: The Constitution requires—and it is imperative—that the House shall judge and determine of the qualifications and election of its members. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] says it shall not perform this constitutional mandate, but that it ought to resolve itself into a do-nothing Congress in election contests for fear that it will go astray if it undertakes to perform its duties at all. The gentleman, too, was somewhat unfortunate in his reference to the contested-election case of Miller *vs.* Elliott, in the Fifty-first Congress. The doing of this at once calls up reminiscences which reflect no credit upon the gentleman's party.

I was not here during the session of the Fifty-first Congress, Mr. Speaker, and can not speak of the details of that contest; but I remember that in the Fifty-second Congress Mr. Miller again ap-

peared and again brought a contest against Mr. ELLIOTT for that seat. I remember that in the committee that case was put by the majority at the foot of the docket, instead of being put in its proper place there for hearing. I remember that gentlemen upon that committee who belonged to the majority persistently absented themselves from the committee room in order to prevent a quorum and prevent that case from being considered and reported. I remember that by this dilatory policy this man Miller, who was clearly entitled to his seat, who was plainly proven to be entitled to it, was not even allowed a hearing, and that, although there were only six contested-election cases before the Elections Committee, they permitted that Congress to expire without even allowing his case to be brought to the attention of the House.

I remember that I myself, urging the case forward to the best of my humble ability on the part of the minority, to the end that the man might have simply a hearing before the House, succeeded in getting from that body an order for the printing of the report of the minority of the committee, whereupon the majority were compelled to report, and I remember, too, that in the last and expiring moments of that Congress I myself sought to call up on the floor of the House this case of Mr. Miller, and demanded that a hearing should be given to it; and that these gentlemen who have been prating to-day about the wrongful actions of the Fifty-first Congress in contested-election cases raised the question of consideration against it, and would not even allow the man so clearly elected an opportunity to be heard or to have his case decided upon.

We are also told, Mr. Speaker, by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] that this scheme of having three Elections Committees is objectionable, because one committee may take one view of a legal question and another committee may take another view of that same question; and then the gentleman proceeded to answer himself immediately afterwards when he admitted that the whole case after all finally rested in the power of the House. Why, the House will have, of course, plenary power and control over the various Elections Committees. The House may adopt or reject the reasoning of any of them. It may adopt the report of one committee and reject the report of another committee, or it may finally refer the whole case back to the Committee on Contested Elections for further action. There is no danger, however these committees may differ in their views of the law, but that when the House has all these cases before it in their proper order it will be able to preserve its consistency and do absolute justice in each one of them.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] further informs the House that there were thirty-five contests for seats commenced in this Congress, but that four or five of them have been abandoned. That is simply for the reason that those of our own political household who instituted these contests knew our sentiments better than does the gentleman from Georgia, and they felt sure that a contest without merits would meet with no consideration at the hands of their party friends in this House. I prefer to take the opinion of these men, with their superior sources of knowledge, as to the feeling of the Republican majority on the subject of election cases than to take the opinion expressed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], whom I hope it will not be thought I deal unjustly by when I say that from the beginning to the end of what he has said in this debate he never rose to the dignity of an argument, but has spent his entire time mainly in predicting misconduct upon the part of this majority, which he has no reasonable grounds to believe will ever occur.

Mr. Speaker, the hindsight of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] will no doubt be more just to the motives and conduct of this House than his foresight. I am sure that if he will await the impartial action of this body his retrospect will be more accurate and just than the forecasts which he has made.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us is a plain and simple one. I need not delay the House longer in the presentation of it. It resolves itself in a very simple proposition, which is this: All previous experience has shown that no House constituted as this is, with a single Elections Committee of fifteen men, can possibly dispose of one-third the number of contested-election cases that are before us for its consideration.

The mandate of the Constitution is plain. It is an imperative duty, from which the House can not escape if it would, that it shall judge of the qualifications and election of its own members.

As has been said, gentlemen upon the other side of the Chamber have contented themselves with predicting evil and have not been able to suggest a single method of relief for the difficulty by which we are confronted. There are proposed in the pending measure three separate committees, constituted not to work injustice, but to do justice; constituted to do justice to the contestant and contestee; constituted to do justice to the people from whom these parties came; and until gentlemen can offer some better argument against the adoption of this rule than a mere pessimistic prophecy as to what will be its results, until they can come forward and offer some tangible substitute to take its place, it were better that they remain silent and let the majority of this House take upon its shoulders, as it is ready to do, the responsibility and the honor of adopting a rule which will dispose of these cases speedily and without delay, and which I hope and believe will do away with party considerations in the matter of contested elections before the American House of Representatives, leaving such cases to be determined solely upon the law and the facts, regardless of the political complexion of any gentleman who comes before a committee or before this House to invoke its investigation and its action. [Applause on the Republican side and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I desire to ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the gentleman from Georgia desires to use any more of his time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia does not seem to be in his seat at present.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman from Illinois, while he is waiting for the return of the gentleman from Georgia, permit me to ask him if he would have any objection to amending his motion by providing that the members of these Elections Committees shall be required to take a special oath?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Texas, touching that matter, that long since I have come to the conclusion that the commandments "Thou shalt not bear false witness" and "Thou shalt not lie" come from the same source; and practicing law, as I have done for many years, I have come to the conclusion that when you find a man who will tell a lie when the truth is called for, he will not hesitate to swear to it. I do not much believe in special oaths myself, and do not think they amount to anything.

Mr. BAILEY. Well, we will make him swear to a lie; then he will be punished hereafter. [Laughter.]

The suggestion I have made was with the utmost good faith. I understand the purpose the gentleman has in view (and I am entirely in sympathy with it) is to secure speedy and impartial determination of these contested-election cases. I fully agree with the idea that when a man has once taken an oath in this House he ought to feel called on, in all his relations with the House, to conform to the obligations of that oath. But the statement is made on both sides of the House and not contradicted—the gentleman from Illinois made the statement himself—that the members of this House and the members of the Committee on Elections have not been controlled in these cases by their general oath; and if they have not done so heretofore, I do not see any reason to believe that they will hereafter.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a question?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. Is there any reason why a member of the House, who happens to become a member of any special committee, should take an oath different from or any more binding than that which the other individual members of the House take when they assume their duties on this floor? And in the second place, let me ask the gentleman, if such an oath should be prescribed by the House as he suggests, would it not become an extrajudicial oath? Would not the only authority competent to prescribe such an oath be the authority that can enact a law?

Mr. BAILEY. Not at all. Does not the House very frequently authorize its committee to administer oaths, and are they not binding?

Mr. PAYNE. But that is done in pursuance of law.

Mr. BAILEY (continuing). I take the distinction to be this: That all other committees of the House deal with various questions. This committee alone deals with the one single question of determining the right of the members to their seats on this floor. The admission has been universally made that in the past these cases have been tried on their politics and not upon their merits. Now, if we are trying to devise a way to decide these cases on their merits and not upon their politics, let us make it as binding as possible.

Mr. PAYNE. The Constitution imposes this duty on each member of the House, to be a judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of each of the other members. We also take an oath to perform our duties as members of the House under the Constitution. Does the gentleman from Texas think that any judicial oath, such as a judge or a jury would take, could impose any additional responsibility or add any moral obligation to that already imposed on the members of the House by the Constitution? And that a man who would not perform his duty faithfully and well under the oath already prescribed, and that he has already taken, would deal more fairly with his fellow-members or perform his duties any better under any additional form of oath that may be devised?

Mr. BAILEY. I was about to say that I think the gentleman from New York would perform the duties of his office without any oath at all; and yet he is required by the law to take the oath before he is entitled to a seat on this floor, and I think it a very sensible provision. I do not doubt either that many members of the House would discharge the duties and responsibilities of the Elections Committee without any special form of oath. But many of them do not, and it can do no possible harm to guard

this matter so as to accomplish as nearly as we can the object the gentleman from Illinois claims to have in view.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. What sort of an oath would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. BAILEY. I will obligate myself to prepare one that will be entirely acceptable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Well, we have already taken one oath to perform our duty faithfully under the Constitution and the law. In the House and in the committee we investigate this matter. We are the court of last resort.

Mr. BAILEY. And I want to swear them as judges.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I think they will discharge their duties faithfully.

Mr. BAILEY. But the admission is that they have not done so.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. If the oath we have already taken does not bind them, they have no conscience.

Mr. BAILEY. The way cases have been decided it does not seem to have bound them.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Then you should resort to some medicine more drastic than two oaths—something that would blister.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I desire to ask the gentleman from Georgia whether he has exhausted his time and desires more?

Mr. CRISP. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I desire to ask the gentleman whether he desires more time. I want to take the floor, but I do not want to cut the gentleman off.

Mr. CRISP. What time have I left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has eight minutes left.

Mr. CRISP. I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like a little more if necessary.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that all the members on that side of the House feel, as they express themselves, determined to consider all the election cases in a fair and judicial manner; but we must remember that the experience of this country shows that when bodies like this come into the excitement of contests they are liable to forget these very virtuous resolutions. When the Forty-seventh Congress met I believe every member on the Republican side of the House came here with just as virtuous intentions as the gentlemen have who came and took their seats in this Hall on the 2d of this month; but when excitement ruled high there were certain things which transpired in that House which can very properly be referred to in this debate, especially as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], who has just taken his seat, appealed to the history of the Republican party in matters of this character as a refutation of this charge that in election cases they had been partisan rather than judicial. I have before me the evidence in the case of Mackey *vs.* O'Connor, Mackey being the Republican and O'Connor the Democrat.

After the contest commenced O'Connor died, and Mr. Dibble, a Democrat, was elected without opposition. When Congress met the Republican side insisted upon considering the case, substituting Dibble for O'Connor. As the case proceeded the following remarkable facts were developed: Undenied proof was brought before this House that after O'Connor's death Mr. Mackey, the contestant, took the testimony in that case, very largely rewrote it, burned up much of the original evidence, and materially changed a great part of the balance, and after holding this evidence some eleven months in his possession he sent it to this House, had it printed, and went before the committee insisting that he should have his seat, basing his claim upon the testimony which, before the case was considered, was proven to be false and forged and not the evidence which was taken under the oath of the witnesses.

In the face of undenied proof that Mr. Mackey falsified and forged the evidence, the House declined to even consider the question of the false and forged character of the evidence, but proceeded to act upon the testimony, and upon such false and forged evidence unseated Mr. Dibble and seated Mr. Mackey. I send to the Clerk's desk to have read evidence sustaining what I charge, and I first ask that the affidavit of Mr. C. Smith, on page 4384, be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Dibble also presented the affidavit of C. Smith, of South Carolina, corroborating the statement made by Mr. Dibble. This affidavit is as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, *Charleston County:*

Before me personally came C. Smith, in response to a summons to testify as to certain matters in a contest entitled E. W. M. Mackey *v.* M. P. O'Connor, and who, being duly sworn, says: "I was employed by E. W. M. Mackey to write out the testimony taken in his behalf in the contest between himself and Mr. O'Connor for a seat in the Forty-seventh Congress; this writing was done at the house of Colonel Mackey, and at the United States court-house, and at my room. The body of testimony was in the handwriting of E. H. Hogarth, stenographer and notary public, and there were interlineations, erasures, and portions of the original sheets were cut out and other sheets substituted, and sometimes left out entirely; that sometimes nearly a whole page was struck out by drawing a line across it; that the interlineations were in the handwriting of E. W. M. Mackey; that the copy made by me omitted the erasures and inserted the interlineations; that sometimes whole pages of this testimony in the handwriting of Col. E. W. M. Mackey would be inserted, and of which there was no original in the handwriting of Mr. Hogarth, the notary public, that I saw; that sometimes when I returned the originals and my copy of the same, Colonel Mackey destroyed the originals by placing them in a stove, or destroying them by tearing them up; that in some instances the copy made by me was returned interlined, and I made fresh copy with such corrections; the interlineations last mentioned were also in the handwriting of Col. E. W. M. Mackey; that the notary public, Mr. Hogarth, placed his seal and signature to the testimony as it was handed to him without making any comparison with the originals, as in many instances, as before stated, the originals had been destroyed, and also without making any comparison with his shorthand notes; that is, in every case in which I was present, my impression is that I saw him sign nearly all of the testimony, certainly more than half of it; that in the case of W. A. Zimmerman the testimony as copied by this deponent was submitted to him for his signature, that he declined to sign the same unless certain corrections were made in it, that the testimony as submitted was not correct, and that unless the corrections were made he would not sign the same; that this testimony of Zimmerman's I returned to Mr. Mackey and I never recopied it; and it was not signed by Mr. Zimmerman when I returned it to Mr. Mackey; that in the case of Maj. T. A. Haguenin the testimony as copied by me was handed to him; he glanced over it and said, "I suppose it is all right," and signed it; that I may have submitted other testimony but can not now recall the other cases where I submitted them for signatures; that Mr. Hogarth in certifying these papers would certify a number of them at one time and without comparison as aforesaid.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise now in my own time and be recognized in my own time to finish this.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN].

Mr. WHEELER. Can not this side be recognized the same time as the other side has been recognized?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I will not detain the gentleman more than three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will suspend. The Chair did not understand the question of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to be recognized in my own time—as this side has not had as much time as the other side—after the gentleman from Maine has spoken.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will proceed, and the other point will be decided afterwards.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to enter into crimination and recrimination in regard to this matter, which seems to me to have no more to do with the issue than it would be if it should be indulged in with respect to any other matter. What is the simple question? There are thirty-two cases of contested seats in this House.

There are thirty-two contested-election cases in this House. The proposition of the rule that has been introduced here is that these cases shall be tried speedily. The objections raised on the other side are in favor of delay. Now, I think there has never been a more absurd practice in this House than that which has obtained heretofore of allowing contested-election cases to run along until toward the end of the Congress. I recollect that in one Congress, I think it was the Forty-eighth, a man was around here until within forty-five minutes of the time of final adjournment, and then he was seated, took his $10,000 salary and his mileage, and went home, and, of course, the other man, whom the Congress decided to be without title, had been sitting here purporting to represent the people of that district during the whole Congress. Gentlemen oppose a speedy trial of these cases on the ground that they fear justice will not be done.

Mr. Speaker, if their position is correct, then we should have no trial of these cases at all. Not an argument has been adduced against the proposition of this rule that does not go to show that there should never be any hearing of contested-election cases in this House. If gentlemen can not get justice here, if the trials of these cases are not to be judicial, but are to be entirely partisan—if that argument obtains to-day, it will obtain to-morrow and until the last hour of this Congress, and, if it be sound, there is no reason why there should be any Committee on Elections or why any gentleman should ever come here to contest a seat. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] says that we want to add 32 members to the Republican roll. Why, in the name of Heaven, does the gentleman from New York think we want to do that? Do we desire to have any more Republican members here unless they have been justly elected? Certainly not.

Why, sir, one almost has to use a telescope now to see our Democratic friends here, so few are they in number, and Heaven knows we do not want to make them any less in number unless some gentleman is a contestant here who, upon the facts and under the law, is entitled to a seat held by a Democrat. The real object of this proposed rule is to do justice and to do it speedily, and if there is any force in the argument used on the other side that this rule ought not to be adopted because under it justice will not be done, then let us appoint no Committee on Elections, but publish to the country that no contestant can have a fair hearing and trial in this House, and that therefore the imperative mandate of the Constitution shall not be obeyed.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, the situation in which the House finds itself placed is simply this: There are more contests pending before this body than it is possible for one Committee on Elections, with reasonable diligence, to consider, and the question is, shall a portion of those cases go unexamined, or shall committees enough be appointed to hear them all in an orderly way and within a reasonable time, and to dispose of them? The position in which we find ourselves in this respect is not unusual in other matters.

Very frequently the people of the States have found themselves embarrassed by the clogging of the wheels of justice in their courts, and court commissions have been organized in several of the States to take up appeals and dispose of them concurrently with the State court of appeals or supreme court. In the same way we now have more contested-election cases to deal with than any single committee can dispose of, and it becomes necessary either to send them to subcommittees and allow those subcommittees to report to the full committee and let the full committee adopt their conclusions, or else to appoint committees enough to give a full hearing to every contested-election case.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we have no reason to desire to seat any more Republicans here. Already we have lent our friends more than 100 of our members to fill the empty seats on that side, and how would the minority look with 32 more of them taken away to make room for Republicans? No contestants will be seated unless it clearly appears that they have been elected. But, while we have been capturing so many Democratic districts in the last election, we can not afford to allow Republican districts, where our candidates have been fairly elected, to be misrepresented here. I do not know, sir, because I have not examined the record in any of these cases, whether any gentleman is unlawfully occupying a seat on this floor, but, on the other hand, if the 32 gentlemen now occupying contested seats have been truly elected, it is due to them that the clouds upon their title should be removed, and they ought to be in favor of having that question determined. It is as much to their interest as it is for the interest of the contestants that these cases should be heard and decided speedily.

Much has been said by gentlemen on the other side as to the action of the Fifty-first Congress. That action was long misinterpreted and misunderstood. It was misrepresented until many people in the country believed that some real wrong had been done by the Committee on Elections in that Congress. There were seventeen contested-election cases in the Fifty-first Congress, and I want to call the attention of the House briefly to those cases and to their results. Eight members were unseated. In one case the contestant, Mr. Clayton, was dead, and a subsequent election took place, in which a Democrat, Mr. Breckinridge, was returned; making a change in the membership of this body of 7, and 7 only.

In the case of Smith *vs.* Jackson, from West Virginia, the gentleman who held the seat held it simply by reason of a clerical error in an election return from one of the counties of that State. The full amount of the votes cast for the contestant not having been correctly written out, the return was defective, and, by reason of that defect, the contestee was seated, although not in fact entitled to the certificate. In the case of Atkinson *vs.* Pendleton, from the same State, the return was held back by the contestee's friends and a recount was had, and on that recount Mr. Pendleton was given the seat. On the hearing by the Elections Committee it was decided that Atkinson was elected. In the case of Featherston *vs.* Cate, from Arkansas, the contest was not by a Republican, but by a Populist, and the Populist was found to be entitled to the seat.

In Waddill *vs.* Wise, from the State of Virginia, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] signed a minority report in which he held that Mr. Wise was not elected and that there should be a new election. That case turned upon this simple point: Five or six hundred voters were prevented from voting by illegal or wrongful challenging; they were held back by the interposition of foolish challengers; and when the polls were closed in the evening those men stood in line waiting to cast their votes. The result of their being refused the right to vote was that Mr. Wise was given the seat. In that case, as I have said, even the gentleman from Georgia signed a report to the effect that there had been no election.

In the case of Langston *vs.* Venable, from the State of Virginia, there was an ordinary contest turning upon a very large number of questions—a contest in which the Republican was finally seated. In the case of Miller *vs.* Elliott, from South Carolina, to which reference has already been made, there was never any decent pretense that Mr. ELLIOTT was entitled to the seat. He was ostensibly elected in a district having 26,000 Republican majority—elected simply by throwing out all the tickets that got into the wrong box. Two boxes were placed before the voter; and he was required to put his ticket in the right box or be disfranchised. The ballots that happened to get into the wrong box were all thrown out; and the boxes were shifted from time to time, in order to prevent the voter from placing his ticket into the right box. The only legal question involved in that case was substantially whether or not a man who had gone and deposited his ticket, and had been deprived of the right of having his vote properly counted because the box had been shifted, should have his vote counted by this body. The ballots were held legal and the House counted them as they were in fact cast.

Mudd *vs.* Compton, from Maryland, was a case where by mistake the judges of the election locked up the returns of the result of a single precinct with the ballots, and sent the box containing the ballots and the certificate to the proper officials, and they refused to have the ballot box opened in order that they might get the returns. In that case the Democrat was given the seat by omitting the return which had been put into the ballot box.

Those are the eight cases to which I referred, including the Breckinridge case, in which the contestant was dead. In those cases the contestees were unseated. On the other hand, there was the case of Eaton *vs.* Phelan, from Tennessee, in which the sitting member was permitted to retain his seat. In Bowen *vs.* Buchanan, from Virginia, and Chalmers *vs.* Morgan, from Mississippi, the result was the same. A similar decision was reached in the cases of Kernoghan *vs.* Hooker, from Mississippi; of Hill *vs.* Catchings, from Mississippi, and Threet *vs.* Clarke, from the State of Alabama. The case of Posey *vs.* Parrett, from Indiana, was a very close case; and in that case also the sitting member was permitted to retain his seat.

In the cases of McGinnis *vs.* Alderson, from West Virginia, and Goodrich *vs.* Bullock, from Florida, the report of the majority of the committee was made in favor of giving the Republican contestants their seats; but neither of those cases was ever reached in the House. Owing to the amount of business in that Congress, and notwithstanding the railroad speed that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] complains of, those two cases in which reports were filed in favor of the contestants were never acted on by the House. If this House will show as good a record as the Fifty-first Congress in the disposition of contested-election cases, no one need be ashamed of its course. In the Fifty-second Congress cases were passed over and not decided at all in committee or House. Of all grievances in election contests it seems to me the worst is when a man who believes he has a just and honest claim to a seat is denied a hearing before the committee or a decision in the House.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, a case from a district in my own State where a contest was made, and the Democratic contestant was seated almost at midnight on the last day of the session. He cast one single yea-and-nay vote, drew his salary for two years, and retired at the final adjournment. His opponent had been permitted to retain his seat and represent the district all through that entire Congress. Now, if it was true, as was claimed by that Democratic body, that the sitting member was not elected, he should have been unseated promptly, not only that his opponent might have drawn the salary, but that the people of that district might have been represented in Congress by the man of their choice.

Such a case ought to have been reported upon and decided promptly, so that the contestant might have had the actual fruits of the contest, those fruits being not merely the matter of salary, but the right to represent the district upon the floor of this House.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DALZELL. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is greatly to be regretted that a question of this importance should take on a political cast, and I have regretted exceedingly that on our side of the House as well as on the other there has been a manifest purpose to thrash over some old straw which was harvested many years ago. Brushing away everything that does not touch this question as now presented, what is the exact proposition that we are called upon to meet? Simply that in view of the fact of an unprecedented docket of contested cases we shall create a court for the trial of those causes.

It is agreed on all hands that a committee of fifteen gentlemen sitting down to investigate these cases must necessarily occupy their whole time until the 3d of March, 1897, when we all expect to see a Republican President inaugurated. It would deprive these gentlemen of all opportunity to engage in other matters in which they are interested before this Congress. Therefore the very necessity of the situation appeals to us to provide some sort of instrumentality by which these election cases can be fairly and intelligently disposed of by the House.

Gentlemen have said that undue haste is observed in the disposal of election cases, and I agree, Mr. Speaker, that they are undoubtedly right about that. The very condition of things in this House, the condition of business in the expiring hours of a session of Congress, necessitates hurrying up matters of this sort, so that there can not be that careful, discriminating, judicial treatment of the question that the importance of the subject demands. It is, therefore, to meet that very fault that we propose to inaugurate a new system by which the election contests can be treated

fairly, by which they can have sufficient time appropriated to them, and by which they can be tried by a tribunal that will give to them all of the care, all of the attention, all of the opportunities, that the importance of the subject calls for.

Now, it has been suggested that the cases would be decided on a partisan basis in the event of the adoption of this rule. I think, my friends on the other side of the House, that there is not the slightest desire whatever to accomplish such a result. On the other hand, there is no necessity for the party on this side of the House—the party in control—to increase its membership. Why, the great danger that confronts the Republican party in the House of Representatives to-day is its large and unprecedented majority. The same trouble you labored under during the two last sessions of Congress confronts us; and you are my witnesses that your large majority in the House was the bane of your success in the affairs of the House. Now, you should not insist that the Republicans, however wicked they may have been in the past, will steal a seat at this time when they have no need for it. On the contrary, I can assure you gentlemen on that side of the House your cases will receive a respectful, candid, patient, and judicial consideration.

I know, sir, somewhat of the purposes of this movement. It is to change the former practices and usages of the House; and it is a golden opportunity now for gentlemen to enter upon such a reform. It is because the majority of the House have no occasion to take a seat that may not rightfully belong to them that it is desirable to adopt such a measure as this. And we have an opportunity here to provide a tribunal to conduct these election cases in a judicial manner. Ever since I have had the honor of a seat on this floor I have advocated the consideration of these questions on that basis.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a question.

Mr. POWERS. Certainly.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Waiving all questions of politics involved in this matter, the important question and the one great consideration, at least on this side of the House, is as to how, in the event of the adoption of this rule, it will be administered. Is my friend in a position to speak for his side of the House, and to assure us that this amendment to the rules, creating three Committees on Elections, if adopted, will not be so administered as to oppress gentlemen on this side of the House whose seats are contested, or is it the purpose that they shall have a fair, judicial, and impartial determination of their cases?

Mr. POWERS. I have no hesitation whatever, Mr. Speaker, in assuring my friend from Georgia that that is the very purpose which promotes the inauguration of this new method of procedure in regard to the determination of election cases.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Then my friend knows that to be the purpose of the gentlemen with whom he associates politically?

Mr. POWERS. I know to a very great extent that that is the purpose. I have conversed with many gentlemen on my side, and all of them with whom I have conversed seem delighted with the prospect of providing some such solution as this for these contested-election cases.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that so long as I have been a member of this body and have had the honor of a seat here I have invariably voted on these questions as if I were deciding the case as a judge of a court. The very first vote I cast in this House was on an election case——

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I wish to assure the gentleman from Vermont that I in common with many others on this side share in his estimate of his own fairness. [Applause.] And if we could know that gentlemen on his side of equal impartiality would compose these committees I can say without hesitation that there is a numerous group about me here who would willingly and cheerfully accept the arrangement proposed.

Mr. POWERS. I have no hesitation in assuring my friend from Georgia that all the members who have contested seats here will have the amplest opportunities to have the cases decided, and that they will be decided upon the law and facts as they appear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, inasmuch as the opportunity is now presented of inaugurating a change in the method and usages that have obtained with both parties in the settlement of these questions, that we ought to join hands, Republicans, Democrats, and Populists alike, in favor of the proposed change.

Why, I agree that undoubtedly the evidence establishes the fact that any political party when pressed hard will strain a point in favor of their own men. As the gentleman from Georgia very aptly said, they are likely to inquire, "Which is our man in this fight?" But in this of all Congresses that question may not appropriately be asked. We do not want to increase our membership for any political purpose. I would rather you should take some of our seats, for the danger we are in is that there are too many of us; and you are the gentlemen who ought to rejoice if we steal your seats, for then you would be able to make campaign thunder of it in 1896, which you know well how to use.

Mr. MILES. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. POWERS. With great pleasure.

Mr. MILES. I would like to ask the gentleman to explain to the House wherein the proposed changed system would be an advantage. Is it not rather an attempt to facilitate the settlement of these election cases under the same old vicious system?

Mr. POWERS. It is not by any means. The change, my friend, is this: Under the old system you had a court with fifteen judges, and you can not make it efficient unless you double the judicial force. By dividing it into sections you give each individual case more extended time, and it makes it easier for the whole matter to be ventilated before the committee. If you have a court whose docket is crowded so that proper time can not be given to the consideration of each case, somebody will suffer injustice, but if you can have ample time and have a tribunal made up as we recommend shall be in this case, then your committee will have ample time to consider the case honestly, and that is all you ask for.

Mr. MILES. But the gentleman has assumed that when this overloaded court brings its reports to this House, this House would not be guided by the same partisan spirit which has actuated it in the past.

Mr. POWERS. I maintain, sir, that if your side of the House will join in this proposed change and enter heartily into the spirit of this proposition we have advanced, that these cases shall be determined according to the law and the facts, you will have established a beneficent precedent for future Houses to follow.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. POWERS. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. I like the gentleman's phrase "court," and I would like to inquire if he is willing to assimilate this committee to a court to the extent of compelling its members to take an oath to try these cases as he says they ought to be tried, according to the law and the evidence.

Mr. POWERS. I have no objection to any formalities that may be prescribed for the guidance of this committee. What I insist upon is that it is the only way possible in which a fair, intelligent, and candid consideration of these cases can be made by this Congress during its life. [Applause and cries of "Vote!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I believe, Mr. Speaker, there has been recognition of two hours on a side.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Georgia occupied an hour. The gentleman from New York was recognized in his own right, and occupied fifteen minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now, I would be glad to take the floor with the view to move the previous question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will permit me.

The SPEAKER. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Georgia might come to some understanding about the matter.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I say I will be glad to take the floor for the purpose of moving the previous question, but I have no desire to unduly curtail debate. The recognitions have been equal, and I would be glad to have a vote to-day.

Mr. CRISP. But this side has not used so much time as the other. I think the gentleman from Alabama wanted time, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], and possibly the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]—not much. The gentleman from New York has three-quarters of an hour remaining, as I understand.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York did not reserve his time; but, without objection on the part of the House, it will be considered as reserved, if the gentleman from Georgia desires.

Mr. CRISP. I do not think we desire that much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I think we can close by unanimous consent. I will ask unanimous consent that fifteen minutes be taken by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], and that then I take the floor.

Mr. CRISP. As I understand, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] desire to offer amendments and to have them voted upon.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I have no objection to the amendments being offered at the proper time, to be read for information.

Mr. CRISP. But the gentleman has certainly no objection to them being voted upon.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Perhaps not. I say I have no objection to them being read for information, but I do not desire to let the previous question operate upon them until I know what they are.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman recollects that the proposition was that these rules should be taken up for consideration and amendment. Now, of course, if our side is not permitted to offer any

amendments, I hardly think that we will have had justice in the spirit of the agreement that they would be taken up for amendment, and we have not had an opportunity to offer amendments.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I say that I do not desire to move the previous question so as to exclude amendments, but I do not think the previous question should operate on any amendment which I do not know.

Mr. CRISP. I hope the gentleman will not demand the previous question until gentlemen have had opportunity to offer amendments.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I say that I have no objection to them being read for information, and after they have been read for information we will elect what we should do. Let them be read.

Mr. CRISP. I understand the gentleman's proposition to be that if he approves the amendments he will let them be voted upon, but if he does not approve of them he will not let them be voted upon. We want the judgment of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Let us know what the amendments are.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I think the time for closing the debate should be fixed first.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that the amendments can be read for information. That will perhaps aid the House in fixing the time for closing the debate. The Chair understands the objection of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to be simply that he does not desire to have the previous question operate upon amendments which he has not heard and which he might wish to discuss.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Precisely.

The SPEAKER. Then, if the Chair is correct in that understanding, the amendments may be read first and then arrangements can be made for limiting the debate.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer this amendment:

And in the consideration in the House of any contested-election case reported by any of said committees six hours shall be allowed for debate if so much be desired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and have it pending.

The amendment was read, as follows:

I move as an amendment to the resolution the following:

"RULE XI.

"POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES.

"All proposed legislation shall be referred to the committees named in the preceding rule, as follows, viz: Subjects relating,

1. To the election of members: to the Committees on Elections; which committees shall take up, consider, and report the same according to the date of the receipt of the printed testimony by the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk an amendment which I desire to submit.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I suppose that no further amendments are in order, but I have no objection to hearing the one the gentleman desires to offer.

The amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY was read, as follows:

That the Speaker shall administer to each member of each Committee on Elections an oath to well and truly try and decide each case according to the law and the testimony.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] have fifteen minutes to close the debate on the other side.

Mr. WHEELER. Will not the gentleman make it twenty minutes? Other gentlemen on this side desire to occupy a few minutes.

Mr. CRISP. Are the amendments to be considered pending?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois agree that these amendments shall be considered as pending?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, no; I can not agree to that.

The SPEAKER. Then the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. TERRY, to present his amendment.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS], and to meet him halfway in the spirit he has expressed for a fair and deliberate consideration of these election cases, I have offered this amendment. Of course, the crucial point in any election case is when it finally comes into this House for its judgment and determination. For that reason we should have a safeguard provided in this very rule creating these three committees—a safeguard which shall operate in this House, the final tribunal, made by the Constitution the judge of the election and qualification and returns of its own members, a safeguard providing and making it certain that here, before this august tribunal, there shall be a fair, full, and reasonable consideration of every contested-election case reported by either of these committees. It may be suggested upon the other side that each election case can be brought in with a special rule, assigning so much time for its consideration in the House; but why leave so important a matter, affecting the membership and dignity of this House, to the whims and caprice of a Committee on Rules? Now is the time to provide for that while we are laying the basis for the settlement of these cases. Let us here and now provide this safeguard, so that we may be certain to have that full and fair and just consideration of every election case advocated by the gentleman from Vermont. I offer my amendment, Mr. Speaker, for that purpose, and appeal to every fair-minded man on both sides of this Chamber to vote for it.

The question being taken on the amendment offered by Mr. TERRY, the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. TERRY. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 48, noes 166.

Mr. TERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays, there were—ayes 42, noes 186.

Mr. TERRY. I call for tellers on ordering the yeas and nays.

On ordering tellers 41 members voted in the affirmative, a sufficient number; and tellers were ordered.

Mr. TERRY and Mr. CANNON of Illinois were appointed to act as tellers.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 57, noes 189.

So the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ABBOTT. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I will state to the Speaker and the House that my seat is contested, and I do not know whether I can with propriety vote in this case. I have an indirect interest in the amendment pending as well as in the rule; and I would like to be advised by the Speaker in regard to my privilege in the matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not undertake to decide that question. The gentleman must decide it for himself.

Mr. ABBOTT. Then I ask that the House excuse me from voting.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman will be considered as excused. The Chair hears no objection.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 62, nays 201, not voting 89, answered "present" 3; as follows:

YEAS—62.

Allen,	De Armond,	Maguire,	Sayers,
Bailey,	Denny,	McClellan,	Sorg,
Baker, Kans.	Dinsmore,	McCreary, Ky.	Strait,
Bankhead,	Downing,	McCulloch,	Sulzer,
Bartlett, Ga.	Erdman,	McDearmon,	Swanson,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Hainer, Nebr.	McKenney,	Tate,
Bell, Tex.	Hall,	McMillin,	Terry,
Berry,	Harrison,	Meyer,	Turner, Ga.
Catchings,	Hart,	Miles,	Turner, Va.
Clardy,	Hendrick,	Miner, N. Y.	Tyler,
Cooper, Fla.	Howard,	Neill,	Walsh,
Cooper, Tex.	Jones,	Owens,	Washington,
Cox,	Layton,	Pendleton,	Williams,
Crain,	Lester,	Powers,	Woodard.
Crisp,	Little,	Richardson,	
Cummings,	Lockhart,	Russell, Ga.	

NAYS—201.

Adams,	De Witt,	Jenkins,	Royse,
Aitken,	Dingley,	Johnson, Cal.	Russell, Conn.
Aldrich,	Dolliver,	Johnson, Ind.	Scranton,
Anderson,	Doolittle,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Settle,
Andrews,	Dovener,	Kem,	Shafroth,
Arnold, Pa.	Draper,	Kiefer,	Shannon,
Arnold, R. I.	Eddy,	Kirkpatrick,	Sherman,
Atwood,	Ellis,	Knox,	Shuford,
Babcock,	Evans,	Lacey,	Simpkins,
Baker, Md.	Fairchild,	Leighty,	Skinner,
Baker, N. H.	Faris,	Leisenring,	Smith, Ill.
Barham,	Fischer,	Lewis,	Smith, Mich.
Bartholdt,	Foote,	Linney,	Snover,
Bell, Colo.	Foss,	Long,	Southwick,
Bennett,	Gamble,	Loudenslager,	Spalding,
Bingham,	Gibson,	Low,	Sperry,
Bishop,	Graff,	Mahany,	Stahle,
Black, N. Y.	Griffin,	Mahon,	Steele,
Blue,	Griswold,	Marsh,	Stephenson,
Boutelle,	Grosvenor,	McCall, Mass.	Stewart, N. J.
Bowers,	Grout,	McCall, Tenn.	Stewart, Wis.
Brewster,	Grow,	McCleary, Minn.	Stone, C. W.
Broderick,	Hadley,	McClure,	Stone, W. A.
Bromwell,	Hager,	McLachlan,	Strode, Nebr.
Brosius,	Halterman,	Mercer,	Strong,
Brown,	Hanly,	Miller, W. Va.	Strowd, N. C.
Brumm,	Hardy,	Milliken,	Taft,
Bull,	Harmer,	Milnes,	Tawney,
Burrell,	Harris,	Minor, Wis.	Tayler,
Burton, Mo.	Hartman,	Mondell,	Thomas,
Burton, Ohio	Hatch,	Moody,	Towne,
Calderhead,	Heatwole,	Morse,	Tracy,
Cannon,	Hemenway,	Mozly,	Treloar,
Clark, Iowa	Henderson,	Murphy,	Updegraff,
Clark, Mo.	Henry, Conn.	Northway,	Van Voorhis,
Codding,	Henry, Ind.	Odell,	Walker, Mass.
Coffin,	Hepburn,	Otjen,	Wanger,
Colson,	Hermann,	Overstreet,	Warner,
Connolly,	Hilborn,	Parker,	Watson, Ind.
Cook, Wis.	Hill,	Payne,	Watson, Ohio
Cooke, Ill.	Hitt,	Pearson,	Wilber,
Cooper, Wis.	Hooker,	Perkins,	Willis,
Corliss,	Howe,	Phillips,	Wilson, Idaho
Crowther,	Howell,	Pickler,	Wilson, N. Y.
Curtis, Iowa	Hubbard,	Pitney,	Wilson, Ohio
Curtis, Kans.	Huff,	Poole,	Wood,
Curtis, N. Y.	Huling,	Prince,	Woodman,
Dalzell,	Hull,	Pugh,	Wright.
Danford,	Hunter,	Quigg,	
Daniels,	Hurley,	Raney,	
Dayton,	Hyde,	Reeves,	

NOT VOTING—89.

Abbott,	Fitzgerald,	Maddox,	Shaw,
Acheson,	Fletcher,	McCormick,	Southard,
Apsley,	Fowler,	McEwan,	Sparkman,
Avery,	Gardner,	McGann.	Spencer,
Barney,	Gillet, N. Y.	McLaurin,	Stallings,
Barrett,	Gillett, Mass.	McRae,	Stokes,
Beach,	Heiner, Pa.	Meiklejohn,	Sulloway,
Boatner,	Hicks,	Meredith,	Talbert,
Buck,	Hopkins,	Miller, Kans.	Tarsney,
Chickering,	Hulick,	Money,	Tracewell,
Clarke, Ala.	Hutcheson,	Moses,	Tucker,
Cobb, Ala.	Joy,	Newlands,	Underwood,
Cobb, Mo.	Kendall,	Noonan,	Wadsworth,
Cockrell,	Kerr,	Ogden,	Walker, Va.
Cousins,	Kulp,	Otey,	Wellington,
Cowen,	Kyle,	Patterson,	Wheeler,
Crowley,	Lawson,	Price,	White,
Crump,	Lefever,	Ray,	Wilson, S. C.
Culberson,	Leonard,	Reyburn,	Woomer,
Dockery,	Linton,	Robertson, La.	Yoakum.
Ellett, Va.	Livingston,	Robinson, Pa.	
Elliott, S. C.	Lorimer,	Rusk,	
Fenton,	Loud,	Sauerhering,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Black, Ga.	Latimer,	Robbins.

So the amendment of Mr. TERRY was rejected.

Mr. MADDOX (when his name was called). For the same reasons as those submitted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ABBOTT], I ask to be excused from voting.

There being no objection, Mr. MADDOX was excused.

Mr. CROWLEY (when his name was called). I ask unanimous consent to be excused from voting.

There being no objection, Mr. CROWLEY was excused.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. DOCKERY.

Mr. ELLIS with Mr. OTEY.

Mr. LINTON with Mr. MOSES.

Mr. SULLOWAY with Mr. MEREDITH.

Mr. HULICK with Mr. KYLE.

Mr. CHICKERING with Mr. MCLAURIN.

Mr. RAY with Mr. BOATNER.

Mr. GILLET of New York with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. LEFEVER with Mr. COWEN.

Mr. STRODE of Nebraska with Mr. COBB of Alabama.

Mr. WOOMER with Mr. LAWSON.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. OGDEN.

Mr. BARNEY with Mr. ELLETT of Virginia.

Mr. GARDNER with Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. REYBURN with Mr. RUSK.

Mr. PITNEY with Mr. COBB of Missouri.

Mr. APSLEY with Mr. MCRAE.

Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. YOAKUM.

Mr. KERR with Mr. CLARKE of Alabama.

Mr. HENDERSON with Mr. CULBERSON.

Mr. JOY with Mr. SPENCER.

Mr. AVERY with Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, for one day.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has offered an amendment, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RULE XI.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES.

All proposed legislation shall be referred to the committees named in the preceding rule, as follows, viz: Subjects relating,

1. To the election of members: to the Committees on Elections, which committees shall take up, consider, and report the same according to the date of receipt of printed testimony by the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. There is another amendment, I believe.

The SPEAKER. There is one other.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I hope that will be submitted. I will state frankly my object is to move the previous question upon the original amendment with the pending amendments.

The SPEAKER. By consent of the House that can be done. Is there objection?

Several MEMBERS. What is the proposition?

The SPEAKER. That this amendment may be considered pending for the purpose of moving the previous question. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me to offer an amendment to be pending?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I think I must decline now.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment, offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY].

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Speaker shall administer to each member of each Committee on Elections an oath to well and truly try and decide each case according to the law and the testimony.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman from Illinois, before demanding the previous question, allow me a moment?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. Some gentlemen appear to think that the amendment which I have offered contains an implication that the members of this House do not respect their oath of office. I not only disclaim all intention of this kind, but I confess my inability to understand how it can be construed in this way. If I did not believe that they would keep an oath after taking it, I would not propose for one to be administered to them. My position is simply this: Gentlemen on both sides declare that these contested-election cases are usually decided according to the political affiliations of the contestant and contestee, and not according to their merits. The majority admit this to be wrong, and aver their intention to remedy it. They profess that their purpose in offering this amendment is to insure "judicial fairness" in the disposition of these contests. Assuming that they are entirely sincere in expressing a desire for "judicial fairness," I simply ask that the committee shall be specially sworn to accord it. My proposition is combated with the statement that the gentlemen who will serve on this committee have already taken one oath and that is sufficient. My answer is that it has not heretofore been sufficient.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very far from assuming that any gentleman on the floor of the House would disregard the obligation of his oath, but I am induced to believe that the general oath taken when they enter upon their duties is not considered by them to cover these particular cases, and I believe that if each member of these committees, who are specially charged with perhaps the highest function of this House, had his attention called by a particular oath to the discharge of a particular duty in a certain way he would carefully and scrupulously observe the obligation.

I know and every other member of this House knows that 95 per cent of the majority follow almost blindly the report of the Committee on Elections, whatever it may be. This being true, I believe that when we are called on to act on the reports of that committee, involving as they do not only the integrity of this House, but involving also the political and property rights of our fellow-members, all ought to have an assurance that they have considered it in a spirit of judicial fairness.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I will say again to the gentleman from Illinois that this amendment is not intended as any reflection on any gentleman who may occupy a place on that committee. Indeed, if adopted at this time, no such construction could possibly be placed upon it, for we do not now know who are to constitute that committee. With the testimony of all sides that heretofore the House and the Committee on Elections have not considered their general oaths to perform the duties of their office as binding in this particular class of cases, I think we ought to be willing to give every member in the House the assurance that in every case hereafter the contestant and the contestee will have all of the security which is implied by a judicial proceeding.

I believe if the majority intend to act fairly there can be no proper objection to swearing that they will, and surely the gentleman from Illinois does not imagine that we lower the dignity of the House by the adoption of a rule that imposes on a committee such an obligation, in view of the fact that the Constitution of the United States imposes on the Senate, when it sits as a tribunal to try impeachment cases, an additional oath.

Mr. PICKLER. Let me interrupt the gentleman to ask this question: Suppose this amendment is carried and some member shall be appointed on one of these Elections Committees who declines to take the oath, what will be the effect?

Mr. BAILEY. I can only answer by suggesting that suppose a Senator, when the Senate of the United States is sitting as a court of impeachment, declines to take the oath provided by the Constitution.

A MEMBER. But that is the Constitution itself.

Mr. PICKLER. That is another question——

Mr. BAILEY. Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. PICKLER (continuing). The gentleman from Texas must not forget that the Constitution authorizes us to make our own rules.

Mr. BAILEY. But if the gentleman will reflect he will remember that the committees of the House are entirely with the House. The Constitution makes no provision in that regard.

Mr. PICKLER. But it fixes the oath.

Mr. BAILEY. It does not require us to swear that we will perform the duties of our office, but simply requires of us an oath to support the Constitution. That part of the oath in reference to the performance of the duties of our office is prescribed by the statute and not by the Constitution.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Does not my friend think that the few moments I have yielded to him are about exhausted?

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his courtesy, and hope I have not abused it.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Not at all.

Mr. Speaker, I call the previous question on the original proposition and the two amendments which have been considered as pending by consent of the House.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment presented by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], which the Clerk will report.

The amendment was read, as follows:

RULE XI.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES.

All proposed legislation shall be referred to the committees named in the preceding rule, as follows, viz: Subjects relating,

1. To the election of members: to the Committees on Elections; which committees shall take up, consider, and report the same according to the date of receipt of printed testimony by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 35, noes 172.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Speaker shall administer to each member of each Committee on Elections an oath to well and truly try and decide each case according to the law and the testimony.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the original amendments, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clause 1 of Rule X shall read as follows:

"1. Unless otherwise specially ordered by the House, the Speaker shall appoint at the commencement of each Congress the following standing committees, namely:

"On Elections, three committees, to consist of nine members each, to be called Nos. 1, 2, and 3, respectively."

Clause 1 of Rule XI to read as follows:

"1. To the election of members: to the respective Committees on Elections."

The amendments were agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CANNON of Illinois, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter that I omitted, and I desire unanimous consent to amend Rule XII as follows: By striking out the word "Territories" where it appears, and inserting after the word "Mining" the words "and two on the Committee on Territories."

The effect of that, as I understand from a hasty examination, is to give the appointment of two Delegates from the Territories as members of the Committee on Mining, as it was in the last Congress.

The SPEAKER. The same as it was in the last Congress?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—VENEZUELA BOUNDARY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States; which was read in full by the Clerk.

[For the text of the message see Senate proceedings.]

The reading of the message was received with general applause.

The SPEAKER. This message and accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and printed.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a joint resolution——

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House do now adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Before the announcement of the result on Mr. DINGLEY'S motion, by unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LEFEVER, until after the holidays, on account of important business.

To Mr. LINTON, for this day, on account of important business.

To Mr. MILLER of Kansas, until after the holidays, on account of important business.

To Mr. CRUMP, for this day, on account of important business.

To Mr. BARNEY, until January 2, on account of important business.

To Mr. STOKES, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. STRODE of Nebraska, until after the holiday recess, on account of sickness.

And then, on motion of Mr. DINGLEY (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILES: A bill (H. R. 1950) for the erection of a public building at Cambridge Md.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROMWELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 1951) to amend sections 2 and 3 of the act passed January 27, 1890, and granting pensions to persons who served in the Western gunboat fleet or ram service who would be otherwise eligible—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 1952) to donate eight old cannons and cannon shot to the Grand Army of the Republic Cemetery Association of Colorado—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 1953) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the District of Columbia Suburban Railway Company," approved July 5, 1892—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 1954) relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE (by request): A bill (H. R. 1955) to redeem and cancel the Treasury notes of 1890, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 1956) for the erection and completion of a monument to the memory of the soldiers that fell in the battle of Tippecanoe—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. TAYLER: A bill (H. R. 1957) prohibiting the removal of certain postal employees except upon written charges—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 1958) granting pensions to the Kansas militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1959) relating to and protecting the rights of pensioners—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 1960) to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 1961) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost their limbs or the use of them, or have additional disabilities—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANEY: A bill (H. R. 1962) giving military and pensionable status to the officers, enlisted men, their wives, children, and dependent parents, of the military organizations of the loyal States during the late civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 1963) to provide to whom contracts for carrying mails shall be awarded—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1964) to repeal the act of March 3, 1887, regulating the removal of cases from State courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1965) to amend section 3331 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1966) to define the liability of receivers or managers of railroads or other property appointed by the United States courts, to prescribe where and how they can be sued and served, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 1967) to create a new division in the eastern judicial district of the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 1968) donating condemned cannon and cannon balls to Joe Markle Post, No. 623, Grand Army of the Republic, of West Newton, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 1969) making an appropriation for a light and fog-signal station at or near terminus of what is known as the Straight Channel, in Maumee Bay, near Toledo, Ohio—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 1970) providing for town sites in the Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGG: A bill (H. R. 1971) to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," which became a law August 27, 1894—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 1972) in aid of the exposition to be held under the auspices of the Baltimore Centennial Association, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1973) to permit the Home Telephone Company of Washington, D. C., to install, maintain, and operate a telephone and telegraph plant and exchange in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOODY (by request): A bill (H. R. 1974) to provide a roll to be known as the medal of honor roll—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 1975) to increase the limit of cost of the public building authorized by act of Congress approved February 16, 1891, to be erected at St. Paul, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 1976) to reduce the postage on fourth-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 1977) making

appropriation for site and pedestal of a statue of the late Maj. Gen. Ambrose E. Burnside in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 1978) to amend Title LX, chapter 3, of the Revised Statutes, relating to copyrights—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 1979) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Santa Rosa, in the State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1980) to provide a life-saving station at or near Point Bonito, at the Golden Gate, in the State of California—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROYSE: A bill (H. R. 1981) for the relief of soldiers and sailors honorably discharged on surgeon's certificate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACY: A bill (H. R. 1982) for the final adjustment of the agricultural college grant to Missouri—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHANNON: A bill (H. R. 1983) to amend section 2, paragraph 431, of the act of August 28, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 1984) to provide for the use and occupation of reservoir sites reserved by the Geological Survey—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NOONAN: A bill (H. R. 1985) to extend to the ports of Eagle Pass and El Paso, Tex., the privileges of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 1986) granting to the State militia and Grand Army posts located in the city of Detroit the use of the old post-office, court and custom house as a military armory—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 1987) relating to contests of elections of members of the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Elections.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 1988) providing for the entry of land for reservoir purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1989) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the endowment and support of the mining schools in the several States and Territories, for the purpose of extending similar aid in the development of the mining industries of the nation as already provided for the agricultural and mechanical arts—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1990) providing for the construction of a military road from Fort Washakie, Wyo., to the Big Gros Ventre River, in the vicinity of the Upper Gros Ventre Butte—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By. Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 1991) to purchase a painting of Abraham Lincoln—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 1992) to repay the State of Georgia $27,175.50, money advanced by said State for the defense of her frontier against the Indians from 1795 to 1818—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 1993) regulating the sale of certain agricultural products, defining "options" and "futures," and imposing taxes thereon and upon dealers therein—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 1994) to encourage American shipbuilding—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 1995) to provide for a public building at Winston, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 1996) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Stones River—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 1997) to grant the mates of the United States Navy a warrant rank—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1998) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver four condemned cannon to Charles A. Clark Post, No. 184, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ridge Farm, Ill.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 1999) to regulate national currency and provide for national money—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 2000) to reorganize the Pay Corps of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 2001) for the erection of a public building at Marinette, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2002) for the erection of a public building at Wausau, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SULZER: A joint resolution (H. Res. 34) declaring that a state of public war exists in Cuba, and that belligerent rights be accorded to the Cuban government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A joint resolution (H. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress jurisdiction over divorce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A joint resolution (H. Res. 36) tendering the thanks of Congress to Commodore J. H. Gillis—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A joint resolution (H. Res. 37) providing for the reprinting of volumes 16 and 17 of the United States Statutes at Large—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A joint resolution (H. Res. 38) for the restoration of the books of the Beaufort Library Society, of Beaufort, S. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A resolution requesting the Secretary of War, in view of the subsidence of the waters of the Great Lakes of the North, to transmit to the House an estimate of the cost of making a survey of the outlet of Lake Erie at the head of Niagara River, of the outlet of Lake St. Clair at the head of the Detroit River, and of the outlet of Lake Huron at the head of the St. Clair River, with a view to the construction of dams, jetties, locks, and such other work as would increase the depth of water in the lakes—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN: A resolution to appoint Fred. S. Bishop binding clerk for the House, to be borne on the Clerk's roll at a salary of $1,600 per annum—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A concurrent resolution providing for the employment of twelve additional Capitol police—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 2003) for the relief of Mrs. A. C. Wagner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2004) to grant a pension to Caroline Stockton Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AITKEN: A bill (H. R. 2005) granting a pension to Sarah Potter, dependent daughter of Andrew Potter, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2006) to increase the pension of Harriet C. Gregg, widow of Col. John Irvin Gregg, from $30 to $50 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): A bill (H. R. 2007) to incorporate the Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 2008) for the relief of W. T. Trammell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BENNETT: A bill (H. R. 2009) to place the name of Henry Weifenbach upon the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2010) removing the charge of desertion from the record of John T. Faulkner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2011) for the relief of Capt. John T. Bruen, of the State of New York—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 2012) for the relief of Jerome Kunkle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2013) for the relief of Simeon Motz, Nathaniel Robbins, and William J. Sloan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 2014) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Howland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2015) granting a pension to Mary P. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 2016) for the relief of the trustees of the estates of L. G. E. Stone and of William Hooper—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2017) for the relief of Thomas Dyer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2018) granting an increase of pension to Aretas Norris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 2019) for the relief of John Weeks, late of Company E, Third Regiment Tennessee Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2020) for the relief of Samuel McJunkin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 2021) for the relief of Eugene Callaher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2022) for the relief of William T. Crump—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 2023) granting an increase of pension to Ezra A. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 2024) to remove charge of desertion against Bernard Wortman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2025) for the relief of workmen employed in the construction of Poverty Island light-house, Lake Michigan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 2026) for the relief of Catherine Burns, of Annapolis, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2027) for the relief of William B. Bean, of Maryland—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOKE of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2028) to authorize the Postmaster-General to credit the account of James A. Sexton with the amount of funds stolen—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 2029) for the relief of the widow of George C. Foulk, deceased—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2030) granting a pension to Hebe M. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2031) granting a pension to Henry K. Winans, of North Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2032) granting a pension to George Reynolds, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2033) granting a pension to Lawrence H. Boyle—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2034) for the relief of Patrick Montgomery—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2035) granting an increase of pension to Peter Anderson, of Strong City, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2036) granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. Long, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2037) for the relief of Charles Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 2038) for the relief of the estate of A. H. Herr, deceased, late of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2039) for the relief of James Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 2040) authorizing additional compensation to the assistant commissioners to the industrial exhibition at Melbourne, Australia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2041) for the relief of Robert R. Furbey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 2042) to increase the pension of Wilbur F. Cogswell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ERDMAN: A bill (H. R. 2043) for the relief of Valentine Sauppe—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 2044) granting arrearages of pay to Edmund C. Bailey—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 2045) for the relief of Enoch Vernon, a citizen of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 2046) granting a pension to Ellen Connor, widow of Patrick Connor, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2047) for the relief of Charles Fletcher, alias James H. Mitchell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2048) for the relief of Rufus Betz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 2049) to reimburse Louis Benecke for arms furnished the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 2050) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 2051) granting a pension to Ernest Klaus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2052) granting a pension to Mrs. J. S. Denny, an army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 2053) for the relief of William Pyke—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2054) to correct the military record of Charles W. Rinehardt and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2055) to correct the military record of George A. Marks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2056) for the relief of Elenor Brookbent and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2057) for the relief of Silas Quackenbush—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2058) for the relief of James E. Southard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 2059) for the relief of the estate of Ramsay Crooks—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2060) for the relief of the estate of Ramsay Crooks—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2061) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Josias R. King—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 2062) granting a pension to T. C. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 2063) to increase the pension of Jesse Likens, of Company F, One hundred and twelfth Illinois Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2064) for the relief of Charles Harkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 2065) for the relief of James Hutchinson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2066) for the relief of John Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 2067) to remove the charge of desertion against George M. Emery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2068) for the relief of Barney McKay—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 2069) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Andrew Govan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McEWAN: A bill (H. R. 2070) for the relief of George W. Spencer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2071) for the relief of Willis N. Arnold—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2072) for the relief of James M. Brandon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 2073) for the relief of Emanuel Faust, late of Company B, Forty-sixth Illinois Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 2074) for the relief of Mrs. M. J. Bagley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 2075) to provide for extra pay of John Quicke, late private at West Point Military Academy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 2076) for the relief of Abner D. Lewis, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2077) for the relief of Joseph A. Hill, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2078) for the relief of Abner East, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2079) for the relief of Washington East, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2080) for the relief of Edward J. Tucker, of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2081) for the relief of M. V. Dalton, administratrix of Carson R. Dalton, deceased, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2082) for the relief of C. F. Beezley, administrator of John C. Lanier, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2083) for the relief of H. L. Thomas, administrator of B. R. Thomas, deceased, of Shelby County, Tenn.. as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2084) for the relief of Richard Love, administrator of D. W. McKenzie, deceased, late of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2085) for the relief of James A. Richardson, administrator of Ezekiel T. Keel, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2086) for the relief of Benjamin Hahn, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2087) for the relief of the legal representatives of Marcus Holbrook, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2088) for the relief of John A. Farley, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2089) for the relief of James M. Flinn, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2090) for the relief of Jacob Glenn, of Memphis, Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of Thomas J. Graves, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2092) for the relief of Henry M. Green, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2093) for the relief of E. C. Oakley, adminis-

trator of W. H. Neal, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2094) for the relief of Fayette J. Pulliam, of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2095) for the relief of Ellen Savage, administratrix of T. H. O'Donnell, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2096) for the relief of William H. Noland, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2097) for the relief of estate of Jane Newell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2098) for the relief of J. B. Blackwell, administrator of Harvey S. Williams, deceased, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2099) for relief of estate of Stativa Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2100) for the relief of Leger Restle—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2101) for the relief of Thomas C. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2102) for the relief of estate of George W. Reeves, deceased, late of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2103) for the relief of Mrs. W. A. Scott, of Hardeman County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2104) for the relief of the estate of Julius Walker, deceased, of Memphis, Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2105) for the relief of Eliza A. Swift, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2106) for the relief of F. A. Jones, administrator of R. S. Jones, deceased, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2107) for the relief of S. R. Timberlake, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2108) for the relief of T. J. Waller, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2109) for the relief of H. C. Kincaid, administrator of John Kincaid, of Corinth, Miss., formerly of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2110) for the relief of the Overton Hotel Company, of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2111) for the relief of Nicolla Malatesta, of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2112) for the relief of Thomas S. Gallaway, administrator of John H. Mebane, deceased, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2113) for the relief of John D. Ussery, of Hardeman County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2114) for the relief of Mary R. Kirkpatrick, of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2115) for the relief of estate of B. B. Neville, deceased, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2116) for the relief of the estate of Henry E. Sills, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2117) for the relief of Finess E. Wirt, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2118) for the relief of the estate of James Dickenson, deceased, late of Hardeman County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2119) for the relief of Mary E. Mette, administratrix of H. H. Mette, deceased, of Memphis, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2120) for the relief of J. B. Blackwell, administrator of Harvey S. Williams, deceased, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2121) for the relief of J. and J. Steal, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2122) for the relief of Mrs. Ann Kennell, administratrix of John Kennell, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2123) for the relief of Lucy E. Dowdy, of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2124) for the relief of T. D. Thurman, administrator of John G. Thurman, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2125) for the relief of Mrs. Fredonia Knight, administratrix of Joseph T. Knight, deceased, of Hardeman County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2126) for the relief of the estate of George W. Reeves, deceased, late of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2127) for the relief of J. W. Simmons, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2128) for the relief of Mrs. W. A. Scott, of Hardeman County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2129) for the relief of the estate of Julius Walker, deceased, of Memphis, Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2130) for the relief of T. J. Waller, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2131) for the relief of Arthur P. McKinney, administrator of John F. McKinney, deceased, late of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2132) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen P. Malloy, of Shelby County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 2133) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Fugitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 2134) for the relief of Prentiss B. Reed and Lucretia H. Reed Regnier—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 2135) for the relief of Josiah B. Orbison—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2136) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Freeman, widow of D. W. D. Freeman, late a captain, Company C, One hundred and first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2137) to pay the heirs of the late John Roach, deceased, $330,151.42 for labor and material, dockage, and detention and occupation of yards and shops for the gunboats *Chicago*, *Boston*, and *Atlanta*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 2138) for the relief of Mira M. Harbin, administratrix of Nathaniel P. Harbin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 2139) for the relief of the legal representatives of William Doyle and Hudson Cooper—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 2140) for the relief of A. G. Boone—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 2141) to increase the pension of Joseph Claire—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 2142) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Theodore Werner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SORG: A bill (H. R. 2143) granting a pension to Mrs. Emily M. Van Derveer, widow of the late Brig. Gen. Ferdinand Van Derveer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: A bill (H. R. 2144) for the relief of William H. King—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2145) for increased pension of Frederick A. Slocum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 2146) for the relief of C. H. Raymond—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 2147) to reappoint Warren C. Beach a captain in the Army and to place him on the retired list in addition to the number now authorized—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2148) for the relief of Edmund F. Jenkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2149) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Herrman—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARSNEY: A bill (H. R. 2150) for the relief of the legal representatives of Hampton L. Lee, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAFT (by request): A bill (H. R. 2151) to restore to the pension rolls the name of Agnes A. Blackman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 2152) for the relief of William Edward Bailey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2153) to amend the military record of George F. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 2154) to place Henry W. Birkey, M. D., on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 2155) for the relief of the La Grange Synodical College of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2156) for the relief of the estate of H. C. Singleton, deceased, late of Davidson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2157) for the relief of Elizabeth J. Cleveland, of Davidson County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2158) for the relief of the estate of John J. Hamel, of Davidson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2159) for the relief of Daniel Collins, of Davidson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2160) for the relief of Louisa E. McLean—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2161) for the relief of W. T. Garrett—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 2162) for the relief of John Scott—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 2163) to remove the charge of desertion against Frederick Ottstotts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 2164) to grant an increased pension to David T. Stonebreaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2165) for the relief of John Colter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2166) to increase the pension of John Thrasher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2167) to pension Hulda F. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2168) to correct the military record of Patrick Sweeney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2169) to increase the pension of Samuel B. Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2170) to extend to Irvin L. Clifford the benefit of the arrears of pension act—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 2171) granting a pension to Henry J. Burkhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2172) to muster into the United States service and grant an honorable discharge to Charles Edward Hawn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition of 1,000 voters of Cleveland, Ohio, for an educational qualification for voters, and reform of immigration laws—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 1,500 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, in favor of Cuban independence—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of 15 residents of the Fifth Iowa district, asking for legislation to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa (by request): Petition of Le Grand Byington, of Iowa, for governmental reform—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 418 business and professional men of the city of Davenport, Iowa, praying that Congress take such action as shall result in the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Petition of J. M. McKay, foreman of folding room, House of Representatives—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DOVENER (by request): Resolutions by mass meeting of citizens of Washington, D. C., favoring the recognition of the belligerent rights of Cubans—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Petition of F. S. Hagedorn, for compensation for the use of his invention for packing ammunition—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOOTE: Memorial of citizens of Ticonderoga, N. Y., relative to the Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: Resolution on lake levels—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HITT: Memorial of James A. Booker and 13 others, of Little Rock, Ark., praying Congress to give the colored citizens of the United States at least one Representative, and seat Hon. Henry P. Cheatham—to the Committee on Elections.

Also, memorial of P. McIntosh and 94 others, of Okolona, Miss., and Nelson Blackburn and 37 others, of Memphis, Tenn., praying Congress to seat Hon. Henry P. Cheatham and Hon. George W. Murray—to the Committee on Elections.

Also, petition of J. T. Campbell and 37 others, citizens of Forreston, Ill., in favor of the Linton bill to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petition of the United States Maimed Soldiers' League, for increase of pensions for maimed soldiers of the Union—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIEFER: Resolution of St. Paul citizens, protesting against the outrage against Armenian citizens—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of Elisha M. Luckett, late second lieutenant, Company B, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, in the Mexican war, for payment of arrearage of pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Resolution of citizens of St. Paul, Minn., urging the United States Government to interfere and save the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER: Paper of the New Orleans Board of Trade, limited, in favor of the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: Memorial from Islais Creek Property Owners' Association and others, praying for the removal of obstructions from Islais Creek (a navigable stream), in the city and county of San Francisco, State of California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: Petition of R. M. Duffield and 34 others, for the relief of John Cumpston, of Company A, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Petition of citizens of Cameron County, Pa., together with 49 citizens of Pennsylvania, in favor of a bill to reclassify and fix the salaries of railway mail postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Edmund F. Jenkins, for rank of first lieutenant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition in reference to grain gambling—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 18, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SMITHSONIAN BOARD OF REGENTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT reappointed Mr. CULLOM a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, to fill the vacancy caused by the expiration of his term as Senator March 3, 1895.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 803) to amend section 2601 of the Revised Statutes, relative to ports of entry.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 13) granting the State of Pennsylvania permission to use the United States court-houses at Scranton, Pa., and at Williamsport, Pa., with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 1647) to amend an act approved March 24, 1874, entitled "An act to establish bonded warehouses for storing and cleansing of rice intended for exportation;" and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 27) ratifying the use of the appropriation for materials and miscellaneous expenses for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the fiscal year 1896 for the purchase of articles provided for in the appropriation for the miscellaneous expenses of the Treasury Department, and authorizing the continued use of the same for the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1896.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WHITE presented a petition of the Fruit Growers' Association of California, praying for the construction and ownership by the Government of the Nicaragua Canal; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KYLE. I present a petition of 87 prominent business firms of the city of Aberdeen, S. Dak., praying for the appropriation of $100,000 for the erection of a public building at that place, on the ground that Aberdeen is the second largest business city in the State; that it is the most important railroad center in the State, and situated midway between the Government Indian reservations, which furnish a large amount of United States court business; that there is no suitable building in the city for court purposes, and no jail for criminals, and hence the Government is put to great expense in the transfer of business to other points; and that rent is now paid for post-office, land-office, and United States court purposes equal to a fair interest on the proposed investment. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of the Anticombine League of the Twenty-eighth Ward of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom, and also that the first shot fired by

British guns on the Venezuelan frontier be taken by the United States as an act of hostility answerable only by war; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of York, Pa., praying that immediate, definite, and vigorous action be taken by the Government on behalf of the Armenian survivors; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PASCO presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fernandina, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

REMOVAL OF MILITARY DISABILITIES.

Mr. HILL. I introduce a bill which I ask to have read at length.

The bill (S. 1034) to repeal section 1218 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by chapter 416 of the laws of 1884 was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1218 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by chapter 416 of the laws of 1884 is hereby repealed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate for a moment to the bill.

It proposes to repeal section 1218 of the Revised Statutes as amended by chapter 416 of the laws of 1884. The Revised Statutes as amended after the late civil war prohibited the appointment of any person who had served in the so-called Confederate army, in its naval forces, or in any civil capacity from being appointed to an official position in the Army or Navy of the United States. That was the law, and it included every person serving under the Confederate flag in any capacity—military, naval, or civil. That statute was amended in 1884 by providing that it should simply exclude from service in the Army or Navy those who held acommission at the time of the breaking out of the war of 1861. I will read the statute as it now exists, which I think should be promptly repealed by this Congress. Section 1218 as it now stands reads as follows:

No person who held a commission in the Army or Navy of the United States at the beginning of the late rebellion and afterwards served in any capacity in the military, naval, or civil service of the so-called Confederate States, or of either of the States in insurrection during the late rebellion, shall be appointed to any position in the Army or Navy of the United States.

Mr. President, I can conceive of no good reason why that statute should any longer remain upon the statute books of the United States. There are soldiers throughout this Union to-day who held a commission in the United States Army at the breaking out of the war and who served in the Confederate army who are as loyal as any of those who served upon the Federal side, and I think this is an opportune time to wipe out this statute in the interest of the patriotism of the whole country. It is an act which this Congress can afford to do. It is an act which all those who served in the Federal Army can afford to countenance, and it would be particularly fitting and opportune at this critical period of our history that this statute should be wiped out. No good can come by preserving the memories of that war by such offensive legislation as this. While well enough for the war and for a reasonable period thereafter, it has served its purpose, and now it strikes me that the dictates of patriotism require that the statute shall be wiped out.

Mr. President, I do not apprehend any opposition to this patriotic measure. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that this repeal bill may be now put upon its passage.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

Mr. PLATT. What is the request?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. For the immediate consideration of the bill he has introduced.

Mr. PLATT. Introduced this morning?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Introduced this morning.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will indulge me a moment, I will state that there is a statute in force now which absolutely prohibits the appointment to any official position in the Army or Navy of any person who held a commission at the beginning of our late war and who served in any capacity under the Confederate States. The President or any official having the power to appoint is absolutely prohibited now from appointing any such person to a place in the Army or Navy, in case it was desired so to do. I thought it was an opportune time for the repeal of that statute, believing that no good could come from further encumbering the statute book with it, and I had asked unanimous consent that it might be considered this morning.

Mr. PLATT. Has the bill received more than one reading?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill was read the first time by its title and the second time at length.

Mr. PLATT. It seems to me a rather remarkable request. Very likely we shall all vote for the bill—I do not know about that—but in the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], who is first upon the Judiciary Committee on this side of the Chamber, I think I must insist on the bill going to the committee.

Mr. HILL. Has the Senator any objection to the bill lying on the table for a short time?

Mr. PLATT. No; I will make no motion about it.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator from New York will allow me, I suggest that if he wants the bill to pass he should insert in the body of the bill the clauses that are to be repealed. The practice of passing bills to repeal sections of previous statutes merely by referring to the sections by number would be very inconvenient.

Mr. HALE. The rules forbid it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think the rules forbid it. The exact language proposed to be repealed should be inserted in the bill the Senator now introduces.

Mr. HILL. It repeals a section of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know; but even in that case the rule requires, and the convenience of everyone requires, that the words shall be inserted.

Mr. HILL. I am not aware of any such rule.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am advised that there is such a rule.

Mr. HILL. There is no objection to inserting the language; none whatever.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am advised there is such a rule; but aside from the rule, for the manifest convenience of everyone, so as to know precisely what is repealed, it ought to be stated in every repealing bill; and I think the rule requires it.

Mr. HILL. There is no objection to that course. I suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that the bill lie on the table for the present.

Mr. PLATT. I have no objection to the bill lying on the table, but it seems to me there is no immediate haste for the passage of the bill. We are not likely to get into a war before the Congress shall reassemble, and really I think that in the passage of all public statutes the usual course ought to be observed; they ought to go to the appropriate committee and be examined. I make no motion in regard to the bill, however.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1035) authorizing the Sioux City and Omaha Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Omaha and Winnebago Reservation, in Thurston County, Nebr., and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1036) granting a pension to Rebecca E. Kutz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1037) for the relief of John Clyde Sullivan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1038) to grant arrears of pensions in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (S. 1039) granting to the Kern River and Los Angeles Electric Power Company a right of way over and reservoir and building sites in the reservation established by the President by proclamation No. 38, dated the 20th day of December, 1892, and also a right of way over and reservoir and building sites in the reservation established by the President by proclamation No. 43, dated February 14, 1893, and in and over vacant public lands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MCMILLAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1040) to amend the act of June 2, 1890, for the relief of holders of District of Columbia special-assessment certificates, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 1041) for the payment to the lodges of Odd Fellows in the States of Iowa, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, New York, Mississippi, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, Delaware, California, Arkansas, Florida, Connecticut, Indiana, and Louisiana, and other stockholders represented by the Odd Fellows' Hall Association of New Orleans, La., for the use of and damages to and occupation of its real and personal property, and destruction of personal property by the troops of the United States, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 1042) establishing a United States mint at Boise City, Idaho; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1043) to strengthen the military armament; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1044) granting a pension to Mary Newman; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present with the bill a petition and evidence in behalf of a private pension to Mary Newman. I move that the

bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1045) to restore S. S. Robinson, late of the Sixteenth United States Infantry, to the Army, and place him on the retired list; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I introduce the bill by request. A memorandum as to where certain evidence will be found accompanies the bill. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1046) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PLATT. I have been requested to introduce two bills. I am not quite sure whether they should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations or the Committee on Claims, but as the request has been made that they be referred to the former committee, I will ask that reference.

The bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

A bill (S. 1047) for the relief of James H. Cromwell, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1048) for the relief of J. Floyd Johnston, administrator of John Floyd Johnston, deceased, and for other purposes.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 1049) for the relief of the trustees of Stewart College, Montgomery County, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1050) for the relief of the estate of Andrew J. Duncan, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 1051) granting a pension to Elizabeth New, widow of Jethrow New; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1052) increasing the pension of Luvicey J. Summers, widow of William H. Summers, late captain of Company E, Fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteers, and also a soldier in the Mexican war; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1053) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to contract for the purchase of the letters patent granted to the late Beverly Kennon for his invention of a counterpoise battery; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin introduced a bill (S. 1054) to grant pensions to persons of or above the age of 65 years who were brevetted for services or conduct in the late war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

RAILROAD TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION.

Mr. PEFFER. I submit a resolution and ask that it be read, printed, and lie over under the rule.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be directed to inform the Senate—

First. Whether the principal railroad companies acting as common carriers of interstate traffic between the Western States and the Atlantic Seaboard have recently entered into an agreement to frame a joint traffic association; and, if so,

Second. What companies have joined said agreement or have included their traffic therein, and by what individuals said agreement is signed, and what is the amount of the capitalization of each and all of said companies and the mileage thereof.

Third. Whether said agreement binds each company to make and enforce such rates of fares and freights as may be prescribed by a board of officers representing all the companies joining the compact.

Fourth. Whether the agreement provides for collecting from every company a money penalty of $5,000 in each case of violation of such stipulation to make and enforce rates, or a money penalty equal to the gross receipts of the transaction constituting such violation, which money penalty is to be applied for the benefit and to the uses of all the companies except the one offending.

Fifth. Whether said agreement constitutes a combination in restraint of trade and commerce under the existing laws of Congress, or is a violation of the interstate-commerce law.

Sixth. Whether the Interstate Commerce Commission has the power, of their own motion, to investigate such agreement, and whether or not the same, if unlawful, is subject to arrest by process for temporary injunction, or how otherwise the signers thereof may be proceeded against.

Seventh. What action, if any, has been taken by the Commission or by any other tribunal or officer of the Government with respect to said agreement. And in addition the Commission will transmit to the Senate all correspondence, complaints, and other documents in possession of the Commission concerning said agreement, and the action of the Commission in relation thereto

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table for the present. It will be printed as requested.

FOREIGN OCCUPATION OF ALSAKAN TERRITORY.

Mr. DAVIS submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the President is requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to communicate to the Senate all diplomatic correspondence and other information officially possessed by this Government respecting the establishment or attempt to establish post routes by Great Britain or the Dominion of Canada over or upon United States territory in Alaska; also respecting the occupation or attempted occupation by any other means of any portion of such territory by the military or civil authorities of Great Britain or the Dominion of Canada; also respecting any attempt by Great Britain or the Dominion of Canada to assert any claim to territory of the United States in Alaska.

REBUILDING OF THE SHIP CONSTITUTION.

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration, feeling sure that there will be no objection to it.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows;

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to communicate to the Senate, at the earliest practicable day, estimates of the cost of thoroughly rebuilding the old ship *Constitution*, now stationed at the Portsmouth (N. H.) Navy-Yard, with such recommendations as he may deem proper to make on the subject.

IMPRISONMENT OF VICTOR H. M'CORD.

Mr. CAMERON submitted the following resolutions; which were considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and is hereby, requested to furnish for the use of the Senate copies of all papers, correspondence, diplomatic or otherwise, on file in the State Department in connection with the arrest and imprisonment at Arequipa, Peru, of Victor H. MacCord, a citizen of Linesville, Crawford County, Pa., in June, 1885, he being at the time consular agent of the United States in Peru, if any have been received by the State Department since the consideration of those transmitted to the Senate by the President, December 6, 1894, and the consideration of the same by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and its report to the Senate February 14, 1895, upon the subject, accompanied by the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved*, That the President is hereby requested to continue the investigation and efforts heretofore made by the United States in the matter of Victor Hugo MacCord, a citizen of the United States, against the Government of Peru, to the end that such an adjustment of said claim may be made as may be warranted by the facts in the case and by the law applicable thereto."

CORPORATE INFLUENCE IN POLITICAL AFFAIRS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution submitted by Mr. CALL, December 17, 1895:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be charged with the duty of investigating the subject of organized efforts of corporations, or of the president and directors thereof, to control the election of members of Congress or to influence the legislation of Congress; also to investigate and report to the Senate whether corrupt means, bribery, or free transportation have been or are being used to influence such elections; also to inquire and report to the Senate whether the use of such influences or means is consistent with the preservation of the Republic of the United States and the rights and liberties of the people, and to report a bill for the punishment or suppression of such practices.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, this resolution has no party consideration or bias. It is demanded by the condition of the country and by the vast power which, under our present economic system, is vested in a few individuals.

I find, by reference to some statistics upon the subject, that there were in the United States in 1880, according to the census reports, 50 persons with an average income of $1,500,000, and over 16,000,000 people with an average income of from two hundred to three hundred dollars—nearly 17,000,000 people with an average income of $300, and 50 persons with an average income of $1,500,000. It is not proposed to find fault otherwise than to say that a better distribution of wealth would be more consistent with our republican institutions; but it is manifest that there can not be such a vast disparity between the masses of the people and 50 persons without their having great influence and control over the elections of the country. Neither will it be possible to maintain the interests of property if 50 persons, exercising this vast power, shall by corrupt means interfere with and control the elections of the country. This would be a destruction of republican government. It would be the creation of an aristocracy, or a plutocracy, rather, vested with absolute political power over the destinies of the American people.

More than ten years ago Mr. Garfield, in the House of Representatives, in a speech which has obtained very general circulation and great approval, pointed out the danger to our institutions of this great concentration of wealth and of its use for political purposes, using the expression that sovereign States were already held in absolute control by it.

Now, it is proposed that a committee be appointed to inquire into the facts whether or not corrupt influences are being used by the few men who manage these great corporations for the control of elections. It was stated in the newspapers quite a short time ago that eight persons—no doubt citizens of great respectability, of distinguished executive ability, men entitled to respect—had met in the city of New York and entered into an agreement to control the taxation for freight and transportation through railroad franchises upon nearly two-thirds of the entire territory of the United States. With a list of employees of a million voters,

with revenues aggregating nearly three times—certainly two and a half times—as much as the entire amount collected by the Federal Government, it can not but be, unless there is effective legislation to restrain the exercise of political power, that 50 men may control the elections of the country, of whom these eight were a part. This great accumulation of wealth of 50 citizens, with $1,500,000 average income, is not the legitimate result of commerce, of trade, of enterprise, whatever merit it may have, and I am not here to attack it; but it is the result of legislative franchises, and it is attended with the dangerous incident I have mentioned.

I shall not here speak of evidences which I have in my possession that such influences have been and are being used to control elections to this body, but I ask that this committee may be appointed and that the subject may be investigated. If there be no truth in them, there will be no need of legislation. If the evidence be such as to satisfy this body that such influences are being used, then the consequence inevitably follows that, unless they can be restrained and controlled, either this Government will belong to them and the people will be delivered entirely into their power or there must be extreme and radical legislation against the ownership of these great public highways.

I desire that we shall see if we can not keep the elections pure and prevent the corrupt interference of this vast accumulated wealth in the control of the elections to this body and the other House of Congress, and I hope there will not be any objection to the resolution.

Mr. HALE. We have, Mr. President, a great number of regular standing committees and committees on special subjects to do the business of the Senate, and this resolution proposes to create another committee to deal with the question of the influences which surround the election of members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, a subject which has always been considered by the Committee on Privileges and Elections in this body. If there is any member of this body who has ever appeared here with a possible taint on his title, the old, carefully established Committee on Privileges and Elections has always considered that question. I should like the Senator from Florida to explain to the Senate what reason there is for believing that on the subject-matter of this resolution, which he apparently has so much at heart, the Committee on Privileges and Elections is not amply competent in its jurisdiction and in its personal make-up to consider this subject. What need is there of departing from the hitherto unvaried practice of the Senate and establishing now a special committee upon this branch of the question of the title of a Senator to a seat in this body? I should like the Senator to tell us why he is not willing that that great committee should consider this class of subjects, as it always has.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, it is not material to me whether this resolution directs a special committee or the Committee on Privileges and Elections to make the investigation proposed by the Senator from Florida. I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Maine that the investigation had better be made by the regular standing committee of the Senate, the Committee on Privileges and Elections; but the Senator from Maine will remember that the Senator from Florida answered at great length at the last session the question which the Senator from Maine now puts to him, apparently for the first time giving attention to the matters which the Senator from Florida has stated as needing investigation in his section of the country.

Mr. HALE. I had not the pleasure of listening to what I have no doubt were the eloquent and convincing remarks of the Senator from Florida. I am derelict in my duty compared with the Senator from New Hampshire. I am not always here listening to everything. I wish I was. I missed hearing the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CHANDLER. I endeavor to listen to everything that the Senator from Maine says when he speaks to the purpose, and I endeavor to give equal attention to everything which the Senator from Florida says when he has the honor to address the Senate, and I did listen not very long ago to a statement by the Senator from Florida of the reasons why this resolution ought to pass. I think if the Senator from Maine refreshes his recollection, he will recall the fact that the Senator from Florida modified his resolution from time to time at the suggestion of Senators. It was a different resolution when he first presented it, and when it seemed upon the point of passage some Senator would make an objection to this, to that, and to the other part of the resolution, and the Senator from Florida, with that great courtesy which has always characterized him, modified the resolution, struck out this and that and the other part of the resolution, until I supposed he had modified it even to the satisfaction of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Let me suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire, as the Senator from Florida is so good-natured and has taken every suggestion in the line of enabling him to do what he desires to do, that he take my suggestion, and instead of having a special committee where we have so many special committees, let this matter be sent to the committee which has always investigated this class of subjects, the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I agree that it is well to investigate this subject, if there are organized efforts of corporations to control elections. I am inclined to think there are, and I am inclined to think that they are increasing in this country. I think that the efforts of corporations in one way or another to control and influence representation in this body are becoming a stronger influence, a more dangerous influence, than they have been heretofore, and I suggest to the Senator from Florida that this investigation be made through the regular committees. If he does not consent to that, I will move, and let the sense of the Senate be taken upon the matter, to substitute for a special committee the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I bid the Senator from Florida Godspeed in his investigation. I know the Senator from New Hampshire, who is not an inactive member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, will aid him in this investigation and will help to bring about the desirable result.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the substitute shall be agreed to, I assure the Senator from Maine that I will give diligent attention to this matter, as I endeavor to do to every matter to which my attention is attracted that comes before that committee or the Senate.

Now, whether the Senator from Florida shall be inclined to make this last modification of his resolution will depend, it seems to me, somewhat upon the question of whether it is then to be adopted. The Senator from Florida, after making all his modifications at the last session, was unable to get his resolution through; but left for Florida upon my assurance that I should endeavor to bring it to the attention of the Senate and secure its passage before the adjournment. I brought it up on every proper occasion, and whenever I brought it up there was some new objection made to it or some new modification asked for. I was not authorized to make such concessions and modifications as the Senator from Florida had so freely made. Therefore we stood upon the resolution; but action upon it was at last prevented and the investigation which the Senator from Florida desired to have made has not been made, and now the Senator has renewed his motion.

The Senator from Florida has stated why he thinks there should be an investigation of this nature. He has stated the facts in connection with the conduct of public affairs in his own State, and I think we should show some deference to the Senator from Florida in this connection. I know that if I were in such a grapple with railroads and other corporations in my own State as the Senator finds himself in connection with in Florida, and those corporations were unduly and illegally and by atrocious methods interfering with public affairs in my State, I would come to the Senate confidently asking an investigation, and I should expect some consideration to be given to my request. Now, the Senator from Florida comes with exactly that case and that demand. It seems to me that the Senate should either vote down his resolution or should adopt it in the form in which he proposes it, or as he may consent to modify it, or as it may be the judgment of the Senate it should be modified, and take final action thereon.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator from Florida accept the amendment which I have suggested?

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Maine will withdraw his amendment. The objection to the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Privileges and Elections is, first, that the committee is ordinarily confined to the investigation of the elections of members of this body after they have occurred and to the privileges to which they are entitled. This is an inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not there is any necessity for legislation to prevent a public evil. It might as well be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary as to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; but the objection to the reference to either committee is that they will be burdened with a large amount of labor which will exclude them from the performance of the legitimate and proper duties of the committee.

If it be true that this is a subject which requires the attention of Congress, and that the facts should be ascertained by satisfactory evidence whether or not this is a public evil, it will involve a considerable amount of labor and of inquiry, more than any standing committee will be apt to give to it. This has been a public evil, so declared for ten years by leading members of the Republican party; it has been the subject of discussion in the newspapers; it has been commented upon by foreigners who have traveled over this country, who have not hesitated to call the attention of the people of Europe to the fact that we have here a condition of political power which has divested the people of the country entirely of their control of questions connected with these great corporate interests, and has done it by the use of bribery and other corrupt means, and we ourselves in these two Houses of Congress have not escaped the imputation that these influences have been powerful over us. If that opinion shall be allowed to grow, if facts justify that declaration, then, Mr. President, it

will be an unfortunate day for the interests of property and for the interests of good government. If there shall have been only occasional instances of this character, then it is necessary that some action shall be taken.

Now, are we to refer this great question, which strikes at the very vitals of the Republic, to a standing committee which has had the opportunity—and I say it without disparagement to that committee—of investigating the subject for ten years, and yet has never found opportunity and occasion to do so? For that reason I hope the Senator from Maine will not insist upon his amendment. I find here that we have special committees of this body upon various subjects. We have a Special Committee to Investigate the Condition of the Potomac River Front of Washington. That is a subject which belongs to the Committee on Commerce. Why was it not referred to that committee? Because it is a special subject requiring special investigation. We have a Special Committee to Inquire into all Claims of Citizens of the United States against the Government of Nicaragua. Why were not the matters which were referred to that committee referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations? Because they were subjects requiring special investigation. We have special committees on Woman Suffrage, on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress, on the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, on Transportation and Sale of Meat Products, to Establish the University of the United States, on the Quadro-Centennial, to Investigate the Geological Survey, on National Banks, on Forest Reservations, on Corporations in the District of Columbia, to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands, and on the Ford's Theater Disaster.

Mr. President, this subject compares very favorably with all of those subjects which, being within the jurisdiction of standing committees of this body, have yet, because there was special occasion for an investigation, been referred to a special committee. I am therefore strictly in the line of precedent when I ask for this committee, and I am not without authority upon this subject as to its exceeding great importance.

I see it stated in a publication by a Frenchman named Emile Laveleye that 70 persons in the United States own nearly $3,000,000,000 of the values of the United States in legislative franchises for transportation and other corporate interests, while there are nearly 17,000,000 people in this country who save annually only $15, with an average income of $300, and 70 people with, in round numbers, about $3,000,000,000 which derives its value from franchises of taxation granted by this body and the other House and by the States, and when the charge is publicly made that the members of this body and of the other House of Congress are elected by the use of this wealth, accumulated by these franchises, while the employees are living in a state of starvation, it is time, I think, that we should investigate the subject.

When we ask for this special committee on this subject, and it is proposed that it shall be referred to a standing committee, the answer is that it has been the custom of the Senate to create special committees when special investigation was required; and a further answer is that the Committee on Privileges and Elections and the Committee on the Judiciary have been so burdened with work in the last ten years that they have not found the opportunity to bring this subject to the consideration of the Senate. For that reason, and in order that justice may be done to the persons owning these franchises and to these corporations, and at the same time such measures be taken as will preserve this republican Government, without reference to party consideration, I ask that this subject may be investigated, and, as the practical means of doing it, that a special committee be appointed.

In my own State it is a notorious fact that corporations owned abroad, controlled by the American colony in Paris, do interfere with the elections and political affairs of that State; and I say here what I have said before the people of Florida, and propose to say again in the coming canvass at every public meeting in that State where I shall be present, that they do control and have controlled the elections in our State and disfranchised the people, without reference to party.

I ask, therefore, that this subject, which is of national importance, shall have investigation, and have it by a committee that will be sure to give the time and attention required by it.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, I should be the very last one to oppose any effort to investigate the matter set out in the resolution of the Senator from Florida, but when we are called upon to appoint a committee, it occurs to me the committee should be charged with some specific duty; should have some ground to act upon and some subject-matter of which it has especial charge.

The resolution reads thus:

> That a special committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be charged with the duty of investigating the subject of organized efforts of corporations, or of the president and directors thereof, to control the election of members of Congress, or to influence the legislation of Congress.

I do not know that there is any charge made relating to the organized efforts of corporations to control the election of members of Congress. It occurs to me that the position taken by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] in this particular is eminently correct. The Committee on Privileges and Elections is charged with the specific duty of investigating the taint of title, by reason of any undue influences, of any or every member of this body. Would this committee be charged with any specific power to investigate any specific offense? Would they be charged with the duty of investigating every loose report, every rumor, every piece of political scandal or gossip, concerning the election of a member of this body? It appears so from the resolution. Contests, I am told, have been filed very largely in the other House against the claim of certain members to seats in that body. If a contest pends in the Senate against the seat of any Senator by reason of any undue influence on the part of corporations or other bodies, or of individuals, the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections is the body before whom those charges must be investigated and inquired into. But I should like to know of the Senator from Florida whether or not it comports with the dignity of this body to assume in advance of any charges, of any specifications, that the corporate influences mentioned in his resolution corrupt and assail the seat of any member of this body.

I can not vote for the resolution as it is worded. It would be immaterial to me whether the Senate committee was to be charged with the investigation of a specific matter of the kind I have mentioned, just so that there were specific charges. I think that in such a case the Senate would have a right to appoint a committee of investigation, if, peradventure, the committee already appointed was too full of work to attend to the specific matter. For these reasons I am opposed to the resolution.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana, with his views, ought to vote against the entire resolution and not vote for any reference. If the Senator is not advised of the fact that time and again specific charges have been made in this body in regard to the influence of corporations in the election of Senators, he has not read the history of the Senate and is not familiar with it. If he is not advised that time and again men conspicuous in the Republican and the Democratic party have called attention to the growing evil of which I speak and made similar charges, he is not advised of the history of the country. If he is not advised of the fact that time and again in our Presidential elections charges have been made of the improper influence of the controllers and owners of corporations in regard to our elections in both political parties, he is not familiar with our political history.

If the Senator from Louisiana can not distinguish between a great public evil, a threatened evil, acknowledged by all men, stated in the public press, an inquiry as to the specific acts which may justify legislation, and a resolution as to the election of a particular Senator, I think he fails in his logical perception. I am speaking of a public evil. I state in my place in the Senate that it is notorious in the State of Florida. I did not desire to state, but I can state here what I openly state and denounce there, that such influences are believed to have been used and are believed to be now used in that State for the control of its elections. I make that statement without reference to any particular party, either Democratic or Republican, for the men who do those things, distinguished by executive ability, distinguished, perhaps, by the possession of many private virtues, are known to belong to both political parties of the country.

It is known that they demand that their employees shall vote for the men of both parties who are in the interest of the corporations or be discharged from employment. I state that. Not only do I believe this to be true, but a large majority of the people of my State think with me upon the subject and desire that the proposed investigation shall be made; and that ought to be specific enough. The fact that the corporations seek to control the Congressional representation of one particular State is enough to justify the investigation.

If the Senator from Louisiana desires that the country shall be governed by the possessors of this enormous wealth in franchises granted by Congress and by the States; if he desires that the people shall lose all power, I am content that he should have those opinions. I have not. I believe that this is a public evil. If facts shall be ascertained which so demonstrate, I believe that the most severe legislation should be adopted in order to suppress it. I believe that the interests of property, the conservation of private property as well as the rights of the people and the purity of the Government, demand that this action shall be taken by the Senate.

Mr. SEWELL. I desire to ask the Senator from Florida whether he will not confine the scope of the resolution to the charges he makes within the State of Florida. Why make a drag net all over the United States, and reflect on a class of men who are the peers of the members of this body, eminent before the country, and who, as a class, certainly ought to be considered to be just as honest as any other men? If they have not proved so in the State of Florida, and the Senator from Florida desires to make a charge against the railroads of that State, I for one see no reason why a special com-

mittee should be appointed to drag the railroad officers or the companies all over the Union into an investigation without direct charges.

I shall vote for the resolution if it is confined to Florida. I shall vote for any resolution where there are direct charges of improper connection on the part of the officers of any railroad in any State with elections, but if it is not confined to cases in which direct charges are made I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, I hope I am as able as the honorable Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] to distinguish a specific charge from a public rumor. I hope I am as able to see the deleterious effect, the injurious effect of unlawful, corrupt interference in the elections of a State for a member of Congress or for a State officer, by a railroad or by any other corporate body, as is the distinguished Senator from Florida. But the honorable Senator from Florida fails himself to see the part and the broad distinction between the Senate of the United States taking cognizance of every partisan, rancorous charge, of every slanderous accusation made in a loose, indefinite form, and a specific charge made against any member holding a seat in this body by reason of corrupt influences.

In my opinion, sir, this body belittles itself by entertaining these loose, indefinite charges against corporations or individuals, whether in the State of Florida or out of the State of Florida. I have heard the Senator from Florida frequently say that there were corrupt influences at work in his State. I believe that that assertion can be made generally, that corrupt influences are at work in nearly every State in this Union; but what is the result of that work? Where does that work come in? If it does not affect the seats of members of this body, what concern have we with that work? Is there any seat in this body tainted by those influences? If any seat in this body is tainted by those influences, I shall not be behind the Senator from Florida in advancing an investigation. But until the kind of work of which he speaks makes itself manifest here, and until some specific charge upon that sort of work is brought here, I shall oppose the appointment of a committee of any kind to investigate these loose, floating, indefinite charges.

The Senator from Florida makes a statement; I do not gainsay it; but before the Senate can take cognizance of the statement it must be embodied in some definite form. It must be averred to have some definite, deleterious, injurious effect before I believe this body is called upon to take any definite action. Wherefore it is that I oppose the resolution.

Mr. CALL. If there are any Senators here who desire to except particular States from the proposed inquiry, it is not for me to oppose their action. My own primary concern is an investigation in the State of Florida, and I am entirely willing, if it be the pleasure of the Senate, that it should be confined to that State. I think it is not wise, however, to limit the inquiry to any particular State. I have no reflection to make upon the election of any member or this body. I have none to make upon the men of distinguished ability who control these great corporations. I have no complaint to make against the wealth which they have legitimately acquired under existing laws.

The resolution touches none of those points. It simply provides that an inquiry shall be made by a select committee (I shall change the word "special" to "select") because there is a general, a universal, opinion that either by subordinates, possibly by men not connected with the owners of the stocks and the bonds of these great corporations by persons who are subsidiary and who have personal interests of their own, and greatly to the injury of these corporations, power is exercised over the employees to enforce action upon their part such as may desired by the persons in authority. I say there is such a universal opinion, and I cited the statements of Mr. Garfield to that effect.

The Senator from Louisiana desires me to make charges against the election of some Senator here. I am not discussing that proposition. I am willing to admit that all Senators have been elected properly and are entitled to their seats here. I have no charges of that kind to make. I say it is believed in the State of Florida that the influences of corporate power and authority, not only of transportation companies, but of other corporations, have been used and are being used to corrupt legislation, to disfranchise the intelligent people of the State who are qualified to exercise the franchise, and to keep in force laws which received the public reprobation, and I ask that the evidence may be obtained. I am not a personal witness of the acts which constitute the offense. I say that there is a general public opinion to that effect.

The representatives of these particular interests have been placed in power, in public office, in political power in the different party organizations in that State. They are known to be the representatives of those special interests. Proof has been made to that effect. It is known that they exercise a controlling power, and they are admitted by men in all political parties in that State to be important factors in the improper control of elections in the State, not by persuasion, not by contributions of money for legitimate purposes, but by putting in office men paid to serve their interests and promote such legislation here and elsewhere as may be for their benefit, without reference to the interests of the people at large.

Therefore, I hope the Senator from Louisiana will not oppose the appointment of a select committee to be charged with this nonpartisan duty, having no reference to any political party, but in the interest of honest and fair elections.

Mr. HALE. Let the resolution be again read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will again be read.

Mr. CALL. Before that is done I ask permission to modify the resolution by changing the title of the proposed committee from "special" to "select committee." The committees other than standing committees are termed select committees.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That modification will be made. The resolution will be read as modified.

The resolution was read.

Mr. HALE. I am inclined to think, on this reading, that the resolution needs still further pruning. It is a very serious question whether any committee of the Senate ought to be instructed to investigate the reasons or influences controlling members of the House of Representatives. That body has rules of its own. That body has jurisdiction of its own, somewhat under the rules of the House and somewhat under the general law.

The Senator from Florida does not propose by a general law to create a form and manner and extent of investigation into questions relating to the title of members of the other House, but that a select committee of the Senate shall investigate into the reasons and practices influencing the election of members of the House of Representatives. I suggest to the Senator, who, whatever he wants to accomplish here, certainly does not seek to meddle with the jurisdiction of the other House, that he at any rate confine the proposed inquiry to elections of members of the Senate, for clearly, without repeating myself, we have no business to set on foot a committee of our own to investigate into the influences that control the members of the other branch of this Legislature.

When that is done, if the Senator from Florida accepts my suggestion and amends the resolution accordingly, I shall not make a motion. Otherwise I shall move to strike out that part of the resolution, and let it be confined to the election of members of this body. [A pause.] I move that amendment. I ask the Secretary to state it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 5 it is proposed to strike out the word "Congress" and insert "the United States Senate;" so as to read:

Resolved, That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be charged with the duty of investigating the subject of organized efforts of corporations, or of the president and directors thereof, to control the election of members of the United States Senate.

Mr. CALL. I think the Senator from Maine will see, upon reflection, that his observations upon this point are not well founded. The resolution has nothing in the world to do with inquiring into the motives, as such, of the election of members of the other House. It simply asks for an investigation, not to ascertain whether bribery has occurred, but to show the necessity of preventing corrupt influences in the election of members of Congress.

We are legislating for the United States. We are legislating not for this body in its representative capacity, but for the Republic, for its future destiny, for its greatness, for its perpetuity. We say that if the power to control elections is, by the use of money, vested in the great concentrated wealth of this country, held by from 50 to 70 individuals living in Paris, without American sentiments and without sympathy with the mass of our people, it is a public evil, and legislation should be enacted to prevent it.

Now, I am not here to decry the owners and possessors of this great wealth. In my own State they are men of distinguished ability. They are men, I have no doubt, who are patriotic, but I say it is a public evil that by some means this great power is being used, and it ought to be prevented. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] says we have no power to do what? To see that the political power of this country, in the elections by the people, is not influenced by the use of money and corrupt practices. The Senator from Maine will not insist upon that proposition. We have nothing to do with the election of a member of the other House as such. The House has a sovereign authority over that matter, but we, as a part of the legislative power of this country, are charged with the duty of seeing that the people are not corrupted by the use of money and are not prevented by its use from exercising their rightful authority under the laws of the different States in the election of members of Congress and members of this body.

It is legitimate to say that corporations shall not use the power to discharge their employees unless those employees vote according to the instruction of their superiors. It is legitimate to punish the men in charge of those employees who forbid them from exercising the franchise and the right of an American citizen to vote as he thinks best and proper. I acknowledge the conserva-

tive influence of wealth, I am in favor of preserving it to a reasonable and just extent, but I am not in favor of allowing a few men to capture whole States of this Union and send their representatives here.

I have no intention of dragging the State of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] or any other State into the proposed investigation. I have no purpose of making any charges against or imputations upon the men controlling those great organizations. But I do say that if they desire to preserve those interests they must carefully see that such legislation is had as will not allow improper influences to be used in the elections of the country, so as to control the public policy of this country and to deprive the people of their rightful control. This is a proposition which I think we as Democrats or Republicans or Populists alike are interested in seeing successfully carried through. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] will not be adopted. I hope he will withdraw it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think the objection made by the Senator from Maine fails to discriminate between the legislative and the judicial power of the two Houses. If the object of the resolution were to inquire into any facts which relate to the validity of the title of any member of the House of Representatives to his seat in that body, certainly his objection would be valid, because under our system of government each House is the sole judge of the elections and the qualifications of its own members. But the resolution has a very much wider scope than that. It not only has a wider scope, but it does not embrace that idea in it at all. There is no suggestion in the resolution or on the part of the mover of the resolution to inquire into the validity or the regularity of the election of any member of either House of Congress. The resolution relates to a matter of public policy, to a matter which may or may not be within the legitimate scope of the legislative power of Congress. That is the question to be determined. It looks to legislation and not to judicial action, and as it looks to legislation one House of Congress as well as the other may initiate legislation upon the subject of the purity of elections, which will embrace the election of members of the other body as well as its own House.

If the resolution should eventuate, as it contemplates, in a recommendation by the committee, after ascertaining the facts, that certain legislation ought to be passed, then their recommendation must be considered as well by the Senate as by the House of Representatives. It must receive the concurrence of both Houses or it fails to become legislation at all.

I call the attention of the Senator from Maine, therefore, to that broad distinction between what we call the judicial powers of each House as to the elections and qualifications of its members, in which case each House is the sole judge and can not be interfered with by the other, and the legislative power—power which looks to the passing of a rule, the enactment of a law which shall govern as well the election of members of one House as of the other. I think if the Senator from Maine would give his attention to that distinction he would not insist upon his objection.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Mississippi, who is a very good lawyer, has sought to do what the Senator from Florida did not attempt to do, to answer my objection. I see the force of what he says and what is running in his mind. Undoubtedly there is the distinction which he draws between the legislative power, which lies in either body, by legislation to frame laws with penalties to punish frauds and improper influences. But the Senator from Florida does not seek to do that. If the Senator from Florida had reported from a committee a general statute involving the exercise of the legislative power of this body coordinately with the other, seeking to remedy an evil, perhaps applicable here as well as there, it would be one thing. But he, by a resolution of this body alone, seeks to set afoot a committee to investigate into the circumstances attending the elections of members of the other body.

That can not be done without summoning testimony and taking evidence as to the particular facts that bear upon the election of members of the other branch of this Legislature, with which we have nothing to do. That is not our business. We are not legislating generally and invoking the legislative power, the legislative domain, of this body, which, I agree with the Senator from Mississippi, exists in legislative proceedings, but we are proposing to investigate like a committee of elections, as a substitute for the Committee on Elections, and not as a law committee, into the circumstances attending and surrounding the election of members of the other body.

I repeat, we have nothing whatever to do with that. If the Senator wants a committee to look into the facts and the malign influences surrounding the elections of members of this body I am willing he should have it. I am trying to put the resolution into such condition that some of us can vote for it. The Senator from Florida is so persistent in declining every suggestion, that he is driving us to vote against his whole resolution. What ought to be done in this case is to empower and direct the Committee on Privileges and Elections to investigate into these alleged malign influences and report to this body; and that committee would do it. It is so made up of distinguished old and younger members of this body, and it is not a committee overburdened with work. The Senator ought to be willing to intrust his case, if he has a case against these corporations, to that great committee. I insist on my amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Maine so readily accepts the distinction which I pointed out in the remarks which I submitted to the Senate. He has gotten to be very nearly right now. The trouble with the Senator from Maine is that he misconceives the resolution now before the Senate. As I believe the Senator from Maine to be a fair man and desirous of doing what is right, I would respectfully call his attention to the wording of the resolution, as I shall call the attention of the Senate to it.

Before I do so I may as well make the general remark that the initiation of all legislation depends upon some sort of information concerning the matter about which the legislation is to take place. As the old law books stated it, in every statute the first thing to be considered is the evil; next, the state of the old law, and, thirdly, what remedy ought to be provided. So it is an essential part of the idea of enacting a law that there should be information upon which to base the legislation. That information may come to us through the public press, through history, through the general knowledge of members of the legislative body as to the facts calling for legislation, or it may come to us in cases which are not of such general notoriety by reason of an investigation made under the order of the legislative body itself.

It would certainly be a little singular if, without any suggestion from any source whatever, without any investigation or report of facts, the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the United States should undertake to pass a law in reference to corrupt practices as indicated in the resolution. Therefore, he who desires to move the legislative mind in that direction ought first to give the legislative mind instruction on that subject. The proper way to get that instruction is by investigation, and the proper way to get the investigation is by a committee. As to whether that investigation ought to be by a select committee or by one of the standing committees of the Senate I have nothing to say. That is not the issue between the Senator from Maine and myself.

I insist that this resolution has not a particle of judicial aspect in it. It does not look to the unseating of any member of either House, to casting any suspicion upon his title, but it looks to getting information for the Senate, in order that the Senate may, if it sees proper when that information is gotten, initiate some new legislation. To satisfy the Senator from Maine upon that subject I call his attention to the few last words of the resolution:

> Also to inquire and report to the Senate whether the use of such influences or means is consistent with the preservation of the Republic of the United States and the rights and liberties of the people, and to report a bill for the punishment or suppression of such practices.

So, if the Senator from Maine will give his usual careful attention to the reading of the resolution he will see that it looks alone to the acquiring of information upon which legislation may be based. I hope that the Senator from Maine, with his usual candor and fairness, when he sees that it does not look to anything else but legislation, will withdraw his objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida has no objection, I desire to make an inquiry. Does the Senator from Florida understand that under his resolution the committee appointed would be permitted to travel all over the United States?

Mr. CALL. There is no suggestion made of the committee traveling anywhere under the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Then the investigation is to be made entirely here?

Mr. CALL. If there should be any occasion to ask for such authority it would have to be done hereafter.

Mr. GEORGE. By a separate resolution.

Mr. WHITE. I simply desire to say that if the committee should see fit to visit my State we would be very glad to show them around. [Laughter.]

Mr. CALL. I have no doubt the committee would be very glad to be shown around by the Senator if it should go there; but there is nothing in the resolution to give the committee authority to travel around anywhere or to do anything more than make the investigation here.

Mr. CAFFERY. I inquire of the Senator from Florida whether or not in the bill which he proposes shall be reported or contemplates the reporting of he desires any of the clauses of the late Federal election law, which we repealed with great unanimity on this side of the Chamber?

Mr. CALL. That is a very singular question for the Senator from Louisiana to ask. I do not propose to report any bill except such as should meet the approval of the members of the committee. Consequently it is very difficult for me to say what will be the

mind of the committee. But I will say that whether it be in an election law or not, whether it shall have been in any previous legislation of Congress or not, I shall be in favor of reporting a bill that will prevent the use of bribery and corrupt practices of every kind to influence the election of members of Congress and the legislation of these bodies. I shall be in favor of a bill that will effect those purposes to the best of my judgment and ability.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, I simply desire to say, in answer to the Senator from Florida, that an analysis of his resolution shows in the first paragraph of the first sentence no offense whatever, except, perhaps, a violation of moral propriety:

That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be charged with the duty of investigating the subject of organized efforts of corporations, or of the president and directors thereof, to control the election of members of Congress or to influence the legislation of Congress.

The organized efforts of corporations to control the election of members of Congress or to influence legislation may be improper, but it certainly does not come within the category of a crime. There are organized efforts made all through the United States to influence the election of members of Congress. It is to be presumed from the statement in the resolution that no improper or rather corrupt influence must be used or was used. But the resolution goes on:

Also, to investigate and report to the Senate whether corrupt means, bribery, or free transportation have been or are being used to influence such elections.

And the committee is directed to report by bill or otherwise. Whenever this body, in conjunction with the coordinate branch, is charged with legislation upon this subject, I imagine they will not stop at bribery or other corrupt influences. I imagine that they will take the whole domain of legislation. I rather suppose that if the other side of the Chamber is triumphant, as it now appears to be, we shall have a reenactment of the late election law wherein intimidation, force, or the other offenses mentioned under that law will be included in the bill to be reported.

It occurs to me that the States are primarily charged with the investigation which the Senator from Florida desires; that if there are corrupt influences at work in Florida or in any other State, the domestic forum is the proper tribunal where these matters are to be investigated, and where legislation against the corrupt practices can be easily procured if it does not already exist. It seems to me that the Senator is asking of Congress to do that which, perhaps, he might not relish when his wish was gratified. We have condemned upon this side of the Chamber the interference of the Congress of the United States at the election of members of Congress, and this appears to be an effort to revive those repealed laws in another direction. I think from that standpoint, at least, as one on this side of the Chamber, I am warranted in voting against the resolution.

Mr. CALL. I wish to disclaim any such purpose. There is nothing of the kind in the resolution. There is nothing in the resolution of the kind objected to by the Senator from Maine. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] has conclusively shown that I answered his proposition in the beginning by stating the difference between an investigation of the election of a member of Congress and an investigation for the purpose of so legislating as to prevent improper influences in elections.

The Senator from Louisiana now talks about what he imagines. He may imagine wrong or he may imagine right. It is for the committee to say when they meet together, and the Senate to determine what kind of a law shall be passed, if any shall be passed. For myself I am not in favor of any violent and improper interference with the States in the exercise of their right to regulate the elections. But this is not the question. This is a question as to whether great corporations, having power to control the elections in Louisiana and send Senators here who shall not represent the people, but represent them, shall be permitted to do so, while the people of Louisiana are held bound and fettered by these corrupt influences and disfranchised of their right.

That is the condition in some States of the Union, and it is so charged and well known to members of this body that that is the great public evil that the people of this country complain of, that the power of the people is being taken away and vested in the fifty or seventy men who hold $3,000,000,000 of the wealth of this country in legislative franchises of taxation, just as if a sovereign decree had been passed vesting in them power to tax without limit the people of this country. The question is whether that state of things exists and whether legislation shall be had by the representatives of the people to prevent the use of this great power and this money in the elections to this body. I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. CALL. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. FRYE. Let the amendment be read.

The SECRETARY. In line 5, strike out the word "Congress" and insert "the United States Senate;" so as to read:

That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be charged with the duty of investigating the subject of organized efforts of corporations, or of the president and directors thereof, to control the election of members of the United States Senate, or to influence the legislation of Congress.

Mr. CALL. I withdraw the demand for the yeas and nays.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SEWELL. I now offer the amendment which I suggested, and to which I trust the Senator from Florida will agree. In line 4, after the word "corporations," I move to insert "in the State of Florida;" so as to read:

That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be charged with the duty of investigating the subject of organized efforts of corporations in the State of Florida, or of the president and directors thereof, to control the election of members of Congress, or to influence the legislation of Congress.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL].

Mr. SEWELL. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BACON. My colleague [Mr. GORDON], who is absent, is paired with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR].

Mr. GEAR. I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. NELSON (after having voted in the negative). I overlooked the fact that I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. TELLER. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. WOLCOTT] is detained from the Senate by sickness.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon (after having voted in the negative). Since voting, I have discovered that my pair is absent, and I withdraw my vote. I am paired with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS]. I do not know how he would vote. I should vote "nay" if I had the privilege of voting.

Mr. BRICE. I am paired with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT]. I withhold my vote, as I do not know how he would vote if present.

Mr. WILSON. I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO]. As I am not informed how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PERKINS. I was requested by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] to announce that he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. Both Senators are absent.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER]. Were he present, I should vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 32; as follows:

YEAS—20.

Caffery,	Hale,	McMillan,	Sewell,
Cameron,	Hawley,	Morrill,	Sherman,
Faulkner,	Hill,	Perkins,	Shoup,
Frye,	Lodge,	Platt,	Smith,
Gallinger,	McBride,	Proctor,	Wetmore.

NAYS—32.

Allen,	Call,	Harris,	Quay,
Bacon,	Carter,	Jones, Ark.	Roach,
Baker,	Chilton,	Kyle,	Teller,
Bate,	Clark,	Mantle,	Thurston,
Berry,	Cockrell,	Mills,	Tillman,
Blackburn,	Davis,	Mitchell, Wis.	Turpie,
Burrows,	Dubois,	Morgan,	Walthall,
Butler,	George,	Peffer,	White.

NOT VOTING—33.

Aldrich,	Gibson,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Stewart,
Allison,	Gordon,	Murphy,	Vest,
Blanchard,	Gorman,	Nelson,	Vilas,
Brice,	Gray,	Palmer,	Voorhees,
Chandler,	Hansbrough,	Pasco,	Warren,
Cullom,	Hoar,	Pettigrew,	Wilson.
Daniel,	Irby,	Pritchard,	
Elkins,	Jones, Nev.	Pugh,	
Gear,	Martin,	Squire,	

So the amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL].

Mr. HALE. There is another amendment that I offered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 1, strike out the words "a select" and insert "the;" and after the word "committee" strike out the words "of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, who" and insert "on Privileges and Elections," so as to read:

That the Committee on Privileges and Elections shall be charged with the duty of investigating the subject of organized efforts of corporations, or of the president and directors thereof, to control the election of members of Congress, or to influence the legislation of Congress.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I am not going to take up any more time of the Senate, but simply call the attention of Senators to the fact that if this investigation is granted, which I have not opposed, and expect to vote for, instead of multiplying committees, creating new ones and select ones, upon subjects-matter that inherently, intrinsically belong to the old committees of the Senate, we ought to send them to those committees. This is a very great subject; it touches the constitution of this body, the make-up of the membership of the Senate, the influences that surround the elections. We have a committee and have always had a committee that is charged with the great duty of inquiry into that subject. I do not believe that any select committee, that any committee appointed by the Chair, impartial as the Chair is, can bring to this subject the qualities that are necessary for its thorough investigation equal to the Committee on Privileges and Elections that has taken into its domain all such subjects.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair must remind the Senator from Maine that the hour of 2 o'clock has arrived. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during the sessions of Congress.

Mr. CALL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution which has been pending.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution which has been under consideration during the morning hour.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside in order that the matter which has been under consideration may be disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair entertains the motion of the Senator from Florida. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. CALL. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. WHITE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SHOUP].

Mr. WILSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GEAR. I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. MILLS (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], and withdraw my vote.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 12; as follows:

YEAS—38.

Allen,	Call,	Harris,	Proctor,
Bacon,	Carter,	Hill,	Roach,
Baker,	Chandler,	Kyle,	Smith,
Bate,	Chilton,	McBride,	Teller,
Berry,	Cockrell,	McMillan,	Thurston,
Blackburn,	Davis,	Mantle,	Tillman,
Brice,	Dubois,	Martin,	Turpie,
Burrows,	Faulkner	Mitchell, Wis.	Walthall.
Butler,	Gallinger	Peffer,	
Caffery.	George,	Perkins,	

NAYS—12.

Cameron,	Hale,	Morrill,	Sewell,
Elkins,	Lodge,	Platt,	Sherman,
Frye,	Morgan,	Quay,	Wetmore.

NOT VOTING—35.

Aldrich,	Gorman,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Squire,
Allison,	Gray,	Murphy,	Stewart,
Blanchard,	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	Vest,
Clark,	Hawley,	Palmer,	Vilas,
Cullom,	Hoar,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Daniel,	Irby,	Pettigrew,	Warren,
Gear,	Jones, Ark.	Pritchard,	White,
Gibson,	Jones, Nev.	Pugh,	Wilson.
Gordon,	Mills,	Shoup,	

So the motion was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate resumes the consideration of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL]. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. I call for the yeas and nays upon that.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I hope the proposition of the Senator from Maine, substituting the Committee on Privileges and Elections for a special committee, will not prevail. I do not think that committee desire to have the resolution referred to them. It will relate, in all probability, entirely to the elections in one State in which I am particularly interested, and I think that, inasmuch as that is the case, there should be a select committee, and not the Committee on Privileges and Elections, so that I may have some share in directing the investigation. It will be enough that should there be legislation recommended, it will then go before either the Judiciary Committee or, if the Senator from Maine be right, which I do not think he is, in its subsequent stages, before the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Why, then, shall we confine this proposed investigation to that committee, and not allow a select committee to be created for the purpose? The members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections are charged with other duties. They are all members of other important committees. They have not had the time, and have not now, to give this subject the complete investigation which a select committee may give it. As the Senate has been in the habit of appointing, and as we have a dozen select committees here appointed upon much slighter reasons than exist in this case, I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment and will not refer the subject to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. MILLS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY]. I should vote "nay" if he were present.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS].

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

Mr. PUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. SQUIRE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. I am informed by the Senator generally in charge of pairs on the other side that he is not certain how the Senator from Virginia would vote if present, and under the circumstances I withhold my vote.

Mr. WHITE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SHOUP].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CULLOM. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. He not being present, and I not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PASCO. I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 24; as follows:

YEAS—29.

Blackburn,	Elkins,	McBride,	Sewell,
Brice,	Faulkner,	McMillan,	Sherman,
Burrows,	Frye,	Morgan,	Thurston,
Caffery,	Gallinger,	Morrill,	Walthall,
Cameron,	Hale,	Perkins,	Wetmore.
Carter,	Harris,	Platt,	
Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Pritchard,	
Davis,	Lodge,	Quay,	

NAYS—24.

Allen,	Call,	Hill,	Pettigrew,
Bacon,	Chandler,	Kyle,	Roach,
Baker,	Chilton,	Mantle,	Smith,
Bate,	Clark,	Martin,	Teller,
Berry,	Dubois,	Mitchell, Wis.	Tillman,
Butler,	George,	Peffer,	Turpie.

NOT VOTING—32.

Aldrich,	Gorman,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Squire,
Allison,	Gray,	Murphy,	Stewart,
Blanchard,	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	Vest,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Palmer,	Vilas,
Daniel,	Hoar,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Gear,	Irby,	Proctor,	Warren,
Gibson,	Jones, Nev.	Pugh,	White,
Gordon,	Mills,	Shoup,	Wilson.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CALL subsequently said: I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution providing for an investigation was just passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Florida to reconsider will be entered.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed

the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the Senate was requested:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, the 20th day of December, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, January 3, 1896.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid the resolution before the Senate, and, on motion of Mr. COCKRELL, it was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

USE OF COURT-HOUSES AT SCRANTON AND WILLIAMSPORT, PA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 13) granting the State of Pennsylvania permission to use the United States court-houses at Scranton, Pa., and at Williamsport, Pa.

The amendment was to add at the end of the joint resolution the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, in his discretion, at any time to terminate this permit and the possession hereby granted of either or both of said premises upon thirty days' notice to the commissioners of the county wherein the same is situated; and on such termination all further payment therefor shall cease.

Mr. QUAY. The amendment proposed by the House of Representatives is entirely unobjectionable, and I move that it be concurred in by the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 1647) to amend an act approved March 24, 1874, entitled "An act to establish bonded warehouses for storing and cleansing of rice intended for exportation," was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES, BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 27) ratifying the use of the appropriation for materials and miscellaneous expenses for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the fiscal year 1896 for the purchase of articles provided for in the appropriation for the miscellaneous expenses of the Treasury Department, and authorizing the continued use of the same for the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1896, was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution. I will first state that it does not increase any appropriation, but simply removes the objection which the Comptroller has made to the expenditure of a certain sum of money in the appropriation law for certain items, which he says must be paid for out of the contingent fund of the Treasury Department when there is no contingent fund sufficient to do it, and when Congress did not intend that it should be paid out of the contingent fund.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

After thirty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 19, 1895, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 17, 1895.

CHIEF OF WEATHER BUREAU.

Willis L. Moore, of Illinois, to be Chief of the Weather Bureau, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Mark W. Harrington, removed.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Third Lieut. James G. Ballinger, of Washington, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Horace B. West, promoted.

First Asst. Engineer Henry C. Barrows, of New York, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Frank H. Pulsifer, placed on waiting orders.

Third Lieut. John G. Berry, of Maine, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Samuel Howard, placed on waiting orders.

First Asst. Engineer William F. Blakemore, of New York, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed James M. McDougall, placed on waiting orders.

Second Asst. Engineer Denis F. Bowen, of New York, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Frank B. Randall, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer Harry L. Boyd, of Maryland, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Henry C. Barrows, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer Harry U. Butler, of Maryland, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Charles F. Coffin, promoted.

First Asst. Engineer Alfred L. Broadbent, of Ohio, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed J. M. Case, placed on waiting orders.

Second Lieut. Howard M. Broadbent, of Pennsylvania, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed William H. Hand, promoted.

Second Lieut. John C. Cantwell, of North Carolina, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Thomas Mason, placed on waiting orders.

Third Lieut. Claude S. Cochran, of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed David H. Jarvis, promoted.

Third Lieut. Colin S. Craig, of Maine, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed John C. Moore, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer John B. Coyle, of Maine, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Wesley J. Phillips, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer Nathaniel E. Cutchin, of Virginia, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Edward G. Schwartz, promoted.

First Asst. Engineer Charles F. Coffin, of Maryland, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed M. D. L. Dinsmore, placed on waiting orders.

Third Lieut. D. F. A. De Otte, of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Daniel P. Foley, promoted.

Third Lieut. George M. Daniels, of Rhode Island, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed William E. Reynolds, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer George M. De Reamer, of South Carolina, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, in place of Malcolm G. Marsilliot, deceased.

First Lieut. John Dennett, of Maine, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Thomas W. Lay, placed on waiting orders.

Second Asst. Engineer J. Edward Dorry, of Maryland, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Alexander Dennett, placed on waiting orders.

Second Lieut. Francis M. Dunwoody, of Iowa, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed William F. Kilgore, promoted.

Asst. Surg. John M. Eager, of Pennsylvania, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Samuel P. Edmonds, of Missouri, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Byron L. Reed, promoted.

Second Lieut. Howard Emery, of Massachusetts, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed John Morrissey, placed on waiting orders.

Second Lieut. Charles C. Fengar, of Connecticut, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Charles F. Shoemaker, promoted.

Second Lieut. Daniel P. Foley, of the District of Columbia, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed William J. Herring, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer Fred. R. Falkenstein, of Maryland, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Horace C. Whitworth, promoted.

Aaron L. Gamble, of Indiana, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Robert Henderson, placed on waiting orders.

Second Asst. Engineer Carl M. Green, of New York, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Richard W. Champlain, promoted.

Third Lieut. Alexander R. Hasson, of Connecticut, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Howard M. Broadbent, promoted.

First Lieut. William J. Herring, of New York, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Douglas Ottinger, placed on waiting orders.

Third Lieut. Frederick J. Haake, of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Orin D. Myrick, promoted.

First Lieut. David A. Hall, of Rhode Island, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Francis Martin, placed on waiting orders.

Third Lieut. William E. W. Hall, of Maryland, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Thomas W. Benham, placed on waiting orders.

First Lieut. Oscar C. Hamlet, of Michigan, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Leander M. Keene, placed on waiting orders.

First Lieut. William H. Hand, of New York, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Eric Gabrielson, placed on waiting orders.

Third Lieut. Edwin V. D. Johnson, of Indiana, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed James L. Sill, promoted.

Third Lieut. Charles E. Johnston, of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed John C. Cantwell, promoted.

Second Lieut. David H. Jarvis, of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Joseph M. Simms, placed on waiting orders.

Third Lieut. Walker W. Joynes, of South Carolina, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Johnstone H. Quinan, promoted.

First Lieut. William F. Kilgore, of the District of Columbia, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Edward L. Deane, placed on waiting orders.

Second Lieut. Kirtland W. Perry, of New York, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter service of the United States, in place of William S. Baldwin, deceased.

Second Asst. Engineer Levin T. Jones, of Maryland, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Oliver P. Rennick, placed on waiting orders.

Third Lieut. Francis A. Levis, of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Howard Emery, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer Charles A. McAllister, of New York, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Charles F. Dyce, placed on waiting orders.

First Asst. Engineer David McC. French, of Virginia, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed George M. Robinson, placed on waiting orders.

First Asst. Engineer Samuel H. Magee, of New York, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Andrew L. Harrison, placed on waiting orders.

Third Lieut. William L. Maxwell, of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Charles F. Nash, promoted.

Second Lieut. John C. Moore, of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed George Walden, placed on waiting orders.

First Asst. Engineer Charles W. Munroe, of Massachusetts, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Edward F. Hedden, placed on waiting orders.

Second Lieut. Orin D. Myrick, of Massachusetts, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed John Dennett, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer Charles F. Nash, of the District of Columbia, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Alfred L. Broadbent, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer Edward J. Noonan, of Massachusetts, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed James Fitzpatrick, placed on waiting orders.

First Asst. Engineer Frederick E. Owen, of New York, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Alfred Hoyt, placed on waiting orders.

First Asst. Engineer Wesley J. Phillips, of Maryland, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed George C. Dereamer, placed on waiting orders.

Second Lieut. Johnstone H. Quinan, of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Thomas D. Walker, promoted.

First Asst. Engineer, Frank B. Randall, of New Hampshire, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Eugene Vallat, placed on waiting orders.

Second Lieut. Byron L. Reed, of the District of Columbia, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Francis Tuttle, promoted.

Second Lieut. William E. Reynolds, of the District of Columbia, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Robert Barstow, placed on waiting orders.

First Lieut. William H. Roberts, of Massachusetts, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Charles M. Scammon, placed on waiting orders.

Second Lieut. Worth G. Ross, of Pennsylvania, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Oscar C. Hamlet, promoted.

John P. J. Ryan, of New York, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed George C. Carmine, promoted.

Second Lieut. James L. Sill, of New York, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed David A. Hall, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles F. Shoemaker, of New York, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, in place of L. G. Shepard, deceased.

First Asst. Engineer Edward G. Schwartz, of the District of Columbia, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed W. C. Wheeler, placed on waiting orders.

Second Asst. Engineer Henry O. Slayton, of New York, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed D. McC. French, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer Herbert W. Spear, of Massachusetts, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Samuel H. Magee, promoted.

Second Lieut. Percy W. Thompson, of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed William H. Roberts, promoted.

First Lieut. Francis Tuttle, of Maine, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed David Evans, placed on waiting orders.

Third Lieut. Francis S. Van Boskerck, jr., of New Jersey, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Francis M. Dunwoody, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer Eugene Vallat, jr., of Michigan, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed James T. Keleher, placed on waiting orders.

First Lieut. Thomas D. Walker, of New York, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed W. S. Simmons, placed on waiting orders.

John Q. Walton, of New Jersey, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed E. J. Noonan, promoted.

Second Lieut. Horace B. West, of Pennsylvania, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Benjamin W. Loring, placed on waiting orders.

Third Lieut. Chester M. White, of Massachusetts, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Charles C. Fengar, promoted.

Third Lieut. Samuel B. Winram, jr., of Michigan, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Percy W. Thompson, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer William E. Maccoun, of Maryland, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Frederick E. Owen, promoted.

Second Asst. Engineer George B. Maher, of the District of Columbia, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Charles W. Munroe, promoted.

Third Lieut. James H. Scott, of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Worth G. Ross, promoted.

Third Lieut. Hiram A. Seymour, of Florida, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed N. E. Cutchin, promoted.

First Asst. Engineer Horace C. Whitworth, of Maryland, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed James T. Wayson, placed on waiting orders.

Second Asst. Engineer Charles W. Zastrow, of Vermont, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed William H. Warren, placed on waiting orders.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Randolph H. Miner, late a lieutenant, junior grade, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 23d of April, 1895, to the 11th of October, 1895, both inclusive. This officer became entitled to appointment in such grade from the former date, vice Lieut. Charles A. Foster, retired; received a commission under the provisions of paragraph 3, section 2, Article II, of the Constitution, and his resignation was accepted from the latter date.

Maurice B. Peugnet, a graduate of the Naval Academy, to be an assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 1st of July, 1895, to the 18th of September, 1895, both inclusive. This officer became entitled to appointment in such grade from the former date to fill a vacancy; received a commission under the provisions of paragraph 3, section 2, Article II, of the Constitution, and his resignation was accepted from the latter date.

Medical Department.

Capt. Harry Otis Perley, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major, December 7, 1895, vice Vickery, retired from active service.

James Sprigg Wilson, of Maryland, to be assistant surgeon with

the rank of first lieutenant, December 16, 1895, vice Walker, wholly retired from the service.

Corps of Engineers.

First Lieut. David Du Bose Gaillard, to be captain, October 25, 1895, vice Palfrey, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. Spencer Cosby, to be first lieutenant, October 13, 1895, vice D'Armit, deceased.

Second Lieut. John Stephen Sewell, to be first lieutenant, October 25, 1895, vice Gaillard, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 17, 1895.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Allen Thomas, of Florida, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Venezuela.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

William W. Russell, of Maryland, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to Venezuela.

H. Clay Armstrong, jr., of Alabama, formerly consul at Grenoble, France, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Madrid, Spain.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

William A. Bray, of Indiana, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Michigan City, in the State of Indiana.

CHIEF JUSTICE, COURT OF PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS.

Joseph R. Reed, of Iowa, to be chief justice of the Court of Private Land Claims.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICES, COURT OF PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS.

Thomas C. Fuller, of North Carolina, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims.

William W. Murray, of Tennessee, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims.

Henry C. Sluss, of Kansas, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims.

Wilbur F. Stone, of Colorado, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named naval cadets, all graduates of the Naval Academy, to be ensigns: Wilfrid V. Powelson, William S. Montgomery, Frank H. Clark, jr., Henry H. Ward, Eugene L. Bisset, Edward H. Campbell, Charles J. Lang, Walter S. Crosley, William K. Gise, Thomas S. Wilson, Henry A. Pearson, Orton P. Jackson, Frank L. Chadwick, John S. Doddridge, Percy N. Olmsted, Christopher C. Fewel, Frank B. Upham, John L. Sticht, Richard S. Douglas, Alfred A. McKethan, and Alfred A. Pratt.

The following-named graduates of the Naval Academy, to be assistant engineers: Henry B. Price, Martin E. French, Frank D. Read, John R. Brady, Allen M. Cook, Emmet R. Pollock, and André M. Proctor; and the following-named graduate of the Naval Academy to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 1st of July, 1895, in accordance with the act of March 2, 1889, viz, Louis J. Magill.

Surg. Joseph G. Ayers, to be a medical inspector.

P. A. Surg. James C. Byrnes, to be a surgeon.

Medical Inspector William K. Van Reypen, to be a medical director.

Surg. Abel F. Price, to be a medical inspector.

P. A. Surg. Samuel H. Griffith, to be a surgeon.

Reginald K. Smith, a citizen of Alabama, to be an assistant surgeon.

Medical Inspector Thomas C. Walton, to be a medical director.

Surg. Michael C. Drennan, to be a medical inspector.

P. A. Surg. Daniel M. Guiteras, to be a surgeon.

Medical Inspector Charles H. White, to be a medical director.

Surg. James A. Hawke, to be a medical inspector.

P. A. Surg. Averley C. H. Russell, to be a surgeon.

Medical Inspector George W. Woods, to be a medical director.

Surg. Robert A. Marmion, to be a medical inspector.

P. A. Surg. Arthur G. Cabell, to be a surgeon.

George C. Hubbard, a citizen of New York, to be an assistant surgeon.

P. A. Surg. Clement Biddle, to be a surgeon.

Medical Inspector George H. Cooke, to be a medical director.

Surg. Dwight Dickinson, to be a medical inspector.

P. A. Surg. Henry T. Percy, to be a surgeon.

Jacob C. Rosenbleuth, a citizen of New York, to be an assistant surgeon.

Moulton K. Johnson, a citizen of Ohio, to be an assistant surgeon.

Paymaster William W. Woodhull, to be a pay inspector.

P. A. Paymaster Leeds C. Kerr, to be a paymaster.

Assistant Paymaster Samuel McGowan, to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Pay Inspector Arthur J. Pritchard, to be a pay director.

Paymaster Henry T. Wright, to be a pay inspector.

P. A. Paymaster Richard T. M. Ball, to be a paymaster.

Assistant Paymaster Henry A. Dent, to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Barron P. Du Bois, a citizen of New Jersey, to be an assistant paymaster.

William P. Brawley, a citizen of South Carolina, to be an assistant paymaster.

P. A. Paymaster Charles S. Williams, to be a paymaster.

Assistant Paymaster Walter L. Wilson, to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Harry E. Biscoe, a citizen of Michigan, to be an assistant paymaster.

John Irwin, jr., a citizen of California, to be an assistant paymaster.

P. A. Paymaster Thomas J. Cowie, to be a paymaster.

Assistant Paymaster William J. Littell, to be a passed assistant paymaster.

P. A. Engineer Henry Herwig, to be a chief engineer.

Assistanl Engineer Ward P. Winchell, to be a passed assistant engineer.

P. A. Engineer George B. Ransom, to be a chief engineer.

Assistant Engineer Andrew McAllister, to be a passed assistant engineer.

P. A. Engineer William C. Eaton, to be a chief engineer.

Assistant Engineer Charles W. Dyson, to be a passed assistant engineer.

P. A. Engineer Alfred B. Canaga, to be a chief engineer.

Assistant Engineer William C. Herbert, to be a passed assistant engineer.

P. A. Engineer Abraham V. Zane, to be a chief engineer.

Assistant Engineer Alexander S. Halstead, to be a passed assistant engineer.

Ensign Harry A. Field, to be a lieutenant, junior grade.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John Hood, to be a lieutenant.

Ensign Chester M. Knepper, to be a lieutenant, junior grade.

Capt. Frederick V. McNair, to be a commodore.

Commander William Bainbridge Hoff, to be a captain.

Lieut. Commander Henry N. Manney, to be a commander.

Lieut. James W. Carlin, to be a lieutenant-commander.

Commodore Lester A. Beardslee, to be a rear-admiral.

Capt. John A. Howell, to be a commodore.

POSTMASTERS.

Agnes J. Smith, to be postmaster at Stockbridge, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts.

John B. Turner, to be postmaster at Newtonville, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Ernest Winsor, to be postmaster at Chestnut Hill, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

John Kirkpatrick, to be postmaster at South Hadley Falls, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts.

Thomas H. Mann, to be postmaster at Fitchburg, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Charles A. Pilling, to be postmaster at North Andover Depot, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts.

John P. Herlihy, jr., to be postmaster at Monson, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts.

Alfred D. Hoitt, to be postmaster at Arlington, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Timothy Howard, to be postmaster at North Brookfield, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Horace Wheeler, to be postmaster at Shelton, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

John E. Doran, to be postmaster at Attleboro Falls, in the county of Bristol and State of Massachusetts.

Lawrence W. Dower, to be postmaster at Easthampton, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts.

Melvin E. Lincoln, to be postmaster at Willimantic, in the county of Windham and State of Connecticut.

Charles B. Mason, to be postmaster at Danbury, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

Clifford B. Rogers, to be postmaster at Colchester, in the county of New London and State of Connecticut.

Julius Thorson, to be postmaster at Benson, in the county of Swift and State of Minnesota.

Abner K. Northrop, to be postmaster at Pass Christian, in the county of Harrison and State of Mississippi.

George W. Benedict, to be postmaster at South Norwalk, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

Robert Andrews, to be postmaster at Wells, in the county of Faribault and State of Minnesota.

William Cordiner, to be postmaster at Princeton, in the county of Millelacs and State of Minnesota.

William O. P. Hilsdale, to be postmaster at Sauk Center, in the county of Stearns and State of Minnesota.

John C. Hindman, to be postmaster at Rising Sun, in the county of Cecil and State of Maryland.

Daniel E. Kean, to be postmaster at Cumberland, in the county Allegany and State of Maryland.

Alphonso Latchford, to be postmaster at Annapolis Junction, in the county of Howard and State of Maryland.

Charles Walker, to be postmaster at Lewiston, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine.

Mary D. Ellegood, to be postmaster at Salisbury, the county of Wicomico and State of Maryland.

Blanchard Emory, jr., to be postmaster at Centerville, in the county of Queen Anne and State of Maryland.

Edgar R. Dow, to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.

Carrol C. Homer, to be postmaster at Bucksport, in the county of Hancock and State of Maine.

Edwin T. Mayberry, to be postmaster at Westbrook, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine.

Albert G. Patrick, to be postmaster at Oskaloosa, in the county of Jefferson and State of Kansas.

John R. Grinage, to be postmaster at Houma, in the parish of Terrebonne and State of Louisiana.

Benjamin F. Blagdon, to be postmaster at Wiscasset, in the county of Lincoln and State of Maine.

Robert Kennedy, to be postmaster at Pleasanton, in the county of Linn and State of Kansas.

George W. H. Lucas, to be postmaster at Cherokee, in the county of Crawford and State of Kansas.

Joseph L. Mattingly, to be postmaster at Sedan, in the county of Chautauqua and State of Kansas.

Charles P. Baldwin, to be postmaster at Belleville, in the county of Republic and State of Kansas.

Larkin B. Davidson, to be postmaster at Girard, in the county of Crawford and State of Kansas.

John C. Haskett, to be postmaster at Baxter Springs, in the county of Cherokee and State of Kansas.

John Stirling, to be postmaster at Corydon, in the county of Wayne and State of Iowa.

Joseph E. Thorne, to be postmaster at Rockwell City, in the county of Calhoun and State of Iowa.

Enos F. Wenger, to be postmaster at Lisbon, in the county of Linn and State of Iowa.

George F. Parker, to be postmaster at Gladbrook, in the county of Tama and State of Iowa.

William Schneck, to be postmaster at Pomeroy, in the county of Calhoun and State of Iowa.

William W. Shanks, to be postmaster at Odebolt, in the county of Sac and State of Iowa.

Alice H. Groves, to be postmaster at Afton, in the county of Union and State of Iowa.

Richard W. Lloyd, to be postmaster at Lake Mills, in the county of Winnebago and State of Iowa.

William W. Merritt, to be postmaster at Red Oak, in the county of Montgomery and State of Iowa.

William W. Twist, to be postmaster at Toluca, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois.

Charles L. Corneau, to be postmaster at Forrest, in the county of Livingston and State of Illinois.

Addison M. Davis, to be postmaster at Rossville, in the county of Vermilion and State of Illinois.

David F. King, to be postmaster at Roodhouse, in the county of Greene and State of Illinois.

David C. Marsh, to be postmaster at East St. Louis, in the county of St. Clair and State of Illinois.

Ellis K. Mercer, to be postmaster at Princeton, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois.

Sidney B. Conner, to be postmaster at Liveoak, in the county of Suwanee and State of Florida.

Robert Forester, to be postmaster at Murphysboro, in the county of Jackson and State of Illinois.

Frank Friede, to be postmaster at Mount Olive, in the county of Macoupin and State of Illinois.

John Y. Henderson, to be postmaster at Jacksonville, in the county of Calhoun and State of Alabama.

Andrew Royal, jr., to be postmaster at Victor, in the county of El Paso and State of Colorado.

Edwin E. Whedon, to be postmaster at Del Norte, in the county of Rio Grande and State of Colorado.

Antoine V. Matney, to be postmaster at Claremore, in the county of Cherokee Nation, Ind. T.

George W. Harris, to be postmaster at Wardner, in the county of Shoshone and State of Idaho.

Mary A. Potter, to be postmaster at South McAlester, in the county of Choctaw Nation, Ind. T.

James M. Archer, to be postmaster at Mammoth Spring, in the county of Fulton and State of Arkansas.

Edward Atkinson, to be postmaster at Fordyce, in the county of Dallas and State of Arkansas.

Eugene C. Talbott, to be postmaster at Siloam Springs, in the county of Benton and State of Arkansas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 18, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

VENEZUELA.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House for the immediate consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2173) making appropriation for the expenses of a commission to investigate and report on the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana.

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $100,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated for the expenses of a commission, to be appointed by the President, to investigate and report upon the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana.

[Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is upon unanimous consent to the present consideration of the bill which has been reported to the House. Is there objection?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, do I understand it is proposed to pass the resolution without discussion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not tell.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I dislike very much to object to the consideration of a resolution presented by my distinguished friend from Illinois; but it seems to me that this subject is one of such vast importance and such serious gravity that the House of Representatives ought to proceed in a decorous and deliberate manner in its consideration. Late on yesterday the President's message was read to us. I presume most of us have read it more or less carefully in the newspapers. Very little time has been given to the consideration of that very remarkable document, and it seems to me that possibly all the members of this House may not be at this time fully advised as to the scope of responsibility which may attach to the adoption of this resolution. [Cries of "We are ready!" on the Republican side.] Gentlemen about me say that they are ready. That may be; but at the same time I feel convinced that I am doing service to the dignity and interests of my country when I ask those ready gentlemen, on this side or the other, to use in a matter of this momentous importance the cool deliberation and judicious procedure that are due to a matter that may vitally affect the interests of the two great English-speaking nations of the world. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been accused in times past of being somewhat of a "jingo," whatever that may mean. I hope that there is no impression in any part of the country where I may be known that I would falter at any time in upholding the honor and the prestige of my country, and when the moment occurs that the United States Congress, upon a full and deliberate consideration of facts presented, shall determine that either the honor, the safety, or the dignity of my country requires that we take up arms in a just cause against one or all the nations of the earth you will not find me lagging in the rear. But, Mr. Speaker, the public press of this morning brings us abundant evidence of the feverish excitement precipitated in this country by the message that ought to cause us to take counsel of our wisdom. The eyes of the civilized world are directed to-day to this House of Representatives and to the Senate of the United States, and, without abating one jot or one tittle of my desire that every right we have and every right we intend to maintain in the future shall be upheld, I do think we had better give to a matter of this extreme gravity at least as much appearance of deliberate consideration as we insist upon giving to any trivial matter of an appropriation of a few thousand dollars.

Now, sir, I have said all I desire to say at this juncture. I hope that it may be the disposition of the gentleman who has presented this matter and of the House to permit this resolution to go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the regular way, to be carefully considered, so that a resolution may be framed upon such lines as will meet all the requirements of the situation and as will leave the House of Representatives of the United States in the attitude of calmly considering and acting upon a great question concerning which the Executive himself, possibly for the first time in the history of such correspondence, has outlined the possibility of armed conflict between the two great Anglo-Saxon peoples of the earth.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have not objected. I have simply suggested a hope that this matter may go to a committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, appreciating all that was said by the gentleman who has just taken his seat, and the patriotic impulse that led him to make his remarks, I desire to say a word in explana-

tion of the bill and its purpose, which I trust will satisfy everyone in this House—and I will say it without mentioning this side of the House or that side. I hope we have not two sides of the House when it comes to a question of this kind. [Loud applause.] The President of the United States on yesterday sent a message to this House, at the conclusion of the reading of which the House adjourned; there was hardly time for deliberate action; and it might, perhaps, have been deemed precipitate if taken at that time; but we have all examined it after having heard it read from the desk. After a general discussion in that message of doctrines, policies, and national interests, there is a request made directly by the Executive to this House for action to aid him in the exercise of his Executive functions.

It is a part of the Executive function to ascertain the facts relating to any question in negotiation with a foreign country. The gravity of the case is such that the President suggests a mode of determining a cardinal question in the controversy, and he asks us to cooperate with him by enabling him to appoint three or more men to examine the records and evidence and the facts involved. In this contention between two great Governments the first fact for us to remember as patriotic Americans is that the success of our country in its contention depends, above all, upon our presenting a united front, so that all Americans shall appear to be one and that our Government shall speak for all the people of the United States. [Applause.] And the prompt response of the people's representatives here, according this small sum of money to pay the expenses of an investigation, which the President says shall be carefully and judicially made, and with the least delay possible—a suggestion of promptness which I am sure was made in good faith and will be so carried out by an American President—we answering in that spirit which becomes Americans and promptly granting the appropriation, the spectacle will be presented to the foreigner, to our opponent, of a Republic that is as one man. [Applause.]

In negotiations of this character any officer charged with the duty of representing his Government is hampered and the opponent is encouraged by every word of dissent that comes from his home. Every criticism behind the officer's back puts him at a disadvantage, and hesitation by this Congress, the postponing of this simple question of an appropriation to aid the President in performing an Executive function, would be construed by the British press and the British Government as evidence that the people of the United States were not in accord, that his action in the matter had some relation to party tactics, and that he did not speak the voice of the American people.

Let us answer and do our duty, all of us, now. We shall have long days in which to discuss the Monroe doctrine and the exact words in which it should be formulated if we do not agree with the precise terms in which Mr. Olney or the President has put it. But on this particular matter now presented discussion of various views only confuses and gives aid and comfort to those across the sea. Any disclosure of dissent here—and at bottom there really is none—any appearance of dissent would not aid, but would hamper, those who are clothed by the Constitution with authority to speak for the nation and charged with this great duty. I hope, therefore, that the House will proceed to pass the bill without delay. I have made these few remarks, not from any desire to speak or debate myself, but merely as a suggestion by way of guidance to the immediate action which I believe we ought to take, and in which I hope all will concur.

And now, Mr. Speaker, unless there is some considerable body of gentlemen here who desire discussion, I will move the previous question.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman a slight modification in the bill. It appropriates $100,000, and I would suggest that he add the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. HITT. I accept that amendment.

Mr. CRISP. I ask the gentleman to withhold the demand for the previous question for a moment.

Mr. HITT. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, together with all on this side of the House, I rejoice that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] has been recognized to ask consideration of the bill which has just been read at the Clerk's desk. It does seem to me that there can be no division in this House as to the propriety of the immediate passage of that bill. For a great many years there has been a controversy as to the divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana. We respectfully invited Great Britain to submit the controversy between that Government and the Republic of Venezuela to arbitration. Great Britain has declined arbitration. Now, what are we to do? If the American people have a fixed opinion upon any question, it is the opinion that no European country shall be permitted to acquire territory on the American continent by force. [Applause.] Now, the question is, what are we to do——

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentleman at his request, and I was glad to do so, because he is a very distinguished and experienced member of this House, but I yielded for what I supposed was to be a suggestion about the bill, and I beg the gentleman now not to try to precipitate general debate upon this subject.

Mr. CRISP. Surely he will accord to me the privilege of occupying as much time as he occupied; especially as he has presented this morning the bill which I tried to introduce yesterday.

Mr. HITT. But I beg the gentleman not to go into a discussion of the merits of the question at this time.

Mr. CRISP. I did not intend to do that. I simply desired to suggest that, inasmuch as Great Britain has declined arbitration of this controversy, we are bound to ascertain, and to ascertain speedily, on which side lies the right, and that is the object of the President's message and of this bill. If we are not to have the assistance of Great Britain in ascertaining the facts by means of an arbitration, then we must ascertain them for ourselves, and we ought to do it at once.

The suggestion of my friend from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] to wait until a committee is appointed means to wait three weeks, while we should at once authorize the appointment of this commission and the payment of its expenses so that it may proceed, as I have just said, to ascertain where the right is; and everyone may rest assured that when we ascertain where the right is we have the courage and the manhood to maintain it. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves the previous question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will not the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] allow me to ask him a question? I was trying to get his attention while he was on the floor. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky addressed the Chair while the Speaker was proceeding to put the question.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I ask the gentleman from Illinois to yield me two minutes only.

Mr. HITT. The gentleman will pardon me; I can not. I know the patriotic spirit which animates him; but he will have to pardon me. I can not do it.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I simply desire to say that I heartily indorse the bill offered by the gentleman from Illinois——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois does not yield.

Mr. HITT. I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not press the previous question without permitting me to ask him what the scope of the resolution is.

The question being put on ordering the previous question, it was ordered. [General applause.]

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. HITT. I ask that the Clerk read the whole bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be read.

The Clerk read the bill as amended by inserting after "$100,000" the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

The question being then put on the passage of the bill, it was passed.

[The announcement of the result was received with loud applause on both sides of the House.]

On motion of Mr. HITT, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

TELEGRAM FROM A CITIZEN.

Mr. HARRISON addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HARRISON. I rise to a privileged question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, a citizen of this country, a resident of the State of Alabama, desires to make a communication to the Government. I have a telegram just received which I desire to have read from the Clerk's desk as a communication from this citizen. I know no better way to present it to the House, and will simply add that I have known him for years; I knew him under circumstances which satisfied me——

The SPEAKER. This proposition requires unanimous consent.

Several MEMBERS. What is it?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HARRISON] asks that a telegram from a citizen of Alabama be read. Is there objection?

Mr. DALZELL objected.

Mr. DINGLEY. I was about to ask what the object is.

Mr. HARRISON. Simply that a citizen may communicate with the Government——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please be in order. Objection has been made.

Mr. HARRISON. I think if gentlemen on the other side understood this proposition——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please be in order. Any member has a right to object to such a proposition, and objection has been made.

Mr. HARRISON. I yield, sir.

HOLIDAY ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS.

Mr. DINGLEY. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, the 20th day of December, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock m. on Friday, January 3, 1896.

Mr. MEREDITH. I would like to suggest to my friend from Maine before this resolution is passed that some gentleman on the other side ought to prepare and have passed here a resolution to repeal that law which prohibits an old Confederate from entering the Army. I think this would be a pretty good time to do that. [Laughter.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I ask that the question be put on this resolution.

The question being put, the resolution of Mr. DINGLEY was adopted.

On motion of Mr. DINGLEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL MESSENGER FOR REPORTERS' GALLERY.

Mr. QUIGG. I offer a resolution, which I ask may be immediately considered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be appointed by the Doorkeeper an additional messenger in the reporters' gallery of the House at $1,200, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The SPEAKER. This requires unanimous consent.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let us have the resolution again read for information.

The Clerk again read the resolution.

Mr. QUIGG. If I may have the indulgence of the House——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York can address the House, with its consent, before the question is put on granting unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution. [A pause.] The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is offered at the request of the correspondents in the gallery. I will state the facts which, as it seems to me, justify the offering of the resolution and its adoption. By reason of the great increase in the number of correspondents and the additional rooms which they occupy, and the increased work imposed upon them, it is necessary, for a proper guardianship of those rooms and proper attendance, that a proposition of this kind be adopted. When the correspondents numbered 50, and the membership of this House was scarcely two-thirds as large as it is now, two attendants were provided for the reporters' gallery. There has been no increase in that number; and under the present exigencies the doors of the gallery are left constantly unguarded, and there is not sufficient attendance for facilitating the business of the correspondents or taking care of their rooms.

There are now nearly 200 correspondents in that gallery, and the request is for a third attendant. Before offering the resolution I conferred with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], and I sought the concurrence also of the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Accounts. I have been unable to succeed on this point, whether from my fault or his I do not know, but I made diligent efforts.

The matter has been fully investigated, and there can be no doubt that this assistant in the gallery is urgently needed. I hope, therefore, the House will allow unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution, and that it will be adopted.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am very sure there will be no disposition on the part of any member of this House to refuse to provide all the attendants in this service that may be required by the members of the press for their convenience and comfort. But inasmuch as there are now pending before the Committee on Accounts several resolutions providing for additional doorkeepers and messengers, it seems to be only proper that this matter should have the same consideration that is given to these other objects; and I most respectfully object at this time to the consideration of the resolution, and ask its reference to the appropriate committee.

The SPEAKER. Objection being made, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Accounts.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT, LAW OF MINING CLAIMS.

Mr. MCLACHLAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to present a bill and ask unanimous consent to have it read and considered.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

To amend section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to mining claims.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I object.

WOOL AND WOOLEN SCHEDULE, TARIFF ACT OF 1890.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a petition from the Association of Wool Merchants of Philadelphia, favoring the reenactment of the wool and woolen schedule (K) of the tariff law of 1890, sent to me for the purpose of having it made a part of the record; but I find that the same petition has already become a part of the record and content myself, therefore, with merely offering the petition at this time, and asking its reference to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. The petition will be appropriately referred.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. COCKRELL, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

And then, on motion of Mr. DINGLEY (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Friday next.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOODMAN: A bill (H. R. 2174) to prevent adulteration in the manufacture of beer and ale by the use of substitutes for hops—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 2176) to provide for fortifications and other works of defense, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 2177) for the better regulation of insurance companies doing business in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2178) to amend section 864 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to taking depositions de bene esse—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCLACHLAN: A bill (H. R. 2179) to amend section No. 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to mining claims—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SPALDING: A bill (H. R. 2180) to retire certain army officers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHUFORD: A bill (H. R. 2181) to prohibit the further issue of bonds, etc., under acts of 1875 and 1879—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2182) to prohibit discrimination in favor of gold in liquidating the Government's coin obligations—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 2183) to provide a mode for the consideration of certain awards of the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 2184) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Pekin, in the State of Illinois—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHUFORD: A bill (H. R. 2185) to provide for the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present ratio and upon equal terms—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CLARK of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 2186) for the construction of a roadway from the city of Keokuk, Iowa, to the national cemetery at Keokuk, Iowa, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 2187) to establish a military and national park upon the Palisades of the Hudson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 2188) to repeal section 1218 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A joint resolution (H. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators by the votes of the qualified electors of the States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIGG: A resolution to authorize the Doorkeeper to appoint an additional messenger in the reporters' gallery of the House, at a salary of $1,200 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FISCHER: A resolution directing the Committee on Naval Affairs, when appointed, to investigate the reported dismissals on charges of incompetency of mechanics employed at the New York Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 2189) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary A. Freeman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2190) to correct the military record of Hays Gaskill, of Smithfield, Fayette County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 2191) to correct the muster roll of William H. Nelson in the First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry and in the Fifth Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of J. W. Devine, administrator of J. G. Newlee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ABBOTT: A bill (H. R. 2193) for the relief of Henry M. Swann—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 2194) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Adelaide Ball, widow of Maj. Edward Ball, deceased—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 2195) to increase the pension of James F. Campbell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2196) for the relief of Joseph Dunlap—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 2197) for the relief of S. P. Johnson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2198) granting a pension to Amelia T. Seywert—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2199) placing upon the military rolls the names of Jackson M. Leland and others—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2200) for the relief of J. J. Hitt—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2201) granting a pension to Maria Tripp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2202) granting a pension to Maria C. Hany, of Leroy, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2203) for the relief of Mathew Cowley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2204) for the relief of Simeon Motz, Nathaniel Robbins, and William J. Sloan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2205) for the relief of T. H. Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2206) for the relief of E. N. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2207) for the relief of Buell Cronkhite—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2208) granting a pension to Mrs. Nancy J. Johnson, of Alma, State of Kansas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2209) for the relief of Sereno M. Clay, of Toronto, Kans.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2210) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry C. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2211) granting a pension to Joseph Noggle, of Parkerville, State of Kansas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2212) for the relief of Thomas Keating—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2213) granting an increase pension to Joseph B. Williams, of Osage City, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2214) granting a pension to Annie Beach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COWEN: A bill (H. R. 2215) for the relief of James Hooper—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 2216) to place the name of John B. Turchin on the pension roll at the rate of $50 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 2217) to reimburse the city of Menasha, Wis., for money expended, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 2218) for the relief of John W. Lewis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 2219) to restore William McElroy, late a first lieutenant in the United States Army, to his former rank, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2220) granting a pension to Kate C. McDougal—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HURLEY: A bill (H. R. 2221) granting an increase of pension to Peter J. Claassen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) granting an honorable discharge to John B. Tredenick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 2223) to pension Hiram C. Rogers, of Allerton, Iowa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULING: A bill (H. R. 2224) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Schilling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 2225) granting payment to John Shearer for the funeral expenses incurred by him in the burial of John G. Kyle, late lieutenant, First Regiment United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2226) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Behymer, late a private of Company G, Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2227) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jesse P. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 2228) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Lawrence Kennedy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2229) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Frank M. Lalor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE (by request): A bill (H. R. 2230) for the relief of William W. Burns—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2231) for the relief of Bluford Reeder—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 2232) for the relief of Arthur H. Lupfer—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2233) for the relief of James George—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2234) granting a pension to Joseph A. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 2235) to pension John F. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2236) granting a pension to Mary Elizabeth Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 2237) for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILNES: A bill (H. R. 2238) for the relief of Alvin Kingsley, Company G, Second Michigan Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 2239) for the relief of James M. Stephenson, of Mason County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 2240) for the relief of R. D. Beckley and Leon Howard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2241) for the relief of Francis Scala—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2242) for the relief of Isaac W. Busey—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2243) for relief of Jonathan Morris, of Savannah, Hardin County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2244) for the relief of A. J. and B. F. Haydon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2245) for the relief of Daniel L. Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2246) for the relief of George and Charles Shindler, of Spencer County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2247) for the benefit of Levi Hooper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2248) for the relief of the estate of Pearce Noland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2249) for the relief of Granville Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2250) for the relief of I. C. Newland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2251) for the relief of Charles L. Carter—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 2252) for the relief of John W. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2253) for the relief of Barzilla C. Hudson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2254) to increase the pension of William M. Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2255) for the relief of Susan Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2256) for the relief of Robert Spaugh—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2257) to increase the pension of Charles H. Twomey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2258) for the relief of Katharine Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2259) for the relief of William B. Ellis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 2260) granting a pension to Christiana C. Queen, widow of Walter W. Queen, admiral United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 2261) to increase the pension of Alexander E. Ingraham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 2262) to amend the military record of J. R. Utley, late private of Company D, Third Arkansas Cavalry, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 2263) to place Lieut. Col. Alexander Stewart Webb on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A joint resolution (H. Res. 40) authorizing Musadora, Victoria, Ella, and Frank Wasson, of Tennessee, to present their claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of Association of Wool Merchants of Philadelphia, favoring the reenactment of the wool and woolen schedule (K) of the tariff law of 1890—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: Petition of Andrew Harris and others, of Barry County, Mo., praying for an amendment to the pension law of June 27, 1890—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, Cuban resolutions from Kansas City, Mo., adopted at a mass meeting of the citizens thereof—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COFFIN: Petition of the heirs of Jane E. Johns, deceased, late of Prince George County, Md., praying reference of her war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Jacob W. Bird, of Anne Arundel County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: Memorial from the county board of Sangamon County, Ill., asking Congress to use all proper means to maintain and enforce the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Petition of Joseph H. Hawley—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of Hiram C. Rogers, of Allerton, Iowa, asking for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILBORN: Memorial of the San Jose Grange, No. 10, Patrons of Husbandry, of San Jose, Cal., in favor of the Government constructing and controlling the Nicaragua Canal, and the indorsement of the California State Grange thereof—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HURLEY (by request): Petition and memorial of William H. Hale, in regard to the American Association for the Advancement of Science—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LAYTON: Resolution of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, demanding the immediate enactment of a bill giving full and adequate protection to the woolgrowers, etc., of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEYER: Concurrent resolution of the general assembly of the State of Louisiana, in favor of improving the navigation of the River Bœuf and Bayou Macon, in northeastern Louisiana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2074—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia (by request): Petition and exhibits of James M. Stephenson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Papers to accompany House bill No. 2172, Fifty-fourth Congress, "A bill to muster into the United States service and grant an honorable discharge to Charles Edward Hawn"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 19, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, together with a draft of a proposed act to regulate the use of the public parks and improved reservations in the District of Columbia under the charge of the Chief of Engineers, and requesting favorable action upon the same; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. J. W. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2173) making an appropriation for the expenses of a commission to investigate and report on the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

VENEZUELAN BOUNDARY CONTROVERSY.

The bill (H. R. 2173) making an appropriation for the expenses of a commission to investigate and report on the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana was read the first time by its title.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the bill, after the second reading, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have sent for the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], the present chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I had hoped the Chair would not lay the bill before the Senate until he returned. He will be here in a few moments, and I hope the Senator from Ohio will withhold his motion.

Mr. SHERMAN. I looked around for the Senator from Alabama, and not seeing him here thought I would make the motion. But I have no objection to letting the bill lie over until he comes in.

Mr. COCKRELL. He will be here in a moment; and it will be understood that the motion will be called up as soon as he returns.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie on the table for the present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented the petition of George Hughes, of Portland, Oreg., praying for an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition, in the form of a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of Sangamon County, Ill., praying for the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HILL presented the petition of George W. Armstrong, of Minetto, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation granting relief to the heirs of Capt. John Wood, late a soldier in the Revolutionary war; which was referred to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. PEFFER, from the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (S. 238) to prohibit officers of the Government from refusing to pay moneys appropriated by act of Congress, reported it with an amendment.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am instructed by a majority of the Committee on Appropriations to report back favorably, recommending its passage, the House concurrent resolution which I send to the desk.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, the 20th day of December, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, January 3, 1896.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is that a report from the Committee on Appropriations?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is so advised.

Mr. CHANDLER. If in order I object to the consideration of the resolution at this time.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the resolution lie over until to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I should like to inquire of the Senator reporting the resolution whether it is reported favorably?

Mr. COCKRELL. I stated it exactly. The committee report the resolution favorably, and recommend its passage just as it came from the other House.

PAY OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 26) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1895, on the 20th day of said month, to report it without amendment, and ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 1055) to establish a bureau of military education and to promote the adoption of uniform

military drill in the public schools of the several States and Territories; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1056) for the relief of Joseph Tousaint; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1057) for the relief of C. J. Baronett, of Gardiner, Mont.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 1058) providing for the increase of the Navy; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HALE. The bill in its general provisions follows the line of the act of last year, but it provides for a much larger increase of the Navy. I ask that it be sent to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and I hope that committee will give it very early attention. It is an important subject,

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 1059) granting an increase of pension to Louis C. Schilling; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1060) to pay the claim of James H. Sentz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1061) authorizing additional compensation to the assistant commissioners to the industrial exhibition at Melbourne, Australia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1062) making an appropriation to enlarge the military post of Fort Meade, near the city of Sturgis, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1063) to establish a military post at or near the city of Pierre, Hughes County, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1064) to fix the pay of certain noncommissioned officers of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1065) in relation to a farm for the Indian training school at Pierre, S. Dak.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1066) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the amount due the Flandreau Sioux Indians, and making an appropriation to pay the same; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1067) to provide for building and maintaining an Indian industrial school at or near Chamberlain, in the State of South Dakota, and at or near Rapid City, in the State of South Dakota, and to provide a farm in conjunction therewith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1068) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the Indians residing upon the Cheyenne River Reservation, in South Dakota, for the purchase of a part of said reservation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1069) to increase the pension of soldiers and sailors who have been totally disabled from performing any manual labor, and, having one or more additional diseases resulting from the pensionable cause, who have to be under regular medical attendance at least one-half of the time, and that have drawn $30 per month for the past five years; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1070) to increase the rate of pensions for certain cases of deafness; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1071) granting a pension to George Gamache; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1072) granting a pension to Frederick Andros; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1073) to aid the State of South Dakota to support a school of mines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1074) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain damages resulting to any person who made entry upon lands within the present limits of the Sequoia and Yosemite National parks, in the State of California, prior to October 1, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1075) for the relief of the heirs of D. Fulford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1076) for the relief of W. L. Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1077) for the relief of J. M. Montgomery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1078) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to cause to be made all necessary field examinations, surveys, and experiments for the purpose of demonstrating the extent, etc., with reference to irrigation, of the underflow waters between the ninety-seventh degree of west longitude and the foothills of the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, and making an appropriation therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1079) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the extermination of fur-bearing animals in Alaska," and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1080) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Yankton, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. WILSON introduced a bill (S. 1081) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay from their own funds for certain legal services rendered the "Old Settlers" or Western Cherokee Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 1082) for the relief of Irwin Tucker, postmaster at Newport News, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1083) for the relief of George H. Plant, of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1084) for the relief of Isaac Davenport and others, citizens of Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1085) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 1086) to establish a national university; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1087) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Cameron, alias Samuel C. Cole; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1088) in the matter of proof of death in pension cases under the old invalid law of 1862; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 1089) for the erection of a public building at Newport, Vt.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1090) to provide for the restatement, readjustment, settlement, and payment of dues to army officers in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1091) granting a pension to Christiana C. Queen, widow of Walter W. Queen, formerly an admiral in the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1092) for the relief of Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. Madison Cutts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1093) for the relief of Ruth Marshall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1094) for the relief of Thomas G. Corbin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 1095) for the relief of Enoch Vernon, a citizen of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1096) to increase the pension of Wilbur F. Cogswell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1097) for the relief of Thomas J. Miller; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLICATION OF THE MESSAGES OF THE PRESIDENTS.

Mr. GORMAN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Public Printer be, and is hereby, authorized to employ such clerical aid as he may find necessary in the copying, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, of the messages of the Presidents of the United States from the Journals of the Senate and House and the Executive Journals, for the printing thereof, and that the expense therefor be paid out of the appropriation for public printing and binding.

PROPOSED FINANCIAL LEGISLATION.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas by the President's message to Congress of December 17, A. D. 1895, regarding the boundary line between Venezuela and British Guiana, it is made to appear that the contingency of war between the British Empire and the United States of America may suddenly arise; and

Whereas money is the first essential in times of war, and in such an event the Government uses gold, silver, and paper money indiscriminately until the two former disappear and thereafter relies solely on paper money: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and they are hereby, directed and instructed to inquire and report, by bill or otherwise, whether it would not be expedient and proper for the Government of the United States of America at this time to open its mints to the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 1 to 16, and in addition thereto issue an adequate volume of full legal-tender Treasury notes in the same manner such notes have heretofore been issued, and, in the interest of national safety, withdraw the issue power of national banks and retire all bank currency.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is upon agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.]

Mr. PLATT. What is the vote?

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. One Senator has voted for the resolution and another Senator has voted against it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Two voted for it. I voted "aye."

Mr. PLATT. What is the question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ALLISON. Let it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair submitted to the Senate whether there was objection to its present consideration, and no objection being interposed he put the question on agreeing to the resolution. The Chair will again ask if there is objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SHERMAN. I heard it read. It is a simple resolution directing the Committee on Finance to inquire into certain mooted questions. I interpose no objection to it at all. These questions will be before the committee anyway. I have no doubt the subject-matter will be considered without the resolution, and therefore it is perfectly harmless.

Mr. PLATT. I should like to hear the resolution read again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be again read.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. PLATT. I move to amend the resolution by striking out the two "whereases."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is, first, Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PLATT. Then I will object to its consideration at the present time.

Mr. GORMAN. Let the resolution go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection. The resolution will go over under the rule.

SUSAN WALLER.

Mr. VOORHEES submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Susan Waller, wife of John L. Waller, late an American consul at Tamatave, the sum of $1,500 for her necessary support and the support of her children pending an investigation into the legality and justice of said Waller's imprisonment under sentence of court-martial by the French army in Madagascar.

ARMENIAN OUTRAGES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. SHERMAN, referred, with the accompanying report, to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of the 4th instant, requesting the President, "if in his judgment not incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate all information which has been received by him or by the State Department in regard to injuries inflicted upon the persons or property of American citizens in Turkey, and in regard to the condition of affairs there in reference to the oppression or cruelties practiced upon the Armenian subjects of the Turkish Government; also to inform the Senate whether all the American consuls in the Turkish Empire are at their posts of duty, and if not, to state any circumstances which have interfered with the performance of the duties of such consuls," I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 19, 1895.

VENEZUELAN BOUNDARY CONTROVERSY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives, which has been read the first time by its title.

Mr. MORGAN. I should like to have the bill read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The bill (H. R. 2173) making an appropriation for the expenses of a commission to investigate and report on the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated for the expenses of a commission, to be appointed by the President, to investigate and report upon the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to enter an objection to the bill being read the second time to-day.

Mr. MORGAN. It has been read for information.

Mr. PLATT. It has had its first reading.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill has been read the first time.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Nebraska has objected to its second reading to-day.

Mr. MORGAN. It can not be read the second time to-day, except by unanimous consent. It has only been read for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States, in considering a question of the gravity of this, of course ought to deliberate as long as it may find it proper and necessary in order to come to an absolutely correct judgment. I therefore would prefer that this bill should take the course indicated by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], which is the customary course with bills in this body, except in cases of extreme emergency, and that it should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations for consideration. But I should object to any reference unless the Senate agrees that we will have no holiday recess until that committee can make its report, after proper investigation, and bring the bill back before this body; for while I would hasten slowly in this matter, I would still make all necessary speed for the consideration of a question which is agitating the minds of the people of the United States and of the whole world. A delay might give opportunity for the formation of incorrect opinions as to our earnestness on this subject. Misfortunes might attend the formation of such an incorrect opinion in this country and in Venezuela and elsewhere in the world. I prefer that the deliberation which is necessary and appropriate on such an occasion should be given to this measure, but without unnecessary delay.

The wording of the measure as it comes from the House of Representatives leaves some question about the exact line of policy which the House indicates and intends to pursue in its action upon this question. That doubt is whether the Congress of the United States intends to intervene in this matter with whatever constitutional power it has and assume any control over diplomatic questions, and the formulation of the attitude of the Government of the United States toward Venezuela and toward Great Britain. There is some doubt left in this bill as to whether we intend to do that, or whether we intend to leave to the President of the United States the full and unembarrassed exercise of his constitutional power in forming and shaping a very important question for the future consideration of Congress in whatever form the President may see proper to submit it.

The divisional line between the exercise of these functions by the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States upon either hand is a clear one, and it is one that I do not care to cross by anticipation. I do not care to usurp, or appear to usurp, any of the functions, rights, duties, or responsibilities of the President by interposing the action of Congress so as to take out of his hands the proper treatment of any part of this matter.

We had an illustration in our recent history of the power of the President to appoint an adviser to be sent to a foreign country to collect information for the advice of the Executive in regard to a very delicate question existing between us and the Government of Hawaii. The President selected his adviser without the advice or consent of the Senate and sent him to a foreign country, and he came back and made his report to the President, which was laid before Congress. A good deal of debate, both in Congress and out of it, arose upon the question whether the President had the right, in virtue of his constitutional powers, to make that appointment and to charge Mr. Blount with the duties which he went on to execute and report upon. The subject was submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and they reported, not without dissent, however, that the President, under the precedents, a number of which were quoted, had the right to appoint such an agent to visit Hawaii to obtain information for his advice, so as to enable him to shape a diplomatic question between that country and the United States.

If Mr. Blount had composed a part of a commission authorized by an act of Congress and he had gone under the authority of that act to Hawaii and made whatever report he chose to make, the Congress of the United States would have become responsible for the action of Mr. Blount, because he would have been carrying out the will of Congress as expressed in a statute, and not the will of the President. That sufficiently indicates the question which arises in my mind as to the proper line of action to be taken in this

instance. It is a question for the Senate to determine whether we shall in any wise interfere in this question legislatively for the purpose of giving any control or direction to the diplomatic features of it or the diplomatic attitude of the Government of the United States toward the question, or whether we shall leave it where, as I understand the President in his message desires it shall be left, in the hands of the constitutional Executive of the United States to deal with it as being still a diplomatic question.

I desire, Mr. President, to say that I think there is no difference of opinion between the President of the United States and Congress as to the promptitude with which this question ought to be settled. I believe that the President and Congress are in entire accord, that this question is one which demands the earliest settlement consistent with a deliberate course of action and a proper conclusion.

So far as the question which is called the Monroe doctrine is concerned, that is settled by the action of the Executive at least, and if we should pass this bill which comes from the House of Representatives in its present form, without any change, the conclusions reached by the Executive of the United States upon that question would be absolutely and unequivocally confirmed. I think that I do not mistake at all the sense of Congress upon this subject or the convictions of the people of the United States. The question of the application of that doctrine to the particular case in hand, the case of Venezuela, is one that is also, virtually, settled by the President's message almost as conclusively as the other, but it is not settled absolutely. He reserves for the consideration of the United States upon its own responsibility the facts relating to the attitude of Great Britain toward this boundary question in Venezuela and for the purpose of obtaining satisfactory information as to whether in this particular instance the Monroe doctrine is to be applied with all the force that the United States may see proper to exercise on any occasion in its enforcement.

It seems to me that the message of the President, and more particularly, I might say, the letter of the Secretary of State to Mr. Bayard, to be communicated to Lord Salisbury, puts this matter in such a clear, substantial, unequivocal light as that our action in affirming it in any form could never be mistaken. Our action in disaffirming it, if we should refuse an appropriation, of course, would reach back through the whole question, and would deny the existence of that feature of American law which we call the Monroe doctrine. But so far as the question of the Monroe doctrine itself is concerned, we have passed now to an attitude which I think must gratify this generation of men, and will be equally gratifying to all generations of Americans who may hereafter live—we have passed to that attitude in which we assert the right of the United States, as the controlling nationality on this continent, and the first and most responsible Government, for the republican form and principles of human government. That declaration has been made and will stand as the law of the United States if we pass the bill that comes from the House of Representatives, or any other bill executing the wish of the Executive as he has expressed it, or his recommendations upon this subject.

I am incapable, Mr. President, in any words that I can command, to adequately express my gratification that this question, which has been so long under debate, has at last received such a clear-cut definition, so substantially founded in truth and in justice and in American policy, and so rooted and grounded in the system of government which obtains in the United States—our republican constitutional form of government. I repeat, that I can never properly express my gratitude that we have arrived at a conclusion so entirely comporting with the dignity and honor of the Government of the United States, with its prestige among the nations, and with the sentiments of all the people of our country. At last we have attained to a ground by common consent, which is now being put into the form of legislative action, which fixes absolutely the attitude of the United States as to the existence of this question and as to the necessity of its enforcement in any and every case where it becomes material and practical.

If the Senate will indulge me just a moment, I will read a few extracts from the letter of Mr. Olney, in which, I think, the proposition I have just stated is very clearly laid down. I read these extracts from Mr. Olney's letter that there may be no mistake or question that we accept and adopt his definitions of the Monroe doctrine, as it is called, and the conditions that should call for its application.

In his letter to Mr. Bayard, he says:

> The important features of the existing situation, as shown by the foregoing recital, may be briefly stated.
>
> 1. The title to territory of indefinite but confessedly very large extent is in dispute between Great Britain on the one hand and the South American Republic of Venezuela on the other.
>
> 2. The disparity in the strength of the claimants is such that Venezuela can hope to establish her claim only through peaceful methods—through an agreement with her adversary either upon the subject itself or upon an arbitration.
>
> 3. The controversy, with varying claims on the part of Great Britain, has existed for more than half a century, during which period many earnest and persistent efforts of Venezuela to establish a boundary by agreement have proved unsuccessful.
>
> 4. The futility of the endeavor to obtain a conventional line being recognized, Venezuela for a quarter of a century has asked and striven for arbitration.
>
> 5. Great Britain, however, has always and continuously refused to arbitrate, except upon the condition of a renunciation of a large part of the Venezuelan claim and of a concession to herself of a large share of the territory in controversy.
>
> 6. By the frequent interposition of its good offices at the instance of Venezuela, by constantly urging and promoting the restoration of diplomatic relations between the two countries, by pressing for arbitration of the disputed boundary, by offering to act as arbitrator, by expressing its grave concern whenever new alleged instances of British aggression upon Venezuelan territory have been brought to its notice, the Government of the United States has made it clear to Great Britain and to the world that the controversy is one in which both its honor and its interests are involved and the continuance of which it can not regard with indifference.

So far, that is a statement of historical facts, which will be affirmed by the action of the Senate of the United States and of the House of Representatives by whatever act may be passed here appropriating money in any form for executing this purpose on the part of the Government of the United States. So I accept it, and so I believe the Senate of the United States will accept it.

Again, the Secretary of State says in his letter to Mr. Bayard:

> There is, then, a doctrine of American public law, well founded in principle and abundantly sanctioned by precedent, which entitles and requires the United States to treat as an injury to itself the forcible assumption by an European power of political control over an American State.

Further on in the same letter he says, speaking of the attitude of Great Britain:

> Thus, as already intimated, the British demand that her right to a portion of the disputed territory shall be acknowledged before she will consent to an arbitration as to the rest seems to stand upon nothing but her own ipse dixit. She says to Venezuela, in substance: "You can get none of the debatable land by force, because you are not strong enough; you can get none by treaty, because I will not agree; and you can take your chance of getting a portion by arbitration, only if you first agree to abandon to me such other portion as I may designate." It is not perceived how such an attitude can be defended nor how it is reconcilable with that love of justice and fair play so eminently characteristic of the English race. It in effect deprives Venezuela of her free agency and puts her under virtual duress. Territory acquired by reason of it will be as much wrested from her by the strong hand as if occupied by British troops or covered by British fleets. It seems therefore quite impossible that this position of Great Britain should be assented to by the United States, or that, if such position be adhered to with the result of enlarging the bounds of British Guiana, it should not be regarded as amounting, in substance, to an invasion and conquest of Venezuelan territory.
>
> In these circumstances, the duty of the President appears to him unmistakable and imperative. Great Britain's assertion of title to the disputed territory, combined with her refusal to have that title investigated, being a substantial appropriation of the territory to her own use, not to protest and give warning that the transaction will be regarded as injurious to the interests of the people of the United States as well as oppressive in itself would be to ignore an established policy with which the honor and welfare of this country are closely identified. While the measures necessary or proper for the vindication of that policy are to be determined by another branch of the Government, it is clearly for the Executive to leave nothing undone which may tend to render such determination unnecessary.

Those statements in that letter, all of which are exactly in harmony with the conclusions I have just read, put this question in a settled form so far as our own attitude is concerned. They affirm that there is an American doctrine such as the Secretary of State has formulated and has argued and has proven, and that whenever that doctrine becomes applicable in a material way to the interests or the destiny of one of the American Republics the Government of the United States stands committed in its solemn declarations and, after this appropriation is passed, will stand committed absolutely by its legislation to the maintenance of that doctrine.

What, then, remains for Congress to do? According to the recommendation of the President, nothing more than to make an appropriation to enable him to execute his constitutional function of completing the inquiry and examination into the title of Venezuela and of Great Britain, so far as that may come under consideration, and of presenting that to the Congress of the United States in such a manner that our action in the proposed application of these doctrines to the case of Venezuela shall be certain and definite and may be based upon grounds that are sufficient.

I can understand, Mr. President, that a commission of three members, or five, or seven, or whatever number might be selected, might have some differences of opinion in regard to this question of the title of Venezuela; and they might unnecessarily interject those differences into the main question, and they might thereby dissipate a movement on the part of the Government of the United States which is intended to embody, and does embody, the sentiment and strength and feeling and determination of the whole people.

At least, our attitude might be rendered uncertain in some degree by what we might call a preliminary or collateral division in our councils or opinions. Notwithstanding I had formed a different opinion in the outset—I had not understood the exact purport of the President's message as I think I understand it now, that a commission to be organized under an act of Congress would be necessary to complete the work that the President has conducted so far—I now view the subject in a different light, par-

ticularly consulting, as I am glad to be able to do and desire very much to do, the wishes of the President in respect of the further dealing with this question. He says in his message to Congress:

> In order that such an examination should be prosecuted in a thorough and satisfactory manner I suggest that the Congress make an adequate appropriation for the expenses of a commission, to be appointed by the Executive, who shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay. When such report is made and accepted, it will in my opinion be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which after investigation we have determined of right belongs to Venezuela.

Here is an evident appeal by the President for the support, in whatever conclusions he may reach upon the facts relating to the Venezuelan title to disputed territory, of the judgment of persons to be appointed by him, upon a full examination of those questions, some of which are very delicate. I honor him for making that appeal, because it shows a deliberate purpose on the part of the President of the United States to proceed to the execution of these American doctrines announced as law in the letter of Mr. Olney, so far as they are applicable to the case of Venezuela, and to proceed in their execution, unless it shall turn out that, upon a full and fair investigation of the title of Venezuela to this territory, there is such a doubt about it that the American people should either take longer time to consider it or that they should abandon the intervention.

But, Mr. President, I do not wish to have, if I can avoid it, and I do not think the country would like to see, any possible controversy or division of opinion between a high commission organized by Congress and the President upon any question presented in his message. Suppose that after this declaration and after this careful examination by Mr. Olney into the title of Venezuela, which he affirms upon the evidence now in reach, the high commission should find that Mr. Olney was mistaken in some of his conclusions, or that, after all, in their opinion or in the opinion of a majority of the commission, there was such doubt about the title of Venezuela that we could not afford to treat it as a subject that might possibly result in hostile collision with Great Britain, the President, if he did not concur in their report, might be antagonized by this commission, and the Congress of the United States having organized it, would, as a matter of course, have a right to their report and would be guided, to a degree at least, in their action by its recommendations.

We might find ourselves in a state of serious embarrassment in regard to the question of enforcing this American doctrine if we are guided by the report of a high commission, which, in its resultant effects, might uproot the doctrine itself, or might expose it to another half century or century of debate and discussion. I should like to avoid the possibility of such a result as that, and I would prefer that the Congress of the United States in this case, as it has in all other cases where we have had to conduct belligerent operations against foreign Governments, should take upon itself, in connection with the President of the United States, the solution of this question in an authentic form, and not leave its action to depend, in any degree, upon the judgment of a commission, who may not be wiser or better informed, after all, than the Congress itself or the President. It is the faithful research of the commission, rather than its recommendations, that we shall need, and that the President requests us to provide for.

I should dislike very much to be now compelled, after the firm advance we have made upon this occasion, to reverse our action so far as to leave this question in the hands of a commission to be organized by Congress for final decision. I prefer to leave it where the Constitution leaves it, in the hands of the President of the United States and upon his executive responsibility. He has not shrunk from the task. There is no indication that he will shrink from it. The arguments upon which his action is predicated are absolutely firm and sound, and they are right. If they could be wrong, they are still American. The President has adopted the American judgment on this question without seeking for precedents in monarchic Europe, and his attitude upon this subject, in my opinion, is that of patriotism, firmness, decision, and courage. He recommends speedy action, so that I can not mistrust that his object is to delay action or to so provide as not to bring this very exciting question to an early determination. There is not the least reason for anxiety or apprehension on that score.

I believe that the Senate of the United States would do well and would be thoroughly justified if we pass the bill just as it is and support the President and the "commission" by an appropriation of money. The word "commission" used in the bill is not a word which creates a commission by act of Congress. It is a word which merely indicates that persons are to be appointed by the President under his constitutional authority for gathering the proper information as to Venezuela's title.

Nevertheless, if there is an adverse opinion, or if what has arisen in the minds of Senators while they have been considering the question shall suggest to them the propriety of having the matter acted upon by a committee of this body, I am entirely willing that it should be done. But when that is done I shall be of the number who will enter, if it is necessary to enter, serious protest against any recess of Congress until the question is dispeopleof. Such a question can not be wisely or safely settled if it is settled too late. The anxiety of the world over the outcome of this great controversy is too great to admit of unnecessary delay on the part of Congress. And the questions are too seriously important to be presented to Congress by the Executive in any uncertain form through divided counsels. Let us vote the supply that is needed to gain correct information as to all the material facts involved in the case, and leave the right of untrammeled recommendation, as well as the undivided responsibility, in respect of these diplomatic questions, where it belongs under the Constitution, upon the President.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I do not disagree with the views expressed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], and I heartily applaud the message of the President. Still, the question as to how we shall deal with the message is a matter for the consideration of the Senate. We are not to act hastily. Everyone, not only in this country, but in Europe, feels that the position taken by the United States in asserting the Monroe doctrine in a specific case is of the highest importance to all civilized nations.

In acting upon the measure submitted to us by the President of the United States I think we ought to proceed with deliberation. I think the bill as passed by the other House ought to be amended, it ought to be limited, it ought to be defined. There are several amendments suggested on both sides of the Chamber, which no doubt will meet with favorable consideration. There is no hurry about this matter. The controversy between Venezuela and Great Britain will not be settled in a day or in months. In my judgment it will be settled peaceably by the action of those two powers. Great Britain has too great a stake in the history of the world to attempt under the circumstances an act of injustice to a small country like Venezuela. The public sentiment of that country will be aroused against it. The generous sentiments of Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen will be against robbing a small country like Venezuela of a portion of its territory. I have no doubt the question will be settled peaceably.

But the assertion of our right to prevent European powers from seizing any part of the American continents, from treating America as an Africa, to be conquered and divided among the various nations of Europe, can not be questioned. These continents are settled in every part by people of European and Christian races, and are controlled by them. The great nations of Europe are all interested in some part of America, England, however, having the greatest interest. She is in possession of a vast region north of the United States. Under the circumstances I do not expect that war will arise. I do not contemplate or wish to contemplate the possibility of such an event. I have seen enough of war in my time to dread its progress and its consequences. I do not wish in the slightest degree to say a word which would even indicate that a war is likely to ensue about this small matter; but at the same time I think the President of the United States is right, under the circumstances, in announcing what we understand to be our duty as the most powerful of American nations, and in saying to the countries of Europe, "These two continents are already occupied by Christian nations of Europe, and we, with our sixty-odd millions of people, are willing to say that the rights of those nations shall not be trampled upon by force and violence by European powers."

As a matter of course it is proper to say that we could not interfere in any agreement made between Venezuela and Great Britain as to the boundary between British Guiana and Venezuela. I have a map here which shows better than any I have seen before the rapid encroachments made by Great Britain upon what is considered to be the territory of Venezuela. It shows that, beginning with a little colony derived from the Dutch, Great Britain added to it a large region of country lying to the west of it, and then gradually by encroachments has finally reached up almost to the Orinoco River. This is a serious controversy. Great Britain has taken ground that she will not even submit to arbitration as to anything on the south side of a particular line. Now, I think that the British people, when they understand this matter, when they see that it is attracting the attention of the civilized world, will not press their contention, especially when they remember that the Monroe doctrine was perhaps not so much the doctrine of Monroe as it was the doctrine of Canning, of England, then prime minister, which was agreed to by the United States and Great Britain, and that the power to prevent encroachment by European powers upon American territory or upon American States was asserted not only by the United States, but by the cooperation and consent of England.

I do not wish that this matter shall be postponed beyond the present session; I do not desire to create any delay, but under the circumstances I do think that the bill ought to be referred to

the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which my honorable friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] is chairman, and that it ought to be acted upon promptly and immediately. Let us hear and let that committee hear the suggestions of amendment that have been made. I could make some suggestions, and perhaps I shall make them. Let the suggested amendments be fairly considered. If they are voted down by that committee or by the Senate, or if the committee choose to take the House proposition, well and good. We will not resist it. But I insist upon the right of the Senate to consider so grave a proposition, and I am not to be hurried in that consideration. I wish to regard and treat the message of the President of the United States with the utmost respect, and I wish to reserve to the Senate the right of consideration, which we always claim. It is supposed that we are a slow-moving body. We ought to be. It is intended that the Senate of the United States should be conservative in all things. While this body should meet the duties of the hour, it should not too hurriedly adopt new ideas until they are strengthened into convictions. Then the Senate should act.

Now, in this matter, I think the bill should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe that would meet with the consent of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], who objected to the second reading of the bill. Let the committee be especially instructed to report to-morrow or any time that is necessary. Let the matter be there discussed. If the committee should report that no amendment is necessary, well and good. We will all vote for the bill. If they should report amendments, I have no doubt the House of Representatives would at once act upon them. Let us show no haste, no anxiety, but simply pursue the path of duty as it is laid out before us.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it seems to me that it is difficult to exaggerate the gravity of the question involved in the bill which has come to us from the House of Representatives. It seems to me that the proper course for the Senate to take on such an important matter is the usual course, to send the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations, instructing them to report at once, if you please to-morrow, but not to act out of the usual line pursued by the Senate.

I do not think Congress ought to adjourn for the holidays until the House bill is disposed of. I have not the least desire to delay action. On the contrary, I wish to expedite it in every possible manner. But I think that the action which is taken by the Senate in its ordinary and usual way, after the report of a committee selected to deal with these subjects, would have far more weight and would more surely meet with the approbation of the American people than if we should hurry the bill through the Senate now without giving it that consideration which every bill ought to have from the appropriate committee. If the bill is sent to the committee it can be reported to-morrow. If it is impossible for the committee to report the bill to-morrow, then let the Congress of the United States remain here until they have disposed of it. Surely at this time Congress will not set the question of holidays against dealing with a matter which involves a principle on which are staked the interests and safety of the United States and the maintenance of which may result in hostilities between the two great English-speaking nations of the world.

Mr. President, for my own part I do not desire to put the slightest opposition in the way of the Executive or of the Senator who no doubt has represented the wishes of the Executive upon this floor. I cordially agree with the President's message. It is the right, the sound, the American position for the United States to take. But that which is of the utmost importance is that we should show to the world that we are united, without distinction of party or section, in support of the policy which the message outlines. We should be able to say, as Webster said in the House of Representatives, that our politics stop at the water's edge, and that when we come to dealing with a foreign question we deal with it simply as Americans.

It has been freely charged in the English newspapers published in London, and also in that small part of the British press which is published in the city of New York, that this is a matter of politics; that it is being used by the President for electioneering purposes, and that it has been used by the Republicans with that view. That is the most mistaken view ever uttered. The American people, without distinction of party, believe in the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine and are prepared to uphold it at any cost. They desire the appointment of a commission, not to act as a board of arbitration between one country and another, but to inform the United States on what line they ought to stand when they prepare to resist further English aggressions on American soil. The action of the commission is to be for our own information. It is, I think, wisely demanded. There is, however, no need for such a commission to go to Venezuela. It is not contemplated, in my judgment, by the Executive or the State Department. The utmost delay, therefore, that could possibly be caused would be by the necessity of sending experts to The Hague and to Madrid to get copies of papers and documents to which allusion has been made by Lord Salisbury and on which the English case apparently rests. Those papers would be necessary for the information of the commission. It would not take long to send such an expert to Madrid or to the Spanish archives at Simancas and another to The Hague. The methods of travel are now sufficiently rapid to enable them to go to both those points and get the required information in a short time.

I have no desire to limit the Executive in any way. He is acting on his high responsibility. The House of Representatives, overwhelmingly Republican, without a dissenting voice, upheld his hands. The Senate, I am sure, will do the same. But it is possible that we may desire still further to strengthen the bill, in order to show to the American people and to the world that we are not only united, but in absolute earnest; that, without any brag and without any bluster, we are prepared to maintain the Monroe doctrine, not as a principle of international law—I do not myself think it comes within the scope of international law—but as a fact, just as we maintained the Declaration of Independence, because we considered it vital to the interests and to the existence of this country.

There is, therefore, only one amendment that I should desire to suggest. I will give notice of it now, in case the bill goes over until to-morrow, or if it is referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, to be considered to-day and reported to-morrow, I shall ask that the amendment go with the bill to that committee. I desire to give notice of an amendment, that at the end of the bill, after the word "Guiana," the following sentence be added:

And said commission shall report with the least possible delay, not later than April 1, 1896.

I have given some attention to the Venezuelan question; I have studied it during the past year with a good deal of care; I have examined every map and document, I think, that is accessible here, and I think I know enough about it to say that there is nothing in the case that can not be considered within the period specified in my amendment, and that if there are papers to be brought from Madrid or from The Hague they can be brought within that time and laid before the commission. I think fixing the date will strengthen the hands of the Executive, and will give notice to the world that while we are proceeding deliberately and temperately we are also proceeding with absolute firmness; that we mean exactly what we say; that we propose to sustain the President in the position which he has taken, and that at a given time we shall be prepared for action in defense of the line reported as the true boundary by the commission. We want nothing indefinite about the commission. We want them to report as soon as possible, and then we will sustain the Monroe doctrine with all the strength of the Republic.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, I can see no reason why action should not be taken at this time on the bill coming from the House of Representatives. I have listened carefully to the remarks that have been made. I know no need of further investigation as regards the bill, nor any reason why it should go over, and I hope the Senate will act upon it this morning. There are some suggestions that arise to my mind which I may be pardoned for making.

I am not contemplating war or peace. I am contemplating what is right in this case, as near as I know or can understand. We all understand that we have a very firm faith in what is known as the Monroe doctrine, and if anybody's faith has been shaken of late, if he will do as I have done, read the great dispatch of the Secretary of State, which was sent to Mr. Bayard last July, he will have no further doubt that our welfare and safety and honor and dignity all depend upon the strict enforcement of that doctrine. That dispatch will take its place alongside the best in American history, whether prepared by Webster, Madison, Jefferson, or anyone else.

In regard to the talk of haste, Senators seem to be desirous of relieving themselves of all suspicion of being in haste. I am not in haste, and they have not been in haste on the other side of the water, either. I have here the message of the President, and I hope the Senate will pardon me for calling attention to what I conceive to be the best statement that has been made or can be made of our attitude in this matter. Remember, Mr. President, that Mr. Olney's dispatch went to Mr. Bayard last July. It took them on the other side of the water five months to make up their minds what they would say in answer, or possibly whether they would answer at all. At last an answer came, as Mr. Cleveland well says, of a most unsatisfactory character. This is the case, however, that is made on our part. The President says:

In the belief that the doctrine for which we contend was clear and definite, that it was founded upon substantial considerations and involved our safety and welfare, that it was fully applicable to our present conditions and to the state of the world's progress, and that it was directly related to the pending controversy, and without any conviction as to the final merits of the dispute, but anxious to learn in a satisfactory and conclusive manner whether Great Britain sought, under a claim of boundary, to extend her possessions on this continent without right, or whether she merely sought possession of territory fairly included within her lines of ownership, this Government proposed to the Government of Great Britain a resort to arbitration as the

proper means of settling the question to the end that a vexatious boundary dispute between the two contestants might be determined and our exact standing and relation in respect to the controversy might be made clear.

That is a magnificent statement of the case, just in all its parts, appealing to England to be a party to an investigation by arbitration, and to settle a vexatious boundary and avoid the possibility of collision hereafter. After five months of consultation among themselves Great Britain declined that fair and honorable proposition. For my part, I am willing to join issue with them on that subject, and, as a preliminary step, find out exactly what are their rights in that country and what ours are, and then stand by them.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] is a little more magnanimous, possibly, or more generous than I am this morning. He says he has no idea that the great power, England, would attempt to put forth an unjust claim to territorial boundaries, or claim what did not belong to her. There is not a degree of latitude or longitude on the earth's surface on which she has not attempted to do exactly that thing. All around the globe she has been the oppressor of weaker nations and weaker peoples, and the very map which the Senator from Ohio held up from his desk refuted what he said. The very map shows that she has gradually been encroaching from one line to another, hoping to be unseen in it until from some 70,000 square miles, her original claim, she has over 100,000 square miles. She has by silent encroachment, and without any show of right or pretense, gone on and on from her original claim of the Schomburgk line, until now she has absorbed beyond her original claim more territory than there is in the great State which the Senator from Ohio in part represents, and much more than there is in the State which I in part represent.

Mr. President, I do not wish to talk on this subject any more than is necessary, but I do intend to go to the line of what I believe to be right. I have no fear of war. I look upon war as a horror, as other Christian men do, I hope; but there will be no war here. There is a hostage lying on this continent north of us. England will not fight on an issue of this kind. She does not dare to. The commerce of the world is carried in English bottoms, and I remember that in reading Mr. Canning only last year he stated an instance where, in the war of 1812, insurance was paid for at the rate of 13 guineas for £100 of commerce to cross the Irish Channel. And it was not six months after the war of 1812 broke out until armed privateers swarmed the ocean, and insurance shops were shut up in London. They would not insure the commerce.

No, Mr. President, there will be an adjustment and settlement, but it might as well be known now on both sides of the ocean that England's great colonizing career has to have some definite limits, some boundaries. Washington, in his Farewell Address, laid down the doctrine that we would not interfere with the affairs of Europe; and as a sequence they shall not interfere with American affairs. There is a logical sequence of the Farewell Address. Let us have that understood, and we will go on peaceably, but if England determines that she will fix her own boundaries in South America she can come up and with as much justification take the Mexican State of Chihuahua or any other one of those States, and plant her guns until they point over the American line; and inasmuch as she is in a foreign country from us and settling with that country, however weak or feeble it may be, we would have to stand still and look on. Such is not the doctrine of this Government, and such will not be the decision of the American people.

Without any intent to bluster about the matter at all, I think there has been time enough spent. It took nearly six months, as I say, for the British Government to send an answer, and then they sent us a declination to so just and wise a proposition as the communication of the Secretary of State contained, to arbitrate and settle the matter. Now, let us go forward and settle it for ourselves, so far as our responsibilities are involved. As the President says in his message, we will do this as a justification; he does not say of what, but there is a future implied there—as a justification of what shall come hereafter. Let us find out what their line is. Let them have what belongs to them and no more. I trust we may waste no more time on this great question. We should dispose of it and let the President appoint his commission and let the work go on.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I rise at this time simply for the purpose of making an inquiry. I understood the honorable Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] to object to the second reading of the bill to-day. If that objection stands it will be a little more appropriate to have this discussion continued when the bill can be read the second time. I suppose the Senator from Nebraska desires to adhere to his objection.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I objected to the second reading of the bill to-day because I thought there ought to be some delay. There ought not to be hasty action on the part of the Senate. There can be no doubt in my mind that there is a unanimous agreement in the Senate upon the subject of the Monroe doctrine, and that no person misapprehends the force of that doctrine or what it is. But there is or may be a grave question as to the application of that doctrine in this case.

I look upon the question of the Monroe doctrine as settled, not by the declaration of President Washington, nor by the declaration of President Monroe, but I look upon it as a doctrine that is inherent in every nation that has and must maintain an existence. It is a doctrine of self-defense. The honorable Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] has illustrated it in his remarks. It is that doctrine which gives this nation the power to protect itself by prohibiting a foreign nation from acquiring territory upon ground that may be a menace to us. I am not disposed to enter into any dispute as to whether it is a national policy or an international law or a law of self-defense. In my judgment it is a law of nations because it is a law of self-defense, and certainly it is the policy of this Government.

Now, there will arise a question which this committee ought to consider, and consider well. The Constitution invests in Congress, not in the President, the power to declare war. The President is not invested with any power to declare war or conclude peace. It is a power vested in Congress. Are we to give the President power to appoint a commission without any approval upon our part after his selection of a commission to visit Venezuela or the disputed territory, or to sit elsewhere and acquire information upon this subject, and then are we to be called upon to act upon the report of that commission without ever having had the power ourselves of inquiring into it by a joint committee of Congress or a committee of either House? It occurs to me that that is a very important matter. I do not believe the Constitution of this country ever contemplated that the President of the United States should have that power. I think that when our fathers conferred upon us, through the Constitution, the power to declare war and conclude peace, they impliedly conferred upon us the sole power and the sole means of ascertaining the circumstances under which war should be declared and peace concluded.

I am not prepared to say that the President of the United States may choose men whom he may see fit, regardless of the attitude of Congress, and invest in them this high and delicate power. If the President has power or is given power to appoint this commission, one of the important things the Committee on Foreign Relations must consider is, whether the names of the commissioners should not be sent to the Senate for its consideration and approval before they receive their commissions.

I do not anticipate that there is any likelihood of war between Great Britain and the United States of America. When I have listened to resolutions introduced here, and bold declarations upon the part of Republicans and Democrats alike, and especially when I listened to the proposed amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the effect that this matter should not be settled until the 1st of April, I have sometimes been inclined to believe that there was more of political warfare in the future between the two great political parties of the Union than there would be of warfare between Great Britain and the United States.

I shall insist upon my objection to the second reading of the bill to-day.

Mr. CULLOM. I rose simply to inquire of the Senator whether he intended to insist upon his objection, and I did that for the reason that I think the discussion would be more legitimate when the bill has been read the second time, as it has just received its first reading and has been read simply for information.

Mr. ALLEN. I shall insist upon the objection.

Mr. CULLOM. I shall probably make some remarks later on, after the bill has been read the second time.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I do not propose to discuss the probabilities of war. I regret the rather warlike tone of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES]. He even ventured to point out the direction in which England would find herself comparatively weak, and to indicate those considerations which would prevent her from declaring war or accepting our declaration of war. It is not wise to assume that either the great British nation or the great American people will refuse to fight in any imaginable contingency. People do not always fight when they ought. They do not always fight upon the very best of grounds. They are sometimes unjustifiable. They are sometimes ill tempered. They sometimes yield to an undue and oppressive ambition. I do not discuss the question of war at all.

But what do we desire here? Information. There is not a citizen in this Chamber, or the other, or in the United States, who would not be very glad, indeed, to receive to-day the careful report of five of our leading jurists or great legislators or diplomatists upon the merits of this question, its correct history from the beginning, boundaries successively established or claimed, and the correspondence that ensued between the different countries. Nobody knows what the facts are upon which we are expected to act. Great Britain herself does not know, I judge, by the map here issued by Venezuela, which gives six different boundaries that may be found upon British maps from time to time or in British demands, each one creeping northwestward. Now, if that is not a case for a commission, I do not know what can be.

I desire this matter to be referred to the committee because that

is the dignified and deliberate and proper way. It is a method which will strengthen the case of the President and the case of the United States rather than injure it. If we proceed now in a very desultory discussion, such as is now going on here, to act upon this measure and accept the bill to-day exactly as it came from the other House, we shall be reproached with having departed from our usual course and with proceeding upon a supposed knowledge of facts, which knowledge does not exist. If we refer the bill to the committee, then various amendments which are in the minds of Senators on both sides of the Chamber can be considered that might otherwise take up days of debate.

If such amendments should be considered in committee, whether they be reported favorably or not, we shall be stronger before the world than if we pass the bill and concur literally with the action of the other House in the next fifteen minutes. I think it would be well for every man to state his amendment, if he has a suggestion in his mind, that the public also may see that this proposition to refer does not arise from any sort of disposition to make unnecessary delay.

I hope that the bill will be referred and amended. It might provide for a commission of five, to be nominated by the President and appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. I hope that the appropriation may be made larger, and I hope that the time for the final report of the commission may be settled in the bill itself. I think those are important amendments. I know I am not alone here. I am not alone on either side of the Chamber in desiring the changes I have described.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the only contribution that I desire to make in the debate upon this question at this time is to ask to have read at the desk the paper which I send to the Secretary.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read the paper given below.

Mr. CHANDLER. There are some three or four or five hundred names of members of the British House of Commons signed to the paper, which I ask may be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is so ordered, without objection.

Mr. COCKRELL subsequently said: I desire to request the Senator from New Hampshire to permit the letter of W. Randal Cremer to Senator SHERMAN, requesting the presentation of the memorial which has been read from the members of the British Parliament, to be inserted with the paper.

Mr. CHANDLER. To be printed with the document as read?

Mr. COCKRELL. To be printed with the document. I sent for the original papers at the time the Senator requested that the memorial be read.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish that that may be done.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, in the absence of objection.

The letter and memorial are as follows:

[From W. Randal Cremer, M. P., St. Paul's Chambers, 23 Bedford street, Strand, London, W. C.]

LONDON, *January 1, 1895.*

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to forward you a copy of a memorial signed by 354 members of the British House of Commons. As the object of the memorial is of the highest importance, and the signatures represent all shades of political opinion in the British Parliament, I venture to ask for the prayer of the memorialists your earnest consideration.

Respectfully, yours,

W. RANDAL CREMER.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN.

To the President and Congress of the United States of America:

In response to the resolution adopted by Congress on April 4, 1890, the British House of Commons, supported in its decision by Mr. Gladstone on June 16, 1893, unanimously affirmed its willingness to cooperate with the Government of the United States in settling disputes between the two countries by means of arbitration. The undersigned members of the British Parliament, while cordially thanking Congress for having, by its resolution, given such an impetus to the movement and called forth such a response from our Government, earnestly hope that Congress will follow up its resolution, and crown its desire by inviting our Government to join in framing a treaty which shall bind the two nations to refer to arbitration disputes which diplomacy fails to adjust. Should such a proposal be made, our heartiest efforts would be used in its support, and we shall rejoice that the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland have resolved to set such a splendid example to the other nations of the world.

William Abraham (Limerick), William Abraham (Rhondda), James T. Agg-Gardner, David Ainsworth, William Allan, C. F. Egerton Allen, William Allen, Robert A. Allison, Dr. Daniel Ambrose, Robert Ambrose, Joseph Arch, Hugh O. Arnold-Foster, Alexander Asher, Llewellyn Atherley-Jones, Sir John Austin, Bt.; Michael Austin; Sir George Baden-Powell, K. C. M. G.; John Baker, W. H. Walter Ballantine, J. Emmott Barlow, John Barran, Reuben V. Barrow, Edward Barry, Edw. Hodson Bayley, Thomas Bayley, Mark H. Beaufoy, Gilbert Beith, John Williams Benn, Joseph Bennett, Godfrey R. Benson, Michael Biddulph, James Bigwood, Alfred Billson, William Birkmyre, Augustine Birrell, Edward Blake, Matthias M. Bodkin, T. B. Bolitho, Thomas Dolling Bolton, Hon. Arthur G. Brand, Right Hon. Jacob Bright, John Albert Bright, Harrington Evans Broad, Henry Broadhurst, Alex. Hargreaves Brown, John Tomlinson Brunner, Thomas R. Buchanan, Robert J. D. Burnie, Thomas Burt, William P. Byles, Wm. Sproston Caine, James Caldwell, Sir Charles Cameron, Bt.; Sir James M. Carmichael, Bt.; Patrick G. H. Carvill, Francis A. Channing, Joshua M. Cheetham, John J. Clancy, Dr. Gavin B. Clark, Walter Owen Clough, Henry P. Cobb, Hon. Thos. H. Cochrane, Francis M. Coldwells, Jeremiah J. Colman, Andrew Commins, LL. D.; Earl Compton, Thomas J. Condon, C. Aug. V. Conybeare, Arch. Cameron Corbett, Right Hon. Leonard H. Courtney, Herbert H. Cozens-Hardy, Donald Crawford, Eugene Crean, William Randal Cremer, Daniel Crilly, John William Crombie, William Crosfield, Sir Joseph Crosland, Alexander Cross, H. Shephard Cross, Thomas B. Curran, Thomas Curran, Henry J. C. Cust, James H. Dalziel, Maj. Leonard Darwin, William Rees Davies, C. Diamond, Right Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bt.; John Dillon, George Dixon, Cyril J. S. Dodd, Capt. A. J. C. Donelan, William Dunn, Frank Edwards, John Edward Ellis, Sir T. Grattan Esmonde, Bt.; Sir Francis H. Evans, K. C. M. G.; Samuel Thomas Evans, Robert Lacey Everett, Sydney Evershed, Dr. Robert Farquharson, Charles Fenwick, William Field, Charles James Fleming, James C. Flynn, P. James Foley, Matthew Fowler, Dr. Joseph Francis Fox, Sir Theodore Frye, Bt.; Frederick C. Frye, George P. Fuller, Christopher Furness, J. Lawrence Gane, James Gibney, James Gilhooly, Edward T. Gourley, Geo. G. Leveson-Gower, Thomas N. Archibald Grove, William Court Gully, David C. Guthrie Richard B. Haldane, Sir Charles Hall, K. C. M. G.; John Hammond, Timothy Harrington, Luke P. Hayden, Right Hon. Charles Seale-Hayne, Walter Hazell, Right Hon. Sir A. D. Hayter, Bt.; Maurice Healy, Thomas J. Healy, Timothy M. Healy, James Heath, Clement Higgins, Sir Benjamin Hingley, Bt.; E. Brodie Hoare, Hugh E. Hoare, Samuel Hoare, Chas. Edw. H. Hobhouse, Henry Hobhouse, James Francis Hogan, Angus Holden, Sir Isaac Holden, Bt.; William H. Holland, Charles H. Hopwood, Joseph Howard, George Howell, Sir Henry H. Howorth, K. C. I. E.; Arthur C. Humphreys-Owen, William A. Hunter, Charles P. Huntington, John Husband, Alfred E. Hutton, Alfred Illingworth, Sir William J. Ingram, Bt.; William Jacks, James A. Jacoby, Right Hon. Sir Henry James, Sir James Joicey, Bt.; David Brynmoor Jones, Maj. Evan R. Jones, Jeremiah Jordan, Hudson E. Kearley, J. Seymour Keay, Sir John H. Kennaway, Bt.; Patrick J. Kennedy, Dr. Joseph E. Kenny, Matthew J. Kenny, William Kenny, Denis Kilbride, Sir H. Seymour King, K. C. I. E.; Sir John G. S. Kinloch, Bt.; Sir James Kitson, Bt.; Henry Labouchere, George Lambert, J. Batty, Langley, Harry L. W. Lawson, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Bt.; Robert Leake, Thomas Wodehouse Legh, Joseph Leigh, Sir John Leng, Herbert S. Leon, Joseph F. Lesse, John Herbert Lewis, Thomas Lewis, Thomas S. Little, David Lloyd-George, Frank Lockwood, John William Logan, Thomas Lough, Right Hon. Sir J. Lubbock, Bt.; H. C. Fownes Luttrell, Sir Leonard Lyell, Bt.; John A. M. Macdonald, Sir Donald H. Macfarlane, Dr. Donald Macgregor, Miles MacInnes, Michael McCartan, Justin McCarthy, Patrick McDermott, Dr. Mark A. McDonnell, William McEwan, Patrick McGilligan, Edward M'Hugh, Patrick A. M'Hugh, Charles P. Bright McLaren, Walter S. B. McLaren, John McLeod, John Henry Maden, John Mains, W. F. Maitland, Richard Mallock, Francis Mandeville, Sir Moses Philip Manfield, Sir Frederick T. Mappin, Bt.; Richard Biddulph Martin, William Mather, William Jardine Maxwell, Francis B. Mildmay, Matthew J. Minch, Bernard C. Molloy, Sir Samuel Montagu, Bt.; James M. Moorsom, Robert Jasper More, Right Hon. Sir G. Osborne Morgan, Bt.; John Lloyd Morgan, W. Pritchard Morgan, Alpheus C. Morton, Edward J. C. Morton, John Fletcher Moulton, Right Hon. Anth. J. Mundella, Dadabhai Naoroji, Hon. Mark F. Napier, Ralph Neville, George Newnes, Col. John P. Nolan, Hon. Sir Stafford Northcote, Bt.; Capt. Cecil W. Norton, Thomas-Willans Nussey, P. J. O'Brien, William O'Brien, Arthur O'Connor, James O'Connor, Florence O'Driscoll, Francis A. O'Keeffe, Mark Oldroyd, Thomas Owen, Sir Charles M. Palmer, Bt.; George W. Palmer, Herbert W. Paul, James M. Paulton, Henry Fell Pease, Joseph A. Pease, Sir Joseph W. Pease, Bt.; Sir John Pender, Robert W. Pekrs, Benjamin Pickard, Edward H. Pickersgill, John Pinkerton, Thomas B. Potter, Patrick J. Power, Robert John Price, Thomas P. Price, Briggs Priestley, Andrew D. Provand, W. Cuthbert Quilter, David Randell, William Rathbone, John E. Redmond, William H. K. Redmond, Sir Edward J. Reed, K. C. B.; R. Threshie Reid, Joseph Richardson, John Bryn Roberts, John Herbert Roberts, Sir Thomas Robinson, Henry J. Roby, John Roche, Sir Thomas Roe, Sir Albert Kaye Rollit, Sir Henry E. Roscoe, Chas. Savile Roundell, James Rowlands, W. Bowen Rowlands, Thomas W. Russell, Sir Bernard Samuelson, Bt.; William Saunders, Col. Chas. Seely, Thomas Sexton, Charles Edward Shaw, W. Rawson Shaw, Jeremiah D. Sheehan, David Sheehy, Capt. John Sinclair, Clarence Smith, Harry Smith, James Parker Smith, Samuel Smith, William Smith, Thomas Snape, Albert Spicer, Hon. Philip J. Stanhope, Right Hon. James Stansfeld, Henry Charles Stephens, Sydney J. Stern, Francis S. Stevenson, James C. Stevenson, Samuel Storey, James Stuart, Donal Sullivan, Timothy D. Sullivan, Sir Thos. Sutherland, Charles K. Tanner, Francis Taylor, Harold John Tennant, Abel Thomas, Alfred Thomas, David Alfred Thomas, Walter Thorburn, Charles Townsend, Charles Ernest Tritton, James Tuite, Jasper Tully, Right Hon. C. P. Villiers, John Stewart Wallace, Robert Wallace, J. Lawson Walton, Cornelius M. Warmington, Thos. Courtenay T. Warner, Eugene Wason, Sir Edward W. Watkin, Bt.; Thomas Wayman, Alfred Webb, Sir Richard E. Webster, G. C. M. G.; Sir Wm. Wedderburn, Bt.; James Galloway Weir, Sir Joseph D. Weston, Samuel Whitbread, S. Howard Whitbread, Thos. P. Whittaker, J. Shiress Will, Arthur John Williams, John Carvell Williams, William Williams, James Williamson, Stephen Williamson, Charles H. Wilson, Henry Joseph Wilson, John Wilson (Durham), John Wilson (Govan), Joseph Havelock Wilson, Samuel Woods, Caleb Wright, Samuel Young.—*Congressional Record*, Fifty-third Congress, third session, page 2408, February 19, 1895.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the controversy between Venezuela and Great Britain is one of long standing, of certainly at least fifty years. There does not seem to have been any established line between the section of country claimed by Great Britain and the Venezuelan territory—that is, no line recognized by both nations. The English Government has not adhered, if I am correctly informed, to the same line at all times. I have supposed myself that we practically knew where the original line was that they were entitled to hold by the cession of the country from the Dutch. I have discovered by the report of the President that that

is in doubt. I do not think it becomes me, nor do I think it becomes any member of this body to discuss the question of fact. When the President of the United States says that the fact is not sufficiently well known in the Department of State to enable him to act without a commission or further information, I think in ordinary decency we have to wait. My private opinion may be one thing; my public opinion as a Senator in this body is another.

The President of the United States says that he wants a commission to determine facts. He has the power to determine facts without our aid, without reference to us; yet if he wants our assistance to get at the facts he is entitled to it.

There has been some surprise expressed, and a good deal of zeal and enthusiasm exhibited, over the message of the President of the United States. The President's message as a whole meets my hearty approval, but I expected it would. I did not believe we had reached a point in the decadence of national honor and pride where any Secretary of State or any President would retire from the American doctrine that has been so dear to the American heart for seventy years, called the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. President, it is not the Monroe doctrine; it is the American doctrine. It is a doctrine, as stated by one Senator here, that grows out of the doctrine of self-defense. It is not, as has been claimed by some, an international rule. It finds no support in international law except upon the principle which is grounded in all international law that the right of self-defense rests in every nation, limited only by its power. If we in this country believe that it is contrary to our interests and threatening to our institutions to allow colonies to be established upon the soil of the Western Hemisphere it is our right to say that they shall not be established, and we need not resort to international law for our defense; we resort to what has been the recognized law of Christendom for many years, upon which the balance of power is being maintained in Europe to-day, the right of every nation to see that no other nation aggregates to itself so much power as to threaten the peace and stability of others. We can defend the Monroe doctrine upon that principle without the slightest difficulty.

I do not understand that our great competitor in commerce and trade, our great English-speaking relative, has ever denied our right to assert and maintain the Monroe doctrine. What they claim is that the Monroe doctrine does not apply to this case. Whether it applies to this case depends upon the facts, which are unknown to us, it appears. If I knew what the facts were, as an international lawyer I would have no difficulty in applying the law. As a believer in the American doctrine of the right to say that no European power shall invade American soil, either of North or South America, I should have no trouble in coming to a conclusion. Is it an invasion of American soil? I do not know that. I repeat, I thought I did. I have found that I do not.

If the President of the United States had said that in the Department of State they had determined what was the true line between the British possessions and Venezuela, and if he had said, "We are confident that the British Government, instead of attempting to arrange a disputed line, is attempting to use this disputed line as a pretense for territorial acquisition," no matter what may be the character of the Administration, whether Democratic or Republican, I would have stood by that declaration as an American Senator, because there is where we get our information upon these subjects, and not from our own judgment. We must stand by what the Department says upon these great questions when the facts are ascertained by it.

The President says that he needs assistance to make this determination. We are going to give it to him. Nobody doubts that. The only question is, how shall we give it to him. I am as firm a believer in the Monroe doctrine as any man who lives. I am as firm a believer as anyone in the maintenance of the honor of the American people, and I do not believe it can be maintained if we abandon the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. President, there is no haste in this matter. The dispute is one of long standing. Great Britain is not now taking any extraordinary steps with reference to the control of the territory in dispute. They took, it is said, five months to answer our Secretary's letter of July 20. Mr. President, the time was not excessive. It is not unreasonable in diplomatic affairs that there should be months taken in replying to questions of so much importance. We may properly take months, if we choose, to consider it before we plant ourselves upon what we say are the facts in this case. I repeat, so far as the American people are concerned, the Monroe doctrine is not in dispute, is not in doubt, whatever may be the doubt about the facts in this case. If the facts are not ascertained, we must, before we proceed further, ascertain them.

This is a very important question. It is not a question of party politics. It is not a question that any political party ought to take advantage of to get votes. The political party that attempts to make capital out of this question will find that it is a loser in the end. The American people will not be trifled with on a question of this kind. If the other side of the Chamber, or the Administration, or anybody, attempts to make capital out of it, they will find that they will lose in the end, as we should lose on our side if we should be foolish enough, as I know we are not, to attempt to make capital out of it in any way.

The Monroe doctrine, or the American doctrine, grew out of the necessity of the case when the Holy Alliance was threatening the stability and the existence of the South American Republics, when it was the intent undoubtedly of the Holy Alliance, after they had isucceeded in disposing of some affairs in Europe, to take a hand in South American affairs. Then, not by the United States, but from Great Britain, came this doctrine. It was Mr. Canning who suggested it. It was, beyond question, Mr. Adams, Secretary of State, who enforced it upon President Monroe.

From that hour it has been the American doctrine, which no American Senator and no American statesman of any kind has dared to gainsay before the American people. We enlarged it in 1848 undoubtedly under Mr. Polk's Administration, but we had a right to enlarge it. Mr. Polk then laid down the proper law to govern us, and if it was an extension upon the Monroe doctrine of 1823 it was an extension growing out of the condition of the United States and the world, and a proper extension, and it has met the approval of the people of the United States from that hour to this.

The cherished doctrine is, not that we are the guardians of those Republics, not that we assume a protectorate over them, but that while a European Government may claim from them redress for injuries, it shall not claim that redress in a way which shall entitle it to territorial acquisitions from the offending State. That is the American doctrine.

We do not say to Europe that we will defend those States; that we will be responsible for their conduct. We say to all the European nations, if those States do not deal with you as one State should deal with another, you may go to war with them, if necessary, to enforce their national obligations toward you; you may demand of them disavowals, apologies, retractions, cash indemnities, if you choose; but you shall not take an acre of their land; not because we are interested so directly in those Republics, but because we are interested in this great Republic; because we feel that to maintain the integrity of those Republics—or, at least, if not to maintain their integrity as nations, to maintain their independence of European control—is essential to our prosperity. That is the reason why we adopted this doctrine, and that is the reason why the American people are ready to enforce it, no matter what it may cost. Mr. President, that is the feeling of the American people.

This question is of so much importance that I do not care myself if the bill goes to the Committee on Foreign Relations and lies there a month. You will not impress the world with our solidarity and solidity on this question by any haste in this body. Let this proceeding be a dignified proceeding. Let the bill go to the committee. Let the committee take their time on it. Let them return it here and say what is the best way by which we can strengthen the hands of the President of the United States in his efforts to maintain this American doctrine.

Mr. President, I am not one of those who want war. I do not believe in war. I believe in this case Great Britain made a great mistake when she said she would not arbitrate, and I have faith enough in the love of justice and right that pervades the people of Great Britain to believe that on second sober thought they will submit this question to arbitration, as many of their representative men have declared they are willing to submit all questions of this character.

Mr. President, I do not like to talk about war. We are, in my judgment, the greatest nation in the world. We have more force and power and strength than any other nation that flies a flag. We have a compact, homogeneous people, devoted to their institutions and country. But because we are strong and great we do not want to go to war unless there is a necessity and a demand for it, and when that necessity and demand arise we want to go to war with a sentiment back of us that will sink every dollar that we have and sacrifice every man in defense of the national honor and national right.

These are not, I repeat, questions to be kicked about and treated with haste. Let this bill go to the committee. Let it be considered. If the committee want a week, ten days, or two weeks, or a month, let the committee take it. Nothing will be lost. Great Britain will not misunderstand our attitude. She does not misunderstand it now. She knows just as well how we feel upon these subjects as she will when we pass this bill. She has had it dinned in her ears again and again from nearly every Secretary of State that we were not willing to abandon the Monroe doctrine, nor view with indifference the improper interference of any European power with any existing American Government, whether such interference is a violation of the Monroe doctrine or not.

Mr. President, there has been a good deal said of late about the Monroe doctrine, and I do not intend to expatiate on it. The

Monroe doctrine has had repeated sanction by the American people and the American Government. In 1861, when war was flagrant in this country, when there was such a war in progress as modern times have not seen, when one-third of this country was arrayed against the rest, when we were threatened by interference by foreign powers, we were so attached to the Monroe doctrine that our great Secretary of State called the French and the English to account, and said, "Do you propose by your armies, which you are sending to Mexico, to dismember Mexico and make it a part of your European system?" Great Britain and France then, mindful of the great strength we had, and mindful of the strong hold that this doctrine had upon our people, said without the slightest hesitation, "We do not intend any aggrandizement of European countries by this proceeding. We are simply attempting to enforce a claim that we have against the Republic of Mexico." Then Mr. Seward said, "Very well; if that is the fact we will not now complain."

Suppose they had said, on the other hand, that they did intend to dismember Mexico, and partition it between France, Spain, and England, the three countries that were then invading it, we might not have been in a condition to have carried on a war, but we would have had the declaration made by the Secretary of State, and backed up by this Government then, that when the time did come that we could be heard, we would be heard in defense of the Monroe doctrine, at the point of the bayonet if it was necessary.

Later, as is suggested to me, our Army was gathered on the border of Mexico by command of Congress. Recently, in speaking with an officer who had taken part in the important battle where Maximilian was defeated for the last time, and where he met his final rout, this officer said to me that 2,000 Confederate Americans fought under the Mexican banner. He was a Prussian officer, had been an officer in the Confederate army, and he said but for our people, the Confederate army, Maximilian would have been triumphant in that battle. The Mexicans had our sympathy, they had our strong support, and when the French were notified by Mr. Seward that we still recognized and intended to recognize General Juarez as the constitutional President of that Republic they took their troops out of Mexico, because they knew if they did not it meant interference on our part and a war between France and the United States.

Later than that, when the Austrian Government was about to send to their prince reenforcements, the Secretary of State said to them, "If you do this we will not agree to longer remain neutral in this contest;" and they did not come. That was a direct assertion of the Monroe doctrine. It was an assertion that our Government meant to go to war if it became necessary in defense of that doctrine. I might give a number of instances of the recognition of this doctrine by our Government.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair reminds the Senator from Colorado that the hour of 2 o'clock has arrived. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during the sessions of Congress.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the unfinished business will be laid aside informally, so that the Senator from Colorado may conclude.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. TELLER. There are a number of instances which I will not detain the Senate by citing to show that the American Government has never for an hour departed from the principle known as the Monroe doctrine. Does anybody in Great Britain believe we are going to do it now? Does anybody in this country believe we are going to do it? Need we make any special demonstration of our adherence to that doctrine in view of our history in connection therewith? I think not, Mr. President. But if it should be done, it is not to be done by sending this bill to the committee in haste; it is not to be done by the passage of this bill out of the usual course; it is to be done by a declaration that will come from the American people so that it may not be misunderstood. That is what I should like to see done by this Congress and at this session. I should like to see this doctrine put beyond question hereafter, that we rely upon that doctrine and we mean to enforce it whenever there is a necessity for it, and we are to be the sole judges when that necessity arises. Great Britain, in this very correspondence, admits our right to maintain the Monroe doctrine, but questions the right to do it in this case, because she says it is not applicable to this case.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that I was not in favor of war. I am not; I do not believe in it to settle controversies, and yet I know that sometimes a nation in defense of its honor and integrity must go to war. A war between the United States and Great Britain would be the most tremendous war of modern times; nay, I need not say of modern times—it would be the most tremendous war that the world has ever seen from the days of Alexander the Great to the present time. What would it mean? It would mean a universal war. Does anybody believe there can be a war between Great Britain and ourselves without bringing into that war other European nations? If they do, they have not studied the European question. We should not be, in the event of a war with Great Britain, without European allies. The interests of certain European countries would be not to let Great Britain dominate us. Their interests would be that we should destroy the prestige of Great Britain not only upon the sea, but upon the land.

Great Britain knows that; we know it; the world knows it. The great Russian Government, waiting patiently to get its rightful advent to the sea, would find an opportunity then that it has never before had. Do you suppose that Government would be slow to take advantage of it? Waiting to crowd down the line of British India, do you suppose the Russians would fail to take it? Waiting to complete the domination they have begun over China, do you suppose they would fail to complete it? They would move down through the Turkish waters to the open sea; while Great Britain was engaged in this enterprise with us they would have an opportunity to get that for which they have been striving for many years. Once secured, it never could be taken from them.

Mr. President, there is no danger of war, in my judgment, over a question like this. I do not say that if Great Britain should assert a principle that, if carried out, would be dangerous and distressing to us, we ought not to go to war, no matter what the consequences would be. In my judgment the consequences would be much more serious to Great Britain than to us; but I do not want to say that in the way of threat. I do not believe that is the way to discuss these questions. Neither Great Britain nor we could afford to go to war, except there were a great principle at stake, a great necessity for it. We should be derelict if we did. It would be the most inhuman thing in the world for these two great English-speaking peoples to go to war. Yet I would give my voice for war before I would see the country dishonored, and so would our English brethren if they believed it would be a dishonor for them to take certain steps.

I repeat what I started out to say, that there is no haste in this matter. It is a great big question, involving to some extent the peace and prosperity of the two greatest nations of the world. Let us approach it as statesmen and Senators; let us not be impatient; and, above all, do not let us be anxious, one to get the advantage of another in a political way. Too big is the question for party politics or party gain. Let this question be settled in such a way that when Great Britain sees what we have done she will know that there is a united nation back of it, and that we may have, as we ought to have if we go to war, the approval of the civilized world. We can not afford to go to war until we have that; and that, I am told, can not be had until the facts are officially and judicially determined. I am in favor of giving the President every method and every means he wants for that determination. When that determination shall be made, I shall be for acting in accordance with the honor and the dignity of the Government of the United States, without reference to what may be the result.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the debate so far has proceeded, of course, by unanimous consent, and I have no disposition in the world to check it. The question, as I understand, is upon the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] to refer this bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the bill has been read and it will go to the Committee on Foreign Relations in the absence of objection.

Mr. COCKRELL. No, no.

Mr. CULLOM. The bill has been read only once.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The second reading of the bill has been objected to, the Chair is advised.

Mr. MORGAN. The difficulty is that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] interposed an objection to the second reading of the bill to-day.

Mr. CULLOM. The bill can not be referred until after it has had its second reading.

Mr. MORGAN. That, of course, prevents its reference to the committee, and prevents it from being read the second time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The second reading of the bill has been objected to.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to say to the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who are here—and I will reach others by private notice—that I shall ask the committee to meet to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock. We have resolutions before us embodying all of this question, and have given to them some informal consideration. I believe that the committee will be prepared to come in to-morrow, if we have a meeting, with such suggestions as they may see proper to make, and the Senate without further delay can then proceed to action upon the bill.

CORPORATE INFLUENCE IN POLITICAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, if the order which has been pending is disposed of by the objection of the Senator from Nebraska, I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the motion I

entered to reconsider the vote by which the resolution which was under consideration yesterday was passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEFFER. I suggest that there is a resolution on the table, coming over from a previous day, which I should like to have disposed of, which takes precedence of the resolution of the Senator from Florida. I do not think there will be any debate upon it, and I should like to have present action upon it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That resolution will go over under the rule, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived.

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senator from Kansas will not interpose any objection to the motion I have made.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida to proceed to the consideration of the motion submitted by him to reconsider the vote taken yesterday upon the passage of the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the passage of the resolution as amended.

Mr. CALL. I now move to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*," and insert the amendment which I send to the desk.

I will state, in deference to the general opinion of Senators that this resolution should be confined to an inquiry in the State of Florida, that I have so amended it. I hope, therefore, that there will be no objection to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*," and insert:

That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be charged with the duty of investigating the subject of the efforts of corporations in the State of Florida, or of the president and directors thereof, to control the election of members of Congresss from the State of Florida or to influence the legislation of Congress; also to investigate and report to the Senate whether corrupt means, bribery, or free transportation have been or are being used to influence such elections in the State of Florida; also to inquire and report to the Senate whether the use of such influences or means is consistent with the preservation of the Republic of the United States and the rights and liberties of the people, and to report a bill for the punishment or suppression of such practices.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FAULKNER. I raise the question of order, for the Chair to decide, whether or not an amendment can now be submitted by the Senator from Florida which reverses the action of the Senate taken yesterday.

The resolution originally provided for a select committee of five. The Senate by a vote, which has not been at all changed by any action of the Senate to-day, amended that resolution by striking out a select committee of five Senators, and providing that the subject should go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The amendment now offered by the Senator reverses that action already adopted by the Senate, and I raise the question whether or not the amendment is in order.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to say that the Senator from West Virginia can hardly be serious in raising this question of order. The vote by which the original resolution was passed having been reconsidered, the resolution is before the Senate. The Senator from Florida now proposes a new resolution differing from the former resolution by confining the scope of the inquiry to Florida. Therefore, it seems to me, the Senator from West Virginia must admit, the original resolution being before the Senate, that the amendment is strictly in order.

Mr. FAULKNER. No, Mr. President, I do not conceive it in that way. The motion to reconsider is simply to reconsider the resolution as amended. That brings the original resolution as amended by the Senate now before it. The amendment now offered by the Senator is to strike out the action of the Senate had on that resolution yesterday, and, for that reason, I suggest that it is not in order.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not mean to make any suggestions to the Chair, who probably understands this question. I should admit the point of the Senator from West Virginia if the Senator from Florida had simply moved his original resolution; but when he moves the original resolution with an amendment confining the inquiry to one State, instead of extending its operations over every State in the Union, it seems to me it is so different that it is entirely in order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FAULKNER. I must state very frankly to the Senate that upon principle I am entirely opposed to the resolution. I do not see and can not conceive upon what authority the Senate have jurisdiction to go into an inquiry on this subject, which affects the interests of the States in the election of members of the legislature and also of the members of the House of Representatives, when it is not proposed to be done by a joint committee of the two bodies. In fact I do not think, so far as the Senate is concerned, that it has any power to investigate a subject which affects members of the House of Representatives unless there is a bill originating there proposing laws under the provisions of the Constitution to regulate the elections of members of the House of Representatives; and as to it affecting any question before the Senate, I can not conceive how any Senator can vote to sustain this motion who entertains the views which have always been expressed upon this side of the Senate. For that reason, and in order to test this question again, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CALL. The Senator can not displace my amendment by a motion of that kind. The amendment I offer is pending before the Senate, and he can not displace it by submitting a motion to refer the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would state to the Senator from Florida that the motion of the Senator from West Virginia is in order under the rules.

Mr. CALL. Then I hope that the motion of the Senator from West Virginia will not prevail.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Is that a motion simply to refer the resolution?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to refer the resolution of the Senator from Florida to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CALL. I call for the yeas and nays upon that motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I hope that the motion of the Senator from West Virginia will not prevail. I do not see why Senators can raise objections of this kind. The Senator from West Virginia knows very well that it has been the practice of this body, sustained by its rules, to obtain information upon which legislation shall be predicated. Now, when he says that this resolution affects the elections of the other House, that is not true. There is nothing in the resolution that concerns the elections of members of the other House. There is something that concerns the legislation which will require that corrupt methods shall be excluded from the elections of members of Congress. This distinction has been pointed out; it is broad, and there never has been any idea anywhere that Congress could not obtain information by a committee for the purpose of formulating laws upon a subject over which it had jurisdiction.

Does the Senator mean to say that Congress has no jurisdiction over the question of the purity of elections to this body; that that is not a subject upon which we can make laws forbidding fraud, bribery, or corrupt practices, the influences of money in corporations, and the times and manner in which elections shall be held—this in the very words of the Constitution?

It is evident that there is no force in those objections. This resolution was objected to because it opened the door of inquiry in other States where there was no allegation that there were any practices of this kind, and I have amended it so that it meets the views of Senators who urged that objection. I know that the Senator from West Virginia does not desire to cover up influences of wealth and money corruptly used in elections, and therefore he ought not to kill this resolution by seeking to refer it to a standing committee.

I am not attacking any man or any set of men, but to say that there can be no legislation by the Congress of the United States to require that the people of the United States shall have their rights and have their elections for members of Congress conducted fairly, honestly, and properly, that the influences of great accumulated wealth shall not be permitted to control the elections, is to me a most extraordinary proposition.

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. President, I do not propose to submit for one moment in silence to an imputation or suggestion from the Senator from Florida that I am in favor of concealing anything or preventing any investigation in reference to corruptions in elections. I have known none by corporate power or aggregate wealth in my State, I am proud to say. I do not know whether such exists in other States of the Union; but I am not to be deterred from the exercise of what I consider to be a right and a duty devolving upon me as a Senator here, by any suspicion, threat, or insinuation of that character. There is a principle involved in this question, a principle to which I am wedded, a principle for which I have fought since I have been in the Senate, and which I do not intend to surrender simply because of my courtesy to the Senator from Florida.

This whole country is proud of the fact that to-day not a single Federal election law stands upon the Federal statute book affecting the rights and the control of the States in reference to their elections, not only for the members of their legislatures, but even for members of the other House of Congress; and yet here we have a resolution presented by the Senator from Florida for the appointment of a special committee to investigate corruption in elec-

tions in the States, and authorizing that committee to report by bill or otherwise, to provide, as he said in his closing remarks, as to the mode and manner of voting in the States at these special elections, not only to cover elections of members of the House of Representatives, but the purity of elections of members of the legislature. Sir, I am not ready to go to that extent. I do not believe that the American people are ready to reverse the action of the Fifty-third Congress when they wiped from the statute books of the Federal Government every single item of legislation in reference to the control by the Federal Government of State elections. For that reason I have made this point; for that reason I intend to persist in it, believing that it is in accord not only with the view of this side of the Chamber, but with the view of the American people. It means peace; it means leaving to the local communities and the State governments the control of the elective franchise, and delegates, as it properly is delegated, to the State authorities to see to the purity of the elective franchise in those States.

What is the object of this special committee? It is said in the latter part of the resolution it is to bring in a bill here in reference to the elections in the States. There is no question before the Senate affecting the purity of any election in any State involving the title of a United States Senator, and, as suggested by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY], there is no authority in this resolution to summon persons or to bring any of these questions before the committee by evidence under the authority of the Senate, because if it contained a provision of that kind the Senator knows that the resolution would have to be referred to a committee of the Senate known as the Committee on Contingent Expenses. Therefore he avoided making any such provision. But if this committee is created those Senators who vote in favor of the resolution will be in honor bound to vote for any appropriation necessary to carry it out. If the committee is empowered to make this investigation and subsequently to formulate a bill to carry out their views in reference to elections in the States, it will be obligatory upon those who indorse this policy to give to that committee all the means necessary for the accomplishment of the objects and purposes contemplated by the resolution.

For these reasons I renew the motion that the resolution, with the amendments of the Senator from Florida, be referred to a standing committee of this body, so that it may report upon the propriety of again entering into the policy of enacting Federal election laws covering the several States of this Union.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, in the first place, I wish to correct the statement of the Senator from West Virginia. There is nothing in the resolution about the election of members of the State legislatures. There was nothing said in my closing remarks about that subject. If this committee is appointed it will report to the Senate whether it is advisable or not, whether it is constitutional or not, that there should be such legislation.

The Senator from West Virginia contradicts himself when he proposes to refer a resolution which he says contemplates an unconstitutional act to a standing committee of this body to report whether it be advisable or not to have legislation upon the subject. If it be unconstitutional, it ought to have no reference here except to the Judiciary Committee to ascertain and report whether it be constitutional or not. But the argument of the Senator from West Virginia requires the conclusion that if it is proved that the influences of corporate power, of a few men owning three thousand millions of property of this country under its public policies in the form of franchises, which carry with them a power of taxation of the people, shall control the elections of this body, that there is no power in the Government of the United States to prevent it. That is the proposition, Mr. President.

Mr. FAULKNER. Do I understand the Senator from Florida to say that I made that statement?

Mr. CALL. Not that the Senator made the statement, but that his proposition demands that he should occupy that position.

Mr. FAULKNER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. CALL. Certainly I will.

Mr. FAULKNER. Then, as I understand the Senator from Florida, it is admitted upon his part that there is not sufficient power in the States to secure purity of elections in this country.

Mr. CALL. It is a statement on my part that the States should be aided by proper legislation here in restraint of corporations, and that if it is not done, the destruction of private property in these franchises will inevitably occur.

I do not mean that it shall be implied from my remarks that the Senator is in favor of such a proposition. I do not doubt that he is a true and loyal friend of the Republic, as much so as I or any other person, but that his proposition logically demands this consequence.

When there are fifty men owning three thousand million dollars of the property of this country, and 17,000,000 people with less than $300 income, the former, by the use of the great power derived from franchises, controlling the elections of this country, if the Senator means to say that the States and the people should not be aided by legislation to prevent that evil, he makes an issue which I gladly accept with him. It is not a question whether the States have power or not. It is a question whether the whole power of corruption should be brought upon the States, some of them small, some of them with a small population. It is a question whether the whole power of this immense wealth and the million of employees should be brought to bear against the masses—against the people.

Does the Senator mean to say that he does not perceive that throughout the country there is great agitation among the workingmen and the people upon these subjects? Does he mean to say that there should be no restraint exercised by Congress upon the use of bribery and corrupt practices? If so, this Government is powerless, and may at any time be displaced by a combination of the fifty men possessed of the entire wealth of the nation. We all know that it is claimed that those influences do exist. What, then, is the objection to legislation which shall forbid, in conducting the interstate commerce of the country, these corporate powers, whether by subordinates or by principals, from interfering with the right of the people to govern themselves? The States alone have power, says the Senator.

Mr. President, I am as strongly in favor of protecting the autonomy of the States and the just rights of the States as anyone else, but when legislation is proposed which does not impinge upon those rights, but relates to great public questions like these, why should the question of State rights be introduced? State rights for what? To sacrifice the people of the States; to prevent the people of the States from having their constitutional rights. I do not accept such views. I do not ask for a Federal election law. I ask for an investigation of the facts relating to the question whether corrupt influences have been used and are being used to control the elections of this country by a few men, and whether that is or is not consistent with the preservation of our republican government. I ask further that the investigation be confined to a State where the people are almost unanimously of that opinion, and where they are striving with difficulties which it is very difficult for them to overcome.

I believe this investigation is desired by men of all political parties in the State of Florida, who believe in a government of the people and who desire the continuance of the Republic and the institutions established under our Constitution and form of government.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. WALTHALL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 20, 1895, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 18, 1895.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

Wheelock G. Veazey, of Vermont, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner, whose commission will expire by limitation December 31, 1895.

POSTMASTERS.

Gideon A. Hendrick, to be postmaster at Stanton, in the county of Montcalm and State of Michigan, in the place of S. Perry Youngs, resigned.

Soren P. Sorenson, to be postmaster at Albert Lea, in the county of Freeborn and State of Minnesota, in the place of Thomas M. Blacklin, deceased.

James A. Hall, to be postmaster at Irvington, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in the place of John Harvey, whose commission expired February 27, 1895.

Peter Brady, to be postmaster at Bellevue, in the county of Huron and State of Ohio, in the place of John H. Weber, deceased.

Charles Beard, to be postmaster at Tamaqua, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Mary M. Houseberger, whose commission expired January 6, 1895.

George Clark, to be postmaster at Coudersport, in the county of Potter and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of George C. Olmsted, resigned.

Israel K. Deckard, to be postmaster at Middletown, in the county of Dauphin and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Eva R. Wiestling, removed.

Mahlon C. Detweiler, to be postmaster at Richland Center, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Frank Feyler, to be postmaster at Rochester, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of G. C. Deming, whose commission expired February 16, 1895.

Jane F. Hollister, to be postmaster at Mount Carmel, in the county of Northumberland and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of I. N. Hollister, deceased.

George M. Lull, to be postmaster at Sayre, in the county of Bradford and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of I. Burk, whose commission expired February 24, 1895.

Robert S. Magee, to be postmaster at Wrightsville, in the county of York and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Calvin G. Smith, whose commission expired February 28, 1895.

Jennie McAllen Park, to be postmaster at Libonia, in the county of Franklin and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Norman A. Patterson, to be postmaster at Oxford, in the county of Chester and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of E. W. Gibson, resigned.

Ben J. Rhoads, to be postmaster at Boyertown, in the county of Berks and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

William F. Rittase, to be postmaster at Littlestown, in the county of Adams and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1895.

Clayton L. Shimer, to be postmaster at Bethlehem, in the county of Northampton and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of H. A. Gorman, whose commission expired January 27, 1895.

Louis J. Townsend, to be postmaster at Berwick, in the county of Columbia and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Charles H. Dorr, removed.

Irvin S. Weber, to be postmaster at North Wales, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

William P. Clancy, to be postmaster at Westerly, in the county of Washington and State of Rhode Island, in the place of Samuel H. Cross, whose commission expired February 27, 1895.

Richard Hayward, to be postmaster at Providence, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island, in the place of Charles H. George, whose commission expired January 23, 1892.

Milton P. Tribble, to be postmaster at Anderson, in the county of Anderson and State of South Carolina, in the place of William F. Barr, deceased.

Frank M. Adams, to be postmaster at Forney, in the county of Kaufman and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Oscar D. Baker, to be postmaster at Uvalde, in the county of Uvalde and State of Texas, in the place of N. L. Stratton, removed.

Abner L. Board, to be postmaster at Seymour, in the county of Baylor and State of Texas, in the place of A. B. Mayhew, resigned.

Willie M. Compton, to be postmaster at Meridian, in the county of Bosque and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Goldesbery C. Green, to be postmaster at Mineral Wells, in the county of Palo Pinto and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Joseph E. Green, to be postmaster at Giddings, in the county of Lee and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Samuel A. Hill, jr., to be postmaster at Bellville, in the county of Austin and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Clarence W. McNeil, to be postmaster at Laredo, in the county of Webb and State of Texas, in the place of F. H. Pierce, whose commission expired February 14, 1895.

Edmund R. Manning, to be postmaster at Albany, in the county of Shackelford and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Thomas M. Matthews, to be postmaster at Athens, in the county of Henderson and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Oscar Y. Rathbun, to be postmaster at Whitewright, in the county of Grayson and State of Texas, in the place of Nannie J. Renshaw, resigned.

Edward E. Solomon, to be postmaster at Baird, in the county of Callahan and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Ezra M. Tate, to be postmaster at Sulphur Springs, in the county of Hopkins and State of Texas, in the place of John R. Ferguson, resigned.

Sallie West, to be postmaster at Hillsboro, in the county of Hill and State of Texas, in the place of Richard C. West, deceased.

William G. Williams, to be postmaster at Waxahachie, in the county of Ellis and State of Texas, in the place of William D. Neely, removed.

Charles W. Willis, to be postmaster at Big Spring, in the county of Howard and State of Texas, in the place of John Snoddy, resigned.

Caleb R. Barratt, to be postmaster at Salt Lake City, in the county of Salt Lake, and Territory of Utah, in the place of A. H. Nash, removed.

J. Henry McLoud, to be postmaster at Hardwick, in the county of Caledonia and State of Vermont, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

Angus J. McPhee, to be postmaster at Eureka, in the county of Juab and Territory of Utah, in the place of James P. Driscoll, removed.

Bridget J. Copps, to be postmaster at West Rutland, in the county of Rutland and State of Vermont, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 18, 1895.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

Wheelock G. Veazey, to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

CHIEF OF WEATHER BUREAU.

Willis L. Moore, of Illinois, to be Chief of the Weather Bureau.

POSTMASTERS.

Joseph A. Mintrup, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Franklin and State of Missouri.

William D. Crow, to be postmaster at Clarence, in the county of Shelby and State of Missouri.

Thomas J. Cole, to be postmaster at Platte City, in the county of Platte and State of Missouri.

Thomas H. Walker, to be postmaster at Bonneterre, in the county of St. François and State of Missouri.

Elmer C. Trueblood, to be postmaster at Maryville, in the county of Nodaway and State of Missouri.

Garry A. Pratt, to be postmaster at Appleton City, in the county of St. Clair and State of Missouri.

William H. Padon, to be postmaster at Blackwell, in the county of "K" and Territory of Oklahoma.

Mary J. Jacobs, to be postmaster at Pawnee, in the county of Pawnee and Territory of Oklahoma.

Albert F. Ries, to be postmaster at Gallup, in the county of Bernalillo and Territory of New Mexico.

Jerome B. Dunkle, to be postmaster at Veedersburg, in the county of Fountain and State of Indiana.

William S. Thomas, to be postmaster at New Ponca, in the county of "K" and Territory of Oklahoma.

William R. Swartout, to be postmaster at North Enid, in the county of Garfield and Territory of Oklahoma.

Edgar A. Smith, to be postmaster at Converse, in the county of Miami and State of Indiana.

William Richards, to be postmaster at New Harmony, in the county of Posey and State of Indiana.

Fred J. Fife, to be postmaster at East Chicago, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana.

Darius R. Crampton, to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Monroe and State of Michigan.

Maggie Breece, to be postmaster at Three Oaks, in the county of Berrien and State of Michigan.

James W. Weidner, to be postmaster at Delphi, in the county of Carroll and State of Indiana.

William E. Powers, to be postmaster at Hastings, in the county of Barry and State of Michigan.

John Murray, to be postmaster at Port Huron, in the county of St. Clair and State of Michigan.

Walter S. Goodland, to be postmaster at Ironwood, in the county of Gogebic and State of Michigan.

William J. Tully, to be postmaster at Crystal Falls, in the county of Iron and State of Michigan.

Alfonzo J. Southard, to be postmaster at Harbor Springs, in the county of Emmet and State of Michigan.

Fred H. Potter, to be postmaster at Saginaw West Side, in the county of Saginaw and State of Michigan.

William Bleckner, to be postmaster at Oakharbor, in the county of Ottawa and State of Ohio.

Mary Beyersdorfer, to be postmaster at Ripley, in the county of Brown and State of Ohio.

Warren E. Watson, to be postmaster at Mancelona, in the county of Antrim and State of Michigan.

Adolph F. Greenbaum, to be postmaster at Waverly, in the county of Pike and State of Ohio.

Edgar L. Cory, to be postmaster at Degraff, in the county of Logan and State of Ohio.

Charles Edgar Brown, to be postmaster at Cincinnati, in the county of Hamilton and State of Ohio.

D. Lane Conover, to be postmaster at Atlantic Highlands, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey.

Patrick Burns, to be postmaster at Raritan, in the county of Somerset and State of New Jersey.

John C. Hutchins, to be postmaster at Cleveland, in the county of Cuyahoga and State of Ohio.

Joseph E. Haynes, to be postmaster at Newark, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey.

J. Elwood Harvey, to be postmaster at Little Silver, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey.

Milton Cowperthwaite, to be postmaster at Riverton, in the county of Burlington and State of New Jersey.

James R. Pitcher, to be postmaster at Short Hills, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey.

Edward O'Farrell, to be postmaster at Bayonne, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey.

Alfred Jarvis, to be postmaster at Tenafly, in the county of Bergen and State of New Jersey.

Stephen Van Order, to be postmaster at Caldwell, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey.

Mary A. Van Cleve, to be postmaster at Irvington, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey.

Benjamin F. Sweeten, to be postmaster at Glassboro, in the county of Gloucester and State of New Jersey.

Frank Reed, to be postmaster at Bismarck, in the county of Burleigh and State of North Dakota.

William Ray, to be postmaster at Dickinson, in the county of Stark and State of North Dakota.

Henry Stowell, to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, in the county of Seneca and State of New York.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *December 20, 1895.*

Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D., the Chaplain to the Senate, offered the following prayer:

O, Thou who art the King of kings and Lord of lords, as the time draws nigh the birth of Christ inaugurated by the angel song, Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will to men, we pray that the spirit of the season may enter into our hearts and minds and keep us in the knowledge and love of God and of His Son Jesus Christ, our Saviour.

Forbid that the two foremost nations of the world which bear the name of Christ, with one language, one faith, one baptism, one Lord, should be embroiled in war in all its horrors and barbarisms. Grant, we beseech Thee, that we may be saved from imbruing our hands in each other's blood. Endow our rulers, the rulers of both nations, and the kindred people of the two lands, with such wisdom and the spirit of justice and magnanimity that all differences and difficulties may be amicably and righteously settled, and that God's name may be glorified in the establishment of concord, amity, brotherly kindness. So may this become an august and memorable Christmas in the history of the English-speaking world and of the whole earth; so let health, prosperity, brotherly kindness, and charity pervade all our land and our motherland, and God be glorified, and the reign of Jesus Christ, our Saviour, established. We humbly pray in His sacred name. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that the invocation of our Chaplain this morning may be spread at length in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Journal stands approved.

THE BOARD OF IRRIGATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 17th instant, the report of the Board of Irrigation, relative to its organization, the existing legislation relative to irrigation, a list of official publications on irrigation, etc.; which, on motion of Mr. KYLE, was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in accordance with the provisions of the act to regulate commerce, the ninth annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which, with the accompanying report and a statement of appropriation and expenditures, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 803) to amend section 2601 of the Revised Statutes relative to ports of entry; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 26) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1895, on the 20th day of said month.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PEFFER presented the petition of J. G. Wait and sundry other citizens of Sturgis, Mich., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the election of President, Vice-President, Senators, and judges of the Supreme Court be made by a direct vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the reenactment of Schedule K of the tariff act of 1890, relating to duties on wools and woolens; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented a petition of the pastor and congregation of the Emanuel Presbyterian Church of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for prompt action by the Government of the United States to prevent further outrages in Armenia; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN presented petitions of the Central Wyoming Wool Growers' Association; of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa.; of the wool merchants of Philadelphia, Pa., and of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Wool Merchants' Association, praying for the reenactment of that portion of the tariff law of 1890 known as Schedule K, relating to wools and woolens; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the petition of the regent and members of the Roger Sherman Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of New Milford, Conn.; the petition of the regent and members of the Elizabeth Clark Hull Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Ansonia, Conn.; the petition of the regent and members of Abigail Phelps Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Simsbury, Conn.; the petition of Miss Susan Billings Meech and 91 other citizens of Groton, Conn.; the petition of William Price and 102 other citizens of Connecticut; the petition of Addie Avery Thomas and 35 other citizens of Connecticut; the petition of Harriet E. Noyes and 12 other citizens of Stonington, Conn.; the petition of Frank B. Carver and 119 other citizens of Connecticut, and the petition of the regent and members of the Anna Warner Bailey Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Connecticut, praying that the United States purchase certain lots adjoining old Fort Griswold, in the town of Groton, Conn.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented the petition of J. G. & I. N. Day, of Washington, D. C., contractors for the construction of the canal and locks at the Cascades of the Columbia River, Oregon, praying that compensation be granted them by reason of expenses occasioned by the extraordinary high water of 1894 in that river; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Vancouver, Wash., praying that an increase of pension be granted James McCormick, a resident of that vicinity; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., and of the Board of Trade of Ardmore, Ind. T., praying for the enactment of a town-site law at the present session of Congress in the interest of various towns in the Indian Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

CORTHELL'S LECTURE ON ISTHMIAN ROUTES.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have a copy of a lecture delivered by Mr. Elmer L. Corthell, a distinguished and eminent civil engineer, upon the Isthmian routes. It contains valuable data, statistical and geographical. It is not very long, and I ask that it may be printed as a miscellaneous document. There are some plates that will be furnished to the Public Printer, so that there will be no expense, except simply the typesetting of the lecture.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 345) granting a pension to Catherine R. Jardine, widow of Brig. Gen. Edward Jardine, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 344) granting a pension to Mary A. Hall, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

REPRINT OF DOCUMENT ON THE VENEZUELAN BOUNDARY.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following concurrent resolution; which was read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That 6,000 extra copies of Senate Document No. 226, first session Fiftieth Congress, relating to the Venezuela boundary, be printed in paper covers, of which number 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GORMAN. Some days since the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] offered a resolution which was adopted by unanimous consent, authorizing a reprint of this document, and a similar resolution was passed in a coordinate branch. Under the printing law the Public Printer is unable to execute the order of the Senate because the cost exceeds $500, and therefore this concurrent resolution is necessary. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1098) to provide for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. George Rogers Clark; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1099) granting a pension to Elijah Drake; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1100) granting a pension to Russel N. Reynolds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1101) granting an increase of pension to Manon Van Gordon; which was read twice its by title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1102) for the relief of Lorenzo Thomas, jr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin introduced a bill (S. 1103) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of the salmon fisheries of Alaska;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 1104) for the relief of the estates of Hugh McDonald, deceased, and Elijah Moseley, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committeeon Claims.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 1105) granting a pension to Mary E. Sessions; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1106) to place Lieut. Col. and Bvt. Maj. Gen. Alexander Stewart Webb on the retired list of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1107) for the relief of acting assistant surgeons; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1108) granting a pension to the widow of Gen. John Newton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1109) granting a pension to Jennie Leninhen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1110) fixing the times for holding the circuit and district courts of the northern district of Iowa and of the southern district of Iowa; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. GEAR. I wish to say in explanation of this bill that its provisions have been agreed upon by the Federal judges in the State of Iowa, and they would like early action upon it. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and I request the committee to report it back as soon as possible.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1111) to purchase a bust of Gen. Philip H. Sheridan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1112) for the relief of J. F. Bailey & Co., and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 1113) appropriating money for the payment of the claim of the Western Paving and Supply Company for paving with asphalt streets adjacent to United States court-house and post-office building in the city of Indianapolis, Ind.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1114) appropriating $4,323.15 in payment of claim of A. Brewer, of Indianapolis, for constructing sewer adjacent to the lands of the United States in city of Indianapolis, Ind.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1115) granting a pension to Sarah Potter, dependent daughter of Andrew Potter, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1116) to grant a pension to Martha Noble Brainerd; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 1117) granting a pension to Cornelia De Peyster Black; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 1118) for the relief of homestead and preemption settlers on even-numbered sections within the limits of railroad grants; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1119) granting an increase of pension to Peter Daly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1120) for the relief of John W. Lewis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1121) for the relief of J. G. and I. N. Day; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1122) for the relief of Sally Hardmond; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1123) for the relief of Mirilla Sherman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1124) granting an increase of pension to Alfred B. Simpson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1125) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah H. Mitchell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1126) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Tigchon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1127) granting an increase of pension to Russell R. King; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1128) granting a pension to Isabella Morrow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1129) for the relief of Joel N. Sanford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1130) for the relief of B. J. Van Vleck, administrator of Henry Van Vleck, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORGAN. I introduce a bill, prepared in the office of the Attorney-General, which has been sent here. It relates to a subject of very great public importance, and I should like to have it read at length, in order that it may go into the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1131) relating to the jurisdiction of the court of appeals of the District of Columbia was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the court of appeals of the District of Columbia is hereby given jurisdiction over any and all suits that may be brought by the United States to enforce or obtain other relief upon any lien or liens on any railway or railways, or on any property belonging to one or more railway corporations, wherever such property may be situated.

SEC. 2. Separate liens upon different railways or railway properties may be enforced by the United States in the same suit when such railways constitute or were intended to constitute together a through line, or a part of or connected with a through line or general system of railways. The court shall have power to make such orders concerning the sale of said property as may be just and proper for the protection of the interests of all parties concerned.

SEC. 3. Said court shall have power to issue process, mesne and final, which shall run into any district and be served as other like process by the marshal of such district, and to enter all proper orders, decrees, and mandates, including orders, decrees, and mandates for the payment to the United States of any deficiency arising upon a sale under such lien.

SEC. 4. Holders of liens on any such railways or property may be made parties to such suit, or may intervene if not made parties, and said court may order any and all proceedings by any party or parties in other courts having jurisdiction of part only of the property involved to be discontinued or stayed until the termination of such suit by the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 1132) to establish a national university; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee to Establish the University of the United States.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1133) to establish postal savings banks and to encourage the saving of money in small amounts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1134) to establish an assay office in the city of Deadwood, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PUGH. I have received two bills from the Attorney-General embodying the recommendation made in his annual report. I introduce the bills, and ask that they be referred to the Judiciary Committee.

The bill (S. 1135) to amend the act creating the circuit courts of appeals, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 1136) in relation to suits against railroad corporations in Federal courts was read the first time by its title.

Mr. ALLEN. Let the bill be read at length.

The bill was read the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no suit to foreclose a lien upon property of any rail road corporation shall hereafter be brought in any Federal court except in the district in which the principal operating offices of such corporation are located: *Provided*, That a lien upon property wholly located in any one district may be foreclosed by suit in that district.

Second. That no receiver of the property of any railroad corporation shall hereafter be appointed by any Federal court except in the district in which the principal operating offices of such corporation are located; and a receivership so constituted shall extend without further order, except so far as the appointing court may direct to the contrary, to all property of such corporation within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States; and such court shall have sole jurisdiction to settle his accounts and to direct his proceedings.

Third. That if more than one Federal court shall hereafter appoint a receiver or receivers for the same railroad corporation, claiming jurisdiction under this act, any party interested, or any one of said receivers, may apply to the Chief Justice of the United States, or in case of a vacancy in said office, or of his absence from the country or inability to act, to the senior associate justice of the Supreme Court, for an order determining which of said appointing courts had jurisdiction. The justice so applied to shall direct what notice shall be given of the application, and shall hear and decide the same as a motion, and his order deciding the same shall be filed in the office of the clerk of the court which first appointed a receiver; and until the filing of said order the receiver or receivers first appointed shall have charge of the property of such corporation temporarily; but said order, when filed, shall operate as a final and unappealable determination of said jurisdictional question.

Mr. BRICE. I present a communication from the Attorney-General accompanied by the draft of a bill relating to the jurisdiction of the court of appeals of the District of Columbia. I introduce the bill, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 1137) relating to the jurisdiction of the court of appeals of the District of Columbia was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1138) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Gen. Zachary Taylor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1139) granting an increase of pension to A. S. Lowdermilk; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. COCKRELL, it was

Ordered, That W. D. Sigler have leave to withdraw his petition and papers from the files of the Senate, and that they be given to Hon. C. N. Clark, a Representative from the State of Missouri.

DEDUCTIONS FROM SALARIES OF CLERKS.

Mr. ALLEN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether there is a practice in the Post-Office Department, or any branch or line of its service, of deducting from a clerk's salary at the end of the month pay for such offenses as missending a registered package, carrying mail past its destination, or failing to sign a register at terminal points; and if so, to what extent this practice has been carried on, and what aggregate sum of money, if any, is now in the Post-Office Department arising from this practice; and also by what authority such deductions are made.

DUTY ON WOOLS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I submit a resolution, which I ask may be read, printed, and lie on the table. I give notice that at an early date I shall ask the Senate to take it up for the purpose of submitting some remarks in support of the resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and they are hereby, instructed to incorporate into any bill for raising revenue which may come to that committee from the House of Representatives at the present session the following provisions, either as a substitute or as an amendment, and report the same to the Senate at their earliest convenience:

All wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals shall be divided, for the purpose of fixing the duties to be charged thereon, into the three following classes:

Class 1: that is to say, merino, mestiza, metz, or metis wools, or other wools of Merino blood, immediate or remote, Down clothing wools, and wools of like character with any of the preceding, including such as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Buenos Ayres, New Zealand, Australia, Cape of Good Hope, Russia, Great Britain, Canada, and elsewhere, and also including all wools not hereinafter described or designated in classes 2 and 3.

Class 2: that is to say, Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Down combing wools, Canada long wools, or other like combing wools of English blood, and usually known by the terms herein used, and also hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals.

Class 3: that is to say, Donskoi, native South American, Cordova, Valparaiso, native Smyrna, Russian camel's hair, and including all such wools of like character as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Turkey, Greece, Egypt, Syria, and elsewhere, excepting improved wools hereinafter provided for.

The standard samples of all wools which are now or may be hereafter deposited in the principal custom-houses of the United States, under the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be the standards for the classifications of wools under this act, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall have the authority to renew these standards and to make such additions to them from time to time as may be required, and he shall cause to be deposited like standards in other custom-houses of the United States when they may be needed.

Whenever wools of class 3 shall have been improved by the admixture of Merino or English blood from their present character as represented by the standard samples now or hereafter to be deposited in the principal custom-houses of the United States, such improved wools shall be classified for duty either as class 1 or as class 2, as the case may be.

The duty on wools of the first class which shall be imported washed shall be twice the amount of the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed; and the duty on wools of the first and second classes which shall be imported scoured shall be three times the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed.

Unwashed wools shall be considered such as shall have been shorn from the sheep without any cleansing; that is, in their natural condition. Washed wools shall be considered such as have been washed with water on the sheep's back. Wool washed in any other manner than on the sheep's back shall be considered as scoured wool.

The duty upon wool of the sheep or hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals which shall be imported in any other than ordinary condition, or which shall be changed in its character or condition for the purpose of evading the duty, or which shall be reduced in value by the admixture of dirt, or any other foreign substance, or which has been sorted or increased in value by the rejection of any part of the original fleece, shall be twice the duty to which it would be otherwise subject: *Provided*, That skirted wools as now imported are hereby excepted. Wools on which a duty is assessed amounting to three times or more than that which would be assessed if said wool was imported unwashed, such duty shall not be doubled on account of its being sorted.

If any bale or package of wool or hair specified in this act imported as of any specified class, or claimed by the importer to be dutiable as of any specified class, shall contain any wool or hair subject to a higher rate of duty than the class so specified, the whole bale or package shall be subject to the highest rate of duty chargeable on wool of the class subject to such higher rate of duty, and if any bale or package be claimed by the importer to be shoddy, mungo, flocks, wool, hair, or other material of any class specified in this act, and such bale contain any admixture of any one or more of said materials, or of any other material, the whole bale or package shall be subject to duty at the highest rate imposed upon any article in said bale or package.

The duty upon all wools and hair of the first class shall be 11 cents per pound, and upon all wools or hair of the second class 12 cents per pound.

On wools of the third class and on camel's hair of the third class, the value whereof shall be 13 cents or less per pound, including charges, the duty shall be 32 per cent ad valorem.

On wools of the third class and on camel's hair of the third class, the value whereof shall exceed 13 cents per pound, including charges, the duty shall be 50 per cent ad valorem.

Wools on the skin shall pay the same rate as other wools, the quantity and value to be ascertained under such rules as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

On noils, shoddy, top waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, yarn waste, garnetted waste, and all other wastes composed wholly or in part of wool, the duty shall be 30 cents per pound.

On woolen rags, mungo, and flocks the duty shall be 10 cents per pound.

Wools and hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other like animals, in the form of roping, roving, or tops, and all wool and hair which have been advanced in any manner or by any process of manufacture beyond the washed or scoured condition, not specially provided for in this act, shall be subject to the same duties as are imposed upon manufactures of wool not specially provided for in this act.

SEC. 2. All laws and parts of laws inconsistent with the foregoing section be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table and be printed.

TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to transmit to the Senate a statement showing, during each of the last five years, and for the whole period, the gross amount of the imports from ports of Great Britain and her colonies and dependencies, together with the amount of the exports to such ports; also the number of entries of British vessels into American ports, and, if readily ascertainable, their gross tonnage.

IRRIGATION INTERESTS.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture be requested to furnish such information as may be had in their respective Departments concerning the existing legislation relative to irrigation as far as it concerns the Executive Departments, the operations of each bureau and office in any way concerned with irrigation, the principles which govern the subdivision of work among the various offices wherever the law allows latitude, and such other facts as will serve to show clearly what has been already accomplished and what is proposed to be accomplished in this line.

FUNERAL OF ISAAC BASSETT.

Mr. GORMAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Vice-President shall appoint a committee of seven Senators to attend the funeral of Isaac Bassett, late assistant doorkeeper, at half past 2 o'clock Sunday.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed as the committee under the resolution Mr. GORMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FAULKNER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. PEFFER, Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, and Mr. ROACH.

RAILROAD TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution, submitted by Mr. PEFFER December 18, 1895; and the Senate proceeded to its consideration:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be directed to inform the Senate—

First. Whether the principal railroad companies acting as common carriers of interstate traffic between the Western States and the Atlantic Seaboard

have secretly entered into an agreement to frame a joint traffic association; and if so,

Second. What companies have joined said agreement or have included their traffic therein, and by what individuals said agreement is signed, and what is the amount of the capitalization of each and all of said companies and the mileage thereof.

Third. Whether said agreement binds each company to make and enforce such rates or fares and freights as may be prescribed by a board of officers representing all the companies joining the compact.

Fourth. Whether the agreement provides for collecting from every company a money penalty of $5,000 in each case of violation of such stipulation to make and enforce rates, or a money penalty equal to the gross receipts of the transaction constituting such violation, which money penalty is to be applied for the benefit and to the uses of all the companies except the one offending.

Fifth. Whether said agreement constitutes a combination in restraint of trade and commerce under the existing laws of Congress, or is a violation of the interstate-commerce law.

Sixth. Whether the Interstate Commerce Commission has the power, of their own motion, to investigate such agreement, and whether or not the same, if unlawful, is subject to arrest by process for temporary injunction, or how otherwise the signers thereof may be proceeded against.

Seventh. What action, if any, has been taken by the Commission or by any other tribunal or officer of the Government with respect to said agreement. And in addition the Commission will transmit to the Senate all correspondence, complaints, and other documents in possession of the Commission concerning said agreement, and the action of the Commission in relation thereto.

Mr. PEFFER. I move that the resolution be amended in the fifth line by striking out the word "secretly" and inserting the word "recently;" so as to read, "have recently entered into an agreement," etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

PROPOSED FINANCIAL LEGISLATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution submitted by Mr. ALLEN December 19, 1895; and the Senate proceeded to its consideration:

Whereas by the President's message to Congress of December 17, A. D. 1895, regarding the boundary line between Venezuela and British Guiana, it is made to appear that the contingency of war between the British Empire and the United States of America may suddenly arise; and

Whereas money is the first essential in times of war, and in such an event the Government uses gold, silver, and paper money indiscriminately until the two former disappear and thereafter relies solely on paper money: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and they are hereby, directed and instructed to inquire and report, by bill or otherwise, whether it would not be expedient and proper for the Government of the United States of America at this time to open its mints to the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 1 to 16, and in addition thereto issue an adequate volume of full legal-tender Treasury notes in the same manner such notes have heretofore been issued, and, in the interest of national safety, withdraw the issue power of national banks and retire all bank currency.

Mr. PLATT. I move the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I think that this resolution ought to be adopted by the Senate without being sent to the Finance Committee, because it is in the nature of an instruction to the Finance Committee; and therefore the Senate ought to express its views with reference to the matters contained in the resolution before the Finance Committee receives it.

A few days ago we received from the President of the United States a message regarding the controverted boundary line between British Guiana and the Republic of Venezuela. In that message the President of the United States said to us:

Assuming, however, that the attitude of Venezuela will remain unchanged, the dispute has reached such a stage as to make it now incumbent upon the United States to take measures to determine with sufficient certainty for its justification what is the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana. The inquiry to that end should of course be conducted carefully and judicially, and due weight should be given to all available evidence, records, and facts in support of the claims of both parties.

In order that such an examination should be prosecuted in a thorough and satisfactory manner, I suggest that the Congress make an adequate appropriation for the expenses of a commission, to be appointed by the Executive, who shall make the necessary investigation, and report upon the matter with the least possible delay. When such report is made and accepted it will, in my opinion, be the duty of the United States to resist, by every means in its power, as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests, the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which, after investigation, we have determined of right belongs to Venezuela.

This, Mr. President, is no more nor less than a revamp of what is known as the Monroe doctrine, expressed in no better language than it was expressed by President Monroe. It is a doctrine that is as old as nations themselves. It seems to me that it is impossible to conceive of the existence of a nation without at the same time conceiving of the right of that nation to protect its life and its autonomy. It is a law of nature. It is a doctrine that is coexistent with the oldest nation upon the face of the earth; it is a doctrine that is found in nature everywhere. It is the same characteristic that is found in the individual; it is the doctrine of the right to preserve one's self; the doctrine of the right of a nation to preserve itself. It is not a new doctrine, and ought not to be misunderstood.

I can conceive of no particular cause for the delivery of this message to Congress. There does not seem to have been any immediate demand for it, and it occurred to me at the time that the President of the United States, having lost the confidence of the people of this country to some extent during his Administration of the last two years and nine months, sought to restore himself and his party to the confidence of the people, and by that means induce them to forget their grievances and the prostrate condition of the country.

The honorable Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], laboring no doubt under a sense of great obligation to the President for his splendid services in the campaigns in New York in 1894 and 1895, and perhaps actuated somewhat by the splendid services of the President in the campaign in Maryland in 1895, and the magnificent services of the President and his Secretary of the Treasury in the campaign in Kentucky this year, felt as though it was perfectly proper for him to introduce a bill here for the release of all of the ex-Confederates from the disabilities under which they labor, and make them eligible for the position of officers of the Army and the Navy. As they may assist the President in case of war, I have no objection to the Senator's doing so. I am perfectly willing that that bill shall pass and that these men shall be restored to their former rights. This seems to be the Democratic case in brief. The President threw out this message to the country as though it announced something new, as though he was delivering to the people something they never knew before, and he was reenforced by the splendid efforts of my distinguished friend from New York.

Then comes the Republican case, Mr. President. The honorable Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] introduced a resolution here proposing to take the old *Constitution* and revive and repair her for service. The other honorable Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] wants an appropriation for the purchase of 1,000,000 stand of small arms and 5,000 cannon for immediate use—or at least to strengthen the military arm of the Government. I will read the bill he introduced:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strengthen the military armament by adding thereto, equipped for use, 1,000,000 infantry rifles, 1,000 guns for field artillery, and not exceeding 5,000 heavy guns for fortifications; to be procured by manufacture in the arsenals, or by contract for manufacture, or by direct purchase in this country or elsewhere, according to the discretion of the President, who shall conform, when practicable without unwise delay, to the methods prescribed for making contracts and purchases by existing laws.

SEC. 2. That the sum of $100,000,000 is hereby appropriated to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

The honorable Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], no doubt believing that it is good policy to kill two birds with one stone and fight out two controversies in one war, offered a resolution to the effect that we should inquire immediately into the status of the boundary line between the British and the American possessions in Alaska, and especially whether Great Britain is invading our territory in that country by the establishment of post-offices and post-roads. The honorable Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] on yesterday introduced a bill for the appropriation of a large sum—I do not now recall the amount—for the purpose of increasing our Navy.

So we have the President of the United States and distinguished Democrats in this Chamber urging the Monroe doctrine and urging that the country be put upon a war basis, and we have Republicans upon the other side equally anxious for large appropriations for the purchase of arms and the equipment of the country for any emergency that may arise.

Mr. President, it has become necessary for the Populist party to take a stand here. It will not do to permit the President of the United States and his distinguished associates here to carry off all the glory and honor; it will not do to permit the Democratic party and the Republican party in this Chamber to take away all the glory and honor incident to a discussion of the Monroe doctrine. It is necessary that the Populist party shall have a standing here. Realizing, as we did and do, that the President of the United States and his party, aided by the Republican party, can not wage a war without money; realizing, as we do, that in consequence of a foolish financial policy which has been pursued by both these parties the Government of the United States is to-day practically bankrupt, we have concluded that the first and most essential thing in war is money. Therefore this resolution was introduced expressing it as the sense of the Senate that it was essential for the Finance Committee to inquire into and determine whether it would not be good policy, in view of this great emergency, to open the mints of the United States to the free coinage of silver, and to issue additional Treasury notes.

I think this resolution ought to be adopted by the Senate. I do not want to treat lightly this great doctrine; I do not want to put the Senate in the attitude of trifling with a question of this magnitude; but if it be essential for the Government of the United States to appoint a commission to visit the disputed territory between Venezuela and the British possessions, if it be essential for us to create a navy and to raise and equip an army, then, sir, the first step in that direction is the issuance and the coinage of money and the repletion of our already depleted Treasury.

The financial policy pursued for the last twenty years in this country has brought about the results we witness to-day. The people of this country have appealed from time to time to the President of the United States and to Congress for relief, and they have appealed to the Republican party when it was in power for relief, and their appeals have fallen upon deaf ears. When Mr. Cleveland came into power in 1892, with a splendidly equipped party, the people were told that relief would be brought to them. Mr. President, from that time to this moment prices have fallen, enforced idleness has occurred, until universal distress exists throughout the length and breadth of this country to-day. Instead of taking hold of the financial problem wisely and as a statesman should, with a determination to administer the affairs of this country in the interest of all the people and not a few, the policy of this Administration has been to reduce the money in our Treasury and create a vacancy for the issuance of interest-bearing obligations.

Can it be possible, Mr. President, that this agitation goes deeper than the average mind supposes? Can it be that it is simply laying the foundation for greater expenditures in this country and the issuance of millions, if not billions, of governmental obligations bearing interest, to rest as a great mortgage, a great debt, upon the industries of the people for generations yet to come?

If the President is sincere in his message, if Democrats upon this side who have introduced resolutions and bills are sincere, if the Republicans upon the other side are sincere in the bills and resolutions they have introduced on this subject, then, I say to you, the history of this country proves to us that we must have more money, that we can not erect coast defenses, we can not provide an army and a navy and put ourselves in an attitude of aggressive or defensive warfare without additional money. This resolution, or some action in the line indicated in this resolution, is the first essential in this great undertaking that should receive the consideration of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. HARRIS. I did not hear the motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Connecticut please repeat his motion?

Mr. PLATT. That the resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on that motion.

Mr. ALLEN and Mr. STEWART called for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KYLE. I ask that the resolution may be again read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN. I withdraw, for the time being, the demand I made for the yeas and nays.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEWART. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. ALDRICH.

Mr. HARRIS. This is simply a resolution asking the Committee on Finance to inquire as to certain matters, and report as it may decide. It is perfectly innocent. Ordinarily I should vote to refer such a resolution, but as this simply invokes an inquiry and a report of the Committee on Finance, I see no objection to it.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Debate is not in order.

Mr. LODGE. I make the point of order that debate is not in order, the roll call having begun.

Mr. PLATT and Mr. HARRIS. No response has been made.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PLATT. I think the practice of passing resolutions which make certain assertions is very bad. I think, also, that the practice of directing a committee of this body to inquire and report upon a subject is bad, unless the Senate believe in the doctrine laid down in the resolution. Therefore I move to refer it to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the calling of the roll.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I am paired with my colleague [Mr. ELKINS]. I do not see him in the Chamber, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon (when Mr. MCBRIDE'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. MCBRIDE] is detained from the Senate this morning by indisposition. He is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS]. I do not know how he would vote if he were here. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SHOUP [when his name was called]. I am paired with the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE]. I do not see him present, but I will ask his colleague [Mr. PERKINS] if he knows how he would vote on this question?

Mr. PERKINS. I have had no chance to consult with my colleague on this question, and therefore can not answer.

Mr. SHOUP. Then I withhold my vote. If the Senator from California were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SQUIRE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. I do not know how he would vote if present, and therefore I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WALTHALL. I am requested to state that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

Mr. BRICE. I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I suggest to the Senator from Ohio, inasmuch as he is paired with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], and I am paired with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], that we transfer our pairs and vote.

Mr. BRICE. That is satisfactory to me. I vote "yea."

Mr. MITCHELL, of Oregon. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 36; as follows:

YEAS—24.

Allison,	Gallinger,	Martin,	Quay,
Brice,	Gorman,	Mills,	Sewell,
Burrows,	Hale,	Mitchell, Wis.	Sherman,
Caffery,	Hawley,	Morrill,	Smith,
Cameron,	Lodge,	Platt,	Thurston,
Chandler,	McMillan,	Proctor,	Wetmore.

NAYS—36.

Allen,	Chilton,	Mantle,	Roach,
Bacon,	Clark,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Stewart,
Baker,	Cockrell,	Morgan,	Teller,
Bate,	Dubois,	Nelson,	Tillman,
Berry,	Gibson,	Pasco,	Vest,
Blackburn,	Harris,	Peffer,	Voorhees,
Butler,	Jones, Ark.	Perkins,	Walthall,
Call,	Jones, Nev.	Pettigrew,	Warren,
Carter,	Kyle,	Pritchard,	Wilson.

NOT VOTING—25.

Aldrich,	Frye,	Hoar,	Squire,
Blanchard,	Gear,	Irby,	Turpie,
Cullom,	George,	McBride,	Vilas,
Daniel,	Gordon,	Murphy.	White.
Davis,	Gray,	Palmer,	
Elkins,	Hansbrough,	Pugh,	
Faulkner,	Hill,	Shoup,	

So the Senate refused to refer the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs upon agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PLATT. I move to strike out the preamble.

Mr. BACON and Mr. VEST. Let it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the preamble.

The Secretary read the preamble.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator from Connecticut will withdraw his motion, I will withdraw the preamble and agree to its going out. The preamble may go out.

Mr. PLATT. All right; I withdraw the motion.

Mr. VOORHEES. Now let the resolution be read without the preamble.

Mr. FAULKNER. Let the Secretary read the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska withdraws the preamble of the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN. I withdraw the preamble. There is now a call for the reading of the resolution itself without the preamble.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read as it has been agreed to.

The resolution was read.

VENEZUELAN BOUNDARY CONTROVERSY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives which has had its first reading.

The bill (H. R. 2173) making an appropriation for the expenses of a commission to investigate and report on the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana was read the second time by its title.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

Mr. MORGAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from Alabama to allow me to have a vote on the resolution which has been before the Senate heretofore.

Mr. MORGAN. We will get through with the House bill in a very short time. The Senator's resolution is on the Calendar. I can not consent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLEN. This is the House bill which was laid before the Senate yesterday?

Mr. MORGAN. It is.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to offer an amendment to the bill unless the Committee on Foreign Relations have some amendments to present.

Mr. MORGAN. I propose to offer some amendments on behalf of the committee.

Mr. ALLEN. All right. Then I will wait.

Mr. MORGAN. The Committee on Foreign Relations have had the measure under consideration, anticipating that it would be acted upon this morning or to-morrow, and have directed me to report certain amendments thereto, which I by their direction have embodied in one proposition, which will constitute an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House bill.

I wish to state, Mr. President, that there was a difference of opinion in the committee in regard to the propriety or necessity of amending the House bill in any respect, and I, as a member of the committee, do not wish to be committed to the amendments, although if the bill is to be amended I think that the form the committee have adopted for amendment is perhaps as safe and as good as any other that could be selected. I have not given my consent personally, I am allowed to say, I believe, to any amendment to the House bill, thinking that the best and wisest course to pursue and the one that comports most entirely with the present attitude of the question here and abroad would perhaps require of us that we should proceed with the bill as passed by the other House, unless we find some very material objection to it, and pass it.

I will now send to the desk the amendments of the committee as a whole.

Mr. SHERMAN. As a substitute.

Mr. PLATT. Is it proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated for the expenses of a commission, to consist of three members, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to investigate and report to him the facts in regard to the divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana: *Provided*, That section 2 of the act approved July 31, 1894, making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government, and for other purposes, shall not apply to any commissioners appointed under this act.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to explain the proviso. In the event that the House bill should pass the Senate as it came to us the proviso would be unnecessary; at least that is my opinion. The proviso is intended to exempt the three commissioners who are suggested in the substitute from the operation of an act passed in 1894, the general legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act of that year, which in section 2 prescribes that any officer receiving $2,500 a year salary shall not be permitted, under that act, to receive any addition to his salary, although he may be appointed to some additional duties or to some other or different office. In the event that we provide for the three commissioners, it is suggested by the Secretary of State, in a note to the committee, that we ought to exempt them from the operation of that statute. That is the object of the committee in putting the proviso in the substitute. If we do not amend the House bill, of course it is irrelevant and unnecessary.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, I differ from the conclusions of the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee with great diffidence, and I rise to speak briefly under a good deal of embarrassment, for my opinion is very decided that we had better not amend the House bill—that we had better pass it as it came from the House—and in this I understand the chairman of the committee concurs.

Mr. MORGAN. I concur in that.

Mr. PLATT. Therefore, what I am expressing may be in opposition to the wishes and opinions of some who sit upon this side of the Chamber, although in the consideration of a matter like this there ought to be no aisle of division in the Senate.

It is useless to deny that this is a very great and important subject, and it ought to be treated as such. We ought not to talk about war in the consideration of such a subject. We do not invite it. We deprecate it. There is no reason at present to suppose that war is to be precipitated upon us. The American people will not shun it if it becomes inevitable. I think we all agree in the main with the President in the message which he has sent here. There may be some things in the message which perhaps we would have preferred otherwise, but as to his statement of the position and the determination of the American people upon a great subject there is no difference of opinion. It is no matter whether or not we call it a doctrine or a canon of international law. There is an American policy, and a determination to sustain that policy, which has now been in existence for seventy years at least and upon which there is no division of American sentiment, and that is, if I understand it, that no foreign power is to establish sovereignty and dominion upon the Western Hemisphere or unfairly to extend its sovereignty and dominion upon that hemisphere.

The question arises in the Venezuelan case whether Great Britain is attempting unfairly to extend her sovereignty and authority in Venezuela. The message of the President states the policy of the American people on this subject very clearly and very vigorously. It admits that we are not in full possession of the facts, and the President asks of Congress an appropriation to pay the expenses of a commission to be appointed by him to "make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay." What is the "matter" referred to? The President distinctly states it in his message:

Assuming, however, that the attitude of Venezuela will remain unchanged, the dispute has reached such a stage as to make it now incumbent upon the United States to take measures to determine with sufficient certainty for its justification what is the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana.

Then he suggests that we give him—

An adequate appropriation for the expenses of a commission, to be appointed by the Executive, who shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay.

I understand, Mr. President, that it is suggested that we amend the bill which comes from the other House in two or three particulars that may seem unimportant, but which in my judgment are exceedingly important. I desire to remark that any amendment made in the Senate will be construed in England as a hesitation on the part of the Senate to sustain the President in the position he has taken. Unless it becomes absolutely necessary, then, to make amendments I should refrain from making them in order that our attitude may not be misunderstood in England.

There seems to be an opinion on the other side of the water that the assertion of American rights and of the American determination to sustain those rights is a campaigning idea, and is put forth at this time for political effect. England must be disabused of any such opinion or belief. The American people were never more in earnest from the breaking out of the Revolution to this day than in their determination to assert and maintain what they believe is essential to the safety of the Republic of the United States, namely, that no foreign power shall establish governmental institutions upon this continent, or unfairly or unrighteously extend such institutions now existing upon this continent. We must be careful, then, to do nothing here which will give plausibility to the already prevalent idea in England that the United States are not united and in earnest upon this matter. If it became essential to change the bill which the House has sent us I should not hesitate to do it, but to my mind it is of no importance. The bill now contains all that the President asks of us, and it is the President of the United States who asks this of Congress. It is not as an individual who occupies the Executive chair that he has addressed us, but he speaks in an official capacity as the President of the country, and in this matter what he says should be treated as the utterance of the President of the United States.

Now, several amendments are proposed. The first one is that the bill shall fix the number of the commission; that it shall consist of three members. Why is it necessary that the Senate should insist on naming the number of which the commission shall consist? Can we not trust the President for that? Is he likely to make the number too large? I think it is entirely unnecessary, and that the matter may well be left to him.

The next proposed amendment is really to strike out the words "to investigate and report upon the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana," and make the commission report to the President "the facts in regard to the divi-

sional line between Venezuela and British Guiana." It seems to me that this amendment is not only not essential, but that there is nothing more in it than a change of language. The bill is in the language which the President suggested—"a commission, to be appointed by the Executive, who shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay." The "matter" is "to determine with sufficient certainty for its [the country's] justification what is the true divisional line." So the bill as it comes from the House of Representatives follows the language of the President and provides for arriving at the fact which the President asks to arrive at; that is, the true divisional line.

If anything less than that is intended by the language which is employed in the amendment, then it will be construed as receding from what the President asks us to do. The President asks us to authorize the appointment of a commission which shall determine what is the true divisional line. If the proposed amendment means anything less than that, it will be regarded all over Great Britain as not coming quite up to the request the President made of Congress. If to report "the facts in regard to the divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana" means anything less than the ascertaining of the true divisional line, it will be understood, and rightly understood, that the Senate of the United States is not ready to go to the length which the President asks it to go, namely, to ascertain the true divisional line with reference to the justification of the future action of this Government. Those are two of the amendments proposed.

The third amendment is that the nominations of the commissioners shall be consented to and confirmed by the Senate. I regard it as entirely unimportant and unwise to do that merely because it is supposed that there is some shadowy prerogative which gives us a right to claim that when the President appoints persons charged with a duty such as it is proposed to confer upon them in the pending bill, we shall be consulted and shall confirm them or not, as we choose. I do not think that we ought to embarrass a great question like this with that claim of prerogative. Nor do I understand that there is any claim that persons to be appointed, charged with duties like these, should, under the Constitution, be confirmed by the Senate; that it would be an encroachment by the Executive power to appoint them without sending their names to the Senate. If that be so, the very authority proposed to be given by the bill to the President to appoint these persons to these duties would, by inference at least, certainly answer the claim of prerogative.

But I do not understand that it has ever been seriously claimed upon this side of the Chamber that the Executive is not at liberty to appoint agents to ascertain facts to the end that the Executive may know what action he should take in matters arising between this and foreign countries. What we all complained of in the Blount case was that the President went further than that; that he appointed an officer of the United States Government and commissioned him to a foreign power without confirmation by the Senate. But there is no necessity of raising that controversy again. I do not think we have ever claimed—I have never claimed—that the Executive can not appoint persons, whether he calls them commissioners or agents, or whatever name might be bestowed upon them, who should ascertain facts and report to him for his information as to what he as the Executive ought to do with reference to matters springing up between this and another country. And if we do not insist upon the right to confirm the commissioners, I understand that the further amendment suggested here is unnecessary.

Mr. President, I have very plainly and very frankly, and, as I said, with a good deal of diffidence, expressed my opinion upon this subject. I think the amendments are unnecessary. I think the bill as it came from the other House meets the President's request. I think to amend it at all will be misconstrued in England into the belief and will strengthen the belief already prevalent there that the Senate hesitates to sustain the President of the United States in the ground taken in his message.

Mr. CAFFERY. Before the Senator from Connecticut sits down, I ask him which amendment he has discussed. I have heard of but one, the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. PLATT. The Senator from Louisiana could not have been in.

Mr. CAFFERY. My hearing is not very acute, and I did not hear exactly the extent of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. PLATT. The chairman of the committee, although he said he did not personally agree to the amendment, reported an amendment, as a substitute, which differs from the original bill in the particulars which I have alluded to in the few remarks which I have made, and only in those particulars.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the first observation I have to make in regard to this matter is that I can not see for the life of me the necessity of haste in considering the proposition before us. The controversy which is the foundation of these papers is an ancient one; it is one that has existed for many years between Venezuela and Great Britain. The alleged aggressions of Great Britain cover a period of from ten to twenty or thirty years. It is only recently that the subject has been even noted by the people of the United States; but ten or fifteen years ago Great Britain asserted a claim to a line which she now says she will not submit to arbitration.

The message of the President of the United States invites no haste. He simply asks us for certain authority, and that we propose to give him. The terms of that grant of power are contained in the bill sent to us from the House of Representatives. Why should there be any excitement about that? Why should there be any eagerness to seize upon it in order to create a probability of war with Great Britain and to arouse the patriotism of the American people? The American people need no such excitement, if they have to face this matter. Besides, the views of the President of the United States have been sanctioned by both Houses of Congress, and unanimously by both Houses of Congress. He has expressed the opinion of the American people as to the importance of enforcing the Monroe doctrine. He has explained in the clearest possible language the nature and character of that doctrine, the assertion of the people of the United States that they will not allow the various countries of South or North America to be encroached upon by European powers.

This doctrine, though often stated since the time of Mr. Monroe, has never been applied specially in any particular case. We did not regard the doctrine when we invaded Mexico. After Texas had been ceded to us we occupied great portions of Mexican territory, including California. We ought to have thought of it then. But still we have insisted upon our right to protect the American nations from European encroachment, and I believe in it as heartily as any.

But because a bill is sent to us from the House of Representatives in compliance with the request of the President that we should grant him certain money in order to enable him to prosecute and ascertain as near as possible the real boundary line between Venezuela and British Guiana, why this hurry and excitement? Why can not we amend the bill like any other? We can not even refer the bill. We must pass it without inquiry or consideration. Why? Is England engaged in a fresh aggression? On the contrary, England is taking very seriously under consideration the situation here. England wants and needs no excitement on this side to compel her to a careful examination of this whole subject-matter. I firmly believe that this matter will be settled by some arrangement between Great Britain and Venezuela, and I have not the slightest idea that a single drop of American blood will be shed in this contest. It will be settled.

Now, this bill comes to us. The Committee on Foreign Relations were called upon to take it up and see whether the particular proposition of the House of Representatives ought to be taken just as it was without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i." What occasion is there for that feeling? There is no difference of opinion; the House and Senate agree as to what we ought to do; and now it is proposed by the Senate committee to make some slight modification of the House proposition and then to support it thoroughly.

Let us see what those modifications are. First, we say that when we appoint a commission it ought to be composed of a definite number. What that number is it is for us to say. We are to authorize this commission. The President asks for pay for them, and we are called upon, therefore, to state the number of the commission. Does the Senate know of any case where a commission or a committee has been appointed without fixing the number?

We concluded on the whole that three would be better than five or seven; that a larger number would only make probable a division of opinion, while three able men, confessedly so, from all parts of the United States, could be selected to do what? Not to fix the disputed line, not to say which was the line that ought to be adopted, but to give the President information as to the nature and character and as to the facts and conditions of the gradual aggressions of Great Britain. The question as to what title Venezuela has to that land, as to what title Great Britain has to that land, as to the proper boundary between them, can not be transferred to these three commissioners. The proposition of the House of Representatives required them to point out the true line between these two countries. They are not authorized to do that. The President of the United States must take that responsibility upon himself.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator from Ohio permit me just to read how the House bill stands? It reads:

> For the expenses of a commission, to be appointed by the President, to investigate and report upon the true divisional line.

Not to determine it, but to report upon it; to give the facts in connection with it.

Mr. SHERMAN. But the House bill confines them to a true divisional line. That is not the point. The President has got to determine that. Therefore this language was simply changed to prescribe the exact purpose and desire of Congress that these per-

sons should inform themselves and should inform the President of the surrounding facts and of all the matters necessary for his determination.

But, sir, the President, as we all know, does not transfer or evade any responsibility put upon him; and the responsibility by the Constitution is upon him and afterwards upon the Senate of the United States, in ratifying any treaty that may grow out of this controversy. Therefore it was thought proper to modify this measure.

So also as to the confirmation of the commissioners by the Senate. This commission, created by law, is something more than a Blount messenger sent to the Hawaiian Islands. This is a commission recognized by law, created by this act, and properly created by it. Under those circumstances these three persons are to be designated by the President of the United States.

There is no question of his power to do it; but according to all the established usages of the Government, according to the plain provisions of the Constitution of the United States, their names should be sent to the Senate and confirmed. Why not? There is no controversy between the Senate and the President. It is but right that this body should have a voice in their selection. It passes upon the merits of every postmaster and small officeholder in our broad land, whose names are sent to us because the President alone ought not to control all the vast appointments. We are called upon to confirm or to reject them. Is it not, therefore, proper for the Senate of the United States, possessing under the Constitution this power, to require that its approbation at least shall be given as to these particular persons? I do not suppose there will be any controversy about it, but the right ought always to be reserved.

It can not be said that these are unimportant officers. This act creates them officers. It prescribes their duties. Therefore they are as much officers as any other officers of the Government of the United States. Under these circumstances it does seem to me that it is a small matter to refuse to the Senate of the United States the power to pass upon these officers and their fitness and ability, although I do not believe there will be any controversy, and so I have no doubt the House of Representatives will feel. I have reason to believe that these amendments which have been suggested will be approved by the House of Representatives, although, as a matter of course, no one can speak for that body definitely.

The limitation as to time was a matter discussed. It was proposed in the Committee on Foreign Relations that the time should be limited for these officers to make their report, say to the 1st of April or the 1st of May. On the whole, the committee, after full consideration, thought it was best to leave it open and leave this matter under the control and management of the President of the United States, placing the $100,000 at his command and limiting the number of commissioners. This will no doubt be approved by the President, because more than that number on an inquiry of this kind would be unreasonable.

I say that these amendments would not only improve the language and form of the bill, but I have no doubt they would be promptly agreed to by the House of Representatives and by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not want to be forced to take any measure upon excitement, especially when the excitement is not founded upon real danger or real importance. It seems to me that we should have treated this question as an ordinary matter of legislation. We have postponed until next month and perhaps until next session many important subjects-matter. We have been here three weeks, and have not deemed it necessary to take up any single measure which the people of the United States expect us to pass during this Congress.

Now we are called upon pellmell, as if we were under excitement or on a battlefield, to wave aside all our forms of legislation and refuse to make amendments to a bill sent to us under the present circumstances. It seems to me all this is too hasty; it is too eagerly pressed. There is no occasion for it. The Venezuelan controversy will probably be settled before these gentlemen are appointed or before they progress far in their investigation. We ought not to show a sign of timidity and anxious desire about a fear that does not exist. The Senate of the United States is the last body in the world that ought to be moved by fear or danger. Let us take our time to deliberate. If these amendments are not important vote them down, but certainly we should not base our action on this bill upon any ground that there is a necessity to take precisely what the other House hurriedly sent to us and when the other House would no doubt accept from the Senate these amendments as a proper modification of their bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, it occurs to me that one of the most important considerations connected with this whole subject has been utterly overlooked in both Houses. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] well said a few moments ago that money is one of the most essential elements in the prosecution of war. I fail to see, however, how the Government of the United States would be any better off by the proposition submitted by the Senator from Nebraska. It may or it may not be possible that the people of the United States might have more money in their pockets if the mints were thrown open. It may or it may not be possible that it would be better off if the printing presses were to start and print more Treasury notes. But the question for the people and the Government to consider, when about to embark in war with confessedly the first nation of the globe on the ocean, is, where are the revenues to be obtained to come into the pockets of the Government? How are we to get money enough to carry on this war, and carry it on successfully?

It will be no child's play, Mr. President, when we engage in a conflict with Great Britain. Let us not commit the great mistake of underrating our enemy. It may be true, as Senators say, that there will be no war. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN]. My voice is for peace if peace can be obtained honorably and consistently with the safety and dignity of the people of the United States. But the President of the United States, and the Government of the United States through our Executive, and the Government of Great Britain have arrived at the point, after a long discussion, where both say they will not yield, and the President says that we ought to resist with all the means in our power the establishment as proposed by Great Britain. Surely we are standing face to face on the very edge of battle, and prudence and safety demand that we shall look to our Treasury box and see where we are to obtain the moneys to carry on this great struggle.

Mr. President, during the great civil conflict in the United States the Government was not burdened with vast expenditures as it is to-day. We did not have from $140,000,000 to $150,000,000 of annual pensions to meet. We did not have from $30,000,000 to $40,000,000 of annual revenues to be expended in the payment of interest on the public debt. We had an income tax unquestioned. We had a tax on domestic manufactures that brought in one year $127,000,000. The income tax brought to the coffers of the Government one year $72,000,000. All this, sir, is gone. The Constitution declares that you shall not tax real estate except in proportion to population. The Supreme Court has stretched the authority of the Constitution and declared that you shall not tax personal property except in proportion to population. The tax you have got to-day on whisky and on beer and on tobacco is a tax declared unconstitutional by the highest court in the land. It is a tax that exists simply by sufferance.

Then, what are we to depend upon for revenues to carry on this gigantic struggle? Duties on imports? Where are your imports to come from when you are in a death grapple with the greatest naval power in the world? When privateers are swarming out from all the ports of all Christendom on both sides, making the heavens lurid with the flames of burning cargoes in every direction, as they did in 1812, how much imports are going to come into the United States to get you revenues? The amount even to-day is less than $200,000,000 a year. Your annual expenditures require $500,000,000 a year to-day without any war.

Mr. President and Senators, the first duty as we stand on the edge of this conflict is to strike the manacles off this Government and give it power to tax the real and personal estate according to its value all over the Union. We are rich in men, rich in courage, rich in all the elements necessary to carry on a great war; but it is a giant manacled by the Constitution and by the decrees of the Supreme Court. I, as an American citizen, animated by the same fire and devotion to the flag that represents the sovereignty of this nation as the proudest of you, demand that before we are plunged into this conflict the hands of the nation shall be untied, and that we shall not be compelled after a conflict to make a dishonorable peace, disgraceful to the nation, because it had not the means to prosecute a successful war.

Before we adjourn for the holidays we ought to submit an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress the power to levy and collect taxes on both real and personal estate all over the country in accordance with its value and not in proportion to population. The American people will never submit to a tax of that kind, unjust, wicked, nefarious, as it is, if a large amount is drawn from their pockets in such an unequal proportion, but the American people will submit to any taxation that is just and fair when it is levied for the purpose of vindicating the honor, the safety, and the good name of the Republic. They will be lavish in both money and blood.

The legislatures of a number of States will be in session in a few days. We, without distinction of party, in both branches of Congress, ought by a unanimous vote to submit to the legislatures an amendment to the Constitution giving to the National Government the power to reach the pockets of all the $70,000,000,000 of wealth in this country, so as to enable the Government to carry on the war which it may wage, and to carry it on in accordance with the interests and the honor of the American people.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposi-

tion of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during the sessions of Congress.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask unanimous consent that that bill be passed over temporarily, not losing its place.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LODGE. I understand the House bill is still before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I yesterday gave notice of an amendment to the House bill appointing this commission. I desire now to withdraw the amendment, or, rather, to state that I shall not press it.

My first reason for doing so is that I think it is of the utmost importance that there should be absolutely no division whatever in the Senate on any question involving the support of the President in the position he has taken, and there might be a division on this amendment if pressed to a vote.

My second reason is that on reflection it seems to me that placing a limit upon the time within which the commission shall report is needless, because the President has stated in his message that they are to report with the least possible delay. The date I fixed is unnecessarily distant, and it is better that no date should be fixed. I desire to give the President all that he asks and the utmost latitude. Where the fullest discretion is given there the responsibility will lie, and there it ought to lie—the responsibility both to the American people and to the vast interests which are involved.

But, Mr. President, I desire to say that for the same reason I should hope that on this bill would be placed the amendment allowing the Senate to advise and consent to the appointment of the commission, not for the purpose of asserting the prerogative of the Senate, but because I think it would strengthen that commission and strengthen the hands of the President to have it understood that those commissioners enter on their work not only as his appointees, but with the unanimous approbation of the Senate.

The one object, it seems to me, that we should aim at in all this grave business is not haste or excitement, but entire firmness, and that we should show to the world that we are absolutely united in the position that has been taken. It is freely charged that this is mere electioneering business. I want to see that idea done away with. I want to make it understood by every means in our power that there is no division of sentiment among the American people, and I want the action of the Senate to say plainly to those people in London who are undertaking to make a scare in this country by selling stocks and calling loans in the American market, that the American people are united on this question, that they propose to stand by the Monroe doctrine, and that the attempt to create a panic in Wall street, to call loans and drain our gold, is not the road to an honorable and a peaceful settlement.

For this reason, Mr. President, I desire, for my own part, to put no obstacle in the way of the unanimous adoption of the amendments proposed by the committee or of the bill itself. I desire that we shall proceed with deliberation and dignity, but with the most entire firmness, and that we shall settle with this question and pass this bill before we adjourn.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, there is no doubt that the sentiment in this country in favor of what is popularly known as the Monroe doctrine is practically unanimous. Within a few years past many things have happened which have excited the indignation of the American people. They have felt, and had reason to feel, that Great Britain assumed a domineering attitude toward the United States—that she was unwilling to recognize the rights of our people or our country.

Among the irritating causes we might mention the destruction of the seals in Alaska. Undoubtedly Great Britain is to blame for it, and that is the opinion of the American people. We can also mention the fact that she is setting up a claim to a portion of the Territory of Alaska which has been recognized by all as ours, and which has been in the peaceable possession of our grantors and of ourselves for three-quarters of a century. It is asserted by the agents of Great Britain or Canada that instead of the shore line being the shore line that has been recognized for three-quarters of a century, the shore line from which the measurement must be taken is in the ocean beyond the islands. The mere statement of such a claim outrages our sense of justice and has created much feeling.

Again, in Nicaragua last spring, we find Great Britain proceeding to take military possession of a portion of Nicaragua on a claim so flimsy as not to bear examination for one hour among honest men. Her proceedings in that direction were manifestly for the purpose of thwarting the scheme of the United States to build an interoceanic canal. We find Great Britain the lion in the path.

Then, again, we find her changing her boundary from time to time in Venezuela because Venezuela is a weak power. It is not because of Venezuela alone, but if there is a feeling of indignation in the United States against Great Britain it is her fault. It is her aggression, her arrogance, and her disposition to trample upon the rights of the American people which has aroused this feeling.

It is said on the other side of the Atlantic by, I think, a majority of the people in England, France, and Germany that this is a mere electioneering dodge. They assume that the President is actuated by the ordinary motives which have actuated monarchs and despots and presidents from the beginning of governments to get up a controversy with a foreign power whenever politics were desperate at home. That is the old thing to do, and they assume that it is what the President is doing. It is said he is doing it for political purposes. We can see very well how he might gain by it politically. We can see very well how this thing might be dragged along and that Great Britain might settle with Venezuela, and then our task would be done. If Great Britain should disclaim what she has done the President's friends would say that he brought it about by his firmness. I can see how there might be political gain in it; but gain or no gain, it is a declaration in favor of the Monroe doctrine; it is a declaration opposed to the usurpation of Great Britain; it is an American declaration, and I am in favor of sustaining it.

The President having inaugurated this, he having the responsibility, I am in favor of giving him the entire responsibility of ascertaining the facts, and I am in favor of the House bill as it came to us. That bill provides just exactly what he asks for, and if he is not in good faith, if he does not execute this supreme duty according to the spirit and the demand of the American people, the American people will know the reason why. He has put himself in the breach, and declared for the American doctrine of self-defense and noninterference of any European power with the Governments or territories of any country in all the Americas—he has put himself squarely there. Give him the money and let him make the investigation.

I do not believe there is danger of war. I do not believe Great Britain will insist upon an unjust demand against Venezuela when she knows that it involves war with the United States. Great Britain can put an end to this thing in a day by being honest and reasonable. There would be no trouble about that. She is the aggressor, but if she is going to pursue a policy of aggression upon this continent, as she does in every other part of the globe, the sooner we know it the better.

As to raising the necessary revenue and amending the Constitution so that revenue can be raised, that is too unimportant to discuss. We have been through wars before this time, and ample power was found in this Government to raise revenue. When the people of the United States are called upon to defend the principles which they cherish as most sacred and to defend their rights against any country, and particularly against Great Britain, there will be no lack of money. Seventy million people can furnish all the money necessary to vindicate their honor. There can be nothing more injurious to the American people than to submit to the arrogance of Great Britain. It breeds toadyism; it breeds dependence; it destroys American manhood; it destroys the pride of being an American citizen.

War under any circumstances is to be avoided if possible. War is a great calamity; but it is nothing to the sacrifice of honor. There are other things worse than war. We have had twenty-five years of abundant harvests and profound peace, and there is more suffering to-day in the country than ever before in its history. I am not sure but the people of this country would welcome the change, if it was from peace to war, in view of the general distress which prevails.

I want American manhood asserted, and inasmuch as the President has announced a doctrine in which we all concur, let us give him the power to vindicate it, and the country will hold him responsible. He is willing to take the responsibility. Let the House bill as it came to us be passed; let it proceed in order; let it proceed now, so that it will be known on both sides of the Atlantic what the American people mean and what they will do in defense of what they know to be their rights. [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair must remind the galleries that it is in violation of the rules of the Senate to show approbation of or dissent from what is said on the floor of this body. A repetition of the offense will call for an enforcement of the rule of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I can not bring myself to believe that there is in the present situation such serious menace to the peace of the world as may be implied from remarks made here and from utterances elsewhere. I concur in everything that has been said with reference to the necessity of firmly, rigidly, and at all times enforcing the Monroe doctrine. I indorse the views of the President of the United States in affirmation of the principles upon which we understand that doctrine is grounded; but I do not think that any occasion will arise as the result of the Venezuelan dispute to require the assertion of the full powers of this Government in maintenance of that doctrine. I am persuaded

that if upon that careful, that judicial investigation which the President suggests, facts at present but little known and imperfectly appreciated are made patent, there will be no grave obstacle to an honorable solution. I can not understand that there is any immediate reason to apprehend momentous difficulty or cause for intense excitement. The war cloud does not seem to me to be so large. I am unwilling to entertain the thought that as to such a question, important though it may be, any conclusion will be reached which does not comport with the universal desire of all Christian people for peace.

Mr. President, what is the condition of this controversy? What is it concerning which we are now in contention as far as Great Britain is concerned? We lay no claim to one foot of the territory of Venezuela. We merely assert that Great Britain must not take from Venezuela territory which is palpably hers. We do not propose, I imagine, to solve a bona fide boundary dispute upon any narrow or technical ground, nor to engage in conflict without the establishment of a clear case justifying such action; but we are assuming, if we talk in a belligerent manner, that England is about to absorb territory which of right plainly pertains to Venezuela. Is England attempting so to do? This is the vital question upon which our right to act depends. The President of the United States informs us that it is not clearly known to him; that he has not the information to give us upon which he or we can base a final judgment to the effect that England is about to perpetrate this usurpation, this violation of the Monroe doctrine. In order to ascertain whether there is really a just cause for complaint, whether the generally existing sentiment here against English conduct in this case is or is not well founded, he proposes to appoint a commission, and upon the report of that commission to fully and fairly consider the case, and if there is proof that European territorial acquisition is contemplated, then the whole matter will be submitted to Congress with a recommendation for affirmative action.

It may be, and from the statements made by those who ought to know much more about it than I do it is probable, that there has been aggression, but we are not in a condition to announce this as a fact. We have not the evidence upon which we can so find. We must know that we are right before we act. The only question, as I understand it, before the Senate is whether we will concur in enacting a statute giving to the President the means to enable him to carry out the laudable desire which he expresses, and which we all wish may eventuate in a final clear and convincing report and recommendation. So far as the means of accomplishing this end are concerned, if I had my way about it I would rather appropriate $100,000 for the purpose of enabling the President to take such action in this matter as may comport with his views of his executive duty. I would rather omit the word "commission" from the bill, and merely give the President the money to enable him to obtain the essential facts, by commission or otherwise, and report the same to Congress, and, failing in this, I prefer the House bill, without amendment. When the President does act, it will be for Congress to determine what to do.

There can be no declaration of war save through Congress. Anything the commission may do, any suggestion it may offer will be advisory; it will not be conclusive upon us or upon the Executive. The recommendation made by the President will not bind Congress. Such expression will be valuable and presumably correct, but, after all, we must act under our constitutional prerogative; upon our own responsibility and judgment in the final determination as to whether there is or is not a cause for hostilities. I do not agree that we should insist upon any power, actual or assumed, to confirm the commission.

I prefer that the President be allowed to select his own commission absolutely unfettered by the wishes of the Senate. Then when the report reaches us it will be the report of the President of the United States announcing his opinion as to the duty of Congress upon the submission made by the commission. Congress then will take such action with relation thereto as it may deem best.

I consider it proper, before concluding, to call attention to the fact that at the last session of the late Congress the Senate adopted a resolution reported by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE], from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with regard to Hawaii, which clearly and tersely announced our rule in these words:

Resolved, That of right it belongs wholly to the people of the Hawaiian Islands to establish and maintain their own form of government and domestic policy; that the United States ought in no wise to interfere therewith; and that any intervention in the political affairs of these islands by any other Government will be regarded as an act unfriendly to the United States.

Here we extended our jurisdiction beyond the American Continent; we disregarded 2,000 miles of intervening ocean, and we there said with reference to those islands that we should regard any intervention there as an act unfriendly to the United States, and this declaration has been and will be respected. There is, therefore, manifestly no impropriety in the insistence upon the same time-honored principle with reference to the continent upon which we sustain our nationality.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. May I ask the honorable Senator from California a question?

Mr. WHITE. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The question I propose to ask is for the purpose of testing the construction which the Senator from California places upon the Monroe doctrine. Suppose we give the President this commission, that they meet and attend to the duties imposed upon them, that they report back their sentiments, and the President and the Congress of the United States decide upon the facts reported as to the precise location of the line between British Guiana and Venezuela; then suppose after that the Government of Venezuela, either through fear of becoming involved in war with Great Britain, or for any other cause, should consent by treaty stipulation to transfer a portion of the territory which we have decided belongs to Venezuela. What I wish to know is, would that be such a settlement as the United States could agree to and still be held to be a vindication of the Monroe doctrine on our part?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the interrogatory submitted by the Senator from Oregon is broad. It involves the consideration of an extended subject. I do not think that the topic to which he refers is embraced in this controversy. I am firm in the conviction that there might be attempted cessions of territory by some of the States of this continent, to which cessions it would be the duty of the United States to object. Intimations of that character have already been officially given with reference to Cuba. But I am unwilling to lay down a rule in the absence of a subject for its application, or to define the Monroe doctrine in complete and entirely comprehensive terms, or to apply it or attempt to apply it to a contingency which has not yet arisen. I do not pretend to be able upon the spur of the moment, or perhaps at any time, to state our national duty in every case where an American nation may desire to cede land to a European Government. Such an effort upon my part might result in a statement upon which I would be unwilling to rest in every possible controversy. There is a case before us. I am addressing myself to that case, and I am not seeking to enlighten upon a condition which may or may not hereafter transpire. Actual issues I am prepared to decide. The message of the President contemplates the possibility of the taking of territory by force. It treats of the occupancy of Venezuelan soil by the British Government against the will of Venezuela. It is with that hypothesis, and that alone, that I am dealing.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Will the Senator allow me on that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WHITE. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I simply desire to say, in order to place myself right, that I shall answer my own question by saying that that would be a settlement the Government of the United States could not consent to and at the same time vindicate the integrity of the Monroe doctrine, because I believe the true construction of the Monroe doctrine to be that no European power shall, without our consent, be permitted, either by force or by treaty stipulation, to acquire one foot of soil they do not now own or control on this hemisphere.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to add, with reference to the remark of the Senator from Oregon, that while I am glad to have his views upon the subject—for I have a great respect for him and for his views—nevertheless, I do not care to adopt his conclusions at present. We will confer about that later when an issue in which the matter is material is pending.

But, concluding, I will say that I do not propose to offer any amendment whatever to the bill. I have simply expressed my judgment, to the effect that it would be preferable, after making ample appropriation, to leave this feature of the Venezuelan question wholly with the Executive, and I once more indorse the Presidential definition of duty, and while entertaining the opinions already given relating to the formal part of our proceedings, I am ready to support the bill in such form as the Senate may deem desirable.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, I think the relations between the United States and Great Britain at this moment are of a very critical character, and it is because I think war is imminent between these two great powers should the pretensions of either or both sides be stubbornly maintained that I heartily concur in the opinion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] in favor of a conservative and temperate course of action.

Should war ensue between the United States and Great Britain out of this Venezuelan controversy, upon the Senate of the United States and the coordinate branch of Congress will rest the responsibility. We are the war-making power. The President of the United States may precipitate war, but these two bodies have the exclusive power for the authoritative declaration of war. It is precisely for this reason that I contend that the Senate of the United States have the undoubted privilege, and it is their duty in this instance to exercise it, to supervise the appointment of the

commissioners provided for in the bill that passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, in the interrogatory of the Senator from Ohio, what need is there of haste? Is our honor suffering? Is our frontier invaded? Are not our ships permitted to plow the ocean unmolested? In what particular are we assailed so that we can not wait for a dispassionate investigation into the merits of this controversy between Venezuela and Great Britain? It occurs to me that the very appointment of the commission is a warlike step. It occurs to me that it is a very extreme application of the Monroe doctrine to undertake to settle a boundary question in dispute between European powers and Governments in South America. But, sir, even that step, which in my opinion is a forecast of war, may not lead to the dire conclusion of war if temperate and wise counsels are followed as to it.

I can not contemplate war with the tranquillity that some seem to do; I know something of its horrors; I know something of its devastation. But if the occasion demanded war, if the honor or the interests of the United States were so insulted or infringed upon as to make a call to arms necessary, I should not hesitate on account of the financial condition of the United States to enter into war. I believe our people would respond to the call of patriotism; I believe they have the resources in their own midst; I believe that bonds of the United States would be taken by our own population, and afford all the resources necessary to carry on war with the greatest power upon earth.

But, sir, it occurs to me, knowing the terror, knowing the sufferings, knowing the upheaval itself that will follow from the contention between these two vast powers, we ought not to be precipitate or hasty. Let us give a breathing time. The people of the United States are excited. I do not feel that I am saying too much in saying that the members of Congress are excited on this question. All the facts surrounding it, every circumstance connected with it, ought to be diligently inquired into and temperately considered before we launch upon this tremendous scheme of battle.

Senators say that there is no danger of war. I do not share with them in that opinion. I hope they are correct; I pray that they are correct. Feeling the deep responsibility entailed upon me as a member of this Senate and a part of the war-making power of this Government, while I do not take counsel of any fear in my breast, it behooves me to take counsel of my prudence; and in taking counsel of that prudence I consider it wise, and proper, and just that the bill which has passed the House of Representatives be amended as suggested by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, yesterday I thought that perhaps it would be wise to amend this bill as other bills from the House of Representatives are amended. To-day I do not think so. I believe that it is of the highest national importance that this bill should to-day pass the Senate exactly as it came from the House of Representatives.

The amendment proposed is not material. We should, of course, consent to the appointment by the President of any commissioners whose names he might send to the Senate for confirmation, and I am in favor of leaving, as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] has well said, the whole responsibility of present action upon the President. He has all the power in the world necessary for the present crisis except money. He can not touch a dollar of money in the Treasury except with the consent of Congress, and we should freely and ungrudgingly give him that money to use as he pleases.

The President of the United States in this emergency has risen above party. He has shown himself to be patriotic and wholly American. Inspired by the spirit of Massachusetts, which now pervades and prevails in the State Department, he has taken American ground, from which the United States will never recede. I am in favor of meeting the President upon that ground. Is there a Democrat here who is in favor of doing any more than ought to be done, hoping thereby to promote the interests of his party? I do not believe there is. Is there a Republican here in favor of doing less than ought to be done, thinking thereby to promote the interests of his party? I do not believe there is; and if the President, whether he be himself a candidate for reelection next year or whether some other distinguished member of his party shall be a candidate for election as President next year, has done his utmost in the sight of the whole world to remove this question of foreign affairs from the disputes of American politics, shall not the people all over the country, without distinction of party, respond to his efforts and sustain his hands in every direction and in every particular?

If when we enter the Presidential canvass of next year there shall be no question of foreign policies involved, and our politics stop at the water's edge, as Senator LODGE has reminded us Mr. Webster said they ought to stop, and we decide the question who shall be President solely upon the consideration of American interests and domestic policies, we ought to thank God that President Cleveland at this time and in this emergency led the way to that separation from politics which always should prevail among political parties on questions of foreign policy.

Mr. President, I am told that stocks have gone down—that Wall street is agitated and State street is agitated—because a Democratic President, sustained by a Republican Congress, proposes to defend the national honor. If stocks have gone down materially, I undertake to say that they are stocks which ought to go down, irrespective of national complications. No stock of any real value in the American or English markets will be seriously affected because the American honor is to be preserved in this crisis of our fortunes. For one I do not propose, and I do not believe any member of the Senate or of the House or any American citizen proposes, to be intimidated in this emergency by the declarations of foreign capitalists, by any conspiracy of foreign bankers, to destroy the credit of this country or the value of American stocks in the markets of the world in order to prevent the Congress of the United States from appropriating money to enable President Cleveland to do exactly what he thinks he ought to do in this decisive hour in our affairs.

I read a cable dispatch to the New York Sun of to-day:

LONDON, *December 19.*

A grave but inevitable consequence of President Cleveland's message upon the British-Venezuelan dispute has arisen perhaps sooner than might have been expected. A meeting of prominent financial leaders who have important interests in the United States was held in a London banking office to-day——

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish the Senator would read that again.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well.

A meeting of prominent financial leaders who have important interests in the United States was held in a London banking office to-day for the purpose of considering the advisability of united action—

United action—

in calling in their American credits. It is undoubtedly within the power of English capitalists by such a combined movement to deal America a blow which would, temporarily, be terribly embarrassing and disastrous. It would, however, prove, to a certain extent, a boomerang, and this view had its influence upon the majority of those who attended to-day's meeting. The conference was private, and it was not intended even that the fact that it took place should be allowed to be made public. I am permitted to cable only the general trend of the discussion and the result.

The article proceeds:

A strong sentiment of resentment against President Cleveland, and a spirit of retaliation were expressed at the outset of the consultation by several gentlemen. In fact, personal feeling, instead of financial astuteness, seemed to control two or three of those present until cooler counsels prevailed. The point chiefly debated was the question how far the exigencies of domestic politics influenced the President's action, and to what extent his position was supported by the real public sentiment of the country.

Mr. President, I hope a voice may go out from the Senate to-day which will pronounce the opinion of the American Senate that the exigencies of domestic politics did not influence the President or the Secretary of State in the action which they have taken, but that they were guided in this instance, at least, solely by a regard for the public interest and the public welfare.

There were no defenders of the President among those present.

Alas, Mr. President, has it come to this! [Laughter.] I ask the Senators upon the other side of the Chamber to contemplate the fact that their President, who has done more for England than any President that ever sat in the White House, has now fallen so low that there are none to do him reverence, and that when the great financiers of Great Britain assembled and made a determination and quietly allowed what they had done to leak out so that it might go to Wall street and to State street, "there were no defenders of the President among those present." [Laughter.]

On the contrary, he was denounced unsparingly, and his conduct was described by several as insane.

Mr. President, what is to be your answer to that assault upon your President? What is to be the answer of Senators upon the other side to that attack upon their Chief Magistrate? What is to be the answer of Republicans upon this side of the Chamber? Do we propose to sit here when the President has adopted a course and announced a policy that is approved by everyone of us and hear him called insane upon the other side of the ocean—while we debate the petty question whether we should or not insist upon our right to confirm or reject the commissioners whom he may appoint?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CHANDLER. When I finish this sentence. Are we to hesitate whether we had not better insist upon acting upon his nominees, and whether we had not better insist—I do not even remember what the other amendments are——

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. I will yield in a moment, as I always do, to the Senator from Nebraska. Are we to hesitate about such matters when what is needed is a unanimous expression by the Senate sustaining the action of the President? What does the Senator from Nebraska desire to say?

Mr. ALLEN. I did not notice in the account which the Senator

read of the meeting in London whether Rothschild was present or not. I should like to ask the Senator whether Rothschild was there.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Senator's inquiry is appropriate. It is the old game that is being practiced upon us. There are no names mentioned. It was a conference purely for effect on this side of the water. They pretended that it was a private affair, but they intended that it should be public, and it has had its influence to-day in Wall street and State street, and telegrams are being sent in here now by the score, warning the Senate not to protect the honor of the United States for fear stocks may go down a little.

Mr. ALLEN. With respect to applying the Monroe doctrine so as to keep the British out of possession of territory that may menace our mainland, does not the Senator believe that more danger comes to the United States and to the Government of the United States through British capital invested in this country in stocks, mortgages, and bonds?

Mr. CHANDLER. What is the question?

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator whether he does not think there is more danger from that source than from any other source, and whether it would not be wise to pursue such a policy as would cause the withdrawal of English capital from this country and the transaction of business upon our own money. Then there would never be occasion for any Englishman or any congregation of Englishmen to say that they believe the President of the United States is insane.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am willing, with the Senator from Nebraska, to try to accomplish American financial independence of England and our industrial and commercial independence of England. But let us take one thing at a time. I dislike very much the disposition of the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], if he will allow me to refer to him, to mix together different questions.

Now, we are dealing with only one thing, the question of national honor in reference to the Venezuelan controversy. I say this is a deliberately concocted scheme of English financiers to frighten the United States. They believe the pocket nerve is sensitive; that the conservative property-holding and bond-holding people of the United States will check those insane persons who are trying to precipitate war between the two countries, one of whom—our own country—ought to remain perpetually in commercial and financial dependence upon the other.

So, Mr. President, not only was I called insane when a few weeks ago I calmly announced that I thought the grave questions between us and England would have to be settled by war some time within twenty years, but now behold President Cleveland, but lately the great apostle of English principles of American tariff reform and the idol of the British aristocracy, the British manufacturers, and British financiers, is to-day, in a conference of British bankers in London, pronounced insane. If no one will further interrupt me I will finish this article:

Most of those present refused to believe that the American people seriously indorse his action.

Mr. President, I propose that the Senate of the United States to-day give an emphatic utterance of indorsement of his action. I say that any hesitation whatever, any failure to pass the bill now, will be an indorsement of the insult to the President and the attack upon the national credit which the money lenders and the bankers of Great Britain have made, feeling themselves able, by threats and bullying, to frighten the people of the United States.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield the floor to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. I merely desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield the floor to the Senator from South Carolina, who I hope will speak fully on this question.

Mr. TILLMAN. No, sir; I merely wish to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina wishes to interrogate the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am very happy to be interrogated by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether he would vote for the bill if he knew the result would be that the gold reserve would disappear and we should get to a silver basis, as is threatened?

Mr. CHANDLER. There is the same tendency of our Populist friends to mix up questions. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought the Senator understood that I am not a Populist. If I am not a Democrat there are no Democrats here.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not hear the Senator. What are the Senator's politics, may I ask?

Mr. TILLMAN. They are those which I learned from Jefferson and Calhoun and Lincoln. My politics are American. The Senator from New Hampshire does not answer the question, however.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will say to the Senator from South Carolina first that we are all of that politics now.

Mr. TILLMAN. Would the Senator from New Hampshire still vote for the bill if he knew that the gold reserve would disappear; that Wall street would swallow it up?

Mr. CHANDLER. I will answer the Senator from South Carolina by saying that I will vote for any sacrifice, even for the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], which is the concrete absurdity of all his schemes for financial blundering. [Laughter.] I will vote for that if it is necessary to defend the national honor.

Mr. TILLMAN. We join hands. [Laughter.]

Mr. TURPIE. Mr. President, I hope I may say in behalf of the committee that none of the proposed amendments have been offered merely for the sake of amending the bill of the House of Representatives. We think they have substantial merits, which present themselves as a modification of the original proposition.

In the first place, there is an overture here to create a commission without numbering the persons who shall compose it. That, we think, is a precedent with a good deal of mischief in it; more than may now be seen. We think it is much safer to name the number, as we have, by inserting the word "three."

Again, as these commissioners are agents of the President and the Government and the people of the United States, in the discharge of a very important trust and investigation, it would add something to the dignity of their official station as well as somewhat of importance to the examination which they are to undertake, to make them subject to the confirmation of the Senate, without any reference to Senatorial prerogatives. We did it purely for the purpose of making the protest against foreign aggression in one of the South American Republics more effective and more forcible.

In the next place, what I regard as the most material amendment is the insertion of the word "facts" and striking out the word "true." In the bill of the House of Representatives it was said that the commission should report upon the true divisional line, evidently granting to the commission judicial powers, giving them the authority to decide, giving them the authority to determine a mixed question of law and fact—a true divisional line. All that the President alludes to in his message, and all that we think ought to be comprised in the act of Congress passed in answer to it, is an investigation of the documents, evidence, and facts relating to the disputed divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and the colony of British Guiana. We do not want the opinion of the commission as to the law. I think it would be a derogation of both Houses of Congress and a derogation of the executive department of the Government to ask a commission to be created charged with the duty of determining the international law of this case or of any other. The bill with the amendments proposed by the committee clearly confines the commission to a finding and report of facts. It clearly carries out the request of the President, the inquiry of the President for the best and latest and most authentic information with respect to the boundary line between those two countries.

I am at a loss to understand, sir, some expressions I have heard even here and elsewhere to the effect that the commission is to make the discovery whether the Monroe doctrine is applicable to the Venezuelan boundary-line case. I do not think that that is the duty of the commission. When we pass the bill we decide that question. When we pass the bill the Congress of the United States says, the President in his approval of it says, "The boundary line between those two countries is our affair. This is not an unlawful interference. This is not an unlawful intervention either under the law of nations or any American policy." But we say, "What shall be the line between these two countries is our concern; it is an affair of the United States." When we decide that the Monroe doctrine is applicable, the only office of the commission is to gather facts which shall enable us to determine whether there may be necessity for its enforcement in this case—whether there has been any or is likely to be any violation of it.

There are some streams which constitute, or may constitute, a part of the divisional line. There is the Essequibo, and there are other rivers. Whatever other rivers there may be within the disputed territory, we cross one when we pass the bill. We cross the Rubicon, and we can never recede with honor until these differences be settled upon a fair and just basis. For example, if the British Government should accede to our views with respect to the true line—that is, the views of the President after information of the facts, and the views of Congress after the same information—then there is no occasion for the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine.

And there are other contingencies which might do away with the necessity of enforcing it, but in passing the bill we do apply it. Whether we shall enforce it or not depends upon subsequent

contingencies. I believe that it will be enforced, fully enforced with plenary power, with all the military and naval resources of the United States should Great Britain not accede to what we think, after full information, is the just and true line of demarcation between the territory of the two Governments.

I was very glad to hear the learned and honorable Senator from California [Mr. WHITE] decline to make any definition of the Monroe doctrine. I think we ought very seriously to meditate upon this matter. The Monroe doctrine has been enforced over seventy years. No legislative definition of it has ever been made. There is no reason why it should be. All Americans understand what it is. What is meant by it? Like many cases in the courts that concern specific performance, those concerning the quieting of titles, the courts refuse to define, to make any definition, but at the same time they do not hesitate to apply the doctrine whenever a proper case is presented. We have had various applications of the Monroe doctrine. The last, I think, one of the simplest and clearest applications of the Monroe doctrine, was made by this body in its resolution upon the subject of Hawaii, already referred to by the Senator from California, who preceded me.

Sir, there is an exact place and room for the exercise of the doctrine as the President has requested. We are not bound to wait for an actual aggression. We are not bound to wait an attack. So say all the writers upon international law, and especially Mr. Vattel, the Blackstone of that branch of jurisprudence, who has a chapter upon this subject.

How appearances of danger give the right to make war.
A nation that has a neighbor at once powerful and ambitious has her all at stake.

We have such a neighbor. I know it is a very common thing to refer to the 3,000 miles of ocean waste between us; but recollect that our neighborhood with Great Britain is not bounded by that, but by a mere imaginary line on terra firma, the southern line of the Dominion of Canada.

As men are under a necessity of regulating their conduct in most cases by probabilities, those probabilities claim their attention in proportion to the importance of the subject, and their first right to obviate a danger is in a compound ratio of the degree of probability and the danger threatened. * * * If appearances are so easily credited, it is the fault of that neighbor who has betrayed his ambition by several indications.

That is a quotation from one of the oldest authorities, that a threatened danger constitutes a just casus belli. It seems to me as if the institutions of government have a sort of geographical distribution. There is the oldest grand division of the globe, Asia, and the largest, which never had a republic within its limits. To-day it is governed by imperialism, by despotism, and by a modification, in British India, of the same character of government, for where a small minority rules a very large majority by virtue of the sword, though tempered by law, by justice, by Christianity, the republic is yet barred. None has yet appeared in Asia. There is no prospect of any. Europe has had a divided history. A great many republics have appeared there, but, looking to the present status of governments to-day, it would seem there are only two republics in that quarter of the globe. Therefore the great weight and force of public tradition and, as far as it goes, of public opinion seem to be against the republican system in that part of the world. At least this is the present apparent condition.

Our hemisphere has happily had a different history. Very early the United States vindicated the doctrine of self-government. That sublime example has been followed until every nationality from the southern line of the Dominion to Cape Horn has now a government republican in form. The British colony of Guiana is not a nationality, and there are one or two little other specks of colonial possessions, but with that exception the whole of this hemisphere south of the Canadian line is dedicated to the cause and policy of the government of the people, for and by the people. It is consecrated to that cause and policy, and that principle is as dear to every American as his own State and his own country. The cause is dear; the cause is precious; the cause is well worth maintaining that here on this hemisphere men shall govern themselves, and no armed strangers, with whatever force, with whatever violence, shall prevent the feeblest people upon the Western Hemisphere from regulating their own institutions to suit themselves.

Now, Mr. President, it may be asked and has often been asked, will the Government of the United States then assume the guardianship over all the republics of the American Continent? No, Mr. President, we do not assume any such guardianship. The guardianship has been cast upon us. It has come to us by the force of political gravitation, and by reason of our primacy among the republics of the American hemisphere and among the governments of the world. Our primacy is determined first by the great victory of the American Revolution, the seniority of this Government to all other existing republics except one; next, by the wealth, the resources, and the territorial extent of the United States; third, by her accredited and proven naval and military strength. It is this which has drawn to us the guardianship of the other republics upon this hemisphere. We can not avoid it. We can not evade it. It belongs to that class of duties indicated in private life by the maxim "Noblesse oblige." We are bound by this condition to maintain that supremacy, and, as master of the situation, as leader in the line of liberty, to repel every assault, from whatever quarter, which shall interfere with governments by the people established on this continent.

It is a guardianship, sir, that must continue as long as the present condition of those republics obtains. I do not think it will last very long. Before the middle of the next century Mexico, with the lesser republics between her southern line and the Isthmus, will constitute a confederacy, a union; delegates from these republics will meet in full accord, and will at a certain predestined time and place, in imitation of our glorious ancestors, form a more perfect union and establish a firmer form of government than that which now prevails among them. We shall have the United States of Central America.

I think further, sir, that south of the Isthmus those smaller republics—I speak not in disparagement—in wealth and population will find a similar path to unity, to power, to increased prestige, and that there are some even in this audience who may live to witness the United States of South America. Then, when we have three confederacies of free, independent States in the North, in Central America, and in the South, each will have those larger means and resources of defense which will enable it to repel the attacks of Great Britain or any other European power, and will prevent even the menace of injury by any such power. I believe also this example of free government will be still further glorified and some of those older countries will follow the example, the very recent example, of France, that toward the close of the next century mankind may welcome the United States of Europe to complete the constellation of free republics within the civilized regions of the globe.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, this question appears to me to present itself to every Senator in this light: The President of the United States has informed Congress that the Government of Great Britain claims a large portion of the territory of the Republic of Venezuela without foundation of right, and appeals to the Government of the United States to enforce in aid of Venezuela what is known as the Monroe doctrine, with the declaration that the territory of the American Republics shall not by force be taken from them by any European Government and its policy and form of government established over it. The President has informed Great Britain that this country desires an arbitration between the Venezuelan Government and the Government of Great Britain. Great Britain has declined that arbitration, and proposes to insist upon her claim of right as determined by herself in opposition to the action of the Government of Venezuela. The President has declared that the policy of this Government, proclaimed in the Monroe doctrine, will forbid us from assenting to that action on the part of England and will demand of us that we shall use all the resources of this country to prevent it.

Now, we are all in accord to sustain the President of the United States upon this proposition. The question is, how shall we do it? A bill is brought here from the House of Representatives to appoint commissioners who shall have the authority to do what? What are they to do, Mr. President? They can not decide this question of the boundary. If they do decide it, will the Congress of the United States respect that opinion? And, should they respect it, is it not an abrogation of the functions of this body? Are they merely to collect information? Is there, then, no established method by which that can be done? Why shall we appoint commissioners to get documents from abroad, to examine witnesses? Is it not within the competency of this body and the other House to obtain any documents that may be required, and will not the action of Congress be embarrassed if these gentlemen, either three or more, shall declare that Great Britain is right and that the boundary line named by her is the proper boundary line?

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE] says that it is not desired to have the opinion of these commissioners upon the law, but simply as to the facts. Suppose they say that the facts of the case are that the boundary line is as claimed by Great Britain, what is to be the action of Congress? Are we to adopt that report or not; and if we are not to adopt it, will it not be an embarrassment to the Congress of the United States in ascertaining the proposition laid down by the Senator from Indiana that we declare that it is our concern what is the boundary line and what is not when we appoint a commission to report facts here, and that report is not to be binding upon the Congress of the United States?

I am desirous and willing to do whatever may be thought proper to support the President of the United States. It seems to me the suggestion made by the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE] is entirely right. Let us declare that the boundary line between Venezuela and British Guiana is a concern of ours, that we shall maintain it and appropriate the money necessary or asked for by

the President for any investigation he may see fit to make for his information in recommending to Congress such action as may be necessary and proper in the case.

Now, Mr. President, it seems to me that there is too much disposition on the part of Congress to abrogate its functions and invest them in persons outside of this body. I do not see what these commissioners are to do, except to obtain documentary information upon facts which are well known now in the State Department. All the evidence that is necessary to the determination of this question is made public already. It is a matter of history how this claim of boundary has been extended from one point to another until now it embraces a large portion of the territory of Venezuela. We should, I think, sustain the President in his declaration that it is our concern where that boundary line is and where we are to decide it, and if that information is needed appropriate the money to obtain the information.

I should vote for any amendment proposed by the Senator from California to leave the President to his constitutional responsibility of recommending to Congress instead of referring to a commission of three or any other number of men the question which it is incumbent upon Congress to decide, for they can have nothing to do but to obtain documentary evidence which can now be obtained by the Committee on Foreign Relations or by the State Department.

Now, Mr. President, as to all this talk about war, in my opinion there is no possibility of war. There can be, and ought to be, no possibility of it. The enlightened sentiment of the nations of the world would forbid that there should be a war between this country and England upon this question. Nevertheless, it would be the duty of this country to maintain by force of arms the proposition that there shall be no forcible establishment of European institutions and European Governments over any portion of this territory. Who can entertain the idea that war can be made with Great Britain, and that the people of the British Empire will permit that Government to engage in war upon a question of boundaries which is not sustained by the facts of the case, but a mere aggression, and that the peace of mankind shall be disturbed by it?

The Kingdom of Great Britain is composed of a people of the same blood as the greater part of our own people. They have contributed the larger part to the civilization which has been developed by the Christian religion. Her ambassadors to this country have been men of the same blood with ourselves, and have been and are a part of our own race and types of our civilization. Her present ambassador is a man of learning and ability, and while true to the policy of his Government, has been fair and just in his treatment of the contentions between his own Government and ours.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] that there is no necessity for haste in this action, and that it comports better with the dignity of Congress for the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives to declare that this Government will firmly maintain, as a definite proposition, that Venezuela shall not be forced to cede any portion of her territory to Great Britain or to recognize a boundary line which is not based upon the facts of history and upon clear and ascertained proof. It seems to me, Mr. President, that all this discussion about war should not have place here, but that we should make a bold and independent and firm declaration as to the proper policy of this Government, and vote the President of the United States the money necessary, in his judgment, to carry out that declaration so far as obtaining information which may be desired.

As to the appointment of three commissioners, or any number of them, to do that which it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to do—not to express an opinion, not to decide this question—but to gather information. What kind of information? Information already obtainable, documentary information, facts of history to be obtained in different portions of the world. What necessity is there for it? What will we derive from the opinion and judgment of these gentlemen, however eminent they may be, that the boundary line is at this place or the other place or that the facts relating to it are of this character or the other? The Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives speak with an authority, in conjunction with the President, which no commission can do, and I fail to see the practical necessity of it. Nevertheless, if it is the pleasure of the Senate to vote these commissioners, I think that their appointment ought to be approved by the Senate of the United States.

The possibility that war between these two nations will be the result of our defending the right of Venezuela to the integrity of her territory against its forced appropriation by England should not be entertained.

These two nations, the United States and Great Britain, are the main pillars of the civilization of the world, neither can afford to demand of the other anything that is wrong or any injustice to the other.

Great Britain recognizes the supremacy of the United States in the Western Hemisphere, and it is sufficient for them to know that we will maintain this with all the power of the Republic, and that this is not an idle menace.

This is my view of the situation. The President has done his duty. He has recommended that the traditional policy of this country to protect all people who establish governments of their choice against forcible intervention by European powers, under whatever pretense, whether by claiming fictitious boundaries and enforcing their claim, or by any other means, and that we will be the judge of this, but that we are ready to submit the facts to the judgment of a fair arbitration. It is sufficient for us to sustain this declaration and for us to provide the means of obtaining the information necessary for an intelligent judgment on the question.

It will suffice for the able statesman who represents the Government of Great Britain to know and to inform his Government that the people of the United States are united in the determination to maintain and defend this policy with all their power, and a peaceable settlement of the question will be made.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I regret that the President of the United States did not settle this question for himself through the regular channel of the State Department. It seems to me that that was the appropriate and proper method of arriving at the facts. But the President has asked us to appropriate money and appoint a commission. What the number of the commission should be, it seems to me, if the commission is to be appointed, ought to be left to the President. I fail to see any advantage that can accrue to the President, to us, to the country, or to the world in the confirmation of these appointees. They are not to be officers in the proper sense of the term. They are not to perform any official functions, legislative, judicial, or otherwise, although the President refers to their finding as a judicial finding. They are simply commissioners for the purpose of enlightening the President of the United States as to the facts in the premises. The power of the President to appoint a commission for this purpose has never been questioned or doubted. It is like a commissioner in a court of chancery; he gathers the facts for the information of the chancellor, and that is all there is of it.

That being the fact, the President of the United States is entitled to select that commission. Suppose he sends to the Senate three names which we think are not such as he might have sent, are we to say through what channel he is to get the facts upon which he will base his judgment? A very awkward condition would arise if he should send to us names that we did not care to approve, and a still more awkward condition would arise if we should reject them, and the President should then feel that we had deprived him of the proper agent or agencies that he wanted to secure the facts for him.

It seems to me it is better to leave this matter where the President evidently intended we should leave it when he simply asked us for the commission and an appropriation to carry out the purposes of the commission. I think it would have been better if the House of Representatives had sent us a bill simply making an appropriation, leaving the President to select a commission in any manner he saw fit and composed of any number he chose, and to call it whatever he saw fit. It would have been none the less a commission whether we named it or not.

Mr. President, we are to have no responsibility in this matter. I am free to say that I prefer to leave this matter with the President. I do not care, so far as I am concerned, to assume any responsibility in arriving at a question of fact. I should think it very unpleasant if we should assume any right to determine the facts in advance of the President's action. It appears to me it would be very embarrassing if we should arrive at one conclusion and the President should arrive at another. It seems to me we must leave to the President both the number of commissioners and the character of the commission that he is to appoint.

I assume, and I have the right to assume, that in a question of such momentous importance, one upon which we are to make our declaration to the world, the finding of which is to be our moral support, the President of the United States will select the most competent men within the boundaries of this country of ours. I do not believe that he will select a mere politician. I believe every Senator here, if there are to be three commissioners, would look most certainly to the same three men in the United States who ought to be appointed on the commission. I should think that the President ought to appoint five on the commission, and I should have no difficulty whatever myself in finding five men in this country so far removed from the plane of partisan politics that everybody in this country would believe when their judgment was rendered that it was the judgment not only of honest men, but intelligent and able men. The President of the United States can not afford to appoint any other men. He can not afford to appoint any second-rate men; and he will not do so. On this great occasion, where so much is at stake, he will see to it that the men will have the confidence of this body and of the American people; and if he does not, let the responsibility be on him.

Mr. President, there is a provision in this proposed amendment to which I also object. It is a provision which releases the Presi-

dent from the inhibition we put on him in 1894 against the appointment for such purposes of men holding official position. I think that was a wise provision of law. I do not wish to restrict it here, because, in my judgment, the men who ought to be appointed upon this commission, the men most fit to be appointed on this commission, the men that the American people will believe the most capable and whose judgment will carry the most weight, are not in public life to-day, and there is no necessity of removing that inhibition. The President does not need to go through the public officials to find members of this commission, whether the number be three, five, or seven.

I was in favor yesterday of some delay, and I still believe a great question of this character should have been treated with more consideration; but it seems to be the sentiment of the Senate that we shall proceed to dispose of it now. I do not believe that it is at all necessary that we should be in haste to convince Great Britain that the American people stand back of the President in his enunciation of the Monroe doctrine. The public press everywhere in this country with one accord, with perhaps two or three exceptions in the city of New York, where certain influences which are more English than in England even may be felt, have been a unit in favor of supporting the President of the United States. I will venture to say that there is not a chamber of commerce or a board of trade anywhere outside of New York that would not be a unit in favor of supporting him. The public sentiment of all the distinguished governors of this country now in office and very many who are out of office, and of very many ex-public officials, including the most noted and distinguished divines in this country, declare that the Monroe doctrine is an American doctrine; that the doctrine is one to be defended and maintained at all hazards.

Mr. President, we are not going to war, we are not preparing for war, and I do not think that the suggestions of the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] are particularly pertinent at this time. It is true that our financial affairs are not in the best condition; it is true that the opinion of the Supreme Court, when it struck out of the method of raising revenue the income tax, was a blow at this country which I think can only be retrieved by a different opinion from that court or by an amendment of the Constitution. I do not care now to discuss that question. At some other time I propose to discuss it, but not now. I do not want to mix, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] said, any other question with this question. I do not care about mixing the financial question with it. It is sufficient to say that if the American people feel that their honor requires them to go to war they will find the sinews of war, and nobody need be alarmed for fear that, for the want of means, we shall not be able to conduct it to a successful issue.

I am not frightened by the little disturbance in London, nor am I frightened at the disturbance which is said to exist in the city of New York. Suppose stocks do fall; what of it? That is not a matter that the American people as a nation care very much about. I am told railroad stocks went off 4 points to-day in New York. I do not care if they did. I do not suppose that will affect the price of wheat or of corn or of cotton; it will not affect the country generally, but only a few speculators; and if the English capitalists who hold our securities conclude that they want to return them to this country, let them return them. We shall not suffer by that. They will return them here to be put upon our markets and sold, and if they fall 20 points or 40 points or 50 points we need not be disturbed about it. We shall find plenty of money in this country to take them up at those reduced values. Those securities will not be sent back to this country. That is "a bluff" on their part. The Senator from New Hampshire read of their meeting, but he did not read it all. I want to read a word or two:

> Most of those present refused to believe that the American people would seriously indorse his action. They opposed any suggestion of financial retaliation against American interests on the magnanimous ground that it would be unfair to punish the whole nation on account of the conduct of its deluded Chief Magistrate. No one believes that any actual danger of war is included in the present situation.
>
> The meeting finally resolved, with practical unanimity, to postpone any action until it became clear to what extent the President's course represented the will of the American people.

Mr. President, when they have gone to the American press and listened to the voice of the American people, if their sending back their securities depends upon the support we shall give to the President, they will send back those securities en masse; but they will not come back and they will know that the President has the hearty support of the American people. I know, as the Senator from New Hampshire has said, telegrams are being sent here that we must be careful, that our action may affect trade. No consideration of that kind is going to induce the American people to abandon a doctrine which they cherish. No mere question of money is going to prevent the people of the United States from maintaining what they think to be the right and the dignity and the honor of this nation.

We sacrificed one-half of the accumulations of two hundred years to maintain the integrity of this nation. In my judgment, the people of the United States, whenever they know the facts, whenever they are satisfied there is a violation of the Monroe doctrine, whenever they are satisfied that Great Britain, under the pretense of fixing a boundary line, is endeavoring to despoil a Republic in South America, will be prepared to take the consequences of the vindication of that doctrine. I do not myself believe that there will be any trouble of the kind; I do not think there ought to be. I think there ought to be some way to compose this difficulty, and I believe there will be. I do not care myself of talking so much about war. I regret that anybody in this Chamber has introduced any bill which looks as if we needed now to make some special preparations. I should not be making any preparations now that I would not have been making thirty or sixty days or six months ago.

The best thing we can do, in my judgment, is not to adopt the amendment of the committee, but take the bill as it came from the other House, and leave the responsibility with the President, so that he will be untrammeled by anything we may do, and when a decision is arrived at, whatever it may be, if it be that the British have not attempted to despoil Venezuela, we shall accept it; if, on the other hand, it be that they have been intending to despoil Venezuela of her territory, and England still insists upon that spoliation, then the American people will know exactly what to do, and Great Britain will know long before that time exactly what our determination is, and what it will cost her to continue the unrighteous attempt of the spoliation of this our sister Republic.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope the Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will forgive me if I move, as I do now, to lay the amendment proposed by the committee on the table.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from New Hampshire has my free pardon in advance upon this subject, because it is not my report, and I am going to vote with him upon that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make that motion?

Mr. CHANDLER. I make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire moves that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] be laid upon the table. The question is on that motion, which is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, and read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. CAFFERY. Is the bill subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has passed the amendment stage. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BATE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirteen minutes spent in executive session the Senate resumed its legislative session.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives providing for a holiday recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid the resolution before the Senate, and it was read, as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, the 20th day of December, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, January 3, 1896.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish to suggest as an amendment that instead of Friday, the 20th, we fix Saturday, the 21st instant, and instead of Friday, January 3, we fix Monday, January 6, so as to read, "That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, the 21st instant, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, January 6." Everyone knows that if we adjourn to meet on Friday, January 3, there will be nobody here and nothing will be done, and we had just as well put the time over to the 6th. I suggest those amendments.

Mr. CHANDLER. The resolution now provides for adjourning from to-day until the 3d of January. The Senator from Missouri proposes that the two Houses shall adjourn from to-morrow until the 6th of January. I am opposed to adjourning to-morrow. It will be the first time in the history of the Senate, I think, when the Senate has adjourned a fortnight over the holidays with a hundred vacancies on its committees. There has been a great deal said within the last few days about the importance of the crisis that is now upon the country, and we have had a good deal of talk about foreign questions. What will be said of the Senate if, for the first time in its history, we adjourn for a fortnight and

have not any committees, or have committees that are halt, lame, blind, so to speak, with all due deference to the Senators who are upon the committees and with all due respect to the Senators who are not upon the committees?

The new Senators who are in this body were elected mainly last January. They have had ten months to get ready to come here and do business, and the old Senators have had eight months in which to get ready to come here and do business; and here we are. We have been here three weeks. There never was a time when the committees were more in need of organization and of meeting for action than now, and it is gravely proposed by Senators upon the other side of the Chamber that we shall abandon our posts and go home.

I regret, Mr. President, that the members of the Committee on Appropriations upon the other side of the Chamber felt compelled to take advantage of a temporary party majority to overrule by a vote all the Republican members of the committee and undertook to set the example to the country which is being set, of running away for a fortnight from our post of duty. I certainly expected more forbearance from the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Maryland, who I see has already taken the floor to reply to what I have said.

Mr. GORMAN. No, I have not.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thought the Senator was meditating a speech.

Mr. GORMAN. Not at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. I certainly thought that there would not be any attempt to divide parties on this question of adjournment. It seems to me that we should stay here until next Tuesday; that between now and Tuesday we should fill up the committees, as harmoniously as we always have filled them up, and then adjourn until the 3d day of January.

Mr. LODGE. Until the 6th.

Mr. CHANDLER. No; until the 3d day of January. That would be more than a week. Can it be possible that the Senator from Massachusetts is already getting tired of his work at this session of Congress? No, let us adjourn until the 3d of January. I propose that we shall stay here until Tuesday; that on Tuesday we shall fill up the committees, and then take a week's holiday adjournment. I deprecate very much the attempt on the part of the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations to force an unbecoming and an unseemly adjournment of the Senate.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I regret very much that I can not agree with my distinguished friend from New Hampshire. On the other hand, I believe that the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber have treated us with great consideration. They have allowed us to organize the Senate, so far as they are concerned. They have interposed no objection at all, notwithstanding the fact, which everybody knows, that we are not in the majority in the Senate. We have taken three weeks or more to frame our committees, at any rate since the beginning of the session. Now we ask them in two days or three days to do what it took us that long to accomplish. They are confronted with difficulties; I do not care whether they are serious or not; it is for them to decide that. They say to us that they can not complete the committees properly in this short time. I say, in view of the courtesy with which we have been treated on this side, we have no right to question that statement at all. If we undertake on this side of the Chamber to stay here next week and force the other side to organize, we shall make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the country. It is absurd——

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Idaho allow me to make an inquiry?

Mr. DUBOIS. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator says that the other side of the Chamber have informed us that they can not be ready. The Senator may have relations with Senators upon the other side of the Chamber that I myself do not now possess, but I have heard no statement of that kind made as yet. I have heard no statement made that——

Mr. DUBOIS. If the Senator from New Hampshire will allow me, I will answer that question. I presume it is fair to state what was done in our caucus. I hope I am not out of order in stating that our caucus gave plenary powers to the chairman of our caucus committee to confer with the chairman on the other side in regard to these details, and they have stated to him (which any Senator could have known if he desired) that they can not get these committees together in that time; and the chairman of our caucus stated that to us in our caucus.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is, I think, mistaken.

Mr. DUBOIS. Perhaps I am, but the chairman certainly made that statement. It has been stated to me, and to any others who have taken an interest in the matter; and it is apparent on the face of it that if we undertake to stay here we shall find ourselves without a quorum next Monday. I think we had better adjourn. If there has been any fault, it is not due to any action on the other side of the Chamber in delaying the creation of the committees.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President, I will simply state that when the list of the majority portion of the committees was handed over to the Democrats, in order that they might fill up the minority places, I said to them that it was the hope on the part of our side that they would be able to finish their work by to-day—on Friday. The chairman of their committee, representing them, stated that they would go to work at once and call their committee together the next morning and proceed. He thought that was a very short time, but if it was possible to get ready they would do it. The matter went on until yesterday, and again to-day, when I have been informed by their committee that it is impossible, they think, for them to get ready this week. I then said to them, "Is it not possible that you might be able to complete your work by next Tuesday, and, if you are willing to say that you can complete your work by that time, I am sure we will remain here, so far as Senators on this side of the Chamber are concerned." I was then given to understand that it would be impossible to do it by next week. That is about the state of the case as I understand it.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator when he was so informed?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I was informed yesterday by some of the committee, and again to-day, within the last hour.

Mr. CHANDLER. That it would be impossible for the other side to be ready by Tuesday?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. That it would be impossible for the other side to complete their work by next Tuesday.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Oregon has stated the facts. We stated to him on the very day that we were furnished with a copy of the committees that we would do the very best we could; that it was doubtful in the condition we were in whether it would be possible to finish it to-day or to-morrow or even Tuesday, but that we would do the best we could; and we notified him yesterday, and again to-day, that we saw no probability of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. This is the first time when I have been informed that the other side would find it impossible to complete their propositions as to committee membership by Tuesday next. I have always understood the contrary.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that is the fact and it would have been known to everybody, but I had no opportunity to communicate the matter generally because we had no caucus. However, I told quite a number nearest to me and everyone who inquired concerning the matter.

Mr. CHANDLER. I also knew the fact that there was a party division in the committee of which the Senator from Missouri is chairman on the question of adjournment for the holidays; and I generally stand by my party until I am satisfied that it is wrong.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is right.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I am somewhat surprised at the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire and his criticism of this side in regard to delay in the organization of the committees. When it was understood that in all probability there would not be a clear majority in this body between the two great parties, the Democratic and the Republican parties, both sides, after conference at the last session, agreed to pass a resolution, for the second time in the history of the Senate, continuing all the committees until otherwise ordered by the Senate, so as to prevent the possibility of any delay in important public matters. In that condition the Senate stands to-day.

Those of us on this side are perfectly well aware of the fact that there are only 39 Democrats. There were only 42 gentlemen elected as Republicans on the other side of the Chamber. You are powerless, as we supposed at the last session you would be, with your own numbers to organize the Senate. We have, however, a less number of votes than you have, and, therefore, when you desired to assume the responsibility of taking charge of the committees of this body we were content that you should do it in your own way and by your own combination. Three weeks, as was well said by the distinguished Senator in front of me, you have consumed in trying to make an arrangement of committees satisfactory to yourselves—three weeks of time when there was nothing pressing in the Senate, when all day was at the disposal of your committee and your caucus to make your adjustment. On Wednesday evening last, late in the afternoon, I was informed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon of the result of your deliberations. It was not possible to call our committee together until the next day at 12 o'clock; members could not be reached.

Mr. CHANDLER. Was it on Tuesday or Wednesday?

Mr. GORMAN. It was on Wednesday. From that time this great question, which affects not only the honor of the Senate, but of the country, has been pressing here, and we have been continuously in session yesterday and to-day until a very late hour, making it impossible for us to confer. I will say to Senators on the other side that we postponed any minor matter of the mere assignment on committees of vacant places or the reorganization to the public good, and now, as with those on the other side, there are other questions to be adjusted; there are family matters

requiring attention. Never in my experience in the Senate before have the minority been taken to task because of a delay of three or four days in the formation of committees. When we were in the majority, all the time that was necessary in your judgment was accorded you without any public criticism.

Mr. VOORHEES. Let me ask the Senator from Maryland a question. To-day is Friday. Do I understand him to say that day before yesterday he got the notice and that only yesterday he called the committee together?

Mr. GORMAN. Day before yesterday.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The list of committees on the part of the majority was delivered to the Senator Tuesday night, about 6 o'clock.

Mr. GORMAN. It was on Wednesday morning that the committee was called. I stand corrected.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I stated the correct history of the matter.

Mr. VOORHEES. Then this side has had the last two days, when you have had three weeks.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. While we have been three weeks on our part of the work, the fact of the matter is, as we all know, that no movement was made by any Senator to take action in regard to the committees until after we had been here a number of days. After our committee was appointed we did have twelve days to do our work.

Mr. GORMAN. As has been said before, the chairman of the committee on the other side was informed, and informed frankly, that we would dispose of this matter just as rapidly as it could be done. It could not be done within the time indicated on the other side, in view of what has occurred here in legislative matters. It will be impossible to do it in the next two on three days.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I should like to say one word further. I do not believe the Democrats have had time enough to complete their part of the work between the time that we delivered our list to them, which was last Tuesday evening at 6 o'clock, and to-day. Perhaps they would not have time by to-morrow. But I have thought, and I still think, that they could accomplish their work and that they ought to accomplish their work, by next Monday or Tuesday, and that we ought to remain here, if that could be done, and organize the committees before we adjourn for the holidays.

Mr. GORMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon, who must know the fact as well as I do, that whatever are the deliberations of a caucus committee they must be submitted to the main body, and it will be utterly impossible to have a quorum here after to-day.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether it is not also true that in filling these vacancies, or in attempting to assign or to take from committees, it is the custom to consult, to some extent at least, with gentlemen who are interested in the matters, and whether it is not a fact that Senators have been absent with whom we have desired to consult?

Mr. GORMAN. Oh, of course.

Mr. WHITE. That difficulty will be more apparent the nearer we approach the holidays.

Mr. GORMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I beg to make a disclaimer. The Senator from Maryland said he was surprised that I had criticised the other side for delaying in preparing their list of committees. I made no such criticism. I think the Senators should take all the time they need. I am too familiar with the grandeur and the sweetness of what is called Senatorial courtesy to wish to infringe in the slightest degree upon the privilege of the Senators upon the other side of the Chamber in taking what time they say in good faith they need for that purpose. What I did criticise was the desire to adjourn. I never have thought (the Senator from Maryland knows it very well) that the Senators whom he represents would be ready by Friday. I did think they might be ready by Tuesday next. I never have been informed until this moment that Senators think they need longer than Tuesday next.

Now, then, we had a party division for some reason in the Committee on Appropriations, and that committee yesterday reported, by a bare party vote, a resolution to adjourn.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does the Senator want to know? I supposed he knew.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not know. I do not know everything that takes place.

Mr. COCKRELL. Senators desired that the business which has been transacted to-day should be disposed of before the adjournment was fixed, and that being disposed of, I understand that they interpose no further objection to the resolution.

Mr. CHANDLER. And it is done with no desire to delay the appointment of committees?

Mr. COCKRELL. With no desire to delay the appointment of the committees. Now, I hope that the amendments which I have proposed to the resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. That being the case, if it is stated by Senators on the other side of the Chamber not merely that they can not be ready to-day or to-morrow, but that they can not be ready even on Tuesday next, I am content.

Mr. WHITE. That is the statement made.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now, I hope the resolution will be amended and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendments of the Senator from Missouri.

The SECRETARY. In line 2 strike out the words "Friday, the 20th," and insert "Saturday, the 21st;" in the last line strike out "Friday" and insert "Monday," and strike out "3d" and insert "6th;" so as to read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, the 21st day of December, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, January 6, 1896.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senate agree to the second and final amendment?

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senate agree to the resolution as amended?

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

MESSAGE ON VENEZUELAN BOUNDARY CONTROVERSY.

Mr. GORMAN. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 2,000 additional copies of the message from the President of the United States relative to the Venezuelan boundary controversy and correspondence with the British Government on the subject, being Senate Document No. 31, present session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland asks unanimous consent of the Senate that the resolution be now considered. Is there objection?

Mr. CHANDLER. I object for the moment. I desire to ask the leader of the opposition whether it would not be well, before the resolution for adjournment that has just been concurred in is sent to the other House, that we should wait and see what the message is which the President is to send us, for that message may create a crisis in public affairs that will make it important for us to stay here.

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, there is no danger of a crisis.

Mr. GORMAN. This resolution provides for a mere reprint.

Mr. CHANDLER. How are we to know that there is no danger of a crisis?

Mr. COCKRELL. In the very nature of the condition of this country and this people no crisis is possible.

Mr. CHANDLER. But how improper it will be to pass a resolution providing for the adjournment of Congress to-morrow for a fortnight when we are specially requested to remain here in session until His Excellency the President will send us a special communication, which no one knows anything about.

Mr. GORMAN. This resolution is only for a reprint of the recent message. There is not a copy left in the document room, I understand. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

PROPOSED RECONSIDERATION OF HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. FAULKNER. I hope the Senate will not adjourn. A message from the President is now on its way here. I have just received a telegram to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri withdraw his motion?

Mr. COCKRELL. I suppose we shall have to wait a little while.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the resolution for adjournment, and I yield the floor to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire moves to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the concurrent adjournment resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

Mr. CHANDLER. On that I ask for a division.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table, there being on a division—ayes 32, noes not counted.

CONGRESSIONAL FUNERALS.

Mr. PEFFER. May we not take up the Calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first bill on the Calendar will be announced.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House

of Representatives who die at the capital during the sessions of Congress.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. Let the bill be read at length.

The Secretary read the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No amendment has been offered to the pending bill. The bill is open to amendment as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HAWLEY. I understand that we are proceeding under Rule VIII. I do not like to proceed to a vote upon this bill to-day. I am to blame; I did not listen very carefully, but if I had done so I do not think that five minutes would have been time enough for the consideration of the bill. I shall not interpose a factious objection, but——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Connecticut that the bill is not being considered under Rule VIII, with any limit of debate, it being after 2 o'clock; but if the Senate proceeds with its consideration it will be under Rule IX, without limit as to debate.

Mr. GORMAN. Has the bill been referred to a committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been reported from a committee.

Mr. GORMAN. From what committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.

Mr. MILLS. The bill contains a provision for a permanent appropriation. Some years ago Congress undertook to repeal all the laws on the statute books that contained permanent appropriations, intending to keep the appropriations of the Government in the hands of each Congress and subject each act of appropriation to the inspection of the Committees on Appropriations. I think the bill ought to go to the Committee on Appropriations for their consideration, and I move that that reference be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas moves to commit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Texas will not insist upon that motion. This bill has been before the Senate for some time. It was referred to the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, and it was reported by authority of the committee favorably, without amendment. One day I spent about an hour in the discussion of this measure. I had the honor of talking to empty benches most of the time; so I do not wonder that most Senators did not hear what was said; but the remarks made upon that occasion were so full of interest to the newspaper people of the country that I have had many comments of the press sent me. I would not be surprised, if they were counted, if they would foot up as many as five hundred different newspaper comments, and not one of them has been unfavorable. I have three of them in my pocket now; one from the Republican, of Springfield, Mass., an old-established and a very able paper, commenting favorably upon the bill; also one from the Louisville (Ky.) Commercial, and a number of others from the best papers of the country.

But, Mr. President, aside from all that, I gave to the Senate a history of the proceedings of the Senate and of the other House in cases of the deaths of members of these two bodies. So far as the Senate is concerned, the record began in 1790, and it comes on down until 1894, when the last death occurred in this body. I collected the statistical information in connection with all of those deaths, the amount of money that was paid out of the public Treasury on account of them, and I found that so far as the Senate itself is concerned the aggregate amount was something over $100,000. While the amount itself is not very large, yet it appears that upon these occasions as they recur the expense is constantly increasing, until it has come now to be an average of over $4,000 in each case of the death of a Senator during the last ten years. The number of deaths occurring during the last ten years has cost the Treasury more money by several thousand dollars than the deaths of all the rest of the Senators who have died during the existence of the Senate. These facts have been presented to the Senate, and most Senators probably have read the information printed in the RECORD, as usual in such cases, the morning after the delivery of the speech.

If any Senator wishes delay for the sake of information or for the purpose of considering the bill upon its merits further, I have no objection to that course.

So far as the suggestion of the Senator from Texas is concerned, that the bill provides for a permanent appropriation, it simply provides that when there is any expense incurred under the bill the amount shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States instead of——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas will please suspend. The Senate will receive a message from the President of the United States.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, communicated to the Senate a message in writing.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the doors of the Senate be opened.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The formal entry will be made that the Senate has resumed the consideration of legislative business, if there be no objection.

Mr. TELLER. That the doors be opened.

THE FINANCIAL CONDITION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, ordered to lie on the table, and be printed:

To the Congress:

In my last annual message the evils of our present financial system were plainly pointed out and the causes and means of the depletion of Government gold were explained. It was therein stated that after all the efforts that had been made by the executive branch of the Government to protect our gold reserve by the issuance of bonds amounting to more than $162,000,000, such reserve then amounted to but little more than $79,000,000, that about $16,000,000 had been withdrawn from such reserve during the month next previous to the date of that message, and that quite large withdrawals for shipment in the immediate future were predicted.

The contingency then feared has reached us, and the withdrawals of gold since the communication referred to, and others that appear inevitable, threaten such a depletion in our Government gold reserve as brings us face to face to the necessity of further action for its protection. This condition is intensified by the prevalence in certain quarters of sudden and unusual apprehension and timidity in business circles.

We are in the midst of another season of perplexity caused by our dangerous and fatuous financial operations. These may be expected to recur with certainty as long as there is no amendment in our financial system. If, in this particular instance, our predicament is at all influenced by a recent insistence upon the position we should occupy in our relation to certain questions concerning our foreign policy, this furnishes a signal and impressive warning that even the patriotic sentiment of our people is not an adequate substitute for a sound financial policy.

Of course there can be no doubt in any thoughtful mind as to the complete solvency of our nation, nor can there be any just apprehension that the American people will be satisfied with less than an honest payment of our public obligations in the recognized money of the world. We should not overlook the fact, however, that aroused fear is unreasoning and must be taken into account in all efforts to avert possible loss and the sacrifice of our people's interests.

The real and sensible cure for our recurring troubles can only be effected by a complete change in our financial scheme. Pending that, the executive branch of the Government will not relax its efforts nor abandon its determination to use every means within its reach to maintain before the world American credit, nor will there be any hesitation in exhibiting its confidence in the resources of our country and the constant patriotism of our people.

In view, however, of the peculiar situation now confronting us, I have ventured to herein express the earnest hope that the Congress, in default of the inauguration of a better system of finance, will not take a recess from its labors before it has, by legislative enactment or declaration, done something not only to remind those apprehensive among our own people that the resources of their Government and a scrupulous regard for honest dealing afford a sure guaranty of unquestioned safety and soundness, but to reassure the world that with these factors, and the patriotism of our citizens, the ability and determination of our nation to meet in any circumstances every obligation it incurs do not admit of question.

I ask at the hands of the Congress such prompt aid as it alone has the power to give to prevent, in a time of fear and apprehension, any sacrifice of the people's interests and the public funds or the impairment of our public credit in an effort by Executive action to relieve the dangers of the present emergency.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *December 20, 1895.*

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. HAWLEY. I expected some consideration from our Democratic friends of this very serious message.

Mr. COCKRELL. We want time to consider it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, December 21, 1895, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 20, 1895.

INDIAN AGENT.

George H. Newman, of Fayetteville, Tenn., to be agent for the Indians of the Colville Agency, in Washington, vice Capt. John W. Bubb, United States Army, to be relieved from duty as acting Indian agent.

POSTMASTERS.

James L. White, to be postmaster at Hope, in the county of Hempstead and State of Arkansas, in the place of William P. Powell, deceased.

John R. Mathews, to be postmaster at Los Angeles, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, in the place of Henry V. Van Dusen, whose commission expires January 6, 1896.

Fred W. Brush, to be postmaster at Salida, in the county of Chaffee and State of Colorado, in the place of Silas M. Jackson, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Charles A. Crane, to be postmaster at Colorado City, in the county of El Paso and State of Colorado, in the place of Flora Everhart, whose commission expires December 23, 1895.

Charles H. Holt, to be postmaster at Buena Vista, in the county of Chaffee and State of Colorado, in the place of Aaron H. Wade, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

H. S. McDowell, to be postmaster at Highlands, in the county of Arapahoe and State of Colorado, in the place of Frank P. Mannix, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Frank P. Furlong, to be postmaster at Hartford, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut, in the place of Edward B. Bennett, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

A. Hewett Hill, to be postmaster at Eustis, in the county of Lake and State of Florida, in the place of Charles B. Hill, deceased.

John Clark, to be postmaster at Morrison, in the county of Whiteside and State of Illinois, in the place of John Grierson, whose commission will expire December 16, 1895.

Eben S. Clemens, to be postmaster at Chester, in the county of Randolph and State of Illinois, in the place of George B. Allison, whose commission expires December 23, 1895.

Harriet S. Coffeen, to be postmaster at Homer, in the county of Champaign and State of Illinois, in the place of Charles F. Core, whose commission will expire December 22, 1895.

John A. Dufield, to be postmaster at Woodstock, in the county of McHenry and State of Illinois, in the place of Simon Brink, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Nettie Flack, to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Iroquois and State of Illinois, in the place of Eliza Brown, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

William B. Fleming, to be postmaster at Bement, in the county of Piatt and State of Illinois, in the place of Francis A. Jones, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Michael Maloney, to be postmaster at Dixon, in the county of Lee and State of Illinois, in the place of Benjamin F. Shaw, whose commission will expire December 23, 1895.

John D. Martin, to be postmaster at Carmi, in the county of White and State of Illinois, in the place of William H. Phipps, whose commission will expire December 23, 1895.

David A. Frayser, to be postmaster at Vinita, in the county of Cherokee Nation, Ind. T., in the place of Harrison A. Galloway, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

J. J. Eichar, to be postmaster at Clarksville, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa, in the place of Charles B. Nelson, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Edward McCoy, to be postmaster at Rock Rapids, in the county of Lyon and State of Iowa, in the place of Anson Tolman, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Peter Stephany, to be postmaster at Manning, in the county of Carroll and State of Iowa, in the place of Edward L. Ives, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

W. G. Marlin, to be postmaster at Florence, in the county of Marion and State of Kansas, in the place of David C. Battey, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

David A. Adams, to be postmaster at Georgetown, in the county of Scott and State of Kentucky, in the place of Edward C. Barlow, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Zelinda Ashton, to be postmaster at Flemingsburg, in the county of Fleming and State of Kentucky, in the place of Horace C. Ashton, removed.

Herbert M. Bates, to be postmaster at Calais, in the county of Washington and State of Maine, in the place of William R. Ker, resigned.

George W. Beal, to be postmaster at Lisbon Falls, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine, in the place of George Plummer, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Edward B. Burr, to be postmaster at Brewer, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine, in the place of William Spurling, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

John L. Cummings, to be postmaster at Livermore Falls, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine, in the place of Jonathan F. Jefferds, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

George L. Beals, to be postmaster at Florence, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts, in the place of William M. Smith, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Frederick H. Fowler, to be postmaster at Walpole, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Nathan W. Fisher, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Henry S. Moore, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of W. E. C. Worcester, deceased.

George H. Morgan, to be postmaster at Newton, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of George H. Morgan, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Charles N. Perley, to be postmaster at Danvers, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Gertrude S. Kenney, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Samuel E. Walker, to be postmaster at East Northfield, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Samuel E. Walker, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Edward Arnold, to be postmaster at Decatur, in the county of Van Buren and State of Michigan, in the place of May F. Nicholson, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Frank P. Bogardus, to be postmaster at Ypsilanti, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan, in the place of P. W. Carpenter, whose commission will expire January 6, 1896.

William Keough, to be postmaster at Jonesville, in the county of Hillsdale and State of Michigan, in the place of Seth D. McNeal, whose commission will expire December 23, 1895.

A. B. M. Thompson, to be postmaster at Webster Groves, in the county of St. Louis and State of Missouri, in the place of Sallie H. Haley, whose commission will expire December 23, 1895.

Joseph D. Baker, to be postmaster at Edgar, in the county of Clay and State of Nebraska, in the place of William J. Garvin, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Willis F. Hardy, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire, in the place of George B. Gordon, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Waldo H. Jones, to be postmaster at Lakeport, in the county of Belknap and State of New Hampshire, in the place of Wallace E. Woodworth, whose commission will expire December 23, 1895.

John S. Ellen, to be postmaster at Willoughby, in the county of Lake and State of Ohio, in the place of George H. Sharpe, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Mary J. Huntington, to be postmaster at Delta, in the county of Fulton and State of Ohio, her commission having expired December 17, 1895.

Mahlon Purdin, to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Jackson and State of Oregon, in the place of James S. Howard, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

James Carnes, to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Mercer and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of James D. Caldwell, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Frank Strang, to be postmaster at Westfield, in the county of Tioga and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of William N. Hurlbut, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Clayton E. Williamson, to be postmaster at Jersey Shore, in the county of Lycoming and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Edward K. Fiester, whose commission will expire December 23, 1895.

Hambleton P. Wilson, to be postmaster at Altoona, in the county of Blair and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Albert P. McDonald, deceased.

Frank L. Hanley, to be postmaster at Olneyville, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island, in the place of James H. Walch, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Joshua Downing, to be postmaster at Brookings, in the county of Brookings and State of South Dakota, in the place of William H. Skinner, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Augustus Huntemer, to be postmaster at Dell Rapids, in the county of Minnehaha and State of South Dakota, in the place of William C. Nisbet, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

John F. Anderson, to be postmaster at Lockhart, in the county of Caldwell and State of Texas, in the place of William Kelly, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Eugene A. Ayers, to be postmaster at Swanton, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont, in the place of George G. Blake, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Charles N. Brady, to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Orleans and State of Vermont, in the place of Thomas C. Gale, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Oscar McGregor, to be postmaster at Richford, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont, in the place of Herbert M. Goff, deceased.

Daniel C. Spaulding, to be postmaster at Morrisville, in the county of Lamoille and State of Vermont, in the place of George F. Earle, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Felix C. Bennett, to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Green and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Robert A. Etter, whose commission will expire January 14, 1896.

Hugh J. Mulholland, to be postmaster at South Kaukauna, in the county of Outagamie and State of Wisconsin, in the place of John Hoberg, resigned.

Edward F. Rakow, to be postmaster at Burlington, in the county of Racine and State of Wisconsin, in the place of William A. Colby, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 20, 1895.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS.

Frank A. Branagan, of Ohio, to be Chief of the Bureau of Accounts in the Department of State of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Randolph H. Miner, late a lieutenant, junior grade, to be a lieutenant.

Maurice B. Peugnet, a graduate of the Naval Academy, to be an assistant engineer.

POSTMASTERS.

Clayton L. Shimer, to be postmaster at Bethlehem, in the county of Northampton and State of Pennsylvania.

James L. White, to be postmaster at Hope, in the State of Arkansas.

John R. Matthews, to be postmaster at Los Angeles, in the State of California.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *December 20, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday last was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under Rule XXIV, clause 2, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a communication from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, with accompanying statements of disbursements for the Indian Department for the year ended June 30, 1895, and of salaries and incidental expenses of each agency; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the ninth annual report of the said Commission, together with appendixes thereto: which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Judge-Advocate-General of the United States Army submitting the draft of a bill to establish criminal jurisdiction over places ceded to the United States for certain purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Attorney-General amending his estimates for support of the United States penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate and recommendation for an additional appropriation for the enlargement, etc., of the United States court-house and post-office at Little Rock, Ark.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of Mary O. Planche against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Chief of Engineers, together with a draft of a proposed act to regulate the use of the public parks and improved reservations in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Public Printer, relating to the reprinting of Senate Document No. 226, first session Fiftieth Congress (Venezuelan boundary); which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

Also, letters from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of Chief of Engineers with examination and survey of the following river and harbor improvements; which were severally referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, namely:

Stonington Harbor, Connecticut; Rockland Harbor, Maine; Rock Island Harbor, Rhode Island.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, joint resolutions of the following titles:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 26) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1895, on the 20th day of said month.

Joint resolution (H. Res. 27) ratifying the use of appropriation for material and miscellaneous expenses for Bureau of Engraving and Printing for fiscal year 1896 for purchase of articles provided for in appropriation for miscellaneous expenses of Treasury Department, and authorizing the continued use of same for remaining portion of fiscal year 1896.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to joint resolution (S. Res. 13) granting the State of Pennsylvania permission to use the United States court-houses at Scranton, Pa., and at Williamsport, Pa.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The bill (H. R. 803) to amend section 2601 of the Revised Statutes, relative to ports of entry, having been duly enrolled, was signed by the Speaker.

UNITED STATES COURTS, IOWA.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2264) fixing the times for holding the circuit and district courts for the northern district of Iowa and for the southern district of Iowa.

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter terms of circuit and district courts of the United States shall be held in the several divisions of the northern district of Iowa as follows:

In the Cedar Rapids division, at Cedar Rapids, on the first Tuesday in April and on the second Tuesday in September.

In the eastern division, at Dubuque, on the fourth Tuesday in April and the first Tuesday in December.

In the western division, at Sioux City, on the fourth Tuesday in May and the first Tuesday in October.

In the central division, at Fort Dodge, on the second Tuesday in June and the second Tuesday in November.

SEC. 2. That hereafter terms of the circuit and district courts of the United States shall be held in the several divisions of the southern district of Iowa as follows:

In the western division, at Council Bluffs, on the second Tuesday in March and the third Tuesday in September.

In the eastern division, at Keokuk, on the second Tuesday in April and the third Tuesday in October.

In the central division, at Des Moines, on the second Tuesday in May and the third Tuesday in November.

SEC. 3. That no action, suit, proceeding, information, indictment, recognizance, bail bond, or other process in any of said courts shall abate or be rendered invalid by reason of the change of time in the holding of the terms of said courts, but the same shall be deemed to be returnable to and pending and triable at the terms provided for in this act.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF. I would like to make a brief statement, Mr. Speaker, before the request for unanimous consent is presented.

This bill simply changes the time of holding the circuit and district courts of the United States in the district of Iowa, and the change is made at the request of both judges and at the request of the members of the bar, so far as they have been consulted. The proposed change has been fully discussed in the State of Iowa by the bar and notices inserted in the newspapers to all parties interested, and all concur in the desirability of the change.

Mr. TERRY. Does this impose any additional expense on the Government?

Mr. UPDEGRAFF. Not a dollar.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to say that I brought this matter to the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], who was a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House, and he is cognizant of the provisions of the bill. It is purely a local matter to our State, changing the terms of the courts. The members of the bar, the judges, and the entire delegation in Congress are united in asking the change.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether the courts are already held at the points which are designated in this bill?

Mr. UPDEGRAFF. At all of them.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Does the bill affect anything except the time of holding the courts?

Mr. UPDEGRAFF. Nothing at all except the time of holding the courts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. UPDEGRAFF, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ROPOSED ELECTION CONTEST, FIRST DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read. It proposes that J. J. McDonald be allowed to contest the right to the seat of W. A. Jones, from the First Congressional district of Virginia, and that he be allowed thirty days from and after the passage of the resolution in which to serve notice of contest.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CRISP. To make the point that I think this resolution should go to the Committee on Elections. All questions relating to the right of a member to his seat and to the election of members should go to the Committee on Elections.

Mr. DALZELL. If the gentleman will permit me, I think there is no objection to its going to the Committee on Elections, but the

gentleman from Michigan [Mr. THOMAS] has a petition that ought to accompany the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Michigan desires it to go to the Committee on Elections.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] that the only objection to the passage of this resolution would be the competency of the reasons why the notice of contest was not given within the specified time, and to accompany the resolution and as a part of my remarks I send up the following statement.

Mr. CRISP. But, Mr. Speaker, I make the point that this should be referred without debate, under the rules, to the Committee on Elections. There are a great many of these cases, as the gentleman from Michigan knows. There are thirty-two cases just like this waiting for reference to the Committees on Elections when they are appointed, and, as I understand it, this is a new case.

Mr. THOMAS. I am perfectly willing that it should go to the Committee on Elections, but I desire to have this sworn petition accompany the resolution and be printed in the RECORD, and if that can be done without reading I will consent to that.

Mr. CRISP. I think, Mr. Speaker, this ought to go to the Committee on Elections under Rule XI.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman any objection to the petition accompanying it to the committee?

Mr. CRISP. I have no objection to his referring anything that he desires to refer, but not to be printed in the RECORD, because that might do injustice to somebody.

Mr. THOMAS. I will not insist upon that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks this ought to go to the Committee on Elections.

ANNUAL REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO MILITARY ACADEMY.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a concurrent resolution of the Senate which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, in paper covers, 6,000 extra copies of the annual report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy at West Point for the year 1895, of which 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. WHEELER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BELLIGERENT RIGHTS OF CUBA.

Mr. SPERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to have read and printed in the RECORD a numerously signed petition from the people of my district, asking that belligerent rights be accorded to the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom, and that the same may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SPERRY] arks to have read a petition which he has described, and that the same be printed in the RECORD. It requires unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that it may seem to be somewhat ungracious to object to this request, but it is establishing a wrong precedent. I notice that in the other branch of Congress some of these documents have been printed in the RECORD, but it is not proper. Only two days ago I noticed in the proceedings of the Senate for one day not less than six petitions and memorials. If they are to keep up that practice I shall not continue to object to it on this side. The rules of the House require that petitions and memorials shall be sent to committees, and they are not printed in the RECORD. It is apparent to all that if the RECORD is given up to these matters its volume will be swelled to an enormous extent, and its value much impaired. I am therefore constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made by the gentleman from Tennessee, and the petition will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, under authority of section 5581 of the Revised Statutes, announces the appointment of the following Regents of the Smithsonian Institution:

Mr. ROBERT R. HITT, of Illinois; Mr. ROBERT ADAMS, jr., of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JOSEPH WHEELER, of Alabama.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Until after the holidays:

To Mr. TRACEWELL, on account of important business.

To Mr. CLARDY, on account of important business.

To Mr. HULING, on account of important business.

To Mr. MILLER, of West Virginia, on account of important business.

To Mr. BULL, on account of important business.

To Mr. DAYTON, on account of important business.

To Mr. HARRISON, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. CLARK of Iowa, until January 3, 1896, on account of important business.

To Mr. HALL, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. KULP, for this day, on account of important business.

To Mr. OTJEN, for this day, on account of important business.

DECEMBER SALARIES OF HOUSE AND SENATE EMPLOYEES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 26) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1895, on the 20th day of said month; when the Speaker signed the same.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess for one hour.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes) the House was declared in recess.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Pending that motion, by unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. HAINER of Nebraska, until after the holidays, on account of important business.

To Mr. CURTIS of Iowa, until after the holidays, on account of important business.

The motion was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 2265) to provide for reimbursement of the expense of constructing a sewer upon the permanent reservation at Hot Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 2266) to amend section 2275 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 2267) for the erection of a public building at Lebanon, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McKENNEY: A bill (H. R. 2268) to provide for constructing a road from the corporate limits of the city of Petersburg, Va., to Poplar Grove National Cemetery, near Petersburg, Va., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 2269) for the construction of a wooden dry dock at the United States navy-yard, Mare Island, California—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2270) appropriating $15,000 for a statue to General Lafayette, to be erected on the battlefield at Brandywine, where Lafayette was wounded—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 2271) to authorize a retired list for enlisted men and appointed petty officers of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 2272) approving certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, authorizing the issue of certain bonds of said Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. NOONAN: A bill (H. R. 2273) to provide for terms of the circuit and district courts of the northern judicial district of the State of Texas, to be held at the city of San Angelo, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 2274) to amend the act of August 27, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 2275) to construct a road from Springfield, Ill., to the national cemetery at Camp Butler, adjacent thereto—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 2276) to amend chapter 932 of the laws of Congress, and entitled "An act in relation to the western judicial district of Wisconsin," approved August 5, 1886—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE WITT: A bill (H. R. 2277) to coin silver and maintain the parity between silver and gold—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 2278) fixing the rates of duty on importations of wool and manufactures of wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEILL: A bill (H. R. 2279) to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by "An act to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States," approved February 26, 1895—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 2280) to open the forest reservations of the State of Colorado for the location of mining claims—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2281) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Leadville, Colo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCORMICK: A bill (H. R. 2282) to provide for telegraphic communication between the United States of America, the Hawaiian Islands, and Japan, and to promote commerce—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. YOAKUM: A bill (H. R. 2283) to create a national currency based upon gold and silver, of approximately equal value—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 2284) to establish postal savings banks, and to encourage small savings—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TARSNEY: A bill (H. R. 2285) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WELLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 2286) to redeem outstanding certificates issued by the board of audit and the board of public works of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 2287) for the erection of a public building at Fond du Lac, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 2288) for the improvement of various rivers and harbors in the State of Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 2289) to amend "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents"—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 2290) to provide for the time and place of holding the terms of the United States circuit and district courts in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 2291) to donate four old cannons and cannon shot to the Soldiers' Home at Orting, Wash.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2292) providing for a naval training station on Puget Sound, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2293) to aid the State of Washington to support a school of mines—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 2294) for the organizing and disciplining of the militia of the several States—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 2295) for the erection of a public building at the city of Alton, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: A bill (H. R. 2296) extending relief to Indian citizens, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 2297) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Deadwood, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 2298) legalizing the assessment and levy of taxes on personal property on the various Indian reservations in Oklahoma, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 2299) to provide for the examination and survey of Core Sound and Cape Lookout Harbor of Refuge, in North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 2300) to incorporate the Supreme Council of the Thirty-third Degree of Scottish Rite Masonry for the Southern jurisdiction of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 2301) to provide for the examination and survey of that branch of the Pasquotank River known as the Turners Cut, in North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 2302) for the erection of an equestrian statue of ex-President Zachary Taylor—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BENNETT: A bill (H. R. 2303) to incorporate the Professional Woman's League—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2304) to amend the act of Congress relating to patents, trade-marks, and copyrights—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HARRIS: A joint resolution (H. Res. 41) to provide for a commission to ascertain the boundary between Canada and the United States in the Northern Lakes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A joint resolution (H. Res. 42) providing for the publication of 75,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A joint resolution (H. Res. 43) to authorize the purchase of the painting by Victor Nehlig representing Pocahontas saving the life of Capt. John Smith—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JENKINS: A joint resolution (H. Res. 44) amending the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A joint resolution (H. Res. 45) to provide for the presentation of medals of honor to the militia and volunteer troops of the several States who volunteered their services for the defense of the States of Maryland and Pennsylvania in the year 1863 prior to and after the battle of Gettysburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLER: A joint resolution (H. Res. 46) providing for the publication of 100,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BINGHAM (by request): A joint resolution (H. Res. 47) recognizing the Republic of Cuba by the United States Government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a resolution calling on the Department of State for copies of all correspondence with Spain in relation to warfare which is and has been taking place in the Island of Cuba between its inhabitants and those of Spain, and for all information of the Department concerning the formation of the Republic of Cuba on September 16 last—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A resolution to authorize the Doorkeeper of the House to appoint two overseers of pages and eight additional session pages, to be paid out of the contingent fund until otherwise provided for—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CANNON of Utah: A resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish certain information in regard to the Uncompahgre Indian Reservation and commissioners appointed relative thereto—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 2305) to correct the military record of Kyrhan Morrissey, of Uniontown, Fayette County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2306) granting a pension to Jonas J. Boal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 2307) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 2308) for the relief of John L. Jeffries, late a captain in the One hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2309) to pension William. H. Fry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 2310) for the relief of Francis M. McKinney and Porter McKinney, of McMinn County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2311) to complete the military record of Daniel Cook, deceased, and for an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 2312) to grant a pension to Daniel Bryant—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2313) to grant a pension to Sarah A. Nelson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2314) to remove charge of desertion from the record of Robert Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2315) for the relief of Fannie Pemberton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2316) for the relief of William Mixon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2317) to increase the pension of Levi T. E. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2318) to grant a pension to William Samuel Marion Hopper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2319) for relief of Elias Cleveland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2320) for the relief of Samuel Burrell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2321) to increase pension of John J. Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2322) to reimburse Jacob J. Tolbert for personal property taken during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2323) to free Elias J. Brown from charge of of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2324) to grant a pension to Ninian Young—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 2325) granting an honorable discharge to William Miers, late of Company F, Ninth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2326) granting a pension to Thomas Holaday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2327) for the relief of John H. Steele—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2328) for the relief of Patrick Rainey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMP: A bill (H. R. 2329) for the relief of Mrs. Matilda G. Higbee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 2330) for the relief of John H. James—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 2331) for the relief of Pay Inspector John H. Stevenson—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2332) for the relief of James H. Cromwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2333) for the relief of J. Floyd Johnston, administrator of John Floyd Johnston, deceased, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 2334) for the relief of B. F. Moody & Co., or their legal representatives—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 2335) for the relief of William Ludgate—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2336) to grant a pension to Theresa Bonnaveau—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 2337) for the relief of the heirs of William T. Hundley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2338) granting a pension to Mrs. Nancy R. Parker, of Parkerville, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2339) granting a pension to Susan M. Finch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to Caroline Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2341) granting a pension to D. W. Mercer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2342) for the relief of John Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2343) for the relief of Miss Lou Jahn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2344) granting a pension to Roeanea McMullen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2345) for the relief of Mattie Munson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2346) granting a pension to Mary A. White, of Cottonwood Falls, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2347) granting a pension to Martin Seiler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2348) granting a pension to Matilda Taylor, of Yates Center, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2349) granting a pension to David Roche—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2350) granting a pension to Joseph W. Dolman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2351) granting a pension to Henry O'Brien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2352) for the relief of Attie Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2353) for the relief of Cora I. Dexter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2354) granting a pension to Robert Jaeschke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2355) granting a pension to Phebe A. Fornum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2356) granting a pension to William Murphy, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWNING: A bill (H. R. 2357) for the relief of William B. Payne—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DANFORD: A bill (H. R. 2358) for the relief of Arminda White, widow of Israel White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 2359) granting a pension to Katherine Zeigenheim, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2360) granting a pension to Mary Ryan, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 2361) to grant an honorable discharge and to remove charge of desertion against the name of Edward P. Kain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2362) for the relief of Miss Eliza A. White—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2363) to grant increase pension to Louis H, Gein, Company F, Fifty-fifth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 2364) for the relief of Joseph H. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2365) to increase the pension of James F. Dickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2366) to increase the pension of John A. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2367) granting an increase of pension to Merrick Y. Buck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2368) to correct the military record of John H. Stearns—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2369) granting a pension to Mrs. Aletha D. Plank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2370) to correct the military record of Sylvester Weaver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2371) to correct the military record of William S. Dewyer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2372) to correct the military record of Hiram A. Benefiel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2373) granting a pension to Elvin Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2374) to correct military record of James Bates—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2375) to pension Patrick W. Halloran—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2376) for the relief of Capt. Robert E. Bryant—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2377) granting a pension to John E. Kirkham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2378) for the relief of Elizabeth A. Bamford—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2379) to increase the pension of John Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2380) for the relief of Frederick Hutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2381) for the purpose of correcting the military record of Jonas M. Blankenship, alias Charles M. Smith, Company K, Third Kentucky Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2382) to correct the military record of Elijah Watts, Company K, One hundred and twenty-eighth Indiana Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2383) to correct the military record of the War Department relating to one Charles Condon, Company A, Sixty-ninth Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2384) to restore Keziah Howard to the pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 2385) granting increase of pension to John P. Bambush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 2386) to correct the military record of John W. Canary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 2387) for the relief of Benjamin Peter Bailey, treasurer of the Missouri State lunatic asylum—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 2388) for the relief of William R. Wheaton and Charles H. Chamberlain, of California—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of the widow and minor children of John W. Geering, of Vallejo, Cal.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 2390) granting a pension to Mrs. Marietta Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 2391) for the relief of Sarah A. Moler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2392) for the relief of Ruth Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2393) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry Beason, late private of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2394) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Board, late a member of the Twenty-fourth Independent Battery Ohio Light Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2395) granting a pension to Benjamin F.

Young, late private of Company G, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2396) granting a pension to Isaac Holbrook, late private in Company G, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 2397) for the relief of George P. Prentiss and Maggie H. Stephens—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2398) for relief of M. G. Gilbert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2399) for the relief of S. R. Lowry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2400) for the relief of Nathan Joiner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2401) for the relief of W. H. Vaughn—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 2402) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 2403) granting a pension to Jackson Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2404) for the relief of Frederick W. Baker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2405) granting a pension to Maria Gibbons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2406) granting a pension to Frederick Bottjer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2407) granting a pension to Jesse L. Bartoo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2408) granting a pension to John W. Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 2409) granting a pension to Harriet E. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 2410) to amend an act increasing the pension of Marcus D. Box—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEIGHTY: A bill (H. R. 2411) to pension Amanda F. Walter—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2412) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against George Alcott on rolls of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2413) for the relief of Eli Rinehart, of Angola, Steuben County, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2414) granting a pension to Emily E. Dennison, of Peabody, Whitley County, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 2415) granting a pension to Nora McLain, mother of Alexander McLain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McDEARMON: A bill (H. R. 2416) for the relief of Joseph B. Somerville—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2417) for the relief of A. W. Stephenson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2418) for the relief of J. M. Sanders, of Gibson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2419) for the relief of John E. Lewis, of Crockett County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 2420) for the relief of Nathaniel G. Sanford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2421) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Arlington, Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: A bill (H. R. 2422) to relieve Isaac G. Biglow of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 2423) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Cameron, alias Samuel C. Cole—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 2424) granting a pension to Harriet F. Herrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 2425) granting a pension to Edmund P. Tierney—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2426) granting a pension to Carrie F. Anderson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2427) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the cases of Edward N. Fish and others for supplies furnished the Indian service—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2428) for the relief of William J. Bryan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2429) for the relief of S. P. Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2430) for the relief of Lucy A. Steinberger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2431) for the relief of A. Carson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2432) for the relief of James M. Cornelison—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2433) for the relief of G. W. Rogers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2434) for the relief of B. Dudley Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 2435) appropriating $2,500 to pay for the destruction of a brick church, corner of Fifth avenue and East Second street, Rome, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2436) for the relief of James W. Hill, of Gordon County, Ga.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2437) for the relief of C. M. Hall, of Walker County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2438) for relief of estate of Charles Coulter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2439) to pension Allen Philpot—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2440) for the relief of the heirs at law of W. L. Barnes, of Cobb County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2441) for the relief of James B. Bone, of Chulio, Floyd County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2442) for the relief of James M. Lowry, of Floyd County, Ga.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2443) for the relief of Elisha Lowry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2444) for the relief of Pleasant Grove Church, Catoosa County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2445) for the relief of J. S. McLain, of Whitfield County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2446) for the relief of William B. Quinn, of Whitfield County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2447) for the relief of the estate of Martin Fraliex, deceased, late of Walker County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2448) for the relief of George W. Hendricks, administrator of John Weitinger, deceased, late of Bartow County, Ga., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2449) for the relief of Joel Cross, of Dade County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2450) for the relief of the First Baptist Church of Cartersville, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 2451) to correct the records of the War Department in the case of Capt. Henry S. Pratt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 2452) for the relief of William T. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2453) for the relief of George Cobrun—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2454) for the relief of Allen Maze—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 2455) for the relief of William Johnson, administrator of Thomas I. Johnson, deceased, of Fayette County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2456) for relief of W. B. Pannell, of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2457) for the relief of the Little Rock and Memphis Railroad Company—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROYSE: A bill (H. R. 2458) for the relief of Nathan C. Welch, of Company F, Sixty-sixth Regiment Ohio Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2459) for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2460) for the relief of Daniel Morrissey, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2461) to appoint Commodore Edward E. Potter, United States Navy, now on the retired list, to the rank and pay of rear-admiral, retired—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 2462) granting increase of pension to James H. Showalter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 2463) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Michael F. Newell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 2464) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of John Hanna, deceased, late of Company K, First Maryland Cavalry, also known as Morehead's Cavalry, Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHUFORD: A bill (H. R. 2465) restoring Capt. E. W. Ward to active service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 2466) for the relief of John Carney—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 2467) for the relief of O. F. Adams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2468) for the relief of the Primitive Baptist Church at Newport, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2469) for the relief of the Methodist Church of Morehead City, at Morehead City, Carteret County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2470) for the relief of William E. Bond—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHANNON: A bill (H. R. 2471) for the relief of the sufferers by the capture and destruction of the Hawaiian whaling vessel *Harvest*—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2472) for the relief of the legal representatives or assigns of E. D. Morgan & Co., and other persons—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 2473) for the relief of M. D. Crow—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2474) granting an increase of pension to Samantha Barnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2475) for the relief of Mrs. Emma D. Larsh—to the Committee on Claims,

Also, a bill (H. R. 2476) granting a pension to George W. Eveleth—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2477) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Sexton—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2478) for the relief of Charles M. Larsh—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2479) for the relief of the First Colorado Mounted Militia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRACY: A bill (H. R. 2480) for the relief of David C. Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 2481) for the relief of James Healy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2482) for the relief of Thomas J. Kelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WELLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 2483) for the relief of Mrs. Mary B. Hulings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 2484) to place Francis W. Seeley on the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2485) to refer the claim of Hamlin Caldwell to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2486) to increase the pension of Phebe Sibley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2487) for the relief of the heirs of William Farmer and Jeremiah Farmer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2488) for the relief of the trustees of the Primitive Baptist Church of Huntsville, Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2489) for the relief of William Moseley, jr., administrator of the estate of Mrs. Temperance Moseley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2490) for the relief of Rice A. Coffey, administrator of A. J. Peacock, of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2491) for the relief of the estate of F. O. Darly, of Vermilion Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2492) for the relief of Samuel Green, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2493) for the relief of Matthew N. Grimmett, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2494) for the relief of Daniel Hindman, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2495) for the relief of James A. Heard, of Florence, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2496) for the relief of the estate of James L. Holland, deceased, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2497) for the relief of John Jones, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2498) for the relief of John R. Jones, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2499) for the relief of the estate of Mills Jenkins, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2500) for the relief of Zachariah Jones, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2501) for the relief of Julius B. Litten, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2502) for the relief of the estate of Alexander Johnson, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2503) for the relief of Jane W. Locke—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2504) for the relief of the Masonic lodge of Tuscumbia, Colbert County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2505) for the relief of Robert S. McGaha, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2506) for the relief of Robert S. Norris, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2507) to refer the claim against the United States of Mahala H. Portlock to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2508) for the relief of William S. Webb, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2509) for the relief of Dr. Green P. McAfee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2510) for the relief of Samuel Washington, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2511) for the relief of the estate of William P. Tanner, deceased, late of Limestone County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2512) for the relief of Emily Sharp, widow of Joseph Sharp, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2513) for the relief of the estate of John T. Yeatman, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2514) for the relief of Cassa Simpson, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2515) for the relief of the estate of Haywood Peeden—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2516) for the relief of Mary N. Westmoreland, of Obion County, Tenn., formerly of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2517) for the relief of W. H. Rice, of Florence, Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2518) for the relief of Mrs. Levina Wesson, widow of John Wesson, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2519) for the relief of A. A. Greenhow, of Limestone County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2520) for the relief of R. B. Hausserd, administrator of William R. Hausserd, deceased, late of Elkton, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2521) for relief of Thomas H. Streeter, of Leighton, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2522) for relief of the estate of Daniel J. Ray, deceased, late of Rogersville, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2523) for the relief of Robert H. Cook, heir of Robert Cook, deceased, late of Spring Valley, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2524) for the relief of David H. Walker, of Spring Valley, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2525) for the relief of J. E. Wright, of Colbert County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2526) for relief of Ann E. Steenson, heir of Arthur J. Turner, deceased, late of Colbert County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2527) for the relief of Mrs. M. E. Hall, administratrix of John W. Hall, deceased, late of Lawrence County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2528) for the relief of Mollie Hurley, heir of William D. Hurley, deceased, late of Lawrence County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2529) for the relief of William C. Williams, of Center Store, Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2530) for the relief of Juley A. Gargis, of Lawrence County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2531) for the relief of R. H. Bledsoe, of Riverton, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2532) for relief of Mrs. Clara Word, of Florence, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2533) for relief of George Howell, executor of George W. Howell, deceased, late of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2534) for relief of heirs of John Moore, deceased, late of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2535) for relief of H. J. Burns, heir of Robert Wilkinson, deceased, late of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2536) for the relief of Eleuder Harvey, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2537) for the relief of the estate of Vincent Armistead, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2538) for the relief of Ebenezer Cunningham, of Cherokee County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2539) for relief of estate of Thornton Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2540) for the relief of William R. Beckham, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2541) for the relief of Thomas Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2542) for the relief of Giles W. Bass—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2543) for the relief of Susan K. Bennett (formerly Phipps), of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2544) for the relief of William Baugh, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2545) for the relief of John R. Caldwell, of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2546) for the relief of the La Grange College, of Colbert County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2547) for the relief of John C. Carpenter, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2548) for the relief of Walter O. Carpenter, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2549) for the relief of the estate of Marius B. Cawthon, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2550) for the relief of William A. Watkins, of St. Florian, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolutions of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia relating to the tariff—to the Committee on Mauufactures.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of citizens of Missouri, praying for an honorable discharge for William Miers, late private, Company F, Ninth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Patrick Rainey, late of Company K, Fifty-second Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition to remove the charge of desertion against Greer Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition to remove the charge of desertion against John D. Culp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Resolution of Board of Trade of Whitcom, State of Washington, relative to cultivation of flax fiber in certain counties in said State—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Resolutions by the Commandery of Iowa, Military Order of the Loyal Legion, favoring the establishment of a national military park at Vicksburg, Miss.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: Petition of H. L. Africa, James Pritchard, Erne D. Mock, A. C. Reefsnyder, E. E. Kendig, J. L. Barchus, Alex. N. Hast, and 950 other citizens of Blair, Cambria, Bedford, and Somerset counties, of the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of a law (the William A. Stone bill of the Fifty-third Congress) restricting foreign immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Alma Lodge, No. 523, I. O. O. F., of Johnstown, Pa., praying for passage of House bill granting relief to Odd Fellows' Hall Association of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIEFER: Resolution passed by the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., requesting Congress to grant the people of Cuba belligerent rights—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of Marcus D. Box, of Davis County, Iowa, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: Petition and affidavit of Edmund P. Tierney, in support of his application for a pension by special act of Congress—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGH: Petition of sundry citizens of the town of Russell, Greenup County, Ky., for relief concerning an alleged interference with the channel of the Ohio River by furnaces on the Ohio shore, near said point—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition asking for an act to reclassify the railway mail clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petition of Connecticut general assembly for investigation of the case of Dorence Atwater—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition to reclassify and prescribe salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of citizens of New Haven, Conn., asking Congress to take such action as shall result in the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition for a pension for John A. Hipkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNE: Petition of F. W. Johnson, John Ojanpera, August Flood, and 365 others, of Wright County, Minn., praying that Congress take no action to restore the greenbacks, and against any legislation giving banks greater privileges than they now enjoy, and for the coinage of silver bullion now in the Treasury—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of James J. McDonald to the House of Representatives of the United States, praying that he be admitted as a contestant for the seat now held by W. A. JONES, First district of Virginia—to the Committee on Elections.

By Mr. WATSON of Indiana: Resolution adopted by Buffalo Tribe, No. 109, Improved Order of Red Men, indorsing the President's message on the Venezuelan matter—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of C. McDonald, executor, of Madison County, State of Alabama, praying that the Committee on War Claims refer his claim, together with all papers and proofs relating thereto which were submitted to the Southern Claims Commission, to the Court of Claims under act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *December 21, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CONGRATULATION OF BRAZILIAN SENATE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from the Secretary of State; which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, December 21, 1895.*

SIR: The Brazilian minister at this capital, acting under instructions of his Government, informs me that on yesterday both houses of Congress of the United States of Brazil passed unanimously a motion of congratulation on the subject of the message of President Cleveland of the 17th instant, and that the Federal Senate of Brazil asks that its motion be transmitted through the usual diplomatic channel to the Senate of the United States of America.

I have, therefore, to ask that the motion of the Federal Senate of Brazil, which is in the terms following: "The Federal Senate of the United States of Brazil sends its greeting to the Senate of the United States of America upon the worthy message of President Cleveland, who so strenuously guards the dignity, the sovereignty, and the freedom of the American nations," be laid before the Senate.

Very respectfully, RICHARD OLNEY.

Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
Vice-President of the United States, United States Senate.

REPORT OF THE COLUMBIA RAILWAY COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Columbia Railway Company of Washington, D. C., for the fiscal year ended June 28, 1895, together with an abstract of receipts and disbursements of the corporation from its organization, September 1, 1871, to March 1, 1895; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at the fifteenth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE presented the petition of Benjamin J. Berry, president of the Massachusetts Ship Canal Company, praying that reasonable aid be afforded by the Government in the construction of a ship canal from Massachusetts Bay to Nantucket Sound, across Cape Cod, at Bass River, Massachusetts; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of 374 legal voters and citizens of Lancaster County, S. C., remonstrating against the abridgment of the rights of citizenship in the State of South Carolina; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PASCO presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Eufaula, Ala., and a petition of the Board of Trade of Apalachicola, Fla., praying that an appropriation of $300,000 be made for improving and deepening the harbor of Apalachicola, Fla.; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of citizens of Pueblo, Colo., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a communication from the secretary of the board of directors of the Merchants' Exchange of St.

Louis, Mo., stating that at a meeting of the Merchants' Exchange, held on the 17th instant, it was declared to be the sentiment of the members that Congress should grant belligerent rights to the people of Cuba now struggling for their independence. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

PROF. S. H. WOODBRIDGE.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am directed by the Committee on Rules to report a resolution, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas on March 2, 1895, it was resolved by the Senate "that the Committee on Rules be directed to report at the next session of Congress whether any improvement can be made in the ventilation of the Senate Chamber;" and

Whereas in carrying out the provisions of said resolution the said committee caused to be employed Prof. S. H. Woodbridge, of the Boston Institute of Technology, to make a thorough investigation of the Senate wing of the Capitol and report to them a plan for the improvement of the ventilation of the Senate Chamber; and

Whereas the said Woodbridge has made said investigation and report to the said Committee on Rules: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay said S. H. Woodbridge, out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, the sum of $1,022.27, being for the expenses incurred by the said Woodbridge in making said investigation and preparing said report thereon, and for his services; said payment to be made upon voucher to be approved by the Committee on Rules and the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Kentucky that the resolution must, under the rule, go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I beg to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the resolution provides expressly that the payment shall be made upon voucher to be approved by both the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Contingent Expenses, so that the resolution, if agreed to by the Senate, will not take effect until it has gone through the hands of both the Committee on Rules and the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky for the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

PUBLICATION OF THE MESSAGES OF THE PRESIDENTS.

Mr. GORMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution authorizing the Public Printer to employ clerical aid in copying the messages of the Presidents of the United States from the Journals of the Senate, etc., for the printing thereof, to report it with an amendment; and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Printing was, in line 8, after the word "therefor," to insert "not to exceed $600;" so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Public Printer be, and is hereby, authorized to employ such clerical aid as he may find necessary in the copying, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, of the messages of the Presidents of the United States from the Journals of the Senate and House and the Executive Journals for the printing thereof, and that the expense therefor, not to exceed $600, be paid out of the appropriation for public printing and binding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 1140) to permit the Home Telephone Company of Washington, D. C., to install, maintain, and operate a telephone and telegraph plant and exchange in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1141) for the relief of Catherine Burns, of Annapolis, Md.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 1142) for the relief of James C. McCartney, of Gardiner, Mont.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1143) to provide for the location and purchase of public lands for reservoir sites, and granting right of way for water ditches and irrigating canals over public lands in the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona and the States of Montana, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Utah, and Colorado; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 1144) granting a pension to Miss Virginia Howland; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1145) granting a pension to Mrs. Emma L. Kimble; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1146) granting an increase of pension to William Emerson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 1147) for the establishment of a bureau of animal industry for the inspection of meat products and live stock, suppression and extirpation of contagious and infectious diseases among cattle and live stock, to regulate the transportation of cattle and live stock, and prevent the exportation or importation of diseased cattle, live stock, or other animals, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 1148) granting a pension to Celesthia A. Whitney; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1149) granting a pension to Sophia J. Chilcott; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1150) granting a pension to Lucinda S. Twombly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1151) providing for the construction and equipment of a steam revenue cutter for service on the Great Lakes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1152) for the relief of Henry H. Wheeler, of Crook County, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1153) for the development and encouragement of silk, flax, and ramie culture, and their preparation and manufacture in the United States under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1154) for the relief of the sufferers by the capture and destruction of the Hawaiian whaling vessel *Harvest;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1155) for the relief of Lieut. Jerome E. Morse, of the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1156) for the relief of Charles Gallagher, and to refer his claims to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1157) granting a pension to Maria L. Carbee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 1158) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of all claims for the use and occupation of church, college, and school buildings for Government purposes by the United States military authorities, and the value of any such building destroyed during such occupation by the United States, and all claims for repairs to any such buildings and the furniture of same rendered necessary by such occupation by the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HALE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 32) authorizing and directing the acceptance of the ram *Katahdin*, thereby making said ram a part of the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SEACOAST DEFENSES.

Mr. SQUIRE. In the early part of the session I introduced a bill (S. 334) to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses, and made a brief explanation of it at the time. Since that bill was introduced there have been some changes in the condition of affairs and in the public mind, and I wish to introduce to-day another bill, or rather the same bill with an emergency clause included, not changing any of the language of the original bill as it was drafted except to put in at the end of the first section the words "the whole or any part of this appropriation to be immediately available if so ordered by the President," and in the second section, after the words "as follows," to insert the words "unless otherwise ordered by the President." This bill ought to be considered in the Committee on Coast Defenses at an early date, and I hope that our friends on the other side will consent to the prompt organization of that committee. I conceive that the condition of public affairs is such that extraordinary powers should be vested in the President to provide for public defense in case of emergency. If the emergency does not occur, then we shall simply pursue the work deliberately, as provided for in the bill. I am advised that we are all ready with our plans for defense and all that is needed is money to press forward with energy. This bill is not the result of any sudden outburst of patriotic feeling. It is a well-matured measure, proceeding upon systematic lines to carry out a great public purpose.

The bill (S. 1159) to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses was read the first time by its title.

Mr. SQUIRE. I ask that the bill be read at the desk as now introduced. It will take but a few moments.

The bill was read the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of providing the fortifications and other defenses recommended by the board appointed by the President under the provisions of an act of Congress entitled "An act making provisions for fortifications and other works of defense and for the armament thereof for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1885, for the ports named in the report of the said board as the ports at which fortifications are most urgently needed, namely, New York, San Francisco, Boston, the lake ports, Hampton Roads, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Washington, Baltimore; Portland, Me.; Rhode Island ports in Narragansett Bay, Key West; Charleston, S. C.; Mobile, New London, Savannah, Galveston; Portland, Oreg.; Pensacola, Fla.; Wilmington, N. C.; San Diego, Cal.; Portsmouth, N. H.; defenses of Cumberland Sound at Fort Clinch, defenses of ports of the Kennebec River at Fort Popham; New Bedford, Mass.; defenses of ports on the Penobscot River, Maine; at Fort Knox and New Haven, Conn., and further for the defense of Puget Sound, and of such other ports as in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War may require permanent works of fortification, there be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $87,000,000, the whole or any part of the appropriation to be immediately available if so ordered by the President.

SEC. 2. That said appropriation shall be available only as follows unless otherwise ordered by the President: For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, $1,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, $5,500,000; and for each fiscal year thereafter for the period of ten years, $8,000,000; all of said appropriation to be available until expended.

SEC. 3. That said sum shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and under existing laws for the purpose of providing fortifications and other defenses for the ports aforesaid and the armament thereof and the purchase of sites for the said fortifications, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of said board, with such modifications as are made in the more extended study of the individual projects, as approved from time to time by the Secretary of War, until Congress shall otherwise provide, and shall be apportioned among the said ports in accordance with the consolidated estimate of the cost of said defenses in so far as may be most economical and expedient; and the work shall be, as near as may be, commenced at the same time at each of the said ports, and shall proceed as rapidly as said annual appropriations will admit of, excepting at the lake ports, where fortifications shall not be begun until in the judgment of the President work there shall be necessary and expedient: *Provided*, That should any material change in the total estimates for the defenses herein provided for be made necessary, a full and complete statement of such changes and the reasons therefor shall be laid before Congress for its action: *Provided further*, That no part of the money herein appropriated applicable for the defensive works at a port shall be expended for fortifications at that port until the Secretary of War shall have caused the survey necessary to select a proper site to be made and a detailed project to be prepared for that port, not to exceed in cost the sum apportioned to that port included in the total amount herein appropriated for said fortifications and shall have approved the same.

SEC. 4. The proportion of the above sums to be expended in each year by the Chief of Engineers of the Army on fortifications and procurement of sites therefor, who is charged by law with the performance of these duties, and the proportion to be expended by the Chief of Ordnance of the Army on the armament of the fortifications, who is charged by law with the performance of this duty, shall be determined by the Secretary of War at the beginning of each fiscal year, and said sums shall be expended in strict conformity with existing laws and regulations.

VICE-CONSULS AT ERZERUM AND HARPOOT.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to inform the Senate whether the exequaturs of the American vice-consuls duly appointed to the consulates of Erzerum and Harpoot have been withheld or refused by the Turkish Government, while exequaturs were granted to the consuls of other nations at the same points.

COAST-DEFENSE ESTIMATES.

Mr. PROCTOR. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to inform the Senate what amount of money can be advantageously used for the purpose of coast defense prior to July 1, 1897, and what portion of said amount should be made available during the present fiscal year; also an estimate of what portion of the amount would be required for sites for fortifications, and how much for engineering, and how much for ordnance work, and whether the requisite number of heavy guns can be supplied from the Government shops, and if not, whether the deficiency can be manufactured by private plants in this country.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GORMAN. Let the resolution go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

COINAGE OF SILVER BULLION.

Mr. VEST. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed, in pursuance of the existing law vesting in him full power so to do, to coin as rapidly as possible the silver bullion in the Treasury purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into standard dollars, and with such dollars to redeem, cancel, and retire the Treasury notes of the United States of July 14, 1890, issued in the purchase of such bullion, and also to redeem the United States notes commonly called "greenbacks" in standard silver dollars as well as in gold, using whichever may be most abundant or convenient.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PLATT. Let it go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. COCKRELL subsequently said: I should like to inquire what became of the resolution of my colleague?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. It went over under objection.

Mr. COCKRELL. Was it objected to?

Mr. PLATT. I objected to it.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am very much astonished that such a plain proposition as that was objected to.

PAYMENT OF COIN OBLIGATIONS.

Mr. BUTLER. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas it was the purpose of Congress to keep gold and silver coin at a parity by investing the Secretary of the Treasury with the discretion of paying the coin obligations of the Government as they mature in either metal: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed when liquidating either the interest or principal of the Government's coin obligations to make such payment in gold coin whenever the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold is less than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, and to continue to pay in such gold coin until the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be equal to the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, but when the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be greater than the market value of 412½ grains of pure silver he shall pay said coin obligations as they mature in silver coin, and continue to pay the same in silver coin until the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver shall be equal to the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PLATT. That is too important a resolution to be considered immediately upon its introduction.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to its consideration?

Mr. PLATT. There is.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection, and the resolution will go over under the rule.

CORPORATE INFLUENCE IN POLITICAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. CALL. If the order of morning business is concluded, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution which I offered relating to the appointment of a select committee, and which is now upon the Calendar.

Mr. FAULKNER. I was requested by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] to state that he is necessarily absent from the Senate to-day, and if the Senator from Florida should desire to call up this resolution to request him to postpone it until his return, which will be on Monday.

Mr. CALL. I desire to have the resolution taken up. I see no reason why it should be delayed on account of the absence of the Senator from New Jersey, whose views are well known upon the subject. He is opposed to the resolution, and has already submitted his observations to the Senate. I should like to have a vote upon my motion.

Mr. HALE. I wish to state for the information of the Senate that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], before leaving yesterday, told me that he had been called away by a matter that was imperative, and he hoped this resolution, in which he takes a great interest and which he opposes, would not be called up during his absence. Under the circumstances, if the Senator from Florida will not on that suggestion defer his motion, I hope the Senate will vote it down.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I desire to inquire whether the motion by which the resolution was committed to the Committee on Privileges and Elections has been reconsidered?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is the pending question, the Chair is advised.

Mr. FAULKNER. I will state to the Senator from Oregon that when the matter went to the Calendar the pending question was upon my motion to refer the resolution and all the amendments to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida to proceed to the consideration of the resolution indicated by him.

Mr. CALL. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SHERMAN. I expect, as a matter of course, to vote for the resolution of the Senator from Florida when we take it up at an opportune time, but in the face of the declaration of a Senator who is absent and feels an interest in the question, I do not think it is right for the Senator from Florida to press it. I hope, therefore, he will let it go over until the Senator from New Jersey returns.

Mr. CALL. I will withdraw the motion, in view of the objection made by Senators.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Florida is withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2264) fixing the times for holding the circuit and dis-

trict courts of the northern district of Iowa and of the southern district of Iowa; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the printing of 6,000 extra copies of the annual report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy at West Point for the year 1895.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 2173) making an appropriation for the expenses of a commission to investigate and report on the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 13) granting the State of Pennsylvania permission to use the United States court-house at Scranton, Pa., and at Williamsport, Pa.

CONGRESSIONAL FUNERALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Calendar under Rule VIII is in order. The first bill on the Calendar will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during the sessions of Congress.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask the Chair whether that bill is not the unfinished business and if it does not come up regularly at 2 o'clock?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is also the first business on the Calendar of General Orders.

Mr. FAULKNER. As the unfinished business it is to come up at a particular hour; and under the rules it can not properly, after having been fixed as the unfinished business, be taken up now. Otherwise it would certainly take Senators by surprise. It can not be laid before the Senate at this time under a proper construction of the rule.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. It is the unfinished business?

Mr. FAULKNER. It is the unfinished business.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Then it does not come up until 2 o'clock.

Mr. FAULKNER. It ought not to be taken up until the hour when the unfinished business is properly in order.

Mr. PEFFER. I think the Senator from West Virginia is right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next bill on the Calendar will be called.

WILLIAM B. MATCHETT.

The bill (S. 480) granting a pension to William B. Matchett was announced as next in order on the Calendar, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William B. Matchett, chaplain of the Tenth Regiment of New York Volunteers, at the rate of $20 per month.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report in that case be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. PEFFER December 10, 1895, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 480) granting a pension to William B. Matchett, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to report as follows:

This case was examined by your committee during the last session of Congress and its passage recommended. The bill passed the Senate, but was not reached in the House of Representatives.

We adopt our former report, which is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 907, Fifty-third Congress, third session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2696) granting a pension to William B. Matchett, have examined the same, and report:

The petitioner says in his petition that he was enrolled as chaplain of the Tenth Regiment New York Volunteers (McChesney's Zouaves) in April, 1861, after having helped to raise the regiment, and his commission was dated May 15, 1861. That after a time spent at Sandy Hook, New York Harbor, he went with the regiment to Fortress Monroe, Va., and encamped at Hampton on the "Roads" for a few months, and was then ordered to the Fortress, which the regiment garrisoned about eleven months. There being no chaplain at the post, the petitioner occupied the pulpit of the church where the general command attended, first under Gen. B. F. Butler and Colonel Dimick (of the Regular Army), then General Wool, and subsequently under General Mansfield, all now deceased. That while at Camp Hamilton the command was visited by terrific rain and wind storms from Hampton Roads, so that the tents were carried away in the night, the camp flooded with water, and the exposure brought on malarial fever from which he did not recover for several months. The petitioner had a fall, which placed him in the fort hospital, under Surgeon-General Cuyle, for several weeks.

After partial recovery he was called to New York to bury Lieutenant-Colonel Elder, and the funeral occurring in the most inclement weather, he was continually wet to the skin, being on horseback. That with the exposure consequent he was again attacked with malarial fever, followed by chronic diarrhea, and from injuries sustained during the seven days' fight before Richmond and the scant supply of food. He was then taken to General McClellan's headquarters and attended by Surgeon McClelland for several weeks, in June and July, 1862, and by the hospital reports it is clearly shown was treated for chronic diarrhea at Trinity General Hospital, at Washington, D. C., under charge and care of J. W. Hatch, M. D.

Before his entire recovery from this, in April, 1863, and while still suffering from weakness incident to several previous attacks, and while in Washington attending to business in connection with the regiment, the petitioner was arrested illegally, and by some authority not disclosed was immured in the Old Capitol Prison, and could not learn the cause and could not get the charges, and was held there in close confinement for two months, in May and June, 1863, in hot weather, in a small back room with a southern exposure, with guards stationed at the premises with orders to shoot prisoners appearing at the windows, one of whom was shot. He was called in to see the prisoners with a surgeon to counsel the sick and go out to the cemetery to bury the dead as chaplain. Under the strain and anxiety to get at the bottom of the persecution, and prison fare, his system gave way and he became emaciated and demented, and not until General Martindale, whom he had assisted at the battle of Hanover, Va., and Judge A. D. Olin, and Hon. William S. Holman, of Indiana, who demanded his release from the prison, which the War Department granted and sent him to his home, which action he understood was based from evidence of the keeper of the prison, though his own recollection of it is faint, and he did not recognize his own family, and could not walk for weeks.

General Martindale visited his cell and saw for himself and acted. He has not been a well man since, and has not been able to do stated ministerial or pastoral work regularly, nor to resume editorial duties, which he did up to the breaking out of the war, owning and editing the New York (city) Baptist Watchman. He is now unable to perform labor of any kind, and is in very needy circumstances.

He has suffered repeated attacks during these years, which would be brought on by overexertion of body or the brain, and has fallen insensible, and scarcely now recovered from one of those attacks, his life being at times despaired of on account of nervous prostration and partial paralysis. There were two acts of Congress in his behalf, both relating to regulating the time when his service expired.

Your committee also submit copies of the action of the Thirty-eighth Congress, by certain joint resolutions to be found on page 589 of United States Statutes at Large, volume 15, of the first session Thirty-eighth Congress, entitled Joint resolutions Nos. 44 and 52:

"No. 44. *Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Paymaster-General of the United States be authorized and directed to adjust and pay to W. B. Matchett the amount due him as chaplain of the Tenth Regiment of New York Volunteers from the time up to which he was last paid to the time said regiment was mustered out of service.

"Approved June 20, 1864.

"No. 52. *Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc.*, That the above-entitled joint resolution shall be construed to adjust and direct the Paymaster-General of the United States to adjust the account of W. B. Matchett, chaplain of the Tenth Regiment of New York Volunteers, and pay him the amount of the pay and allowances of a chaplain for and during the period that said regiment was in the service of the United States and up to the time the same was mustered out of service, deducting the amount heretofore paid him as such chaplain.

"Approved June 28, 1864."

Your committee having examined carefully all the evidence referred to herein in connection with this case, and which seems to fully justify the basis of this report, which papers are also submitted herewith, recommend the passage of the bill with an amendment, as follows:

Strike out the word "twenty," in line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifteen."

We again recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas if the rate specified in this bill is the usual rate allowed to chaplains?

Mr. PEFFER. So I understand, in such cases.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF PENSION MONEY.

The bill (S. 242) to require payment of pension money to wives in cases where male pensioners desert or abandon their families, or are habitual drunkards, or for any reason fail and neglect to support their families, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes that in all cases where male pensioners desert or abandon their families, or where they are addicted to habitual drunkenness, or where, for any reason or cause, they do not use their pension money for the support of their families and do not support them, and when they have no other sufficient means of support, the Commissioner of Pensions, on such facts being made to appear by competent testimony and on application of the wife of any such pensioner, shall pay the money due him from time to time to his wife so long as such conditions of failure or neglect to support continue.

Mr. HAWLEY. I ask the Senator from Kansas whether this is one of the bills favorably reported by the Committee on Pensions in the last Congress?

Mr. PEFFER. It is; I will say to the Senator it was favorably reported.

Mr. HAWLEY. The committee had agreed to rereport immediately such bills as the Senate passed at the last session, and this passed at the last session.

Mr. PEFFER. The bill passed the Senate at the last session.

Mr. PLATT. I understand that there are amendments proposed to this bill according to the report of the committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. The report refers to the bill of the last session.

Mr. PLATT. But this bill which is reported by the committee needs the amendments which are suggested in the report.

Mr. COCKRELL. This bill, as I understand, is a bill amended in accordance with the report made at the last session.

Mr. PEFFER. And passed the Senate in the form it is now presented. The House of Representatives did not reach it.

Mr. PLATT. Perhaps so, but I find on December 10—I may be entirely mistaken about this, but I want to be clear—that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] reported without amendment

Senate bill 242. I find also in the Senate report of last session a letter from Mr. Lochren, the Commissioner of Pensions——

Mr. COCKRELL. Referring to Senate bill 1175.

Mr. PLATT. One moment. Allow me to state, and then the Senator will understand.

The very first suggestion made by the Senate report of last year is that in lines 5 and 6 the words "or where, for any reason or cause, such pensioners" be stricken out, and the word "and" inserted. Those very words which it was proposed should be stricken out are in this bill. The next recommendation of the report was, in line 11, after the word, "pensioner" to insert "she being a woman of good character." Those words are not inserted in this bill. The changes proposed by the report of last year have not been made. If Senators will examine the bill they will see I am correct about it.

Mr. PEFFER. In order that we may understand this fully I suggest that the bill be passed over temporarily without losing its place.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator will allow me, I wish to protest against a provision which would place all the soldiers of the Union Army now receiving pensions under the care or surveillance of anybody. Pensioners may sometimes have unfortunate domestic relations; they may sometimes drink too much; but we do not put men under subjection or surveillance because they drink too much or because they disagree with their wives. This would subject every pensioner on the pension rolls to that kind of surveillance by a civil officer which would be exceedingly offensive. Therefore I shall oppose the bill whenever it comes up.

Mr. PEFFER. Let it be temporarily passed over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over without losing its place on the Calendar.

ANNIE M. GREENE.

The bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Annie M. Greene, dependent and invalid daughter of Jeremiah Greene, late a private in Company A, First Regiment New Hampshire Artillery Volunteers, at $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES H. OSGOOD.

The bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James H. Osgood, late a seaman on the U. S. S. *Circassian*, and pay him a pension of $50 per month, in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JULIA A. HILL.

The bill (S. 141) granting a pension to Julia A. Hill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Julia A. Hill, widow of Charles W. Hill, late colonel of the One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Infantry Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. STEWART. Is the message of the President of the United States which was received last evening still on the table?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is on the table. No disposition has been made of it.

Mr. STEWART. Is it in order to make comments upon it at this time?

Mr. HAWLEY. I wish to appeal to the Senator from Nevada. We have come so near to doing some real good here this morning that I wish he would wait for fifteen or twenty minutes. The two last pension bills on the Calendar I am especially interested in.

Mr. STEWART. I will yield for the consideration of pension bills, and then I shall take the floor.

SAMUEL GOLDWATER.

The bill (S. 404) granting a pension to Samuel Goldwater was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll, at $15 per month, the name of Samuel Goldwater, late of Company A, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, National Guard.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTIONS AND BILL PASSED OVER.

Mr. HAWLEY. I suggest that the next three items of business on the Calendar be passed over without prejudice to their position, as they will inevitably involve debate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The resolutions and bill referred to are as follows:

A resolution submitted by Mr. STEWART, December 12, 1895, that the Committee on Finance be directed to inquire what effect the difference of exchange between gold-standard countries and silver-standard countries has upon the agricultural and manufacturing industries of the United States, etc.;

A resolution submitted by Mr. CALL, December 17, 1895, providing for the investigation of organized efforts of corporations to control the election of members of Congress; and

A bill (S. 238) to prohibit officers of the Government from refusing to pay moneys appropriated by act of Congress.

MARY A. HALL.

The bill (S. 344) granting a pension to Mary A. Hall, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary A. Hall, widow of Charles J. Hall, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment of Connecticut Volunteers, and to allow her a pension of $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATHERINE R. JARDINE.

The bill (S. 345) granting a pension to Catherine R. Jardine, widow of Brig. Gen. Edward Jardine, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COCKRELL. Was there not an amendment reported to that bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There was an amendment reported by the Committee on Pensions, which will be stated.

The amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, in line 7, after the words "rate of," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Catherine R. Jardine, widow of Edward Jardine, late brigadier-general of the Army of the United States, and pay her at the rate of $50 a month.

Mr. HAWLEY. I was very sorry to have such an amendment made to a bill to pension the widow of General Jardine by the Committee on Pensions at the last session. I preferred to have it stay at $100 a month, but it was put down to $50 because that was supposed to be the most we could get from the then existing House of Representatives. We think we might get a little more from the present House.

The history of this case is extraordinary, and I shall not undertake to give it here. It is all shown in the report upon the bill. General Jardine was one of the officers who jumped in in an emergency to the help of the United States troops against that fearful mob at the time of the draft riots in New York City in 1863. In the course of his very brilliant and daring behavior on that occasion he was wounded by a slug made from a piece of gas pipe, fired from a musket, the charge going through his knee and thigh. The good woman referred to here was his tender nurse for many years, and it is a wonder that her prolonged and faithful ministrations did not kill her also. General Jardine was kept in an office in the New York custom-house, I am proud to say, though he was not able to do a full day's work always, and sometimes had to lie abed for a whole week in agony. I want his widow to have $100 a month, and as the bill stands at $50 I move to strike out "fifty" and put in "one hundred," as we originally intended.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let me make a suggestion to the Senator. I think the members of the Committee on Pensions will agree with me that nearly every widow of a brigadier-general has been pensioned at $50 a month, and if the pension in this case is raised to $100 a month it will mean that they must all be raised. I think it had better stand at the amount which has been agreed upon as the amount that will be given the widows of brigadier-generals. It is very hard, it is very difficult and ungrateful to make discriminations and distinctions, and give one widow $100 a month and another $50 a month. I know of two or three cases from Missouri where I shall have to insist, if this increase is made, that the same increase shall be made, and they are cases where $100 was the amount originally proposed by the Committee on Pensions. If I am not mistaken, the rule of the Committee on Pensions has been for years past to allow only $50 a month.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAWLEY. What is the amendment reported by the committee?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. To strike out "$100" and insert "$50."

Mr. HAWLEY. I thought that change had been made. Therefore I moved to make it "$100." I have no objection to an increase to $100 in any case that approaches this in merit, any case of such extraordinary injuries and such prolongation of agony from the middle of the war until a year or so ago. If any other widow of a brigadier-general or a colonel——

Mr. COCKRELL. This is not to pay General Jardine for the physical sufferings that he endured.

Mr. HAWLEY. I know that.

Mr. COCKRELL. But it is to pay the widow of a brigadier-general. That is all there is about it.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is to pay the widow of Ed. Jardine $100 a

month; I do not care what his rank was for this purpose, but he was a brigadier. I oppose my own committee's amendment, but am willing to take $50 a month if we can not get $100.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Pensions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. CULLOM. On the 3d day of December I introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 12) to enforce the Monroe doctrine, and I at that time asked that it be laid upon the table to enable the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] to make remarks upon it, as he indicated his intention to do. I believe he is now determined not to speak upon the joint resolution, and even if he wished to do so the subject has passed out of the Senate for the time being. I therefore move that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

COURTS IN IOWA.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the bill from the other House relating to Iowa courts may be laid before the Senate at this time.

The bill (H. R. 2264) fixing the times for holding the circuit court and district courts of the northern district of Iowa and of the southern district of Iowa was read twice by its title.

Mr. ALLISON. This is a bill which relates wholly to fixing the dates for holding the several courts in Iowa. I called the attention of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to its provisions, and for reasons which he stated to me it is not practicable to have a meeting of the committee within the next few days, and yet it is important that this bill shall pass before the 1st of January. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that it may be now considered.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GEAR. I introduced yesterday a similar bill, identical in its terms with the bill which has just been passed. I suggest that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from its consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee will be discharged from the consideration of Senate bill 1110, and it will be postponed indefinitely.

THE FINANCIAL CONDITION.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, yesterday the President's patriotic course was commended and indorsed not only by the two Houses of Congress, but by the American people. The loyal people of the United States were resolved and are resolved to stand by the President in his patriotic vindication of the Monroe doctrine, in which is involved the safety of the Republic.

I regret, and I suppose all patriotic citizens must regret, that the President, immediately after that grand indorsement, placed himself on a lower level. Why this was done is not explained by words in the message which he sent to Congress, but it is coincident with proceedings on the other side of the Atlantic which were of such a threatening character that they appear to have diverted him from his grand purpose. The meeting in banking houses, the financial war made upon American securities, the threat to destroy American credit, reached to the White House, and the President has yielded before it.

What does he command us to do? To carry out the recommendations of his annual message. What are those recommendations? Five hundred million dollars of gold bonds and five hundred million dollars less money with which to pay them by the destruction of the greenbacks.

He says:

If, in this particular instance, our predicament is at all influenced by a recent insistence upon the position we should occupy in our relation to certain questions concerning our foreign policy, this furnishes a signal and impressive warning that even the patriotic sentiment of our people is not an adequate substitute for a sound financial policy.

Of course there can be no doubt in any thoughtful mind as to the complete solvency of our nation, nor can there be any just apprehension that the American people will be satisfied with less than an honest payment of our public obligations in the recognized money of the world.

What is the recognized money of the world? There is no recognized money of the world. The world does not issue money. The only recognized money is the money of nations, and the money of one nation is not money in another. The recognized money of the world is a myth! Our duty is to pay our obligations according to contract. Our highest duty is to pay our obligations in the recognized money of the law and the contract. But the suggestion that we now destroy greenbacks and issue gold bonds comes too late. It is obsolete.

If the President means what he says in his patriotic message to Congress, he means that if the demands of the United States are resisted specie payment will be suspended and that the United States will exercise its inherent constitutional right and power to clothe any material that may be necessary with the monopoly of paying debts and taxes, and with that kind of money to defy the world. It should be remembered that no great war has ever been fought with gold; that gold is a coward. The suggestion, while these difficulties are pending, that we will rely on England to borrow her gold in order to vindicate the Monroe doctrine is absurd. It can not be done. We need go no further back than modern history to show that our national existence and our national safety depend upon the power to create money and not to borrow it.

What would have become of Great Britain in the time of the Napoleonic wars if she had not exercised the power to make the Bank of England notes legal tender for twenty-two years and suspended specie payment, during which time she prospered more than in any other period in her history? What would have become of us in the Revolution if we had relied on borrowing money of England or anybody else; if we had talked about the world's money? What would have happened to us in the war of the sections if we could not have issued the greenback? It is true that the greenback was dishonored by us in part, because it was not receivable for all debts, for all Government dues. But in case England will not comply with our demand, the United States has no resource to defend itself except by the exercise of the sovereign power to issue money and to clothe it with the functions of paying debts and taxes.

The experiment has been tried too frequently to doubt its efficacy. There never was a time from 1803 to 1861 when there was not paper out, either of the Government or United States bank notes, which was received for all Government dues, and in no instance was that paper below par. Greenbacks did not go below par until they were crippled and degraded by refusing to receive them for Government dues. We have an example now. The best money we have in circulation is the silver certificate, redeemable in silver dollars, and the silver in a silver dollar is worth only 50 cents. Nobody asks the redemption of these certificates. They have the function of paying debts and taxes, and therefore they are good money, the best money. If the President attempts to resist English aggressions with English money he will fail. It is our duty to stand by the President, to uphold his hands, and point him to the American people for assistance. He should withdraw his attention from the other side of the Atlantic.

We knew very well that if the United States attempted to assert her rights as against England, British financiers would make financial war. We expected it; it has come. The President should not yield to it. We must hold up his hands in this emergency and get him to understand that there is power enough in 70,000,000 people and resources enough in this country to cope with all the world, and that we have also the power, which has been frequently exercised and should always be exercised in great emergencies, to create money good at home. There is nothing necessary in the way of materials of war that can not be created here and paid for with American money. If that be not so, we are already whipped; but it is so. I tell you that the American people are behind the President in his patriotic declaration that America will no longer submit to insult or aggression from any foreign power, particularly Great Britain. He has the American people behind him. Why should he fear a bombardment from Wall street? Why should he call upon us to rescue him from that enemy? We knew that that enemy would attack him. We expected it. The last clause of his message indicates that he is panic-stricken, so to speak. Just listen to what he says. He needs support; he needs the assistance of a brave Congress. Here is the language of his message:

I ask at the hands of the Congress such prompt aid as it alone has the power to give to prevent, in a time of fear and apprehension, any sacrifice of the people's interests and the public funds or the impairment of our public credit in an effort by Executive action to relieve the dangers of the present emergency.

He tells us that his apprehensions are such that he wants Congress to come to the rescue, lest, by Executive action, he should increase the dangers in the present emergency. What does he contemplate? I hope and I believe that he does not contemplate a submission to the demands of Great Britain. I hope he does not contemplate a submission to the demands of Wall street or Lombard street. I hope he does not contemplate another bond issue to placate the enemies of this country. I hope the fears which he says he has are not such as to prevent him from executing the law. It is plain. All he has to do in order to save the credit of the country is to pay the Government obligations according to contract. If he has not gold, the law says he may pay silver. Let him announce that he will do that, and there will be no more

raids on the Treasury. We owe no gold obligation. Every obligation of this Government is payable in silver, except the gold certificates, and there is enough gold in the Treasury to meet them. There need be no apprehension.

I hope the President does not distrust himself and fear that he will plunge the country into greater distress by reason of the action of the money powers. It is true that they have praised him because he was their friend, but they have deserted him now because he has become the friend of the American people. He must have known that if he chose to be the friend of the American people and to declare in favor of defending American rights, those men were the enemies of this country and would make war upon us. Let them go on with their financial war. We can meet it now better than at any other time. We have a just cause and a brave declaration by the President. I am glad that Congress is not going to adjourn and that it will stay here to sustain the President in his Venezuelan message, and tell him that he need not fear. The American people are behind him; Congress is behind him, and let the Wall street speculators and gold gamblers do their worst. They will do it anyhow. Let them know that the Government of the United States is in favor of the people of the United States and is not for the gold gamblers of Europe. When that declaration is made the President will be out of danger. He is now out of danger of flattery from the crowned heads of Europe, which has been his besetting danger ever since he has been President. Since he is out of danger of flattery, let us put him out of danger of threats. They can not hurt him as long as he stands and acts for the American people as he did in his bold declaration of principles which was discussed yesterday.

The President knew when he made his bold assertion in favor of the rights of the American people against British aggressions that he was burning every bridge between him and the money powers—that loyalty to 70,000,000 people would be regarded as treason in Wall and Lombard streets. He could not if he would desert the people and join the bondholders, money changers, and gold gamblers of New York and London. Such a desertion would expose him to the scorn and indignation of an outraged people. Hereafter, whatever may occur, the space between him and the enemies of the Republic is illumined by the calcium light of his patriotic message, and any attempt on his part to retreat or desert will be seen by all. It can not be concealed. He can not hereafter cooperate with gold gamblers without having it known of all men, and nobody believes that the President is bold enough, if such was his purpose (which God forbid), to desert the American people in this crisis and take refuge in Rothschild's army of avarice.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I regret very much that the President has seen fit to send his last financial message to Congress at this time. He must know, as the country does, that Congress is not going to retire the greenbacks, nor are they going to give him authority to issue gold bonds.

I see in the New York Sun of this morning the statement of ex-Governor Flower, in which he says:

> Congress will, in my opinion, pass a resolution in accordance with President Cleveland's request, and, if necessary, give him authority to issue $500,000,000 in short-time bonds.

President Cleveland must know, and Congress certainly does, that no such authority will be given him, and at this crisis all that the President accomplishes is suddenly to precipitate upon the country a tariff discussion. If anything at all is accomplished by Congress it will be a revision of the tariff on Republican lines, and this the President will veto. Nobody that I know of wants to issue bonds. Nobody to speak of wishes to retire the greenbacks, and it seems to me that it is extremely unfortunate that the President has precipitated this discussion at the present time. He might have put it off, or he should have recommended something that there was some hope of passing.

The Senate, if they are allowed to vote on it, will pass as soon as they can get to it on the next legislative day the resolution submitted this morning by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], declaring that outstanding paper obligations shall be paid in silver as the law directs. The country might just as well understand that. We understand it here. Yet the supporters of the President in this Chamber will probably not let us vote on that proposition. They surely will not until after considerable debate and the consumption of much time. It is utterly, absolutely impossible to legislate financially in accordance with the recommendations of the President, because the Congress is not in favor of it, and no one knows it better than the President. The sooner the people clearly and distinctly understand it the better, it seems to me, it will be for the country.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY.

Mr. FAULKNER. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, December 24, 1895, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 21, 1895.

POSTMASTERS.

John Knewitz, to be postmaster at Williams Bridge, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in the place of Elizabeth Heilman, resigned.

Lizzie C. Yates, to be postmaster at Warrenton, in the county of Fauquier and State of Virginia, in the place of Henry C. Yates, deceased.

Edward E. Miles, to be postmaster at Onancock, in the county of Accomac and State of Virginia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Peter F. Clark, to be postmaster at Aberdeen, in the county of Chehalis and State of Washington, in the place of Amos F. Stevens, whose commission expired October 1, 1894.

Gilbert S. Meem, to be postmaster at Seattle, in the county of King and State of Washington, in the place of Griffith Davies, whose commission expired February 14, 1895.

John Richardson, to be postmaster at Hoquiam, in the county of Chehalis and State of Washington, in the place of Jay D. Dean, removed.

Willis M. Dent, to be postmaster at Montgomery, in the county of Fayette and State of West Virginia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

James H. Edwards, to be postmaster at Weston, in the county of Lewis and State of West Virginia, in the place of Granville M. Chidester, resigned.

Lloyd Reed, to be postmaster at Clarksburg, in the county of Harrison and State of West Virginia, in the place of Lee H. Vance, resigned.

Griffith B. Thomas, to be postmaster at Point Pleasant, in the county of Mason and State of West Virginia, in the place of Frank D. Hoy, resigned.

Michael J. McNamara, to be postmaster at Cudahy, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1895.

Charles Reed, to be postmaster at Menasha, in the county of Winnebago and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Curtis Reed, deceased.

Marvin L. Bishop, to be postmaster at Casper, in the county of Natrona and State of Wyoming, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1895.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 21, 1895.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

John L. Peak, of Missouri, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Switzerland.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

To be assistant surgeons, with the rank of first lieutenant:
Thomas Jellis Kirkpatrick, jr., of Pennsylvania.
John Hamilton Stone, of the District of Columbia.
Irving Wallace Rand, of New Hampshire.
Powell Conrad Fauntleroy, of Virginia.
James Sprigg Wilson, of Maryland.

To be chaplain of the Ninth Regiment of Cavalry.

The Rev. George W. Prioleau, of Ohio.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Medical Department.

Capt. Harry Otis Perley, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon.

Corps of Engineers.

First Lieut. David Du Bose Gaillard, to be captain.
Second Lieut. Spencer Cosby, to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. John Stephen Sewell, to be first lieutenant.

General officers.

Brig. Gen. Wesley Merritt, to be major-general.
Col. Zenas Randall Bliss, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be brigadier-general.

Quartermaster's Department.

To be assistant quartermasters, with rank of captain:
First Lieut. John Theodore French, jr., Fourth Artillery.
First Lieut. James Buchanan Aleshire, First Cavalry.
First Lieut. Isaac William Littell, Tenth Infantry.
First Lieut. Gonzalez Sidney Bingham, Ninth Cavalry.

Pay Department.

Col. Thaddeus Harlan Stanton, assistant paymaster-general, to be paymaster-general.

Corps of Engineers.

Col. William Price Craighill, to be Chief of Engineers.

Ordnance Department.

Second Lieut. Charles Clark Jameson, Fifteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Judge-Advocate-General's Department.

Lieut. Col. Thomas Francis Barr, deputy judge-advocate-general, to be assistant judge-advocate-general.

Maj. George Breckenridge Davis, judge-advocate, to be deputy judge-advocate-general.

Quartermaster's Department.

Lieut. Col. George Henry Weeks, deputy quartermaster-general, to be assistant quartermaster-general.

Maj. Gilbert Cole Smith, quartermaster, to be deputy quartermaster-general.

Capt. John Lincoln Clem, assistant quartermaster, to be quartermaster.

Subsistence Department.

Maj. Samuel Tobey Cushing, commissary of subsistence, to be assistant commissary-general of subsistence.

Capt. Wells Willard, commissary of subsistence, to be commissary of subsistence.

Capt. Henry Granville Sharpe, commissary of subsistence, to be commissary of subsistence.

Medical Department.

Lieut. Col. Dallas Bache, deputy surgeon-general, to be assistant surgeon-general.

Maj. David Lowe Huntington, surgeon, to be deputy surgeon-general.

Maj. William Elkanah Waters, surgeon, to be deputy surgeon-general.

Maj. Justus Morris Brown, surgeon, to be deputy surgeon-general.

Capt. William Cummings Shannon, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon.

Capt. Louis William Crampton, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon.

Capt. Louis Stanislaus Tesson, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon.

Capt. Edwin Fisher Gardner, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon.

Capt. William Henry Corbusier, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon.

Capt. Daniel Mitchell Appel, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon.

Pay Department.

Lieut. Col. George Evan Glenn, deputy paymaster-general, to be assistant paymaster-general.

Maj. Asa Bacon Carey, paymaster, to be deputy paymaster-general.

Corps of Engineers.

Lieut. Col. John Moulder Wilson, to be colonel.
Lieut. Col. John Whitney Barlow, to be colonel.
Lieut. Col. Peter Conover Hains, to be colonel.
Lieut. Col. George Lewis Gillespie, to be colonel.
Lieut. Col. Charles Russell Suter, to be colonel.
Maj. Oswald Herbert Ernst, to be lieutenant-colonel.
Maj. David Porter Heap, to be lieutenant-colonel.
Maj. William Ludlow, to be lieutenant-colonel.
Maj. William Albert Jones, to be lieutenant-colonel.
Maj. Andrew Neaf Damrell, to be lieutenant-colonel.
Capt. Richard Leveridge Hoxie, to be major.
Capt. William Louis Marshall, to be major.
Capt. Joseph Henry Willard, to be major.
Capt. William Herbert Bixby, to be major.
Capt. Eric Bergland, to be major.
First Lieut. William Campbell Langfitt, to be captain.
First Lieut. Henry Ely Waterman, to be captain.
First Lieut. James Clark Sanford, to be captain.
First Lieut. Hiram Martin Chittenden, to be captain.
First Lieut. Cassius Eric Gillette, to be captain.
Second Lieut. William Wright Harts, to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Robert McGregor, to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Edgar Jadwin, to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Charles Keller, to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Herbert Deakyne, to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Charles Summers Bromwell, to be first lieutenant.

Cavalry arm.

Maj. Samuel Marmaduke Whitside, Seventh Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel.

Capt. Henry James Nowlan, Seventh Cavalry, to be major.

First Lieut. Curtis Bushrod Hoppin, regimental quartermaster, Second Cavalry, to be captain.

First Lieut. Loyd Stone McCormick, Seventh Cavalry, to be captain.

First Lieut. Henry Lewis Ripley, regimental quartermaster, Third Cavalry, to be captain.

First Lieut. Jacob Garretson Galbraith, First Cavalry, to be captain.

Second Lieut. Alexander Lucien Dade, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. John Sheridan Winn, Second Cavalry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Solomon Pervis Vestal, Fifth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Charles Aloysius Hedekin, Third Cavalry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Francis John Koester, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. John Daniel Leinbach Hartman, First Cavalry, to be first lieutenant.

POSTMASTERS.

Perce C. Montgomery, to be postmaster at Portersville, in the county of Tulare and State of California.

Joseph Marks, to be postmaster at Oroville, in the county of Butte and State of California.

Mathew J. Byrnes, to be postmaster at Visalia, in the county of Tulare and State of California.

Frank M. Adams, to be postmaster at Forney, in the county of Kaufman and State of Texas.

Webster Wotkyns, to be postmaster at Pasadena, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

William S. Staley, to be postmaster at Selma, in the county of Fresno and State of California.

Willie M. Compton, to be postmaster at Meridian, in the county of Bosque and State of Texas.

Abner L. Board, to be postmaster at Seymour, in the county of Baylor and State of Texas.

Oscar D. Baker, to be postmaster at Uvalde, in the county of Uvalde and State of Texas.

Samuel A. Hill, jr., to be postmaster at Bellville, in the county of Austin and State of Texas.

Joseph E. Green, to be postmaster at Giddings, in the county of Lee and State of Texas.

Goldesbery C. Green, to be postmaster at Mineral Wells, in the county of Palo Pinto and State of Texas.

Thomas M. Matthews, to be postmaster at Athens, in the county of Henderson and State of Texas.

Edmund R. Manning, to be postmaster at Albany, in the county of Shackelford and State of Texas.

Clarence W. McNeil, to be postmaster at Laredo, in the county of Webb and State of Texas.

Ezra M. Tate, to be postmaster at Sulphur Springs, in the county of Hopkins and State of Texas.

Edward E. Solomon, to be postmaster at Baird, in the county of Callahan and State of Texas.

Oscar Y. Rathbun, to be postmaster at Whitewright, in the county of Grayson and State of Texas.

Charles W. Willis, to be postmaster at Big Spring, in the county of Howard and State of Texas.

William G. Williams, to be postmaster at Waxahachie, in the county of Ellis and State of Texas.

Sallie West, to be postmaster at Hillsboro, in the county of Hill and State of Texas.

Joshua Downing, to be postmaster at Brookings, in the county of Brookings and State of South Dakota.

Augustus Huntemer, to be postmaster at Dell Rapids, in the county of Minnehaha and State of South Dakota.

Mahlon Purdin, to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Jackson and State of Oregon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *December 21, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under Rule XXIV, clause 2, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the report of the Columbia Railway Company of Washington, D. C., for the fiscal year ended February 28, 1895, together with an abstract of the company's receipts and disbursements from September 1, 1871, to March 1, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed joint resolutions of the following titles:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 7) providing for the printing of the

Monthly Summary Statement of Imports and Exports of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department.

On December 20, 1895:

A joint resolution (H. Res. 26) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1895, on the 20th day of said month.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 2173) making an appropriation for the expenses of a commission to investigate and report on the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Resolved, etc., That 6,000 extra copies of Senate Document No. 226, first session Fiftieth Congress, relative to the Venezuelan boundary, be printed in paper covers, of which number 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment the concurrent resolution providing for the holiday recess; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the message of the President; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

[For text of message see Senate proceedings of December 20.]

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following Committee on Ways and Means:

Committee on Ways and Means.—Messrs. Dingley, Payne, Dalzell, Hopkins, Grosvenor, Russell of Connecticut, Dolliver, Steele, Johnson of North Dakota, Evans, Tawney, Crisp, McMillin, Turner of Georgia, Tarsney, Wheeler, and McLaurin.

APPOINTMENT OF HOUSE COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair also announces the appointment of the following committees, which the Clerk will read:

Committee on Elections No. 1.—Messrs. Daniels, Royse, Cooke of Illinois, Leonard, Moody, Linney, Dinsmore, Bartlett of Georgia, and Turner of Virginia.

Committee on Elections No. 2.—Messrs. Johnson of Indiana, Strode of Nebraska, Prince, Tayler, Miller of West Virginia, Long, Harrison, Maguire, and Kyle.

Committee on Elections No. 3.—Messrs. McCall of Massachusetts, Thomas, Jenkins, Walker of Virginia, Overstreet, Codding, Bell of Texas, De Armond, and Jones.

Committee on Appropriations.—Messrs. Cannon of Illinois, Bingham, Grout, Northway, William A. Stone, Arnold of Rhode Island, Hainer of Nebraska, Blue, Pitney, Hemenway, McCall of Tennessee, Sayers, Dockery, Livingston, Robertson of Louisiana, Layton, and Bartlett of New York.

Committee on the Judiciary.—Messrs. Henderson, Ray, Broderick, Updegraff, Gillett of Massachusetts, Strong, Baker of New Hampshire, Connolly, Burton of Missouri, Brown, Lewis, Culberson, Boatner, Washington, Bailey, Terry, and De Armond.

Committee on Banking and Currency.—Messrs. Walker of Massachusetts, Brosius, Johnson of Indiana, Van Voorhis, McCleary of Minnesota, Fowler, Lefever, Spalding, Calderhead, Hill, Cooke of Illinois, Cox, Cobb of Missouri, Cobb of Alabama, Black of Georgia, Newlands, and Cowen.

Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.—Messrs. Charles W. Stone, Hartman, Hunter, Loudenslager, Brewster, Hadley, McClure, Southard, Fairchild, Allen, Bankhead, McRae, Sparkman, Spencer, Clarke of Alabama, and Cannon of Utah.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.—Messrs. Hepburn, Fletcher, Sherman, Wanger, Doolittle, Settle, Aldrich, Joy, Noonan, Corliss, Bennett, Stewart of New Jersey, Price, Patterson, Bartlett of New York, Rusk, and Ellett of Virginia.

Committee on Rivers and Harbors.—Messrs. Hooker, Hermann, Stephenson, Reyburn, Cooper of Wisconsin, Burton of Ohio, Barrett, Reeves, Towne, Dovener, Clark of Missouri, Walker of Virginia, Catchings, Lester, Clarke of Alabama, McCulloch, and Berry.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.—Messrs. Payne, Perkins, Hopkins, Strong, Griswold, McCormick, Simpkins, Minor of Wisconsin, Berry, Robbins, Cooper of Florida, Fitzgerald, and Crowley.

Committee on Agriculture.—Messrs. Wadsworth, Stahle, Warner, Willis, Henry of Connecticut, Sauerhering, Leighty, Baker of Maryland, Wilber, Murphy of Illinois, Snover, Moses, Kem, Williams, Clardy, Stokes, Turner of Virginia, Shuford, and Cannon of Utah.

Committee on Foreign Affairs.—Messrs. Hitt, Draper, Adams, Quigg, Cousins, Taft, Smith of Michigan, Heatwole, Pearson, McCreary of Kentucky, Price, Tucker, Dinsmore, Money, and Newlands.

Committee on Military Affairs.—Messrs. Hull, Curtis of New York, Marsh, Woomer, Griffin, Southwick, Parker, Bishop, Fenton, Tracy, Tarsney, Tyler, McClellan, Washington, Lockhart, and Catron.

Committee on Naval Affairs.—Messrs. Boutelle, Robinson of Pennsylvania, Hulick, Hilborn, Bull, Hanly, Wilson of New York, Foss, Dayton, Cummings, Meyer, Money, Hall, Tate, and Hart.

Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.—Messrs. Loud, Smith of Illinois, Gardner, Linton, Sperry, Settle, Huff, Lorimer, Bromwell, Miller of Kansas, Mahany, Kyle, Swanson, Crain, Ogden, Pendleton, Hall, and Murphy of Arizona.

Committee on the Public Lands.—Messrs. Lacey, Stephenson, Meiklejohn, Bowers, Ellis, Barney, Curtis of Kansas, Wilson of Idaho, Kulp, Shafroth, McRae, Latimer, Downing, Underwood, Jones, and Flynn.

Committee on Indian Affairs.—Messrs. Sherman, Curtis of Kansas, Wilson of Ohio, Meiklejohn, Gamble, Doolittle, Fischer, Eddy, Stewart of Wisconsin, White, Hyde, Watson of Indiana, Allen, Maddox, Pendleton, Little, Owens, and Flynn.

Committee on the Territories.—Messrs. Scranton, Perkins, Lefever, Avery, Harris, Hadley, Knox, Taft, Low, Harrison, Turner of Virginia, Owens, Cooper of Texas, Catron, and Murphy of Arizona.

Committee on Railways and Canals.—Messrs. Chickering, Cook of Wisconsin, Leisenring, Warner, Foote, Lacey, McEwan, Calderhead, McLaurin, Lockhart, McGann, McKenney, and Otey.

Committee on Manufactures.—Messrs. Apsley, Coffin, Halterman, Faris, Crump, Stewart of Wisconsin, Kulp, Beach, Sorg, Meyer, and McKenney.

Committee on Mines and Mining.—Messrs. Aitken, Cousins, Hartman, Leisenring, Mondell, Crump, Graff, Eddy, Hardy, Tate, Cockrell, Neill, Kendall, and Cannon of Utah.

Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.—Messrs. Milliken, Morse, Mercer, Hicks, Hilborn, Kiefer, Gillet of New York, White, Hyde, Henry of Indiana, Bankhead, Abbott, Skinner, Sparkman, and Little.

Committee on the Pacific Railroads.—Messrs. Powers, Hepburn, Wright, Watson of Ohio, Black of New York, Arnold of Pennsylvania, Johnson of California, Hubbard, Faris, Boatner, Kyle, Bell of Texas, Harrison, Patterson, and Sulzer.

Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.—Messrs. Ray, Adams, Arnold of Rhode Island, Cooper of Wisconsin, Milnes, Clark of Missouri, Curtis of Iowa, Hunter, Royse, Allen, McDearmon, Woodard, and Otey.

Committee on Education.—Messrs. Grow, McCall of Massachusetts, Clark of Iowa, McCormick, Henry of Indiana, Barrett, Pugh, De Armond, Bell of Texas, Ogden, Elliott of South Carolina, Lawson, and Shuford.

Committee on Labor.—Messrs. Phillips, Walker of Massachusetts, Apsley, Gardner, McCleary of Minnesota, Lorimer, Low, Sorg, McGann, Erdman, Talbert, and Strowd of North Carolina.

Committee on the Militia.—Messrs. Marsh, Broderick, Burton of Missouri, Spalding, Fenton, Woodman, Miller of West Virginia, Parker, Bartlett of New York, Elliott of South Carolina, Tyler, Shaw, and Yoakum.

Committee on Patents.—Messrs. Draper, Hicks, Sauerhering, Fairchild, Treloar, Sulloway, Cooke of Illinois, Kerr, Tracewell, Hutcheson, Strait, Robbins, and Walsh.

Committee on Invalid Pensions.—Messrs. Pickler, Thomas, Wood, Sulloway, Poole, Kirkpatrick, Kerr, Anderson, Andrews, Crowther, Erdman, Layton, McClellan, Miles, and Baker of Kansas.

Committee on Pensions.—Messrs. Loudenslager, Coffin, Colson, Halterman, Howe, Mozly, Strode of Nebraska, Hardy, Moses, Stallings, Baker of Kansas, Black of Georgia, and Elliott of South Carolina.

Committee on Claims.—Messrs. Brumm, Heiner of Pennsylvania, De Witt, Hanly, Graff, Snover, Watson of Indiana, Minor of Wisconsin, Colson, Cox, Russell of Georgia, Hutcheson, Woodard, Downing, and Denny.

Committee on War Claims.—Messrs. Mahon, Avery, Wilson of Ohio, Hatch, Gibson, Otjen, Hurley, Pugh, Fitzgerald, Cooper of Texas, Neill, Buck, and Lester.

Committee on Private Land Claims.—Messrs. Smith of Illinois, Andrews, Bartholdt, Bishop, Black of New York, Cook of Wisconsin, Hill, Howell, Hager, Jones, McCulloch, Miles, and Owens.

Committee on the District of Columbia.—Messrs. Babcock, Harmer, Curtis of Iowa, Hulick, Shannon, Huling, Odell, Milnes, Wellington, Richardson, Rusk, Cobb of Alabama, Meredith, Abbott, and Cobb of Missouri.

Committee on the Revision of the Laws.—Messrs. Bowers, Huff, Gibson, Harris, Dayton, Southwick, McEwan, Otjen, Linney, Maddox, Bailey, Kendall, and Denny.

Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.—Messrs. Brosius, Sherman, Gillett of Massachusetts, Van Voorhis, Tawney, Pearson, Pitney, McLachlan, Meredith, Miner of New York, Dockery, Lockhart, and Crowley.

Committee on Election of President and Vice-President and Representatives in Congress.—Messrs. Curtis of New York, Baker of New Hampshire, Atwood, Arnold of Pennsylvania, Beach, Raney, McLachlan, Corliss, Tucker, Crain, Lawson, Stallings, and Howard.

Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.—Messrs. Morse, Daniels, Hainer of Nebraska, Kiefer, Burrell, Willis, Livingston, Cooper of Texas, Woodard, and Spencer.

Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.—Messrs. Hermann, Barham, Wilson of Idaho, Shafroth, Mondell, Gamble, Hyde, Hutcheson, Washington, Bartlett of Georgia, and Bell of Colorado.

Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.—Messrs. Bartholdt, Danford, Acheson, Tracewell, Howell, Barney, Mahany, Cowen, Wilson of South Carolina, Hendrick, and Buck.

Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics.—Messrs. Linton, Heiner of Pennsylvania, Atwood, Prince, Skinner, Strait, and Yoakum.

Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.—Messrs. Quigg, Hitt, Smith of Michigan, Pearson, Lester, Miner of New York, and Jones.

Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.—Messrs. Grosvenor, Wadsworth, William A. Stone, Miller of Kansas, Stokes, Terry, and Wheeler.

Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.—Messrs. Grout, Raney, Russell of Connecticut, Loud, Cockrell, Cooper of Florida, and Dinsmore.

Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.—Messrs. Thomas, Stewart of New Jersey, Stahle, Southard, Turner of Virginia, Hendrick, and Wilson of South Carolina.

Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department.—Messrs. Bingham, Griffin, Graff, Sperry, Ogden, Howard, and Robertson of Louisiana.

Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.—Messrs. Curtis of Kansas, Poole, Noonan, Mozly, Sulzer, Williams, and Harrison.

Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.—Messrs. Ellis, Moody, Joy, Fischer, Turner of Georgia, Catchings, and Kem.

Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.—Messrs. Gillet of New York, Foss, Fletcher, Evans, Hall, McDearmon, and Strait.

Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.—Messrs. Settle, Updegraff, Leighty, Knox, Underwood, Talbert, and Sayers.

Committee on Rules.—The Speaker, Messrs. Henderson, Dalzell, Crisp, and McMillin.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Committee on the Library.—Messrs. Harmer, Quigg, and Cummings.

Committee on Printing.—Messrs. Perkins, Chickering, and Richardson.

Committee on Enrolled Bills.—Messrs. Hager, Clark of Iowa, Acheson, Crowther, Russell of Georgia, Latimer, and Clardy.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to have printed and bound all documents for the use of said committee that it may deem necessary in connection with subjects in relation to appropriations being considered, or to be considered, by the said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. CANNON of Illinois, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I also ask present consideration for the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or such of the subcommittees as they may designate, shall have leave to sit during the sessions of the House during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. CANNON of Illinois, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

PRINTING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents, for the use of said committee, as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. DINGLEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING HOUSE SESSION.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask also for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to sit during the session of the House.

The resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. DINGLEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the resolution providing for adjournment over the holidays, in order to move its reference to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication from the Senate, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, the 20th day of December, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, January 3, 1896.

Resolved, That the foregoing concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives be passed with the following amendments:

Line 4, strike out "Friday, the 20th," and insert "Saturday, the 21st."

Lines 7 and 8, strike out "Friday, January 3" and insert "Monday, January 6."

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concurrent resolution, with the Senate amendments, be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The motion was agreed to.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. Clarke, is present and desires to be sworn in. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Hutcheson, is also present and desires to take the oath.

Mr. Clarke and Mr. Hutcheson accordingly appeared at the bar of the House, and the oath of office was administered by the Speaker.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Pending that motion the Chair desires to submit certain requests of members.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BROWN, until December 28, on account of important business.

To Mr. MCCALL of Tennessee, on account of important business.

To Mr. LITTLE, until after the holidays, on account of important business.

To Mr. BURRELL, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. KULP, for this day, on account of important business.

To Mr. WELLINGTON, for two days, on account of a death in his family.

To Mr. LEISENRING, for the holidays, on account of important business.

To Mr. COBB of Missouri, for the holidays, on account of important business.

To Mr. HATCH (on motion of Mr. STEELE), indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The joint resolution (S. R. 13) granting the State of Pennsylvania permission to use the United States court-houses at Scranton, Pa., and at Williamsport, Pa., having been found truly enrolled, was signed by the Speaker.

A bill (H. R. 2173) making an appropriation for the expenses of a commission to investigate and report on the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana, having been found truly enrolled, was also signed by the Speaker.

The motion of Mr. DINGLEY was then agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes) adjourned until Monday next.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 2551) to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCALL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 2552) to consolidate mail matter of the third and fourth classes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 2553) to increase the pension of those who receive $72 per month under act of Congress of June 16, 1880—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 2554) providing for the manner of making application for patent on mineral placer lands where same are located upon surveyed lands of the United States—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2555) providing for proofs of the discovery of mineral on placer mining claims—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2556) to amend the fourth section of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895," approved August 18, 1894—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. COOPER of Florida: A bill (H. R. 2557) to provide for settlement of titles and disposition of public lands in the Arredondo grant in Columbia County, Fla.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 2558) making appropriation for a statue of the late Maj. Gen. John Sedgwick, in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COLSON: A bill (H. R. 2559) for the relief of the Kentucky State Militia and Provisional Kentucky Militia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 2560) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals, and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 2561) to establish a court of appeals for the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 2562) fixing the rates of duty on importations of vegetable ivory buttons—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 2563) to provide for the enrollment and organization of naval reserve forces—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 2564) to amend the judiciary act of August 13, 1888—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 2565) to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 2566) to approve an act of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico entitled "An act to create a county court"—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2567) to enter on the pension roll all officers, noncommissioned officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines awarded medals of honor for gallant and distinguished service under the act of Congress approved March 3, 1863—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLSON: A bill (H. R. 2568) authorizing the construction of a road from the Mills Springs National Cemetery, in Pulaski County, Ky., to the town of Somerset, in said county—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McEWAN: A bill (H. R. 2569) to provide for the erection of a public building at Jersey City, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 2570) to increase the circulation of national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 2571) to prevent the carrying of obscene literature and articles designed for indecent and immoral use from one State or Territory into another State or Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 2572) to limit the redemption of United States notes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2573) to empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to control sleeping cars, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2574) to provide for the payment of certain duties in gold, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CODDING: Joint resolution (H. Res. 48) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver condemned cannon to Watkins Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Towanda, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Joint resolution (H. Res. 49) concerning completion of breakwater and dredging of the Housatonic River in Connecticut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HALL: Joint resolution (H. Res. 50) proposing an amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 2575) for the relief of Chester B. Sweet, of California—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2576) for the relief of A. Berding or A. Berding & Co., of California—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 2577) for the relief of Mary Matilda Flanigan, late widow of Moses Waters, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 2578) to refer the claim of the owners of the brig *Tally-Ho* to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 2579) for the relief of Isaac W. Busey—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 2580) for the relief of the estate of John Deady, deceased, late of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2581) for the relief of O. H. P. Wayne, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2582) for the relief of Martin Van Buren McReynolds, of Warren County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2583) for the relief of Matilda Witt, of Monroe County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2584) for the relief of the estate of Josiah J. Bryan, deceased, late of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2585) for the relief of Joseph Ruohs, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COLSON: A bill (H. R. 2586) for the relief of Mrs. Martha Noe, née Blanton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2587) for the relief of Mrs. Edward Luster, of Cumberland City, Clinton County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2588) for the relief of William Hobbs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2589) for the relief of L. D. Hutchison—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2590) for the relief of Mrs. Mary C. Stokes, of Edmonton, Metcalfe County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2591) for the relief of Mrs. Parmelia Smyth, of Casey County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2592) for the relief of Mrs. Fannie R. Pierce, of Cane Valley, Adair County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2593) for the relief of W. B. Estes, of Rockholds, Whitley County, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CODDING: A bill (H. R. 2594) to remove the charge of desertion against David G. Lamb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 2595) granting a pension to Mary H. Woodward, widow of Commander Edwin T. Woodward, late of the United States Navy, retired—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2596) for the relief of John S. Friend, of Eldorado, State of Kansas—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2597) for the relief of the heirs of the late J. R. Wasson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2598) granting a pension to Ayers Cochran, of Lebo, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2599) for the relief of Mrs. John D. Gibson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2600) to define the status and for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of certain recruits for the Fourteenth Kansas Cavalry Volunteers who were killed at Lawrence, Kans., August 21, 1863, by guerrillas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2601) for the relief of D. E. Kelsey—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 2602) for the relief of Solomon Hyams—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 2603) for the relief of William Stephenson Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 2604) to increase the pension of Caroline A. Hough, widow of Brig. Gen. John Hough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2605) granting pension to Henry V. Andrews, of Fulton County, Ill., a survivor of the Black Hawk war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 2606) for the relief of Capt. Martin Hammer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 2607) to pay to ——— Blue for grain and stock taken from him by United States troops in July, 1864—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 2608) for the relief of James O. Bryant, of Johnson County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2609) removing charge of desertion from John Ward—to the Committee on Miliy Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2610) for the relief of A. H. Sympson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2611) to place on the pension roll the name of Mrs. S. A. Farley, of Newcombe, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2612) for the relief of B. L. Davis, of Johnson County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2613) removing the charge of desertion from the record of John T. Faulkner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 2614) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the cases of Edward N. Fish and others for supplies furnished the Indian service—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: A bill (H. R. 2615) to place William T. Dodge on the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 2616) for the relief of Cornelia De Peyster Black, widow of Henry M. Black, late colonel in the United States Army, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 2617) granting a pension to Nicholas H. Adams—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A bill (H. R. 2618) granting honorable discharge to Andrew V. Sende—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 2619) to correct the record of muster and discharge of Francis A. Kitchen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLER: A bill (H. R. 2620) to place the name of Lauretta S. Prince on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2621) to increase the pension of Jane Webster, widow of Joel Webster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 2622) to increase the pension of William Shelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT: Petition of the Massachusetts Ship Canal Company, asking an appropriation for a ship canal from Massachusetts Bay to Nantucket Sound—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions in favor of uniform hours of labor throughout the United States—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: Petition of California pioneers, in favor of bill granting a pension to Carrie F. Anderson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POOLE: Petition of the Central Association of Congregational Churches in the State of New York, expressing their profound sympathy with the Armenian people—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of William F. Good, Company L, Tenth Indiana Cavalry Volunteers, for pension, to go with his bill for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 23, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION, ETC.

Under Rule XXIV, clause 2, the following executive communication, etc., were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

Letters from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the findings filed by the court in the following-named cases; which were referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed:

Henry Field against The United States.

William McDaniel against The United States.

C. E. Hall, administrator, against The United States.

Lamoureux N. Kennedy, administrator, against The United States.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report on the auditing and adjusting of the claim of the Richmond Locomotive and Machine Works for damages and losses incurred in the construction of the armored battle ship *Texas*, accompanied by certain reports, etc., relating to the case; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A concurrent resolution relative to printing extra copies of Senate Document No. 226, first session Fiftieth Congress, relating to the Venezuela boundary; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MORSE, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. SHUFORD, for ten days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. CULP, until after the holidays, on account of important business.

To Mr. WASHINGTON, for two days, on account of important business.

To Mr. SORG, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. DOCKERY, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

DUTIES ON WOOL, COTTON, ETC.

Mr. DANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to introduce a bill to levy and collect duties on wool, hair, sheep, and cotton. This is substantially the bill of the National Wool Growers' Association. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. This bill will be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means; but the Chair understands that under the rules of the House these bills should ordinarily be handed to the Speaker's clerk.

The bill (H. R. 2623) was read twice, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

BUSINESS OF COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS.

Mr. DANIELS. I have a resolution which I desire to offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That each Committee on Elections shall be authorized to appoint a clerk; also, that each of said committees be authorized and allowed to sit during the sessions of the House; also, that the chairmen of such committees shall have power to divide the contested-election contests as nearly as may be between the several committees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. CRISP. There is no objection to its consideration, but I should like to ask the gentleman from New York a question. Does he not think that in the distribution of cases among these several committees some of the minority members ought to be consulted. The ordinary method has been, there having been only one committee, for the Speaker to refer these cases to the Committee on Elections. But now we have three divisions of the committee; and it is proposed that the assignment of the cases shall be determined by the chairmen of the respective committees. I ask again, does it not occur to the gentleman from New York that some member of the minority of the committee, as well as a member of the majority, should have some voice in determining the reference?

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that this is not like a case where you make the reference, because you do not pass upon the case at all. After referring a case to a committee you have no voice in deciding it. But this proposition is to let three members of the majority who are to decide the cases determine which cases each division of the committee shall take—how the cases shall be distributed up among the different branches of the committee. Now, if the distribution is to be made by the committee or any member of it, ought not some one of the minority to be consulted or have some voice in the matter?

This is a question of considerable substance. I will say with the utmost frankness that one of the contestees—it is not necessary to mention his name in public—objects to having his case come before that committee of which a certain gentleman is chairman. For the reason that he has had in the Committee on Elections heretofore a personal controversy with that gentleman, and that he has been assailed on the floor of the House by that gentleman, he does not believe that if his case should go before the section presided over by that gentleman he will have justice accorded to him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I suggest that in justice to the members of the committee the name of that member should be stated.

Mr. DANIELS. I will say in answer——

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that if there is objection to this part of the proposition of the gentleman from New York, the matter be left where it is by the rules, under which, as the Chair understands (subject to correction), the Speaker would make the selection.

Mr. CRISP. Undoubtedly that is where the selection rests under the rules.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I think that would be, by all odds, the best plan. I want to say——

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, then, to that modification, the question is on the remainder of the resolution.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I understand that this modification eliminates the provision that the chairmen of these committees designate to what division or branch certain cases shall go.

The SPEAKER. It does.

Mr. BAILEY. My understanding is that without any action by the House, the Speaker having referred certain cases to the committee, the chairman of that committee always refers those

cases, as his judgment may direct, to the various subcommittees. Will the resolution of the gentleman from New York vary the present practice?

Mr. DANIELS. There is no objection to leaving out the clause referred to.

Mr. BAILEY. I was trying to ascertain if it would alter the present rule. The Speaker, under the rule as it now stands, would refer these cases to these respective committees as his judgment might dictate, and when the cases have been thus referred the chairman of each committee would subdivide the work, and allot to each of the subcommittees the cases of which it should take charge. That is the present practice, I believe.

Mr. DANIELS. Let that part of the resolution be struck out, and let the rest be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. DINGLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York, before that, if he intends that each of these clerks shall be a per diem clerk, receiving the salary of $6 per day, or is it proposed to make the appointment an annual one?

Mr. DANIELS. I understand from the gentleman from Indiana that these would be per diem clerks, under the practice.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, would be a matter to be determined hereafter. This resolution simply authorizes the appointment of the clerks, and the question of their compensation would be a question for consideration at some future time, and not necessarily now.

Mr. DINGLEY. It might be better to determine it now. If it be desired to have per diem clerks, you can insert in the resolution such language as will accomplish that purpose and provide for their pay.

Mr. BINGHAM. It would have to come up in the nature of a deficiency anyway.

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes, on the deficiency bill. Well, the committee can determine that hereafter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that there is already provision for one clerk for the Committee on Elections. This resolution, the Chair understands, would be a substitute for that.

Mr. DANIELS. That is the idea.

The resolution was adopted.

REFERENCE OF ELECTION CASES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will refer the first nine of the contested-election cases to the first branch of the Committee on Elections; the next eleven to the second committee, and the remainder to the third. In dividing the cases in this way the Chair is governed simply by a desire that the cases from each State shall go to the same committee, inasmuch as the members of such committee would naturally familiarize themselves with the State law.

Mr. CRISP. What does the Chair mean by the "first nine?"

The SPEAKER. That is as the Clerk has designated them. The Chair does not know on what basis the Clerk made that arrangement, but takes it precisely as made up by the Clerk, since it covers the question of the distribution of the cases by States.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me ask, Mr. Speaker, if the reference, as indicated by the Chair, is designed to take them as they appear in the RECORD of the first day's proceedings?

The SPEAKER. So the Chair intended.

COMMITTEE CLERKS.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit at this time for consideration a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Accounts is hereby authorized and directed to designate the committees of the House to which the clerks provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, should be allowed and assigned for the present Congress, and report by resolution to the House for its action thereon.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, before the question is submitted, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois if this resolution is intended to indorse the action of the House taken at the last session of Congress? In other words, when the appropriation bill passed to which reference is made in the resolution there were a certain number of annual clerks taken off, a certain number of committees were deprived of the use of clerks, and certain other committees had clerks assigned to them. Does this allow that arrangement to stand, or does it propose to revise the whole committee list?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not so understand the resolution. It is customary at the beginning of each Congress to introduce a resolution of this character, have it referred to the Committee on Accounts, and let that committee determine which of the various committees of the House are entitled to per diem clerks, or session clerks, as the case may be, under the appropriation bill referred to in the resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. The per diem clerks are appropriated for, I understand, in the aggregate, a lump sum being given for that purpose. The annual clerks are specifically provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not understand that this has anything to do with the annual clerks.

Mr. PICKLER. Then I have no objection to it.

The resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. ALDRICH, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a statement which will be of interest to the members of the House. The concurrent resolution for the holiday recess, which passed the House some time ago, and which was sent to the Senate and returned with an amendment, and then referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, has been considered by that committee, and in view of the message which the President has addressed to the two Houses, and in view of other circumstances, the committee have unanimously determined that it is not appropriate at present that the two Houses of Congress should adjourn until they shall have considered the questions which have been brought to the attention of Congress by the President. In view of the urgency which has been presented, the committee are already entering upon the preparation of a bill or bills to provide a remedy for the situation which has been indicated; and while I am not able at this moment to say at what time the committee will be prepared to report, yet I am prepared to say that the committee will be prepared to report as soon as members who are absent on the supposition that we were to have the usual holiday recess shall have had an opportunity to return, and they hope to be able to present matters for the consideration of the House at the opening of the session on Thursday next. I will say, in justice to members who are absent under the expectation of the holiday recess, that it is appropriate that we should wait until they can have an opportunity to return. Members having this information before them who are being telegraphed to by absent members will see from this that it is exceedingly desirable that all the members of the House should be present in the House at the opening of the session on Thursday next.

I shall ask the House to have a session to-morrow, simply for the purpose of distributing the President's message, when probably an adjournment will be taken until Thursday morning. We hope on Thursday morning to proceed to make some response to the urgent request which the President has made upon Congress to take some action with reference to the condition in which the country now finds itself. This is all I think I desire to say. [Applause.]

LEASE OF PREMISES FOR USE OF FOLDING ROOM.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Accounts desire to submit a report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and is hereby, directed to continue for the use of the folding room of the House the lease of the brick stable owned by the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company, the rent, $100 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House from and after January 1, 1896, and until other provision is made therefor.

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred the accompanying resolution, directing the Doorkeeper of the House to continue for the use of the folding room of the House the lease of the brick stable owned by the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company, the rent, $100 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House from and after January 1, 1896, and until other provision is made therefor, beg to report that after due investigation they respectfully recommend the passage of the same.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to say in connection with that report that the old lease of these premises will expire on the 1st of the coming month, and that the committee have not been able to find space elsewhere to accommodate the large number of publications which are stored in that building. At present there are 400,000 volumes of new matter in that building. There is no room in this building for them. The lease is a low one——

Mr. McMILLIN. We are unable to hear the statement of the gentleman, by reason of the confusion in the House.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. Gentlemen will please take their seats and cease conversation.

Mr. ALDRICH. Now, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the gentleman from Tennessee, I will repeat that the lease of these premises will expire on the 1st of the coming month, and that no other space has been found which could be substituted for that purpose. The committee therefore recommend the adoption of the report, believing that the rent is low and that the room is absolutely necessary for the transaction of the business of the folding room.

Mr. McMILLIN. It is being used for the storage of documents now, I believe, is it not?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; it is.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Before the gentleman sits down, I wish to suggest to him that if I read the newspapers aright the name of that company has been changed to the Capital Traction Company, so that if this resolution is passed with the name of the old company in it it might be void.

Mr. ALDRICH. The point may be a good one, Mr. Speaker; I have no objection to amending the report to conform to the new title of the company.

The SPEAKER. The change will be made, without objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. It can be made by inserting the words "or its successors."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will add the words "or its successors," in the absence of objection.

There was no objection.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ALDRICH, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. COLSON, for five days, on account of important business.

To Mr. COX, for ten days, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. DINGLEY (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes), the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DANFORD: A bill (H. R. 2623) to levy and collect duties on wool, hair, sheep, and cotton—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2624) for the erection of a public building at Marshall, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 2625) to provide for the use and occupation of reservoir sites reserved by the Geological Survey—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2626) for the protection of agricultural staples and American ships in the foreign trade by authorizing the payment of bounties on exports of agricultural products of the United States conditioned on their carriage in American or foreign vessels—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 2627) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fresno, Cal.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2628) to restrict the disposition of public lands to citizens of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2629) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Visalia, in the State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2630) to provide for the erection of a public building at San Diego, Cal.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2631) to extend the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891, to include certain claims presented to the Secretary of State for the State of Nevada—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 2632) to relieve the United States Treasury and to familiarize the people of this country with the advantages of a silver coinage—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2633) to increase the pensions of widows and minor children, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2634) to appropriate the sum of $75,000 to erect a public building at Emporia, Kans.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2635) authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Pensions, upon rejection of a pension claim, to explain fully upon what evidence and for what reason said claim was rejected, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2636) for enlarging the public building at Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 2637) to increase the compensation of fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHUFORD: A bill (H. R. 2638) directing the coinage of the silver bullion held in the Treasury—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 2639) to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs in the military or naval service of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2640) for the relief of telegraph operators during the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2641) to indemnify the State of Pennsylvania for money expended in 1864 for militia called into the military service by the governor under the proclamation of the President of June 15, 1863—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2643) to provide for the appointment of Indian agents—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2644) to amend the law relating to final proofs in timber-culture entries—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2645) to amend the homestead laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2646) to provide revenue for the Government by an increase of the duties upon imported wools and agricultural products—to the Committee on Way and Means.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): A bill (H. R. 2647) relating to the testimony of physicians in the courts of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2648) to license billiard tables, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2649) to provide for continuing the system of trunk sewers in the District of Columbia, for completing the system of sewage disposal and protection against floods, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2650) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," approved March 2, 1893—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2651) to secure uniformity in the names of minor streets of the city of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2652) to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2653) to provide for the appointment of a public administrator in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2654) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish false swearing before trial boards of the Metropolitan police force and fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1892—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2655) to amend sections 720, 721, 722, and 723 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, in relation to marriages—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2656) to provide for the incorporation and regulation of medical colleges in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2657) providing penalties for charter violations by corporations operated in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2658) to provide for a municipal building and court-house in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2659) to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine and surgery in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ABBOTT: A bill (H. R. 2660) to regulate the prices which may be charged by individuals or companies operating a telephone plant and exchange in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2661) to permit the Home Telephone Company of Washington, D. C., to install, maintain, and operate a telephone and telegraph plant and exchange in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 2662) to provide for the adjudication of the claim of the Fond du Lac band of Chippewa Indians, arising upon the failure of certain treaty stipulations—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE (by request): A bill (H. R. 2663) to amend the laws relating to navigation—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2664) concerning sail vessels over 700 tons—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2665) to encourage American shipbuilding—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2666) to encourage American shipping—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2667) to encourage American shipping—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2668) to amend sections 7 and 8 of the act of August 28, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2669) to promote repair work in American shipyards—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2670) to prohibit advances and regulate allotments of wages to seamen—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2671) to abolish imprisonment of seamen in the common jails of the United States for desertion—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2672) concerning tonnage tax—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2673) to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels in the coasting trade—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A joint resolution (H. Res. 51) authorizing and directing the acceptance of the ram *Katahdin*, thereby making said ram a part of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A joint resolution (H. Res. 52) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to contract for projectiles for a reserve supply for the Navy and for auxiliary cruisers—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): A joint resolution (H. Res. 53) to compile and publish the laws relating to street-railway franchises in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHUFORD: A joint resolution (H. Res. 54) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the election of Senators by the qualified voters of the several States when the legislatures thereof shall so provide—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLER: A resolution providing for the employment of three assistant clerks by the Committee on Invalid Pensions—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A resolution to refer claim of Patrick G. Meath to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENDERSON: A resolution relating to the Order of Business—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 2674) for the relief of E. L. Ross—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2675) for the relief of assignees of Augustus Haraszthy, a bankrupt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 2676) for the relief of James Gillice—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2677) for the relief of Charles H. Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2678) for the relief of Thomas Corcoran—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2679) for the relief of Jesse Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2680) for the relief of Jerome Kunkel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2681) granting a pension to Mary A. Watkins, of Quenemo, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 2682) granting a pension to Ralph Whitehead, of Wheeling, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 2683) for the relief of J. D. Golden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 2684) for relief of S. W. Peel, for services rendered the Old Settlers Cherokees—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 2685) to increase the pension of Jeremiah V. Pinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 2686) for the relief of Marion Martin, late second lieutenant Company E, One hundred and seventy-third Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 2687) for the relief of B. J. Van Vleck, administrator of Henry Van Vleck, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 2688) granting a pension to Mrs. Christine Arkkemper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2689) granting a pension to Charlotte Weirer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2690) for the relief of Edward Calahan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEIGHTY: A bill (H. R. 2691) to correct the military record and grant an honorable discharge to Michael F. Dearmitt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 2692) for the relief of William H. Crook—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 2693) granting a pension to Martha A. Cornish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 2694) for the relief of Charles Springer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STAHLE: A bill (H. R. 2695) for the relief of Joseph A. Bomberger, Company C, Twenty-second United States Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLER: A bill (H. R. 2696) for the relief of William W. Crissinger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DALZELL: Memorial of the Trades League of Philadelphia, as to improvement of Delaware River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of Pennsylvania State Millers' Association, in favor of legislation to extend the milling industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, relative to revenue legislation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition to remove the charge of desertion against Adam Borden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of Martha A. Cornish, for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: Memorial of the Poplar Manufacturers' Association of Tennessee, Kentucky, and Ohio, asking Congress to place a tariff on imported lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Three petitions of J. E. Abbott and 50 others, together with J. A. Craig and 51 others and W. C. Pratt and 57 others, to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 24, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 20th instant, a statement showing during each of the last five years and for the whole period the gross amount of the imports from ports of Great Britain and her colonies and dependencies, together with the amount of the exports to such ports; also the number of entries of British vessels into American ports and their gross tonnage; which, with the accompanying statement, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the operations of the Bureau of Animal Industry for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, together with a statement of disbursements from the appropriation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895; which, together with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

RAILROAD TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 20th instant, a report respecting an agreement of common carriers of interstate traffic between the Western States and the Atlantic Seaboard to form a joint traffic association; which was read.

Mr. PEFFER. I rose to ask that the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission be read, but I observe that it is longer than I thought it was. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF SEED.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 12th instant, a statement of expenditures from the appropriation for the "purchase and distribution of valuable seeds," made by the act approved March 2, 1895, and a copy of each "bid or offer made to the said Department to furnish it with seeds, bulbs, cuttings, etc.," in response to its advertisement dated April 27, 1895, or otherwise submitted for its consideration, etc.; which, with the accompanying statement, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CLAIM OF RICHMOND LOCOMOTIVE AND MACHINE WORKS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to the authorization contained in the act making appropriations for the

naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, a report as to the claim of the Richmond Locomotive and Machine Works against the Government for damages and losses sustained by that company; which, with the accompanying report, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

COURT OF CLAIMS REPORT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the court in the claim of A. P. H. Stewart and Charles A. Weed, formerly partners under the firm name of Stewart & Co., *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against hasty action in regard to the Venezuelan question, and praying for arbitration and a peaceful settlement of all international controversies; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Aberdeen, the Board of Trade of the city of Hoquiam, the Business Men's Club of the city of Montesano, the Board of Trade of the city of Cosmopolis, the Merchants' Club of the city of Elma, and the Commercial Club of the city of Ocosta, all of Chehalis County, southwestern Washington, urging the need of improvement at the entrance of Grays Harbor. The memorialists call attention to the facts respecting the tributary country, the present industries, the commerce, and benefits to shipping; also to the great increase in the wealth of the nation that will result from such improvement, and from the harbor of refuge that will be created in the North Pacific Ocean. I move that the memorial be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN presented resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the action of the President in regard to Venezuela; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Bushnell Club of Logan, Ohio, indorsing the action of Congress as to Venezuela and expressing sympathy with Cuba and Hawaii; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Joe Hooker Post, No. 21, Grand Army of the Republic, of Mount Vernon, Ohio, praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALLISON. I present the petition of Rufus L. B. Clarke, a citizen of the United States, praying for the reception and reference to the proper committee for consideration and report of the protest presented by him against his removal as examiner in chief in the Patent Office. I move that the petition, with the accompanying brief, be referred to the Committee on Patents.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Newark, N. J., praying that belligerent rights be granted to the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VEST presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted by the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BRICE presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, expressing to Congress and the President its hearty approval of the steps they are taking to preserve the national dignity and honor in connection with the question of the Venezuelan boundary lines; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Lodge No. 103, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Elyria, Ohio, praying that an appropriation be made to reimburse the Odd Fellows' Hall Association for destruction or loss of personal property at New Orleans, La., during the war of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I present house joint memorial No. 2, adopted at the eighteenth regular biennial session of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, praying for the early construction and control of the Nicaragua Canal by the Government. I ask that the memorial be read and that it lie on the table for the present.

The memorial was read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

[House joint memorial No. 2.]

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the Pacific Coast, and particularly the State of Oregon, would be greatly benefited by the opening up, at the earliest possible date, of the Nicaragua Canal; and

Whereas the people of the United States, and especially of the coast, have shown much interest in the project, realizing the great benefits to be derived therefrom by shortening the route by sea from coast to coast: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, That by the showing made in the above-recited facts, such project should be under the control of the United States of America, and we therefore recommend that the same be constructed by this Government to be operated and owned exclusively by it.

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, as soon as adopted, be presented to our Senator, who is now in Salem, and one each to our Senator and Representatives in Washington.

Adopted by the house January 30, 1895.

CHAS. B. MOORES,
Speaker of the House.

Concurred in by the senate February 12, 1895.

JOSEPH SIMON,
President of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Oregon:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Salem, Oreg., December 16, 1895.

I, H. R. Kincaid, do hereby certify that I am the secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State; that the foregoing transcript of house joint memorial No. 2, adopted at the eighteenth regular biennial session of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, has been by me compared with the original copy of the said house joint memorial No. 2, now on file in this office, and that it is a true and correct transcript thereof, and the whole of said original house joint memorial No. 2.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol, at Salem, Oreg., this 16th day of December, A. D. 1895.

H. R. KINCAID,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented a petition of the legislature of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation reimbursing volunteers who were called to assist the regular soldiers of the United States in the years 1855–56, when war was made upon the white settlers of the Territories of Oregon and Washington, and known locally as the Yakima and Rogue River wars, respectively; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

[House joint memorial No. 6.]

By the house of representatives of the legislative assembly of Oregon, the senate concurring.

To the Congress of the United States:

We, your memorialists, respectfully represent that during the years 1855 and 1856 war was made upon the white settlers of the Territories of Oregon and Washington, which, though known locally as the Yakima and Rogue River wars, respectively, was in fact a collusive effort on the part of the native race to exterminate the American settlers of the North Pacific Coast, during which volunteers were called out to assist the regular soldiers of the United States, and men and property were furnished by the settlers of Oregon and Washington (as found by a commission appointed by act of Thirty-fourth Congress, chapter 129, section 11) to the aggregate amount of $6,011,459.36.

That this sum, found due by the commission, consisting of Gen. Rufus Ingalls, United States Army, Capt. A. J. Smith, United States Army, and L. F. Grover, since governor of Oregon and United States Senator, was scaled down arbitrarily and unjustly by the Third Auditor of the United States Treasury the full difference between the prices of labor and property on the Pacific and Atlantic sides of the continent at that time to the scales of the latter, thus withholding the sum of $3,296,643.81 lawfully and justly due the people of Oregon and Washington for the services rendered and property furnished.

The following is section 4 of an act passed by the Oregon Territorial legislature at its session of 1855-56, fixing the rate of pay for the volunteers called for, showing the local valuation of the service and property:

"SEC. 4. Whenever such volunteers are called and received into the service of the Territory by virtue of this act, each noncommissioned officer and private shall be entitled to receive $2 per day and rations, and $2 per day for the use and risk of his horse and equipments, except for horses actually killed in action, unavoidably lost, or reported unfit for service and turned over to the quartermaster, in which case the owner shall receive the appraised value thereof. And all commissioned officers shall receive the same pay as officers of the same rank in the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That commissioned officers shall receive the same pay for use and risk of horses as noncommissioned officers."

The act of which the above is an extract, contained an emergency clause, and the men who responded to the call were mainly of the patriotic frontier class, to whom the wealth winners of the nation are much indebted. They are now nearing the end of life and only ask at your hands what was found to be justly due and arbitrarily and unjustly withheld.

The men thus served are many of them old and needy and can therefore add necessity to their plea for justice. Moreover, they do not understand why, as soldiers, they are not as well entitled to pensions and land warrants for services rendered and risks incurred as any other soldier of the Republic.

We would also submit that the soldiers who served in the Cayuse war of 1847 and 1848 under the provisional government of Oregon should receive pension on the same basis as the soldiers of the Mexican war.

In the preparation of a bill in accordance with the prayer of this memorial our delegation in Congress is respectively to make provision for the payment of any sum of money that may be awarded by this act direct to each individual for whom it is intended by the issuance in each case of a Treasury warrant payable to the order to each person above named or their assigns, said warrants to be forwarded to the treasurer of the State of Oregon, to be handed to such persons upon satisfactory proof that he or she is the person for whom the said warrant is intended.

Whereas the subject of the foregoing claim is preferred by men widely scattered and are therefore unable to present their claims as individuals in the Court of Claims: Therefore,

Resolved, That our representatives in Congress be forwarded each a copy of this memorial and ask their earnest service in securing the justice herein prayed for.

Adopted by the house January 30, 1895.

CHAS. B. MOORES,
Speaker of the House.

Concurred in by the senate January 31, 1895.

JOSEPH SIMON,
President of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Oregon:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Salem, Oreg., December 16, 1895.

I, H. R. Kincaid, do hereby certify that I am the secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State; that the foregoing transcript of house joint memorial No. 6, adopted at the eighteenth regular biennial session of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, has been by me compared with the original copy of the said house joint memorial No. 6, now on file in this office, and that it is a true and correct transcript thereof, and the whole of said original house joint memorial No. 6.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol, at Salem, Oreg., this 16th day of December, A. D. 1895.

H. R. KINCAID,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I present a memorial of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, urging the Congress of the United States to place purchasers of even sections within the limits of forfeited railroad land grants upon an equality with other purchasers of such lands within the limits of said grants. I ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask the Senator from Oregon if it would not be quite satisfactory to him to allow the memorial to be printed in the RECORD, instead of taking the time to read it?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly; I am entirely satisfied with that course.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, hereby respectfully represent:

Whereas the even sections of public lands within the limits of the Congressional land grants in aid of the construction of railroads were sold by the Government at $2.50 an acre on account of the supposed increase of their value which would be caused by the construction of the roads in aid of which the grants were made; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has forfeited all of the unearned portions of railroad land grants, has fixed the price of the forfeited odd sections at $1.25 an acre, and has reduced the price of the even sections within said grants to $1.25 an acre, and the consideration to purchasers of said even sections for the increase of their price paid by them has failed; and

Whereas simple justice demands that the Government should refund to purchasers of the even sections within the limits of all forfeited land grants who have paid the maximum price of $2.50 an acre $1.25 an acre of such purchase price: Therefore,

Resolved, That your memorialists urge the Congress of the United States to place said purchasers of even sections within the limits of forfeited railroad land grants upon an equality with other purchasers of lands within the limits of said grants and to pass the Dolph bill, which has been favorably reported from the Senate Committee on Public Lands and is now upon the Calendar of the Senate, providing for the repayment to such purchasers of even sections of $1.25 an acre.

Passed by the senate February 2, 1895.

JOSEPH SIMON,
President of the Senate.

Passed by the house February 4, 1895.

CHAS. B. MOORES,
Speaker of the House.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Oregon:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Salem, Oreg., December 16, 1895.

I, H. R. Kincaid, do hereby certify that I am the secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State; that the foregoing transcript of senate joint memorial No. 5, adopted at the eighteenth regular biennial session of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, has been by me compared with the original copy of the said senate joint memorial No. 5, now on file in this office, and that it is a true and correct transcript thereof, and the whole of said original senate joint memorial No. 5.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol, at Salem, Oreg., this 16th day of December, A. D. 1895.

H. R. KINCAID,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented a memorial of the legislature of Oregon, urging the enactment of legislation granting a pension to Mrs. Margaret C. McKay, widow of the late Dr. William C. McKay, of Portland, Oreg.; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Senate joint memorial No. 2.]

Memorial to the Congress of the United States praying for the passage of an act of Congress granting a pension to Mrs. Margaret C. McKay, widow of the late Dr. William C. McKay, of Pendleton, Oreg.:

Whereas Dr. William C. McKay, late of Pendleton, Oreg., was in 1851 instrumental in securing the surrender of the Indian murderers of Dr. Whitman; and

Whereas at the trial of said murderers at Oregon City the Indian chiefs present incited Dr. McKay to establish a trading post in their country, which he did, near the site of the present city of Pendleton, Oregon, and said post became a rendezvous of traders and travelers and was a powerful factor in restraining the restless tribes of the Northwest; and

Whereas in June, 1855, Dr. McKay was secretary in behalf of the United States at the great Wallawalla Council called by Gen. I. I. Stevens, Gen. Joe Palmer, and others, and was instrumental in securing a cession of Indian lands; and

Whereas in the autumn of 1855 the sudden influx of whites into the Indian country brought on a war, in which the Indians singled out Dr. McKay as a fitting object for their revenge and totally destroyed his post and property; and

Whereas Dr. McKay was a prominent scout in the war of 1855-56 and his services were of extraordinary value to the commanding generals, who were unacquainted with Indian methods of warfare; and

Whereas in the fall of 1856 Dr. McKay acted as a guide for the expeditions of Generals Wright and Steptoe, and it was at his suggestion that the site for Fort Wallawalla was selected and a garrison established there; and

Whereas in 1866 the Snakes began to commit depredations, massacreing settlers and cutting off supply trains, and by act of the Oregon legislature Dr. McKay was asked to organize a company of Warm Spring Indian scouts to take the field against the hostile Snakes, which he did, and the Doctor and his company were sworn into the United States service in October, 1866, entering the field in midwinter. In one year's time the Snakes and Pi-Utes sued for peace, openly attributing their defeat to McKay and his scouts. The amount of life and property saved to the whites by the Doctor's heroism in this hazardous campaign is beyond estimate; and

Whereas the Doctor did during his lifetime try to secure compensation for his losses, but unsuccessfully; and

Whereas though of mixed blood, he was always a friend and helper to the whites; and

Whereas Margaret C. McKay, the widow of said William C. McKay, is a cripple in old age and straitened circumstances;

Wherefore, in view of these many and valuable services to early Oregon, *Be it resolved by the senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives concurring)*, That our Representatives and Senators in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to exert their influence to secure the passage by Congress of an act granting a suitable and adequate pension to said Margaret C. McKay, widow of said William C. McKay.

Adopted by the senate January 29, 1895.

JOSEPH SIMON,
President of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house February 8, 1895.

CHAS. B. MOORES,
Speaker of the House.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Oregon:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Salem, Oreg., December 16, 1895.

I, H. R. Kincaid, do hereby certify that I am the secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State; that the foregoing transcript of senate joint memorial No. 2 adopted at the eighteenth regular biennial session of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon has been by me compared with the original copy of the said senate joint memorial No. 2 now on file in this office, and that it is a true and correct transcript thereof, and the whole of said original senate joint memorial No. 2.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol, at Salem, Oreg., this 16th day of December, A. D. 1895.

H. R. KINCAID,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented a memorial of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, praying that Congress reimburse the Port of Portland in the full sum or the amount expended by that port in making certain improvements; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Senate joint memorial No. 1.]

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas by an act of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, filed in the office of the secretary of state February 16, 1891, a corporation known as the Port of Portland was created embracing within its limits certain portions of Multnomah County; and

Whereas the object of the creation of said corporation was to improve the Willamette River at the cities of Portland, East Portland, and Albina (now consolidated and embraced within the city of Portland, Multnomah County, Oreg.) and the Willamette and Columbia rivers between said cities and the sea, so that there should be made and permanently maintained in said Willamette and Columbia rivers from said cities to the sea a ship channel of good and sufficient depth at all points at mean low water; and

Whereas said act incorporating said Port of Portland provides for the issuance of $500,000 in bonds or notes for a certain term of years, said bonds to bear interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, payable semiannually all in United States gold coin; and

Whereas said act gives said corporation the authority to assess and collect taxes on all property within its boundaries which is by law taxable for State and county purposes at a certain specified rate sufficient to pay the interest on said bonds and to provide a sinking fund for the redemption of the same; and

Whereas the said corporation so created was organized and commissioners appointed to exercise the powers conferred upon it; and

Whereas since the creation and organization of said Port of Portland the said corporation has realized $310,000 from the sale of the bonds authorized by said act, which said money has been expended in the improvement of the said Willamette and Columbia rivers under the supervision of the officers of the United States Government and which said sum the said Port of Portland commission is now obligated to pay, and

Whereas $37,729.77 has been paid by said Port of Portland in interest on said bonds; and

Whereas the said sum, to wit, $310,000, has been expended in the improvement of said rivers by dredging and constructing permanent dikes beyond the limits of the said district embraced within the limits of said corporation; and

Whereas the remaining portion of said money has been expended in the necessary improvement of said rivers and the harbors thereof; and

Whereas the money so expended by said corporation inures to the benefit of the State of Oregon and the country at large and the improvements accomplished thereby are of a nature generally and properly undertaken by the General Government: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, That Congress be requested to reimburse the Port of Portland in the full sum of the amount expended by said Port of Portland in making the improvements aforesaid, and in paying interest on the bonds heretofore issued for such purpose, and that provision be made by the General Government for the payment of the interest yet to accrue on said bonds now outstanding.

Be it further resolved, That the Government of the United States assume full charge of the work heretofore completed and now being performed by said Port of Portland, and provide for the maintenance of the same.

Passed by the senate January 26, 1895.

JOSEPH SIMON,
President of the Senate.

Passed by the house January 25, 1895.

CHAS. B. MOORES,
Speaker of the House.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Oregon:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Salem, Oreg., December 16, 1895.

I, H. R. Kincaid, do hereby certify that I am the secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State; that the foregoing transcript of senate joint memorial No. 1 adopted at the eighteenth regular biennial session of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon has been by me compared with the original copy of the said senate joint memorial No. 1, now on file in this office, and that it is a true and correct transcript thereof and the whole of said original senate joint memorial No. 1.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol, at Salem, Oreg., this 16th day of December, A. D. 1895.

H. R. KINCAID,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying that certain lands now included in the Cascade Forest Reservation in that State be released from the effect of the proclamation of the President of September 28, 1893, and that said lands be thrown open to settlement; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a resolution adopted at a stated meeting of the Washington Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States held at Seattle, Wash., on the 20th of November. I ask that this resolution, which is in the form of a memorial to Congress, be read at the desk.

Mr. HARRIS. Is that a memorial of citizens or of a legislative assembly?

Mr. SQUIRE. It is a memorial of the Loyal Legion of the State of Washington, and is very brief.

Mr. HARRIS. I object to its reading.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection.

Mr. SQUIRE. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD, since objection is made to its reading.

Mr. HARRIS. I am constrained to object to it. Memorials and resolutions of legislative assemblies have a right to be either read or ordered printed in the RECORD, but the memorials of private citizens can not be printed in the RECORD or read at the desk except by the unanimous consent of the Senate. I am constrained to object to filling up the RECORD with various memorials.

Mr. SQUIRE. I beg to state that this is not a memorial from private citizens, but it is from an organized body of officers and ex-officers of the Army constituting the Commandery of the Loyal Legion of Washington. In this memorial it is set forth that the Commandery of Washington of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, in recognition of the conspicuous ability and distinguished services to the nation during the late war for the preservation of the Union of Maj. Gen. Nelson A. Miles, now in command of our national armies, and in further recognition of the loyalty and valor displayed by the volunteer forces of the Union cause during that war, of which General Miles was and is an eminent representative, earnestly recommends to the Congress of the United States the revival of the grade of Lieutenant-General of the Army, to continue at least during the present incumbency of the Army commandership.

I think as a matter of respect to that body it should be published in the RECORD in the form in which it is stated by the commandery—but the exact form is not important.

Mr. HARRIS. It is a memorial of a class of citizens, but citizens still. My objection will stand.

Mr. SQUIRE. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. VOORHEES, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (S. 420) for the purchase of the oil portrait of Mrs. Dolly Madison by E. F. Andrews, reported it without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1160) for the purchase of the statue of Salmon P. Chase, late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1161) for the relief of Joseph T. Vincent; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MORRILL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1162) making an appropriation for the purchase of Fairbanks & Co.'s Infallible American gold and silver coin scale and counterfeit-coin detector for use in the post-offices throughout the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1163) for the relief of Charles T. Trowbridge, George D. Walker, and John A. Trowbridge which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1164) granting a pension to Aaron B. Page; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1165) granting a pension to Robert N. Pollock; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1166) for the relief of Dorence Atwater; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. PLATT. I desire to say with reference to the bill, that the legislature of the State of Connecticut passed a resolution asking its Senators to endeavor to secure the passage of such a bill as I have now introduced. I think the resolution was presented by my colleague [Mr. HAWLEY]. If not, I shall present it hereafter, that it may be referred to the committee to accompany the bill. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1167) for the relief of the Berdan Firearms Manufacturing Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1168) for the relief of the heirs of Erskine S. Allin and the United States Regulation Firearms Company, respectively; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1169) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue Springfield rifles to each State and Territory for the National Guard thereof in exchange for other rifles now held; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HAWLEY. Lest even so small a bill should add to the idiotic war scare, I wish to state that this is merely a matter of current business. In some States the National Guard have rifles that are antiquated, that are no longer manufactured, and for which they can not obtain spare parts for repairs. The Government has adopted the Krag-Jorgensen gun, and there is now a large collection of Springfield rifles on hand. The National Guard in some States wish to bring in their old useless Peabodys or other arms and have Springfield rifles issued to them instead. It is a privilege they have tried to get for several years, and the Ordnance Bureau now asks for clear legal authority to grant it.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. And it is to cost the Government nothing?

Mr. HAWLEY. Nothing except the cost of the Springfield rifles, minus the value of the old rifles that are turned in. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1170) for the relief of Morgan Everts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1171) to remove the charge of desertion against Hannibal S. Soule; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 1173) to increase the pension of James McCormick, of Vancouver, State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1174) for the relief of J. A. Towle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 1175) to authorize the Secretary of War to appoint an examining board of medical officers of the United States Army, for the purpose of examining officers upon the retired list who may have made application for restoration to active service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1176) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Oregon and Washington Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Columbia River, between the State of Oregon and the State of Washington, and to establish it as a post road; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1177) to pay S. W. Peel for services rendered "Old Settler" Cherokees; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 1178) conveying to Rafael Seguro, of Iberia Parish, La., the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in said parish of Iberia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

MERCHANT MARINE SERVICE AND NAVAL RESERVE.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 1172) to amend section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to improve the merchant-marine engineer service, and thereby also to increase the efficiency of the Naval Reserve; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. SQUIRE: Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in

reference to the bill before moving that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. President, this bill is in furtherance of justice toward the American merchant marine service. Engineers residing in various parts of the country, some of them, I am informed, in my own State and city, have had the renewal of their licenses to be engineers refused by the local boards under circumstances that savor strongly of rank injustice and favoritism. Thus it would appear that these men have been unjustly deprived of their means of livelihood.

It is one of the objects of this bill to put a stop to this injustice and furthermore to build up a still greater degree of efficiency among these important servants of commerce.

Mr. President, still another most important feature of the bill is to increase the efficiency of our Naval Reserve. When, a few years ago, a bill was passed granting, under certain conditions, a subsidy to American steamers for carrying the mails to foreign countries, there was a stipulation in that bill that these ships should be "officered by American citizens." When this bill was passed I am sure that it was the belief of every Senator that this meant that, in all parts of the ship upon which her movements and her navigation depended, the responsible men in charge—call them what you will—should be American citizens. When the steamers of the American line were accorded the privilege of carrying the American flag, and thus taking advantage of the provisions of the postal subsidy act, the managers of this great line of steamers openly and successfully contended that the provisions regarding citizenship did not apply to the engineers, because, forsooth, in the eyes of the people who control this great line, an engineer was not an "officer;" and so it goes to-day. The ships which we are annually paying a large subsidy for carrying the mails, under the supposition that they are officered by American citizens, actually have only a few real American citizens on board. The rest are foreigners upon whom we could not count in an emergency; men who have no interest in the ships save that which comes from their employment in time of peace. And thus is lost to us the very thing for which we are paying a subsidy—the building up of an American merchant marine and the officering and manning of these ships by truly American citizens, so that in the event of the services of these steamers being required by the Government in case of war with a foreign government, they would be in a condition to at once be pressed into service. As it is now, the ships of the American line are officered in their engine rooms almost entirely by foreigners, and this fact was apparent a few days ago, when the papers gave an account of a sad catastrophe on board the American liner *St. Paul*, where most of the engineers are not citizens of this country.

When this bill comes up for discussion I shall have something more to say on the subject, and shall endeavor to ascertain why it is that we are paying a subsidy to the steamers of this line for an ocean speed which I have heard stated they have never yet maintained in a voyage across the Atlantic—to a line which appears to be American only in name, and which for its own greed has seen fit to cry out to the civilized world that the engineers of their steamships are not "officers," and that therefore they need not be American citizens, a contention as humiliating as it is un-American. If the steamship companies which are getting subsidies from the Government do not consider their engineers officers I want Congress to make them officers in the eyes of the law, so that in case of trouble with any country requiring the services of these steamers to supplement those of the Navy, we shall have them already with their officers and crew as the act contemplated, and not as they now are, officered in their engine rooms by foreigners. Another thing which I want to see enacted into law is that these men shall be bona fide American citizens, and not merely men who have taken out their first papers and who may have no intention of going further in that direction.

I believe that wherever and under whatever circumstances Americans have served, they have acquitted themselves most creditably, and I can not believe that the engine rooms of these big steamers are such mysterious places that the American marine engineer would be a stranger there.

Our American engineers are serving creditably on vessels engaged in Oriental commerce and along the shores of Asia. I claim that they are equal to the Scotch or any other engineers. They get the best pay and perform as good service as any. Our country can depend upon them in its commerce in time of peace, and can depend upon them, if need be, in time of war.

As I said before, I shall have more to say on this subject when the bill is reported from the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. SHERMAN, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of Philip Hawk be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no action having been taken thereon.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask for the adoption of the resolution I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That 600 copies of the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the year 1895, without appendices, be printed for the immediate use of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. It will take probably three or four weeks anyway before the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, with the accompanying documents, can be printed, and this is simply a resolution to provide for printing 600 copies of the report proper.

Mr. PLATT. Does not the new printing act provide for the printing of reports proper, so that they can be laid before the Senate and House? I know we have had great difficulty in getting the reports of heads of Departments here because they were not printed for weeks and sometimes months.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not think there is any such provision.

Mr. PLATT. If that be not the law now, certainly such action ought to be taken not only with reference to this report, but with reference to the reports of other heads of Departments.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. SQUIRE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to send to the Senate any information in his possession with reference to the continued improvement of the Columbia River between the mouth of the Willamette River and the city of Vancouver.

PAN-AMERICAN UNION.

Mr. ALLEN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas recent events have shown that European nations are making an aggressive attempt to obtain a greater foothold on the American Continent; and

Whereas such an attempt shows the necessity of a closer union of the American Republics: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States of America should, as speedily as possible, invite all American Republics to enter into a closer union, to be known as the Pan-American Union, for the purpose of promoting the general, industrial, and commercial welfare of the members thereof, and secure said respective Republics from European or other foreign encroachment. Such union should be made of lasting benefit to the people of the several Republics forming it and a unit of value should be established and maintained therein, which shall be a full legal tender and circulate freely between the various Republics and the people thereof.

CORPORATE INFLUENCE IN POLITICAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. CALL. I offer a resolution which I send to the desk, and ask that it be printed and lie over under the rule.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be charged with the duty of investigating the subject of the efforts of corporations in the State of Florida, or of the president and directors thereof, to control the election of members of Congress from the State of Florida, or to influence the legislation of Congress; also to investigate and report to the Senate whether corrupt means, bribery, or free transportation have been or are being used to influence such elections in the State of Florida; also to inquire and report to the Senate whether the use of such influences or means is consistent with the preservation of the Republic of the United States and the rights and liberties of the people, and to report a bill for the prevention of such practices.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over under the rule and be printed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AFFAIRS.

Mr. CALL. I have a resolution in my hand, sent to me by the Knights of Labor, with a request that I shall present it. I ask leave to submit the resolution, and that it lie on the table and be printed.

The resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed, as follows:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and are hereby, directed to furnish, as soon as practicable, for the information of the Senate, a statement showing—

First. The names of all streets, avenues, alleys, and reservations in the limits of the cities of Washington and Georgetown which are partially or wholly unpaved, and the total length thereof so unpaved; also the length thereof unsewered; also the length thereof without water mains, together with the estimated cost of fully improving the same.

Second. An estimate of the full amount required to carry out the provisions of the act of March 2, 1893, to provide a permanent system of highways in the District of Columbia outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown; the total number of feet of land in streets, avenues, and reservations required to be condemned in each subdivision or piece of land and the value of the same; the number and estimated value of buildings required to be condemned to carry out the provisions of said act in such districts as are prepared by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; the total number of feet of land in streets, avenues, etc., in each subdivision or piece of land that will be abandoned, and the amount and nature of improvements of such streets, avenues, etc., the amount of said improvements at public and private expense. Also an estimate of the cost of fully improving said streets, avenues, and reservations by grading, paving, sewering, and laying water mains, building bridges, culverts, etc., in such streets, avenues, and reservations as are to be condemned by the provisions of said highway act. An estimate of the value of

property held by the United States, and the assessed value of private property held in the county, outside of Washington and Georgetown.

Third. A statement showing the amount of taxes collected in the cities of Washington and Georgetown and the county, respectively, by years, from 1878 to 1894, both inclusive, and in like manner the amount expended in each of said sections by the District of Columbia for the same period.

Fourth. The amount of the revenues of the District of Columbia applied by the Treasurer of the United States to liquidate any undue debt of the District of Columbia to the United States or other parties from 1878 to 1895 and from what fund taken and to what debt applied, and if any of such revenue has been refunded and the amount and time of such refunding; an estimate of the amount of the revenues of the District of Columbia that will remain above the appropriation asked for at the end of the years 1895 and 1896.

REMOVAL OF MILITARY DISABILITIES.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I introduced the other day a bill in reference to the employment of officers in the Army of the United States. The title of the bill is "A bill (S. 1034) to repeal section 1218 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by chapter 416 of the laws of 1884," the provision which I desire to have repealed having been incorporated into the statutes and then afterwards amended. I did not recite in the title the object of the bill, nor did I place in the bill itself a copy of the section proposed to be repealed. I desire to call up that bill now and supply those two defects by offering the bill I send to the desk as a substitute, which simply changes the title so as to read: "A bill to repeal section 1218 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by chapter 46 of the laws of 1884, relating to appointment of officers in the Army or Navy of the United States." Then I desire to incorporate in the bill itself a copy of the section referred to which is proposed to be repealed.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to say a word about the bill.

Mr. HILL. Let the bill I have now introduced be first read.

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well.

The bill (S. 1179) to repeal section 1218 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by chapter 46 of the laws of 1884, relating to appointment of officers in the Army or Navy of the United States, was read twice by its title.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should vote for a bill accomplishing the object which the Senator desires, to remove the discrimination which has been made against those who were engaged in the Confederate service during the war. The time has passed for such discrimination. I think it ought to be repealed, but I think it would come with much more effect and in much better form and manner to have the bill referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and let that committee report it to the Senate in the regular way. That is my opinion. The Senate can pass a bill of this kind, if it chooses, without a reference; but it does seem to me that the ordinary formal way is the better way, especially in a case like this, where a stigma is sought to be removed from a great mass of people.

Mr. HILL. The bill is unusual in its character, it is true, because the law now existing is itself unusual, and I thought the bill might be permitted to take an unusual course. There is nothing in it requiring special consideration by any committee. It is a simple proposition, which is to take from the statute books the old proscriptive statute which forbids the employment in the Army of the United States of those who formerly held commissions in that Army and who subsequently joined the Confederate army. I thought that it would be a good thing just before Christmas to give this present to the old Confederates. I consulted with several members of the Military Committee, all of whom seemed to favor the proposition.

The objection made the other day was simply to the form of the bill, that there was not recited in its title or in the bill itself the statute proposed to be repealed.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. I have some recollection of this proscriptive statute on a former occasion in the Senate of the United States, but I do not now recollect whether the prohibition of certain citizens from fighting in the armies of the United States applied only to those who had formerly been officers in the Army of the United States and had resigned their commissions and taken service in the Confederate cause or to all who held commissions from the Confederate States. I am asking for information.

Mr. HILL. The present law only applies to those who held formerly commissions in the Army of the United States and subsequently joined the Confederate army, the previous general restriction having been changed in 1884; and now my proposition is simply to wipe out the remaining restriction.

Mr. COCKRELL. How old were those men in 1861 who held commissions in the United States Army and went into the Confederate army?

Mr. HILL. They were young lieutenants, I suppose.

Mr. COCKRELL. They must have been over 21 years of age.

Mr. HILL. I presume they were.

Mr. COCKRELL. And this was thirty-four years ago. That would make them at least 55 years of age if they were only 21 years old at that time, and, as suggested by the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], a great many of them were 25, 30, and 40 years old.

Mr. HILL. Then that objection would only restrict the number to which the statute would apply.

I have received numerous letters from various parts of the South saying that their people approved this bill, and would regard it as a most generous act on the part of Congress to pass it. I received this morning a copy of resolutions passed by the Virginia house of delegates upon this very question, expressing the hope that such a bill may pass.

It is a simple proposition. It requires no deliberation. I concede the general propriety of the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] to refer all bills about which there is any question to committees. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], who objected to the immediate consideration of the bill the other day, is entirely satisfied, as I understand, with the proposition in its present form, and I hope the Senator from Ohio in this one instance may be willing to depart from the usual order and allow the bill to be now considered and passed as a Christmas present to these old officers.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, when this bill was introduced a few days ago by the honorable Senator from New York I concurred with the Senator from Connecticut in thinking it had better lie over a day, especially as it needed an amendment in the matter of form, which amendment has now been made by the Senator from New York, so that the bill is in accord with the views of the Senator from Connecticut as to its propriety in that respect.

Mr. HAWLEY. There are two Senators from Connecticut, and the Senator, I suppose, refers to my colleague.

Mr. CHANDLER. I refer to the Senator from Connecticut who sits near me [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. HAWLEY. I mention that because he was the one who made the objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. It was the Senator from Connecticut who sits near me who made the suggestion. It would have satisfied me quite as well if this bill had been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and reported from that committee; but now that it is before the Senate, it seems to me it ought to be passed, and it ought to be passed to-day. It is simple in its character. Whatever disabilities there were upon citizens who, having held commissions in the Union Army, afterwards aided in the war of secession, have been removed. This bill proposes a simple repeal of whatever disabilities there are upon the statute book, and from the time of this repeal the old Confederate soldiers and officers will stand, with no disability upon them whatever, the equals in all respects before national law of Union soldiers and citizens who adhered to the Union cause.

Mr. President, thirty years having elapsed since the close of the war, there is no reason for keeping the disability provision upon the statute books; there is abundant reason for removing it therefrom, and as we the other day, unanimously, without distinction of political party, came to the support of a Democratic President when he announced national principles in reference to foreign affairs, so I hope that to-day, without delay, without criticism, without amendment, and freely and generously, this bill may be passed by the affirmative voice of every Senator in this Chamber.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, ordinarily I should be in accord with the Senator from New York in his motion to consider at once the proposition to repeal this provision of the statutes, which it is high time should be effaced from the face of the statute book of this country; but I am inclined to think that the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] that this proposition should go to the Committee on Military Affairs is a proper one, because I have been in the Senate long enough to remember with some distinctness that a few years ago, when the proposition was made in the way of an amendment to a bill reported from the Committee on Military Affairs by its then distinguished chairman, Senator Logan, of Illinois, to repeal this provision, although the general sentiment on this side of the Chamber was to acquiesce in the increase of the Regular Army, which was proposed by that bill, that amendment was voted down with a degree of unanimity on the other side of the Chamber which was somewhat surprising to me then, as I was new in the Senate. That brought about the defeat of what I then thought was a very wise proposition for the increase of the Regular Army. Therefore I think that this bill perhaps had better go to the committee, in order that we may find out whether that sentiment still continues in the Senate, or whether a sentiment that so emphatically disapproved the removal of this prohibition in the "piping times of peace" has been reversed in these more warlike times. At all events, it seems to me that, without some evidence that there has been some real change of sentiment and heart in that direction, we had better have the deliberation of a committee upon the bill, so that sentiment may have a chance to be heard.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I am not exactly satisfied with the temper displayed here by a noncombatant. There was a great

deal of "unanimity of feeling" on both sides of Appomattox and Gettysburg and other places, but that was some time ago, and a dozen years ago we had probably not got over all our feeling on that subject. Neither was this statute proscriptive. It was a perfectly just law at the time it was originally passed. I personally know many of the men to be affected by this bill and have nothing to say against their personal honor. I hold for many of them a very warm personal affection; but a government that respected itself could not, upon the close of a terrible war like that, take into its Regular Army men who were educated at the expense of the Government to be our champions in defense of the country, but after serving for a time in honorable and high places went off, almost in the night, some of them, to engage in the great rebellion. The country simply said that no person who had served in any capacity in that war should hold an office, etc. That was in 1866. Some years after that, in 1884, the statute was modified. That I may be precise in my statements I will read the statutes. The act of July 20, 1866, said:

SEC. 1218. No person who has served in any capacity in the military, naval, or civil service of the so-called Confederate States, or of either of the States in insurrection during the late rebellion, shall be appointed to any position in the Army of the United States.

That was when there were hundreds of thousands of men who had just laid down their arms—compelled to do so by superior force. It was one of the reasonable things done at that time.

Before that statute was passed we were in the habit of freely enlisting into the Regular Army as privates men who had not got cold in their desertion from the Confederate ranks. I know it, because I forwarded some men from the line who came about 800 yards and joined us, and in some cases were exceedingly anxious to go into our Army, making only one condition, that they should be sent out to the plains, so that they should not be captured in the South and be hanged. There was no objection in our laws to taking them to help put down the rebellion. These were private soldiers, and after the war and after the passage of the aforesaid statute they could not have been enlisted.

But in 1884 the statute was modified to read in this way:

No person who held a commission in the Army or Navy of the United States at the beginning of the late rebellion and afterwards served in any capacity in the military, naval, or civil service of the so-called Confederate States, or of either of the States in insurrection during the late rebellion, shall be appointed to any position in the Army or Navy of the United States.

That excluded only officers who were graduates of West Point and Annapolis before the war and held office in the Regular Army. The time has passed——

Mr. FRYE. The statute of 1884 repealed the former law?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes, distinctly. It is entitled "An act amending the Revised Statutes of the United States in respect of official oaths, and for other purposes."

Mr. HILL. "So as to read as follows"—taking the place of the other statute.

Mr. HAWLEY. "So as to read as follows;" and that was one of the sections. There were one, two, three, four sections of this amendatory act. I have read the first one, that confines the prohibition to United States ex army and navy officers who went into the rebellion. The Senator from Delaware says that a proposition to remove the disability came before us some years ago and was rejected, all the Republican Senators so voting.

Mr. GRAY. What year was that?

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not remember when it came up.

Mr. GRAY. 1887 or 1889?

Mr. HAWLEY. It certainly did not hurt my feelings very much or I should have remembered something about the occasion. Probably our people thought it was a little early to be taking off all marks of disapproval of the rebellion. By and by somebody will want to strike the word "rebellion" out of the Constitution of the United States. There is such a thing as going too far in this matter. But as for pardoning, and removing of this restriction, or saying that these old fellows who went from West Point or Annapolis into the rebellion may fight now if they can, I have not the slightest objection; for, so far as I know, they would all fight for the flag if they could. If there be any man who is still so sore that he would not do so under any circumstances, may the Lord "send him repentance and a better mind."

I think the formal, forceful way to do things of this character is to do them in response to a committee report; but I am not particular enough about that to make an objection.

Mr. DANIEL. I desire in this connection, Mr. President, to ask that there may be associated with this bill—if it shall be referred, and if not, that it lie on the table—a resolution adopted by the house of delegates and the senate of Virginia indorsing the message of the President, and also expressing "the wish that the statute providing that no person who held a commission in the Army or Navy of the United States at the beginning of the late war between the States and who afterwards served in any capacity in the military, naval, or civil service of the Confederate States shall be appointed to any position in the Army or Navy of the United States, should be repealed," and heartily indorsing the bill offered for that purpose.

I beg leave to say in this connection that I have heard with gratification the sentiments expressed by the Senators who have approved of the passage of this bill at this time. I have for successive years, as a member of the Senate, taken the liberty to introduce a bill of like import, and I have regretted that it has not received the early attention and action of the committee of this body to which it has been referred and of this body.

I beg leave further to say that those of us who have the honor to represent portions of the South in this body and those of us who were in the Confederate army have never realized the necessity or expediency of any such statute upon the statute books of this nation. When we were soldiers of the Confederate States, we were its soldiers and loyal to it. When the Confederate soldiers laid down their arms, they laid them down and were done with fighting; and it has been their desire ever since to obliterate the disagreeable memories of the war and that we should be in act as we are in fact one people with a common country.

I shall make no disagreeable allusions on this occasion, for I do not feel the sentiments which might inspire them, if they still lurk in other breasts; but I hope I may be indulged to say that as to the West Pointers and Annapolis men, I have never seen that any difference existed between them and any others who took up arms for the Confederate States. The basis upon which all classes in the South took up arms to defend its cause in the late fratricidal war was that their loyalty was due to the States which summoned them into service, and that principle comprehended the men who had been educated at one place as well as at another.

Besides, sir, it is not to be forgotten that if young men of the South were educated at Annapolis and at West Point their States contributed to this Government the means which supplied the funds for their education proportionately with all other States of the Union who educated their sons in like manner, and at the end of the argument the fact existed that the community to whom the West Pointers and others gave their services themselves supplied the means of those services according to the Constitution and laws of the country, which distributed taxation proportionately and justly upon all sections.

I say thus much, sir, simply to call attention to that fact; but it is hardly necessary to go into the minutia and detail of arguments which have applied to former times and to former conditions, "All's well that ends well," and if this matter shall end in inducing a more patriotic and friendly sentiment, North and South, East and West, it will have accomplished a good purpose.

Mr. SHERMAN. I desire now to submit the motion to refer the bill introduced by the Senator from New York to the Committee on Military Affairs.

I look upon this simply as a form, a manner of doing a gracious and proper thing. After this long period of time I shall not even stop to debate the proprieties of the measure, but I prefer to have the bill referred to the committee in the ordinary way, rather than to have it brought in in an unusual way and sought to be put upon its passage without even having been read. I think it will be much more pleasant to the people who will be affected by the bill if, upon the proposition submitted by the honorable Senator from New York, we should have a report by the honorable Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE], who was himself a distinguished Confederate soldier and who is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and in the ordinary course of business that would be done. Why we should make any difference in our mode of procedure I can not see. I wish to vote for the bill, but I wish to see it take its regular course in the progress of our business.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, I am inclined to think with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] that it would add weight to the measure if it should be referred to and regularly reported back by the Committee on Military Affairs. Having said that, I desire to state that I am ready to vote for a measure of this kind in any form. I attach no great importance to it now except as an expression. It is an expression of nationality, of brotherhood, of total reconciliation, and the last process of healing all that has passed.

In rising, however, I desired more than anything else to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to a few points of history which perhaps have been overlooked, to show how little the men of the South who went into the Confederate army have been distrusted by this Government, and how much of pretense there is in the legislation which has been read to us and in the statement that we have feared to employ them. I desire to call attention to the fact that long years ago the Senate of the United States, when very strongly partisan—I say it with great respect—confirmed General Longstreet as collector of the port of New Orleans—a West Point man, a hard fighter, and a Confederate soldier. Nobody was afraid and nobody got hurt. It may be answered that that was a civil office, but I belong to the school of men who believe that a man who is fit to hold a civil office can be trusted in any office, can be trusted in a military office.

Mr. GRAY. And can be trusted to fight for his country.

Mr. VOORHEES. And can be trusted to fight for his country. I have never for a moment, and the world has never for a moment believed that those men would be false to the Government under any circumstances from the time they surrendered in good faith at Appomattox. I do not believe there is a Senator on the other side of the Chamber who in his heart entertains any such feeling.

We confirmed here that great military leader, second only to Lee on the Southern side, Joseph E. Johnston, as Commissioner of the great Pacific railroad system. We have confirmed in the Senate within the last two or three years, or less than that, I believe, a gentleman who is in my mind. He was a West Point cadet, a West Point graduate, and in the Army, though very young, and went to the other side and fought all the way through. Nobody has ever impugned his honor.

I remember General Maury, who was an officer of the old Army. I was reading his book the other day when I was down at Hot Springs, and a most charming book it is. It details the frontier history of the army movements when he was with it, and then continuanda in the shape of history gives an account of proceedings while he was in the Confederate army. We confirmed him to some foreign mission. I do not now recall what it was, but I think it was one of the South American missions. I have no doubt that if I took a little more time I could recall a dozen instances within the last thirty years where West Pointers in the Regular Army, who went into the Confederate army, have been confirmed by this body. The instances I have mentioned occurred to me as I sat in my seat, and I do not speak of them to reproach anybody. On the contrary, it has been highly creditable—creditable to this body, creditable to the manhood of the United States, creditable to American sentiment everywhere.

The law on the statute books has been a dead letter. If the services of those men had been needed in military affairs the law would have vanished. Their services are not needed now, and they never will be needed. The men are being mustered out. I suppose there are not fifteen living on the shores of time. They are going. It is a pleasant thing to do. Let us bid them good-bye in this way, and say to them that the last vestige of a prejudice—no, it was not born of that, either, it was a pretense of distrust that never existed, and the record of this body shows it—is removed.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, it is perhaps proper that I should say a word with reference to the objection I interposed the other day when the bill was first introduced. A bill was introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] repealing section 1218 of the Revised Statutes as amended by chapter 46 of the act of 1884. The bill did not state what it was that it was proposed to repeal, except by giving the title of the act in the Revised Statutes and in the statutes of 1884. It was read amidst considerable confusion, so that it was difficult to understand from the reading at the desk what it was proposed to do. I suggested that it was a novel thing to ask for the passage of a bill upon its first reading, and it was soon suggested, I think by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], that the bill was not in the form required by our rules. Therefore I objected to further proceedings on the first reading of the bill, insisting upon the observance of the rules and the order of the Senate with reference to the passage of bills.

The Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] also explained that he thought it was a very opportune time to pass the bill. It was when the Senate was laboring under considerable excitement caused by the sending here of a message by the President, and I took occasion to say that I did not think there was going to be any war until after the recess of the Senate, certainly. I felt then, as I feel now, that all this war talk throughout the nation had been unwise and I will say almost insane. I did not think there was any occasion for the immediate hurrying of the bill through the Senate because there had been a message sent to the Senate with reference to a possible difference between this country and Great Britain. I said then that very probably we should all vote for the bill when we had an opportunity to examine it. I certainly have been ready to vote for it. I should prefer that it came in the ordinary way and took the ordinary course of bills in the Senate.

This country has forgiven a great deal, Mr. President, and it is ready to forgive more. We all believe that those officers of West Point and Annapolis who held commissions in the Army at the breaking out of the rebellion and who joined the Confederate forces are now loyal to the flag, and if they were not too old, as they are, would fight for it if it became necessary to fight. So the suggestion of delay or of reference which was made was not made in any spirit of bitterness; it was not the result of a prejudice felt anywhere against those officers; nor was it with the intention of objecting to the removal of their disability. We have removed this disability from the privates who fought against us. We have, I think, removed political disabilities from every man who fought in the Confederate army against us, and there remain under disability only those officers who, holding commissions in our Army and Navy at the time of the breaking out of the war, joined the Confederate forces. We have removed those disabilities cheerfully and not grudgingly, and yet everything that we have done, as well as everything that we are ready to do, is misunderstood and is not received in the section of country in which the rebellion started in the spirit in which it is offered.

The fact that on the day when the bill was presented I suggested that it ought to take the regular course seems to have stirred once more the Southern heart. The newspapers from one end of the South to the other have taken occasion to laud the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] as a patriot, and to condemn me as wanting in every attribute of patriotism. They have applied all sorts of epithets to me, and then have been very careful to send me a marked copy of each paper containing the articles. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. President, I have examined the bill; I am satisfied that it is in proper form; that it effectuates the purposes the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] has in view; and I am so full of forgiveness this morning, on the day before Christmas, that I am willing to join with the Senator from New York and present this Christmas gift to the officers who fought in the Confederate army and who, I believe, would rejoice to fight in our Army, the Army of the whole country, under the flag of the United States, if the opportunity presented itself, of which I believe there is no prospect, present or remote.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I believe that I am the only Senator on this side of the Chamber who served as a private soldier in the Union Army during the war and carried a musket during the entire time. My experience was with the grandest soldier the world has ever seen, in my judgment—the late George H. Thomas. If I have any prejudices coming to me from youth or from early association, those prejudices would be against the passage of the bill, but I have none.

To indulge in a little ancient history, I remember distinctly that on the 9th of April, 1865, when Lee surrendered at Appomattox, the branch of the Army in which I served had the honor of assaulting the fortifications of Fort Blakely, Ala., of which my honorable friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], was in command. My distinct recollection is that we captured the honorable Senator and his entire command. There are on this side of the Chamber five or six gentlemen who were in command of Confederate troops whose forces, I remember, were confronted by the branch of the Army in which I served.

I think if such a bill had been presented to the Congress of the United States ten or fifteen years ago it would have been the proper thing to have passed it.

Mr. GRAY. Such a bill was presented seven years ago.

Mr. ALLEN. If a measure of this kind had been presented ten or fifteen years ago it would have been the proper thing to have enacted it into a law. This country has lived upon prejudice ever since the close of the war. There has never been a Presidential campaign since that time in this country in which the "bloody shirt" or the questions arising out of the war have not been resurrected and fought over and analyzed and reduced to their last results.

The trouble is that there has been too much of this kind of talk North and South. Appeals have been made to prejudice for party sake. I know it has been so in the North. I have heard it since the days of the close of the rebellion. In every Presidential campaign the issues growing out of the war have been presented to the people, and the ignorant, and the vicious, and the suspicious have been appealed to to follow the fortunes of the Republican flag. I am told that the same thing is true or has been true to some extent in the South; that the fires of sectional prejudice have been fanned into a flame from time to time there, too. Is it not surprising that thirty years have elapsed before a scene of this kind should be witnessed in the United States Senate? Here are men who are bound together, members of a common race, speaking a common language, with a common inheritance, and is it not strange that a third of a century should elapse after a great event like the war for the Union before a simple measure like this can pass without objection?

What would our country have been if after the days of reconstruction we had had the statesmanship and the manhood and the common sense to bury the issues growing out of the war and had all united in giving our strength to building up the waste places and to making this the grandest country upon the face of the earth, as I believe it is? Why should we have waited until now, just at a time when the country is in a condition, as it would appear, where we are likely to engage in a foreign war, before we are willing to relieve these men from this restriction? It seems to me that it is cowardly. It seems to me that we have waited until apparently we are in need of the services of these gentlemen, and then at the last moment we say to them, "We will make you a Christmas present of a release from the restrictions which have been placed upon you." I suppose if war had not been threatened, if Mr. Cleveland had not twisted the English lion's tail so vigorously within the last week or so, we would never have heard of a measure for releasing these soldiers from this restriction.

In fact, it has passed through my mind, and if I am wrong I desire

the senior Senator from New York to correct me, that possibly this measure came upon the heels of the Venezuelan message to forge the lightning in Washington in order that it might thunder throughout the South. Why did not this measure come before? If Senators upon the other side are so anxious for the measure to pass, if they believe it to be just, and I certainly believe it to be just, why was it not introduced in this Chamber and passed through Congress at a time when there was no threat of a foreign war? No, measures like this have been held back for the purpose of dividing the people of this country, lining them up on one side as Republicans, appealing to their passions to follow the flag which came successfully through the rebellion, and upon the other side appealing to the passions of the more ignorant portion of the South.

It would have been an act of justice, Mr. President, to have passed such a bill years ago. While I do not approve of placing back in the public service a man who has once violated his oath of allegiance to this country, if there had been that statesmanship at the head of the affairs of this country that there should have been, if there had been that disposition in public life that there should have been to heal up the scars of the war, such a measure would have passed here years ago. Those men would have been released from their disabilities and the country would have been united in sentiment from North to South and prepared for this or any other emergency. But now, at the last moment, at a time when it may seem that the country is liable to be plunged into a foreign war, then comes this tardy measure to those men. They are invited at 60 and 70 years of age to take their places in the Army if the exigencies of the times should require it.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] can be induced to withdraw his motion, and that the bill may pass without further consideration.

Mr. HILL. I do not quite understand whether the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] has actually made a motion to refer the bill. I ask for information whether he has done so.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] entered a motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs. That is the pending motion.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word. I did not suppose that my simple suggestion would have occasioned this lengthy debate. I had hoped that the bill might be taken up and passed. The discussion we have had, however, illustrates one of the peculiarities of doing business in the Senate of the United States. Everybody has heard the bill read, everybody understands it, everybody is in favor of it, for divers reasons, and yet nobody wants to have it passed to-day. It must be referred to a committee that knows all about it; the committee must take time to consider it and then report it to the Senate, and we must go through these useless forms.

I labored under the idea that if only last week the Senate of the United States could afford to take up a great measure affecting the welfare and honor of the country, and which in its consequences might involve us in peace or war, and pass it unanimously without its reference to any committee at all, the Senate would not scruple over a little bill to give to the old Confederates this Christmas present. Strain at a gnat and swallow a camel is the spectacle presented. I recollect that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] the other day made a motion to refer that, the most important bill which has passed the Senate for many a year, and then failed to press his motion. He failed even to vote for it himself, so far as the RECORD shows. Others who spoke in favor of the reference of the bill did not desire to put themselves on record.

Now, the other day the objection was raised that there was something the matter with the form of the bill which I introduced, and Senators on the other side very quickly suggested that it was not in accordance with the rules—the same old rules about which we hear so much. They said there was a rule requiring that the statute proposed to be repealed should be set forth. I said that I doubted the existence of such a rule. There is no such rule, Mr. President. There has not been any such rule. The Senators looked at it subsequently and became convinced that there was not. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] then made an objection to the bill on the ground of propriety, saying that the statute proposed to be repealed should be set forth in full, and I agreed to it. I regret that there has been any criticism upon his conduct in any Southern papers. I have only one complaint to make of him, and that is that if he has received a lot of notices complimentary to myself and in condemnation of himself he ought at least to have sent them to me, in order that I might have seen the complimentary notices, as I receive so few of them nowadays in the press. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I think the Senate would vote almost unanimously for the bill to-day and would vote down the motion of the Senator from Ohio. There is some question as to whether a quorum would appear on a vote, as there are so many pairs. I do not care to have a division upon the bill. I should have preferred that we should have passed it after a few remarks had been made. But the Senator from Ohio, who now seems to be absent, has not withdrawn his motion, and probably finds the task of taking his lunch more agreeable than discussing the bill. I think that by reason of the situation I should not press the bill at this time. Let the motion of the Senator from Ohio prevail. Let the bill take the ordinary and usual course, and Senators will then be satisfied when it comes up again. It will be safe in the hands of the Committee on Military Affairs, as at present constituted, or in the hands of the new committee, of which I understand the gallant Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] is to be chairman. Let that course be taken, and when we return after Christmas we can take up and pass the bill, I presume, in the same way that the other bill was passed a few days ago—unanimously.

Mr. STEWART. I hope that course will not be taken. After the discussion which has taken place it seems to me it would raise the question whether there is a unanimous desire in the Senate to pass a bill of this kind. I think everyone now ought to put an end to this whole matter, and inasmuch as there has been discussion with regard to a reference of the bill, if it should be referred it would look like a controverted question. I do not like to have the Senate put in that position. I think, under the circumstances, we ought, by unanimous consent, to pass the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be referred and be done with it.

Mr. STEWART. I hope that course will not be taken.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I heard from several the expression just made by the Senator from Missouri. I think myself that now the bill might as well go to the committee. I was entirely willing to take it up and pass it.

I wish to say in justice to my colleague [Mr. PLATT], who is temporarily absent, that whatever objection he made the other day was purely technical, as I suppose he has explained. I think that of course there is no rule that requires in a repealing or a modifying statute a repetition of the whole of the old law, but I think my colleague had in mind that whether it be a rule or not it is a frequent criticism in the Senate when a bill is introduced that it fails to indicate in the title the subject-matter thereof, which it always ought to do, and if it repeals or modifies another statute it ought to refer to that statute. That is what I suppose my colleague had in mind.

It is in a certain sense a mortifying thing that we could not have discussed this matter this morning without observations that brought back the condemnations and disabilities of the Confederates during and after the war, or indicated that now we have yielded on our side, and consented to repeal an act of injustice; that we are just beginning to do justice to our friends on the other side; that we were proscriptive at that time, and things of that sort. When we have made up our minds that we are friends, and that we are willing to brush away these things, willing to clear the table, now that the thing is well over with, the short and cordial way to do it is to say, "Yes; shake."

Mr. GRAY and others. Question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MILLS. I do not wish it to appear that the bill goes to the committee by unanimous consent.

Mr. BATE. I desire to say that I am opposed to a reference of the bill to the committee.

Mr. MILLS. I shall vote against its reference.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CHANDLER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR].

Mr. CARTER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. MCBRIDE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MILLS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. If he were here, I should vote "nay." I do not know how the Senator from New Hampshire would vote.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS]. I should vote "nay" if I were not paired.

Mr. PUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the negative). Is the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE] recorded?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. DAVIS. I voted "nay," but I am compelled to withdraw my vote, being paired with that Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. I think I ought to state that my colleague [Mr. THURSTON] is necessarily absent from the Chamber to-day.

Mr. GEAR. I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PASCO. I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. BURROWS. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY].

Mr. HAWLEY. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 30; as follows:

YEAS—8.

Bacon,	Elkins,	Gray,	Teller,
Cockrell,	Frye,	Sherman,	Walthall.

NAYS—30.

Allen,	Daniel,	Murphy,	Squire,
Baker,	Harris,	Nelson,	Stewart,
Bate,	Hawley,	Peffer,	Vest.
Brice,	Hill,	Perkins,	Voorhees,
Butler,	Jones, Nev.	Platt,	Wetmore,
Cameron,	Lodge,	Pritchard,	White.
Chandler,	Martin,	Roach,	
Clark,	Morrill,	Shoup,	

NOT VOTING—47.

Aldrich,	Dubois,	Jones, Ark.	Proctor,
Allison,	Faulkner,	Kyle,	Pugh,
Berry,	Gallinger,	McBride,	Quay,
Blackburn,	Gear,	McMillan,	Sewell,
Blanchard,	George,	Mantle,	Smith,
Burrows,	Gibson,	Mills,	Thurston,
Caffery,	Gordon,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Tillman,
Call,	Gorman,	Mitchell, Wis.	Turpie,
Carter,	Hale,	Morgan,	Vilas,
Chilton,	Hansbrough,	Palmer,	Warren,
Cullom,	Hoar,	Pasco,	Wilson.
Davis,	Irby,	Pettigrew.	

Mr. HAWLEY. I ask unanimous consent to state that I delayed giving my vote until the end of the call to see if I could ascertain what was the choice of the ex-Confederates.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No quorum has voted. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

PRESENT.

Allen,	Chandler,	Lodge,	Pritchard,
Bacon,	Clark,	McBride,	Pugh,
Baker,	Cockrell,	Martin,	Roach,
Bate,	Daniel,	Mills,	Sherman,
Berry,	Davis,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Shoup,
Brice,	Elkins,	Morrill,	Stewart,
Burrows,	Frye,	Murphy,	Teller,
Butler,	Gear,	Nelson,	Vest,
Caffery,	Gray,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Call,	Harris,	Peffer,	Walthall,
Cameron,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Wetmore,
Carter,	Hill,	Platt,	White.

Mr. VOORHEES. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. TURPIE] has been called home to Indiana on matters of importance, and is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]. If the Senator from Minnesota desires to do so, he can vote on this measure. I feel certain that it would not interfere with the terms of his pair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Forty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will again call the roll on the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHERMAN. As a majority of the Senate are rather desirous of passing the bill before Christmas Day, as evidenced by the vote, I will withdraw my motion to refer.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio withdraws his motion to refer. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill; which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1218 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by chapter 46 of the laws of 1884, which section is as follows: "No person who held a commission in the Army or Navy of the United States at the beginning of the late rebellion, and afterwards served in any capacity in the military, naval, or civil service of the so-called Confederate States, or of either of the States in insurrection, during the late rebellion, shall be appointed to any position in the Army or Navy of the United States," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill (S. 1034) to repeal section 1218 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by chapter 46 of the laws of 1884 will be postponed indefinitely.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 27) ratifying the use of the appropriation for materials and miscellaneous expenses for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the fiscal year 1896 for the purchase of articles provided for in the appropriation for the miscellaneous expenses of the Treasury Department, and authorizing the continued use of the same for the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1896, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

COAST DEFENSE ESTIMATES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], coming over from a previous day.

The resolution submitted by Mr. PROCTOR on the 21st instant was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to inform the Senate what amount of money can be advantageously used for the purpose of coast defense prior to July 1, 1897, and what portion of said amount should be made available during the present fiscal year; also an estimate of what portion of the amount would be required for sites for fortifications, and how much for engineering, and how much for ordnance work, and whether the requisite number of heavy guns can be supplied from the Government shops, and if not, whether the deficiency can be manufactured by private plants in this country.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope that resolution will be passed over for the present. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] is not here.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 23d instant approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 13) granting the State of Pennsylvania permission to use the United States court-house at Scranton, Pa., and at Williamsport, Pa.

COINAGE OF SILVER BULLION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], coming over from a previous day.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. VEST on the 21st instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed, in pursuance of the existing law vesting in him full power so to do, to coin as rapidly as possible the silver bullion in the Treasury purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into standard dollars, and with such dollars to redeem, cancel, and retire the Treasury notes of the United States of July 14, 1890, issued in the purchase of such bullion, and also to redeem the United States notes commonly called "greenbacks" in standard silver dollars as well as in gold, using whichever may be most abundant or convenient.

Mr. VEST. I ask leave to modify the resolution by presenting a substitute for it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted as a substitute will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to coin as rapidly as possible the silver bullion in the Treasury purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into standard silver dollars, and with such dollars to redeem the Treasury notes issued for the purpose of purchasing said bullion when offered for redemption, such notes to be destroyed so soon as they are redeemed.

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall also redeem the Treasury notes, commonly called greenbacks, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins or both, as the condition of the Treasury may require. And said notes, commonly called greenbacks, when so redeemed, shall be reissued as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution just read.

Mr. HILL. What course does the Senator from Missouri desire concerning the resolution?

Mr. VEST. I should like to have a vote upon it, if there is a quorum here.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. Is it a joint resolution?

Mr. PUGH. The Senator from Missouri has changed it to a joint resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It was a simple Senate resolution, the Chair will state, but it has been changed to a joint resolution.

Mr. HILL. I desire to make some remarks to the Senate upon this general subject, about which the Senate has heard so little lately. I do not suppose that a vote can be had upon the resolution to-day, and I do not know how long the Senate intends to remain in session. I ask the Senator from Missouri whether he desires to speak upon the resolution?

Mr. VEST. I do not.

Mr. HILL. I will yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MORRILL. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont to refer the pending resolution to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. VEST. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HILL. I should like to have the resolution read again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be again read.

The Secretary again read the joint resolution.

Mr. MORRILL. Obviously most Senators supposed, on leaving the Chamber a few moments ago, that the Senate was about to adjourn. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, December 27, 1895, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 24, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under Rule XXIV, clause 2, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a reply to the resolution of the House relating to the allotment of Wichita Indian lands in the Territory of Oklahoma, and also transmitting accompanying documents; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Upper White River, Ark.; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the cases of James T. S. Greenfield and others against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the operations of the Bureau of Animal Industry for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

A bill (S. 480) granting a pension to William B. Matchett;

A bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene;

A bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood;

A bill (S. 141) granting a pension to Julia A. Hill;

A bill (S. 404) granting a pension to Samuel Goldwater;

A bill (S. 344) granting a pension to Mary A. Hall; and

A bill (S. 345) granting a pension to Catherine R. Jardine, widow of Brig. Gen. Edward Jardine.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 2264) fixing the times for holding the circuit court and district courts of the northern district of Iowa and of the southern district of Iowa.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Public Printer be, and is hereby, authorized to employ such clerical aid as he may find necessary in the copying, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, of the messages of the Presidents of the United States from the Journals of the Senate and House and the Executive Journals for the printing thereof, and that the expense therefor, not to exceed $600, be paid out of the appropriation for public printing and binding.

PALM BEACH, FLA., A SUBPORT OF ENTRY AND DELIVERY.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill which I send to the Clerk to report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2720) to make Palm Beach, Fla., a subport of entry and delivery.

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. That Palm Beach, in the State of Florida, shall be, and is hereby, made a subport of entry and delivery, and a customs officer, or such officers, shall be stationed at said subport with authority to enter and clear vessels, receive duties, fees, and other moneys and perform such other services and receive such compensation as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury the exigencies of commerce may require.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to make an inquiry as to the nature of this bill.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. I will state to the House that the bill has been submitted to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the original was drawn under the direction of Mr. Hamlin, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, to meet present exigencies. The necessity for the bill is this: Mr. Flagler, the owner of the East Coast Railroad and the great Florida hotels, has just put on an American steamship line to run between the Bahamas and Palm Beach, and the first of the steamers will arrive at Palm Beach on the morning of the 17th.

It has been discovered that Palm Beach is within the boundaries of the port of entry of Key West, which is on the other side of the State, and not of St. Augustine, as was supposed. It would take a week to enter and clear these steamers from Key West by having to send the papers around through the northern part of the State by Palatka and Jacksonville and down to Tampa, and by triweekly steamer to Key West; so that it renders it practically impossible to get a prompt entry and clearance, and it will prevent the accommodation of a great deal of commerce which will be brought to Florida by this line unless we empower the Treasury to authorize a deputy collector or other officer to enter and clear these vessels there. This bill will merely authorize the stationing of a deputy or inspector to enter and clear these vessels at Palm Beach as a subport of entry.

Mr. PAYNE. Will it require any new official or render necessary any additional or new expense?

Mr. COOPER of Florida. It will not require an expenditure of probably more than $3 or $4 a day for a deputy or inspector; but the expense will be more than offset by the receipts from customs dues from this line. It is necessary that it should be got through this House, through the Senate, and signed by the 17th. It is a matter of great importance to the State of Florida, and important to American marine interests in the way I have stated, and therefore I trust there will be no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. I think a matter involving the creation of a new official ought to go to the committee.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. I beg that the gentleman will not object. I submitted the bill to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, as I stated, the bill is drawn under the direction of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is not organized, and will not be in a condition to consider business until after the holidays, and therefore the vessels which are to land at that place will be unable to transact business unless this authority is given. It is a very meritorious measure, and it affects practical business, and for that reason I ask that the bill may be passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COOPER of Florida, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CLERKS TO CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to introduce the resolution which I send to the desk and ask its reference to the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the chairmen of the following committees, to wit, the Committees on Ways and Means, Appropriations, Judiciary, Banking and Currency, Coinage, Weights, and Measures; Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Rivers and Harbors, Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Post-Office and Post-Roads, Public Lands, Indian Affairs, Public Buildings and Grounds, Invalid Pensions, Pensions, Claims, War Claims, and District of Columbia, are hereby authorized to appoint a personal clerk, who shall receive the same compensation and for the same period, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, as is received by the clerks of other members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks to introduce this resolution and to have it referred to the Committee on Accounts. Without objection, it will be referred to the Committee on Accounts.

There was no objection.

BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the enrolled copy of the joint resolution (H. Res. 27) ratifying the use of the appropriation for materials and miscellaneous expenses for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the fiscal year 1896 for the purchase of articles provided for in the appropriation for miscellaneous expenses of the Treasury Department, and authorizing the continued use of the same for the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1896; when the Speaker signed the same.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. CATRON, Delegate from the Territory of New Mexico, to be a member of the Committee on Private Land Claims.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUCK, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WOODMAN, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. MONEY, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

OPENING OF WICHITA RESERVATION.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a resolution of inquiry was introduced by the Delegate from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN] in regard to the delays which he alleged had occurred in the opening of the Wichita Reservation. The Chair will remember that some debate took place upon that matter, to which there was scarcely any reply on this side. But the Secretary of the Interior has sent to the House a letter in answer to the resolution, couched in very temperate terms, and I ask, in justice to him, that his letter, omitting the exhibits, may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] asks unanimous consent for the printing in the RECORD of the reply of the Secretary of the Interior to an inquiry made by the House some time ago.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Delegate from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN] is not here, and that that matter should go over until he returns. Therefore I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] objects.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I will suggest that the printing of the letter can do no injustice to the Delegate from Oklahoma, but will rather furnish him with matters in printed form to which he himself may want to refer. It is but common justice to print in the RECORD the answer of the Secretary required by the House, as the RECORD was the medium of attack upon him. There has hitherto been no answer to the strictures made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN], and this paper merely gives the official facts. Of course there will be no objection on this side to any debate which the gentleman from Oklahoma may see fit to invoke when he returns. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the matter go over until the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN] is present.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Has it occurred to the gentleman that perhaps the gentleman from Oklahoma himself would like to see this in print?

Mr. MURPHY of Arizona. I should like to have him so state before giving my consent.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I am powerless to resist the gentleman's objection.

Subsequently,

Mr. MURPHY of Arizona withdrew his objection.

The SPEAKER. The objection is withdrawn. Is there further objection to the printing of the Secretary's reply in the RECORD?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY NEXT.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to report a resolution distributing the reference of the President's annual message to the various committees, and to recommend the adoption of the resolution.

I will state that under the rules this resolution would go to the Calendar, but I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It is the ordinary resolution for the distribution of the President's annual message.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution distributing the President's message. That will give consideration in the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That so much of the annual message of the President of the United States to the two Houses of Congress at the present session as relates to the national finances, the public debt, including bond issues, to the public revenues, to treaties relating to revenue questions, to our trade relations with foreign countries, and to the wants and condition of the Treasury be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

That so much as relates to foreign affairs, the consular and diplomatic service, including appropriations therefor, together with the accompanying correspondence and documents, the revision of treaties, and the enlargement of extradition treaties be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

That so much as relates to the appropriation of the public revenue for the support of the Government, as herein provided, namely, for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses, for sundry civil expenses, for fortifications and coast defenses, for pensions, for the District of Columbia, and for all deficiencies, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

That so much as relates to the judiciary of the United States, to the administration of justice, and the organization of courts be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

That so much as relates to banks and banking and currency be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

That so much as relates to the mints of the United States and to the coinage of gold and silver bullion be referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

That so much as relates to the commerce of the United States, domestic and foreign, intercolonial railways, and to the Nicaragua Canal be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

That so much as relates to rivers and harbors and their improvement be referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

That so much as relates to the merchant marine and fisheries and to tonnage dues be referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

That so much as relates to agriculture and forestry, to the destruction and eradication of diseases of domestic animals, and to the inspection of cattle and pork products intended for shipment to foreign countries be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

That so much as relates to the military establishment be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

That so much as relates to the naval establishment and to the construction of additional vessels for the Navy be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

That so much as relates to the post-offices and post-roads and to the carrying of the foreign mails be referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

That so much as relates to the public domain be referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

That so much as relates to the relations of the United States with the Indian tribes be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

That so much as relates to the Territories be referred to the Committee on the Territories.

That so much as relates to the protection of life on railways be referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

That so much as relates to the manufacturing industries of the United States be referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

That so much as relates to mines and mining be referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

That so much as relates to public buildings and grounds be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

That so much as relates to the Pacific railroads be referred to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

That so much as relates to levees and improvements of the Mississippi River be referred to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

That so much as relates to education be referred to the Committee on Education.

That so much as relates to labor be referred to the Committee on Labor.

That so much as relates to the militia of the United States be referred to the Committee on the Militia.

That so much as relates to patents be referred to the Committee on Patents.

That so much as relates to pensions for service in the civil war be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

That so much as relates to the District of Columbia, other than appropriations therefor, be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

That so much as relates to the civil service be referred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

That so much as relates to quarantine regulations and foreign immigration be referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Maine to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LACEY. I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and of the House to the fact that the resolution as reported from the Committee on Ways and Means sends all matters relating to the Nicaragua Canal to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I would suggest to the House that that is not a proper reference. After a canal is once built its control and all legislation affecting it would go to that committee, but until it is built it would go, under the rules, to the Committee on Railways and Canals, or else there is no necessity for the existence of that committee at all. It would have nothing to do, it would have no jurisdiction of any kind, if it had not the consideration of such propositions. I suggest to the gentleman from Maine that he permit that modification to be made.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have simply to say in response to the gentleman from Iowa that in that respect we have followed the action of the last Congress. It is true, as said by the gentleman, that strictly speaking the Nicaragua Canal matters might be said to belong to the Committee on Railways and Canals; but the committee did not have its attention called to the subject——

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman from Maine permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SAYERS. Has not the phraseology of the rule been changed in regard to the jurisdiction to the Committee on Commerce, so as to make it embrace foreign commerce as well as domestic?

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Railways and Canals has always been confined to canals constructed within the limits of the United States. It has no jurisdiction over foreign matters. The gentleman from Iowa is entirely mistaken in supposing that that committee would have jurisdiction, or could possibly have it, over this subject. The matter in question belongs to the Committee on Commerce, and can belong to no other committee, and the precedents are all in harmony with the suggestion I make.

The SPEAKER. Bills relating to the Nicaragua Canal have heretofore been referred by the Chair to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LACEY. I know it has been done, there having been no question presented to the Chair upon it. But I now call attention to the fact and ask that this matter be referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals, where it properly belongs.

The SPEAKER. The Chair simply stated that as a matter of fact, the question not having been discussed heretofore.

Mr. LACEY. That committee, it seems to me, was organized especially to have jurisdiction of the construction of any railway or canal that is to be constructed under the direction or by the assistance of the United States, and the location of the canal, whether in Nicaragua or anywhere else, or whether in the United States or outside its limits, is immaterial.

But to bring the matter to the attention of the House, I move to strike out so much of the resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means as refers the Nicaragua Canal matter to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and move its reference to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will submit his resolution in writing.

The proposed amendment was read by the Clerk.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the resolution be acted upon, and that this portion to which the amendment is offered be permitted to stand over until the chairman of the Committee on Railways and Canals is present, so that it may be considered in his presence. Let the balance of the reference be without prejudice.

Mr. HEPBURN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LACEY) there were—ayes 8, noes 80.

Mr. LACEY. No quorum.

Mr. HEPBURN. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. DINGLEY. I hope, in view of the decided expression of sentiment in the House, that my friend from Iowa will withdraw his point of no quorum.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to have the resolution withdrawn, and let the whole matter stand over by unanimous consent until Mr. CHICKERING returns. It is only a matter of justice to him that this should be done. I am not disposed to be captious, but I think the chairman of the committee ought to be here.

Mr. HEPBURN and others. Regular order!

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the question on the yeas and nays, demanded by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, at the instance of gentlemen around me, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

So (no further count being demanded) the amendment was rejected.

The original resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. DINGLEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the usual resolution in reference to printing matter for use by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The resolution was considered, and agreed to.

SOUTH PLATTE AND PLUM CREEK FOREST RESERVATIONS.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution; and before objection is made I desire consent to make a brief statement.

The resolution was read at length. It provides that the South Platte and Plum Creek forest reserves, in Colorado, be opened to the location of mining claims.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state concerning these reservations that they were never intended to be for the use of the United States Government itself. They were set aside for the preservation of timber, so that the snows in the mountains should not melt until midsummer, so that a copious supply of water would be assured for the irrigation of the lands in the valleys and on the plains below. The bills for the setting apart of these reservations did not except mining, although they should have done so; and there is a unanimous sentiment in our State that these reservations should be opened to the location of mining claims thereon. There have been some very important gold discoveries made on these reservations, and the people in that vicinity are flocking upon them, and they ought to have the right to perfect title to these claims. I do not think there should be any objection to this resolution, as I have submitted it to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, and also to one or two other members that I could find. They seem to have no objection to the same. I therefore ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to ask my colleague on the committee whether——

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to appear ungracious, but the gentleman on this side who was chairman of the Committee on Public Lands in the last Congress [Mr. MCRAE], who is familiar with these questions, is absent, and to most of us the public-land laws and public-land questions are a sealed book, no matter how long we have served. We hardly think it just and proper that matters of importance like this should be determined without the examination of a committee and without some expression from the head of the Department. This has not been referred, I think, to the Interior Department. The gentleman spoke to me about it, and when I asked him he said there had been no reference of it to that Department. We hardly think that is fair, so that I shall have to object.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state to the gentleman, if he will permit me——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia objects.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I hope he will not insist.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE PUBLIC PRINTER.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a Senate concurrent resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Public Printer be, and is hereby, authorized to employ such clerical aid as he may find necessary in the copying, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, of the messages of the Presidents of the United States from the Journals of the Senate and House and the Executive Journals for the printing thereof, and that the expense therefor, not to exceed $600, be paid out of the appropriation for public printing and binding.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will make a statement which will require only a moment. The last Congress directed the Joint Committee on Printing to have printed all the annual, veto, and special messages, inaugural addresses, and proclamations of the Presidents of the United States from 1789 down to date. There is no appropriation for it, except that it be done by the Public Printer out of the appropriation for printing and binding. There is no money the joint committee can use in having the work done.

That committee met and considered this resolution. They knew that it would be an exceedingly valuable compilation, as the Government has never made any such publication. The committee hesitated for some time, as they had no authority to employ any one to do the work, however great the desire to do it. But, to make a long story short, they finally, with my consent, put the labor on myself. I will state that in the effort to do the work put upon me I have compiled enough to make about two volumes, having spent three or four months of hard labor upon it.

In carrying out the order, I found it necessary to have printed certain Executive messages which are not printed in Senate and House Journals, but in what is called the Executive Journal. Of that there are only a few copies in existence. One copy is in the hands of the Clerk of the Senate, who will not permit it to go to the Printing Office in order that the messages therein may be copied and printed. The printers could not very well set up the matter from this Journal anyway, and therefore it becomes necessary that there shall be some clerical work done in the copying of these messages. This resolution does not make any appropriation. It simply directs the Public Printer to do what he possibly has a right to do anyway in carrying out the order to have the work printed. It simply authorizes him to make use of the appropriation already made for public printing and binding, to such an extent as may be necessary in the compensation of two or three copyists to copy these messages. It does not require any new appropriation, but limits it to $600.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Is it limited in the resolution? I was just going to ask the gentleman the estimated cost.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It will probably not exceed three or four hundred dollars, but the limit is fixed in the resolution at $600. The work is being delayed, and I want to advance it as rapidly as possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I send forward a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Elections No. 2 be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents, for the use of said committee, as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I raise this question, that under the law neither House can authorize printing to an amount exceeding $500; and inasmuch as the Committee on Elections is now divided into three, or three subcommittees, as they may be termed, the printing authorized by the Committee on Elections could not exceed $500, or $166.66⅔ for each committee; and I doubt, therefore, whether a House resolution would cover the purpose of the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. If the gentleman will pardon me, the view I take of the matter is that the original Committee on Elections has gone, that there are now three Committees on Elections, and that each committee would be entitled to expend $500 in printing. I do not, of course, know what the understanding of the other gentlemen, chairmen of the Committees on Elections, may be, but if this resolution pass I should deem it within my right to order that amount of printing. At the same time I would restrict the printing ordered to the lowest possible amount for the proper performance of the duties of the committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not object, because if it amounted to more than $500 I do not think it could be had under this resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. It would require a joint resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House do now adjourn.

CONGRATULATIONS OF BRAZILIAN CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES.

The SPEAKER. Pending that motion, the Chair will lay before the House, although it has reached the Chair in a somewhat irregular form, the following telegram.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Received at Washington, D. C., December 21, 1895.]

PRESIDENT CHAMBER OF THE REPRESENTATIVES, *Washington, D. C.:*

The Chamber of Deputies of the Republic of the United States of Brazil congratulates the Chamber of the Representatives of the North American Union for President Cleveland's worthy message, which so nobly and highly defends the rights and liberty of the American nations consecrated in Monroe's principles.

ROSA E. SILVA, *Presidente.*

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine moves that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, December 26, at 12 m.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 2697) to amend section 31 of an act entitled "An act to provide for a temporary government for the Territory of Oklahoma, to enlarge the jurisdiction of the United States courts in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved May 2, 1890—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2698) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, from some suitable point between the north line of St. Clair County, Ill., and the southwest line of said county—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 2699) to secure a uniform bank-note circulation and to provide for the redemption thereof—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 2700) to authorize the Secretary of War to issue arms to National Guards—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. SHUFORD: A bill (H. R. 2701) to repeal joint resolution No. 21, March 3, 1893, authorizing the employment of clerks by Members and Delegates in Congress—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BEACH: A bill (H. R. 2702) providing for the reciprocal interchange of products between the United States and other nations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2703) authorizing the President of the United States to call an international conference—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 2704) for the erection of a public building at Green Bay, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2705) constituting Green Bay, in Wisconsin, a port of delivery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 2706) to grant to the city of Charleston, S. C., the old post-office lot and building for the use of the commercial bodies of the city—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TRACY: A bill (H. R. 2707) to prevent the stopping or reduction of pensions without an investigation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2708) to constitute a new division of the eastern judicial district of Texas, and to provide for the holding of terms of court at Beaumont, Tex., and for the appointment of a clerk for said court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2709) to establish a customs collection district at Sabine Pass, Tex.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 2710) to provide for the erection of a public building at Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 2711) for the construction of a public building at Clinton, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 2712) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 2713) to increase the pensions of all helpless soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2714) to grant a pension to all Union soldiers and sailors in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 2715) to supply public revenues—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 2716) relating to the retired officers of the Army or Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 2717) to amend the pension laws by increasing the pensions of soldiers and sailors who have lost an arm or leg, or been totally disabled therein, while in the service—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 2718) for the erection of a public building at Mayfield, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2719) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Joliet, in the State of Illinois—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WHEELER (by request): A bill (H. R. 2721) to incorporate "The Independent Order or Colored Men and Women of Honor in the United States"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DALZELL: A resolution providing for a change in the rules of the House—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A concurrent resolution to permit the location of mining claims on certain forest reservations in the State of Colorado—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A resolution providing for the appointment of personal clerks by chairmen of certain committees, the services of whom to be paid for in the same manner as are the clerks of other members of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A concurrent resolution directing the Public Printer to furnish correspondents and the press galleries of the Senate and House a copy each of the Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2722) for the relief of Louis Levy, of Jefferson County, State of Texas—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2723) granting an honorable discharge to James Coughlin, of North Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2724) granting a pension to Samuel E. Martin of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 2725) granting increase of pension to Henry Slaughter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 2726) for the relief of S. Hodge, of Caldwell County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2727) for the relief of the executors of the estate of Joseph Watts, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2728) for the relief of H. Wilhite—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2729) for the relief of J. C. Peebles—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2730) for the relief of the estate of S. M. Grace, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2731) for the relief of the estate of Aman Price, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 2732) authorizing the President to place the name of Julius R. Frederick on the retired list of the Army, with the rank, pay, and perquisites of second lieutenant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 2733) to increase the pension of James Moss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2734) to increase the pension of Gustavus M. Cowger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2735) for the relief of Enoch Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 2736) for the relief of the estate of Hugh Montgomery—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2737) for the relief of Peter F. Kendall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 2738) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Michael Baker—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2739) for the relief of Michael A. Dace—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEILL: A bill (H. R. 2740) to carry into effect finding of the Court of Claims in favor of the estate of George Case, late of Independence County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2741) for the relief of Peter Cook, of Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PENDLETON: A bill (H. R. 2742) granting a pension to J. J. Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. QUIGG: A bill (H. R. 2743) for the relief of Mary Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2744) for the relief of Nancy E. Day, administratrix of the estate of James L. Day, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAW: A bill (H. R. 2745) for the relief of Thomas S. Lutterloh and Cape Fear Steamboat Company—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TRACY: A bill (H. R. 2746) to authorize the Secretary of War to settle the claim of Abner Welch and pay him $100—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2747) to remove the charge of desertion from the service record of John R. Killingsworth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also a bill (H. R. 2748) to pay the claim of the estate of Green Lutterill, of Polk County, Mo., $1,620—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of A. W. Wheeler and 65 others, merchants and professional men of Chicago, Ill., asking for a popular Government loan—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, congratulations of Abram Poole and 58 others, members of Chicago Board of Trade, to Congress, for prompt action in efforts to relieve the Treasury—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of St. Louis merchants, asking that belligerent rights be granted to the people of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the St. Louis Merchants' Exchange, in favor of the passage of a town-site law for the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Petition to the Congress of the United States in the matter of the imprisonment of Hon. John L. Waller, signed by the governor, State officers, and 6,743 citizens of Kansas—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the citizens of Kansas for the relief of Hon. John L. Waller—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition for a bill to secure pension for Anapies S. Ramey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of W. L. Scott and 990 other citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, asking the enactment of a law restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of James Mass, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Gustavus M. Cowger, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDOX: Petition of the heirs of Jane A. King, deceased, late of Polk County, Ga., praying that her war claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEYER: Memorial in favor of fast railway mail service between Cincinnati, Ohio, Louisville, Ky., and the South, by Andrew Stewart, president New Orleans Cotton Exchange, Alfred Le Blanc, president Maritime Exchange, and others—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TRACY: Petition of Ozark County Home Guards, to be placed on a pensionable status—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition to pension George W. Dewald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 26, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last was read and approved.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under Rule XXIV, clause 2, the following Senate bills were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood; which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

A bill (S. 141) granting a pension to Julia A. Hill; which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

A bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene; which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

A bill (S. 344) granting a pension to Mary A. Hall; which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

A bill (S. 345) granting a pension to Catherine R. Jardine, widow of Brig. Gen. Edward Jardine; which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

A bill (S. 404) granting a pension to Samuel Goldwater; which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

A bill (S. 480) granting a pension to William B. Matchett; which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 1179) to repeal section 1218 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by chapter 46 of the laws of 1884, relating to appointment of officers in the Army and Navy of the United States; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

REVENUE BILL.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to report, with a favorable recommendation, a bill (H. R. 2749) "to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency."

The SPEAKER. The bill and report will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CRISP. I understood the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to make a report from that committee.

The SPEAKER. The report has been made and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CRISP. In explanation of the fact that the views of the minority are not presented on this occasion, I desire to say that we have had no opportunity of preparing a statement of our views, because at fifteen minutes before 12 o'clock to-day we saw for the first time the views of the majority in regard to this measure. I make this statement, Mr. Speaker, in justification of the minority. On yesterday, Christmas Day, we were called to meet with the other members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and were then shown the bill which has just been reported by the gentleman from Maine. Then, for the first time, we saw that bill, a measure affecting every one of the tariff schedules. We asked for time to submit the bill to the Treasury Department and obtain estimates as to its probable effect upon the revenue. That was refused. We asked the gentlemen of the majority if they had any estimates upon which they had based this bill—any expert testimony—and we were informed that they had not. We then asked for a reasonable time to prepare the views of the minority, and that was refused. So the minority desire the House to understand the course that has been pursued by the majority in respect to this matter and to understand that the views of the minority

are not presented now only because we have not been accorded that courtesy which is usually extended to minorities of committees in cases of this character.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Rules to report the resolution which I send to the desk as a substitute for one introduced by me on Monday, December 23, and referred to the Committee on Rules.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately after the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order in the House to call up for debate, the previous question being considered as ordered, a bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, entitled "A bill to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency;" that at 5 o'clock, without delay or other motion, the vote shall be taken. General leave to print is hereby granted for ten days.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

The question being taken, the previous question was ordered.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask whether the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] is not going to make an explanation of this rule.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is my purpose to do so. The effect of the adoption of this rule is to permit debate upon the bill just reported by the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means for raising revenue, the debate to continue until 5 o'clock to-day, when a vote is to be taken upon the bill. I refer to the bill changing the tariff rates in some particulars, for members of the House will understand, I think, that another proposition will be brought in later. That other bill, however, will not be brought up until to-morrow, so that this day until 5 o'clock will be devoted entirely to the discussion of this tariff bill. The provisions of the bill we will not now stop to discuss. The discussion of them will come on when the forty minutes allowed for debate upon this rule are exhausted. I may say this, however, at the present time that the bill is in no sense a general revision of the tariff law, but is legislation designed to promptly and efficiently provide sufficient revenue for carrying on the Government. The Chief Executive of the nation has by a special message called our attention to the financial condition of the country. He has sent us two messages, in fact, which have produced a high degree of excitement throughout the country, and we are given to understand that the business centers are staggering under the weight of the consternation that has followed what I may call two feverish declarations from the White House. The object of the bill just reported to the House is to exercise the judgment of Congress, to which the President referred the subject of his message. The President has stated the conditions as he sees them, and has referred them for action to the wisdom of Congress. The Executive and the majority of the members of this House may perhaps differ as to the causes and the nature of these troubles, but these bills are designed to meet the existing difficulties as the majority of the House see them. With this brief explanation I reserve the balance of my time until we hear from the other side.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. Culberson appeared at the bar of the House and the oath of office was administered to him by the Speaker.

REVENUE BILL.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] is recognized to control twenty minutes.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I desire the attention of the House for a few moments in order that members may know exactly what the pending proposition is. Of course each Representative should vote in accordance with his own sense of propriety, but before he casts his vote he ought to know the effect of it. He ought not to blindly follow others who prescribe a rule for him, but he ought to follow the dictates of his own conscience, ascertain what the rule is, and determine whether he approves or disapproves it.

This rule relates to a tariff bill—the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] says not a general, but a temporary bill. Sir, a bill may be general although temporary. This is a general tariff bill that affects all the schedules on the list. As to some it prescribes a specific rate of duty; as to others it prescribes a horizontal increase. Now, under the rules of the House (and I refer to those rules because there are many members here who are not yet acquainted with the rules)—under the rules adopted by this body "all motions or propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people shall have their first consideration in Committee of the Whole." The special rule now reported deprives the House of that right. In Committee of the Whole a bill is first read for debate under what is called the hour rule. This proposition deprives the House of that right. In Committee of the Whole a bill, after debate under the hour rule, is considered under what is known as the five-minute rule, when amendments are in order. This special rule deprives the House of that right. So that every single right which was intended to be reserved to the representatives of the people by the rules established under the Constitution of our country is taken away by this special rule now reported from the Committee on Rules.

Do gentlemen understand that if this rule be adopted no amendment will be in order? What authority is it that is so powerful, so omnipotent on the Republican side of the House that it can say to you, "Here is a general tariff bill affecting the interests of every district and community in the United States, and you must take it without the right to offer a single amendment"? You may disapprove some parts of it; it may injuriously affect interests in your locality; yet under the operation of the "machine"—under the crack of the party whip—you are not to be allowed to criticise it and you are not to be allowed to offer an amendment to it, but you are to be required on your fealty to your party to vote not only to pass it, but to pass it without any sort of consideration.

We hear a great deal said about the justice of the rules of the Fifty-first Congress. We on this side have never complained so much of those rules as we have of the practices under them. Here we find a return, a prompt return, to the practices of the Fifty-first Congress. I could point you—I have no doubt our friends on the other side will do so—to some cases since the Fifty-first Congress where the Committee on Rules have presented a report providing for the consideration of a bill and limiting it to a very short period of time for consideration. But I defy any gentleman to point to any rule reported by any committee of any Congress heretofore in the history of the country whereby a general tariff bill was to be disposed of in the House of the people's representatives in about four hours, without the right to offer a single amendment.

The Constitution of the United States declares that this House shall originate measures of taxation. A committee of this House has originated a measure of taxation. The body of this House has not been consulted or conferred with respecting it. It is brought into this House; and you are told that you must vote for it just as it is, without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." And that is what you call Republican methods. That is Republican independence of thought and idea. All individual judgment is to be subordinated; and those who crack the party whip on the other side are to be obediently and respectfully followed. You are to be chained to their chariot and to follow wherever they lead.

Now, this is the very first opportunity we have had to see what is the composition of that side of the House. Here is a great question. There is no necessity for this bill. This bill is not demanded by any Department of the Government. There is no suggestion from any source that there is an insufficiency of revenue. Yet, under whip and spur, without giving members of the Committee on Ways and Means, as I have said, an opportunity even to send this bill to the Treasury Department and invite the judgment of an expert as to its effects, it is to be driven through. You are required to vote yea or nay. You are required to take it or reject it, depriving yourselves by the adoption of this special rule of that ancient right that has always existed since Congress existed, the right of the people's representatives to consider and offer amendments, to have them voted upon, to know the effect of the bill when passed. All those things are taken away from you by the adoption of the present resolution. It remains to be seen whether the other side of the House will in this way, as a body, surrender their independence and their manhood as Representatives.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] has sixteen minutes, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] twelve.

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield ten minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, there is no gentleman within the sound of my voice who does not know that we face to-day as a people a peculiar exigency. Since the 4th day of March, 1893, when the Democratic party came into power, we have been issuing bonds, borrowing money, and day by day, month by month, year by year, our revenues have been showing a greater and greater deficiency. The President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury have both become alarmed. The President of the United States, appealing to a party that is not his own in the House of Representatives, has asked them with all the solemnity that pertains to his high office to come to his aid. He has said: "Gentlemen, will you not forego the pleasures even of a holiday season and address yourselves to legislation that shall aid the Government?" Under these circumstances, in this most extraordinary emergency, the Committee on Ways and Means have addressed themselves for the last three or four days, and I may say nights, to the solution of the problem—to ascertaining the best solution possible under the circumstances.

I agree with my friend from Georgia that a tariff bill, if it were now presented in the first instance as a new one, ought to be considered and prepared with great care and proper deliberation, after due hearings upon the various schedules. But the gentleman knows, as every member of the House knows, that if the House responds at all to the Executive call, it must respond immediately, and must content itself with such deliberation only as is possible under the existing circumstances. But this is not a tariff bill; it is not a revision of the tariff at all, in any general sense of the word. It is not an attempt to correct the many manifest absurdities, incongruities, and injustices of existing law. It is merely an emergency revenue measure, intended to bring relief to the suffering Treasury of the country.

The gentleman from Georgia says that we are to be driven into the support of this measure to-day under the party whip. It is refreshing to hear from the gentleman from Georgia about the "party whip" and "ironclad rules." [Laughter on the Republican side.] Is his memory so short that he forgets the act which I hold in my hand, with over 600 amendments, not one of which was ever considered by this House, and which was passed through the House with but two hours' debate pursuant to a rule framed by the gentleman from Georgia himself? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Does the gentleman from Georgia forget that, in violation of all precedents and of parliamentary decency, bills were introduced in this House, and, without reference to any committee, passed under a rule framed by the gentleman from Georgia with but fifteen minutes' debate on each side? Does he forget that a bill which dealt with the great coal interests of this country, a bill that dealt with the great sugar interests of this country, and a bill that dealt with the ore interests of this country, each and every one of them never deliberated upon in the Committee on Ways and Means at all, were presented in open House and passed in thirty minutes under a gag prepared by the gentleman from Georgia himself? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Is it not refreshing?

Now, gentlemen on both sides of the Chamber, what are we called on to do? You are called on to-day to answer, as best you can, and to answer under the circumstances existing, the request of the President of the United States. It is not in answer to the party whip; but rising, as the Republican party always rises, above the plane of party consideration or party prejudices to the high level of patriotic purpose, we propose to afford to the President of the United States and to the Treasury of the country the relief that he has asked. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN].

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall wish to occupy only one-half of the time, as I desire my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. TURNER of Georgia] to occupy a portion of it.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has very appropriately asked what this House is called upon to do. And I will give the answer that he failed to give. You are called upon to pass upon a general tariff bill to-day without the right to amend; a bill which affects every item on the dutiable list, I believe, in the tariff schedules, except sugar, amounting to more than 4,000 in number, and you are asked to come blindly up and cross your hands and let the gentleman from Maine and his colleagues tie you hand and foot, hard and fast, and surrender your right even to present an amendment to the bill. You are called upon to take such a course in connection with this bill as has never been taken in connection with any revision of the tariff in the history of the House of Representatives since the organization of the Government.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania attempts to confound the action taken by the House on the Senate bill in the last Congress in connection with the Wilson bill, and to offer that as a comparison to this proposed rule. But the gentleman fails to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that on that bill we had elaborate hearings in the Committee on Ways and Means, where he had a right to bring his friends. We had ample arguments and ample opportunities for hearings before that committee. He should also remember that after the time that bill had been agreed upon an opportunity was given to him and his colleagues to present and have considered the views of the minority. But how different is it here. Yesterday, a holiday, when the Departments of the Government were closed, when the Treasury was closed, when even the Library of this Capitol was closed, and no man had an opportunity to get the bill proposed by the gentleman from Maine, that measure was brought in to the Committee on Ways and Means, never having been introduced in the House at all, never having been considered, was never read before the Committee on Ways and Means, and even amended materially after it was brought there, and in thirty short minutes we are asked to take and swallow it whole, without even an opportunity for amendment!

They announce to us that no time will be given for the consideration of the different schedules; that no time will be given to call upon the Secretary of the Treasury to know whether or not this measure is needed. No time will be given to call upon him to know whether he needs the revenue; but they come in here this morning, when the bill has never been read here, and when not ten men on this floor understand fully its provisions, and ask you on that side to surrender your right even to offer amendments. Ah, Mr. Speaker, when Esau surrendered his birthright and his heritage for a mess of pottage he at least had hunger as a pitiful excuse. These gentlemen have not even their Christmas turkeys in front of them as an excuse for their peculiar manner in dealing with this measure and their surrender of their rights. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.] When they get it into the House they propose to impose $44,000,000 of taxes on more than 4,000 different articles in less than four hours, or $11,000,000 an hour. They announce to us that they have seized the reins again; that they are going to drive the old chaise of state over the same old track to the same destructive terminus again. Go ahead, gentlemen. There was a power that checked you once before. There is a power which will check you again—the masses of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER].

Mr. CRISP. Unless the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] desires to use all his time in conclusion, will he let some one on that side address the House, and then this side will follow?

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to conclude the debate, Mr. Speaker. How much time has the gentleman from Georgia remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. CRISP. How much time has the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON]?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has eleven minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON. The gentleman from Georgia will please conclude his time.

Mr. CRISP. I yield that time, Mr. Speaker, to my colleague [Mr. TURNER].

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is idle, perhaps, on this occasion to indulge in epithets. Perhaps it would be unprofitable to make comparisons. But it may not be amiss to ask gentlemen to pause and consider the situation.

The President on Friday morning sent to Congress a message informing us of the gravity of the financial situation. In his annual message he had suggested the remedy which to him seemed wisest, and our able Secretary of the Treasury—as able as ever occupied that high position since the days of Alexander Hamilton—had given to Congress his frank and manly statement of our financial condition. In each of those great communications to Congress the assurance was not only given that the Treasury had ample funds to meet all its expenditures and all its ordinary demands, but that it had a surplus which would reach over two or three years; that above the gold reserve there was over seventy millions of dollars in the Treasury available for the current expenses of the Government. And, according to the very nature of the case, gentlemen on our side, the great party to which we belong, though momentarily in defeat, have believed during all the agonizing experience of the last two or three years that it was not a question of revenue, but that it was a question which struck higher and concerned our entire financial policy. And when the President and the Secretary recommended to Congress the consideration of that view, aye, sir, when they asked for bread, you give them a stone. When they ask you to relieve the stress on the Treasury, that particular stress which every man understands and appreciates, you reply by putting in front of all your remedial legislation the proposition to still further bleed and tax the American people.

And, Mr. Speaker, let gentlemen remember that this is done with the most extraordinary haste ever known in the history of the American Congress. This bill, although laid on our desks as a print of the House of Representatives, could not have been printed and sent here since this bill was introduced a few moments ago. Neither could this report of the Committee on Rules have been presented here on the basis, as it says, of a bill reported to the House, because the Committee on Rules have had no meeting since this bill was submitted to the House. The bill has not been printed in the orderly course. The report of the Committee on Ways and Means has not been printed in the orderly course, as my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], has shown. The report of the Committee on Rules has not been presented in the orderly course, and coming to the rule itself, I say that it is unprecedented and unheard of that a rule should be offered contemplating a general revision of our entire tax system without the power of the people's representatives to be heard even in the five-minute debate. Here is a proposition to tax the American people $40,000,000 or $50,000,000, more or less, in one broad sweep of pro-

tection, and yet we have scarcely time for the members of the Committee on Ways and Means to enter their protest against it. They have had no time to formulate and embody their views in a minority report, and if we, on this side, are heard at all in opposition to this measure, it will be in such brief and limited speeches as we can make by voluntary arrangement among ourselves within about two hours or two hours and a half.

Reference has been made here, Mr. Speaker, to what took place at the heel of the last Congress. Gentlemen who were members of that House understand fully the condition which then prevailed.

The House had sent to the Senate a bill embodying the view of my party. The Senate put upon that bill a great number of amendments, and with reference to their course upon it I dare not offer my sentiments in stricture. I can not do that without violating parliamentary proprieties. After two or three months' consideration of the bill in the Senate it went to a committee of conference, and was there considered for two months; and, as a last resort, in order to get a measure in some form of the nature we desired upon the statute books, it went through the House in some such way as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has stated. Then, after the question of coal had been discussed through weeks and months, incidentally, in both Houses; after the sugar question had been considered in both Houses; and after the ore question had been debated for a long and almost indefinite time in both Houses, then, in the closing hours of the session, when there was no hope or opportunity for consideration and deliberation, we passed those measures to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has referred. Ours is not now that situation. We are at the very beginning of the session, or at the opening of a Congress of which the friends of the gentleman have the majority. Why is it that they do not give us an opportunity for the discussion of this great question? If they are actuated by any spirit of deference to the department of Government which now holds our fortunes in its hands, why do not they put some other measure in front instead of seeking in this Christmas time to tax the American people to the amount of $40,000,000 or $50,000,000—an imposition against which the Treasury itself protests?

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more to say. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has one-half minute left.

Mr. CRISP. I reserve that. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the half minute reserved?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia claims to reserve a half a minute. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a business matter, for a business people, and should be met in a business way. A few days ago, when this House was considering the Bayard resolution, we were taunted by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] that we dared not take responsibility. We will show him to-day whether the Republican party is afraid to take responsibility or not. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] Whether this country is presided over by a Republican or a Democratic Executive, whether it is threatened with bullets or ballots, whether by deficiency or surplus, the Republican party never shirks its duty to this country. [Renewed applause.] We are taunted with working on a holiday. I want to say to my friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] that if the Democratic ass falls into the ditch with a national load upon its shoulders we will even work on Sunday to take the national part of it out of the ditch. [Laughter and great applause.]

The gentleman from Georgia tells us that this is for the purpose of taxing the people. My God, there is no power in Congress to put back in the pockets of the American people that which Democratic policies have robbed them of since the Democratic Administration went into power on the 4th of March, 189[illegible] [Renewed applause.] They talk of speed in behalf of the Treasury. Do they forget the speed with which Democratic policies have emptied the Treasury? [Laughter.] They have emptied it, and we propose to put money there. Since this Administration came into power it has kept this nation oscillating between chills and fever. [Laughter.] We propose to stop these diseases and let the American regain a normal condition. We will do our part of it.

Talk about war; as one Democratic statesman said, the President comes in here one day and makes a declaration of war, and in three days afterwards files his petition in bankruptcy. [Laughter.] We are not for war. The Republican party is against war. It has made no declaration in this House for war. Let the country take observation of that. True, the President demanded money to carry out his constitutional functions, and the Republican party said it would supply him with the money; but we have not declared for war. If war becomes necessary the Republican party will be ready; but we have not yet exercised the judgment of the Republican party on that question. Let not the business interests of this country run before this "tempest in a teapot." This country is solvent. It has the assets; it has the integrity. Give to a nation assets and integrity and the business interests of the nation need not be afraid. We have returned to power here, and we will look after the solvency of the nation, and never again will the American people find our integrity put in question.

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. HENDERSON. I want to reserve one minute of my time, and I ask the Speaker to keep his eye on me, so that I will not run over it. [Laughter.]

Now, the claim has been made in debate just now that the Wilson bill had been considered here in the late Congress, and that ample opportunity had been given to consider it. After the House bill went over to the Senate it came back so completely covered with patches that the original pantaloons could not be recognized by Mr. Wilson himself, and these amendments we never had opportunity to examine and pass upon. When you consider that on the final home stretch in that great tariff discussion and legislation the gag was put upon this House, that all the declarations of Jefferson's Manual and other authorities on rules were overturned by a single rule emanating from the committee of which my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] was chairman, and that it was lashed through this House without chance of amendment, does it lie in the voices of those gentlemen to complain now about "whip and spur" and "the gag"?

The statement is made that the Secretary of the Treasury says there is plenty of revenue. Mr. Speaker, that is not true. I join issue with that statement, but will leave the discussion of it for the proper time, after this rule shall have been adopted. Then we will demonstrate that the Treasury has not sufficient funds. Then we will demonstrate, by proofs that can not be refuted, that this country is suffering for want of revenue to pay its legitimate expenses. Greenbacks and gold are being taken out of the Treasury to pay current expenses; yet the gentleman from Georgia last on his feet [Mr. TURNER] dares to sustain the statement of the Treasury Department that we have sufficient revenue.

Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, this is a business matter. The pending bill is not a general tariff measure. It represents neither the aggregate judgment of the Republican side nor of the Democratic side on the tariff question, but the President of the United States has laid before us the condition of the Treasury and the business interests of the country.

Mr. LINNEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HENDERSON. Not at this moment. The business interests of the country say that financially we are in a crippled condition. Now, we all know that if we were to go into a general revision of the tariff every member would feel bound to investigate details and to stand up for his local interests. That has been done by both sides of the Chamber whenever there has been a general revision. To enter upon such a course now would be to tie our hands for months, and that would bring about a crisis in this country compared with which the Democratic crash of 1893 was a holiday entertainment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINNEY. Will the gentleman yield now for a question?

Mr. HENDERSON. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. LINNEY. As a Republican I am with the gentleman, of course, in this matter; but under the rule as it now stands, can we not extend to our Democratic brethren the opportunity of offering amendments, and then, under the operation of the previous question, pass the bill?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, that can not be done. It is not best in the opinion of the committee.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, our friend on my left [Mr. LINNEY] is not so new a member that he has not discovered the kernel of this controversy. [Laughter.] This rule is brought in not only for the purpose of preventing this side of the House from offering amendments, but to prevent gentlemen on the Republican side from voting for amendments. It is not necessary that you should tie us up by this rule, because, if you all agree to this bill, you have a majority far more than sufficient to vote down every amendment that we might offer. The purpose of the rule, Mr. Speaker, is to prevent any gentleman on your own side from voting for any amendment which he might conceive to be in the interest of his constituents. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the real object of this rule. It is designed not only to gag us, but also to gag gentlemen on the Republican side who might be disposed to rebel against the party whip which is being applied in this summary manner.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia wholly misconstrues my statement. It was upon the ground of want of time alone that I called attention to the fact that differences are dangerous in dealing with this subject. As to Democratic amendments, of course we would vote them down, for no Democratic tariff proposition would justify any patriot in voting for it. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The question being taken on the adoption of the resolution, the Speaker declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CRISP. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 208, nays 90, not voting 57; as follows:

YEAS—208.

Acheson,	Doolittle,	Hunter,	Prince,
Adams,	Dovener,	Hurley,	Pugh,
Aitken,	Draper,	Hyde,	Quigg,
Aldrich,	Eddy,	Jenkins,	Raney,
Anderson,	Ellis,	Johnson, Ind.	Ray,
Andrews,	Evans,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Reeves,
Apsley,	Fairchild,	Joy,	Reyburn,
Arnold, Pa.	Faris,	Kerr,	Robinson, Pa.
Arnold, R. I.	Fenton,	Kiefer,	Royse,
Avery,	Fischer,	Kirkpatrick,	Russell, Conn.
Babcock,	Fletcher,	Knox,	Scranton,
Baker, Md.	Foote,	Kulp,	Settle,
Baker, N. H.	Foss,	Lacey,	Shafroth,
Barham,	Fowler,	Lefever,	Shannon,
Barney,	Gamble,	Leighty,	Sherman,
Bartholdt,	Gardner,	Leisenring,	Simpkins,
Bennett,	Gibson,	Leonard,	Smith, Ill.
Bingham,	Gillet, N. Y.	Lewis,	Smith, Mich.
Bishop,	Gillett, Mass.	Linton,	Snover,
Black, N. Y.	Graff,	Long,	Southard,
Blue,	Griffin,	Lorimer,	Spalding,
Bowers,	Griswold,	Loudenslager,	Sperry,
Brewster,	Grosvenor,	Low,	Stahle,
Broderick,	Grow,	Mahany,	Steele,
Bromwell,	Hadley,	Mahon,	Stewart, N. J.
Brosius,	Hager,	Marsh,	Stewart, Wis.
Brown,	Hainer, Neb.	McCall, Mass.	Stone, C. W.
Brumm,	Halterman,	McCleary, Minn.	Strode, Nebr.
Burrell,	Hardy,	McClure,	Sulloway,
Burton, Mo.	Harmer,	McCormick,	Taft,
Calderhead,	Harris,	McLachlan,	Tawney,
Cannon,	Hatch,	Meiklejohn,	Tayler,
Clark, Iowa	Heatwole,	Mercer,	Thomas,
Clark, Mo.	Heiner, Pa.	Miller, Kans.	Towne,
Codding,	Hemenway,	Miller, W. Va.	Tracy,
Coffin,	Henderson,	Milliken,	Treloar,
Colson,	Henry, Conn.	Milnes,	Updegraff,
Cook, Wis.	Henry, Ind.	Minor, Wis.	Van Voorhis,
Cooke, Ill.	Hermann,	Mondell,	Wadsworth,
Corliss,	Hicks,	Moody,	Walker, Mass.
Cousins,	Hilborn,	Morse,	Walker, Va.
Crowther,	Hill,	Mozly,	Wanger,
Crump,	Hooker,	Murphy,	Warner,
Curtis, Iowa	Hopkins,	Newlands,	Watson, Ind.
Curtis, Kans.	Howard,	Northway,	Watson, Ohio
Curtis, N. Y.	Howe,	Odell,	Wellington,
Dalzell,	Howell,	Overstreet,	White,
Daniels,	Hubbard,	Parker,	Willis,
Dayton,	Huff,	Payne,	Wilson, Idaho
De Witt,	Hulick,	Pickler,	Wilson, N. Y.
Dingley,	Huling,	Pitney,	Wood,
Dolliver,	Hull,	Poole,	Wright.

NAYS—90.

Abbott,	Cummings,	McClellan,	Shuford,
Bailey,	De Armond,	McCreary, Ky.	Skinner,
Baker, Kans.	Denny,	McCulloch,	Sorg,
Bankhead,	Dinsmore,	McDearmon,	Stokes,
Bartlett, Ga.	Dockery,	McKenney,	Strait,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Downing,	McLaurin,	Strowd, N. C.
Bell, Colo.	Elliott, S. C.	McMillin,	Sulzer,
Bell, Tex.	Erdman,	Meredith,	Swanson,
Black, Ga.	Hart,	Meyer,	Tarsney,
Buck,	Hendrick,	Miles,	Tate,
Catchings,	Hutcheson,	Miner, N. Y.	Terry,
Clarke, Ala.	Jones,	Neill,	Turner, Ga.
Cobb, Ala.	Kem,	Noonan,	Turner, Va.
Cobb, Mo.	Kendall,	Owens,	Tyler,
Connolly,	Kyle,	Patterson,	Underwood,
Cooper, Fla.	Latimer,	Pendleton,	Walsh,
Cooper, Tex.	Lawson,	Price,	Wheeler,
Cowen,	Lester,	Richardson,	Wilber,
Cox,	Linney,	Robbins,	Williams,
Crain,	Little,	Rusk,	Woodard,
Crisp,	Livingston,	Russell, Ga.	Yoakum.
Crowley,	Maddox,	Sayers,	
Culberson,	Maguire,	Shaw,	

NOT VOTING—57.

Allen,	Fitzgerald,	McRae,	Stallings,
Atwood,	Grout,	Money,	Stephenson,
Barrett,	Hall,	Moses,	Stone, W. A.
Beach,	Hanly,	Ogden,	Strong,
Berry,	Harrison,	Otey,	Talbert,
Boatner,	Hartman,	Otjen,	Tracewell,
Boutelle,	Hepburn,	Pearson,	Tucker,
Bull,	Hitt,	Perkins,	Washington,
Burton, Ohio	Johnson, Cal.	Phillips,	Wilson, Ohio
Chickering,	Layton,	Powers,	Wilson, S. C.
Clardy,	Lockhart,	Robertson, La.	Woodman,
Cockrell,	Loud,	Sauerhering,	Woomer.
Cooper, Wis.	McCall, Tenn.	Southwick,	
Danford,	McEwan,	Sparkman,	
Ellett, Va.	McGann,	Spencer,	

So the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules was adopted.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. LITTLE.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio with Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. STEPHENSON with Mr. MCRAE.

Mr. POWERS with Mr. OTEY.

Mr. LOUD with Mr. BERRY.

Mr. HEPBURN with Mr. ALLEN.

Mr. BOUTELLE with Mr. MONEY.

For this day:

Mr. HARTMAN with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. PEARSON with Mr. LOCKHART.

Mr. MCCALL of Tennessee with Mr. COCKRELL.

Mr. HANLY with Mr. TUCKER.

Mr. OTJEN with Mr. ELLETT of Virginia.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE with Mr. LAYTON.

Mr. TRACEWELL with Mr. SPENCER.

Mr. GROUT with Mr. BOATNER.

Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. MOSES.

Mr. BARRETT with Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

Mr. PERKINS with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. WOOMER with Mr. CLARDY.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio with Mr. TALBERT.

Mr. WILBER with Mr. OGDEN.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I should like to have my vote recorded in the negative.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall and did he fail to hear his name called?

Mr. WASHINGTON. I was not in my seat. I was called out and did not get back in time to vote.

The SPEAKER. Under those circumstances the Chair can not ask consent that the gentleman's vote be recorded.

Mr. WASHINGTON. If permitted to do so I should vote "no."

Mr. TERRY read a telegram stating that his colleague, Mr. MCRAE, was detained from the House by sickness.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill referred to in the order just adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act, and until August 1, 1898, there shall be levied, collected, and paid on all imported wools of classes 1 and 2, as defined in the act hereinafter cited, approved October 1, 1890, and subject to all the conditions and limitations thereof, and on all hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals, except as hereinafter provided, and on all noils, shoddy, garnetted waste, top waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, yarn waste, and all other wastes composed wholly or in part of wool, and on woolen rags, mungo, and flocks, a duty equivalent to 60 per cent of the duty imposed on each of such articles by an act entitled "An act to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes," approved October 1, 1890, and subject to all the conditions and limitations of said act; and on all wools and Russian camel's hair of class 3, as defined in said act approved October 1, 1890, and subject to all the conditions and limitations thereof, there shall be levied, collected, and paid the several duties provided by such act approved October 1, 1890. And paragraph 279 of Schedule K, and also paragraph 685 in the free list of an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," which became a law August 27, 1894, are hereby suspended until August 1, 1898.

SEC. 2. That from and after the passage of this act and until August 1, 1898, there shall be levied, collected, and paid on all imported articles made in whole or in part of wool, worsted, or other materials described in section 1 of this act, except as hereinafter provided, 60 per cent of the specific pound or square-yard duty imposed on each of such articles by an act entitled "An act to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes," approved October 1, 1890, and subject to all the conditions and limitations thereof, in addition to the ad valorem duty now imposed on each of such articles by an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," which became a law August 27, 1894; and on carpets, druggets, bockings, mats, rugs, screens, covers, hassocks, bedsides, art squares, and other portions of carpets or carpeting, made in whole or in part of wool, the specific square-yard duty imposed on each of such articles by said act approved October 1, 1890, and subject to all the conditions and limitations thereof, in addition to the ad valorem duty imposed on such articles by said act which became a law August 27, 1894.

SEC. 3. That from and after the passage of this act and until August 1, 1898, there shall be levied, collected, and paid on all imported lumber and other articles designated in paragraphs 674 to 683, inclusive, of an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," which became a law August 27, 1894, a duty equivalent to 60 per cent of the duty imposed on each of such articles by an act entitled "An act to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other porposes," approved October 1, 1890, and subject to all the conditions and limitations of said last-named act; but pulp wood shall be classed as round unmanufactured timber exempt from duty: *Provided*, That in case any foreign country shall impose an export duty upon pine, spruce, elm, or other logs, or upon stave bolts, shingle wood, pulp wood, or heading blocks exported to the United States from such country, then the duty upon the lumber and other articles mentioned in said paragraphs 674 to 683, inclusive, when imported from such country, shall be the same as fixed by the law in force prior to October 1, 1890.

SEC. 4. That on and after the passage of this act, and until August 1, 1898, there shall be levied, collected, and paid on all the imported articles mentioned in Schedules A, B, C, D, F, G, H, I, J, L, M, and N, of an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," which became a law August 27, 1894, a duty equivalent to 15 per cent of the duty imposed on each of said articles by existing law in addition to the duty provided by said act of August 27, 1894: *Provided*, That the additional duties imposed by this section shall not in any case increase the rate of duty on any article beyond the rate imposed thereon by the said act of October 1, 1890, but in such case the duty shall be the same as was imposed by said act: *And provided further*, That where the present rate of duty on any article is higher than was fixed by said last-named act, the rate of duty thereon shall not be further increased by this section, but shall remain as provided by existing law.

The SPEAKER. The debate on this question will be limited to three hours and a half, which will give to each side an hour and three-quarters. If there be no objection, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] to control the time on one side, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to control the time on the other. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, when there was read at the Clerk's desk on Saturday last a special message from the President of the United States informing Congress that there existed a serious condition of the finances of the country and of the Federal Treasury requiring immediate relief, and appealing to the Senate and House to take no recess until relief should be afforded, every member of this House, I take it, felt that there was imposed upon us a special responsibility—not only a special responsibility, but also that there existed an urgent demand for immediate relief on the highest patriotic grounds. So thoroughly did the Committee on Ways and Means feel the urgency of this appeal that it was unanimously decided without distinction of party that it was the duty of this House to remain in session, omitting the usual recess for the time being, until there should be some measure or measures of legislation passed that would afford relief to the exigent condition of the Federal Treasury.

The Committee on Ways and Means immediately took up the subject and proceeded to consider what measures of relief could be proposed. The first thing that attracted the attention of the committee—the first in order because the most important and lying in large measure at the very foundation of the difficulties through which the Treasury had passed—was the fact that for two years and a half there has been a constant deficiency of revenue—an insufficiency of current income to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government—until that condition has become chronic.

Gentlemen have said in the debate upon the rule which was presented that there is no demand for more revenue, that the revenue is sufficient. I remember that in the last House, almost a year ago, when I presented upon this floor what seemed to me the urgent demand for an increase of revenue, it was replied by gentlemen on the other side that "next week," "next month," there would be revenue sufficient. And so we have gone on with this cry of hope all through this year up to this hour; and almost every month from the 1st day of July, 1893, up to to-day there has been an insufficiency of revenue to meet the current expenditures of the Government, amounting now to the enormous sum of $132,000,000. And in the present fiscal year, commencing on the 1st day of July last, up to night before last, there was, as shown by the official report in my hand, a deficiency of eighteen and a half million dollars; and in this very month of December, as shown in the same way, there has been a deficiency approximating $3,000,000.

Now, gentlemen tell us that there is revenue enough to meet the expenditures of the Government. What do they mean? What does the Secretary of the Treasury mean when he says that we need no more revenue? What did he mean one year ago when he communicated to one of the Houses of Congress that there was no need of additional revenue? His own reports presented from day to day show that there has been a deficiency all through this fiscal year, and never larger than at this moment. He means simply this (and I ask the attention of the House to the manner in which this issue is being avoided, for I wish to show the evil results which flow from it)—he means that after he has borrowed gold under the resumption act of 1875 for the purpose of redeeming United States legal-tender notes as they are presented for redemption, and after those notes have been thus redeemed by the proceeds of bonds sold, he has taken the very United States notes thus redeemed and immediately paid them out to meet a deficiency of revenue from day to day, from month to month, and from year to year. I ask, gentlemen, if so plain and practical a matter as this is to be met in this manner, what difference does it make if the Secretary of the Treasury sells bonds and immediately uses the proceeds to pay a deficiency in the revenue, or, having first used the proceeds of the bonds to redeem greenbacks, then to turn around and use the greenbacks to pay the necessary expenses of the Government and meet the deficiencies of the revenue? I ask gentlemen to point out the difference. Is not this in effect practically selling bonds to pay the deficiency?

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this policy is to be pursued, if we are to go on with insufficient revenues to meet the expenses of the Government, and then when bonds are sold for gold to redeem outstanding legal-tender notes those notes are to be immediately used to pay deficiencies of revenues, then I say to you that the "endless chain" of which the Secretary of the Treasury complains is fully established, and he may continue selling bonds without limit to put gold into the Treasury, taking the greenbacks to pay the deficiency in revenue, and never stop the raids upon the Treasury gold. Is there any doubt of this? Can it be questioned? And yet gentlemen say to us that because we have to-day $75,000,000 of cash above the redemption fund in the Treasury—$25,000,000 being required for a working balance, leaving $50,000,000 of free United States notes—gentlemen tell us that we may proceed to use those notes to meet a deficiency in the Treasury, placing the notes so that they may be presently presented for a second redemption in gold, and still need no more revenue. Is there any doubt that if we are to stop this run on the Treasury, to stop the issue of bonds to be sold for gold to maintain the redemption fund, that the first thing in order, the first step, is to provide sufficient revenue to meet the daily and monthly and yearly expenses of the Government? It is admitted that we do not have sufficient revenue for these purposes, and that the deficiency must be made up by taking the redeemed notes and immediately paying them out again. This is practically using the proceeds of the bonds to meet the deficiency of revenues of the Government.

Now, how did it happen that from 1879 up to 1893 there was no serious run on the Treasury gold? We had the greenbacks existing during that period, and preferred everywhere to gold. But why? Because, in the first place, the revenues of the Government were equal to or greater than the expenditures; and there was no necessity for creating an "endless chain," which must exist as long as there is insufficient revenue; in the second place, because there was maintained a redemption fund up to the minimum of $100,000,000, which created confidence every day and every hour; and third, because there was existing such a policy in the country as put all the people at work, all the spindles turning, and all the machinery moving, while consumption was up to the highest point, and prosperity existing in all directions. These conditions have been set aside since 1893, and insufficiency of revenue is a potent cause of existing distrust.

As long as this condition exists I contend that you may continue to sell bonds to maintain the redemption fund indefinitely, and yet, unless you furnish sufficient revenue to carry on the Government without a deficit at the end of each month and each year, that you are making simply an endless chain which will sustain the run on the gold in the Treasury—a run inaugurated by distrust.

I contend, further, that the fact that the Government has for two years and a half had insufficient revenue to pay its expenses has cast a cloud over all the business of the country and is an important factor in creating the distrust prevailing everywhere.

Now, in view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, and it seems to the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, that the first thing to be done—and on that must depend the success of all measures of relief—is so to legislate as to provide sufficient revenues for the expenses of the Government. And believing this, appealed to by the President of the United States to furnish a remedy for the existing situation, and to furnish it at once, has excused and even made necessary what would otherwise seem to be something of haste. But when the country is in danger, when such a message as that sent to us on Saturday by the President of the United States is brought to our attention, it becomes the duty of this House, charged with the constitutional duty of inaugurating revenue measures, to provide such a measure at the earliest possible moment in view of the great urgency that exists.

The first duty, then, that confronts the House is to provide sufficient revenue to meet the expenditures. How much revenue is required? Up to the 1st of January, the close of the first half of this fiscal year, the deficit will reach nearly $20,000,000, and assuming that that condition will exist during the next six months, for it is hardly reasonable to suppose that there will not be a deficiency during that period, it will bring the total up to at least $30,000,000, probably $35,000,000, and this may be increased to a much larger sum in certain contingencies.

Now, the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, in view of this situation, have felt it to be their duty immediately—first in order because first in importance, upon which everything else depends—to provide about $40,000,000 of additional revenue annually during this exigency. We do not know how long this exigency may continue, but we believe that it is safe in any event to provide $40,000,000 additional revenue annually for two years and a half. Hence the measure which has been reported by the committee is limited in its operation to two years and a half, the additional revenue to begin on the passage of the bill which has been presented and to terminate on the 1st day of August, 1898. It is exigency legislation which we have presented. It is legislation demanded by the special condition of the Treasury, to which our attention has been called by the President of the United States. It is demanded in the interest of the people of the United States.

The majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, in looking around to see where this revenue could be obtained, have agreed that it should be obtained from the customs side of our revenue system for two reasons: First, on the excise side we already raise over $150,000,000, which is all that should come from internal taxes. Second, it was always the intention of the founders of this Government to raise revenue for the support of the National Government from duties on imports. You well remember the position taken by the founder of the Democratic party, Thomas Jefferson, who raised the issue in 1800 against the Administration of John Adams because it had introduced excise taxes and introduced them because there was a threat of a war with France. Now, it has been the traditional policy of the old Democratic party, from its foundation even up to 1884—when in its national platform it adopted a resolution to the effect that the expenditures of the Federal Government should be raised exclusively from duties on imports—I say it has been the traditional policy of that party to

have the Federal Treasury rest on duties on imports, and to leave all other forms of taxation to the several States.

We have held, therefore, that it was our duty, especially in view of the fact that the balance of trade during this fiscal year has turned against us—and having turned against us has created a demand for gold for export—to raise additional revenue by increasing duties at some points in order that we might thereby increase the volume of goods to be made in this country, incidentally, and at the same time diminish the imports of that class of goods, and thus turn the balance of trade in our favor, instead of against us. For it must be remembered that so long as the balance of trade is against us, gold must be exported to pay that balance, or else securities payable in gold, which are precisely the same thing.

Therefore it seemed to us that for these reasons we should look to the import side for the purpose of raising $40,000,000 additional revenue. Looking in that direction, with the urgent demand upon us for instant action, we have, of course, found it impossible to revise the tariff, especially upon our ground; and looking at the fact of the great necessity, we have decided, by the simplest possible measure, to raise $40,000,000, or thereabouts, of additional revenue and to stop this deficit that is causing such serious injury to the finances of the country. In raising revenue in this way we have been obliged to turn, in large part, to a horizontal increase of duty.

Now, I admit that under other conditions, when there was no urgency, this would be an improper way to modify the tariff for the purpose of obtaining more or less revenue. But there is no time to go through the tariff and to examine the condition of each industry and adapt legislation to the wants of each and make a thorough revision of the tariff. Whatever is done, if it is to accomplish any good, must be done at the earliest possible moment, and it must be done in a way which will not provoke the aggressive hostility of others who differ with us on the point of the tariff in order to bring it into law. And for that reason we have proposed, as to a large number of schedules—all the schedules except the sugar and woolens schedules—simply to increase the duty 15 per cent during the next two years and a half. It is estimated that from this increase of duty, on the basis of the imports of last year under the existing tariff, we shall secure an additional revenue of $16,500,000 or thereabouts; but assuming that even this slight raise of duty, amounting really to an addition of only about 8 per cent ad valorem, may cause—especially as to those articles which this country can make for itself without any climatic disadvantage—somewhat of a decline in imports, we reduce the estimate of revenue from this part of the bill to $15,000,000.

Now, turning to wool, the great revenue producer. Wool was placed upon the free list by the act of 1894, unjustly, as it has always seemed to me, to the farmers of this country. We propose to take wool from the free list by the bill which has been presented, and to give clothing wool—that is, wool of classes 1 and 2—a duty of 60 per cent of the duty given by the act of 1890, which is 6.6 cents per pound as to most clothing wool.

It has been thus slightly reduced from the act of 1890 for two reasons. First, we felt that if the same duty was selected, in view of the opposition which has been made in certain quarters to the wool duty, and especially that if we raised it to the point that this opposition had taken position against, it might furnish an excuse for those whose aid we must obtain in order to secure legislation to refuse to sanction what we have done.

Believing this, we dealt with wool in the manner the exigency seemed to demand. This duty runs only about two and a half years. The duty of 6.6 cents per pound will be a benefit to the woolgrowers of this country. It is not all that we desired to do, nor is it all that the Republican party proposes to do when they shall come into full possession of the Government of this country; but it is believed that for the present, with this exigency upon us, with men of hostile views standing in other departments of the Government, it is the wisest present disposition of the matter in order to secure legislation and the needed revenue.

But as to carpet wools we have retained the same duty (32 per cent) as provided by the act of 1890, simply for the fact that carpet wools are not produced to any general extent in this country, and therefore that the duty on carpet wools is essentially a revenue duty. When there is a duty placed on wool, to make it of any advantage to the woolgrowers of this country, there must at the same time be given a compensatory equivalent duty to the manufacturers of wool, for the reason that when a duty is imposed upon wool, in view of the fact that as yet we have not been able to raise all the wool that is wanted in this country, the price here will be substantially the extent of the duty in excess of the price abroad.

Now, in order to make that of any advantage to the farmer and woolgrower, you must maintain the manufacture of wool in this country, because there can not be a market opened abroad for wool under such conditions except at free-trade prices. Therefore those interested in woolgrowing have for many years recognized the necessity, in order to furnish a demand for wool in this country, that there should be put upon imported cloth a compensatory duty equivalent to the duty on wool. For that reason we have placed upon imported manufactures of wool a duty of 60 per cent of the specific square-yard and pound duty of the act of 1890, in order to conform to the reduction of the duty on clothing wools, and the same specific square-yard duty on carpets as was imposed by the act of 1890, for the reason that carpet wools have the same duty in this bill as in the act of 1890.

Now, it is found by computation that should there be an importation of wool during the next fiscal year equal to the importation of the last year we should obtain a revenue of $12,000,000 on wool alone. We imported last year about 100,000,000 pounds of carpet wool. Carpet wool is valued on the average at 9½ cents a pound, which gives substantially a duty of 3 cents per pound, and 3 cents per pound on 100,000,000 pounds gives us $3,000,000 revenue. We imported last year about 138,000,000 pounds of clothing wool. Now, if there should be as much imported next year under this tariff, if it should become law, there would be, as I have already said, an increased duty of about $9,000,000, making about $12,000,000 revenue from wool.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. DINGLEY. I will, although I prefer not to be interrupted until I close.

Now, the suggestion has been made that if we place a duty upon wool, there will not be so much imported during the next fiscal year. I agree that after two or three years there will not be so much imported; but I think there must be as much for the next two years. You must bear in mind that the farmers during the last two or three years, since it was understood wool was to be placed on the free list, have been slaughtering their sheep because of the low price of wool. According to the Bureau of Statistics the production of wool in this country in the year 1894 was 54,000,000 pounds less than it was in the year 1892. Now, that has been caused by the fact that woolgrowing has become unprofitable since wool was put on the free list. Now, if we lost 54,000,000 pounds in the production of wool for 1894, as shown by the returns for the fiscal year, I think that when the returns of the present calendar year are made the loss will be found to exceed 100,000,000 pounds for the two years.

Now, you must bear in mind that as the farmers have been for the last two or three years slaughtering their sheep, it will take, even with a duty on wool, two or three years for them to again supply the deficiencies in their flocks. If this bill should become law, with a duty of 6.6 cents per pound on wool, the effect of it being to increase the price which the farmer obtains for this wool, in view of the fact that we only raise a part of the wool we consume, I have no doubt that the effect would be, first, to stop the further killing of flocks by the farmers of this country; second, the inauguration of measures looking to the increase of their flocks. Though we may not consider the duty imposed by this bill as the ultimate duty, yet even this would be an encouragement to woolgrowers to hold on to their flocks. They would speedily stop the killing of their sheep, and while there would not be an increase during the next fiscal year, there would be no further decline, and in a few years there would be an increase. It is more than probable, therefore, that in each of the next two fiscal years we shall be obliged to import as much clothing wool as we imported in the last fiscal year, and that being the case, we shall obtain $12,000,000 additional revenue from this source during that period.

From woolen goods, on which is to be laid a compensatory duty equivalent to the duty on wool, there would be a further increase of revenue to the extent of $16,000,000 if the importation should continue as large as it has been since the new tariff on woolen goods went into operation last January; but I assume that when this duty shall be laid, being specific, its effect will be to cut off, to some extent, the importations of foreign manufactures of wool coming into this market, which have already seriously injured that industry in this country. Nevertheless, supposing such an effect should result from the passage of this bill, with a reduction even to the extent of one-third of our current imports of woolen goods, we should get about twelve millions additional revenue from this source. It must be remembered that in 1892 we imported only $36,000,000 of woolen goods, while in the present calendar year the importations will exceed $60,000,000, and that on an undervaluation, because the duty now is exclusively ad valorem, which has unquestionably resulted in the importation of goods that on a fair basis of valuation would come nearer to $90,000,000. Now, we shall get from the imposition of the proposed duty on wool an increased revenue of twelve millions, and we shall get at least twelve millions more upon goods, making twenty-four millions increase of revenue from these two sources; and if we obtain fifteen millions from the horizontal increase on the other schedules, that, added to the twenty-four millions, will make thirty-nine millions. In addition to that, it is estimated that there will come about a million dollars' increase of revenue in consequence of the transfer of certain lumber from the free list to the protected list, at a rate of duty only 60 per cent of that which was imposed by the act of 1890.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is well-nigh certain that this measure, if enacted into law, would give us additional revenue of not far from $40,000,000 during the year following its enactment, and it is just this $40,000,000 that we need to make our revenue equal to or slightly more than our expenditures, to restore confidence, and to give to the business of the country the moral influence of a government that is solvent, that is paying its bills from its revenue, and that has a credit second to that of no government upon the face of the earth. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, I have occupied more time than I intended, and yet there are many other things that I should like to say with reference to this measure. It seems to me, sir, that its importance can not be overstated in view of the exigency which exists. It is no time for us to talk about what would be logical or illogical, or what we should or should not do under other circumstances. We are seeking to put something promptly into law that will give us the revenue that is needed, and then, by and by, when there shall have been another Presidential election, and when every department of the Government shall be in harmony with this House of Representatives [applause on the Republican side], we may proceed to investigate all the questions relating to the tariff and to carry out by legislation the principle which the Republican party believes so necessary to the prosperity of this country, and under which, during the thirty years preceding 1893, the United States enjoyed a measure of prosperity never known to any other country in the world. [Renewed applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to take up any more time, in view of the fact that the situation is so serious that urgent action is required. I was in hopes that gentlemen on the other side, with whom we have differed in the past upon questions of tariff, would welcome this opportunity to increase the revenue on revenue grounds, for whatever protection may come from this proposed legislation will be only incidental. We are not seeking at this time to pass a protection bill. We are seeking to raise more revenue, and to raise it in a way which may tend as far as it goes to restore the stricken industries of this country and give prosperity to our people.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I shall occupy but little of the time that has been assigned to this side for the discussion of this bill. I shall not attempt to follow my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] along the devious path which he has trodden. I shall not undertake to reply to his first argument, that this is a bill purely for revenue, and then to his last argument, that this is a bill to protect the wool industry. Those inconsistencies answer each other. But, sir, I do desire to call attention to certain facts which controvert the position assumed by the gentleman. The gentleman from Maine says that this extraordinary spectacle, this extraordinary haste, this extraordinary bill is all caused and all justified by a message of the President of the United States. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in making that statement the gentleman from Maine does not practice his habitual candor. If this bill is intended to be responsive to any suggestion from the President of the United States, then the action proposed ought to be in line with the suggestion made. The excuse the gentleman from Maine gives for the hurried manner in which this bill is presented and proposed to be rushed through is that there is a deficiency of revenue and that therefore the Government can not live without some such legislation. Now, the Secretary of the Treasury, in his report made to the House the other day, says:

> The cash balance in the Treasury on the 1st day of December, 1895, was $177,406,386.62, being $98,072,420.30 in excess of the actual gold reserve on that day, and $77,406,386.62 in excess of any sum that it would be necessary to use for replenishing that fund in case the Secretary should at any time be able to exchange currency for gold. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt the ability of the Government to discharge all its current obligations during the present fiscal year, and have a large cash balance at its close, without imposing additional taxation in any form upon the people.

This great fiscal officer, charged with the duty of making estimates and setting before us the condition of the Treasury, says that there is absolutely no necessity for imposing additional burdens in the shape of taxation upon the people. But the gentleman from Maine cites what he calls a deficiency, and claims that this demonstrates the necessity for an immediate increase of revenue.

Mr. Speaker, that gentleman knows—no man knows better—that there is in the Treasury to-day over and beyond the gold reserve, largely more free money by three times over than any deficiency that can occur during the fiscal year. It is not a question, Mr. Speaker, of borrowing money to meet expenditures; the money is already borrowed; the money is in the Treasury; but it is a question whether you will use an asset which you now have, or whether you will run posthaste to impose additional burdens upon the people in order to pile up money in the Treasury of the United States.

Now, let us understand this matter. There has been a deficiency. Why? What law caused it? I listened in vain to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] to hear some confession that the deficiency and the withdrawal of gold began under what is known as the McKinley law. Not one breath did we hear indicating there had been any financial disturbance under that celebrated law. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the receipts under the McKinley law had fallen until during the four months next preceding the 1st of March, 1893, the expenditures exceeded the receipts by $4,094,021.30. That was before the inauguration of the new Administration, and of course it was years before the passage of what is known as the Wilson tariff bill.

The first deficiency, therefore, we find arose under what is known as the McKinley law. That law was then peculiarly the pet of the Republican party. In that day there was none on that side to criticise or arraign the supremacy of the gentleman whose name had been given to that bill. It was the typical Republican idea of imposing taxation; that is, to reduce the receipts going into the Treasury by increasing the receipts going into the pockets of the protected manufacturer, to put at the water's edge of our country a tax collector with rates so prohibitory that no goods could come in in competition with goods made at home, thus reducing the revenue coming into the Treasury and thus increasing the profits of the domestic manufacturer by putting a burden upon his competitor. That is the Republican idea, and that was the idea embodied in the McKinley bill. Under that bill, Mr. Speaker, the revenues fell.

My friend from Maine, so far as I could understand him at this distance, stated that there were no withdrawals of gold until after the advent of the Democratic Administration. I will not say that I apprehended his statement correctly, but that is what I understood him to say—that the withdrawals of gold did not begin until after the inauguration of the present President of the United States. What is the fact? During the nine months next preceding March, 1893—the date when the Democratic President was inaugurated—the withdrawals of gold were $58,746,000. That was under the McKinley law and under a Republican President. You gentlemen recollect very well the apprehension that existed in the Treasury Department as the time for the inauguration of Mr. Cleveland approached—the apprehension that there might be a necessity to issue bonds before that event took place. You recollect the stories that went through the press—I do not vouch for them—that already in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing they were preparing bonds to be issued to build up the gold reserve.

Mr. DOCKERY. Secretary Foster actually gave the order, which is on file in the Treasury Department, for preparing the plates.

Mr. CRISP. My friend from Missouri states that the Secretary of the Treasury—Secretary Foster—actually issued the order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me?

Mr. CRISP. I do not want to be interrupted in the middle of a sentence.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I simply want to challenge the statement of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman will have an opportunity to do that in his own time. This statement, Mr. Speaker, will not be controverted—that the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury under the Administration of Mr. Harrison urged in his last report the importance of an increase in the revenue, thereby showing that the much-vaunted McKinley bill, which was built upon the Republican idea, had accomplished that which, though they do not often confess it, they always desire—prohibition of importations, so that the domestic manufacturers had the monopoly of the home market.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. CRISP. I am only going to occupy a few minutes, and my friend must excuse me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no additional taxation needed. We have that information from the Secretary of the Treasury. We ought to be candid with each other. Suppose you passed this bill; suppose it increases taxation $40,000,000, and that $40,000,000 goes into the Treasury each year. How will that help the existing condition? The President's message to which my friend from Maine has referred does not appeal for more revenue. It appeals for a particular kind of money. If you agree with him that that particular kind of money ought to be piled up in the Treasury, then you ought to provide some method by which it may be accumulated. The method now suggested, as stated by the Secretary of the Treasury, will be wholly inadequate to prevent or remedy that condition of things which alone prompts the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to appeal to Congress for relief. They ask for a particular kind of relief; and you offer them a supposed measure of relief which you know they do not want.

You pretend that this action must be hastily taken; and yet you know that can not be done because you know there yet remains to the people of the United States a legislative body where matters can be examined and considered, where amendments are in order, where the rights of the people can be somewhat preserved and protected. It is a strange commentary, Mr. Speaker, upon our institutions that the House, composed of representatives elected

immediately by the people, is unable to give any sort of careful consideration to a bill imposing $40,000,000 of taxes upon them, but that they must depend upon the other branch of the Congress to obtain a hearing and to secure consideration. [Applause.]

With reference to the bill, Mr. Speaker, I can not go into details. Friends on this side will do that. This is a "horizontal rise," not a "horizontal cut." You recollect, perhaps, a few years ago hearing a great deal about a horizontal bill, and you remember how our Republican friends ridiculed that idea at that time. And yet you find them now favoring a horizontal rise. You find them in favor of a 60 per cent increase of the rate of the act of 1890—that is, the McKinley bill. The Republican platform indorsed that bill. Now you say McKinley and McKinleyism is only 60 per cent right. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] What change has come over the spirit of your dream? Why is he not now so potential in the minds of the Republican party as he was in that day? Are there those in the household who are concerned in betraying McKinleyism? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] You have 60 per cent of McKinleyism in this bill. What has become of the other 40 per cent? [Laughter and cries of "REED!" "REED!"] It is apparent in framing the present bill that the Republican party, or the Committee on Ways and Means at least, have undergone a change of heart as to the high rates of the act of 1890.

But let me read what opinion Mr. McKinley has of the method and plan adopted by the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means of this House. [Laughter.] In 1884 there was a proposition for a horizontal cut. On April 30 of that year Major McKinley, addressing this House on the Morrison bill, said a horizontal revision "was a revision by the crosscut process." [Laughter.] That was his opinion of the system at that time. Further he says:

It gives no evidence of expert skill.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The majority here are amenable to all these characterizations. Again he says:

It is the invention of indolence and the mechanism of a botch workman.

[Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Did the gentleman vote for it?

Mr. CRISP. I am calling to the attention of the majority of the House the view as to horizontal revision expressed by their great tariff leader—he whose bill was not only approved by the Republicans on this floor, but was indorsed by the Republican platform. That is all. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have used more time than I expected. Friends on this side who are to follow me will go further into the details of this bill. I confess to the House that from the notice I have received—or rather from the want of notice—I have not been able to obtain statistics from the Treasury Department. But I know we are considering a law providing for a general revision of the tariff. It is limited, it is true, to two and a half years. Why that limitation was made I can not tell. I know what its framers say on the subject. They say they expect to be in full possession of all the Departments of the Government before the expiration of that period, and when so in possession they will again revise the tariff. There is to be a continued agitation of this question and no cessation thereof. The business interests, it seems, are never to find the time when they shall have peace. This is a "temporary expedient," my friend from Maine says; and when the Republican party again secures control of the Government we are to have another bill.

When that time comes, we hope, of course, to be prepared to meet them. On that issue we are ready to go to the people. Tariff for revenue or tariff for protection; give the people a chance to choose, and I have no fears that in the future, as in the past, when fairly submitted, they will decide the question in favor of lower taxation, which, being interpreted, means in favor of themselves. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DINGLEY. I would suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that, as I have used about forty minutes of my time and he has used probably twenty or more, some other gentleman on that side shall follow him.

Mr. CRISP. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, while the ink is still wet upon it there is being railroaded through the House by the Republican party a bill violating nearly every principle which has ever been insisted upon by the Republican party. First, it is a horizontal bill, which, as our distinguished leader tells you, was so keenly denounced by the king of protection, Major McKinley, in 1884. It will be remembered that at that time Mr. Morrison reported a bill to this House providing for uniform reduction of the tariff upon the necessaries of life, the purpose being to relieve the people from unnecessary and onerous burdens. Mr. McKinley made a carefully prepared speech on that bill on April 30, 1884. It is printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 134. His criticism of the Morrison bill was largely devoted to the reduction being uniform, or, as he called it, horizontal. In referring to this feature of the bill, on page 136, Mr. McKinley says:

What can be said of the capacity of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means as evidenced by the bill now before us? It is a confession upon its face of absolute incapacity to grapple with the great subject. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] The Morrison bill will never be suspected of having passed the scrutiny of intelligent experts like the Tariff Commission. This is a revision by the crosscut process. It gives no evidences of the expert's skill. It is the invention of indolence. I will not say of ignorance, for the gentlemen of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means are competent to prepare a tariff bill. I repeat, it is not only the invention of indolence, but it is the mechanism of a botch workman.

And, on page 40, Mr. McKinley says:

No man on this floor can determine its consequences or predict its results. It is a leap in the dark.

I beg to ask, if the uniform or horizontal bill was so vicious in 1884 and was so bitterly denounced by Republicans at that time, how can they be justified before the country in now insisting upon the same character of legislation?

INCREASE OF REVENUE NOT NEEDED.

Second. It is a bill to raise revenue, when no revenue is needed, and such measures have been denounced by the best and most conservative leaders of the Republican party.

The distinguished head of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. DINGLEY] had us in session during a great part of Christmas day preparing and perfecting this measure, which he informed the committee and the House was in response to the demand of our eminent Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Carlisle; and this statement is made in the face of the fact that Mr. Carlisle's report, so far from containing any request for legislation which would give an increase of revenue, especially states and repeats that no such legislation is desired or needed. On page 53 of his report, Mr. Carlisle says:

The cash balance in the Treasury on the 1st day of December, 1895, was $177,406,386.62, being $98,072,420.30 in excess of the actual gold reserve on that day, and $77,406,386.62 in excess of any sum that it would be necessary to use for replenishing that fund in case the Secretary should at any time be able to exchange currency for gold.

This shows that instead of a deficiency there is an actual excess of over $77,000,000.

The Secretary then says:

There is, therefore, no reason to doubt the ability of the Government to discharge all its current obligations during the present fiscal year, and have a large cash balance at its close, without imposing additional taxation in any form upon the people.

In order to emphasize this statement Mr. Carlisle repeats his objection to legislation of this character. On page 54 he says:

While the situation does not require any legislation for raising additional revenue by taxation at this time, it is such as to require the strictest economy in appropriations and public expenditures.

Now, in the face of these statements and recommendations by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Republican party proceed to do exactly what Mr. Carlisle asks them not to do, and yet they say they are doing this in response to his request. The Republican leaders boldly assert that the falling off of customs receipts has been due to the Wilson bill, in the face of the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury, which show precisely the contrary.

INCREASED REVENUE UNDER WILSON BILL.

The Wilson bill did not become a law until August 28, 1894, and therefore the customs receipts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1894, were all collected under the McKinley rates, while the customs receipts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, were nearly all collected under the Wilson bill rates; and Mr. Carlisle tells us that the receipts for one year under the Wilson bill rates exceeded those collected under the McKinley bill rates by $20,340,086.83. I read his language from page 52 of his report:

The revenue derived from customs during the fiscal year 1895 exceeded the revenue derived from the same source in 1894 by the sum of $20,340,086.83.

THE BILL INJURES BUSINESS BY USELESS AGITATION OF THE TARIFF.

Third. The action of the Republican party in insisting upon this bill is astonishing for another reason. During the last year the Republican side of the House were loud in their assertions that nothing was so detrimental to the business interests of the country as tariff agitation. They asserted that the worst kind of a tariff bill was better than frequent changes or frequent propositions to change the tariff. They asserted that what the business people of the country needed was quiet and an assurance that the tariff laws were stable and permanent. To-day they reverse that position, and the entire power of the Republican party is exercised in a most uncalled-for and injudicious agitation of this subject. They inform the country that this bill is to pass the House to-day, and that it will speedily become the law, and that in a short time the tariff on every imported article will be materially changed, thus doing all in their power to disturb trade, to interfere with commerce; yet every member who votes for this bill knows that its requiem will be sung as it passes from the doors of this House to that deliberative body on the other side of the Capitol, where the rights of the people will receive mature consideration.

Before I leave this subject I want to call attention to the fact that had not the decision of the Supreme Court cut off the income-tax feature of the Wilson bill the revenue from that measure would by this time have exceeded our expenses by nearly $100,000,000.

TO HOARD GREENBACKS WOULD BE AS DETRIMENATL AS THEIR CANCELLATION.

The Republican leaders tell us that they desire this additional revenue in order that the money thus received for customs may be used to pay the running expenses of the Government, and thus enable the Secretary of the Treasury to withhold greenbacks and Treasury notes and thus retain them in the Treasury. The advocates of this bill especially disclaim any desire to destroy the greenback and Treasury notes, but I beg to ask if the effect upon the people to permanently hoard them in the Treasury would not be just as detrimental as it would be to enact a law providing for their cancellation.

SECOND SECTION ESPECIALLY OBJECTIONABLE.

There is one feature of this bill to which I ask your especial attention. It is lines 17 to 25 of the second section of the bill. It will be seen that in that clause the McKinley bill is being restored in toto, up to the very extreme of that measure, which three years ago was so bitterly denounced by the American people.

Mr. HARDY. How was it last year?

Mr. WHEELER. The election last year could not have been materially affected by anything resulting from the Wilson bill, and especially not by the woolen schedule, because that did not go into effect until nearly two months after the election took place. The criticisms, as I recall them, were that we were slow in enacting our bill into law. The depression, which was due more than anything else to Republican profligacy, seemed to impress the people. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Since the Wilson tariff law has become understood by the people it has certainly received their approval. Manufactories have increased all over the country, wages are increasing, and manufacturing industries are again becoming prosperous.

Mr. HARDY. That is, in England.

Mr. WHEELER. I hold in my hand an authenticated statement that under the provisions of that wise measure which passed this House in August, 1894, all the manufactures of our country were increasing, that wages in some thirty of the largest establishments of the country were being raised, and general prosperity pervaded all our manufacturing industries.

M'KINLEY BILL REDUCED AND WILSON BILL INCREASED WAGES.

The first column in the following table shows the reduction of wages and the closing of factories which took place just after October, 1890, the date that the McKinley bill went into operation.

The second column shows the increase of wages and the reopening of closed manufactories which took place just after the Wilson bill became operative.

BETHLEHEM IRON WORKS, BETHLEHEM, PA.

December 6, 1890, works closed; 1,000 men out.	May 30, 1895, wages advanced 11 per cent; 2,000 men affected.
January 29, 1891, wages reduced 10 per cent after February 1.	June 15, 1895, 5 per cent to 10 per cent second increase.

WASHINGTON WOOLEN MILLS, LAWRENCE, MASS.

December 13, 1890, mills closed.	April 5, 1895, wages of 4,000 men advanced.

ACUSHNET MILLS, NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

December 20, 1890, mill No. 1, spinners and back-boys struck because wages had been reduced.	January 4, 1895, wages increased.

JOHN CHASE & SONS, WEBSTER, MASS.

December 25, 1890, mill running on three-quarters time.	April, 1895, wages of 300 men advanced 10 per cent.

CARNEGIE BROS'. STEEL WORKS, HOMESTEAD, PA.

January 1, 1891, wages reduced 9 per cent. February 21, 1891, 4,000 men out. April 9, 1891, wages reduced 5 per cent. August 15, 1891, open-hearth department closed; 300 men out. July 1, 1892, 3,800 men strike against heavy wage reductions; several weeks of riot and bloodshed.	May 14, 1895, wages advanced 10 per cent.

ILLINOIS STEEL WORKS, CHICAGO, ILL.

January 8, 1891, works, except blast furnaces, closed; 1,500 men out. August 11, 1892, for Milwaukee works, 10 per cent reduction in finishing department accepted.	June 20, 1895, wages of 7,000 men increased 10 per cent.

SANITARY WARE MANUFACTURING (POTTERY), TRENTON, N. J.

January 10, 1891, reduction of 33⅓ per cent proposed. April 30, 1891, pressers reduced 22 per cent; men have been on strike many weeks. May 14, 1891, reduced 7 per cent.	June 16, 1895, 10 per cent to 40 per cent increase.

MAHONING AND SHENANGO VALLEY IRON FURNACES, YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO.

January 22, 1891, fifteen blast furnaces closed; 10,000 men out. June 11, 1891, average reduction of 10 per cent. April 10, 1892, wages reduced 10 per cent; several thousand men concerned.	June 7, 1895, wages of 2,000 men increased 10 to 15 per cent. June 15, 1895, 10 per cent; second increase.

LAUGHLIN & CO., PITTSBURG, PA.

January 15, 1891, Eliza furnace closed down. January 17, 1891, another furnace closed. May 14, 1891, one stack idle.	April, 1895, increase of 10 to 15 cents per day.

BELLAIRE NAIL AND STEEL COMPANY, BELLAIRE, OHIO.

January 15, 1891, idle several months. August 25, 1892, steel plant idle since July.	June 18, 1895, wages of 1,000 men increased 15 per cent. June 18, 10 per cent; second increase promised August 1.

IRON WORKS, SHARON, SHARPESVILLE, AND WEST MIDDLESEX, PA.

January 17, 1891, six furnaces out of blast; 200 men idle. April 2, 1891, rolling mill No. 2 closed. November 1, 1891, mill idle some months. May 5, 1892, two furnaces to be closed.	May 9, 1895, wages of 1,500 men increased.

PENNSYLVANIA STEEL WORKS, STEELTON, PA.

January 17, 1891, after February 1 will reduce wages 8 and 10 per cent.	June 4, 1895, wages of 4,000 men increased 10 per cent.

CAMBRIA IRON COMPANY, JOHNSTOWN, PA.

January 22, 1891, wages reduced 10 per cent; 5,000 men affected. May 30, 1891, wages to be based on 2,600 tons instead of on 1,800.	June 1, 1895, wages of 5,000 men increased 10 per cent.

COCHECO MILLS, DOVER, N. H.

January 24, 1891, reduced wages 4 per cent.	October 15, 1894, wages increased 5 per cent.

CRANE IRON COMPANY, ALLENTOWN, PA.

February 2, 1891, reduced wages 10 per cent.	June 12, 1895, wages of 200 men increased 10 per cent.

WEYBOSSET WOOLEN MILLS, OLNEYVILLE, R. I.

February 21, 1891, wages decreased by a change of schedule of allowances.	April, 1895, an increase in wages.

IRON FURNACES, NEW CASTLE, PA.

February 26, 1891, all employees accept reduction of 10 to 15 cents per day.	May 2, 1895, wages of 500 men increased 30 per cent.

ILLINOIS STEEL COMPANY, JOLIET, ILL.

March 6, 1891, 2,500 men idle; refuse to accept reduction. July 2, 1892, reduction of 45 per cent; entire plant shut down. August 3, 1892, men accept a cut of 23 per cent. August 11, 1892, reduction of 10 per cent in finishing department accepted.	June 18, 1895, wages of 7,000 men increased 10 per cent.

COTTON MILLS, ADAMS, MASS.

March 7, 1891, two mills closed.	May 6, 1895, wages increased.

RIVERSIDE IRON COMPANY, WHEELING, W. VA.

March 12, 1891, nail factory idle some time.	May 10, 1895, wages of 2,200 men increased 10 per cent.

EDGAR THOMSON STEEL WORKS, BRADDOCK, PA.

March 19, 1891, works closed. October 25, 1891, scrapers' wages reduced over $10 per month; ladelmen's 30 cents per day. April 10, 1892, 50 workmen discharged. August 6, 1892, two furnaces closed.	May 14, 1895, wages increased 10 per cent; 5,000 men affected.

LUCY FURNACES, PITTSBURG, PA.

March 19, 1891, one furnace closed. May 14, 1891, two stacks idle. September 15, 1892, one furnace idle some time.	May 14, 1895, wages increased 10 per cent.

LOCHIEL IRON WORKS, HARRISBURG, PA.

March 28, 1891, works closed.	June, 1895, wages increased 10 per cent.

LOWER UNION MILLS, PITTSBURG, PA.

May 1, 1892, wages of 150 men reduced, 75 blacksmiths accepted cut of 20 per cent, 75 hammermen struck. August 11, 1892, reduction of 10 per cent accepted.	May 14, 1895, wages increased 10 per cent.

READING IRON COMPANY, READING, PA.

April 2, 1891, wages of 2,000 puddlers reduced $2.25 per ton. February 25, 1892, mill No. 5 idle; 300 men affected. April 17, 1892, general reduction of from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. July 18, 1892, two furnaces closed, 150 men idle.	June 5, 1895, wages of 500 men increased 10 per cent.

MOSES T. STEVENS & SONS, ANDOVER, MASS.

May 7, 1891 working on half time.	April 1, 1895, wages of 1,200 men increased 15 per cent.

JUNCTION IRON AND STEEL COMPANY, MINGO JUNCTION, OHIO.

May 14, 1891, only one stack in operation.	June, 1895, wages increased 10 per cent.

ISABELLA FURNACE COMPANY, PITTSBURG, PA.

May 14, 1891, two stacks idle.	May, 1895, wages increased 10 per cent.

NELSON MILLS (RUN BY D. WHITE & SONS), WINCHENDEN, MASS.

May 28, 1891, mills closed.	June 15, 1895, reduction of August restored.

JAS. H. WINCHELL & CO., HAVERHILL, MASS.

August 8, 1891, closed probably for three months; 600 men out.	March 6, 1895, wages of 700 men increased 5 cents per case.

LACKAWANNA IRON AND STEEL COMPANY, SCRANTON, PA.

August 20, 1891, lower mill shut down.	June, 1895, wages of 4,000 men increased 10 per cent.

COTTON MANUFACTURING ASSOCIATION, FALL RIVER, MASS.

September 3, 1891, wages reduced 10 per cent.	April 22, 1895, reduction of 1894 restored.

OLIVER IRON AND STEEL COMPANY, PITTSBURG, PA.

September 3, 1891, plant to be closed until iron business improves. March 19, 1892, 250 furnaces idle. August 11, 1892, 10 per cent reduction in finishing department accepted.	April, 1895, wages increased to $4 per ton. July 1, second increase, the two amounting to 18 per cent.

ROWLAND PAPER COMPANY, MECHANICS FALLS, ME.

October 3, 1891, closed part of the time.	April, 1895, wages increased 12½ per cent.

BEAVER AND ECLIPSE MILLS, NORTH ADAMS, MASS.

October 15, 1891, cotton mill closed.	April, 1895, wages increased 12 per cent.

UNION MILLS, PASCOAG, R. I.

November 12, 1891, running on short time.	June, 1895, wages increased 5 per cent.

JONES & LAUGHLIN, PITTSBURG, PA.

November 12, 1891, reduced wages 10 per cent; 500 men affected. February 29, 1892, 200 puddlers dismissed. March 5, 1892, 37 puddling furnaces closed; 200 men out. August 13, 1892, closed; 4,000 men out.	May 16, 1895, 4,000 men receive an increase of 5 per cent to 10 per cent.

MOORHEAD BROS. & CO., PITTSBURG, PA.

March 17, 1892, puddlers' wages reduced from $5.50 to $5 per ton.	May 13, 1895, 350 men receive an increase of 15 per cent.

STEWART IRON COMPANY, SHARON, PA.

April 7, 1892, furnace No. 1 out of blast.	May, 1895, wages increased.

IRON FURNACES, NEW CASTLE, PA.

April 10, 1892, notices of reduction in all furnaces.	May 2, 1895, wages of 500 men increased 30 per cent.

NATIONAL TUBE WORKS COMPANY, M'KEESPORT, PA.

April 25, 1892, works idle some months. August 11, 1892, reduction of 10 per cent in finishing department accepted.	May 8, 1895, wages of 5,000 men increased 10 per cent.

SLIGO IRON WORKS, PITTSBURG, PA.

April 26, 1892, mill closed; 300 men idle.	May, 1895, wages increased 40 cents per ton.

PENNSYLVANIA BOLT AND NUT WORKS, LEBANON, PA.

May 5, 1892, 10-inch mill idle.	June, 1895, 1,000 men receive 10 per cent increase.

KKOXVILLE IRON COMPANY, KNOXVILLE, TENN.

May 15, 1892, idle some time.	June 12, 1895, wages increased 10 per cent.

CALUMET AND HECLA MINING COMPANY, CALUMET, MICH.

July 15, 1892, three and possibly five smelting furnaces closed.	May 27, 1895, wages of 2,500 men increased 10 per cent.

TILDEN IRON MINES, GOGEBIC RANGE, WIS.

August 8, 1892, all mines, save the Ashland mine, under control of Wisconsin Central Railroad Company, closed; 2,000 men out.	June 1, 1895, 700 men receive old rates.

CARNEGIE STEEL WORKS, BEAVER FALLS, PA.

August 11, 1892, reduction of 10 per cent accepted.	May 14, 1895, wages increased 10 per cent.

AMERICAN WIRE NAIL COMPANY, ANDERSON, IND.

August 11, 1892, reduction of 10 per cent in finishing department accepted.	June 5, 1895, wages of 1,000 men increased 10 per cent.

SALEM WIRE NAIL COMPANY, FINDLAY, OHIO.

August 25, 1892, closed; 400 men out. August 27, 1892, Bellaire, Ohio, furnace banked down; steel works closed.	May 18, 1895, several thousand men receive an increase of 10 per cent.

These statements conclusively show that a tariff law which cuts us off from the markets of the world is disastrous to the wageworkers in every vocation, and is also disastrous to manufacturing interests of every character.

Mr. MILLIKEN. May I ask my friend a question?

Mr. WHEELER. I beg my friend to excuse me.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Just one question. Do you state that seriously?

Mr. WHEELER. I state it positively, and no one knows better than does the gentleman himself the correctness of the statement.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The incorrectness of it, you mean.

Mr. WHEELER. In reply to what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARDY] said about England, I would respectfully call his attention to incontrovertible truths that I incorporated in a speech which I made on this floor May 4, 1888, by which I showed that, especially in cotton goods industries, England had, prior to that time, paid higher wages to operatives than were paid anywhere in the United States or in any other part of the world, and the reason was that our extreme protective tariff had prevented our supplying the world with cotton goods, and this had given England the full control of the markets of the world outside of the United States and enabled English manufacturers to supply the world with some $400,000,000 cotton goods, while we supplied the world with but about $12,000,000.

The demand by foreign nations for English cotton goods being nearly forty times the demand for American goods, there was necessarily a demand for cotton operatives in England nearly forty times as great as it was in the United States, and this of necessity had an effect upon the wages.

Now, the second section of the bill we are discussing, the paragraph to which I ask special attention, includes articles which are found in the home of every poor man in our country. It includes articles which we are now manufacturing more cheaply than they are made anywhere else in the world. We are supplying the world with carpets, and the only purpose in restoring the McKinley figures is to restore that system by which the manufacturers can have the entire control of the American market, and by combinations close up such factories as they choose, raise prices to the highest degree possible, and reduce the weeping, starving operatives to the lowest possible figure of wages. That method followed the passage of the McKinley bill, and the statement which I have read shows that the manufacturers who have increased wages under the Wilson bill reduced them under the McKinley bill shortly after its passage.

REPUBLICANS FINALLY ACCEPT DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES.

The Republican leaders state that this bill is a bill for revenue. I am very glad indeed to see that the Republican party have at last adopted one of the cardinal principles of Democracy. When the tariff bills were discussed fourteen years ago, the question of revenue from tariff was not considered. Leading Republicans contended that a tariff bill should be for protection, not for revenue.

In 1882 Mr. William A. Russell, of Lawrence, Mass., in his speech on this floor, went so far as to contend that a tariff which produced any revenue at all was not satisfactory to the interests which he represented. He said:

> There is no protection in a strictly revenue tariff—that is, to an American manufacturer; for if a revenue is to be derived from an imported article it must be imported, which certainly involves its manufacture elsewhere, and the rate of duty must be so fixed as to invite its importation. Therefore, a tariff can not be adjusted on a single article to serve the double purpose of revenue and protection. It must be either at a point to check importation, and thus protect, or it must be at a point low enough to admit importation, and thus produce a revenue. That is, when fixed at a revenue point it ceases to protect, and when fixed at a protective point it ceases to yield a revenue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the arguments in favor of this mad theory of protection are the old arguments that were made fifty years ago when the manufacturers of the United States were insignificant as compared to those of Europe. Now the condition is entirely changed. To-day we produce more than one-third of the staple products of the earth. We produce 80 per cent of the corn and 30 to 35 per cent of the wheat. We produce from 33 to 39 per cent of the steel, from 30 to 35 per cent of the coal, from 25 to 35 per cent of the iron ore, from 30 to 35 per cent of the pig iron, from 26 to 30 per cent of the finished iron, and from 80 to 86 per cent of the raw cotton. The iron and coal figures I take from the reports of the American Iron and Steel Association and the cotton figures from the last report of Messrs. Latham, Alexander & Co., New York. On page 157 they state that the world's supply of cotton last year was 14,050,000 bales of 400 pounds each, of which the United States supplied 12,050,000, which shows that last year the United States supplied from 85 to 86 per cent of the cotton of the world. We have but 4 per cent of the world's population, and certainly no one will contend that 4 per cent of the world's population can consume 40 per cent of the world's products.

American toil is now demanding the markets of the world, and, in the language of Mr. Blaine, I ask, How can this bill aid in getting a market for a barrel of pork or a bushel of wheat? Our changed condition in the last fifty years demands a change of policy. Our increasing productions admonish us to increase in every way possible the markets which consume the products of American toil. [Applause.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair please inform me what time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOPKINS). One hour and seven minutes remain to the gentleman from Maine and one hour and fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican party in this House is ready to meet the responsibility that is upon it to-day, and presents a bill for the purpose of increasing the revenue. Two years from now, I want to inform the gentlemen upon the other side, the Republican party will again meet the responsibility of that hour, and will present to this House and the Senate, and to a Republican President, a bill for the protection of American labor and American agriculture, and will write that bill on the statute books. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman from Georgia——

Mr. LESTER rose.

Mr. PAYNE. I can not be interrupted, Mr. Speaker. I only have ten minutes. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] says that there was a deficiency of revenue under the tariff act of 1890. Mr. Speaker, the tariff act of 1890 produced sufficient revenue to meet the expenses of the Government down to the 1st day of November, 1892. Not only that, it put into the Treasury a surplus of over $38,000,000. I can not stop to describe the other benefits that are known and read of by all men that followed from the tariff act of 1890 into every nook and corner of the United States of America.

In November, 1892, there was a deficiency in the revenue. There was not quite enough to meet the expenditures. But the gentleman from Georgia seems to have forgotten what also occurred in 1892, when the Democracy was placed in power in the White House and in both ends of the Capitol, and their destructive hand was cast like a shadow over every industry in this broad land of ours. [Applause on the Republican side.] It was that shadow of destruction that brought a deficiency of revenue in November, 1892. It was followed by their acquisition of power, on the inauguration of their President in March, 1893, and by the events which followed, until the Wilson-Gorman bill was written upon the statute books; and from the very day and hour that you placed that bill upon the statute books there has been a deficiency in the revenue of the Government. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that for two months the Treasury Department figured out a surplus; but it is equally true that in each of the months that followed there was an excess of expenditures over the expenditures of the month preceding of from $7,000,000 to $10,000,000. Your deficit in the revenue brought further distrust among the people.

When we assembled in the summer of 1893, the President of the United States informed us that all that was necessary to bring prosperity to this country was the repeal of the so-called Sherman silver act. The Republican party united with a few of you who voted for it on the other side and repealed that silver act; but we told you then that if you wanted to bring prosperity back to the country you should follow it by the further declaration that you would not have any tariff legislation; that you would not interfere with the industries of this country. And we predicted to you then that if you persisted in your agitation, that if you persisted in the passage of your bill, evils would come upon the country; and they have come since that time, and have followed as surely as night follows the day. We have had this run upon the Treasury. Now, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] says that there is $175,000,000 in the Treasury—$100,000,000 of redemption fund and $75,000,000 more—and that is true; but you have borrowed $181,000,000 since you came into power; and if you had not borrowed a dollar of that money the $175,000,000 would be gone and the Treasury bankrupt by a sum of over $6,000,000. Do you want to continue that state of things? Do you want to deal with syndicates that charged a premium of $10,000,000 upon a $60,000,000 loan? Does not your cheek blush with shame at even the suggestion in a newspaper, whether it may be true or not, that one of the powers of Europe was coming to America with her gold to help us out of the difficulty. Is it not about time that the American people shall cease to be placed in the position of a mendicant and suppliant going to the Governments of Europe or to the syndicates of Europe begging them for gold to replenish the Treasury?

Two remedies are proposed. The President says it is necessary to negotiate a loan of $400,000,000 or $500,000,000 to retire the greenbacks and Treasury notes. There is not a business man but what says that any such operation as that in the present condition of the financial affairs of the country would bring ruin and disaster to the country. Are any of you in favor of carrying out the President's scheme, or the scheme of the able Secretary of the Treasury, to retire the greenbacks and Treasury notes by issuing $400,000,000 or $500,000,000 in bonds?

Another remedy is proposed. The Republican party has lived long enough to be able to deal with financial questions, and long enough to observe that no business man or business corporation, or even a great government, can exist unless its income is sufficient to pay its expenses. It did not take us two and a half years to find that out. We told you so two years ago. The same thing is true to-day. You have been running along here and calling it a temporary deficiency. Why, I remember that a leader on your side, in the last hours of the last Congress, in his optimistic way, marched down the aisle and proclaimed that a surplus was almost in sight. Yet we have lived nine months, and the surplus and the sight of it have been growing less every day. Something must be done to relieve the Treasury. We propose a business method. We propose that the income shall equal the outgo. Now it lacks nearly $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 per annum. We offer it to you. We offer it to you in the shape of your own tariff bill, with a horizontal increase of 15 per cent. The gentleman from Georgia has read what a former member of Congress has said of this as a "crosscut method." Gentlemen, this is a "crosscut method." We are going by the "crossroad," using the swiftest way to go to the relief of the Treasury and your Administration. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is not our idea of a tariff bill. We are not satisfied with your Wilson-Gorman bill, as no one was satisfied with it, even on your side. We are offering it as a question of revenue, and not as one of protection of a single industry of the United States, and yet incidentally there is not one industry that had been laid open to destruction by that bill——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield two more minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. There is not such an industry but that will receive some protection from this bill.

I appeal to you, my Democratic friends from the Northern States. How can any of you refuse to vote for it? Why, you often cry that you favor a tariff for revenue with incidental protection. This is your kind of a tariff. We give it to you as a temporary measure. We give it to you to increase the revenue. We give it your President and your Secretary of the Treasury to help lift the business of the country and the Treasury out of the bankrupt condition which seems to be the result of every Democratic Administration that ever had full control of the country from the time of Monroe's inauguration down to the time of Grover Cleveland. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

[Mr. MCMILLIN withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition or intention to enter into any discussion of the schedules of this bill. I merely wish to contribute a few remarks toward the avoidance of any misunderstanding, either in this House or elsewhere, of the character of the pending measure.

As I have had occasion to say, it is in no sense a protective tariff bill. It is in no sense a revision of the tariff. It is not an attempt to correct the inequalities of the tariff. It is not such a bill as the Republican party would pass if it were dealing with the tariff as such. It is simply an emergency revenue measure, matured in haste, under the whip and spur of a pressing and cruel necessity. When passed it will be—and history will record it as such—a conspicuous tribute to the patriotism of the Republican party. Rising above party prejudice at the summons of a Democratic President, at the sacrifice of our own personal convenience, resisting the importunities of our constituents, who would have us pass a bill that we apprehend could not become a law, we offer the country, in this hour of its dire extremity, a measure which, though to some extent a concession of principle, will, we think, to some degree afford relief.

The President of the United States, in his official capacity, has advised us that the Republic stands in peril, peril of such a character that he begs us to forego our personal convenience and to aid him by such legislation as we may be able to mature in the present difficulty surrounding the National Treasury.

We know well why it is that this dire calamity has come upon us. It is because our expenditures exceed our revenues, and because of the consequent distrust that succeeded to the universal feeling of confidence that had hitherto prevailed up until the accession of the Democratic party to power. Under the act of 1890, up until to the time that Democratic tariff legislation was threatened, our revenues exceeded our expenditures by $38,000,000. Our commerce, foreign and domestic, was increased. The balance of trade was in our favor. No person found any fault with our currency then. No person attempted a raid upon the gold reserve. Now, under this tariff law and a Democratic Administration, precisely the reverse of this condition exists. Our revenues are not equal to our expenditures; we are borrowing money on bonds issued in time of peace. We import more than we export; the balance of trade is against us. Under all these circumstances, I submit, is it not plain to any intelligent man that the seat of our difficulty, the cause of our trouble, is lack of revenue?

We believed, when we came to our response to the appeal of the President of the United States for aid, that there was but one honest course open to an honest Republican Congress, and that was to proceed to raise revenue through the custom-houses.

Now, I have doubts as to whether any gentleman who has not had the experience appreciates the difficulty that confronted the Committee on Ways and Means when they came to mature a revenue bill. We would have liked to have picked out from the various schedules those items the increase of the duty on which would bring us additional revenue, and in the first instance we made an attempt to deal with the matter in that way. A very few hours' discussion made it perfectly patent that no bill upon that line of policy could be presented to the House within such a time as to afford the relief called for by the President. We were compelled, then, to deal not with items, but with schedules, and that is a matter about which no man can have greater regret than I. I would like to have repealed that wicked, sectional piece of tariff legislation that puts cotton ties on the free list and northern hoop iron on the dutiable list. I would like to have increased the duty upon that splendid American industry, built up by the law of 1890, that keeps so much of our capital at home and gives to so many of our laborers employment upon their own soil, the tin-plate industry. [Applause on the Republican side.] I cast my vote for this bill, not because it embodies what I would like to have in it, but because it is the best we can have under the circumstances, and because I believe that it is a high, patriotic duty to answer the demands of the President. I trust that when it comes to that other body that has to pass on it equally with us we shall find that what my friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] says is true, that it is a Republican Senate, and that when it comes to the Executive he will make the concessions that patriotism may demand of him, and let the bill become a law, to the immediate relief of the country. And then, repeating what my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] suggested a while ago, two years hence, when the successor of the two tidal waves that already have swept the land from ocean to ocean shall sweep some great Republican leader into the White House and give us a Republican Senate and House, we will frame a tariff bill which will be in the interest of America for Americans. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman now yield time on that side?

Mr. CRISP. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the Populist members, while few in number, believe that they are not less sincere in their convictions on this subject than the great Republican party on our right or the great Democratic party on our left. Well do we remember that for many years the American people as a mass believed in remaining colonies of the mother country while the few proclaimed, "Give us liberty or give us death."

Well do we remember that the great Republican party, with its little coterie, for years proclaimed to the American people, "Let us emancipate the black man," while the great phalanxes represented on the Republican side throughout the North, as well as on the Democratic side throughout the South, said, "Nay, nay; it is the Divine will that they should serve their white brethren."

Our friends say that this difficulty is located in the tariff schedules. The little bunch that represents the Populist party says, "Nay, nay; we have tried this in vain for, lo, these many years; that it is a fundamental error in the financial system that has destroyed the prosperity of all gold-standard countries; that the true remedy is not in taxing the impoverished people more, but it will be found in an increase of their money supply and in making money a servant of the people instead of their master." The Populist party believes that the necessary expenses of operating this Government should be equitably distributed over every industry that may be incidentally benefited thereby. We discard the doctrine of raw material. It is a device, a delusion, and a snare in the interests of the manufacturers of the world.

There is no such thing as raw material. Wool is the finished product of the farmer and the raw material of the spinner; the thread the raw material of the weaver and the cloth his finished product; the cloth is the raw material of the tailor and the suit of clothes his finished product. And so it runs through the evolution of an industry. Therefore, as a Populist, I would cheerfully vote for a tariff on wool in proportion to that now existing on woolen goods if you would stop there, but your methods are such that they are not tolerable. You come into this House with a combine and deal and say that in order that the farmer shall be given a tariff upon wool that the manufacturers' present high tariff must be greatly increased. You say to the West that by virtue of giving us a tariff on wool we must forego the silver issue. You shackle the Republican members, then tell them to take the little pittance of tariff on wool and to be quiet on silver, the overshadowing industry of their country, or to take nothing. Some of us prefer nothing to this bagatelle on your hard conditions. Our forces believe the way to make up the deficiency is to coin the seigniorage in the Treasury and pay it out on the Government obligations. We know you disbelieve in this, because you have learned from the Eastern press that it is in the sole interests of the silver miner.

I respectfully refer you to Japan, Russia, Mexico, and to every other country using silver while we are scrambling for gold. They are building up manufacturing plants and thriving beyond precedent with the exclusive use of the very money you so scornfully reject. The farmers in England are now proclaiming from the housetops everywhere that the only possible success for the English farmer in the future is to reinstate silver or to establish a par of exchange between the two metals. They tell their Government that in England, if silver was reinstated, not a bushel of wheat could be imported from the Orient. A British consul from one of the islands of Japan informs the English people that Japan is one of the most prosperous countries upon the globe; that she can manufacture goods, take them to England, and sell them at 50 cents on the dollar of the home price, take the gold, buy silver bullion, return to Japan, have it coined, and recover the apparent shortage.

He tells his people that Japan owes no public debt, buys everything but a little machinery and a few other indispensable articles with silver, pays her laborers, taxes, insurance, home-grown raw material, and domestic debts in silver.

We say as Populists if you will come back to American principles, if you will come back to our national currency, that the farmers will yet regain their old markets and the manufacturers will have customers that can buy at home, and they can compete with silver-using countries abroad, and the people at large will be prosperous. There will be no deficiency, no occasion for bond issues, no paralysis of business. What the country demands is cures, and not palliatives. Your tariff measure can only help a few classes at the expense of many others. We are not suffering for the want of an abundance of products. We are suffering from the want of consumers, or, rather, from their inability to buy. I want to say to our friends in the East, when you destroyed the American farmer and silver miner in the West you struck a death blow to your manufactories. Your remedy will be at furthest but a temporary relief and unquestionably a permanent injury. What the country wants is something to prevent deficiencies and to cure the structural defects of our false system. When you destroy the miners and the farmers you destroy every industry, including your own.

One of the reasons why I will not vote for this bill is that I, with many other Populists, have determined never to vote another dollar to the manufacturers until they conclude to vote the people some money with which to buy their goods. I know our friends will not study this question while we submissively yield to their demands without requiring some reciprocation. Our Eastern friends think that the sum of the American people are embodied in the great money centers. This House has long thought that it performed its whole duty when it obtained their plaudits. They are always referred to as the business men of this country. The dealers in ready money and securities have for twenty years completely controlled this House or the other, as they determined, when any great governmental measure was involved. You have, I think, long since concluded that the chief industry of this country is carried on by brokers and stock gamblers; they have been favored so long and you have made the per cent of the entire game so much in their favor that they now have all of the ready money of the world. They have long since ceased to put a dollar into open enterprise or into any development of the country that tends to employ a day's labor or that incurs a possibility of loss. The balance of the people are submissive borrowers.

When the farmer is considering the question of feeding his crops, the banker says to him, "If you will give me a mortgage upon your cattle, upon your grain, and upon your hay, I will lend you the money with which to feed." He says the same to the manufacturer; he says the same to every other man who puts a dollar into a private enterprise. He takes no chance upon building up the country in which he lives, but he enjoys the very best in the land.

Now, I am not opposed to bankers. I believe in a banking system, but I do not believe in this Congress turning this country into a rendezvous for all the gold gamblers of earth.

I do not believe in substituting the specialists in the art of handling money and securities so as to make the largest possible private gains at the expense of the public, thereby making the public depend upon them for its financial life and liberty, for the unselfish and patriotic governmental financier who works for an independent constitutional money to be made for and by the Government for all of the people. There is no question but that such a change has taken place. I do not believe in making money superior to other property. Now, can any Western Representative accept the little benefit to one industry upon these hard terms? You propose to pull through your bonding system with the same machinery; you will give the West a little wool tariff; a poor recompense, indeed, for the advantage you gain, and then demand your portion of bonds in addition to the heavy increase in general tariff duties.

Because of the fact that the rules of the House only allowed a fraction of a minute for each member to express himself on this all-important question, if each one could have obtained the floor, and I being awarded only ten minutes for the whole Populist

party, and received this through the kindness of Judge CRISP, I feel inclined to take advantage of the leave to print and give some reasons why an individual Representative can do so little for his constituents as against the great majority.

The rules of the House by long usage give the Committee on Rules and the chairmen of the different committees practical control of the measures in the House and of the time for debate. This autocratic rule is fully exposed upon a casual examination of the committees.

It will be seen that the little State of Maine, the State of Massachusetts, and the State of Iowa have more power in directing the business of the House of the American Congress than all of the other States in the Union. This is an offspring of the rule that they must be advanced according to their seniority on the committees, and the people of these favored States have seen fit to return the same members consecutively for a great many years. Under this unrepresentative rule the little State of Maine, with less than 700,000 inhabitants, has Mr. DINGLEY, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; Mr. BOUTELLE, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs; Mr. MILLIKEN, chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and the Speaker, who also has the first place on the Committee on Rules. This little State has four Representatives in the House and four chairmanships and the Speakership, being far more than have all of the States from Colorado to California, inclusive, and yet California has nearly twice the population and more than four times the area and wealth.

The population of Iowa is about two million, and she has eleven Representatives. There are seven good places to the credit of the State, being as follows: HENDERSON, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who also has the second place on the Committee on Rules, next to the Speaker; HEPBURN, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; HULL, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs; LACEY, chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands; PERKINS, chairman of the Committee on Printing, and HAGER, chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills. New York has ten, Pennsylvania has nine, and Massachusetts has six, and so it runs, while twenty-six of the States have no chairmanships at all.

These favorite States not only have the chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee, but they have the Judiciary, the Banking and Currency, Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and Rivers and Harbors, which control everything of substantial benefit to the people at large. The rule also prevails in the House that the Speaker selects whom he will recognize as entitled to the floor, not according to the person who first rises to his feet and addresses the Speaker, but according to his simple desire. If the member desires to present a measure to the House, he goes and sees the Speaker and has to tell him or show him his proposition and then the Speaker will inform him as to the probability of recognition for such a measure.

While the House was meeting and adjourning simply, the Populist members agreed in their conference to introduce a resolution in the House and Senate inviting the Finance Committee in the Senate and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures in the House to investigate and report what effect on the industrial condition of the country, if any, the divergence between gold and silver had. Senator ALLEN promptly introduced the resolution in the Senate, and it passed by a good majority. I was appointed to secure recognition from the Speaker and have him ask the House for unanimous consent for its consideration there. Upon approaching the Speaker, he very thoroughly examined my resolution, and firmly but kindly replied, "I should not care to recognize you for this resolution," though the House was then in idleness. Had it been some little local measure or something that the Speaker approved he doubtless would have extended the courtesy.

I mention this simply to show the complete dependency of individual members on the will of the Speaker and the committees.

All of the committeemen in the House have the first right to the floor on matters coming from their respective committees, and those holding different chairmanships also rank high on the important committees of which they are not chairmen and get the additional right to the floor, so the individual who is not on an important committee must, by the courtesy of some one else, beg the opportunity to address the House, and can get recognition in no other way. New members or members of a new party are practically ostracised in the House and have no power under the rules to promulgate any of their principles.

As a further discussion of the silver question, I append a short interview published in the Philadelphia Evening Item of December 23, 1895:

The Item man asked Mr. BELL if he would give some of the reasons why his constituents favored the free coinage of silver, outside of their interest as silver miners. The answer is one of the very strongest arguments that could be presented in favor of free coinage.

The philosophy of money has been greatly mystified by confusing specialists in so handling money and securities as to make the greatest possible private gains at the expense of the public, and rendering the Government wholly dependent upon them for its financial life and liberty, with the unselfish patriotic economist who attempts to evolve a financial system for the greatest good to the greatest number and to make the Government financially superior to and independent of the professional money dealer.

For the past two decades the dealers in ready money and securities have been complete masters of the Government. The economic theory of money is that it shall be a servant of the people in facilitating their exchanges. The practice now prevailing makes the people its complete slave. The world has gone mad on the desire for money to lend for interest. The professional money lender and municipal bond dealer never put a dollar into development or open enterprise, but procure enterprising neighbors, who can doubly secure them, to take all of the chances of loss. The banker says to the farmer, "Now, I will advance you sufficient money with which to buy beef cattle if you will give me a good interest and a mortgage on your hay, corn, and cattle. I know there is good money in it for you to feed your crop." The farmer takes all the chances of loss, as do the manufacturers, builders, and every other vocation that tends to employ a day's labor or develop a public or private enterprise.

The per cent of the whole game has been so long in favor of the banker and bondholder that they now have all of the money in their end of the box. The balance of the world are submissive borrowers. These classes care no more for gold than they do for silver. They are adverse to any form of money that furnishes an ample supply without the intervention of banks. It is interest-bearing bonds and bank paper they want.

The reason they favor a single gold standard is that it furnishes the people only one-half as much full legal-tender money as the double standard. The owners of ready money are as much interested in the limiting of money as the owners of horses, hogs, wheat, or cotton are pleased with the limited supply of these articles. The scarcer the article, whether money or property, the dearer the price. These dealers are struggling for dear money and cheap property.

No logical attempt has been made to establish the gold standard on the merits of the system. The gold votaries have held up the single silver standard of Mexico and warned the public to beware of Mexicanizing our money. The bimetallists never advocated a silver standard or a gold standard, but supplicate for both metals, because this would double the volume of full legal-tender money, and when one metal becomes scarce or a scramble for one metal takes place the other will come to our rescue and keep our domestic finances healthy while the money kings fight over the coveted coin. If we are compelled to have a single standard, then by all means give us the metal that our great trade competitors use and the one not in the great international scramble.

A most important factor not generally considered is the domestic exchanges among ourselves, which constitute ninety odd per cent of all our commercial transactions. We want an abundant national currency for this trade. When our banks were suspending in every quarter, when wreckage and involuntary insolvency were rife everywhere in 1893, José Maximillano Damen, of Durango, Mexico, contrasted his own country with ours while visiting the World's Fair at Chicago. He declared that instead or its being a "silver trouble" it was a genuine "gold trouble"; that the United States was trying to do business on a substance it could not get—gold; that its paper, which was supposed to represent gold, was a swindle; that it only represented "credit and confidence," which were worthless in times of panic, as the gold could not be had with which to pay; that the banks of Mexico were in excellent condition; that the interior trade of Mexico did not depend upon the price of silver in New York or London, as inside of Mexico a silver dollar was worth a hundred cents, and that its depression in New York and London simply caused the people of Mexico to reduce their foreign purchases to the most indispensable articles, which was a real benefit in disguise.

The same may be said of Japan and all other silver-using countries. In fact, history probably has shown no such increase of trade and manufacturing in so short a time as has been developed by Japan, while the Caucasian nations have been scrambling among themselves for gold. This scramble has been in the exclusive interest of the money brokers. We have permitted all of our domestic industries to be paralyzed and formidable competitors to become thoroughly intrenched in our great marts of trade through the exclusive use of the very money that our Government has been trying to destroy.

There is not and never can be such a thing as an international legal-tender money. The precious metals by weight, whether in coin or bars, by common consent have been accepted and treated as a kind of international medium of exchange, but so little metal is required to pay these balances, as compared with our domestic commerce, that it is an insignificant incident merely of our monetary necessities. Immediately upon the destruction of silver in the United States India, Russia, and other silver-using countries felt the beneficial effects. For many years last past an ounce of silver would exchange for a bushel of wheat in Liverpool both before and since demonetization in this country. If England had to pay $1.29 for an ounce of silver, her wheat cost her $1.29. If she paid 70 cents an ounce, her wheat cost her 70 cents a bushel. The mints of India remained open to the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 15 to 1 up to June 26, 1893, and were then closed because the Indian manufacturers were controlling the markets for manufactured goods. England and other countries would buy silver at from 80 cents to $1 per ounce and have it coined into rupees at par and buy her wheat and cotton in India. This benefited England in obtaining wheat and cotton, but it made India the manufacturer. To meet this competition we had to sell our products for enough less than the India price to make good the profits made on these silver bullion purchases. This impoverished the American farmer.

India, Japan, and other oriental countries followed this up by establishing great manufacturing plants, through the aid of enterprising English, American, and other Caucasian citizens, and they are now invading every civilized country with their manufactured products.

All labor, transportation, raw material produced on the ground, living expenses, taxes, insurance, and domestic debts, etc., are paid in silver money. Under present conditions they can sell their products to any gold country for 60 per cent of the home prices in gold, buy silver bullion, take it to their mints, and recover all of their shorts where their mints remain open, as in Japan. The same force that destroyed the profits of American farming is now sapping the life out of American manufacturing.

According to Joseph Nimono, former statistician of the Government, the imports from other States into the arid regions of the West in 1892 were $200,000,000; exports from Western States into the other States, $240,000,000, $100,000,000 annually more than the trade of the whole country with Central, and South America and the West India islands. He declared that this trade was worth more to the Eastern manufacturers than the whole trade with South America and Europe combined.

Every silver mine of the West used engines, boilers, steel, cars, iron, piping, a great line of all kinds of manufactured goods, caused the building and equipping of railroads, opened coal mines, built up towns and all kinds of new enterprises. These people were content to mine while silver would pay and allow the East to do their manufacturing, but with the destruction of this industry, manufacturing plants are now going up all over the Rocky Mountain States and they are making steel rails, paper, cotton and woolen goods, etc., and it is now, as shown by Mr. Henry Clews & Co.'s Folder of recent date, one of the most prosperous portions of the country. The manufacturers of the East, by their blind policy in catering to the money lenders, surely killed the goose that laid the golden egg when they destroyed the

prosperity of the farmers and miners—their best customers of their own country—and built up a destructive competition abroad.

In 1792 Congress fixed the United States ratio at 15 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold. In 1803 France fixed her ratio at 15½ ounces of silver to 1 of gold. Both countries threw their mints open to the free and unlimited coinage of both metals. The United States ratio being more favorable to silver than the French and other European countries, it freely coined and circulated silver at home and shipped its gold, in coin and bars, abroad in payment of balances, foreign debts, etc. France freely coined and circulated gold at home and shipped her silver abroad for like purposes. In 1834 Congress changed the United States ratio to 16 to 1. This reversed conditions, and we then freely coined and circulated gold at home and shipped our silver abroad in payment of balances and foreign obligations, and France freely coined and circulated silver at home and shipped her gold for the same purposes, without material harm to either country. These changes were caused solely by favors shown by statute by one country and then by the other.

Under ordinary conditions the price of all necessary substances is controlled by supply and demand. As proved by a successful experience of eighty years, the Government stamp and the legal-tender quality given to silver by a great trading nation, with the right of unlimited coinage, will create such a demand as to hold it to the most favorable ratio fixed by any one of them. When the United States and French mints were closed silver stood at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and the ratio of weight in the world to-day is about 15½ tons of silver to 1 ton of gold, and four-sevenths of the commerce of the world is done on the double standard or single silver standard.

Ever since the closing of our mints every President and every Secretary of the Treasury have refused to obey the statute under the Bland and Sherman acts for its purchase, have refused to pay it out, have declared officially and privately in and out of season that it was cheap, dishonest, and dangerous money, and yet the disinherited bullion stands to-day at 67 cents an ounce, and not an idle or surplus ounce in the world. Change the position of silver with gold, and could the latter metal excel this standing? It has been phenomenal.

The Government refuses to pay out silver in common with gold, as the President and Secretary of the Treasury say, to maintain the parity of the two metals. This directly destroys the parity. It increases the demand for gold and appreciates it, decreases the demand for silver and depreciates it, under the universal law of supply and demand.

The American people owe national, municipal, and private debts estimated at about $30,000,000,000. At 4 per cent interest it would require $1,200,000,000 to pay the annual interest. The greater portion of this was contracted when gold and silver were both legal-tender money, and all national bonds and greenbacks are by statute specially payable in either. The gold standard doubles the value of these obligations and is contrary to every principle of common honesty and makes a perpetual income class of coupon clippers in America. The specialists controlling our finances clamor continually for an international money with which to pay our debts and do our home business, which completely destroys our internal prosperity in the interest of the foreign and domestic bondholders and money lenders.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY].

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, the adverse business conditions prevailing in 1892, under the McKinley law, contributed largely to the overwhelming defeat of Mr. Harrison. Gentlemen will remember the cyclone of disapproval which swept over this country from Maine to California. Why, even the eminent Speaker of this House, with his distinguished colleagues from Maine, only escaped the wreck made by that cyclone because they "got over the bridge" before it went down in November, 1892; and the bridge went down largely because of adverse trade conditions. It was the paralysis prevailing in business circles which compelled the Republican party to extend $25,000,000 of maturing Government bondsand take $54,000,000 of trust funds belonging to holders of national-bank notes and cover them into the general Treasury. All this occurred long before the election of Mr. Cleveland.

I quote from the debate which took place here just a few moments ago, using the official reporter's transcript:

Mr. CRISP. You recollect the stories that went through the press—I do not vouch for them—that already in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing they were preparing bonds to be issued to build up the gold reserve.

Mr. DOCKERY. Secretary Foster actually gave the order, now on file in the Treasury Department, for preparing the plates.

Mr. CRISP. My friend from Missouri states that the Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary Foster, actually issued the order. Mr. Secretary Foster, under the Republican Administration, not only——

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me?

Mr. CRISP. I do not want to be interrupted in the middle of a sentence.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I simply want to challenge the statement of the gentleman from Missouri.

Now then, in answer to the challenge of the gentleman from Ohio, I have obtained by special messenger from the Secretary of the Treasury the official order of Secretary Foster under date of February 20, 1893, in these words:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1893.

SIR: You are hereby authorized and directed to prepare designs for the 3 per cent bonds provided in a Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill now pending. The denominations which should first receive attention are $100 and $1,000 of the coupon bonds and $100, $1,000, and $10,000 of the registered bonds.

This authority is given in advance of the enactment, in view of pressing contingencies, and you are directed to hasten the preparation of the designs and plates in every possible manner.

I inclose a memorandum for your guidance in preparing the script for the body of the bond.

Respectfully, yours. CHARLES FOSTER,
Secretary.

THE CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

Not only this, Mr. Speaker, but on page 70 of Special Report No. 2621, made to the House of Representatives by Mr. Springer, then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is a statement by Secretary Foster, of date February 25, 1893, in answer to questions by the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. TURNER. It disclosed an unsatisfactory Treasury situation:

Mr. TURNER. Taking into consideration all these conditions which you anticipate, what, in your judgment, would be a fair conjecture of the condition of the Treasury at the end of the next fiscal year?

Secretary FOSTER. I should say the next fiscal year would show a deficit.

Mr. TURNER. Can you give an approximate estimate according to all the data accessible to you?

Secretary FOSTER. I will only say this, that if I was to have the management of the Treasury I should insist upon an increase of revenue to the extent of $50,000,000.

Mr. TURNER. In order to meet those conditions which you anticipate?

Secretary FOSTER. Not only those conditions, but the gold conditions as well.

In the same report, page 64, Secretary Foster said that the unfavorable conditions as to gold were so severe under the Sherman Act and from other causes that he gave the order to Mr. MacLennan (now chief of the division of bookkeeping and warrants, then chief of the division of warrants, bookkeeping, and estimates) to hold back for a day or two requisitions amounting to five or six millions of dollars. I have not time to read his testimony, but append it to my remarks.

So, Mr. Speaker, we find that the original outflow of gold from the Treasury of the United States was the effect of untoward trade conditions and of the passage of the Sherman Act, which, under the Treasury construction, resulted in an issue of $150,000,000 of gold obligations, with no gold in the Treasury to redeem them. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Extracts from testimony of Secretary Foster, February 25, 1893:

Mr. TURNER. But could you not bring that statement down for the basis suggested by Mr. MCMILLIN to include the year 1894?

Secretary FOSTER. He wants to see the difference in the manner of making the statements now and what formerly prevailed.

Mr. TURNER. And how the condition of the Treasury would appear each year since then on the basis of the former mode——

Secretary FOSTER. And how it would appear now on the basis of the former method of making up the accounts.

Mr. WILSON. What items in the Treasury are now covered in as available cash assets which were heretofore set apart as not under that heading?

Mr. MCMILLIN. And also what they amounted to when turned in?

Secretary FOSTER. Of course there is nothing turned in. Under the law we charged off as a liability against us about $5,000,000 on hand for redemption of national-bank notes which come in mutilated, and we charged that off as liabilities. We also charged off to liabilities the amount of outstanding checks, what we call agency accounts, which are largely post-office accounts. The Treasury in actual cash is always better off than a statement would make it.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I would suggest, Mr. Secretary, without some of my colleagues would prefer a different date, for you to make the statement covering the 31st of December, and then we will have it in unison with the balance of the reports here.

Secretary FOSTER. All right. Under Mr. Manning the bank deposits were not considered as money in the Treasury; subsidiary silver was not, but if I eliminated those items now there would be a showing of deficit.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand you are keeping books according to law, and that this statement they used to make was not according to law.

Secretary FOSTER. I do not want to say that; I do not want to say that in regard to my predecessors.

Mr. WILSON. As I understand, Mr. PAYNE, according to law means when I get pretty hard pressed I can take trust funds and pass them to my account and take some of my obligations I have got on hand for sale and count them as sold.

Secretary FOSTER. It is not that; but the changes in the keeping of the statement are simply this: There were two items, one of money in banks and the other subsidiary coin, which were eliminated from the cash and were not called cash. Now, I got to a point where if I did not include them in my cash my statement would show a deficit. I thought they were cash. I can take every dollar out of these banks in a minute, and I believe I have reduced the deposit to about $10,000,000.

Subsidiary coin is now at a point where it is not a large factor, it is gradually coming down. In my time it was $23,000,000, and when we get the Chicago Fair appropriations paid it will be down to $9,000,000, perhaps just about a fair working balance, and in the course of about three years you will have to supply some more. But when my predecessors were handling it it was $25,000,000 or $30,000,000, and the real significance of these statements is what the Secretary at the time being wants to show. My predecessors had a great deal of money and they wanted to show it was as small as possible. I had little money and wanted to show it was as large as possible, and I did just exactly what brother Springer and you would have done if you had been in my place. There is no juggling of figures at all.

Mr. PAYNE. You went on to a point where, if you continued the old statement, it would have showed a deficit, but you still had plenty of money in the Treasury for all needs?

Secretary FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. The Treasury was easy at that time?

Secretary FOSTER. Yes. The difficulty with the Treasury has not been any lack of money. It ought to have more money, but by the act of July 14, 1890, you have created an additional liability upon the gold in the Treasury of $130,000,000. That $100,000,000 was set apart as a redemption fund for $346,000,000 and it is now nearly $500,000,000.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Four hundred and seventy-six million dollars, I believe.

Secretary FOSTER. Now, there is a demand for this gold from abroad, and the truth is we owe the money and it is natural. My best information is that our securities are not coming back here; we are shipping securities abroad, but when you take into account the shrinkage of the balance of trade as shown upon the custom-house books compared with former years, and then deduct from that the balance of what our people spend abroad, say $120,000,000; $30,000,000 balance freight; $25,000,000 undervaluations (and I think it is probable we are cheated that much); $12,000,000 servant-girl funds sent abroad; (the balance on postal money orders is $12,000,000 against us); the Chinese send what money they have back to China; most of the money of the Italians goes back; 75,000 American citizens go abroad every year in the steerage who spend more or less money; all of these elements must be considered in determining the balance of trade. When you take all these elements into account you will find we owe money abroad.

Seeing these things, the Secretary felt that we should keep all the money we could in gold. About $25,000,000 was the limit he could pay for. He had no trouble to get gold if he had the money to get it with. Possibly, sometimes,

when five or six or seven millions of requisitions would come in in a day, for which he would have to pay gold if all were paid in a day, I probably have suggested to Mr. MacLennan that he had better wait a day or two until we got in a better shape, because I did not want to pay out gold for current liabilities. I knew just as well as I was living that this thing was going to come, and I wanted to be as strong as I possibly could. So you see in my report I made as good a statement as I could of our condition, and asked you to give the Treasury more money, so this gold reserve might be increased. Now, since $21,000,000 of this gold has gone and I have but $4,000,000 left, I can pay any requisitions which come in promptly, because I have currency in the place of gold.

I merely make this explanation so you may know what the situation has been. This has not been for the want of money. Once in a while, when large requisitions come in and pile up together, I do not want to pay them, because I would have to pay them in gold, and so we would paddle along for a day or two, when some one would say the Treasury was bankrupt and all that sort of thing. Now, I commenced with $25,000,000 in gold in the Treasury when gold exports commenced in December; $35,000,000 have gone out of the country and we have $4,000,000 left. Now, more gold is going, I have no doubt. If the Secretary could have had $50,000,000 more money on the 1st of December he could have increased the gold to $150,000,000 and kept his reserve at about $125,000,000, but not having the money, he could not do it.

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS].

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, the scenes that are being enacted here to-day illustrate in a marked manner the difference between the two great political parties of this country. Less than a week ago the President of the United States sent to this Congress a message stating that a great crisis was impending and recommending that the members of this House remain in session to provide some means or some method to avert the financial dangers that, in his opinion, were so imminent. Upon the reception of that message in this House the Republican members went into consultation as to the best means to aid the President in his effort to maintain the financial integrity of the country. Where, I ask you, is the Democrat in this House who by his voice or his vote has come to aid the Republicans in their patriotic effort?

If this measure, Mr. Speaker, that has been presented to this House is not such a measure as will meet the emergency, then I ask you, in the name of justice, why is it that the ex-Speaker of the House, the acknowledged leader of the Democratic party in the House, has not suggested some remedy of his own? Why is it, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] finds so many defects in the bill presented here by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, that he, with all his great experience in legislation and his ability from a Democratic standpoint, has not been enabled to offer some amendment in the committee or to make some suggestion upon this floor which would meet the emergency which the President says exists?

Mr. MCMILLIN. No amendment is allowed under the rule you have adopted. That is one thing that we complain of.

Mr. HOPKINS. Why, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was in committee with the Republican members yesterday; he had an opportunity to make some suggestions, if he had any to make. Why is it that gentlemen on that side have waited until the Republican party formulated the bill which has been presented before taking any action in the premises? If they are patriots instead of partisans, if they desire to uphold the arms of their President in this great emergency, why have they waited until this time? Why did they not get together and formulate some measure? Why did they not come to the Republicans and say, "This is an emergency where partisanship should be sunk and patriotism should control"? Not a word is heard from them. They remain in the quiet of their rooms until the Republicans, sinking their party prejudices, formulate a bill not in accordance with the views entertained by the party to which I belong, and then they assume their old rôle of critics. They are in their proper place to-day, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from Tennessee never appears so well as when he is kicking against some proposition or criticising some argument that is made on the opposite side. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely satisfied with the measure presented here for the consideration of this House; and it is only under the shadow of the great crisis which the President of the United States in his official message to us has stated to exist that I am willing to give it my approval. In an emergency like this, brought to our attention in so solemn a manner by the President, I feel that my convictions as a Republican should be modified, and I meet him more than halfway to avert the dangers that he says overhang the country. The measure that is presented here, while it is not a Republican measure, will, in my judgment, if it becomes a law, bring in enough additional revenue to the Treasury of the United States to make our revenues equal or exceed our expenditures. It will stop the endless chain that takes our gold from the Treasury, and will restore confidence to our people.

Mr. Speaker, this condition which confronts us to-day was not brought upon the people of this country by the Republican party. The ills to which the people have been subjected for the last two or three years are not the creation of the Republican members of this House or the Republican party of the country. When the Wilson-Gorman bill was first formulated in the Committee on Ways and Means the Republican members of that committee protested against its being reported to the House. They pointed out to the then leader of the House, Mr. Wilson, of West Virginia, its many inequalities, its many features of injustice to the great interests of the country, and its inadequacy to supply sufficient revenues for the Government. But the Democratic leaders of the House, regardless of the protests that were made by the members of that committee, overriding the prayers and entreaties of the manufacturers, the laborers, and producers who appeared before the committee and sought to have that bill modified, brought it in and passed it under their party whip and lash.

They were told at that time of all the evils that would come. As I have said, it is only necessary for us to recall the peaceful condition of affairs under the McKinley law and the Administration of President Harrison to realize the marked change that has been brought about in this country by Democratic inefficiency and blundering legislation. When the McKinley law was upon the statute books of this country we had peace, contentment, and prosperity throughout the land. Our manufacturing industries were successful beyond compare. America in those days was the paradise of the laboring man. Farmers and other producers received for their rich harvests and for their abundant products prices that made that a golden period indeed for them. This brief description of the condition of our country at that time portrays inadequately the facts. How is it now? The Wilson-Gorman bill, which we seek to amend in the interest of all alike, made "tramps" of a million of honest, industrious workingmen. It sent the wolf of hunger and want into the homes of our laboring classes. It destroyed the manufacturing industries of the country. It put out our furnace fires. It stifled the noise of the loom and the spindle. Not only that, but it nearly bankrupted our Treasury. This is what has been brought upon us by the legislation which we seek to remedy in the manner proposed by the bill before us. While, as I have said, I do not approve the bill in all its provisions, yet I do know that if it is adopted it will be one step in advance toward repairing the ravages under which the country and the American people have suffered by reason of Democratic incompetency and the Democratic reform legislation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. I will ask the gentleman from Maine, inasmuch as my colleague, Mr. TURNER, will conclude the debate on this side, if he has reached that stage where the remaining time is to be used in closing by one individual? If so, my colleague will go on now.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is my purpose, I will say to my friend from Georgia, to yield to another gentleman, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, before concluding the debate on this side.

Mr. CRISP. My colleague will close on this side, and therefore if there are other gentlemen to speak on the side of my friend from Maine I hope he will allow the debate to continue on that side.

Mr. HENDERSON. Do you intend to give all of the time to your colleague?

Mr. CRISP. Yes, all the remaining time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has thirty-three minutes remaining.

Mr. DINGLEY. How much time remains on this side?

The SPEAKER. Thirty-seven minutes.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the gentleman propose to consume all of the time?

Mr. CRISP. My colleague proposes to consume it himself.

Mr. DINGLEY. Of course, the conclusion is to be retained on this side?

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield my support to the measure pending before the House because it is, first, a revenue measure demanded by the President of the United States, or else the President of the United States is guilty of assault upon the integrity of the Treasury, which I can not lay at the door of an American President; and second, because in raising the sum of something like $40,000,000 which will be theproduct of this bill, that proportion of protection to the American producers will be gained by this legislation.

I will not stop here to discuss the direct and necessary effects of the bill upon the several branches of industry to be affected. I will leave that either to a future occasion or to such an extension of my remarks as I may see fit to make. I am unalterably in favor of protective duties. I believe that the products of the farm, the products of the mines, and the products of the factories of this country should all be protected by ample provision of law against the incursion of cheap-labor products into this country. And representing, as I do, an agricultural district, and especially a woolgrowing district, I greatly regret that something more substantial and more beneficial for those interests can not be obtained in this session. But I am one of those who believe in doing the best that I can under existing circumstances, and in recognizing the practical rather than the theoretical in politics. The woolgrowing interest

of Ohio has been practically ruined by Democratic legislation. The producers of wool have become discouraged, and in large lot have sacrificed their flocks.

If this bill can be passed, which carries nearly 7 cents a pound duty upon the wools of Ohio, I have confidence to believe that it will be beneficial in two respects. First, it will be protective in itself to the extent of this duty, and second, it will encourage our sheep owners to hold on to their flocks with the assurance of better times in the near future.

Furthermore, the action of the House in favor of this bill will be admitted as a guarantee that protection to wool and agricultural products throughout is the settled purpose of the Republican party. The repeal of the McKinley law carried destruction to the best interests of the American people. If we can add to all the schedules of the bill that destroyed those interests an increase of 15 per cent and put upon this Schedule K of wool and wool products 60 per cent of the McKinley law, it certainly will be beneficial in both directions—beneficial in its immediate effects and beneficial in the assurance of our action in the future. So I take this as a mere tentative measure, and one that is a harbinger of the future.

I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the leader of the Democratic side of the House, is anxious about the McKinley bill and the fortunes of that great leader of this American sentiment. He asks, if 60 per cent of the McKinley law was right, what has become of the 40 per cent? If the gentleman from Georgia should happen to straggle through the mazes of Georgia politics, and does not become engulfed in that rising tide that seems to be sweeping him off the field of future possibilities, and will come back here to the Fifty-fifth Congress, we will try to show the gentleman, and the people as well, where the 40 per cent of the law of 1890 is. [Applause on the Republican side.] It may be that we shall not want the whole 100 per cent on some items, for in the distress sweeping over the country under the Democratic rule changes have come, and it is likely that the interests of the country will demand that the measure which will be adopted in the Fifty-fifth Congress shall be builded upon new lines of taxation and not on the ancient landmarks which were necessary in the bills that have preceded.

The enemies of protection in this country have sought from time to time to see discord among the Republicans talking about McKinley schedules and McKinley rates. When the proper time comes I will call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to the fact that the Republican party will show itself not only loyal to protection and true to wisdom and good sense, but will frame its protective bill of the Fifty-fifth Congress upon lines incident to the conditions then, always, however, upon the basis of the true policy of protective tariff.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY]—the gentleman from Georgia used language that brought about the statement of the gentleman from Missouri—to the true history of Republican financiering so far as any proposed issue of bonds in 1893 is concerned. The gentleman from Georgia was very cautious, but he used language which in fact was a statement that there was made necessary by the condition of affairs in the closing months of the Republican Administration, an issue of bonds, and thereupon the gentleman from Missouri states that which has been so often said and so often exploded, that an order had been issued by Governor Foster, Secretary of the Treasury, to make a plate for the use of a bond in February, 1893.

First, let me point out to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], who has attempted a comparison between the two Administrations, that it is an unfortunate suggestion of his that we should now institute a comparative statement between the two Administrations. During the Administration of Benjamin Harrison we paid off nearly $250,000,000 of the national debt and destroyed the bonds, and put an end to the necessity to relieve the country of that burden. Under Mr. Cleveland's Administration we have already increased the national debt, first, by one hundred and sixty-two and a half million dollars of bonds, bearing a high rate of interest, added to an additional floating debt or deficit, which present the sum total of about $2000,000, and within the next ten days it is safe to predict that that sum will be increased by another hundred million dollars of bonds. All these are the true elements of comparison which the gentleman from Georgia has entirely omitted to refer to.

Now, what was the truth in regard to the issue of bonds proposed by Secretary Foster? So soon as Mr. Cleveland was elected President of the United States in 1892 symptoms of distaess which then spread over the country made themselves manifest. Confidence was shaken, wages fell, enterprises took fright, business subsided, and the gold reserve began to be diminished and began to fall, and the danger line was reached. Shortly after, the Almighty, for some reason that the human intellect can not understand, afflicted this country with a Democratic victory in 1892. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] The high-water mark of prosperity in this country in every branch of industry was on the day when Grover Cleveland was elected President of the United States, and all branches of prosperty began to depreciate at once. The gold reserve began to fall. It kept pace with the fall of industries. It kept pace with the fall of wages. It kept pace with the fall of enterprises, and it became apparent to the people of the country that something had to be done, and the Republican party in 1893 was the same patriotic party that it is to-day, and seeing the exigencies of the country, and seeing that the very presence of Mr. Cleveland, his very election, had stricken a deadly blow at the Treasury, Mr. SHERMAN introduced and tacked on—I state this from public rumor—at the request (and I state without qualification) by the acquiescene of the incoming prospective Secretary of the Treasury—a proposition to allow the issuance of certificates of indebtedness at a low rate of interests, to-wit, at 3 per cent, so that the incoming Democratic Administration might be enabled to sell a 3 per cent bond. The proposition, as I remember it, was practically and, I think, exactly the proposition now involved in the second section of the bond bill which will be brought before the House, perhaps, to-morrow.

I quote from a speech of Secretary Foster in the opening of the campaign at Senecaville, Ohio, this year. Governor Foster said:

WHAT THE HARRISON ADMINISTRATION DID.

Besides paying all the expenses of the Government, including enormous payment for pensions, payments much larger than have been paid before or will be paid hereafter, aggregating an excess of (approximately) $100,000,000 more than was paid by the first Cleveland or will be paid by his second Administration. It paid, also, all the extraordinary expenses for rivers and harbors and new Navy, and the other expenses of the "billion dollar Congress;" and in addition paid, including premiums, about $200,000,000 of the public debt. On the 4th of March, 1893, we turned over to the new Administration nearly $125,000,000 in cash, more than one hundred millions of which was gold.

Notwithstanding that Carlisle's statement shows the facts just stated, true to their habits and instincts, which have abided with them in the past and will no doubt continue in the future, they make these false allegations in the face of their refutation over the signature of their own Secretary.

THE TWO FALSEHOODS MOST PLEASING TO DEMOCRATS.

The two falsehoods that the Democratic leaders persistently publish, and in which they would take fiendish delight if true, are that American genius is incapable of producing tin plate and the Treasury under Harrison was bankrupt.

ORDERING PLATES FOR BONDS.

Now, as to the charge that the Secretary was so straitened for cash that he ordered plates for bonds to be prepared. I believed at that time that the gold reserve of one hundred millions should be maintained, and I would have sold bonds had this reserve fallen below the $100,000,000 limit to replenish it.

I believe now that much of the trouble that came to the Treasury could have been avoided if Secretary Carlisle had promptly announced that he would maintain his gold reserve at all hazards. I feared such a contingency might occur in my time. To fortify myself and be ready for such an emergency I conferred with capitalists and found I could sell bonds for gold on a basis of 3 per cent interest. The only bonds available were those authorized by the resumption act of 1875, none bearing interest at a less rate than 4 per cent. The plates for these bonds had been prepared while Mr. Sherman was Secretary, and quite a supply was already printed and ready for final execution. Mr. Carlisle, I suppose, used this class for delivery to the purchasers of bonds sold by him. About the 20th of March, 1893, the Senate, with the approval of Mr. Carlisle, who was then known to be the incoming Secretary, passed an amendment to an appropriation bill authorizing the issue of a 3 per cent bond by a practically unanimous vote. I had no doubt then that the House would concur, and that a 3 per cent short-term bond would be authorized. The emergency was such that I thought it prudent to direct the preparation of plates for these anticipated new 3 per cent bonds, which were in all respects a better bond than those authorized, for the use of myself or my successor at the earliest date possible.

The House failed to concur with the Senate amendment providing for a 3 per cent bond, and on the 4th of March I revoked the order for the preparation of plates; the plates were not completed and were not used by Secretary Carlisle.

THE ONLY PURPOSE FOR WHICH BONDS WERE TO BE SOLD.

The fact that my only purpose in contemplating a sale of bonds was to maintain the gold reserve at more than one hundred millions, and not in any sense to provide for current expenses, must be borne in mind. The revenues were ample, and continued so until July 1, three months after President Cleveland's Administration began. As the gold reserve did not fall below one hundred millions during the Administration of President Harrison (and did not for six weeks afterwards), there was no occasion for selling bonds, even upon the rigid views I held and still hold as to my duty. There was no occasion for the intervention of the President to prevent the sale of bonds.

This is the history of the whole affair, and proves that all there was of it was an honest effort on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury, Governor Foster, a patriotic effort, a wise effort, the effort of a patriotic man to leave himself in such shape as that the crumbling credit of the United States, falling beneath the blows of Democratic accusation and power, might not be without remedy. That is all there is of it. That is all there ever was of it. The Republican party, going out of power, saw the storm coming up and, like a wise seaman, trimmed its sails to meet the coming storm before it struck the country. The Republican Administration of 1893 placed the financial ship of state in a position to weather the storm. Their efforts were futile. The storm struck the ship and we lost the country by the election of Cleveland and the Democratic Administration, and the cost to the country in money value has far exceeded the cost of the great rebellion. And so our proposition now is to raise only forty millions extra to sup-

plement the falling of the Treasury, and we propose to make a provision so that the bond act of 1875 shall be no longer used in the reckless manner that it has been heretofore.

Referring again to the bill under consideration, it may not be a protective tariff bill; it certainly is not. Yet there is protection in it, and, best of all, there is protection against Democratic inefficiency, Democratic incompetency, Democratic blundering in all that they have done.

Gentlemen on the other side speak of the estimates of the Treasury Department and the hope they have that it will not be necessary to raise more money. I ask the gentlemen to point out to me one estimate made by the Treasury Department since 1893, beginning with the very first utterance of this Secretary of the Treasury, whether it related to the estimates of receipts or to the estimates of expenditures, and tell me when it was right, and tell me when it was that in a single instance his estimates have been found to be true. [Applause on the Republican side.] Look at the estimates of expenditures. They have all failed. Look at the estimates of receipts. See how he has divided them up. Not one of them has met the estimates. Not one of them was ever accurate. How can you ask the Republicans on this floor to take his estimates as the basis of anything which we shall do or fail to do? So far I have simply replied to the gentlemen on the other side.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] tells us that we are going to walk the plank again in obedience to the demands of the American people. I remember in the first session of the Fifty-third Congress how the gentleman gloried over the defeat of 1892, and told us that upon the passage of the Wilson-Gorman bill we should again walk the plank. The election came in 1894, and I heard a great many splashes in the water from the planks of political destruction. I heard our friends walking the plank in every State, and the screams of the dying and the gurgle of the drowning was the music of November, 1894. But the unfortunates were not Republicans. The unfortunates were Democrats, and were men who voted for the Gorman-Wilson bill. And indeed, I heard some clutching at a political plank in the State of Tennessee, not far from the district of my distinguished friend [Mr. McMILLIN]. I heard the clutching at the plank and the flying of the splinters in the air, and I learned that he had been barely saved. I advise him to be very careful that the plank which he has been talking about shall not be the plank upon which his overthrow in politics will take place in 1896. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am not vain enough to imagine that at this hour of the debate, when the ground has been so thoroughly covered by the distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me, I can, in the short time allotted to me, add anything that will be very striking or original; but I shall take advantage of the opportunity so kindly accorded to me to express my individual views with respect to the matter under discussion; and possibly I may be able to state briefly some of my reasons for supporting this measure, as well as to answer some objections that have been urged against it.

The Secretary of the Treasury has informed us in his recent report that there is no necessity for legislation of this character, that the skies are brightening, that the receipts of the Government are gradually increasing, and that the expenditures are slowly decreasing. He informs us further that there is in the Treasury of the United States about $50,000,000 of free money to bridge the chasm which he admits exists between the actual receipts and expenditures of the Government, and which he also concedes will probably exist at the end of the current fiscal year. Gentlemen upon the other side of this Chamber, who seem to have no remedy of their own to suggest in the emergency by which we are confronted, taking their cue from the Secretary, repeat this argument of his upon this floor; but they do not see fit to inform us whether they are willing to follow him to the full extent of the reasoning in his report and vote to-morrow for a law to issue gold bonds with which to retire all of the greenbacks and all of the United States Treasury notes now in existence.

But, Mr. Speaker, we must be pardoned if we listen with incredulity to the Secretary of the Treasury in the predictions which he makes with reference to the future of the Treasury. We have tried him in the past and found that he was inaccurate. He told us that there would only be a deficit of $20,000,000 in the fiscal year 1894, and the deficit turned out to be $69,000,000. He prophesied that there would be a surplus in the year 1895, and it turned out that we had a deficit of $42,000,000.

He concedes now that there is a deficit of some $17,000,000 to date in the revenues for the current year. He tells us that his prophecy for the fiscal year 1895 would have been fulfilled but for the fact that the income tax was declared to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court and that the receipts from internal-revenue sources unexpectedly fell off; and so the receipts from internal-revenue sources may fall off in the future, Mr. Speaker, just as they have fallen off in the past, and the Secretary's present forecast turn out to be a bitter disappointment to those who put faith in it.

We are also told by the Secretary that there is enough money in the Treasury, which is free and unpledged for the redemption of any outstanding indebtedness of the country, with which to bridge over the chasm between the receipts and expenditures of the Government in the future; but, as has already been well observed on this floor, everybody knows that this balance consists of greenbacks, and that the moment they are paid out they can be at once presented again to the Treasury and used as the means by which to drain it of its gold; and yet, sir, it is this very thing—the draining of the gold reserve from the Treasury by means of our paper money—which the Secretary informs us is our greatest menace and to prevent which he urges the issue of bonds.

Mr. Speaker, large as the deficit is, it would have been still larger but for the fact that there has been niggardliness practiced in Congress in the appropriation of money with which to carry on the legitimate operations of the Government. For the last two Congresses scarcely a cent has been appropriated for the construction of public buildings, although many such have been needed, and the work upon public improvements already in course of construction has in many instances been suspended for lack of funds. Not daring to attempt the open repeal of the beneficent pension act of 1890, it has nevertheless been so administered, through narrow, technical, and unjust construction at the Pension Office, that many brave, patriotic, and deserving men have been deprived of the pension to which, under a proper and liberal construction of that law, they were entitled, and thereby the deficit has been diminished in amount. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Sir, while I am not in favor of prodigality, while I do not believe a surplus ought to be created simply to invite extravagant schemes of public plunder, yet I do insist that there should not be in the conduct of public affairs such parsimony as will cripple the Government, but a just and reasonable expenditure, and for this reason I believe there should be an endeavor made to put money into the Treasury to meet such expenditure, as is contemplated by the pending measure.

I will vote for this bill, too, sir, because it will tend to restore confidence. Much of the anxiety and confusion which has arisen in our financial affairs has grown out of the fact that there was known to be a deficit every month in the National Treasury. When there is no further deficit in the revenue you will likely restore confidence not only at home, but also abroad. [Applause on the Republican side.] Let it be known to-morrow morning that the House has refused to come to the relief of the Treasury and you will find that the public anxiety will increase and the financial embarrassment will rapidly develop. The passage of this measure, sir, will turn the balance of trade in our favor, and thereby diminish to this extent the gold now drawn from our resources with which to liquidate the balance which is against us. To my mind, sir, the pending bill is a salutary one, and I shall therefore give to it my unqualified support. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I now yield to the gentleman on the other side.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Before I proceed, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Chair whether in any way this bill is amendable in its present condition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that no amendment is eligible under the rule.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a few historical facts which relate to our present condition may not be amiss on this occasion. When the party of President Harrison came into possession of the Government in all its branches his Democratic predecessor turned over to that Administration of available cash over and above the gold reserve $230,348,916.12. After four years of that Administration, and when again the party to which I belong succeeded to power in the White House, in this House and nominally in the other branch, or rather on the 1st day of March, 1893, we found in the Treasury, exclusive of the one hundred million reserve, a surplus of $62,450,575.18. And in order to show that balance there was a sort of jugglery with the figures.

Under the act known as the Sherman Act a trust fund of $54,000,000 and over deposited in the Treasury for the redemption of the national-bank notes was seized to make this balance. Taking the form of statement such as had existed before that time, or taking from this balance this bank-trust fund, we found in the Treasury when we succeeded to power in March, 1893, scarcely any surplus at all over the gold reserve. The surplus was gone and the bank-trust fund was converted into a debt. The previous Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Foster, appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means and expressed the opinion that there should be added to the resources of the Treasury $25,000,000 in gold to replenish the redemption fund.

My friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] has just read a statement establishing the well-known fact that Mr. Foster near the close of his term prepared to supplement that gold reserve with an issue of a large amount of bonds. At that time we had had

the full fruition of the McKinley Act. We had had the beneficent influence of protection under the leadership of that undaunted man, Mr. McKinley. We had had that system at the highest rate ever known in the history of this country, and yet the revenues ran down and the surplus had nearly disappeared, as was admitted by Mr. Foster in my presence.

With this empty Treasury, with the state of alarm existing in the country as to the integrity of our currency system, growing out of the Sherman silver act, with gold withdrawals already going on at a rate which gave Mr. Foster the greatest concern, and with the approach of that season of our commerce when these gold withdrawals were necessarily bound to increase—in that state of things, Mr. Speaker, we acceded to power. The new Congress, which was elected with Mr. Cleveland, revised the tariff in the interest of the Treasury as well as of the taxpayer. The revenue the McKinley Act had promised had run down, because that great measure of protection was a restriction upon importations and a prevention of revenue, as it was designed to be.

In the midst of a panic which threatened the credit of the Government itself and in the face of a depleted Treasury the party of which I am an humble member courageously went forward and said, "The remedy for the situation is not to raise taxes, but to lower them." [Applause on the Democratic side.] We said that we could increase the revenues of the Government by taking off the restrictions upon our commerce and at the same time lessen the burdens of the people. How have our anticipations been realized? Even after all the tribulations of the long session of the last Congress we finally passed a tariff measure which was not acceptable to me and not acceptable to many of my friends upon this side, but which we said would produce ample revenue for all the necessities of the Government. If the Supreme Court of the United States, that highest tribunal in the land, had not reversed its apparent attitude upon the question of the income tax and nullified that feature of the law, we would have had no deficiency at all at the beginning of next year.

Now, what has been going on under the customs features of that bill? Furnaces whose fires had been banked have resumed operations throughout the country, and they stand as witnesses to the correctness of the Democratic view. In every town, in every community, in every place where men manufacture American goods, almost without an exception, under the operation of that act, styled a "free-trade" act, wages have gone up, and at the same time one of its most glorious effects is that in spite of all the prophecies of ill, in spite of the desolating effects which were predicted for it, our exports of manufactured goods going out to sea and contending with our competitors in the markets of the world have actually increased by more than $17,000,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WELLINGTON. Will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I hope my friend will not interpose here. I have but a brief time.

Mr. WELLINGTON. The gentleman says that wages have gone up all over this country, from Maine to California. I want to remind him——

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. The gentleman can not remind me. I know as much about the matter as the gentleman does. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me add to this brief statement another fact. The defeat of the income tax made a deficiency, but there is actually no deficiency in the Treasury. According to the last printed statement, which I received this morning from the Secretary of the Treasury, there is in the Treasury over $170,000,000 of surplus, including the gold reserve. Why should we, in the face of these facts and in view of the history which I have briefly recited, reverse our policy and take from the people, by taxation, still more of their hard-earned money when the Treasury does not need it? I heard my ingenious friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] when he attempted just now to justify that course, but I confess I have not yet been able to understand his contention.

We have more money in the Treasury than we need; why, then, should we want to put more of the same kind of money there? I have here a statement from the Treasury showing the form in which our customs duties have been paid during the last few days. From this statement it appears that not a cent of gold has been paid into the Treasury, not a gold certificate has been paid into the Treasury, not a cent of anything has been paid into the Treasury under our customs laws but greenbacks and Sherman notes. Why, I ask, should gentlemen seek by another tax levy to pile up in the Treasury forty millions more of this same kind of money, which will no more relieve the situation than the money of which we have already a surplus of over seventy millions?

But, sir, gentlemen to commend this bill claim for it magnanimity on their part. They assume that they are coming to the relief of this Administration. The Administration declines it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, there lies behind this measure a motive which is not apparent on its face or in the avowals made by its friends and champions on the other side. My friend from Tennessee adverted briefly to the motive which directs this measure. It is proposed by this measure to put the tariff question behind for the session. What has come over the "grand old party" that its chieftains dare not meet responsibilities on their own account? What is it that has induced them to tent on our abandoned camp grounds? [Laughter.] This is a bill which treats in a special way, with a sort of popgun policy, one or two articles; and you ought to send by express an apology to William M. Springer, among the savages in the Indian Territory. [Laughter.] You denounced that great Democratic statesman, William R. Morrison, for a horizontal bill, as has been said here; yet you have to-day simply adopted his policy, and you ought to send a resolution of thanks to him for having instituted a policy which you are copying here in a great emergency.

And, sir, as was also stated by my friend who preceded me, this is a bill which is claimed by the gentlemen advocating it to be a bill "for revenue only." In view of the history of this country since 1876, you ought to apologize to the Democratic party and the whole world. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I again ask you what has come over the spirit of the "grand old party"? When I first came to Congress I heard one of the gentlemen, now supported by his friends for the highest office in the gift of the American people, declare that he was for a tariff for protection with incidental revenue. He afterwards gave to the tariff which was constructed strictly on that principle the benefit of his name. You say you can not afford to enter now on general legislation. Why can you not follow his lead? He was once a doughty champion in your cause.

If, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, the existing law is wicked and iniquitous, why did you not in two or three sentences provide that the existing law be repealed and the McKinley Act reinstated? It would have taken but a few words, and it would have brought into the ranks all the followers of protection. But you do not do that. You see fit not to adopt the policies of your own distinguished men. You repudiate their leadership. You go back on all your own traditions, and you misapply and pervert devices of ours that we have long since repudiated. If you did not see fit to repeal the Wilson Act and reenact the McKinley law, why did not my good friend from Maine, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, offer here a bill to tax beer $1 a barrel more—a proposition which he favored during the last Congress? On this one item alone he could have raised nearly all the money which he now expects to raise by a tax on the necessaries of the American people; and it would not in any degree have disturbed the business of the country.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that after distinguished Democrats have been by Republican orators here and elsewhere accused of dreadful crimes and combinations in connection with the sugar-trust scheme in the present law, the gentlemen on the other side have simply passed over that so-called iniquitous feature without touching it up or touching it down? [Applause.] They have simply followed their denunciation of that scheme by letting it severely alone. Senators were put under investigation on account of it, and the President also came in for some share of abuse in this connection; but this bill stays its hand at the sugar schedule!

Why is it, if the Wilson tariff act is bad, that this bill does not attempt to correct its wickedness? Where is the courage of that great party? Even during the last Congress, as during all my service here, there sat on that side a man from whom a stern look was like the frown of offended majesty. There was on that side a courageous hand the mere motion of which could put down or put up every member on that side. That same hypnotic hand, once so potent in action, now silences associates and represses their ardor while it wields the gavel of this House. [Laughter and applause.] I think it is wise in him. I think he will rejoice still more at the end of two years from now than he did at the end of the last four years if he can congratulate himself on having suppressed a reagitation of the tariff during his primacy in this Congress. But the country will take up this battle.

Why, Mr. Speaker, so far as I remember, during my entire career in Congress I have never before seen that party decline the gage of battle. I never before knew them to deliberately turn their backs when we challenged them to the old breastworks. [Applause.] They are scarred and maimed in the cause of protection. They have carried its flag on a hundred hard-fought fields; but in this, the culminating hour of their fate, instead of hoisting again the old flag of the old party, they run in here a popgun, horizontal, revenue-only bill. [Laughter.] Mr. Speaker, among the stout-hearted champions of protection hitherto I have seen courage, confidence, ability, and all the qualities that constitute magnificent leadership. "But the age of chivalry is gone; that of sophisters, economists, and calculators has succeeded." [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Speaker, this horizontal bill adopts, except in one schedule, the Wilson bill, with all its alleged iniquities, as its base.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania stood up just now and re-

vived that old contention about cotton ties. I have fought on that field with him many a time. It is an old issue. It is a matter about which I have had deep convictions. He calls the present provision on that subject a great iniquity. I want to tell him that, while the Wilson bill put cotton ties on the free list, the manufacturers of this country are still able to hold the cotton-tie market against the world. [Applause.] And in my opinion so it would be if we were to put almost everything in the iron schedule upon the free list. These enterprising Yankee manufacturers—I use the word not as a term of reproach—would under free trade be able not only to hold this market against the world, but to invade, not with the horrors of war, but in the pursuit of peaceful commerce, the mother country, and to take charge of her markets with very many of our iron and steel products. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that this bill is not now amendable. That means, of course, that nobody here can offer any proposition to change a single feature of it. I for one would be especially glad to amend a few iniquities. [Applause.] And, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if revenue were needed to again show that we can supply it abundantly, not by raising rates, but by lowering them [applause on the Democratic side]; and in that manner bring to the Treasury more than the gentleman from Maine contemplates in this bill. [Continued applause on the Democratic side.] But it can not be permitted to-day.

Now, I tell you that you yourselves have adopted a measure which you will be glad to amend before you vote for it. We can not, and you will need to have our unanimous consent before you will be able to do it yourselves. The bill presented by the gentleman from Maine in several sections refers to the act which it avers became a law on the "27th day of August, 1894." As the basis of the bill, it specifies in the first and second sections "An act which became a law on the 27th day of August, 1894." The next section concludes with the same reference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to the House that no tariff act ever became a law on the 27th day of August, 1894. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] Pass it, then, if you will; but it refers to a fact which did not exist. The so-called Wilson Act became a law on the 28th day of August, 1894. [Renewed laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] And this is but a fair sample of the rash and inconsiderate way of treating so important a proposition as a tariff bill. You do not even correctly cite the law you propose to supersede. [Laughter.]

Mr. CATCHINGS. But this is an "emergency" law. [Laughter.]

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. My friend from Mississippi on my right suggests that this is an emergency law. I beg to add that a bill which proposes to inflict a burden of seventeen millions more to the general list of taxes and twenty-seven millions more upon the clothing of the plain people of the United States, a measure which adds more than $44,000,000 to our load on the basis of our last year's imports, and still more to the burdens that we are carrying for the benefit of protection, ought to receive at least something like deliberate consideration in committee and upon the floor of the House; and while we are called upon to vote for or against it, we ought to have some opportunity to propose and consider amendments in this House, which has the sole power to lay taxes upon the people. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Has the gentleman from Georgia exhausted his time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The gentleman from Georgia has two minutes remaining.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I believe there was an agreement that I was to close the debate. I suppose the time might be considered as exhausted.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. ARNOLD].

Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we in supporting this measure are only performing a patriotic duty. There is no "party whip," as stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP]; the crack of the lash was always a discordant and repulsive sound to Republican ears. The Republican party knows no master but the American people; neither have we any "cuckoos" in our ranks. On another occasion (in the Fifty-first Congress) the gentlemen on the other side said we were ruled by a czar; but soon thereafter the gentleman from Georgia and his associates wove the wreath that crowned the alleged czar as the peerless prince of parliamentarians. [Applause.]

A very few days ago the President sent us the message pertaining to the Venezuelan question, and all Republicans, joined by our Democratic friends on the other side, promptly, without a dissenting voice, passed the bill to provide for the expenses of the commission suggested by the Executive. This measure grew out of the reassertion of the Monroe doctrine. In this the President only recognized the patriotic spirit of the American people, which he has so slowly learned. By passing that measure we all, Republicans and Democrats, voted to call a halt on the selfish aggression of England. Now, Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration demands the support of all of us again, because it is another blow at English interests. Be consistent, my Democratic friends, and vote with us. [Laughter.]

But the gentlemen on the other side say there is no deficiency and no need of revenues. I refer them to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, page 52, wherein he states that the expenditures exceed the receipts from July 1, 1893, to December 1, 1895, over $130,000,000. How the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] can arrive at the conclusion that there is no deficit it is difficult to understand, and it can only be explained by believing that he calculates from the Treasury reports with the same peculiar system of mathematics which he applies to the silver question, namely, that the one-half of one hundred cents is one dollar. [Laughter and applause.] For months and months and many months the deficit has been millions per month, and this is known to all people who read. Your Wilson-Gorman bill of the Fifty-third Congress is not one of "tariff for revenue only," but a tariff for deficit only. So your revenue and financial measures are absolute failures, and you are continuing in that pathway, which has all along been strewn with the wrecks of your failures and with the evidences of your incompetency. All this now being history, you on the other side should thank and support us when we propose to help you in your extremity of threatened bankruptcy.

When the revenues are sufficient the financial question will settle itself, and therefore let us address ourselves to our plain duty and pass this bill. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] has said to-day in his remarks that this is a tariff measure, and threatens that, if passed, "there is a power who will stop it." This threat will not deter us from our duty to the country; we will pass this bill, and with it we will pass the responsibility to the President. But this is not a tariff bill—it is only a revenue measure; after March 4, 1897, he will know what a Republican tariff bill really is, and then there will be no danger of the Executive vetoing it. [Applause.]

Then we will, in truth, provide a home market for our products and for the laboring man, and though he may be required to pay 1 cent more for a dinner bucket, he will have plenty to put in that bucket. Amid the sweet harmony of roaring furnaces, whirling looms, hammering forges, and buzzing sawmills happiness will then come to the home of the laborer, who will be fully employed at fair wages, and peace and plenty and prosperity will be constant guests at every fireside throughout this land. [Applause.] But the deficit, great as it is, would have been much greater had not the Democratic Administration used every ingenuity to keep it down. Think of the many pensions which have been cut off entirely in grossest injustice; the many pension claims, wherein the testimony has long since been complete, which are held back and not granted; and the many granted at a much less rate than the testimony shows them entitled to. Think of it, my countrymen, that the brave "soldier boys" of this nation, who gave most that life is worth living for that this Union might be preserved, are thus deprived of their just dues—many in the clutches of disease and want—that some excuse may be made for the free-trade Democracy. The soldier's pension is not a charity or gratuity, but rises to a higher plane of earned compensation and patriotic duty. God pity the party which thus denies, and not only denies, but forgets, the "brave boys in blue." [Applause.]

This measure will repair a little of the great evil that has come upon us; it will aid the laboring man some, and he needs all we can give him. We must not forget that a long step is taken toward communism, if not anarchy, when you deprive a man of the opportunity of earning bread for his family. The sons of toil of this land ask not for charity, but only for the opportunity of labor at fair wages, and these we demand they shall have. The Wilson-Gorman Democratic bill has signally failed, and it would degrade our labor to that of European pauper labor.

The Republican party stands committed to the protection of American labor, and will not follow England's free-trade policy which is protected at the mouth of the cannon. England has ever been a robber; she opens foreign markets by extending her commerce, and holds those markets by physical force. Might is right with her, and weaker peoples have often been required to yield territory to her because of her brute force. It is high time a halt were called. Let us have no more legislation in her interest, such as the Wilson-Gorman bill.

It is pleasant to know that the end of Democratic rule is near at hand—consistent in their inconsistencies, and most competent in their incompetency. But incompetency is a failing, not a fault, and it were, indeed, cowardly to attack the present Administration. [Applause.]

That knowledge is most valuable which is distilled over the fire of experience, and with such knowledge the American people will, in November, 1896, make provision to hand over to the Republican party—the party of principle, prosperity, and protection—full control of every department of this Government. Then will the Wilson-Gorman bill be repealed; that measure which can be fairly designated, with authority, as the child resulting from the

union of "party perfidy and party dishonor." And no wonder, with such degraded parentage, the child is disgraced and disgraceful! [Laughter.]

And the financial methods of the Cleveland Administration are as discreditable as the revenue law it placed upon the statute books. Think of its selling $62,000,000 of 4 per cent gold bonds at $1.04 to a syndicate which made $10,000,000 profit in the transaction. Mr. Speaker, up in my State, in that city of brotherly love, business integrity (and I may add, parenthetically), beautiful women—Philadelphia—Mayor Warwick issued and sold to his own people $1,250,000 of bonds at 3 per cent interest, at par, and no syndicate or other person got one penny in commission. And the Pennsylvania Railroad Company negotiated lately a large loan at 3½ per cent interest at par. All this was accomplished by competent business management, while this great nation must pay 4 per cent, and in addition give $10,000,000 to negotiate $62,000,000. And with this fact in his possession the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] a few moments ago compared the present Secretary of the Treasury to Alexander Hamilton, the most versatile genius our country has ever produced. Shades of Hamilton, what profanation! "Pigmies are pigmies still on mountain tops, and pyramids are pyramids in vales." [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN. I take this opportunity, under leave of the House to print remarks on the bill under consideration, to state that had amendments to the bill been allowed I should have offered an amendment inserting the following as a sugar schedule:

That from and after the passage of this act and until August 1, 1898, there shall be levied, collected, and paid on all sugars and on all tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice or of beet juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem, and upon all sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard in color and upon all sugars which have been discolored there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of one-eighth of 1 cent per pound in addition to the said duty of 50 per cent ad valorem; and all sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, or of beet juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete or concentrated molasses which are imported from or are the product of any country which at the time the same are exported therefrom applies, directly or indirectly, a bounty on the export thereof, shall pay a duty of one-tenth of 1 cent per pound in addition to the foregoing rates: *Provided*, That the importer of sugar produced in a foreign country the Government of which grants such direct or indirect bounties may be relieved from this additional duty under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, in case said importer produces a certificate of said Government that no indirect bounty has been received upon said sugar in excess of the tax collected upon the beet or cane from which it was produced, and that no direct bounty has been or shall be paid: *Provided further*, That there shall be paid from the duties collected on sugar under the provisions of this act the sum of one-half of 1 per cent per pound on all sugar testing above No. 16 Dutch standard in color, to any person or persons who, from sugar manufactured by him or them from beets, sorghum, or sugar cane grown in the United States, shall cause such sugar to test as aforesaid, under rules and regulations as to license, bond, supervision, inspection, and manufacture which shall be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded between the United States and the King of the Hawaiian Islands on the 30th day of January, 1875, or the provisions of any act of Congress heretofore passed for the execution of the same.

That there shall be levied, collected, and paid on molasses testing above 40° and not above 56° polariscope a duty of 2 cents per gallon; if testing above 56° polariscope, a duty of 4 cents per gallon.

Sugar candy and all confectionery made wholly or in part of sugar, and on sugars after being refined, when tinctured, colored, or in any way adulterated, 35 per cent ad valorem; glucose, or grape sugar, 15 per cent ad valorem; saccharine, 25 per cent ad valorem.

That so much of the act entitled "An act to reduce revenue, equalize duties, and for other purposes," approved October 1, 1890, as provides for and authorizes the issue of licenses to produce sugar, and for the payment of a bounty to the producers of sugar from beets, sorghum, or sugar cane grown in the United States, or from maple sap produced within the United States, be, and the same is hereby, repealed, and hereafter it shall be unlawful to issue any license to produce sugar or to pay any bounty for the production of sugar of any kind under said act.

This is the only schedule under the present tariff law which is omitted from the proposed bill as reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, and I am at a loss to understand how a revenue-producing article like sugar should be omitted from a revenue measure, conceded by all to be an emergency bill.

When we consider that this Government, from its foundation, has relied upon sugar as an article from which liberal revenue can be quickly and certainly realized, and that prior to the tariff act of 1890 the revenue from sugar exceeded $50,000,000 annually, and the fact that this bill is based on a horizontal increase of rates on every schedule except that of sugar, I can not comprehend why it is not included in this measure.

The amendment proposed by me increases the present duty of 40 per cent on all sugars to 50 per cent, which is a decrease of 5 per cent below the rate of general increase provided by this bill.

The only further change in the present law suggested by this amendment is as follows:

Provided further, That there shall be paid from the duties collected on sugar under the provisions of this act the sum of one-half of 1 cent per pound on all sugar testing above No. 16 Dutch standard in color to any person or persons who, from sugar manufactured by him or them from beets, sorghum, or sugar cane grown in the United States, shall cause such sugar to test as aforesaid, under rules and regulations as to license, bond, supervision, inspection, and manufacture which shall be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The present duty of one-eighth of 1 cent a pound on refined sugar, and the one-tenth differential additional thereon from foreign countries paying an export bounty, remains unchanged by my amendment.

Briefly stated, the effect of this amendment, as a whole, would be an additional revenue to the Treasury of about $10,000,000, less the amount which would be paid our domestic producers who manufacture and refine their own product. This would approximate $2,000,000.

There could have been but one objection to my proposed amendment, and that would probably have come from the sugar trust. It would operate to deprive the trust of about $8,000,000 of its annual profits, which would find its way into the Treasury.

The cost of foreign raw sugar for refining purposes is under 2¼ cents per pound, which, with the present duty on it of 40 per cent ad valorem (1 cent) and one-eighth of a cent cost of refining, makes refined sugar cost the trust 3⅜ cents a pound, the selling quotation for which is 4⅜ cents per pound, showing a profit to the trust of 1 cent a pound on the 3,500,000,000 pounds which it refines annually, giving it $35,000,000 of profit.

Under my proposed amendment, to the cost of foreign sugar for refining, 2¼ cents, add duty on it at 50 per cent ad valorem (1¼ cents) and one-eighth of 1 cent for cost of refining, making the total cost of refined sugar to the trust 3⅜ cents per pound, which, deducted from the quoted New York price of refined sugar (4⅜ cents), leaves the trust a profit of only six-eighths, instead of 1 cent, a pound.

On this (six-eighths) basis its profit on its refined product, 3,500,000,000 pounds, would be $26,250,000 annually, instead of $35,000,000. The two-eighths or quarter of a cent a pound difference amounts to $8,750,000.

From the duty paid on sugars under my proposed amendment the one-half cent a pound will be paid to our domestic producers and farmers, amounting to $2,000,000, leaving a net revenue to the Treasury of nearly $8,000,000.

I am unable to perceive why this proposition in favor of revenue for the Government and protection for our domestic sugar producers and farmers should not have the favor of this Congress.

Mr. DANFORD. This bill is possibly a little better than nothing, and with that view of it I will give it my support.

I would have been greatly gratified to have had the privilege of testing the sense of this House upon an amendment to the wool schedule on the lines of House bill No. 2623; also, an amendment to the pottery schedule increasing the rate of duties and correcting errors in the schedule; also, an amendment increasing the tariff on tin, so as to make the schedule conform more nearly to the present iron and steel schedule; but these amendments are precluded by the rule under which we are considering this bill, and, while the bill is far from satisfactory to me in its present form, I will not for that reason vote against it, believing that it is better to pass the bill in its present form than to pass no bill.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this bill, which fixes 60 per cent of the duties under the McKinley law, is not such a measure as meets my entire approval. It seems to me that the Republicans are not called upon to yield their convictions concerning a protective tariff to the end that the President, who is a recognized opponent of protection, may be induced to give the measure his approval. If Mr. Cleveland is unwilling to approve of a properly constructed tariff bill on the lines of protection, then leave the results with him, and he should bear the responsibility of an insufficient revenue to meet the demands of his Administration.

The greatest danger, in my opinion, which threatens the country from the passage of this unsatisfactory tariff bill is that it may fix the measure upon the industries which need greater protection than this bill affords, a permanency which is not contemplated in the minds of a majority of the Republicans who will vote for this bill. After the bill goes into operation and business shall be adjusted to it, many reliable protective tariff men in all parts may doubt the propriety of another change in the duties imposed upon imported commodities.

In my opinion we ought to tender Mr. Cleveland a just and satisfactory tariff bill and leave the results with him. The people of the United States have three times since his election repudiated Democratic theories and practices; and I firmly believe that nothing contributed so much to the complete overthrow of the Democratic party as did its position on the tariff question.

But whether I approve of this bill or not I think I shall vote for it. I am unwilling to even seem to oppose any measure which may possibly afford any benefits to the vast industries of the people of this country. The suffering and distress which have been so general throughout the whole country since the Democratic party came into power in 1893 appeal to our patriotism, and therefore I shall vote for this insufficient protective tariff measure in the hope of increasing the revenues of the Government and affording some increased protection to American industries and opening up additional avenues of employment to workingmen. And although this bill tends to place the Republican party in a false

position concerning protection, I am glad to hear gentlemen who brought in this bill openly declare on the floor of this House that the bill in no sense represents the views of the Republicans of this House. They inform us that this bill is only a temporary measure, and that when the Republicans get control of the executive and legislative departments of the Government we shall enact a tariff law which will afford adequate protection.

Accepting the statement of these eminent gentlemen, I shall expect a wiser and more acceptable measure in the near future, one that will meet the demands of the times as effectually as the McKinley bill did the needs of the people in 1890.

Give the country such a just and comprehensive bill and there will be another period of prosperity which will afford relief to the producers, manufacturers, and laborers in all branches of our industries. This is the one great object which should command our very best efforts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the contention of the Republican party on this floor is that the present bill has been introduced for the purpose of raising additional revenue to supply an alleged deficiency. The short space of time allotted to the minority in which to examine the provisions of the bill has prevented us from examining the rates of each article upon which a change is proposed. The present duty on pig iron is $4 a ton. I represent the principal manufacturing district in the Southern States, and in that district within the last year pig iron has been sold by our manufacturers free on board the cars at Birmingham for $5.75 a ton. This is nearly $2 less than the tariff duties levied under the McKinley bill. With iron selling at $5.75 or $6 a ton, the present duties amount to a prohibitive tariff, and an increase of rates on an article that is at present almost entirely prohibited from importation into this country can not increase the revenues derived from that article. This may not be true of other articles on which the increased tariff tax is levied, but it shows that the hasty preparation of this bill may reduce the amount of income derived from many articles from which we now derive some revenue, instead of increasing them, and that the real purpose of the bill is to increase taxation by a protective tariff system, and not for the purpose of relieving the deficit in the Treasury.

It has been contended on the floor of the House that the Wilson bill has caused great loss to our manufacturing interests throughout the country and loss of work to those persons engaged in manufacturing in this country. As far as the district that I represent is concerned, the opposite has been the case. During the summer of 1894, before the repeal of the McKinley tariff bill, a large majority of the manufacturers in the Birmingham district were "out blast" and a large number of men were out of employment. After the repeal of the McKinley bill and the enactment of the Wilson bill, during the fall of 1894 and the winter of 1895, the furnaces in the Birmingham district commenced to go into blast, until at the present day instead of there being a large number of men out of employment all of the furnaces of this district are in operation except six, and four of these six are prevented from going into operation by reason of litigation in which they became involved prior to the enactment of the Wilson bill. Instead of a reduction of wages, as is claimed by the Republican members on the floor of this House, the wages of the laborers employed in the coal mines, iron-ore mines, and furnaces in the Birmingham district have been increased 25 per cent. These are facts and not theories, and go to show that where manufacturing industries are located at advantageous points a protective tariff is not necessary for their prosperity.

Mr. DOVENER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say to the House that while this bill does not go as far as I should like upon some of the schedules, such as wool, lumber, coal, and pottery, and I should like also to see tin plate included and all of these articles protected by the provisions of this bill as provided by the act approved October 1, 1890, known as the McKinley Act, yet as this has been called an emergency bill, and no amendments allowed under the provisions of the rule governing the consideration of the bill, and believing something should be done at once under the appeal made by the President in his message, as a patriotic duty, I believe in sustaining him and providing revenue sufficient to meet the current expenses of the Government, trusting that later on we shall have the privilege of voting on a measure of revenue which shall come up to my ideas of tariff, which will not only furnish revenue to pay the current expenses of the Government, but pay the interest on and pay off annually a part of the bonded debt, as well as protect American labor and every American industry in the land needing the same. Therefore I shall vote for this bill.

Mr. WATSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I shall support this bill as a temporary means of replenishing our National Treasury. The President has warned this House by special message that the Treasury of the Government is in a dangerous condition, and that immediate relief is necessary to prevent, perhaps, another dangerous financial panic. To afford the relief which the President asks is the duty of Congress, and to that end I am willing to vote for this measure and contribute what I can to prevent what might result in financial disaster to the nation.

As a tariff measure, I do not think the bill meets the requirements of the country or that it will bring the relief to the prostrated industries of the nation which they deserve or which they have the right to expect from this House, or that it fully and sufficiently meets the demands of the Republican party or the promises made to the people by the representatives of that party in this House. As an emergency revenue measure, I support the bill. As a tariff measure, it does not meet my full approval.

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut. I desire to occupy some time in the debate on the bond bill which is expected to be reported to the House to-morrow. I yield the time allotted to me this afternoon to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent from the debate on this bill that it chiefly concerns the wool and woolen interests.

The district which I have the honor to represent is more largely interested in the woolen industry than any other in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and there are corporations there which individually consume more wool and produce more worsted goods than any other single corporation in the United States.

It is with a good deal of hesitancy that I vote for a bill relating to such important interests and which affects them to such an extent as this bill does. I should prefer time for consideration and thought. Why, then, am I called upon to vote for this bill, and why am I going to vote for it? It is because there is a financial exigency in the affairs of this Government that calls for relief.

Who says there is a financial exigency existing? The President of the United States. Who created that exigency? The Democratic party, whose representative he is. And it is because of that exigency that I am going to vote for this bill.

The woolen industry was prosperous under the McKinley bill, but those engaged in that industry shared that prosperity with the whole country. It was not a sectional prosperity. All others were prosperous. Under the present bill the chief prosperity has been enjoyed by the men who import foreign goods and export American gold.

Having shared in the general prosperity, Mr. Speaker, we have shared very seriously in the adversity. With that adversity upon us, what do we wish? We should like to have a general revision of the tariff. We should like to have it revised in the interest of the whole country and all its industries. But we know we must wait for about two years, and what do we desire in the meantime? We desire peace, commercial repose, a chance for the business industries of the country to adjust themselves to the changed conditions. But we can not have this peace, we can not have this repose, for the reason, it is said, there is an exigency now for more revenue for the Government. Aside from that, we are going to look for the increase where the loss was made, to the tariff which was destroyed by Democratic legislation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE].

Mr. STEELE. I prefer to yield the time back to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DINGLEY. I now ask the other side to conclude what they have to say in the discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE). The Chair understood the gentleman from Georgia to surrender his time.

Mr. DINGLEY. Has the whole time on that side been used?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Will the Chair indicate how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. To this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No; it was stated when the gentleman from Georgia concluded that he had two minutes remaining. He stated that he was to close the debate upon that side, and that he surrendered the time. So there is no time remaining on that side.

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield fifteen minutes, or the remainder of the time on this side, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. CRISP. There can not be fifteen minutes remaining on that side, for we take a vote at 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Very well; at 5 o'clock the vote will be taken.

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, there is much in what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] has said as to the hurry and anxiety with which this bill has been prepared. He ought not, however, even in the midst of such remarks as he has made to the House, to lay upon the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means any responsibility for such a blunder in the date of the act of 1894 as that to which he has called the attention of the House. The act of 1894, for reasons which the Democratic party at least ought to appreciate, was not signed by the President of the United

States, and it appears upon the statute book without his signature, with the annotation at the beginning of it that the date of it is August 27, 1894. [Applause on the Republican side.] If that is not the true date of the act of 1894, it only indicates that the State Department is mixed up with the general incompetency that has marked the present Administration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. It only shows that my friend did not thoroughly investigate the subject for himself.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I understand that. If we can not rely upon the Statutes at Large published by a Democratic Secretary of State, where on God's footstool ought we to go for information? [Laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. It does not make any difference, anyway.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It makes little difference, anyhow, and I am sorry that my friend [Mr. TURNER of Georgia], whose argument is usually respectable at least, should have descended to a criticism of that character.

My friend starts out with the proposition that all the misfortunes that have come upon the country since the election of 1892 came by reason of the law that was in force at that time. He does not deny that instantly after the election of that year the American people found themselves in the midst of bankruptcy and poverty and business calamities the like of which was never visited upon an American community before. He says to this House and the country that all these evils came from the tariff law of 1890; that is to say, he asks us and the American people to believe that we had been plundered and robbed and burdened for so many years by the Republican policy that we put ourselves into the hands of a receiver the very moment it became certain that relief was at hand, a situation which will not, according to my judgment, commend itself to the common sense of the American people. [Applause.]

Now, the gentleman says that, notwithstanding all we have seen and know, we are in the midst of a general revival of prosperity; that wages have increased in all parts of the country, and that all these blessings we owe to the tariff law of 1894.

I do not propose to enter into a controversy on the subject of protection. Everybody must judge that for himself; but I do say that my Democratic friend from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] ought to be very careful about attributing any very great amount of American prosperity to the operation of the law of 1894. If the American people can be persuaded of that it will do more to popularize perfidy and dishonor than anything that has ever happened in this world. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

My friend asks the Republican majority why we do not bring in a general tariff law, and he refers to the leadership of this House as wanting in courage; but the leadership of this House can always be relied on not to "fight as one that beateth the air." But we know, and everybody knows, that a Republican tariff law can not be enacted by this Congress. We do not know that the President of the United States would not sign the present bill. Does my friend speak by some commission when he says that the Administration declines this relief? We have the best reason for knowing that this law will please the present Chief Magistrate. We had a letter from the President in the last session of Congress which contains evidence that he will sign this law, restoring a reasonable revenue duty upon wool; and if my friend will listen to me I will read exactly what he says. He says:

> In these circumstances it may well excite our wonder that Democrats are willing to depart from this most Democratic of all tariff principles and that the inconsistent absurdity of such a proposed departure should be emphasized by the suggestion that the wool of the farmer be put on the free list and the protection of tariff taxation be placed around the iron ore and coal of corporations and capitalists.

The present law leaves a duty upon iron ore and coal substantially equivalent to 60 per cent of the law of 1890.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I make a suggestion?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Not at all.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I would say that he misconstrues the letter.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have not read it all.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. The President meant to say that the duty on woolen goods should be reduced.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. He spoke of the wool of the farmer; and now I want to impress on the Democratic side what he said:

> How can we face the people after indulging in such outrageous discriminations and violations of principle.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

With all his eloquence and all his ability the gentleman from Georgia can not explain how this great agricultural interest of the country was put on the free list, while 60 per cent of the McKinley rate was retained upon iron ore and coal. So I say that there is no man who knows the heart of the President as it has been revealed to us in these delicate communications we have had from the throne. [Laughter.] Who is authorized to say that he will put the signature of his Executive disapproval upon this bill for the relief of the Treasury? [Applause on the Republican side.]

My friend says the Treasury is in no danger and in no difficulty. On a question like that facts are more serviceable than mere opinions. From the day the act of 1890 went into effect up to and including October, 1892, there was a surplus of receipts in the Treasury over current expenditures. There has not been a quarter from that time until this hour when the receipts of the Treasury, compared with expenditures, have not shown a deficit. The shortage has averaged four millions and a half a month, more than seventy millions in aggregate, and if there is any man who believes that the Treasury of the United States can be permanently maintained upon a basis like that he may get the reputation of being a great statesman, but I doubt if he will be recognized as an authority in the science of modern business.

What do we propose to do? We propose—camping sorrowfully and regretfully upon Democratic ground for the purpose of giving final efficacy to what we do—we propose, by modifying certain provisions of the act of 1894, to put at the disposal of the Treasury annually nearly $40,000,000; and then we propose by an authority of law which ought always to exist in this country to permit the orderly, economical use of the public credit to maintain the reserves of the Treasury and to provide against temporary deficiencies in the revenue. Now, in order to do that, we have to do a thing which we have got quite accustomed to in these later years. Ever since the Democratic party has been in charge of the Government I have been politically embarrassed every now and then by the duty that has been laid upon me of "rising above party." [Laughter.] About once in three months there comes a demand to this House for the Republican party to rise above its principles and its platform and do something to meet the exigencies of the public Treasury.

To-day we come and offer to the uneasy Treasury of the United States an increment of revenue of $40,000,000 annually, and then we propose to clothe the Secretary with discretion to make a legal, salutary use of the national credit to protect the solvency of the Government and to maintain the value and parity of all the outstanding currency of the United States. There can be no permanent disaster in a country like this. As my friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] has said, a country with assets and integrity is always safe in the business world. There is one thing that we ought all to be agreed upon, whatever else we are divided about, and that is that the Treasury of the United States should no longer be left at the mercy of the organized avarice of the world without money to pay or power to borrow or means for increasing the public revenue; and so, Mr. Speaker, closing this debate, I appeal to the patriotic sentiment that may still be supposed to reside in the Democratic breast to meet the Republican party halfway when we offer upon your own party principles a measure to relieve the embarrassment and distress of the Treasury of the United States. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as but two minutes of the time remain, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the previous question be considered as now made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair will put the question.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly engrossed and read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question now is upon the passage of the bill.

Mr. CRISP. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 83, not voting 44; as follows:

YEAS—228.

Acheson,	Brosius,	Danford,	Griswold,
Adams,	Brown,	Daniels,	Grosvenor,
Aitken,	Brumm,	Dayton,	Grow,
Aldrich,	Bull,	De Witt,	Hadley,
Anderson,	Burrell,	Dingley,	Hager,
Andrews,	Burton, Mo.	Dolliver,	Hainer, Nebr.
Apsley,	Calderhead,	Doolittle,	Halterman,
Arnold, Pa.	Cannon,	Dovener,	Hanly,
Arnold, R. I.	Chickering,	Draper,	Hardy,
Avery,	Clark, Iowa	Eddy,	Harmer,
Babcock,	Clark, Mo.	Ellis,	Harris,
Baker, Md.	Codding,	Evans,	Hartman,
Baker, N. H.	Coffin,	Fairchild,	Hatch,
Barham,	Colson,	Faris,	Heatwole,
Barrett,	Connolly,	Fenton,	Heiner, Pa.
Bartholdt,	Cook, Wis.	Fletcher,	Hemenway,
Beach,	Cooke, Ill.	Foote,	Henderson,
Bennett,	Cooper, Wis.	Foss,	Henry, Conn.
Bingham,	Corliss,	Fowler,	Henry, Ind.
Bishop,	Cousins,	Gamble,	Hermann,
Black, N. Y.	Crowther,	Gardner,	Hicks,
Blue,	Crump,	Gibson,	Hilborn,
Bowers,	Curtis, Iowa	Gillet, N. Y.	Hill,
Brewster,	Curtis, Kans.	Gillett, Mass.	Hitt,
Broderick,	Curtis, N. Y.	Graff,	Hooker,
Bromwell,	Dalzell,	Griffin,	Hopkins,

Howard,	Loud,	Pearson,	Steele,
Howe,	Loudenslager,	Phillips,	Stewart, N. J.
Howell,	Low,	Pickler,	Stewart, Wis.
Hubbard,	Mahany,	Pitney,	Stone, C. W.
Huff,	Mahon,	Poole,	Strode, Nebr.
Hulick,	Marsh,	Prince,	Sulloway,
Huling,	McCall, Mass.	Pugh,	Taft,
Hull,	McCleary, Minn.	Quigg,	Tawney,
Hunter,	McClure,	Raney,	Tayler,
Hurley,	McCormick,	Ray,	Thomas,
Hyde,	McEwan,	Reeves,	Towne,
Jenkins,	McLachlan,	Reyburn,	Tracy,
Johnson, Cal.	Meiklejohn,	Robinson, Pa.	Treloar,
Johnson, Ind.	Mercer,	Royse,	Updegraff,
Johnson, N. Dak.	Miller, Kans.	Russell, Conn.	Van Voorhis,
Joy,	Miller, W. Va.	Scranton,	Wadsworth,
Kerr,	Milliken,	Settle,	Walker, Mass.
Kiefer,	Milnes,	Shafroth,	Walker, Va.
Kirkpatrick,	Minor, Wis.	Shannon,	Wanger,
Knox,	Mondell,	Sherman,	Warner,
Kulp,	Moody,	Shuford,	Watson, Ind.
Lacey,	Morse,	Simpkins,	Watson, Ohio
Lefever,	Mozly,	Skinner,	Wellington,
Leighty,	Murphy,	Smith, Ill.	White,
Leisenring,	Newlands,	Smith, Mich.	Willis,
Leonard,	Noonan,	Snover,	Wilson, Idaho
Lewis,	Northway,	Southard,	Wilson, N. Y.
Linney,	Odell,	Southwick,	Wilson, Ohio
Linton,	Overstreet,	Spalding,	Wood,
Long,	Parker,	Sperry,	Woodman,
Lorimer,	Payne,	Stahle.	Wright.

NAYS—83.

Abbott,	Culberson,	Maguire,	Sorg,
Bailey,	Cummings,	McClellan,	Stokes,
Baker, Kans.	De Armond,	McCreary, Ky.	Strait,
Bankhead,	Denny,	McCulloch,	Strowd, N. C.
Bartlett, Ga.	Dinsmore,	McDearmon,	Sulzer,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Dockery,	McKenney,	Swanson,
Bell, Colo.	Downing,	McLaurin,	Tarsney,
Bell, Tex.	Elliott, S. C.	McMillin,	Tate,
Black, Ga.	Erdman,	Meyer,	Terry,
Buck,	Hart,	Miles,	Tucker,
Catchings,	Hendrick,	Miner, N. Y.	Turner, Ga.
Clarke, Ala.	Hutcheson,	Neill,	Turner, Va.
Cobb, Ala.	Jones,	Owens,	Tyler,
Cobb, Mo.	Kem,	Patterson,	Underwood,
Cooper, Fla.	Kendall,	Pendleton,	Walsh,
Cooper, Tex.	Kyle,	Price,	Washington,
Cowen,	Latimer,	Richardson,	Wheeler,
Cox,	Lawson,	Robbins,	Williams,
Crain,	Lester,	Rusk,	Woodard,
Crisp,	Livingston,	Russell, Ga.	Yoakum.
Crowley,	Maddox,	Sayers,	

NOT VOTING—44.

Allen,	Fitzgerald,	Meredith,	Sparkman,
Atwood,	Grout,	Money,	Spencer,
Barney,	Hall,	Moses,	Stallings,
Berry,	Harrison,	Ogden,	Stephenson,
Boatner,	Hepburn,	Otey,	Stone, W. A.
Boutelle,	Layton,	Otjen,	Strong,
Burton, Ohio	Little,	Perkins,	Talbert,
Clardy,	Lockhart,	Powers,	Tracewell,
Cockrell,	McCall, Tenn.	Robertson, La.	Wilber,
Ellett, Va.	McGann,	Sauerhering,	Wilson, S. C.
Fischer,	McRae,	Shaw,	Woomer.

So the bill was passed.

The following additional pairs were announced:

For the rest of the day:

Mr. SAUERHERING with Mr. LOCKHART.

Mr. HANLY with Mr. BERRY.

Mr. ODELL with Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. ATWOOD with Mr. MEREDITH.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

On motion of Mr. DINGLEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF UTAH TERRITORIAL OFFICES, ETC.

Mr. CANNON of Utah. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A resolution to transfer certain offices of the United States in the Territory of Utah to the officers of the State of Utah.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States (the Senate concurring), That the governor and secretary of the Territory of Utah be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed, upon the issuance of Executive proclamation declaring Utah a State, to deliver to the then governor and secretary of the State of Utah, for the use and benefit of said State, the safes, desks, and all furniture and fixtures of their respective offices, and all property of like character belonging to the United States, under control of the secretary, including that held by the board known as the Utah Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there unanimous consent for the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. MCMILLIN. Reserving the right to object, I desire to ask whether this is the usual form of resolution adopted on the admission of a State, and whether the property designated in the latter part of this resolution is needed by the State. The Commission named, if I remember correctly, was a sort of extraordinary commission.

Mr. CANNON of Utah. The property enumerated in the resolution is needed by the State. This resolution is not in the usual form for the reason that we have had in that Territory an unusual condition. Only in Utah has there existed any such board as that known as the Utah Commission. Its offices now contain all the necessary machinery for the proper conduct of the State government. The enabling act did not make provision for this transfer. My attention was called to the matter this morning by the present Territorial governor, and with the approval of the Treasury Department this resolution has been prepared and introduced.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Is this a concurrent resolution?

Mr. CANNON of Utah. It is.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. It seems to me it ought to be a joint resolution. I suggest that it be so modified.

Mr. CANNON of Utah. Then I propose the necessary amendment for that purpose.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I wish to inquire the meaning of the words "like property," embraced in the resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Utah. Those words refer to the fixtures of the offices under the control of the secretary of Utah, who is also the secretary of the board known as the Utah Commission—the election board, in other words, provided by the Edmunds Act of 1882.

In accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], I now ask unanimous consent that the form of the resolution be changed, so that it may be a joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that change will be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. COX. I object.

COINAGE OF SILVER BULLION.

Mr. BAILEY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a substitute which I desire to offer to-morrow (if I am permitted to do so by the rule) for the bill which the Ways and Means Committee have reported, authorizing the sale of bonds and the issue of certificates of indebtedness.

Mr. WELLINGTON objected.

TRANSFER OF UTAH TERRITORIAL OFFICES, ETC.

Mr. CANNON of Utah. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX] has withdrawn his objection to the resolution which I desired to have acted on.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee, as the Chair is informed, withdraws his objection. Is there further objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution; which was read a first and second time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of this joint resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have read, as a part of my remarks on this bill, a substitute which I desire to offer to-morrow for the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report this as a part of the gentleman's remarks.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act directing the coinage of the silver bullion held in the Treasury, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to coin as rapidly as possible the silver bullion in the Treasury purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion, and the issuing of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," into standard silver dollars, which shall be held in the Treasury for the redemption of the Treasury notes issued in the purchase of the said bullion.

SEC. 2. That whenever any of said notes may be redeemed or be received into the Treasury from any source whatever, and shall belong to the United States, they shall be canceled and destroyed in amounts equal to the coin in the Treasury derived from the coinage herein provided for, and the notes so canceled and destroyed shall be replaced by the standard silver dollars herein directed to be coined.

SEC. 3. That any holder of said standard silver dollars may deposit the same with the Treasurer or any assistant treasurer of the United States, in sums not less than $10, and receive therefor certificates as now authorized by law, and the standard silver dollars used to replace Treasury notes as herein provided for may be held in the Treasury and certificates issued in lieu thereof. The coin deposited for or representing the certificates herein authorized shall be retained in the Treasury for the payment of the same on demand, and said certificates shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received may be reissued.

SEC. 4. That whenever any of the United States notes commonly known as "greenbacks," or any of the notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issuing of Treasury notes, and for other purposes," are presented for redemption, they shall be redeemed in gold or silver coin, as the convenience of the Treasury may require, but in no case shall they be redeemed in gold when the gold in the Treasury above the amount held for the redemption of gold certificates is less than $100,000,000: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to alter or repeal the act of May 31, 1878, entitled "An act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes."

SEC. 5. That a sufficient sum of money is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. If there is no further debate [laughter], the

the Chair will put the question. The question is on ordering the joint resolution to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I wish to ask the gentleman from Utah what has become of the State of Utah—whether the enabling act passed by Congress and signed by the President has been carried into effect by the action of the people of Utah; and where, along the line somewhere, the whole business has been lodged; and whether the law has been executed or violated, so far as he knows, by the Executive of this Government?

Mr. CANNON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the law, so far as the people of Utah could execute it, has been fully carried out, as has been the fashion in Utah now for some years past with reference to all of the laws of the United States. The bill provided for a constitution to be framed by the people, which was presented in due form to the President of the United States, and we are now awaiting his issuance of a proclamation announcing its adoption. I am informed by officials at the Department that the proclamation has been prepared, and will be issued by the President on the 4th of January next.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment excepting from the operation of this joint resolution such property as shall be required for the use of the United States.

My object is to prevent the turning over of libraries and other valuable personal property, which may be required for the use of the United States Government, to the State.

Mr. CANNON of Utah. If the gentleman from New York will allow an explanation, I think he will withdraw his amendment. There is no such property in the offices to be turned over of the character he has described. The United States courts and the land offices and other offices of that character will continue in the possession of the property they now possess. This resolution refers merely to the Territorial conveniences which would naturally pass to the officers of the State, and would not include libraries or anything of that sort.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. On that statement I withdraw the amendment.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PICKLER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BURTON of Ohio, until January 2, on account of important business.

To Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. ODELL, until Monday, on account of important business.

To Mr. SPENCER, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. OTEY, for one week, on account of a death in his family.

To Mr. ALLEN, for ten days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. HARRISON, indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family.

And then, on motion of Mr. DINGLEY (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAHANY: A bill (H. R. 2751) to provide for the construction of a bridge or tunnel across Niagara River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 2752) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Moscow, in the State of Idaho—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 2753) to limit the operation of an act entitled "An act to restrict the ownership of real estate in the Territories to American citizens, and so forth," approved March 3, 1887—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2754) to authorize irrigation and live-stock corporations to hold land in the Territories, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 2755) to authorize the location of a branch home for disabled volunteer soldiers and sailors in the State of New York—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2756) for the restoration to active service of certain officers now on the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMICK: A bill (H. R. 2757) to fix the compensation of district superintendents and of the crews of life-saving stations—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HURLEY: A bill (H. R. 2758) to fix the standard of weights and measures by the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 2759) to incorporate the National Capital Gas Light, Heat and Power Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 2760) to provide for the erection of a public building at Uniontown, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 2761) to grant title to certain lands in the Territory of Arizona—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 2762) to authorize and encourage the establishment of an international permanent exhibition company in the city, county, and State of New York, and making an appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 2763) to establish a postal telegraph system and to enlarge the postal facilities of the people of the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 2764) regulating the issuance of license for the sale of intoxicants—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 2765) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a court of private land claims, and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. LINTON: A bill (H. R. 2766) empowering and directing the Secretary of War to furnish two pieces of condemned cannon to Forest Lawn Cemetery, Saginaw East Side, Mich.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTHWAY (by request): A bill (H. R. 2767) for the development and encouragement of silk, flax, and ramie culture and their preparation and manufacture in the United States under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 2768) to authorize the extension of the Columbia Railway, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 2769) to authorize the leasing of lands for educational purposes in Arizona—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2770) to provide for an additional justice of the supreme court of Arizona—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 2771) to authorize the Attorney-General to bring suit in the supreme court of the District of Columbia against the Wichita and affiliated bands of Indians, the Comanche, Kiowa, Apache, Choctaw, and Chickasaw tribes, to determine and settle the legal or equitable interest of said Indians in certain lands located between the ninety-eighth and one hundredth degree of west longitude, in Oklahoma Territory, and located within the territory leased from the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribes in the year 1855 and ceded in 1866, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 2772) to appropriate money for the construction of works to impound mining débris, and thereby to protect the navigable streams of California—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2773) to amend an act entitled "An act to create the California débris commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," approved March 1, 1893, by amending section 22 thereof—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2774) to provide for ascertaining and determining the character of certain lands in the State of California—to Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2775) to amend chapter 6 of Title XXXII of the Revised Statutes, relating to mineral lands and mining resources—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 2776) to further increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 2777) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate condemned cannon and condemned cannon balls to certain posts of the Grand Army of the Republic—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 2778) to light and improve public thoroughfare between the northwest section of the city of Washington and the Zoological, the Rock Creek, and Soldiers' Home parks—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2779) authorizing Isaac M. Mason and Webster M. Samuel, and their associates, to improve the channel of the Mississippi River between St. Louis, and Cairo, Ill., and between Cairo, Ill., and Vicksburg, Miss., upon certain conditions and for certain considerations to be paid by the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HULL (by request): A bill (H. R. 2780) extending the

benefits of the act of June 27, 1890, to certain persons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 2781) providing for the return to the War Department of obsolete or unserviceable arms or military supplies by any State or Territory or the District of Columbia and the crediting of the respective States, Territories, or District therefor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 2782) to codify and arrange the laws relating to pensions—to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 2783) donating condemned cannon and condemned cannon balls to McLouth Post, No. 279, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, at McLouth, Kans.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 2784) to amend sections 720, 721, 722, and 723 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia, in relation to marriages—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 2785) to provide for the redemption of the legal-tender notes of the United States and the substitution therefor of other legal-tender notes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2786) to provide for the appointment of a permanent commission to investigate the question of the tariff and its practical operations, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROSIUS (by request): A bill (H. R. 2787) to establish a gold currency and a silver currency on a basis of interchangeable value throughout the world—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2788) to fix the denominations of gold and silver coins to be issued by the United States and to establish the free coinage thereof—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 2789) to amend section 1754 of the Revised Statutes, giving preference to soldiers for civil offices—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. KULP: A bill (H. R. 2790) to appropriate the sum of $60,000 to purchase a site and erect a public building at Shamokin, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COWEN: A bill (H. R. 2791) for the purchase of the oil portrait of Maj. Gen. William Smallwood—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 2792) to define and regulate the practice in the Pension Department—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHANY: Joint resolution (H. Res. 55) to extend assurances of sympathy and friendship to the Republic of San Marino—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS: Joint memorial of the Oregon legislative assembly, praying for the early construction and control of the Nicaragua Canal by the United States of America—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, joint memorial of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, asking Congress to reimburse the Port of Portland, in the State of Oregon, for the sum expended in making certain river improvements—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, joint memorial of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation by Congress to reimburse volunteers who were called to assist the regular soldiers of the United States in the Yakima and Rogue River wars with Indians—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, memorial of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, urging Congress to place purchasers of even-numbered sections within the limits of forfeited railroad land grants upon an equality with purchasers of other lands within the limits of such grants—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, joint memorial of the Oregon legislative assembly, urging the enactment of legislation granting a pension to Margaret C. McKay, widow of the late Dr. William C. McKay, of Pendleton, Oreg.—to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 2793) for the relief of Mrs. Maria McMurdie—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 2794) to correct the military record of John E. McCollough, of Florence, Washington County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2795) to correct the military record of David P. Kelley, of Connellsville, Fayette County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 2796) for the relief of Henry Kortzendorfer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 2797) granting a pension to Peter B. Palmenteer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 2798) for the relief of John Birkett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2799) granting a pension to Henry Demuth—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2800) granting a pension to Martha Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 2801) for the relief of Jacob Mann, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2802) for the relief of the estate of Isaac Easterly, deceased, late of Grundy County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2803) for the relief of the estate of John C. Gillespie, deceased, late of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2804) for the relief of John J. Lowery, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2805) for the relief of the estate of Richard W. Corbin, deceased, late of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: A bill (H. R. 2806) for the relief of the assistant treasurer of the United States at New York, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 2807) granting a pension to Phebe B. Colton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2808) granting a pension to Hiram Hopson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2809) granting a pension to Anna K. Rodell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 2810) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry W. Freedley, late major in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2811) for the relief of the estate of John C. Thompson, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2812) granting an honorable discharge to Thomas J. Allen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2813) granting a pension to Rita Stine, amounting to $20 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2814) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob W. Demoy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLSON: A bill (H. R. 2815) for the relief of William Lock and James H. Tinsley—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 2816) to grant a pension to Fordyce R. Melvin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 2817) for the relief of Mrs. A. Shirley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 2818) for the relief of Mrs. Nancy Beard, widow of Edmond C. Beard, late a soldier in the Indian war of 1836—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 2819) revoking sentence of court-martial and granting honorable discharge from military service to William G. Walker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2820) for the relief of the estate of Isaac Jones, of Adams County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2821) for relief of James A. G. Winston, of Adams County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2822) for the relief of Eliza L. Rivers, of Adams County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2823) for the relief of Burks Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 2824) for the relief of Mrs. Ann M. Madden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 2825) granting a pension to Peter Wild, teamster for Second Regiment West Virginia Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2826) granting a pension to George W. Schachleiter, Company G, Seventy-fourth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 2827) to correct the military record of James S. Staggs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 2828) for the relief of William J. Murtagh, late proprietor of the National Republican, of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2829) for the relief of James W. Snyder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2830) for the relief of David F. Hood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 2831) for the relief of John Stull—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 2832) to authorize the investigation by the Attorney-General of certain claims alleged to be due the late proprietors of the Knoxville Whig for advertising, and authorizing the payment thereof—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2833) for the relief of Col. Jesse H. Strickland, Eighth Tennessee Cavalry, United States Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2834) for the relief of E. B. Crozier, executrix of the last will of Dr. C. W. Crozier, of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2835) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Houk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2836) for the relief of W. R. Price—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALTERMAN: A bill (H. R. 2837) granting a pension to Lovina Woodcock, widow of Caleb L. Jackson, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment of New York Volunteers, war of 1861—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 2838) for the relief of Samuel H. Sentenne and Paul Boileau—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 2839) for the relief of Daniel V. Sevier, of Franklin County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2840) for the relief of William B. Owens, of Cherokee County, Ala., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2841) for the relief of the estate of A. Underwood, late of Franklin County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 2842) to place the name of Mary A. Fowler upon the pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 2843) for the relief of William M. Boyd—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 2844) granting a pension to Martha McNeil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEM: A bill (H. R. 2845) granting a pension to Emily Grove—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2846) granting a pension to William Cromie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2847) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 2848) for the relief of Archibald P. Cooper—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2849) granting a pension to James M. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2850) for the relief of George W. Case, of Mount Sterling, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2851) for the relief of George W. Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2852) for the relief of Lewis C. Dils—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2853) for the relief of Samuel May, of Floyd County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2854) for the relief of James L. Kidd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTON: A bill (H. R. 2855) authorizing the Secretary of War to remove the charges of desertion against the military record of Frederick Stewart and to issue to said Stewart an honorable discharge for services rendered—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2856) to pension George W. Graves—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2857) authorizing the Secretary of War to remove the charges of desertion against the military record of James H. Deal and to issue to said Deal an honorable discharge for services rendered—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2858) for the relief of Lewis Miller Bennett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 2859) granting a pension to Harriet F. Herrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 2860) for the relief of Ed. S. Carl Lee, administrator of Cora C. Bancroft, deceased, of Woodruff County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2861) for the relief of James C. Tappan, administrator of Samuel T. Sutton, deceased, of Phillips County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2862) for the relief of James M. Humphreys, of Phillips County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2863) for the relief of the heirs of Mark W. Izard, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2864) for the relief of Thomas Wallace, of Phillips County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McDEARMON: A bill (H. R. 2865) for the relief of W. H. Bryan, of Gibson County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2866) for the relief of John A. Roe, of Gibson County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2867) for the relief of A. W. Stephenson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2868) for the relief of Joseph B. Somerville—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2869) for the relief of Jesse L. Branch, of Gibson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2870) for the relief of Julia Holbrook, of Haywood County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2871) for the relief of Humboldt Female College—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 2872) authorizing and directing the proper accounting officers of the Treasury to audit and pay the claims of certain laborers in the custom-house at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 2873) for the relief of Tandy Duval, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 2874) for the relief of W. F. Sanderson, administrator of W. W. Sanderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2875) for the relief of John R. Elliott, of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2876) for the relief of Pierre Garrot, of Orleans Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2877) for the relief of heirs of David and Barbette Carb—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2878) for the relief of Louis V. Porche, of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2879) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Carlin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2880) for the relief of Francis Massich—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2881) for the relief of Alexis Leduff—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 2882) granting an increase of pension to James Cushing Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEILL (by request): A bill (H. R. 2883) for the relief of J. S. Murrell, of Monroe County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2884) for the relief of the estate of Thomas J. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2885) for the relief of J. S. Siddall, of White County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2886) for the relief of L. G. Bowers, of Monroe County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OWENS: A bill (H. R. 2887) for the relief of Lawrence Tobin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2888) for the relief of D. W. Price—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2889) for the relief of James Miller, of Bourbon County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 2890) for the relief of I. A. Beaumont, administrator of Claiborn Deloach, of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 2891) granting an honorable discharge to George A. Daniels—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAW: A bill (H. R. 2892) for the relief of the estate of John C. McNeill, of Cumberland County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 2893) for the relief of E. W. Pelleter, of Carteret County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STAHLE: A bill (H. R. 2894) to correct the military record of A. M. Dittmore, of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 2895) for the relief of George W. Wood—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2896) for the relief of Jane Elizabeth Owen, legal representative of John Young, sr., late of Elizabeth City County, Va., deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 2897) to remove charge of desertion against Thomas Riley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODARD: A bill (H. R. 2898) for the relief of C. G. Holt, administrator of Wiley Holt, deceased, of Wayne County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2899) for the relief of Elizabeth T. Flowers and Sarah E. Bridges, of Wayne County, N. C.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALKER of Virginia (by request): A bill (H. R. 2900) for the relief of the estate of R. M. Ely—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER (by request): A bill (H. R. 2901) to authorize the purchase of an oil painting now on exhibition in the

office of the Architect of the Capitol—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2902) granting a pension to Ira Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2903) to provide for the restatement, readjustment, settlement, and payment of dues to army officers in certain cases—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP: Petition of C. A. Gurney, J. F. Widal, T. S. Gurney, J. K. Flood, and 86 others, residents of Hart, Mich., asking for the recognition of the Cubans as belligerents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petition of citizens of Macon County, Mo., relative to the paying of pensions to the Enrolled Militia of Missouri—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: Petition of 326 citizens of Gloversville, Fulton County, N. Y., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 58 of the Fifty-fourth Congress, entitled "An act for the inspection of immigrants by the United States consuls"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARDNER: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of John Stull—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Petition in behalf of Capt. Edmund C. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: Petition of John R. Cummings, H. E. Luke, B. F. Varner, S. S. Paul, W. M. Salkeld, and 85 other citizens of South Fork, Pa., praying for the passage of the William A. Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWARD: Papers relating to the claim of David N. Patterson, of Franklin County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Wilkinson C. Bowen—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAYTON: Petition of C. G. Mendenhall and others, of Greenville, Ohio, praying for the passage of the bill (H. R. 1) to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Petition of citizens of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., protesting against Turkish outrages in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDOX: Papers relating to the claim of William Quinn, of Floyd County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Smith B. Sale, of Floyd County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers relating to the claim of George P. Burnett, of Floyd County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Peter Hammond, of Stitesboro, Barton County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petition in favor of granting an honorable discharge to George A. Daniels—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Resolutions of a meeting of citizens of Grand Valley, Warren County, Pa., in favor of a constitutional amendment prohibiting any State from granting the right of franchise to any person not a citizen of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER: Eleven petitions, severally of George T. Hudson, George M. White, I. J. Flanagan, of Limestone County; Mrs. Nancy Williams and James G. Porter, of Lauderdale County; H. C. Armistead, Mary H. McReynolds, and others, of Colbert County; Robert D. Nelson, agent, of Hillsboro, Lawrence County; D. L. Carmichael, of Franklin County; James Thompson, of Madison County, all of the State of Alabama; and Mary A. Abernathy, of Giles County, Tenn., praying that the Committee on War Claims refer their claims to the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, six petitions, severally of Mrs. M. E. Hall, administratrix of John W. Hall, deceased; George Howell; H. J. Burns, heir of Robert Wilkinson, deceased, all of Lauderdale County; Thomas H. Streeter; Ann E. Steeson, heir of Arthur J. Turner, deceased, all of Colbert County; and James H. Bulls, heir of D. D. Bulls, deceased, of Livingston, all of the State of Alabama, asking that their claims be referred to the Court of Claims for a finding of facts—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Claiborne Evans and others, of Jackson County, Ala., asking reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of John D. Tanner, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Josiah Springer, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Robert Kent, of Lawrence County, Ala., for $1,167.50, property taken by United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Lorenzo D. Armstrong, of Marshall County, Ala., for a claim of $445—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition for the relief of Richard Compton, of Winston County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Martha A. Streets, administratrix of Reuben Streets, deceased, of Madison County, Ala., to the Congress of the United States, requesting a rehearing of her case—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *December 27, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the resolution of the Senate authorizing the Public Printer to employ such clerical aid as may be necessary for copying the messages of the Presidents from the Journals of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Executive Journals.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 2720) to make Palm Beach, Fla., a subport of entry and delivery; and

A bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of the Government and provide against a deficiency.

IMPROVEMENT OF CLEAR WATER RIVER, IDAHO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 3d instant, calling for information in his possession relative to the improvement of the Clear Water River, Idaho, begun under the project submitted by Maj. J. M. Wilson, Corps of Engineers, in 1878, a report of W. P. Craighill, Chief of Engineers, dated December 19, 1895, together with a report from Capt. W. L. Fisk, Corps of Engineers, dated December 10, 1895; which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REBUILDING OF THE SHIP CONSTITUTION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, in response to a resolution of the 18th instant, transmitting estimates of the cost of thoroughly rebuilding the old ship *Constitution*, now stationed at Portsmouth, N. H.; which, with the accompanying estimates, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

RAILROAD TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in further response to a resolution of the 20th instant, a statement respecting an agreement of common carriers of interstate traffic between the Western States and the Atlantic Seaboard to form a joint traffic association; which, on motion of Mr. CULLOM, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 2720) to make Palm Beach, Fla., a subport of entry and delivery was read twice by its title.

Mr. CALL. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and I ask that committee to report it immediately, as it is a matter of very great urgency.

The motion was agreed to.

The bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase the revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the New York Produce Exchange, praying for the enactment of legislation in accordance with the recommendation contained in the recent message of the President, to relieve the present financial condition of the Treasury; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Produce Exchange of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation, without re-

gard to party bias, relieving the present financial condition of the Treasury; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of John B. Moulton, late private Company K, Twenty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, praying that certain relief be granted him for services rendered during the late war; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOAR. I present resolutions adopted by the senate and house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the claims of Massachusetts against the United States for the removal of wrecks in tide water. I ask that the resolutions be read and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The resolutions were read, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

[Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In the year 1895.]

Resolutions relative to Massachusetts' claims against the United States for the removal of wrecks in tide waters.

Resolved, That the senate and house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in general court assembled, request the members of Congress from this Commonwealth to use their best efforts to procure from the General Government an appropriation to reimburse the Commonwealth for removing wrecks from navigable channels in tide waters in cases where the necessary delay on the part of the United States authorities incident to fulfilling the requirements of the acts of Congress in such case made and provided have made it necessary for the Commonwealth to act in order to avoid the impairment of freedom of navigation for an unnecessary length of time, and also to amend existing acts of Congress, to the end that the United States authorities may be able to remove wrecks in navigable channels of tide waters forthwith upon their discovery.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, properly attested, be transmitted by the secretary of the Commonwealth to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

In house of representatives, adopted March 21, 1895.
In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 26, 1895.
A true copy. Attest:

WM. M. OLIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. HOAR. I present another resolution of the legislature of Massachusetts which was passed just about the close of the last Congress. It relates to a matter which was acted upon by Congress—the lottery matter. I suggest that the resolution be printed in the RECORD instead of being read at the desk, and that it lie on the table.

The memorial was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In the year 1895.]

Resolutions relative to national legislation for the suppression of the lottery traffic.

Resolved, That the senate and house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in general court assembled, respectfully urge upon Congress the enactment of legislation which will prevent, so far as possible, the introduction of lottery matter into the United States from foreign countries and its transportation from one State to another.

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions, properly attested, be transmitted by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and also to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted March 1, 1895.
In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, March 6, 1895.
A true copy. Attest:

WM. M. OLIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Congregation, of Newburg, N. Y.; a petition of Rev. A. P. Van Gieson, D. D., Hon. Charles N. Arnold, mayor, and sundry other citizens of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; a petition of the Reformed Church of Jersey City, N. J., and a petition of sundry citizens of Haverhill, Mass., praying that the President make known to the Government of Turkey the strong feeling of regret with which the people of the United States have heard of the injuries inflicted upon Christians in Turkey, and approving the steps already taken by the United States for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens in Turkey; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing full and active protection to the woolgrowers of the United States, and duties compensatory on the manufactures of wool upon the lines and principles of Schedule K of the act of 1890; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a series of resolutions adopted by the Farmers' National Congress of the United States, composed of delegates appointed by the governors of the various States, in annual session at Atlanta, Ga., held October 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16, 1895, 36 States being represented by 328 delegates. The resolutions relate to the protection of agricultural products, the free coinage of gold and silver, the restoration and rehabilitation of the merchant marine, the construction of a continuous deep waterway from Lake Erie or Ontario to the deep waters of the Hudson at Albany, the improvement of the navigation of the ports on the Atlantic, etc. The officer of the congress in sending me these resolutions asked me to request the Senate to print the memorial as a public document, and I hope that it may be so ordered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the memorial will be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Illinois State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting option dealing in grain; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Illinois State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, praying for the enactment of legislation extending the free mail delivery to the rural districts; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Illinois State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, remonstrating against the issuance of interest-bearing bonds and the retirement of greenbacks; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Illinois State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, praying for the abolishment of the veto power and the submission of acts of Congress to the people through the initiative referendum; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Illinois State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, praying for the enactment of legislation equalizing and reducing freight and passenger rates on all interstate railroads; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Haverhill, in the State of Massachusetts, approving the recent action of the United States in demanding of Turkey protection to the life and interests of American residents in that Empire; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the New England Furniture Exchange, of Boston, Mass., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BACON. I present a petition of the Savannah Board of Trade, calling the attention of Congress to the necessity of increased defenses for the harbor of Savannah and other seacoast cities, and praying for the enactment into law of the bill introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE] providing for the improvement of seacoast defenses. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY presented resolutions of citizens of Plain Grove, Pa., favoring the intervention of this country to suppress outrages upon Christians in Turkey; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the petition of Hon. Charles A. Russell and 24 other citizens of Killingly; the petition of Ebenezer J. Hill and 20 other citizens of Norwalk; the petition of R. W. H. Jarvis and 61 other citizens of Hartford, and the petition of Hon. Arthur D. Osborne and 20 other citizens of New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the purchase by the Government of certain lots adjoining old Fort Griswold, in the town of Groton, Conn.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT. On Tuesday I introduced a bill (S. 1166) for the relief of Dorence Atwater, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I now present a joint resolution of the general assembly of the State of Connecticut in reference to the matter. As a similar resolution has already been presented by my colleague [Mr. HAWLEY], I do not ask to have it read or that it appear in the RECORD, but let it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, in connection with the bill which I introduced.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The memorial will be referred as indicated.

MR. FIELDS'S PAPER ON FINANCES.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hold in my hand a communication from a worthy gentleman, Mr. John T. Fields, of St. Louis, Mo., giving a financial plan and a few lines in explanation of it. It is short, and I move that it be printed as a miscellaneous document.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 894) granting a pension to Nancy G. Allabach, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

ACCEPTANCE OF RAM KATAHDIN.

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report back, with an amendment, the joint resolution (S. R. 32) authorizing and directing the acceptance of the ram *Katahdin*, thereby making the vessel part of the United States Navy. I ask that the joint resolution may be considered now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I object.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator, before he objects, listen to the reason for the passage of this joint resolution?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will withhold my objection to hear the reason stated.

Mr. HALE. This measure is recommended by the Navy Department for the reason that technically the Department could not accept the ram, which had not made the speed required in the contract. But all the reports from every board of examination, from naval officers, and from the Secretary declare how complete a ship it is. The Secretary recommends acceptance, taking the ground that the technical right to accept does not exist in the Department, but that it exists in Congress. I have the Secretary's letter here.

Mr. CHANDLER. Before the Senator from South Dakota objects I hope he will hear the Secretary's letter.

Mr. HALE. I ask the Secretary to read that part of the letter which recommends acceptance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, D. C., December 23, 1895.*

* * * In answer to your request "for information as to the grounds which prevented the acceptance of the ram by the Department and a statement of the facts as to the manner of construction, and whether the ram does not furnish to all intents and purposes a substantial compliance with the contract, and whether in your (my) judgment it is not desirable that the ram be accepted and put upon the list of commissioned vessels of the United States Navy," I have to state as follows:

The ship is well built and has been completed in accordance with the contract save in a few minor particulars, and is a desirable vessel for the Navy, being designed for harbor defense. The construction of the *Katahdin* was authorized as an experiment, and inasmuch as the proper method of applying the principles of naval architecture to a vessel of her type had never been demonstrated, the results that would be obtained were by no means ascertainable, and it was, therefore, largely conjectural as to what performance she would be capable of. The Bath Iron Works accepted the contract for this vessel upon faith in the Department's designs of hull and machinery; they complied with the letter of the contract and endeavored in good faith to carry out the desires of the Department in regard to particulars that had not been fully prescribed. They performed their part of the undertaking in the most satisfactory manner and did everything that it was possible to do to make the vessel fulfill the purposes of Congress in authorizing her construction and prove successful and efficient. Their success is evidenced by the fact that the power which the engines were designed to develop was exceeded, but it seems that the good workmanship applied on the hull could not offset the resistance to be met with on account of the peculiar lines of this type of vessel, and her failure to develop the required speed can in no wise be attributed to fault on the part of the contractors. Owing to the way the ram behaved on the trial when her engines were exerting their full power, the Department is of opinion that it would probably be impossible to make a ship of this kind run at 17 knots an hour with engines of any horsepower that could be put into her.

The vessel was sent to the navy-yard, New York, to remain there at the risk and expense of the contractors until the question as to her acceptance should be decided, and she is still at that yard.

The Department recommends that it be given authority to accept the vessel under the contract for her construction, the contractors to make good all uncompleted work necessary to put the vessel in the condition required by the contract. * * *

H. A. HERBERT, *Secretary.*

Hon. EUGENE HALE,
United States Senate.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to know whether the contract provided for an additional bonus in case of greater speed than that required by the contract?

Mr. HALE. The contract is the only ironclad contract that was ever made, calling for a specific speed, with no provision for a right to accept it if less than that were attained. The Secretary had no right to give premiums. The truth is that the contract ought not to have been made in that way. It ought not to have been ironclad, but when the contractor made it he was at the mercy of the Department. He built entirely on the plans of the Department; and as is shown, and as the Secretary shows, it was probably a literal impossibility to get that amount of speed out of that kind of a ship as designed by the Navy.

So strong is the case that it went both to the Secretary and to the President and they both recommend, in effect, that Congress authorize the Department to accept this ship. They have no authority now to accept it. I may say to the Senator that I do not think a stronger case can be made than this. I can not imagine a stronger case. I thought that perhaps the Department would have the authority to accept the ram by the act of the Secretary or of the President, but I recognize the force of their reasoning that technically they have not that power, and that it could only be given by Congress.

The contractor has gone on, I will say, and has spent $40,000 or $50.000 in trials additionally, and he loses that, anyway.

I should be very glad if the joint resolution could be passed before the first of the year.

Mr. FRYE. It only lacked half a knot, did it not?

Mr. HALE. Oh, a fraction of a knot.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I think it is an exceedingly bad precedent when we pay great commissions to secure greater speed and then accept a vessel that falls below the required speed without any reason whatever. Further than that, a vessel that will not make the required speed under a test of speed will fall several knots behind the speed required in actual service, because in these tests they secure the most skillful and able firemen they can obtain, sometimes sending a great distance for them; they select every pound of coal by hand, and then they put the vessel to the highest possible strain. So if this vessel is required to make 17 knots and falls short one-half a knot, it can be expected to make from 13 to 14 knots in actual service.

Mr. HALE. Let me say to the Senator right here that the officer who is to take command of the ram has been examined by the committee, or members of it, and he states, what will be apparent to the Senator when I state it, that the 17-knot speed was not by any means required. In ramming a vessel of a hostile fleet, as Captain Leary says, he would never require more than a speed of 12 knots, which is 4 knots less than this ship can make. The *Merrimac*, which committed such devastation in 1861, never got up to a speed of 10 knots. The impact, the blow, is more destructive; and Captain Leary says he should never put the ship to the speed even of 16 knots when she strikes the blow.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine one question, if he will allow me. Suppose there were not any contract and this vessel were offered to the United States at the price, would it not be a good bargain to buy it?

Mr. HALE. So the Secretary says, and so the President says. Let me say further to the Senator from South Dakota—I see the point about premiums—there is not a provision for premiums in the late bills, and in no future bill will there be any such provision. I should be very glad if the Senator could let this measure go through, because it is important that it should be passed before the 1st of January.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Inasmuch as there are peculiar conditions surrounding this matter, and inasmuch as the responsibility is upon the Secretary of the Navy, who recommends that the vessel be received, I will withdraw my objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. ALLEN. There is objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska objects.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine if there is to be any reduction in consequence of the failure of this vessel to reach the required speed?

Mr. HALE. No; the Department, in consideration of the reason as given by the Secretary that the ram has been built under their design and under their plans and is in every respect a better ship than was agreed to be furnished and furnishes a larger horsepower, does not claim any deduction. The contractor has already suffered a penalty of near $40,000 in the trials, which were at his expense.

Mr. ALLEN. What was the contract price?

Mr. HALE. About $1,000,000.

Mr. ALLEN. How far does this vessel fall short of reaching the required speed?

Mr. HALE. Only a fraction of a knot.

Mr. ALLEN. That is under a test something like the Senator from South Dakota has indicated?

Mr. HALE. It is the test that is applied to all of continuous speed.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine (who is entirely familiar with these matters, and I myself am not) whether this vessel in actual service can make anything like the time that it would make on one of the exhibitions or tests?

Mr. HALE. Yes; I have no doubt that in any emergency she can make the 16 and odd knots, but I have just stated—the Senator perhaps was not listening—that the officer who is to take charge of her says that in actual use as a harbor defender he would never need 17 knots. The ram is not to pursue and overtake, but is to meet and oppose and strike, and 14 or 15 knots are just as good as 16 or 17 knots.

Mr. ALLEN. Does not the Senator believe that 17 knots would be better?

Mr. HALE. No, I do not; not for ramming.

Mr. ALLEN. That is, if the vessel had a capacity of 17 knots and then used such speed as might be necessary?

Mr. HALE. If I were framing a contract for another ram I should not ask for over 14 or 15 knots.

Mr. ALLEN. I think the bill ought to go over until to-morrow.

Mr. HALE. I hope the Senator will not press his objection.

Mr. ALLEN. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. HALE subsequently said: If the Chair will lay the joint resolution again before the Senate, the Senator from Nebraska will not, I think, object to its consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COCKRELL. What is it?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is the joint resolution which was reported by the Senator from Maine. The title will be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. R. 32) authorizing and directing the acceptance of the ram *Katahdin*, thereby making said ram a part of the United States Navy.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, in line 4, after the word "make," to strike out "her" and insert "said vessel;" so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to accept the ram *Katahdin*, and to make said vessel a part of the United States Navy.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE. I understand it to be true that the coast defense vessels do not require the speed of either the cruisers or the battle ships in order to be efficient for the principal object of their construction, which is to assist in the defense of our harbors. For example, I have learned from experts of the Navy Department that it is not specially important that the speed of such vessels as the *Monterey* should be 16 knots per hour for the purpose of harbor defense. While I have no objection to this rate of speed or even greater speed if it can be obtained in this class of vessels, consistently with other essential qualities, yet I do not regard this rate of speed as being essential. Hence, if there be proven only a slight falling off from the speed required in the specifications for the *Katahdin*, I am willing to have the full purchase price paid for her if she is right in all other respects for the purpose for which she is built. Accordingly, as at present informed, I favor the passage of the joint resolution of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HAWLEY. I want to make a suggestion just there. It is very convenient for such a vessel to have a speed of 16 or 17 knots an hour, and I had rather say instead of that it is not desirable to have such a speed, that it is not absolutely indispensable. In case of a vessel having to cross a harbor to meet an enemy, a speed of 15 or 16 or 17 knots may be very convenient sometimes. As to the effect of a moving mass of iron weighing a thousand tons, there can be no doubt that at a speed of 5 miles an hour it would enter the side of any ship in the world.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PALM BEACH (FLA.) PORT OF ENTRY.

Mr. FRYE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2720) to make Palm Beach, Fla., a subport of entry and delivery, to report it favorably without amendment.

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of that bill. I will state that there has been established at the terminus of the railroad a line of steamers to the Bahamas, commencing on the 17th of the month. It is a long way to any port of entry; there will be considerable inconvenience and a very great delay unless some special legislation is had creating a subport for the entry and discharge of vessels at that place.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1180) to pay the heirs of the late John Roach, deceased, $48,858.03, for labor and material furnished for the gunboat *Dolphin;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1181) to pay the heirs of the late John Roach, deceased, $330,151.42 for labor and material, dockage and detention, and occupation of yards and shops for the gunboats *Chicago*, *Boston*, and *Atlanta;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1182) granting a pension to Mary E. Tyson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1183) for the relief of Frank J. Burrows; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1184) for the relief of telegraph operators who served during the war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 1185) for the relief of Henry E. Rhoades; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1186) granting a pension to Mrs. Rebecca S. Holman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1187) to provide for the reorganization of the consular and diplomatic service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1188) to provide for the erection of a monument to Gen. Nathanael Greene on the battlefield of Guilford Court-House; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1189) granting a pension to Eliza Sandford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1190) for the relief of Lizzie M. Sibley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1191) granting a pension to Francis Sherman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1192) granting a pension to Daniel Cooledge Fletcher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1193) granting a pension to William Bradshaw; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1194) granting a pension to Ezra J. Riggs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1195) granting a pension to Sarah M. Bennett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 1196) to authorize Charles E. Fenner, executor of George E. Payne, deceased, to prosecute his claim before the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1197) for the relief of Marcellin Gillis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1198) to provide for the restatement, readjustment, settlement, and payment of dues to army officers in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1199) to place Francis A. Field, late captain, Eleventh United States Infantry, on the retired list of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1200) for an additional circuit judge in the sixth judicial circuit; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin introduced a bill (S. 1201) for the relief of Joseph Reise, alias Julius Rosier, late of Company D, Second Regiment New Jersey Infantry Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1202) to establish a University of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee to Establish the University of the United States.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1203) granting an increase of pension to Mary Doubleday, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Abner Doubleday; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1204) for the relief of John C. Phillips; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1205) for the relief of the persons who sustained damage by the explosion of an ammunition chest of Battery F, Second United States Artillery, July 16, 1894; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1206) granting a pension to John L. Kirk; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PASCO introduced a bill (S. 1207) to provide for the complete execution of the ninth article of the treaty of 1819 between the United States and Spain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1208) for the relief of Riley Moutrey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DANIEL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1209) for the relief of William Wheeler Hubbell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1210) to pay just compensation to William Wheeler Hubbell for his invention of high-power steel guns and improvements in other guns made and adopted by the United States for its military service and Navy at the present time; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1211) authorizing and directing the

Secretary of the Navy to contract for the purchase of a lot of land opposite to the Gosport Navy-Yard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1212) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims and for the relief of Samuel Fitzhugh, administrator of Henry Fitzhugh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1213) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Fortress Monroe, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 1214) to appropriate funds for investigations and tests of American timber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 1215) granting a pension to Ellen Kingsley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1216) for the relief of John W. Lewis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 1217) for the relief of the legal representatives of P. M. Craigmiles, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to introduce a bill to amend the act creating the circuit courts of appeal, and for other purposes, and a bill in relation to suits against railroad corporations in Federal courts.

I wish to say that the bills were prepared at the Department of Justice, in accordance with the recommendations of the Attorney-General's report. They have my approbation, except that they may require some slight amendment. I ask that they be twice read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PUGH. I desire to state to the Senator from Massachusetts that the bills which he is about to introduce were sent to me in his absence, and I introduced them and had them referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; I was not aware of that. I withdraw the bills.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 1218) to facilitate the collecting of revenue, to provide for the construction and equipment of sampling works for the sampling and assaying of imported silver ores and other ores containing lead, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PEFFER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1219) to amend the pension laws by increasing the pensions of soldiers and sailors who have lost an arm or a leg in the service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VEST introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 33) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin as rapidly as possible the silver bullion in the Treasury purchased under the act of July 14, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 35) to amend the Constitution of the United States relating to direct taxes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO REVENUE BILL.

Mr. BURROWS. I introduce a bill, and if I may be indulged a word in explanation it will avoid the necessity of reading the bill in extenso.

By the tariff act of 1893 a large number of articles were placed on the free list hitherto dutiable. By the measure which has just passed the House of Representatives the rate of taxation on the dutiable list as it now exists has been increased, but the articles made free by the Wilson Act, with the exception of wool and lumber, remain on the free list. The bill I propose is to restore to the dutiable list the articles taxable under the law of 1890, imposing upon them a rate of duty in harmony with the bill just passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to the fact that this body has no right to originate a bill imposing duties on imported goods or in any measure a revenue bill. Therefore the bill should be offered in the nature of an amendment to the House bill.

Mr. BURROWS. I intended to offer the bill that it might be referred to the Committee on Finance and considered by that committee, with the hope that it would be ingrafted as an amendment on the revenue bill. Of course I was aware of the fact that revenue measures can not originate in the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is contrary to the Constitution for the Senate to attempt such legislation, except in the way of an amendment to the House bill. I think it had better be introduced as an amendment.

Mr. BURROWS. I will offer it as an amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. QUAY. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of the Government and provide against a deficiency. The amendment proposes to increase the duty upon imported leaf tobacco to the rate provided for by the McKinley Act. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. DAVIS. The bill (S. 895) for the relief of Christopher Ellis was erroneously referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask that that committee be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. PASCO, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the claim of A. J. Tinsley, of Florida, now in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate.

SALE OF BONDS.

Mr. HILL. I introduce a joint resolution, which I desire to have read in full, after which, with the consent of the Senate, I shall submit some remarks upon it.

The joint resolution (S. R. 34) to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in relation to the sale of bonds under existing laws was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That any bonds hereafter issued under the laws now in force may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made payable in United States gold coin of the present standard weight and fineness or in standard silver dollars, at the option of the holders of such bonds, but no bond containing such option shall bear a rate of interest exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable quarterly.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire at this time to explain the purpose and effect of this joint resolution.

Under our existing financial system, for which candor compels me to say both of the principal political parties of the country are largely responsible, there are outstanding to-day about $346,000,000 of legal-tender United States notes, which this Government is considered obliged to redeem in gold whenever presented for redemption, and when redeemed these notes—which are demand debts of the Government—can not be retired or canceled, but must be reissued and paid out. As a redemption fund for this purpose the Government is obliged to maintain a "gold reserve," so called, of $100,000,000. That fund to-day is only about $68,000,000, and is rapidly disappearing by reason of the large amount of greenbacks being daily presented for redemption. In a few days this fund is likely to be less than $50,000,000. The honor and credit of the Government require that this fund shall be restored to the full sum of $100,000,000.

How is the Government with reasonable dispatch to procure this necessary gold? Every avenue of securing it is blocked, except the one method of borrowing it. The revenues of the Government are not paid in gold, and while the Government itself must pay in gold, it can not compel, under existing laws, its revenues to be paid in that coin, and it has, therefore, but one practical recourse left, and that is to borrow the gold upon the best terms possible.

It can not refuse to redeem the greenbacks whenever presented. It can not regulate their presentment. The law requires it to pay, redeem, and then reissue them. Any other course is repudiation; anything less is national dishonor.

The question which now confronts us—the practical question, the condition, not the theory—is, in what manner shall the gold revenue fund be restored?

Its prompt restoration is the duty of the hour. It can not safely be postponed. It is the duty of the coming week, not of two weeks hence.

As gold must be borrowed, and borrowed at once, it follows that the Government should be permitted to make the best terms possible for the people. If it was unhampered and unrestricted—if it could negotiate and borrow the same as an individual—the task would be materially lessened, but it is restricted by laws passed years ago which it must observe and respect. The law which especially controls and regulates the method of borrowing gold to supply the gold reserve is the resumption act of 1875. That statute, taken in connection with the act of July 14, 1870, regulates and prescribes what bonds may be issued for such purpose. I know that it has been claimed that this statute furnishes no authority for present redemption, but that contention does not seem to be very seriously insisted upon. The power is alleged to exist, and has been repeatedly exercised. No court has decided against its existence nor is likely to. The Secretary of the Treasury will continue to exercise the power and may safely do so. It is the only feasible method left by which to protect the credit of the Treasury.

That statute (taken in connection with the law of 1870) authorizes the issue of coin bonds as follows: Ten-year bonds, interest payable semiannually at 5 per cent; fifteen-year bonds, at 4½ per cent; thirty-year bonds, at 4 per cent.

There is no authority to issue any other kind or form of bonds for redemption purposes. No less rate of interest can be secured upon the face of the bonds. A less rate must be secured by the exaction of premiums or not at all. There is no authority to issue gold bonds, even though a less rate of interest might be secured thereby. The provisions of this statute hamper, restrict, and embarrass the Government, so far as the securing of favorable terms is concerned. Unless this statute should be modified, whatever bonds are now to be issued must be issued thereunder. There is no other alternative. While the existence of this old statute is the sole reliance and protection of the Government at this time, my criticism of it is that its provisions are not sufficiently elastic—not broad or liberal enough—to fully and adequately meet the present emergency. More discretion should be vested in the Secretary of the Treasury. He should be permitted to issue gold or silver bonds as may be deemed most expedient. The rates of interest should be reduced. The conditions which existed in 1870 and 1875 do not now exist and are inapplicable to the present situation.

The joint resolution which I have introduced simply enlarges the discretion vested in the Secretary of the Treasury, enabling him to issue bonds payable either in gold or silver at the option of the holders, but reducing the rate of interest to be exacted on any bonds which may be issued containing such option. I can see no objection to this modification. I do not know whether this change would be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury or not, and it is somewhat immaterial to me. I do not see how he could well oppose it. He may desire other modifications, more sweeping and radical; he undoubtedly desires legislation in accordance with the full recommendations of his annual report—many of which I fully concur in, and with others of which I do not entirely agree. But be that as it may, it is unpracticable to enact such legislation to meet the crisis which now especially confronts us, and which must be speedily met.

Let us be practical. Unless this old statute shall be changed unquestionably bonds must be issued thereunder within the next ten days.

It matters not that as a general principle we may be opposed to the further issuing of Government bonds and to the further increase of the national debt. The power exists to issue them—it is the only authority now provided by which to sustain the national credit; and they will inevitably be issued, whether we approve or not—issued at a high and unnecessary rate of interest. Why should we refuse to simply change the rate of interest and to enlarge the discretion of the Secretary so as to enable him to make the best bargain possible for the Government? Will we refuse to amend a statute so as to render it more acceptable and less burdensome simply because we may not like the original statute, or do not approve other provisions of the statute as amended?

An opportunity is here presented to us to save the people millions of dollars in the shape of interest, and why should we not avail ourselves of it?

If those who have money to loan are willing to charge us a lesser rate of interest if the bonds to be issued are made payable in gold, it is difficult to see what reasonable objection can be urged to making them so payable at the option of the holders.

Everybody believes that we should always pay our bonds in the best money in use—always pay them in gold if any difference exists in the real value of gold and silver, and if that be the case why not declare our purpose on the face of the bonds—our purpose to permit the holders to have either currency they desire. If that option shall enable us to negotiate our bonds at a less rate of interest, why not avail ourselves of it?

It is a business proposition which is presented to us. It does not involve, neither does it antagonize, any question relating to the free coinage of silver. That question is wholly foreign to the proposition submitted. There are three hundred and forty-six millions of greenbacks afloat, which are being constantly presented to the Government for payment, for redemption, and the gold must be forthcoming, or else repudiation ensues; there is no adequate time to retire these greenbacks, because the question of redemption is actually upon us; bonds must be issued under this old statute, and the only question involved is whether we shall by our inaction, by our refusal—by our obstinate refusal, I might say—to modify its provisions so as to permit greater discretion to be exercised and so as to permit the bonds to draw a less rate of interest, compel the Government to pay an enormous unnecessary sum of money for interest. Is not such refusal virtually a wicked waste of the people's money, a virtual squandering of public funds, for which we will surely be held responsible?

Have Senators reflected upon what amount of money we have now an opportunity to save? The change proposed will save the people on an issue of fifty millions of bonds at least 1 per cent interest, which on thirty-year bonds will amount to $15,000,000. If the bonds issued shall be one hundred millions, the interest saved will be double that sum. This estimate assumes that coin bonds can not in the present emergency be floated for less than 4 per cent. I hope they can. There are many who seriously doubt whether they can be floated for less than 5 per cent; and if so, the loss to the people will be 2 per cent annually, amounting in the aggregate to $30,000,000.

Besides, if no legislative relief shall be agreed upon between the two Houses, or between the two Houses and the President, as to the permanent disposition of the greenback currency or the maintenance of the gold reserve, then numerous future issues of bonds must occur and similar losses must continue, ad infinitum, so long as the Government under existing laws is compelled to maintain at par with gold a credit paper currency and required to be constantly able to redeem it.

The question is often asked, why does not the Government issue a "popular loan," so called, to replenish the gold reserve? And it is intimated that such a loan would naturally draw from its hiding places vast quantities of gold now hoarded by the people and prevent the necessity for seeking gold abroad. The answer is plain; the very statute which I am criticising and am virtually proposing to amend practically makes such a loan very difficult. The high rate of interest which the present statute compels the bonds issued thereunder to draw upon their face, and which is higher than the Government ought really to pay, practically requires the bonds to be sold at a premium in order to reduce the actual interest to a reasonable market rate, and the exaction of such premium prevents a popular disposition of bonds. Premiums are liable to fluctuate in the market, and the average man wants to know exactly what he is purchasing and what he is likely to receive when he sells. He does not want the real value of his bonds to be determined by an uncertain premium which he may or may not thereafter realize. He prefers to purchase bonds at their face value, with the true rate of interest which he is certain to realize correctly specified thereon, rendering the whole transaction one of easy calculation.

The amendment here proposed would make a popular loan feasible. If investors loan gold to the Government they wish to be sure that gold will be repaid. They prefer to retain the option themselves—to retain the privilege of determining for themselves—whether they will accept gold or silver, and in consideration of that option are naturally willing to accept a lower rate of interest.

What business man desiring a loan of money, and intending to repay it in gold or its full equivalent, will hesitate to agree in the contract itself to pay in gold if the lender so desires, if the borrower can thereby secure a material reduction in the rate of interest?

Why should any prejudice against gold, if any such exists, be permitted to interfere in such a transaction? Why should any general theory about money—any question about independent or international free coinage—be allowed to prevent the consummation of a favorable bargain for the Government and the people?

No free-silver man—no honest and intelligent free-silver man—desires this Government to pay its obligations in silver or to compel its creditors to accept silver, if any difference in market value should exist between the two metals at the time of such payment. As has been repeatedly said by the ablest of silver advocates on this floor, we desire and intend to pay in the best money in use. If that be so, then why not virtually so declare by permitting the holder of our bonds hereafter issued to retain the option as to the kind of money they will accept? If gold and silver shall be kept at a parity, as we all hope and expect will be the case, holders of bonds will not care in which coin they shall be paid; and as we are pledged to maintain that parity and expect to be able to accomplish the task, it becomes really immaterial to us in what coin our bonds shall be made payable in—it becomes a question of no practical importance—except so far as it affects the rate of interest we are forced to pay and the ease with which they can be negotiated. If we can save to the people millions of dollars, what terrible objection can there be to yielding to the caprices, the prejudices—if you so please to term them—the timidity, and lack of confidence which prevail among those from whom we must borrow, and specify in the bonds themselves exactly what coin they are to be paid in, or, what is better still, confer an option on the holder, as suggested in my joint resolution.

Why stand contending about conflicting theories when borrower and lender all mean substantially the same thing and desire the same result, but differ simply as to the precise form of expression—differ as to which party, the borrower or the lender, shall have the option as to the kind of money the bonds shall be payable in, when the Government expects to pay in the best money in use (if any difference in value exists) and can save millions by simply saying so?

Individually, as a mere matter of personal choice, I should prefer our bonds to be payable "in coin," but I do not regard the question as a very important one—certainly not a vital one. I have no gold to lend to the Government, and I presume none of

us here has, and hence we do not share in the timidity which affects lenders, especially lenders in other countries. We have greater confidence in the stability, the integrity, and the capacity of our Government than they naturally have, and hence we would not insist, as a condition of a low rate of interest, upon guaranties as to which kind of coin the payments are eventually to be made in. But as the Government must have gold, and as it is preferable for divers reasons to draw it from other countries if possible, we can not expect foreigners to share our confidence, and hence they desire an explicit understanding; and they preferring bonds to be payable in gold I can see no insuperable objection to gratifying them, so long as nobody is harmed and no real principle is jeopardized.

The fact should not be overlooked that the bonds to be issued are not revenue bonds. They are not desired to supply a deficiency in revenues, but are issued for the sole and specific purpose of supplying gold for a gold reserve which we are bound in honor to maintain. Revenue bonds, if any such are necessary to be authorized to be issued, a fact most strenuously denied, however, can still be made payable in coin; but bonds to realize gold to supply a diminishing gold reserve can with propriety be made payable expressly in gold, or contain an option permitting the holders to insist upon that coin if they prefer it.

The difficulties which confront the Treasury and are now embarrassing it do not arise on account of any deficiency in revenues. Those difficulties would still exist even if the present revenues were ample to meet all the expenses of the Government. The Treasury to-day has a cash surplus on hand, over and above the remaining gold reserve, of $100,000,000.

One of the difficulties is that our revenues are not payable in gold, and were they ever so ample they would not supply the gold for the gold reserve. The Government under our financial system must pay out gold—not for the ordinary expenses of Government, it is true, but for the redemption of the greenbacks whenever and as fast and as often as they are presented, and it can only secure that gold in one practical way, to wit, by borrowing it. If the Government did not absolutely require gold, it would easily be obtainable, and would ordinarily be exchangeable for other money. But financiers know the exact situation, and know that the Government, in order to maintain its credit, must redeem these greenbacks in gold, and hence they take advantage of the situation and will not exchange their gold for greenbacks or silver, but, upon the other hand, insist upon requiring gold for greenbacks. This difficulty can not be obviated so long as greenbacks are permitted to be circulated and are bound to be redeemed on presentation, in fact, so long as the Government, under existing laws, is bound to maintain and preserve on a parity with gold a credit paper currency.

New tariff laws will not cure the difficulty, increased greenback and silver revenues will not relieve the embarrassment to any perceptible or material extent; new gold loans will alleviate present conditions, but not permanently. A lasting cure can only be effected by the retirement and cancellation of the entire greenback currency, and the Government thereby relieved from the great burden of supplying a paper credit currency always to be kept at a par with and redeemable in gold.

The able arguments upon this point presented by the President in his annual message and by the Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report leave nothing to be added. In my humble opinion their contention has not been answered and can not be successfully answered. They have clearly demonstrated that it is our vicious financial system—the evil of our enormous paper circulation, which is a constant drain upon the gold of our Treasury—that has produced the present crisis, and not merely because our annual revenues do not quite equal our annual expenditures. Their facts, their figures, and their illustrations seem conclusive of the question.

The distrust of investors, especially foreign investors, is not of the ability of the Government to increase its revenues by increased taxation, which it can do at any time, if deemed desirable or really necessary—that is a matter of a few millions, comparatively, because they know as well as we know that a surplus is easily obtainable, a surplus, however, of silver and paper currency—but the distrust arises as to whether the Government is able or desirous of maintaining its five hundred millions of paper currency and its more than four hundred millions of silver currency on a parity with the standard money of the world, and hence our paper greenback currency is constantly being presented for redemption, and lenders insist upon gold bonds, and if they accept merely coin bonds they demand a much larger rate of interest.

These are the plain facts. We may say that they ought not to exist, but still they do exist. We may say that investors ought to have more confidence in our financial ability and honesty, but they must be permitted to be the judges of that, and not we ourselves. We must accept the situation as we find it, and deal with it accordingly.

As a measure of permanent relief it is reasonably clear that all the United States notes and Treasury notes should be redeemed and then canceled.

Let me anticipate some of the arguments against this proposition.

It will be said that to accomplish this end there must be an increase of the bonded debt to the extent of the amount of such notes. That is true, because it would not be feasible to raise the necessary money by taxation, at least not immediately. If it can not well be raised by taxation, and as the Government has not sufficient money on hand for that purpose, of course it must be raised by loans.

But it is also true that the bonded debt is necessarily and unavoidably increased under the existing system, and increased without at all diminishing the greenback debt. If no adequate relief is afforded, if no change is made in the present financial system, then it is possible that the bonded debt may be increased to the full amount of our whole greenback currency and yet there will still remain the whole greenback debt. This is so, because under existing laws redemption does not really mean redemption, because it is immediately followed by a reissue of the notes redeemed.

We have already incurred a bonded debt of one hundred and sixty-two millions to redeem outstanding notes to that amount, but not a single note so redeemed has been actually extinguished, but all may be used again for the purpose of creating additional bonded indebtedness.

Why is it not the part of prudence and wisdom to create a bonded debt for the whole amount of these notes and then cancel and extinguish them? That sensible course would stop the creation of any further bonded indebtedness. Otherwise the process of borrowing and bonding must continue—to what extent no one can foretell.

Mr. President, I have not introduced any measure for permanent relief. I have not introduced a measure providing for the retirement of the greenback currency. There is time enough to do that within the next thirty days. The joint resolution which I have introduced is simply presented for the purpose of relieving the present emergency and relieving the exigencies of the Treasury. We can now within the next ten days substantially prevent the issue of bonds by the Secretary of the Treasury under the old statute by giving him the discretion permitted under the joint resolution, and thereby reduce the rate of interest to be paid.

I move that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLEN. I hope the Senator from New York will allow the joint resolution to lie on the table for the present.

Mr. TELLER. Before the joint resolution is referred I wish to say a few words upon it.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Nebraska asks me to allow the joint resolution to lie on the table, and I consent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion to refer is withdrawn, and the joint resolution will lie on the table.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the financial question now, but I wish to enter my protest against the assertion that has been made repeatedly through the executive department and now in the Senate of the United States that the Government is bankrupt. The Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] says we understand now that we can not sell any bonds under the existing law, or words to that effect. I reply that that statement is an error, in my judgment and in the judgment of a great many men who, in my opinion, are better qualified to judge than either the Senator from New York or I. The United States Government can sell at 3 per cent any amount of bonds it chooses to put on the market. It can sell in any market in Europe as many bonds at 3 per cent as the American people are willing it should sell, and a hundred times more. It can sell those bonds at 3 per cent in this country to the extent of $500,000,000, if it wants to do so.

In 1894, a little more than a year ago, the Government of the United States asked for bids for bonds under the existing law. The existing law provides for a 4 per cent bond, but it was thoroughly understood that the Government would not allow a loan to be made that exceeded 3 per cent. Under that proposition only thirteen months ago $178,000,000 of bonds were bid for in this country. It was desired to issue $50,000,000 of bonds, and $178,000,000 of bonds were bid for. The contract was made for $50,000,000 at 2.88 per cent, or a little less than 3 per cent. What has happened in a year which justifies any American Senator in saying that the American credit has been destroyed to the extent that you can not sell a 3 per cent bond in the United States without making it a gold bond? Those were not gold bonds; they were coin bonds which were bid for.

In February last the President of the United States made a contract with a syndicate in New York that will ever stand as a lasting disgrace, either as to the dishonesty or the imbecility of the Ad-

ministration under which it was made, putting upon the market at $1.0449 $62,000,000 of American bonds, the best bonds in the world and the highest bonds that are sold in any market under the sun. There was a panic in New York the other day and there was a panic in London, and the very best stocks in this country went off from 4 to 10 points. But the American bonds which sold for 104¼ less than a year ago maintained in the face of that panic a quotation of $1.19. Yet the Senator from New York tells us that the American credit is so low that we can not sell a 3 per cent bond at par. I repudiate that statement.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I may or may not reply when the Senator from Colorado is through, but I can not permit that statement to go unchallenged. I have made no such statement as he says I did.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from New York said we can not sell bonds under existing law, as I understood him.

Mr. HILL. That we can not sell bonds under existing law?

Mr. TELLER. That is, we can not find a market for the bonds, as I understood the Senator.

Mr. HILL. I have not said so.

Mr. TELLER. I understood that the whole address of the Senator from New York was based upon the theory that we have now reached a point where, under existing law, we can not dispose of bonds. If that is not the case, what does the Senator from New York want this relief for?

Mr. HILL. I want this relief for the purpose of having the face of the bonds specify exactly what the interest is; and I said that those who had money to loan, good financiers, doubted the ability of the Government to float a loan at 4 per cent.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, that is it! Mr. President, nobody doubts it. We are told—I do not know whether it is true or not, and I do not propose to go into any sensational statements—that there has recently been invited to this city a great banker from the State of New York to consult as to how the Government should get out of the dilemma it is now in. What is the dilemma? What is the trouble now? There is $70,000,000 or thereabouts of gold in the Treasury; there is a surplus of money in the Treasury to pay expenses, and enough to last for a year. What is the emergency presented to the American people that requires the Administration to call here a great banker who was concerned in, I repeat, the former disgraceful operation, financially at least?

We are told by the public press that we are to have another bond issue and that it will not be so favorable this time as before, because the Government of the United States is in greater distress than it was a year ago. Against all this I protest. I protest because I know, and so does everybody else here, that the securities of the United States in every market of the globe are the gilt-edged securities of the world, and to-day bring more than those of almost any other nation. They have never been discredited by any banker nor have they ever been discredited by anybody, save it is by the executive department of the Government under the present Administration and members of the party in sympathy with the Administration, who appear as its champions in the Senate.

I do not intend to discuss the financial question. We shall have plenty of time to do that on the bills that are here and those which it is said are coming here from the other body, but I do want to enter my protest against this degradation of our credit. I repeat that there is not a financier in this country who will not tell you that we can put our bonds upon the market at 3 per cent and sell all we want. Now, because we can do that I do not say it might not be well to amend existing laws, but I say we are not required to amend existing laws because of our inability to get money on our securities.

At the proper time I propose to express my opinion upon all the utterances of the Administration, from the President down to the tidewaiter who now assumes to speak on financial matters. There was a flurry in New York the other day, a bank flurry, brought about, it is said, by the utterances of the President concerning our foreign affairs. Stocks fell, and it was stated that a great quantity of American securities held in Europe were to be returned to this country. The United States assistant treasurer in the city of New York, if the newspapers are correct, announced to the public that in all probability a hundred millions of American securities would be thrown upon our market—a statement well calculated to quiet and maintain the market, was it not?

Every man connected with this Administration, whether it be the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Mint, the assistant treasurer at New York, or a subordinate in office of those officials, has been talking in the newspapers within the last month or two about the lack of American credit. The only way we should know that there is a lack of American credit is through the markets of the world, and the markets do not show that there is any lack of American credit. If any utterances are to come to us or to the public concerning financial affairs, they should come through the Executive and not through the subordinates in any department of the Government.

It is time that the American people resented these repeated attacks upon their credit by the men they have intrusted with power and whom they have put in place to maintain the credit of the Government. If our credit is in danger to-day it is in danger because of the intemperate and uncalled-for utterances of the executive department concerning financial matters. I do not refer to foreign affairs at all. I propose when the time comes to take up the subject and to show that there is not the slightest reason why any man should be afraid of the American credit. I wish to show that, no matter what a man may believe upon financial matters, there is not a man in public life outside of the executive department who has ever suggested that we would not maintain our credit to the highest possible degree. There ought to be no more talk in the country about the lack of our ability to maintain our credit, and it is disgraceful for anybody to suggest that there is not a universal sentiment in this country to maintain the credit of the United States at the highest possible point. The American people intend that it shall be done. They may have their ideas about how it shall be done, but they intend that it shall be done, and any party or any set of men who for a moment advocate anything but the strictest honesty in public affairs in this country will go to the wall, as they ought to do.

I have said this as a protest to what I think is a slander upon the people, a slander upon the Government, and a false statement as to our ability. Who has ever doubted our ability? The richest country in the world, with more untaxed and untouched resources than any five nations on the earth, will maintain its integrity and pay its debt as it has agreed to pay it.

A Democratic President, truckling for Democratic support in the great city of New York, fearful that his utterances on another subject may have brought him into disrepute with the class of men with whom he has always been in accord, will not make the people of the country nor the world believe that we have not both the ability and the inclination to maintain our credit equal to that of any people under the sun.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator from Texas to withdraw the motion.

Mr. MILLS. I withdraw the motion.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] has asked me to yield to him for a few moments, which I will do, and then I desire to take the floor.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of entering my feeble protest against the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], especially against the conclusions he has reached. We have in this country three forms of paper money issued by the Government. We have practically $346,000,000 of the old legal-tender notes, known to the world as greenbacks; we have about $348,000,000 of certificates issued under the Bland-Allison Act of 1878, and we have $151,000,000 of Treasury notes, issued under what is known as the Sherman Act of July 14, 1890.

The Senator from New York gave utterance to a statement which has been going the rounds for the last three weeks, to the effect that all those notes are redeemable in gold. The President of the United States, in his annual message to us on the convening of the present Congress, stated that the greenback was redeemable in gold. I rise for the purpose of entering my protest against the correctness of the President's statement and the correctness of the statement of the senior Senator from New York. When the greenback was issued, in 1862–63, silver was money of final redemption in this country equally with gold, and those notes were redeemable in coin and are redeemable in coin to-day, and there never has been a minute or an hour or a day when they were redeemable in anything else.

In 1878 Congress passed a law known as the Bland-Allison Act, the third section of which is as follows:

> That any holder of the coin authorized by this act may deposit the same with the Treasurer or any assistant treasurer of the United States, in sums not less than $10 and receive therefor certificates of not less than $10 each, corresponding with the denominations of the United States notes. The coin deposited for or representing the certificates shall be retained in the Treasury for the payment of the same on demand. Said certificates shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and, when so received, may be reissued.

That act provides especially for the redemption of those notes in coin.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL]. The Senator from Nebraska can just as well address his remarks to the substitute.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed substitute will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas it was the purpose of Congress to keep gold and silver at a parity by investing the Secretary of the Treasury with the discretion of paying the coin obligations of the Government as they mature in either metal: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary, when redeeming Treasury notes, commonly called greenbacks, and when liquidating either the interest or principal of any of the Government's coin obligations, to make such payment in gold coin whenever the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold is less than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, and to continue to pay in such gold coin until the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be equal to the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver; but when the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be greater than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, he shall pay said coin obligations as they mature in silver coin, and continue to pay the same in silver coin until the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver shall be equal to the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold; and said notes, commonly called greenbacks, when so redeemed, shall be reissued, as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from New York says there is no need for revenue, that the bonds to be issued are to enable the Treasury Department to keep up the gold reserve. I have been looking for some law for the gold reserve and have not found it. It seems to be an arbitrary matter. The resolution I have introduced is intended to interpret the law as it stands now and as the people of this country understand it, and it directs the Secretary of the Treasury to obey the law. In the opinion of a large number of the people of this country, if the law had been obeyed in letter and spirit as it was declared by Congress on the 28th of February, 1878, that all our coin obligations should be paid in gold and silver, the emergency message of the President would not have been sent in and there would have been no crisis. The answer I wish to make now to the message and to the resolution of the Senator from New York is to offer this resolution and ask the Senate to pass it, calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury to obey the law as we now understand it. I wish not only to enter a protest, as the Senator from Colorado says, against the message and the statement that we are bound to pay in gold and that our credit is not good, but I wish to protest against any statement that the coin obligations of the Government must be paid in gold and the Government must borrow gold to do it when we have other resources to pay our debts according to the letter of the law.

Mr. ALLEN. According to the section I have just read, the certificates issued under the act of February 28, 1878, are specifically redeemable in silver coin. The act requires that coin shall be deposited in the Treasury Department for the specific purpose of redeeming the notes issued under it. Any Secretary of the Treasury of the United States who would undertake to redeem those notes in anything but silver coin would violate the statutes and violate his oath of office, and would justly be subject to impeachment.

Now, turn for a moment to the act of July 14, 1890, known as the Sherman Act. The second section, in speaking of notes issued under that act, provides—

That upon demand of the holder of any of the Treasury notes herein provided for the Secretary of the Treasury shall, under such regulations as he may prescribe, redeem such notes in gold or silver coin, at his discretion, it being the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law.

The old greenback issued during the days of the war, the notes or certificates issued under the Bland-Allison Act of 1878, and the notes issued under the Sherman Act of 1890 are the only forms of paper money this Government has or has ever had since the days of the war. When the President of the United States said in his annual message to us that any of those notes were redeemable in gold he falsified the history of this country. I am not prepared to say that the President of the United States knew that the statement was false at the time it was made. The Senator from New York suggests to me that I had better "go the whole hog," as he calls it. I do not want to impugn the motives of the President of the United States. I want to believe that he is the President of the entire United States and not of Lombard and Wall streets alone. But I say when the President of the United States said that the greenbacks were redeemable in gold he gave utterance to that which all history proves to be false. They were specifically redeemable in coin, and gold and silver were coined upon terms of equality at that time and for several years afterwards.

When the Senator from New York says these different forms of money are redeemable in gold, that statement is not true except as to the notes issued under the act of 1890. The old greenback was redeemable in either metal or in both. The certificates issued under the Bland-Allison Act were specifically redeemable in silver and in nothing else; and according to the terms of the Sherman Act of 1890 it is made the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem the notes issued under that act in gold or silver coin at his discretion. Those were the fatal words entering into that act, investing in the Secretary of the Treasury discretion in reference to the redemption of these notes.

The Senator from New York would change the whole law of legal tender. The very element of the law of legal tender is a power or right on the part of the debtor to choose the money in which he shall pay. It has been so throughout the entire history of the common law. There is not a State in the Union where the law is to the contrary to-day. Yet the Senator from New York, by this resolution, would change that common-law rule and invest in the holder of the bonds of the United States the right to demand a specific kind of money.

Mr. President, if there be needed any proof of the money power that controls the affairs of this Government, we have but to turn back to the scenes transpiring in London and New York a few days ago. When the President of the United States sought to redeem his lost fortunes in the estimation of the people by the issuance of his Venezuelan message and precipitated a panic in London, immediately there was a threat of sending back our securities here; and $375,000,000 were lost in the city of New York in one day, according to the report in the New York World of recent date.

Is it not a burning shame that a great nation of 70,000,000 people, of continental magnitude, of exhaustless resources, should have its financial fortunes held in the grasp of a few foreigners? We profess to be American when we come to the Monroe doctrine. When our Republican friends come to the policy of protection they say we must be protected against Great Britain and other foreign countries by a protective tariff; and yet we voluntarily permit the British Empire to dictate to us our financial policy.

Suppose the Secretary of the Treasury had followed out the requirements of this law, suppose when these notes had been presented for redemption he had redeemed them in gold and silver or in silver, according to an option that would have been in the interest of the Government, how many times does the Senator from New York suppose the notes would have been presented at the Treasury Department for redemption under those circumstances? Not more than once. When these gentlemen understood that the Secretary of the Treasury, following out the interest and wishes of the people of this country, would redeem the notes in silver, they would not have been presented the second time for redemption. And yet, sir, this has been made an excuse for the issuance of $163,000,000 of bonds within the last eighteen months. I suppose that within the next ten or twelve days we shall be invited to the feast of a new issuance of Government bonds to the amount of $100,000,000 or more. The President of the United States and his Secretary of the Treasury have issued $163,000,000 of bonds, every dollar of which is void and was void when issued. There was no more authority in John G. Carlisle to issue the bonds of this Government than there was in me. There is not a statute upon our statute books, there is not a line or syllable of law that confers upon him authority to issue Government bonds. They were void and are absolutely void to-day; and while the people of this country as a matter of honor will protect them now, as I believe they should be protected in view of the fact that we have had their money, I believe the time is coming when the people of this country will rise up in their might and hurl from power every man who undertakes and does usurp power such as has been usurped in this case. The Secretary of the Treasury issued those bonds without authority. The act of 1875 was repealed by the act of May 31, 1878, and yet I am told that the Bureau of Engraving and Printing is at work getting out more bonds, bonds to be issued without any limitation whatever, bonds to be used in extending the national banking system over this country and fastening upon the institutions of this country that system of banking which takes from the Government the sovereign power vested in it to coin and issue money and invests it in private corporations and private individuals.

I simply rose, Mr. President, not to review at length, as I shall have occasion to do before the present session is over, and carefully, the utterances of the President and his Secretary of the Treasury upon this question, but I did not propose that the senior Senator from New York should put his speech in the RECORD without some kind of a contradiction of the facts upon which its rests. There is not now, there never has been in the history of this country to this moment, a note or a bond redeemable in gold—not one. Yet the President and his Secretary of the Treasury, by violating the law of this country, have made these notes redeemable in gold.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during sessions of Congress.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not propose to detain the Senate long.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senate consent to the unfinished business being laid aside?

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, without objection.

Mr. HILL. There have been three distinct protests entered here to-day against the remarks which I had the honor to submit to the Senate, and it is not a very good day for protests either. The first came from the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], who protested that the proposition which I submitted, as well as the remarks which I made, in some way, shape, or manner, were an attack upon the public credit of this country. The Senator is entirely mistaken. The proposition which I submitted was for the very purpose of the maintenance of the credit of the United States.

I do not intend to detain the Senate with any elaborate argument upon the question whether the bonds to be issued in the future should be payable in gold or silver, but I have simply the suggestion to make that the provision that they should be paid in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury in either metal is in aid of the public credit at this time, and not against it, and I think no one knew that better than the distinguished Senator from Colorado. But the difficulty with the Senator seems to be that every time a suggestion is made upon the subject of gold it interferes, as he thinks, with his favorite theory upon the silver question, and therefore he must necessarily antagonize it.

This proposition can stand, and when the Senator comes to examine my remarks he will find that they were carefully made, and I am willing to stand upon every line of them. The proposition submitted is not the proposition or recommendation contained wholly in the President's message or in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury. There are some views which I expressed which are the same as theirs. I am not going to disavow them because I entertained them years ago. I pressed them in this Chamber a year ago in January last, upon this very point, before either the President or the Secretary of the Treasury had made any suggestion whatever upon the subject.

Mr. President, I do not know precisely what the Senator from Colorado means, unless he intends to be offensive, by his statement that in the propositions and suggestions I have made somebody was a tidewaiter. I hardly think the Senator in his cooler moments——

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. TELLER. The allusion I made to a tidewaiter certainly had no reference to the Senator. What I meant to say was that under this Administration there has grown up a system by which every fellow who stands at the door of the Treasury Department seems to understand that he is connected officially with the Department and is authorized to instruct the American people on finance, and so we get it from the Secretary down, I said, to the tidewaiter. I had no reference whatever to the Senator from New York.

If I may interrupt him a moment further, I will say that even the officer whose duty is purely or almost mechanical—to fabricate coin—is daily in the public press, telling us what ought to be the policy of the United States, and various subordinates of the Treasury Department have been from time to time enlightening the Senate and the country upon what should be the proper financial policy and criticising the policy of all who did not agree with their chief. That is what I referred to, and it had no reference at all to the Senator from New York.

Mr. HILL. I, of course, am not responsible for the utterances of the Director of the Mint, who I assume to be the gentleman to whom the Senator refers. I am one of those, I think, who doubted the policy of his appointment; but I can not now go into the secrets of executive sessions. I suppose he has a right officially to discuss the financial question. He is probably as competent to do so as gentlemen who hail from the wilds of Colorado. The President has given him an important office, and he is discharging his duties, I assume, satisfactorily. I have heard no particular complaint upon that subject.

Mr. President, I do not know of anyone especially who is hanging around the Treasury Department. The Senator said he did not refer to me. I think possibly I am the only Senator here who can say that I never but once entered the Treasury Department, and that was upon a simple errand—to accompany another Senator there.

I am not authorized to speak for the Secretary of the Treasury. I am not authorized to speak for the President of the United States. I speak for no one except myself, and I utter my own sentiments, and because the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States have seen fit to make certain recommendations in accordance with views I expressed here a year ago they can not crowd me off my own platform.

I have made an attack upon the public credit, says the distinguished Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Nebraska protests against it also. The Senator from North Carolina also entered another protest, and there is still room for more. The Senator from Colorado puts words into my mouth which I did not utter. I said I thought it would be wise to change this old law under which bonds could be issued, and finally he said he did not know but possibly that might be so; it might be wise enough to amend it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator explain——

Mr. HILL. One at a time. When I get through with the Senator from Colorado and his remarks, I will hear the Senator.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wanted the Senator from New York to state what the difference is, so far as the rate of interest the people pay is concerned, between selling a bond at a big premium and selling a bond at a lower rate without a premium. There is not a particle.

Mr. HILL. Of course there is none; but for the purpose of a popular loan taking bonds at a premium is not as feasible nor as practicable as to have the precise interest specified upon the face of the bond. Everybody knows that. Every practical financier will tell you that you can not negotiate bonds at a premium among the people with the same facility as bonds which specify on their face the true rate of interest which they bear, and where you do not have to rely upon a so-called premium in order to determine the particular interest allowed. That is the point I make. Every Senator here can understand it. It is easier to float Government or other bonds where, in order to compute the amount of interest they will pay, it is not necessary to take into account the premium. Therefore the suggestion I made was a proper one for that purpose, if for no other. It was proper for another purpose, namely, for the purpose of investing the Secretary of the Treasury with discretion to issue gold or silver bonds. Senators may not agree with me upon that proposition. I submit it simply for their consideration. I assail no man's motives because he disagrees with me; but whether he disagrees with me or not, this is not an attack upon the public credit; far from it.

The Senator from Nebraska seems to supplement the remarks of the Senator from Colorado. His complaint against this proposition is that the Secretary of the Treasury should pay silver not only for Sherman Treasury notes, but also for United States greenback notes. That is the way he would protect the Treasury of the United States. Undoubtedly that is precisely what the Senator from North Carolina means. That is undoubtedly what the Senator from Colorado means. They would protect the Treasury and the credit of the United States by attempting to pay not only the Sherman and United States notes, but these bonds in silver coin. What kind of protection would that be in this emergency?

Mr. MORGAN. Good.

Mr. HILL. My suggestion was in the line of the protection of the public credit, and not to undermine it.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the Senator from New York if it is not true that the greenbacks were redeemable in gold and silver or in coin, and at the time they were issued were not both gold and silver coined and capable of redeeming those notes?

Mr. HILL. There was very little silver, indeed, being coined at the time those notes were issued.

Mr. ALLEN. Greenbacks were issued in 1862 and 1863?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. Silver was money of final redemption equal to gold until 1873. Will the Senator not only answer that question, but answer this question: Where a statute imposes upon a public officer a discretion, is not that discretion always to be exercised in the interest of the public? The Sherman Act investing in the Secretary of the Treasury the power to redeem the Sherman notes in either gold or silver coin at his discretion, is it not, according to all precedent, the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem in silver when that becomes necessary for the protection of the Treasury Department?

Mr. HILL. The difficulty with that proposition is simply that in the same law to which the Senator refers it is stated further on, and as a part of it, that it was the duty of the Government to maintain the parity of the two metals.

Mr. ALLEN. That is the way to maintain it.

Mr. HILL. With the present condition of the silver market, in my humble judgment, it could not be done by the payment of those bonds in silver, irrespective of any legal question. I am not going to discuss the abstract question here or enter much into it. I simply desire to call the attention of the Senate and the country to the fact that we understand precisely what these Senators want and what their grievance is against me because I offer a counter proposition. They want to pay off the United States Treasury notes in silver and thereby help the credit of the country! Because I have suggested a different proposition, or one that varies from that, namely, the issuing of bonds payable in gold or silver, at the discretion of the holders, it is said I have made an attack upon the credit of the Government.

Mr. President, Senators attack Mr. Carlisle. They complain of his doing what has been done by every Secretary of the Treasury for the last fifteen years, and they know it, or should know it. There was no criticism made of previous Secretaries of the Treas-

ury because they maintained the gold reserve. I suppose the next thing we shall hear is that there is no authority for a gold reserve at all. I hold in my hand the statute which speaks of the gold reserve, and refers to it as "the gold reserve." It has become a part and parcel of the statutes of the United States. The precise, technical authority under which the gold reserve was first established is perhaps difficult to ascertain, but it has grown up with our system and is a part of it; it is a legal gold reserve, so considered by the Government and so considered by every official of the Government; and now these Senators do not wish that gold reserve protected. That is the idea.

Mr. ALLEN. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the statute to which he refers—section 12 of the act of 1882, extending bank charters—simply incidentally in three or four lines recognizes a gold reserve. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that that gold reserve was established in 1879, when there was not a statute upon the statute book authorizing it, and there never has been one since.

Mr. HILL. We shall next hear that there is no Secretary of the Treasury and no Treasury of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN. Practically that is true.

Mr. HILL. The gold reserve has been established by law and by recognition of the authority of the Treasury. It is interwoven in the statutes of the United States; it is there; it is to be protected; and, without intending to be offensive, I will suggest to Senators if they destroy that, they must admit that to a large extent they will injure the credit of the United States.

It would be an idle waste of words for me to argue here now about the propriety of the preservation of the gold reserve. I supposed that was elementary, and that no Senator at this date in the history of our finances would rise and argue that the gold reserve should not be preserved. I supposed that the only difference between us was as to the precise method of maintaining it, not as to the real fact itself.

Mr. President, the other day the Senator from Colorado appeared as the champion of the President when the great war message was sent here for the action of this Congress, and so anxious was the Senator to have the bill passed which was then introduced, for an appropriation of money, that he was willing to have it acted upon without even a reference to a committee. He then praised the loyalty of the President of the United States and used fine-spun words about his patriotism and his keen discernment of his duty. The Senator then assumed to be the champion of the present Administration. It does not make any difference whether the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, or any other official is or is not in favor of this precise proposition.

I sustain these officials when I think they are right. I oppose them when I think they are wrong. That is the precise platform upon which I stand. I do not propose to keep up a constant fire against these officials because I do not always agree with them; but upon this question of the retirement of the greenback currency I think they are correct, and I propose to express my opinion as freely as the Senator from Colorado or other Senators here. I have heard no real argument in answer to the proposition. We may probably hear one next week, but it would be dignifying the opposing remarks made here to-day to say that they were an answer to the proposition which has been submitted by me for our consideration.

This question must be met, and of course there will be ample time to discuss it. The country must have some relief. In my judgment the best relief to be afforded at the present time is to be found in this resolution. It may or may not meet the approval of the Senate; it is immaterial to me. I discharge my duty by its presentation. It is no attack on the credit of the United States. On the contrary, it is an effort to maintain it, and I think it marks out the true and correct course which this Government ought to pursue.

INCOME TAXES.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to call up the joint resolution that I introduced this morning, recalling its reference to the Judiciary Committee, with the permission of the Senate. I ask that the joint resolution be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

A joint resolution (S. R. 35) to amend the Constitution.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be submitted to the legislatures of the several States for ratification or rejection, to wit:

ARTICLE XVI.

The provisions of the Constitution of the United States relating to direct taxes and the apportionment thereof among the several States in proportion to the census enumeration shall not apply to income taxes; but the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on all incomes regardless of the source from which the income is derived or acquired: *Provided, however*, that all income taxes which the Congress may lay and collect shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to request that the resolution lie on the table for a few days.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER. It will be printed, I understand.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be printed, under the rule, and lie on the table.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the substitute which I offered to the joint resolution of the Senator from New York be printed also?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. An order to print will be entered.

BATTLE SHIPS FOR THE NAVY.

Mr. QUAY. I offer a resolution calling for information from the Navy Department. I suppose there will be no objection to it, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether in his opinion it would be advantageous to the naval service to now contract for six battle ships, instead of for the two at present authorized, on the basis of the bids now before the Navy Department, modified as might be in the opinion of the Department to the public interest.

Mr. GORMAN. Let the resolution go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution goes over under the rule.

INCREASE OF COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP.

Mr. CALL. I submit a resolution, which I ask may be read, printed, and lie over under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRYE in the chair). The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

I give notice under the rule of an amendment in the Senate rules in paragraph 9, line 9, page 153, Rule XXV, by striking out the words in the lines "A Committee on Commerce, to consist of thirteen members," and inserting the following:

"*Resolved*, That the Committees on Naval Affairs, Military Affairs, Judiciary, Foreign Relations, Appropriations, and Interstate Commerce shall each consist of fifteen members.

"Second. That until each of the Senators shall be assigned to one of the before-mentioned committees no Senator shall be a member of more than one of the said committees.

"Third. That five members shall constitute a quorum of the said committees.

"A Committee on Commerce created, which shall be charged with all questions which concern the foreign commerce of the United States and the improvement of the tide-water harbors of the United States.

"A Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which shall be charged with the consideration of all bills for the improvement of rivers and inland lakes and harbors, which shall consist of fifteen members, of which five shall constitute a quorum."

Mr. ALDRICH. Unless the Senator from Florida desires to submit some remarks upon the resolution, I move that it be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CALL. I ask that it be printed and lie over, and afterwards I shall be willing that it be referred to the Committee on Rules. I do not know that I shall have a word to say upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be printed and lie over under the rule.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 56) to transfer certain offices of the United States in the Territory of Utah to the officers of the State of Utah; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to give notice that on Monday next at the conclusion of the morning business, with the permission of the Senate, I desire to address to them a few remarks on the joint resolution which I introduced on the second day of the session, affirming the Monroe doctrine.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

TRANSFER OF OFFICES TO THE STATE OF UTAH.

Mr. DUBOIS. I ask the immediate consideration of House joint resolution No. 56, which passed the House of Representatives unanimously and is now on the table of the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 56) to transfer certain offices of the United States in the Territory of Utah to the officers of the State of Utah was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. PLATT. Let it be read at length.

Mr. FAULKNER. I see no objection to the joint resolution. It is strictly in accordance with all former resolutions in relation to the admission of States.

Mr. BERRY and others. Let it be read.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator from Idaho explain what is to be accomplished by it?

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator will understand the object of the resolution when it is read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That the governor and secretary of the Territory of Utah be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed, upon the issuance of Executive proclamation declaring Utah a State, to deliver to the then governor and secretary of the State of Utah, for the use and benefit of said State, the safes, desks, and all furniture and fixtures of their respective offices, and all property of like character belonging to the United States, under control of the secretary, including that held by the Board known as the Utah Commission.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 30, 1895, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 27, 1895.

CHIEF OF CONSULAR BUREAU, DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Robert S. Chilton, jr., of the District of Columbia, to be chief of the consular bureau of the Department of State of the United States, to fill a vacancy.

POSTMASTERS.

Henry B. Anderson, to be postmaster at Covington, in the county of Newton and State of Georgia, in the place of Samuel M. Sullivan, deceased.

Lyde A. Keagy, to be postmaster at Cambridge, in the county of Henry and State of Illinois, in the place of Swan J. Chilberg, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

George W. Blair, to be postmaster at Lamoni, in the county of Decatur and State of Iowa, in the place of Lucy L. Lyons, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Jonathan L. Pettyjohn, to be postmaster at Olathe, in the county of Johnson and State of Kansas, in the place of Kate Shaw, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

D. F. Ayer, to be postmaster at Dover, in the county of Piscataquis and State of Maine, in the place of Nathan C. Stowe, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Alfred R. Huston, to be postmaster at Woodfords, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine, in the place of William H. Motley, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

William M. Pennell, to be postmaster at Brunswick, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine, in the place of Charles E. Townsend, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Winfield S. Reed, to be postmaster at Orono, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine, in the place of Charles C. White, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Julius Meredith, to be postmaster at Sparrows Point, in the county of Baltimore and State of Maryland, in the place of Fred L. Webster, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Charles F. Reed, to be postmaster at Whitman, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts, in the place of James E. Bates, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Charles D. Johnson, to be postmaster at Brainerd, in the county of Crow Wing and State of Minnesota, in the place of William Durham, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Frank R. Matthews, to be postmaster at Raton, in the county of Colfax and Territory of New Mexico, in the place of Emma C. McPherson, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Charles Morgenstern, to be postmaster at Attica, in the county of Wyoming and State of New York, in the place of Henry P. Gardner, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Darby O'Malley, to be postmaster at Valley City, in the county of Barnes and State of North Dakota, in the place of Peter J. Pederson, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Webster W. Lewis, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Summit and State of Ohio, in the place of Isaiah B. Jones, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

William L. Diehl, to be postmaster at Lansdale, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of David S. Heebner, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

H. A. Noeckel, to be postmaster at Lansdowne, in the county of Delaware and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of John C. Hilbert, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

John M. Woodburn, to be postmaster at Newville, in the county of Cumberland and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of James T. Dunfee, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

James M. Portwood, to be postmaster at Amarillo, in the county of Potter and State of Texas, in the place of Martha H. Ingerton, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Sallie Spivy, to be postmaster at Henderson, in the county of Rusk and State of Texas, in the place of John M. Hickey, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Daniel W. Blake, of Mississippi, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed O. N. Turner, placed on permanent waiting orders.

Horace D. Glover, of the District of Columbia, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed J. B. Coyle, promoted.

Urban Harvey, of Virginia, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Eugene Vallat, jr., promoted.

Theodore G. Lewton, of Virginia, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Henry O. Slayton, promoted.

Herman Kotzschmar, jr., of Maine, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Harry L. Boyd, promoted.

Albert C. Norman, of Kentucky, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed H. U. Butler, promoted.

Taylor W. Ross, of Indiana, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed D. F. Bowen, promoted.

Henry F. Schoenborn, jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed R. W. Champlain, promoted.

Henry K. Spencer, of Wisconsin, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Philip Littig, placed on permanent waiting orders.

Milton W. Thompson, of Pennsylvania, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed H. W. Spear, promoted.

Robert E. Wright, of Virginia, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed F. R. Falkenstein, promoted.

MISSOURI RIVER COMMISSION.

Lieut. Col. Amos Stickney, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, vice Col. Charles R. Suter, relieved.

Maj. William Henry Heuer, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, vice Lieut. Col. William R. King, relieved.

Maj. Thomas Henry Handbury, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, vice Maj. Charles J. Allen, relieved.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Maj. Thomas Henry Handbury, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, vice Col. Charles R. Suter, relieved.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 27, 1895.

TERRITORIAL ASSOCIATE JUSTICE.

Henry H. Rolapp, of Utah Territory, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Utah.

POSTMASTER.

Zelinda Ashton, to be postmaster at Flemingsburg, in the county of Fleming and State of Kentucky.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *December 27, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under Rule XXIV, clause 2, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Trinity River, Texas; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of preliminary examination of Colorado River, Arizona; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the case of Cornelius Boyle and Thaddeus Sny-

der against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 2720) making Palm Beach, Fla., a subport of entry and delivery.

PROTECTION OF THE COIN REDEMPTION FUND.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to make a favorable report on a bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue; which I ask to be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be so referred.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution (H. Res. 56) to transfer certain offices of the United States in the Territory of Utah to the officers of the State of Utah.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. R. 32) authorizing and directing the acceptance of the ram *Katahdin*, thereby making said ram a part of the United States Navy; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE, M'GANN VS. BELKNAP.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to report from Committee No. 1 on Elections the action of the committee in the case of Belknap against McGann. The report cites the fact that the committee took up the case this morning, the parties being before them, and an oral statement was made by Mr. McGann to the effect that Mr. Belknap was duly elected. The committee, therefore, unanimously adopted a resolution that Mr. McGann was not elected, and Mr. Belknap was, and have signed a report recommending that a resolution to that effect be adopted by the House. We also commend the action of Mr. McGann and his fairness and justice in appearing before the committee and making the statement he did, and the committee desire the House to add their commendation of the conduct of Mr. McGann in this respect. I present the unanimous report, signed by all the members of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire the report to be read?

Mr. DANIELS. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

The Committee No. 1 of Elections, at a regular meeting of said committee, at the committee room in the Capitol, on the 27th day of December, 1895, were attended by Hugh R. Belknap, contestant, and his counsel, and by Lawrence E. McGann in person, and the contest between the said contestant and contestee regularly came on for hearing and the contest being presented on the papers and briefs furnished on behalf of said contestant and contestee and on the oral statement of the contestee, who conceded the election of the contestant as a member of the Fifty-fourth Congress from and for the Third Congressional district of the State of Illinois, and with the assent of the contestant and the contestee resolutions to that effect were unanimously adopted by the said committee. The committee unanimously add their commendation of the fairness and justice of the action of the contestee and recommend that it shall be cordially approved by the action of the House as very high evidence of his character and standing and fairness. All of which is respectfully submitted.

December 27, 1895.

CHARLES DANIELS, *Chairman.*
L. W. ROYSE.
ROMULUS Z. LINNEY.
S. S. TURNER.
FRED C. LEONARD.
WILLIAM H. MOODY.
EDWARD D. COOKE.
HUGH A. DINSMORE.
CHARLES L. BARTLETT.

The SPEAKER. The report will be printed. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DANIELS] presents the following resolutions, which will be reported to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Lawrence E. McGann was not elected a Representative to the Fifty-fourth Congress from the Third Congressional district of the State of Illinois, and is not entitled to a seat in said Congress as the Representative of that district, and agreeably to the recommendation of the committee the conduct and character of the said contestee are hereby approved and commended as eminently just and proper by this House.

Resolved, That Hugh R. Belknap was elected a Representative to and in the Fifty-fourth Congress from the Third Congressional district of the State of Illinois, and that he is entitled to a seat in the Fifty-fourth Congress as the Representative of the Third Congressional district of the State of Illinois.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of these resolutions.

The resolutions were agreed to.

SWEARING IN OF MR. BELKNAP.

Mr. DANIELS. I move now that the contestant be sworn in.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Belknap, will present himself.

Mr. Belknap came forward and took the oath of office.

PRINTING FOR ELECTIONS COMMITTEE NO. 3.

Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Elections No. 3 be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents for the use of that committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Rules to report the following resolution as a substitute for one introduced and referred to that committee on December 23.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this rule it shall be in order in the House to call up for debate a bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means entitled "A bill to maintain and protect the coin-reserve fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue," the previous question being considered as ordered; that at 5 p. m. this day a recess be taken until 7 p. m., when the session shall continue until 10 p. m.; that debate shall be resumed immediately after reading the Journal Saturday, December 28; and that the vote shall be taken at 3 p. m. on the bill without delay or other motion, separate votes being taken on each section, if demanded; and that leave to print be granted for ten days.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on that resolution.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the previous question will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Iowa desire to explain the resolution?

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no desire to at present. If the gentleman from Georgia does, I will reserve my time.

Mr. CRISP. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of the House again to the impropriety of the course pursued by the majority, and to appeal to committees, in justice to themselves, to have a little more care and consideration in preparing bills to present to the House. Now, I understand, Mr. Speaker, that nothing I can say in opposition to any bill reported from the committee would have any effect upon that side. I understand that. And yet I want to say that your own experience as to the two bills which have already been reported ought to induce you to make haste a little more slowly. Let us see what has been done. You have disposed of a general tariff bill in one day. There are very few, if any, members on that side or this who understand the scope of the bill, or the effect it will have on particular industries, the amount of importations affected by the bill, and what amount of revenue it would produce; and then, as I understand, you have passed a bill referring to an act as going into effect on a certain day, when that act did not go into effect on that day. This may or may not be true; that question ought to have been determined by the Committee on Ways and Means, and would have been but for the unseemly haste observed by that committee. Then we considered the bill under a rule which prevented the amendment of the bill in any particular; so that no errors, however apparent, could be corrected.

At the session of the Ways and Means Committee at which this bill was agreed upon there was a bond bill authorized to be reported. I had supposed until this morning the bond bill had been reported to the House. I had supposed so, because the fact was stated in the newspapers, and from the newspapers the minority of the committee have obtained most of the information they have received as to what is to be done and what has been done. But we learned this morning that bill had not in fact been reported to the House, although its report had been authorized. When members read the reports in the papers and saw what report the Committee on Ways and Means had authorized to be made there began to be murmurs on that side. There began to be criticisms on that side, and when that side murmurs, and the murmurs are sufficiently numerous to endanger the passage of the bill, a pause is had. In this case it was discovered, whether so intended or not, the bill reported from the Committee on Ways and Means might result in the retirement of the greenbacks.

We had criticised the bill; we had suggested to the gentlemen that its effect would be to retire the greenbacks. What we say has no weight, but when murmurs came from that side the committee is called to correct the error. They claim it was an error, and I give them credit for the statement. They assembled to correct an error which by reason of great haste they had committed, and now they report a bill providing expressly against the retirement of the greenbacks. How carelessly and negligently are we proceeding!

How much time have I used?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used five and one-half minutes and has fourteen and one-half minutes remaining.

Mr. CRISP. I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] whether there are to be any further observations made on that side?

Mr. CRISP. I wish to yield five or six minutes to my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. HENDERSON. Let him be heard, then.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if it is his purpose to yield to anyone else on his side, or to consume the time himself in closing the debate?

Mr. HENDERSON. I was going to ask for a vote; what I may do after the gentleman from Texas has made his observations I do not yet know.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, whatever may have been the justice of our criticism against the general methods of procedure which prevailed in the Fifty-first Congress, it is certain that the sober judgment of the country has approved the effort to expedite the public business which it inaugurated and which the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses completed. Personally I do not grudge any man or any party proper credit for this achievement, though it is my judgment that the credit is mainly due to the American people, whose common sense, without distinction of party, had long before condemned the practice of continuing the debate upon public questions simply to postpone the decision of them. Our constituents were quicker than their representatives to perceive the folly of a legislative body adopting rules which rendered it powerless to legislate; and after the first irritation, which innovation always excites, had passed away, all of us were ready to agree that the privilege of debate had been grossly abused and that the abuse ought to have been corrected. But, sir, while we have remedied one evil, we are about to fall into another which is still more serious.

Having adopted rules under which a vote can be reached, we are verging upon an opinion that a vote is the only desideratum, and that debate is a useless waste of time. This error, sir, is more mischievous than the one which we have abandoned. It was foolish, I grant you, to debate without deciding; but it is dangerous to decide without debating. There is a happy mean, where, after a full discussion, there can be a prompt conclusion, and it is that happy mean which it is the duty of every member on this floor to earnestly assist in establishing. If the rule which we adopted yesterday and the one which we are asked to adopt to-day are to become precedents, this House of Representatives must soon sink to a level with the infamous Corps Législatif. We will soon be required by practice, as it was by law, to accept or reject the bills which our committees present to us without the right of expressing our opinions or of proposing amendments.

Yesterday the majority forced through this House a bill raising the tariff upon every article except one now subject to a customs duty, and which assessed an additional tax of $45,000,000 against the consumers of this country. That, sir, is more than 80 per cent of all the taxes collected by the Federal Government in the year which immediately preceded the civil war; and yet, with less than four hours' debate, and without an opportunity of amendment, you have imposed this enormous burden upon an already overtaxed constituency. To-day you propose to authorize an increase of the public debt which the youngest among us will probably not live to see extinguished, and you propose to spend the energies of the next generation without allowing a reasonable time for debate, and without giving any opportunity at all for amendment. Mr. Speaker, I admonish gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber that this country will no more tolerate their unseemly haste than it did the inexcusable delay of our predecessors.

There is nothing, sir, that justifies this precipitate action. "The seriousness of the situation" about which we have heard so much has been exaggerated, as well by the special message of the President as by the ill-considered measures of the majority. The condition which has been thus unduly accentuated as a grave national crisis consists mainly in a disturbance of the New York stock market. It ought not, sir, to arouse either surprise or apprehension in the mind of any man who will give it a second thought that recent events should have influenced some foreign holders to sell their American securities. The possibility of a war between the United States and Great Britain would inevitably dispose British subjects to sell, because such a war would probably mean confiscation to them in the end. I can easily understand that these sales would tend to depress the price of similar offerings, but I do not understand that this is necessarily an evil. If foreign creditors, either through timidity or in the hope of coercing this Government, see fit to sacrifice their debts against us, the loss is theirs and the profit is ours. Some of our own citizens, it is true, have suffered in the decline, but few of them deserve any sympathy, because, with rare exception, they are mere gamblers, whose trade it is to buy what they never expect to receive and to sell what they never intend to deliver; and it is a monstrous outrage that the great commercial, industrial, and agricultural interests of the country should be imperiled by the fear of a panic simply because the stock jobbers are at each other's throats.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to enter a protest, though I know that it will be unavailing, against the method by which these exceedingly important matters are being considered and disposed of by this House. Yesterday, with only a few hours' debate and no opportunity to amend, you forced through a hastily constructed, ill-advised, and blundering tariff bill which affected all our industries, and imposed $44,000,000 taxes annually. With equal precipitancy, with as little excuse, you propose to go forward now and increase the bonded indebtedness of this country without giving the representatives of the people any opportunity to amend the bill by which it is to be done. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the rule adopted yesterday and the one proposed to-day are peculiar in their phraseology. Instead of providing that after 3 o'clock to-morrow the previous question shall be considered as ordered, this rule provides that the previous question shall be ordered when the rule is adopted, so that members vote in advance that even if debate gives out they will not use whatever remaining time there may be in offering amendments. They vote to make amendments utterly impossible. Why is it that a Republican Committee on Rules and a Republican Committee on Ways and Means are afraid of a two-thirds Republican majority? If they can not trust such a majority, how dare the people trust them?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Ways and Means are both learning a little by experience. They both confess to-day that they blundered yesterday. On the day before yesterday, without allowing us to offer amendments in the Committee on Ways and Means, they prepared the measure that has been reported to-day. This morning, in hot haste, we are assembled in committee, after it is ascertained that a great blunder has been made by which all the greenbacks would be destroyed. Yet the committee stood ready yesterday morning to force that bill through the House to-day. Why not allow members an opportunity to amend if they desire to do so? There are still many defects and crudities. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed in some of my reading that a celebrated Indian chief who roamed the plains of the West had a very peculiar and appropriate name, "Young man afraid of his horses." I wonder, sir, whether we have any such chief here on this occasion, and whether those in authority on the other side dare not trust the majority in whose hands they find themselves? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] It is a poor commentary on a majority of over one hundred that it can not be trusted to even offer an amendment, that it can not be trusted to participate in a five-minute debate, that it can not be trusted to deliberate, that it can not be trusted to do anything but vote; and then the motion to be voted on must be cut and dried and offered to them in toto before they can do anything with it. And passing strange it is that the majority itself confesses the fact by every act. If gentlemen on the other side are willing to accept that as a proper measurement of their qualifications as legislators, the country will look out and see that others are sent here in their places who have different qualities. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] used all his time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has three minutes left.

Mr. CRISP. I do not care to use the remainder of my time.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then I ask a vote.

The question being taken on the adoption of the resolution,

The SPEAKER said: The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. CRISP. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 102, not voting 57; as follows:

YEAS—196.

Adams,	Burton, Mo.	Fenton,	Hicks,
Aitken,	Burton, Ohio	Fischer,	Hilborn,
Aldrich,	Calderhead,	Fletcher,	Hill,
Anderson,	Cannon,	Foote,	Hitt,
Andrews,	Chickering,	Foss,	Hooker,
Apsley,	Clark, Iowa	Fowler,	Hopkins,
Arnold, Pa.	Clark, Mo.	Gamble,	Howe,
Arnold, R. I.	Codding,	Gibson,	Howell,
Avery,	Coffin,	Gillet, N. Y.	Hubbard,
Babcock,	Cook, Wis.	Gillett, Mass.	Huff,
Baker, Md.	Cooke, Ill.	Graff,	Hulick,
Barrett,	Cooper, Wis.	Griffin,	Hull,
Bartholdt,	Corliss,	Griswold,	Hunter,
Beach,	Cousins.	Grosvenor,	Hurley,
Belknap,	Crowther,	Grow,	Hyde,
Bennett,	Curtis, Iowa	Hager,	Jenkins,
Bingham,	Curtis, Kans.	Hainer, Nebr.	Johnson, Cal.
Bishop,	Curtis, N. Y.	Halterman,	Johnson, Ind.
Black, N. Y.	Dalzell,	Hanly,	Johnson, N. Dak.
Blue,	Danford,	Hardy,	Joy,
Boutelle,	Daniels,	Harmer,	Kerr,
Bowers,	Dingley,	Harris,	Kiefer,
Brewster,	Dolliver,	Hatch,	Knox,
Broderick,	Dovener,	Heatwole,	Kulp,
Bromwell,	Draper,	Hemenway,	Lacey,
Brosius,	Ellis,	Henderson,	Lefever,
Brown,	Evans,	Henry, Conn.	Leighty,
Bull,	Fairchild,	Henry, Ind.	Leisenring,
Burrell,	Faris,	Hermann,	Leonard,

Lewis,	Moody,	Scranton,	Tracy,
Long,	Morse,	Settle,	Treloar,
Lorimer,	Mozly,	Shannon,	Updegraff,
Loud,	Murphy,	Sherman,	Van Voorhis,
Loudenslager,	Noonan,	Simpkins,	Wadsworth,
Low.	Northway,	Smith, Ill.	Walker, Mass.
Mahany,	Overstreet,	Snover,	Walker, Va.
Mahon,	Parker,	Southard,	Wanger,
McCall, Mass.	Payne,	Spalding,	Warner,
McCall, Tenn.	Phillips,	Sperry,	Watson, Ind.
McCleary, Minn.	Pickler,	Stahle,	Watson, Ohio
McClure,	Pitney,	Steele,	Wellington,
McEwan,	Poole,	Stewart, N. J.	White,
McLachlan,	Prince,	Stewart, Wis.	Wilber,
Meiklejohn,	Pugh,	Stone, C. W.	Willis,
Mercer,	Quigg,	Strode, Nebr.	Wilson, N. Y.
Miller, W. Va.	Reeves,	Taft,	Wilson, Ohio
Milliken,	Reyburn,	Tawney,	Wood,
Milnes,	Royse,	Tayler,	Woodman,
Minor, Wis.	Russell, Conn.	Thomas,	Wright.

NAYS—102.

Abbott,	Dayton,	McCormick,	Shaw,
Bailey,	De Armond,	McCreary, Ky.	Shuford,
Baker, Kans.	Denny,	McCulloch,	Skinner,
Baker, N. H.	Dinsmore,	McDearmon,	Sorg,
Bankhead,	Dockery,	McKenney,	Stokes,
Bartlett, Ga.	Downing,	McLaurin,	Strait,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Ellett, Va.	McMillin,	Strowd, N. C.
Bell, Colo.	Elliott, S. C.	Meredith,	Sulzer,
Bell, Tex.	Erdman,	Meyer,	Swanson,
Black, Ga.	Hart,	Miles,	Tarsney,
Buck,	Hendrick,	Miller, Kans.	Tate,
Catchings,	Howard,	Miner, N. Y.	Terry,
Clardy,	Huling,	Mondell,	Tucker,
Clarke, Ala.	Hutcheson,	Neill,	Turner, Ga.
Cobb, Ala.	Jones,	Newlands,	Turner, Va.
Cobb, Mo.	Kem,	Otey,	Tyler,
Connolly,	Kendall,	Owens,	Underwood,
Cooper, Fla.	Kirkpatrick,	Pearson,	Walsh,
Cooper, Tex.	Kyle,	Pendleton,	Washington,
Cowen,	Latimer,	Price,	Wheeler,
Cox,	Lawson,	Richardson,	Williams,
Crain,	Lester,	Robbins,	Wilson, S. C.
Crisp,	Linney,	Rusk,	Woodard,
Crowley,	Livingston,	Russell, Ga.	Yoakum.
Culberson,	Maddox,	Sayers,	
Cummings,	McClellan,	Shafroth,	

NOT VOTING—57.

Acheson,	Gardner,	Money,	Sparkman,
Allen,	Grout,	Moses,	Spencer,
Atwood,	Hadley,	Odell,	Stallings,
Barham,	Hall,	Ogden,	Stephenson,
Barney,	Harrison,	Otjen,	Stone, W. A.
Berry,	Hartman,	Patterson,	Strong,
Boatner,	Heiner, Pa.	Perkins,	Sulloway,
Brumm,	Hepburn,	Powers,	Talbert,
Cockrell,	Layton,	Raney,	Towne,
Colson,	Linton,	Ray,	Tracewell,
Crump,	Little,	Robertson, La.	Wilson, Idaho
De Witt,	Lockhart,	Robinson, Pa.	Woomer.
Doolittle,	Maguire,	Sauerhering,	
Eddy,	Marsh,	Smith, Mich.	
Fitzgerald,	McRae,	Southwick,	

So the resolution was adopted.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. ODELL with Mr. TALBERT.

Mr. GROUT with Mr. BOATNER.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE with Mr. LAYTON.

Mr. OTJEN with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. WOOMER with Mr. LITTLE.

Mr. RANEY with Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. STEPHENSON with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. BERRY.

Mr. POWERS with Mr. MONEY.

Mr. HEPBURN with Mr. ALLEN.

For this day:

Mr. CRUMP with Mr. LOCKHART.

Mr. SAUERHERING with Mr. OGDEN.

Mr. PERKINS with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. MOSES.

Mr. TRACEWELL with Mr. SPENCER.

Mr. RAY with Mr. MCRAE.

Mr. LINTON with Mr. MAGUIRE.

Mr. STRONG with Mr. HALL of Missouri.

Mr. GARDNER with Mr. COCKRELL.

CHANGE OF MEMBERSHIP, COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that Mr. GRAFF of Illinois wishes to be excused from service on the Committee on Mines and Mining. Without objection, he will be excused. [A pause.] There being no objection, the Chair appoints as a member of that committee Mr. HATCH of Indiana.

BONDS AND CERTIFICATES OF INDEBTEDNESS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill which is now before the House for consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2004) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to the authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury by the act approved January 14, 1875, entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," he is authorized from time to time, at his discretion, to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par in coin, coupon or registered bonds of the United States, to an amount sufficient for the object stated in this section, bearing not to exceed 3 per cent interest per annum, payable semiannually, and redeemable at the pleasure of the United States, in coin, after five years from their date, and payable in fifteen years after their date, with like qualities, privileges, and exemptions provided in said act for the bonds therein authorized. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall use the proceeds thereof for the redemption of United States legal-tender notes, and for no other purpose: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify an act approved May 31, 1878, entitled "An act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes." Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall offer any of the bonds authorized for sale by this act or by the resumption act of 1875, he shall advertise the same and authorize subscriptions therefor to be made at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States.

SEC. 2. That to provide for any temporary deficiency now existing, or which may hereafter occur, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, at his discretion, to issue certificates of indebtedness of the United States, to an amount not exceeding $50,000,000, payable in three years after their date to the bearer in lawful money of the United States, of the denomination of $20, or multiples thereof, with annual coupons for interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and to sell and dispose of the same for not less than an equal amount of lawful money of the United States at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States and at such post-offices as he may select. And such certificates shall have the like qualities, privileges, and exemptions provided in said resumption act for the bonds therein authorized. And the proceeds thereof shall be used for the purpose prescribed in this section and for no other.

Mr. DINGLEY took the floor.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Before the gentleman from Maine proceeds I suggest that he occupy during his remarks some position nearer to the center of the Hall than where h e now stands At this distance we have difficulty in hearing him from his pres ent position; and if it is agreeable to him to make the change suggested, he would oblidge us by doing so.

Mr. DINGLEY. As my papers are right here, I prefer to speak from this place.

The SPEAKER. If the House will be in order, the gentleman from Maine can be heard.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, before the debate opens, let me say I take it for granted the time is to be distributed by the Speaker, there being no other arrangement. I should like to know whether that is the understanding, because gentlemen are coming to me for time and I have referred them to the Speaker, supposing that would be the arrangement to-day. In the absence of any other arrangement that, of course, will be the mode of proceeding.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will proceed.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill contains two simple propositions. Section 2 (reversing the order in which the sections are placed in the bill) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue certificates of indebtedness to an amount not exceeding $50,000,000, to be paid within three years, bearing 3 per cent interest—to be used for one purpose and one purpose only—to meet temporary deficiencies in revenue—temporary deficiencies—deficiencies that may occur not only now, but at any future time, for this second section is to be permanent law.

I have only to say in respect to that section that it is in substance the exchequer-bill system which prevails under many Governments, and is intended to be a form of loan for temporary purposes, of a popular nature, that can be paid out even by the Secretary of the Treasury for current objects of expenditure. The committee have provided that these certificates of indebtedness shall be used only for that purpose. Our object in so limiting their use is to separate as far as possible in the accounts, the cash in the Treasury available for current expenses, and the reserve that is retained for redemption purposes.

One great difficulty we have had in maintaining the redemption fund in the past, as I suggested yesterday, arises from the fact that the reserve or redemption fund has been used not exclusively for the purpose for which it was established, but in part to meet the deficiency in the revenue; and therefore it seemed to the Committee on Ways and Means desirable that there should be two forms of obligations—one temporary in its character, in the form of certificates of indebtedness to meet merely temporary deficiencies, and to be set aside and to be devoted to that purpose entirely; and another to maintain the redemption fund with a provision that the proceeds of that obligation should be set aside as a reserve and so maintained, in order that if we are to continue to use circulating notes of the Government as currency—as we have been doing for thirty years—we may maintain the same financial condition that a bank does in permanently maintaining its reserve and not allowing it to be encroached upon for merely current expenditures.

This section, as I have said, is intended to present a remedy not simply for present exigencies, but for any possible exigencies that may arise in the future, and in the judgment of the Committee on Ways and Means it ought to be on the statute books without reference to the existing situation.

Passing now, Mr. Speaker, to section 1 of the bill, it simply proposes to add another description of bonds to those already authorized by existing law for the maintenance of the redemption fund. Under the resumption act of 1875 two descriptions of bonds are authorized, namely, ten-year bonds bearing 5 per cent

interest, and thirty-year bonds bearing 4 per cent interest. These are the only two descriptions of bonds authorized and that have been issued under the resumption act.

Under that act the Secretary of the Treasury during the past two years has issued one hundred millions of 5 per cent ten-year bonds and sixty-two and one-third millions of 4 per cent thirty-year bonds, realizing from the sale about $182,000,000 in gold. He has the authority to continue to issue such bonds for the purpose of maintaining the redemption fund under the resumption act to-day. He has been exercising that authority, and has indicated in his report that if there is no further authority given to him—no other description of bonds authorized—if the exigency arises, which it will, evidently, in a very short time, he will proceed to issue, sell, and dispose of additional bonds bearing interest at 4 per cent, with thirty years to run, or bonds bearing interest at the rate of 5 per cent, with ten years to run. With that authority on the statute books to-day, this bill simply provides for the authorization of the issuance of another description of bonds for the same purpose, and that is a 3 per cent bond, redeemable five years after date and payable after fifteen years from date.

The only practical question involved, then, in this first section of the bill is simply this, shall we, in the interest of the Treasury—in the interest of economy—authorize the issuance of bonds bearing a lower rate of interest, to wit, 3 per cent, when we know that if we have no legislation the Secretary of the Treasury will proceed to issue either a ten-year 5 per cent bond or a thirty-year 4 per cent bond?

Now, it seems to me that in this situation, as practical men representing the interests of the taxpayers of this country, when the simple question is presented whether or not we will issue the lower rate bonds, in the face of the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury has the right to issue a higher rate of bonds, we ought to act as legislators here precisely as we would act in our own business, and to that extent defend and protect the interests of the people, and thus authorize the lower rate bond.

There are two points of legislation presented in the first section of the bill that relate not only to the proposed issuance of 3 per cent bonds, but which also relate to any other issue that may be made hereafter under the resumption act of 1875 of either of the other descriptions of bonds that I have referred to. The first provision is that whatever bonds are sold, or offered for sale, whether they are the bonds authorized under the resumption act of 1875 or those to be authorized by the bill now pending, they shall be first offered to the people of the United States by advertisement, and that our own people shall have an opportunity to purchase such bonds if they so desire. It seems to me that some such provision ought to accompany this legislation, and not only that it should accompany this legislation, but it ought to also apply to the resumption act of 1875. The loans, whether issued under the resumption act or under this bill, should be of a character; for I believe that when a 3 per cent bond of this character shall be offered, as is proposed by this bill, to the people of the United States, they will respond from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf.

I believe that the people of the United States, with the opportunity thus offered, will come forward with millions upon millions of gold which is now hoarded, for there can be little doubt that $500,000,000 of gold is in this country outside of the Treasury fund and bank reserves, and hence I should deprecate beyond measure the defeat of a bill like this, which proposes simply to authorize the issue of a lower description of bond, and at the same time proposes to require that all bonds issued shall first be offered to the people of the United States.

Second. There is another provision of legislation in this first section, and that is that the proceeds of the bonds thus sold under this act and under the resumption act of 1875 shall be devoted, as was intended when the act was passed, and as ought to be made clear, exclusively to redemption purposes.

It was supposed that in using that language it would not be understood that it authorized in any way the retirement and cancellation of the United States legal-tender notes; but to make that clear, to put it beyond dispute, carrying out precisely the object that the committee had when they first drafted this bill, the committee have placed in the bill itself, immediately after this direction that the proceeds shall be used for this one purpose, a proviso that nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or to modify the act of May 31, 1878, which forbids the further retirement and cancellation of United States legal-tender notes.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN], who spoke a short time ago, informed the House, as I understood him, that the Committee on Ways and Means had been hastily assembled this morning to correct a blunder, as he said, and that it was announced that it had been ascertained that the language used in the first draft of the bill would authorize the retirement and cancellation of the greenbacks. There was no such announcement or thought.

Mr. MCMILLIN. If my friend from Maine will permit an interruption, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DINGLEY. I will.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The gentleman mistook my remark.

Mr. DINGLEY. I hope so.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Yes. I did not say that it had been "announced."

Mr. DINGLEY. I understood the gentleman to use the word "announced."

Mr. MCMILLIN. No.

Mr. DINGLEY. I accept the explanation.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I did not say that. There was no such announcement made so far as I was concerned. On the other hand, it is but fair to state that I failed to get my notice of the meeting of the committee, and was not there, and could not have made the statement that the gentleman attributes to me. I said it had been ascertained. I suppose it has been ascertained.

Mr. DINGLEY. Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is well understood that that provision was put in because gentlemen on the other side and some others had given a construction to this provision never intended, and one to which it was not justly susceptible. Having ascertained this fact, the committee, in order to carry out their own original intentions, have put in a proviso which renders their purpose beyond any question. So much for that.

It is not the intention of this legislation to do anything more than to provide that the proceeds of bonds sold under the resumption act, or the proceeds of the additional description of bonds provided for here, shall be used for the one purpose for which the law authorizes them; and I think there can be no one present who does not realize the propriety of such legislation as this. Bonds that are sold in the markets of this country and the world ostensibly for the purpose of maintaining the redemption fund should not have their proceeds used for the purpose of meeting deficiencies in revenue. Let us have the reserve maintained as a reserve, and whenever bonds or certificates of indebtedness are sold, the proceeds of which are to be used for the purpose of meeting deficiencies in the revenue, let them be sold for that purpose, so that there can be no evasion of the point as there was during the discussion yesterday, when it was stated that we have not been borrowing money to meet the deficiency in the Treasury. Let the proceeds of the bonds sold to maintain the redemption fund be separated from the proceeds of certificates of indebtedness sold to meet any deficiency, which is what is intended to be done by the operation of the bill which is pending.

There can be no more fatal policy than that which calls upon the people of this country to contribute the proceeds of loans ostensibly made to maintain the resumption fund on which the credit of the Treasury stands to meet current deficiencies of revenue. Such a policy promotes distrust. Capital is always timid. If it obtains the impression that what we call the reserve is not a reserve, but that it is to be drawn upon, as it has been drawn upon during the past two and a half years, to meet current deficiencies, capital at once takes alarm. A reserve is a distinct thing, and it is of the utmost importance that it should be maintained without any attempt to divert it to other purposes; and the most important part of this legislation, I want to say to my friends on this side of the House, lies in the fact that if this bill shall pass it will compel the separation of the accounts, and the reserve will and must be treated as a reserve, not to be trenched upon to meet current deficiencies of revenues. And when there is any necessity to have money to meet a deficiency of revenue, then the resort must be had to another source to supply that deficiency of revenue.

Mr. MARSH. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question right there, for information?

Mr. DINGLEY. I will.

Mr. MARSH. Under the provisions of this bill, if it becomes law and the greenbacks shall be redeemed with the proceeds of these bonds, what becomes of the greenbacks?

Mr. DINGLEY. Precisely what became of them all the time from 1884 upward until 1893, when we had a large surplus revenue. If there had been a run upon the Treasury, it could have temporarily held them for the purpose of protecting the reserve. But if there was not a run upon the Treasury, then the surplus greenbacks would be used just as they were from 1884 until 1893, for the purpose of paying off a portion of the public interest-bearing debt.

Mr. MARSH. I am very glad to hear that answer from the gentleman from Maine. Will you allow me to ask you one further question?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MARSH. You have stated in your speech here that during the last two and a half years the proceeds of the sales of bonds under the redemption law of 1875 have been used by the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the ordinary expenses of the Government. Now, one moment. Do you mean to say that the gold received as the proceeds of the sales of bonds has been paid out for the expenses of the Government, or do you mean to say that the greenbacks redeemed by that gold have been paid out?

Mr. DINGLEY. I mean to say this——

Mr. MARSH. I want to know the facts.

Mr. DINGLEY (continuing). The Treasury has redeemed

$133,000,000 of greenbacks by paying out gold obtained from these loans of which I have spoken, and has immediately taken these $133,000,000 of greenbacks and paid them out to meet the deficiency, and thus has furnished a second time to persons who wanted to draw gold from the Treasury the means of drawing from the Treasury another $133,000,000 of gold. That is what I mean.

Mr. MARSH. And hence the law which we passed yesterday to supply the deficiency in the revenues?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this seems to be——

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly; although I do not care to use time which others ought to have.

Mr. COX. Now, why do you provide in the first section of this bill that the bonds that shall be issued shall be paid in coin?

Mr. DINGLEY. Well, that has been the provision in all laws which have been enacted for the issuance of bonds.

Mr. COX. Why do you provide in the issue of certificates that they shall be paid in lawful money?

Mr. DINGLEY. Because they will be paid out for current obligations and only be used for a short time.

Mr. COX. Then you provide two kinds of redemption money in the same bill?

Mr. DINGLEY. No. The certificates of indebtedness are not redemption money. They are not legal tender.

Mr. COX. They will have the same qualities as the greenback?

Mr. DINGLEY. No. A greenback is a legal tender.

Mr. COX. Then you are going to issue certificates that are not a legal tender?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly. They are interest bearing, and, being interest bearing, they will be used the same as any other interest-bearing obligation, namely, as an investment. There is a great difference between a certificate of indebtedness which is simply an interest-bearing obligation and a noninterest-bearing demand note, which is a legal tender and therefore passes from hand to hand as a medium of exchange.

Mr. MARSH. In the same connection and for the purpose of eliciting information, not for the purpose of annoying the gentleman, I will ask him to state to the House how the proceeds of these bonds for redemption purposes can pile up in the Treasury? What is there in this bill to prevent them from being used for the payment of the ordinary expenses of the Government just as the Treasury has used such funds in the last two years and a half?

Mr. DINGLEY. If the second section of this bill should become a law, then only the proceeds of the certificates of indebtedness can be used to meet deficiencies of revenue, and the proceeds of bonds sold for the redemption fund can not be used to meet such deficiencies. When there is no deficiency few greenbacks will be presented for redemption, and those that are so presented can be used, just as they were from 1879 to 1893, to redeem and pay the interest-bearing debt. The intention, of course, is not to have any permanent deficiency of revenue. The second section is intended to apply only to temporary conditions which may arise and which do arise in all Governments; it is not intended to apply to a permanent, chronic deficiency that shall run two years and a half, as the present one has done. The purpose is simply to do what other Governments do under like circumstances. The intention is to avoid deficiencies by providing revenue. That is the normal condition of every Government. That is the policy which is contemplated by the legislation which we have already inaugurated in this House. But accidentally, through some unforeseen condition, there may be for a short time, when Congress is not in session, a deficiency of revenue, and at such a time the Secretary of the Treasury should have the means of laying hold upon some form of obligation that he can issue for the purpose of obtaining funds to meet that temporary condition. That is the intention of the second section.

Further, it is intended that obligations that are issued for the purpose of meeting temporary deficiencies of revenue shall run for only a short period; hence we limit the amount to $50,000,000. It is expected that such obligations will be paid by surplus revenue within a brief period, for the section provides that these certificates of indebtedness must be paid within three years. It is precisely the same thing that is done, for example, by Great Britain under certain conditions. She authorizes the issue of exchequer bills, which are almost exactly the same as what are here denominated certificates of indebtedness. Those bills are issued, under the British system, not for permanent loans, but to meet any temporary deficiency of revenue that may occur, and are paid in a comparatively short time from surplus revenues which Parliament is expected to provide.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman pardon one further inquiry?

Mr. DINGLEY. I will yield for the gentleman's question, though I am occupying time that I ought not to use.

Mr. COX. When you issue one of these certificates of indebtedness, what is it to be redeemed in?

Mr. DINGLEY. Lawful money.

Mr. COX. Now, why make that "lawful money" in the certificate and "coin" in the bond?

Mr. DINGLEY. Because we require a coin fund for redemption purposes; the law so provides. But current obligations of the Treasury we can pay in any kind of lawful money that may exist at the time.

There has been no bond issued by this Government up to this hour but that provides that it shall be paid, both principal and interest, in coin, and we are simply meeting the conditions of preexisting legislation. We have heretofore contracted these obligations, and we propose to meet them as an honorable people. But as to temporary deficiencies of revenue, where there has been no such previous obligation, they can always be paid in lawful money. How is the gentleman paid his salary as a member of this House? In lawful money, whatever that may be. But whenever you undertake to make a loan, and especially to borrow coin, you can not expect to obtain it unless you are ready to pay in the same kind of money that you borrow. We have always borrowed gold, and hence coin as used in our bonds means the same kind of coin that we have borrowed. It is because we have preserved good faith with our creditors that we have been able, up to within two years, to borrow on so favorable terms.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman permit a question in connection with the first section? That section provides that the proceeds of redemption of United States legal-tender notes shall be used for the redemption of legal-tender notes, and for no other purpose.

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes.

Mr. LACEY. Now, after they are thus redeemed and the notes get into the Treasury, does the gentleman think that this bill guards sufficiently against their being paid out to meet current expenses?

Mr. DINGLEY. Of course, if the Secretary of the Treasury desires to so use them and finds that there is a necessity, there is no absolute provision otherwise in this bill. But the suggestion here, and it is a suggestion which is exceedingly important, is that the Secretary of the Treasury shall adopt the policy of separating the two funds and shall use the greenbacks or any other forms of currency precisely as they were used from 1879 up to 1893. At one time during President Cleveland's first Administration there was in the Treasury of the United States $130,000,000 of greenbacks. They were the result in large part of deposits of United States legal-tender notes by banks retiring their circulation or going into liquidation. Those were gradually drawn out, but it took several years, and it was not until the act of July 12, 1890, was passed that those funds were turned into the Treasury. The same policy that prevailed from 1879 to 1893, provided we can have revenue sufficient to meet expenditures, will be repeated by the operations of the bill which is now before the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to enter further into the discussion of collateral questions, because the points covered by this bill are exceedingly simple.

We need not enter into any discussion of the silver question. We need not enter into any discussion of any of the collateral questions relating either to finance or to the currency. They have no bearing here. We need not enter into a discussion of the propriety of establishing and maintaining a coin redemption fund for the purpose of maintaining United States legal-tender notes at par, as was done, under the operations of the act of 1875, in 1879. That is the established policy of the Government of the United States. That policy being established, and the law providing the requisite means for maintaining the redemption fund by a sale of bonds—and it was by a sale of ninety-five and one-half millions of bonds in 1878, in time of peace, that the redemption fund was first created—it is obvious that there is no other way of replenishing this fund when it is drawn upon by the presentation of United States legal-tender notes for redemption than by the sale of bonds, two descriptions of which, bearing 4 and 5 per cent interest, are now authorized to be issued and sold.

The only question really for us now is whether, in the interest of the people of this country, we shall not authorize the issue of a lower rate bond, and thus have the lower rate bond sold in preference to the higher rate bond, with the provision that when sold it shall be first offered to the people of this country, and the further provision that the proceeds shall be separated from ordinary cash in the Treasury and maintained as a reserve. That is all there is in this bill.

The provision as to certificates of indebtedness is a matter of no serious importance except in certain contingencies that may happen to any Government. There is not a Government on the face of the earth, except our own, which has not a provision for some form of certificate of indebtedness or exchequer bill to meet temporary and accidental deficiencies of revenue. We propose in this bill simply to give that authority which has been asked by the Secretary of the Treasury, which the Senate once unanimously gave, and which it seems to me ought to be on the statute book.

But at the same time we contemplate no deficiency, after a short time, if the legislation which this House has inaugurated shall be put upon the statute book.

It ought to be the policy of this Government, certainly, to maintain its revenues equal to and somewhat larger than its expenditures, but there should be at the same time a provision for the sale of some short-term obligations in case by accident or through some unexpected contingency there should be for a short time a deficiency of revenue.

We have adopted the policy of issuing and maintaining in our circulating medium $346,000,000 of United States legal-tender notes. They have been in our currency for a great many years. There is no intention at the present time, so far as I know, to take them from our currency. But being there, in order to make them as good as any other money you must do precisely what was done in 1879—maintain a coin redemption fund that shall give confidence not only to our own people, but to the whole world, that these Government notes will be redeemed in full-value coin whenever presented for redemption. And the maintenance of this fund lies at the very basis of the credit of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, no more fatal policy could have been inaugurated than that which was inaugurated in April, 1893, of allowing this coin redemption fund to fall below the minimum of $100,000,000, which public sentiment had marked as the line of demarcation between safety and danger. If that coin redemption fund had been maintained, and when there came up in April, 1893, the cloud of distrust over this country, if it had been increased by the sale then of $50,000,000 of bonds, our credit would have been safe; it would not have been disturbed, and the sale of bonds since that time, amounting to $113,000,000 in addition to the $50,000,000, would not have been necessary.

You must bear in mind that confidence in the credit of a government which issues its notes as currency is like confidence in a bank. It must rest upon something substantial, and that must be a coin redemption fund. So long as the people believe that there is behind the notes of a bank or behind the deposits of a savings bank or behind the notes of a Government a safe reserve, sufficient means that may be availed of at any moment for the purpose of meeting its obligations, there is no call on bank of issue or savings bank or on the treasury of the Government for the redemption of its notes. But let distrust come over the country, let it be believed that that redemption fund or that reserve fund is being trenched upon and allowed to fall below the line of safety, and at once distrust, inaugurated perhaps by some other cause, strengthens and grows from day to day on the failure to maintain the reserve. Could you expect, Mr. Speaker, that anything else than distrust, strengthening as the days and the months went on, would prevail when the people of this country and the capitalists of the world have seen the coin redemption fund upon which our credit rests greatly depleted, falling below the line of safety of $100,000,000, to $90,000,000, to $80,000,000, to $70,000,000, then to $60,000,000, and then to $50,000,000? Is it any wonder that alarm seized upon capital?

How is it with any bank of your own city or town, gentlemen? I remember a few years ago there was a run on a savings bank in a city not a thousand miles from my own residence. Some little distrust arose, and I remember that during the progress of that run (which continued but a single day) an excellent Quaker, a friend of mine, drove into town lashing his horse, and rushing into the bank, threw down his deposit book, saying, "I want my money." There was the treasurer sitting before him with a large roll of bills and a large pile of coin, and he immediately counted out the amount of my friend's deposit. The old Quaker looked at him a moment and exclaimed, "Thee has the money, has thee?" "Why, of course we have an abundance of money; we would be glad to have you take your money." "Well," said the old Quaker, "if thee has the money I don't want it, but if thee hasn't it I want it right off." [Laughter.] Now, that illustrates the basis of confidence. So long as your redemption fund is preserved, so long as it is maintained at the line which public opinion regards as the safety line, so long nobody wants your gold. But let that fund run below the limit of safety, as it has been running for two years and a half, and everybody wants his gold. If we can have proper care in the management of this redemption fund, and sufficient revenue, this reserve can be maintained and this distrust stopped.

Mr. QUIGG. Will the gentleman indulge me a moment?

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. QUIGG. I am trying to catch the meaning which the gentleman attaches to the words "and for no other purpose." Of course that language does not interfere, as the gentleman has explained, with the continued use of the greenbacks?

Mr. DINGLEY. Not at all.

Mr. QUIGG. Now, does the gentleman conceive that it will have the effect of maintaining the reserve at any given figure?

Mr. DINGLEY. It will have just this effect: It will have the effect of taking away part of the means by which the assault is made on the Treasury gold, and will have the effect of creating that condition of the market which will make the greenbacks more desirable than gold and stimulate the return of gold to the Treasury. Mr. Speaker, from 1879 to 1893 there was no run upon the Treasury gold. We had $100,000,000 of gold in the redemption fund all the time, and we maintained this fund all the time at that figure, the revenues being more than the expenditures, the country in a prosperous condition through the economic policy then prevailing, and when the industries of the country were prosperous nobody wanted gold. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We can return to the same condition only by a return to the same economic system which then prevailed. [Renewed applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. QUIGG. Let me ask the gentleman if it is not true also that considerable gold was exported at the time to which he refers?

Mr. DINGLEY. Undoubtedly. For several years there were large exportations of gold, and then large importations. That depends largely upon the balance of trade, which from 1876 to 1893 was in our favor every year except two. But even when we exported gold it came from the banks and not from the Treasury.

Mr. QUIGG. They simply did not use the Government as the conduit for getting the gold out.

Mr. DINGLEY. Not at all. Whatever gold was required for export up to 1893 came from the banks of the country and not from the United States. It came through business channels in the regular legitimate way. The Government received nearly all gold for its duty on imports and paid its balances at the clearing house in gold.

Now, I say to you gentlemen, especially to gentlemen on this side of the House, that one of the remedies for the present unfortunate condition of the Treasury, next to the remedy which passed the House yesterday providing for more revenue, is that remedy which will maintain the redemption fund intact, in order that the people of this country and the capitalists of the world may have ocular evidence of the fact that we have the wherewith to maintain our Government notes at par.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Does the gentleman from Maine think that the issuance of the Sherman notes, which became an additional charge on the one hundred millions of gold reserve in the Treasury, had anything to do in bringing about the condition of affairs to which he has alluded?

Mr. DINGLEY. I do——

Mr. WASHINGTON. I would like to hear the gentleman on that point.

Mr. DINGLEY. I am not discussing that question now. When those notes were issued the coin reserve ought to have been increased. I am frank to say that. But I want to discuss this question as a business proposition, and not from any partisan standpoint whatever. I am not talking of who is responsible for the condition that prevails. I am simply counseling a return to the sound methods which prevailed from 1879 to 1893. [Applause on the Republican side.] And this bill contemplates a return to the practical and satisfactory policy prevailing then so far as it goes.

Mr. MARSH. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes.

Mr. MARSH. The advantage of the first section, as I understand the gentleman, is that it provides for the issuance of 3 per cent bonds——

Mr. DINGLEY. That is one of the advantages.

Mr. MARSH. Let me conclude my question. The sale of 3 per cent bonds to maintain the reserve, instead of the sale of a 4 or 5 per cent bond; and you have told us that it would be a great saving of interest to the people if we could negotiate a 3 per cent bond instead of a 4 per cent bond. Now, that argument is significant if true, but I ask the gentleman from Maine if it is not true that when a 3 per cent bond can be sold at par, a 5 or a 4 per cent bond will sell at a rate of premium that will be less than 3 per cent? In other words, when a bond runs for ten years, is it not worth more than one that runs for five?

Mr. DINGLEY. Undoubtedly. What I say is this, that when you offer a bond to the people of the country—to the plain people, who do not stop to make calculations as to premiums—you will find that a large proportion of them would prefer to purchase a 3 per cent bond at par rather than a 4 per cent bond on which they will have to pay a premium. People do not like to pay a premium on their investments. But when they can get a 3 per cent bond at its face, the plain people of this country will take that in preference to paying what would be less than the equivalent for a 4 and 5 per cent bond at a premium. That is the practical working of it.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is true.

Mr. DINGLEY. Why, for what were our thirty-year 4 per cent bonds sold last winter? For 104½, to the syndicate, and at that very date a 3 per cent bond could have been sold to the people of this country, unquestionably, at par. And a sale of 3 per cent fifteen-

year bonds at par, in lieu of 4 per cent thirty-year bonds at 104½, would have saved many millions to the Treasury and the people.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Cleveland said not. He said if you would make it a gold bond you could sell it for 3 per cent.

Mr. DINGLEY. Of course my friend does not adopt the argument of President Cleveland, I take it. There is not a gentleman acquainted with financial matters in this House who does not know that a 3 per cent bond would have sold at par at that very moment to the people of this country and brought out gold.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DINGLEY. And yet we disposed of thirty-year 4 per cent bonds at 104½. I believe that if we had had the authority, under this act, at that time, to issue a 3 per cent bond, and had offered them to the people of this country, every dollar of it would have been taken at par [applause], and I want that authority to sell bonds to the people of this country to maintain the redemption fund alone and to preserve the credit of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must not be further interrupted in this discussion, because I am trespassing upon the time of other gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, with this practical question before us, I think we ought to set aside all collateral issues. This has nothing to do with the silver question. It has nothing to do with any of the outside problems which gentlemen have been inclined to discuss. It is a plain, practical question. Is it not better for us to authorize the issue of a 3 per cent bond that may be sold to the people of this country, sold, I have no doubt, to any extent, and that will bring out gold, too, than it is to leave the law as it is and have long-term bonds sold for 4 and 5 per cent interest, as they are certain to be sold unless we authorize bonds at this lower rate of interest?

It seems to me that this is a plain proposition and that we ought to lay aside all prejudice, that we ought to look at this matter as plain, practical men and adopt the plan proposed by this bill, and having, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, taken measures to increase the revenue until it equals expenditures, if the House bill shall become a law, then we can look the people of this country in the face and say that so far as the majority of this House is concerned, we have met the exigencies of the day, the exigencies forced upon this country, in a plain, practical, and patriotic way. And I doubt not, if such a measure as was inaugurated yesterday by the House and as is proposed by the pending bill shall become laws, and the redemption fund shall be constantly maintained, that we shall find the distrust gradually passing away, and when this legislation shall be supplemented by such other legislation as is possible only with a Republican Senate and President we shall find prosperity again coming over this country as it prevailed from 1861 to 1893. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, having so recently addressed the House, I apprehend that my strength will not be adequate to any extended discussion of the bill which is now under consideration. I beg the Chair to admonish me when I have spoken half an hour, if I shall be able to do so, in order that I may then yield the floor to some other gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, our financial situation has given rise to many strictures on the party in power and the present Administration. It ought to be remembered that the present Administration is conducting our financial affairs under laws made by our political adversaries, and the present embarrassment does not arise from any deficiency of funds in the Treasury. The fault lies in vicious currency legislation that comes down to us from a time when my party scarcely had any voice in the framing of the laws.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, would it interrupt the gentleman if I should ask him a question?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I wish the gentleman from Illinois would allow me to finish my statement, and I will try then to oblige him, as I have always endeavored to do.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, certainly; I will not seek to interject a question.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I do not deny that at some subsequent stages of our financial system the statesmen of my party have participated more or less in changes of policy, some of which I believe were blunders. But, in my opinion, the fundamental error in our finances was committed in the creation and perpetuation of one vast volume of uncovered paper money, which by legislation has been declared to be a legal tender, and which by the Supreme Court has been validated as constitutional money.

The party that confronts me from the other side has shifted and changed its attitude not only on the tariff, as you saw yesterday—I say it respectfully—it has made the most shameful tergiversations on the subject of our currency. They claim to have conducted the Government through the great civil war; and the energy and endurance and the lavish way in which resources for the success of that great struggle were accumulated will command the admiration of mankind. Following the war that party of the Union, realizing the dangers of an irredeemable currency, passed the resumption act. In the modification of that act in 1868 Democratic representatives participated, I admit. By the action of the Republican party all of our obligations were made payable in coin. At that time we had very little silver, and the little we had was substantially demonetized; in fact, it did not circulate at all. The obligation to pay our debts in coin was in reality an obligation to pay in gold.

On the face of this record for sound money, how does the Republican party stand to-day? Their representatives are paltering with this crisis and cowering with fear. They dare not say a word against this legal-tender paper. They dare not say a word now against the perils of silver payments to our creditors who do not wish silver. How have the mighty fallen!

Mr. Speaker, it is unpleasant to occupy the rôle of a mere critic and censor in this business. We have all made mistakes. But the policy of the House under the rule under which we acted yesterday, and under the rule now pending, leaves us on this side no recourse but strictures. We can not offer amendments. We are not permitted to help you perfect this measure.

I now venture to suggest to my friends on the other side that either they have not been entirely candid or they themselves do not understand this measure. It is said that out of abundant caution a proviso was added to the first section to prevent the retirement of the legal-tender notes. Gentlemen who are the friends of all these notes may find themselves unwittingly entrapped. There is in the first section of the bill a provision to this effect:

And the Treasury shall use the proceeds thereof—

That is, of these bond sales—

for the redemption of United States legal-tender notes, and for no other purpose.

And to that is added this morning a proviso, which I will now read:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify the act approved May 31, 1878, entitled "An act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes."

Now, in the first place, Mr. Speaker, what is to become of the United States legal-tender notes into which this gold reserve may glide by the process of redemption?

My friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] in the outset of his remarks, which I failed to hear distinctly, seemed to hold that by the operation of this bill the Treasury will have to open two accounts and segregate the proceeds of this redemption into a separate fund and a separate account. I deny it. There is nothing, absolutely nothing, in this bill which would have this effect. It would in no way change the Treasury policy in this respect. The proceeds of these bonds when they reach the Treasury in the form of gold or coin and are converted into legal-tender notes by redemptions will take their place side by side with such legal-tender notes as are already there for any lawful purposes to which the Treasury can devote them. This provision, therefore, is not even a suggestion to the Treasury, as the gentleman has said. "The proceeds thereof" are the gold procured on the bonds, and not the legal-tender notes that may be redeemed with the gold.

But I take a step further. The proviso just quoted, out of abundance of caution, to save the power to reissue legal-tender notes thus accumulated, takes care of that class of these notes which are specified in the act of May 31, 1878, commonly called United States notes, or greenbacks. Let me read it again:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify the act approved May 31, 1878, entitled "An act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes."

What, then, becomes of the Sherman notes under the act of 1890, the power to reissue which depends not on the act of 1878, but on the provisions of the Sherman Act of 1890? There is no reference whatever to this latter act. Hence this bill may be construed by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with strict law to authorize the retirement of the Sherman notes.

Mr. QUIGG. May I ask the gentleman whether, if the proviso were not in the bill, it would not have the same effect on the United States notes as if the proviso were there?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Now, my friend from New York asks me a pertinent question. I am not sure that the proviso was necessary for the professed object. I think that the Treasury without this proviso would have had to reissue all these notes received under the process of redemption under this bill, because both the act of 1878 and the Sherman Act of 1890 would then apply; but when Congress puts in a proviso which saves the reissue of greenbacks and says nothing about the others, the Secretary and the courts would probably enforce the maxim, "The expression of one is the exclusion of the other." Now, what are you gentlemen on the other side going to do with the explanation of my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. DINGLEY], who has endeavored so adroitly to avoid the factious differences in his party? The pretext of "abundant

caution" in this proviso seems to have been inspired by no caution at all. I endeavored to show yesterday that there was a fatal lapsus or omission in the bill then pending. I show to-day that the gentlemen who are railroading this bill through are doing so regardless of the fatal effect it will have on the Sherman notes. Now, I am not in favor of the Sherman notes. I voted against the act authorizing them. I believe that they contributed greatly to our present difficulties. I have shown you that I deeply regret the perpetuation of the greenback notes; but I am in favor of letting every member of this House and every man throughout the country know what is contained in this crude bill which none of us are permitted to touch.

I may be asked what would be our policy on this side. I have not the power to speak for this side; but I can speak for myself and for a few gentlemen who agree with me in opinion. But first let me say to gentlemen on the other side that when they claim that this measure is a response to the demands of the Treasury and of the Executive they are sailing under false pretenses.

In the first place, the bill does not contain a single provision or a single policy which the Administration or the Treasury recommends. If gentlemen mean to meet the emergency which the Administration depicts in urgent messages, why do they not at least allow some of us the poor privilege of offering such provisions as the Administration desires? Yet we are cut off from that opportunity.

The Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States believe—and there are some of us who believe the same way—that there ought to be provision made for the retirement of all our paper money, so called. Gentlemen on the other side, who have now the laboring oar, felt that way at one time, but now they will not even allow us the opportunity to offer such a provision in response to the demand of a Democratic Administration. It is also a part of the policy recommended by the Administration that these bonds which are to be offered on the market shall be made payable in that sort of coin which it receives for the protection of our legal-tender money; but we are not allowed to offer that amendment. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], when that proposition was offered in the last Congress, when we on this side had the opportunity to propose legislation, voted for it. Why is it that the gentleman and those with whom he is now associated do not allow members on his own side an opportunity to vote for such a proposition? The present Speaker himself supported that proposition.

Now, I do not speak for all my political associates. There is an honest difference of opinion between us on this side. So far as I am concerned, I have endeavored, conservatively and with great forbearance, to avoid inflaming that difference of opinion. I do not in any wise impeach the honesty or patriotism of those who differ with me. Far from it. I have deprecated some of their views, but I have done it with the utmost toleration and respect. Speaking only for myself, I believe that this unfortunate difference of opinion in my own party and in the other has done a great deal to prolong and intensify our financial difficulties. Any settlement, sir, on the basis of sound money would have a restorative effect on the country such as mankind has never before witnessed. And, sir, its effects would not be confined to this country alone. It would tend to reassure the tottering credit of our securities in other countries from which they are sent back to us on every impulse of fear and apprehension.

I would to-day be glad to offer a proposition for the retirement of every one of our legal-tender notes of every kind; and I would provide at the same time for such an unfettering and extension of banking facilities and privileges as would restore to the people the power to regulate the volume of their currency and to manage their own fiscal policies and the redemption of their own money.

Not a single one of these bonds, whether exchequer certificates or 3 per cent bonds payable in coin, can be sold at par in any market in this country or anywhere else, in my opinion. Why, sir, on the 26th of the present month United States fours maturing in 1925 were bid for at 116, which, when ciphered out, makes a rate of income of over 3 per cent—three and one-tenth and a fraction. With the market in that condition—with a bond already on the market which is bid for at a rate which would produce a larger rate of interest than the bond you offer, having a much longer time to run, do you suppose you can hold up a 3 per cent bond at par which is itself an addition to the supply of our bonds?

Now, as to these certificates of indebtedness, it is true, as said by the gentleman from Maine, that almost every Government in the world of any dignity and power except our own has authority to supplement deficient revenues by these short bonds or exchequer certificates. And I admit that the granting of such authority to our Government has been recommended by the Treasury Department for years, because it was supposed it would be a useful power in case our revenues should run short. But I insist, Mr. Speaker, that the condition of things which justifies these exchequer bills in other countries does not exist in ours. I believe that you can not dispose of these obligations in a popular way, as this bill presupposes, in amounts of $20 and multiples thereof.

The people of this country have no strong boxes, as have the people in France and elsewhere. They do not keep their money by them. They have no way to secure their valuables. On the contrary, they go to banks, and where savings institutions exist they go to them to deposit their money, and they take a pass book, by which arrangement they are not only saved from any risk as to the keeping of their funds, but their pass book is itself a thing which is equal to the cash whenever they choose to sell it, and on their deposits they receive interest. What need have they for exchequer bills? Will they take them and put them in their hoards at home? Their habits and tastes and previous experience are all against any such arrangement.

In the next place, there is at this time a large surplus in the Treasury available for the current expenses of the Government. I regret to have to say that that large surplus itself is a peril. Let us suppose, if you please, that our friends on the other side should, by some inscrutable providence, realize their hopes next year, and that they should come into power with a large surplus in the Treasury and an added revenue under the bill which they have just passed. I ask (if we may judge by experience), would they not repeat the budget of the Fifty-first Congress and so make exchequer bills necessary? The power to spend, coupled with the power to supply deficiencies with these certificates, would be dangerous in the hands of a party devoted to large expenditures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut). The Chair understood that the gentleman from Georgia desired to be reminded when one-half hour of his time had expired.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I thank the Chair. I will occupy a moment more, and then yield the floor to my friend from Tennessee.

Under our present system, Mr. Speaker, we have what is called the "endless chain" operating in the Treasury. That is a means by which persons who have gold can use it and at the same time recover it at their pleasure. By this arrangement you can eat your cake and keep it, too. [Laughter.] Any man or any bank that has gold by which large store is set can go to the Treasury and offer it in exchange for bonds when these calls are made, and as soon as he receives his bonds, if he is a man of means or a bank with resources, he can return and take out his gold, and thereby have both bonds and gold. [Laughter.]

It is a system, Mr. Speaker, which imperils the entire integrity of our currency system. If it is perpetuated it will continue over our heads the menace under which we have been conducting our business for the past four or five years. I ask gentlemen whether this is not a convenient time to stop this process and to substitute some better system? It has been said that it can be stopped at once by the exercise of the option which the law confers on the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem notes in silver. I candidly admit, Mr. Speaker, that I once had that opinion myself to some extent, and perhaps such a policy, if it had been inaugurated before the fear of silver became general, might long have been safely administered by the Treasury. But further reflection satisfies me that a change from gold to silver in these times of panic and confusion would precipitate a panic which would be almost as bad as if you were to cry "havoc" and let loose the dogs of war. [Applause.]

But, sir, I have already occupied more time than I had intended, and I yield the remainder of my time to my friend from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve the time allowed me by my friend from Georgia until the members of the Committee on Ways and Means have had an opportunity to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that no other gentleman is ready to proceed now.

Mr. PATTERSON. I would like to hear from somebody on the other side before proceeding myself.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to occupy the time of the House to-day, but it has been suggested that perhaps it would be better to add my contribution to the discussion at this time.

The advisability of the passage of this bill must be considered in the light of events that have called it into existence. If I believed it to be true, as has been proclaimed in the message of the President of the United States, and as it has been reiterated in the report of the honorable Secretary of the Treasury, and as insisted upon in the discussion on yesterday by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], that there is no deficit of a permanent character in the revenues of the Government, and that there is prospectively and beyond all reasonable doubt sufficient revenue going into the Treasury, so that no extraordinary means need be resorted to to protect the integrity of the Treasury, I would not favor the passage of either of the sections of this bill. But when, after an experiment of nearly three years of Democratic administration, we find, in the first place, that there are no words in the English language capable of describing the bad effect of this bad Administration on the affairs of the country; and secondly, that no estimate, or promise, or prophetic utterance of this Administration has had the smallest value from the standpoint of truth,

I am bound to assume that the necessity has arisen which calls for such a measure.

I defy gentlemen on the other side of the House to show me a single utterance, from either the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury, or any other of the distinguished leaders of the Democratic party in either branch of Congress that has not utterly failed of fulfillment. So, Mr. Speaker, we are compelled to take things as we find them, and proceed to administer the Government as though there were no Democratic party on the face of the earth. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Georgia, and I may say the Democratic minority on this floor, come here now and criticise the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and yet that same body of men, both in the majority on this floor during the last Congress and in the minority on the floor now, have wholly failed to suggest a single remedy for the troubles and the crushing evils that we are laboring under.

The President of the United States during the last Congress appealed to this House of Representatives to afford him some sort of relief, and his proposition was the issuance of a gold-bearing bond. His proposition was to revolutionize the entire financial system of the Government so far as the borrowing of money was concerned. And yet his party, his Administration, could not muster on this floor one-half of the Democratic vote to stand by him; and while the President was proclaiming and notifying Congress that unless some relief was offered there would be an early suspension of specie payments, this Democratic majority on the floor, with more than one hundred majority, were absolutely unable to offer to the country and to the Administration any sort of relief whatever. And to-day the President has no party behind him or for him in the country.

The differences of opinion were as vital and were as bitterly fought out then as they are being fought out in the country now in the Democratic States, or as they are on this floor here and now. So we have to assume that the Treasury of the United States is without funds.

Gentlemen talk about there being money enough. What do we hear in the organization of our committees as to enforced economy in expenditures? What do we discover, looking back over the history of the appropriations of the last Congress? They were large in the aggregate; but they did not meet the necessities of the people. The demand for the erection of public buildings was almost totally ignored. The improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country was practically abandoned. And when we made appropriations, probably most of them judicious ones, we found the Secretary of the Treasury figuring how not to meet the appropriations of Congress.

The repeal of the McKinley law had deprived the sugar growers of the country of that on which they had a right to depend; and when a Democratic Congress had appropriated upward of $5,000,000 for the relief of those people we suddenly discovered that there had come a pestiferous growth upon the administration of the laws and the Constitution of the United States, and a bureau officer of this Government, actuated possibly by his own self-conceit, actuated possibly by the general demand for the curtailment of appropriations, repealed the law of Congress and refused to execute it. We find stalking through these Departments a total disregard of law. A petty head of a Department, after having been rebuked by the Congress of his own party upon the same question involved later, dared to repeal the act which made appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, dared to violate the law of his country just as viciously as any mob in the whole country ever dared to do it. The troops of the Regular Army were called out to suppress the insurrection of Debs in Chicago; and yet Debs and his followers no more flagrantly violated the law of the country than did this Secretary of Agriculture when he refused to carry into effect the law of Congress, a law against the passage of which he had protested and which was passed over his protest.

So we come to find these things happening, and yet gentlemen tell us that there is money enough. We do not believe it; and, kindly as we would treat them, implicitly as we would rely upon their statements as gentlemen, we can not believe their statements as members of the Democratic party.

What, then, is to be done? Shall we, the party that has always stood by the Treasury, always defended the honor of this Government, always seen to it that the appropriations of Congress should be met, shall we hesitate to provide the necessary revenue?

What is the bill before us? If this was an original proposition to borrow money upon bonds, there might be a great deal of ground for our opposition. A gentleman on the other side yesterday undertook to tell us something about the comparative Administrations of Benjamin Harrison and Grover Cleveland, and he admitted the deficit in this Administration, but undertook to say that the Administration that had preceded this Democratic Administration had also been a failure in its financial operations. That learned gentleman, that able exponent of Democracy, forgot to state that during the Administration of Harrison we paid over $250,000,000 of the bonded national debt, and that up to this time this Administration has sold $162,500,000 of the bonds of the Government, and now comes back for more authority and threatens this country with $200,000,000 more. That is the difference between the two Administrations. One decreases the debt by $250,000,000, the other increases it by nearly a like sum.

But let me go rapidly forward. If this was an original proposition to borrow money, it would not be here in a Republican House of Representatives. We have not had to borrow money. It is something new to us. We have been enabled to run this Government without any oppression upon the people, and constantly pay the national debt. At the close of the war the bonded debt of the country was nearly $3,000,000,000, and when we turned it over to Mr. Cleveland it was only about $700,000,000. During his Administration he has succeeded in adding to the national debt over $250,000,000, and the Lord only knows in what shape it will be turned over to us again. It is new business for the Republican party to borrow money for any other purpose than to protect and make possible specie payments by the Treasury Department.

And now what is happening? We have a law in Congress that no man proposes to repeal. Gentlemen on the other side have not offered any proposition, either in this Congress or in any other that I know anything about to repeal the act of 1875, called the resumption act. That act authorized the President of the United States to borrow money for resumption purposes only, and that law has never been violated by a Republican President. Whether that law has been violated by a Democratic President I leave to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] to discuss, if he sees fit to do it. That law authorized the President to borrow money upon bonds at 4 and 5 per cent interest. If at 4 per cent, he might make the bonds for thirty years; if at 5 per cent, for a lesser term; but he could borrow money upon no other bonds. And so stands the law of this country to-day.

So, Mr. Cleveland's proposition to Congress having failed in the last session, he proceeded to borrow under that law. I do not care to stop now and discuss the results of that loan. It was the most unfortunate blot upon the record of American financiering—done in a night; done in a secret chamber somewhere; done without the knowledge of Congress; done without the knowledge of the people; done in the interest of a speedy relief of the Treasury, and it cost the Treasury not less than $10,000,000, that went into the hands of men who ought not to have had a dollar for all they did, above a reasonable commission—in striking contrast with the record of the Republican administration in 1878.

Now, what do we say by this bill? We say that if this thing is to go on we will here and now divide this scheme of finance. One shall be a scheme for the redemption of outstanding notes of the Government. The money raised for resumption purposes shall be kept separate and apart from the ordinary expenses of the Government. We will not have the statutes and laws of the country trampled under foot in spirit if not in letter by the Treasury Department any more. We will not have money borrowed for redemption purposes used in the current expenses of the Government. So we say that in the event the Treasury of the United States shall become unable to pay the current appropriations of Congress, then and in that case the 3 per cent certificates of indebtedness may be issued by the Treasury Department, and that only in case of emergency; that bonds shall not be issued for current expenditures without necessity, but only to relieve the Treasury from the bungling of incompetent administration and from the violation of the spirit if not the letter of the law of 1875.

Then we say that in order to protect the gold reserve, which all concur is a necessary adjunct to a sound financial system, we will authorize the President to change the mode of operation under the law of 1875, and that he may sell 3 per cent bonds instead of 4 per cent bonds. He may make them payable in fifteen years instead of thirty years, and redeemable after five years if the Government shall be able to do it, and I think it will. I think the signs of the times all indicate that the old party that knows how to pay the national debt is coming back into power, and it will pay the national debt again and give the Democracy of some future generation, if again it comes into power, an opportunity to pile it up, as it has always done. [Laughter.]

Then we say just this much further: You shall make these bonds payable in fifteen years; you shall make them redeemable in five; and then you shall never again—never again—enter into a financial conspiracy to harm the people of the United States by any more secret syndicate contracts. Not only shall you sell this new 3 per cent loan, if necessary, so that all the people of the country shall know what is going on—shall have an opportunity to take them, have an opportunity to bid for them—but under that changed law of 1875 we say, even if you resort to that law and want to sell a 4 per cent or a 5 per cent bond, you shall do that by public outcry, as it were, through the Treasury and every depository of the Government throughout the country. That is all there is in

this proposition. It is not to enlarge the power to issue bonds, except when the Treasury is in default for money to pay its obligations. If the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] be a true one, if he is a correct prophet, and if he rightly foretells the future, there never will be one of these certificates issued in the country. I think if there is one of them issued it will be during the term of Mr. Cleveland or very soon thereafter, for the Republican party does not issue certificates of indebtedness—they pay cash as they go along. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Why, my countrymen, what is there here that any man shall object to on the score that he is not willing to issue any more bonds? You do not propose to repeal the act of 1875? You do not propose to take away the barrier that all this time has stood between the greenback dollar and depreciation for want of a redeemer? Surely not. Then what objection is there in changing the law in the interest of a lower rate of interest and in the interest of a more public if not a more honest administration of the Treasury Department?

So, Mr. Speaker, waiving no jot or tittle of my opposition to the general idea of increasing the public debt of the country, I am willing to vote for this measure as a measure of relief to the Treasury Department, and I am willing to do it even though it be to rescue a Democratic Administration from bankruptcy and disgrace. Behind the occupation of the public places by the Democratic party there stands my country; behind the Administration, the most unutterable in its total failure of perfection of any Administration that this country ever had; behind it all, and underneath it, is my country, a country which the Republican party has saved in war and saved in peace; a country that will, in the hands of the Republican party, again rise from the ashes of Democracy and go forward to ultimate glory and perfection. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to recite to the House a very few historical facts. Under the act of 1878, known as the Bland-Allison Act, $383,000,000 silver dollars were coined and placed in circulation, every one of which is to-day a part of our currency. On the 14th of July, 1890, the Congress of the United States passed what is known as the Sherman law, which required the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase monthly 4,500,000 ounces of fine silver. That amounted to 54,000,000 ounces every year, or 540,000,000 ounces every ten years. This extraordinary legislation, legislation enacted by the Republican party and approved by a Republican President, was the beginning of the distress which now fills our country.

No wonder that such legislation should have alarmed the commercial world. You can trace financial disaster from that hour, just as you can trace the track of a cyclone. The customs receipts plainly indicate the progress of the disaster. In the month of June, 1890, the month preceding the enactment of that law, 94.6 per cent of all the revenues of the Government received at the custom-house in New York—and that is where the great bulk of our revenues from importation is collected—94.6 of all the revenues there received, I say, was paid in gold. Gold then was freely in circulation. It was upon the counter of every bank, and importers preferred paying gold to any other currency in discharge of customs dues. Ninety-four and six-tenths per cent of the customs revenues received at the New York custom-house was paid in gold in that month of June, 1890, and that was about the rate for other months preceding.

Passing on, now, one year, we find that in the month of June, 1891, only 12½ per cent of the customs dues were paid in gold, showing that the want of confidence in our financial system had become fixed in the mind of the commercial world. The returns for June, 1892, show that of the entire revenue collected at the custom-house at New York only 8.3 per cent was paid in gold, showing that there had been an increase in the want of confidence between June, 1891, and June, 1892. Coming down another year, the record shows that for the month of June, 1893, not one cent, not the millionth part of a cent of the revenues collected at the port of New York were paid in gold. Gold ceased to flow into the Treasury. The gold currency of the United States was then hoarded.

The country was in the throes of a great panic, and our extreme distress was upon us. Then, in the month of October, 1893, Congress repealed the Sherman law, and what was the result? In the month of October, 1893, 37.6 per cent of the customs dues were paid in gold. Then it was that a renewed attack was made upon the reserve, growing out of a further want of confidence in our currency, and, as I believe, largely on account of the action of the Fifty-third Congress. So it happened that in the month of October, 1894, again not one dollar of gold entered the Treasury of the United States through our custom-houses. Again—and this is the last report which is accessible to me—in the month of September, 1895, not one dollar of gold came into the Treasury through the custom-house at New York.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a strange, an extraordinary condition of affairs. It shows that the commercial world has no confidence in our financial system, that confidence has not been restored, and that to-day there is still a want of confidence in the currency of our country. Is that very remarkable, sir, when we have in circulation 423,000,000 of silver dollars, the metallic value of which is about 50 cents on the dollar, and about $500,000,000 of legal-tender paper money outstanding against a reserve of less than $100,000,000 in gold? Is it at all remarkable that there should be a want of confidence when such a condition of affairs exists?

Mr. Speaker, I have reached the conclusion, which is firmly fixed in my mind, that the great and paramount duty of Congress is to restore confidence in the currency of our country. A simple resolution passed by Congress that it is the purpose and policy of this great Republic to maintain inviolate its standard of value would be worth a great deal more to the American people and to the prosperity of the country than a bond issue. What the American people demand, what the commercial world needs, is a declaration of that kind. The thing that stands in the way of our prosperity and of the entire recuperation of the business of the country is the absence of an effort to remove all doubt from the mind of the commercial world and from the minds of our own people as to the absolute stability and safety of our currency, the absolute fixedness and certainty of our standard of value.

In 1875, when the act was passed for the issuing of our coin bonds, there was not a million silver dollars in circulation, and their coinage was suspended. To-day, as I have already said, we have $423,000,000 of them and five hundred millions of uncovered paper money, making over $900,000,000 in circulation, all dependent upon a low Treasury reserve. And that, too, with our people divided in opinion on the question. I unite with my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] in saying that I have no word of censure for gentlemen who do not agree with me. I concede to gentlemen who differ with me honesty of opinion, but I do invite investigation and honest discussion in respect to the existing condition of affairs and the causes of it. What is the apprehension of our own people? What is the apprehension of the commercial world in respect to our financial condition? It is that it may at any time be precipitated to a silver basis. A very large proportion of the membership of the two great political parties is to-day advocating free coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1. Those gentlemen with whom I agree on that subject, no matter of what political party they may be, are absolutely of the opinion that free coinage would result in silver monometallism in the United States.

This being the state of mind of the country, this being the sentiment of the commercial world in respect to our currency, are we discharging our duty to the American people when we propose to pass such a law as this? The proposition is to sell a coin bond. Suppose that our free-silver friends should succeed two years hence in passing an act for the free, unlimited, and independent coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, what would be the result? These bonds would be payable in coin and could be discharged in silver dollars worth much less than 100 cents on the dollar compared with our present currency. Now, this is the apprehension in the minds of people at home and abroad. What is the purpose of this bill? It is to sell bonds for gold to replenish the gold reserve. No member who joined in reporting this bill has ever conceived it possible that these bonds would be sold for anything else than gold; yet the bill provides that they shall be redeemed in coin—that is, in either gold or silver; and if the country should come to a silver basis they could be discharged in depreciated money. I appeal to the House whether this meets the wants of the country. Does this answer to the situation of the hour?

I am satisfied that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], does not contemplate anything else than that these bonds shall be sold for gold and that they shall be paid in gold. If that is true, why not say so upon the face of the bonds? There is not a member in this House, there is not a citizen in the land, who would not regard it as honorable and right to return that which he had borrowed. The authors of this bill know that gold is required to maintain the gold reserve. The object of this bill is to provide gold for that purpose. Yet these bonds will go out into the markets of the world with the stipulation upon their face that they can be discharged in any kind of coin which happens to be standard money when the bonds fall due. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this does not meet the exigencies of the situation. It may meet the exigencies of the political situation, it may meet the exigencies of the Republican party, but it does not meet the requirements of the country; it does not meet the requirements of commerce; it does not restore that confidence which the American people so much desire.

These bonds are redeemable after five years. They are required to be sold in this country to the highest bidder; and all that the bidder need do is to reach his hand into the Treasury reserve, take out the gold, buy the bonds, and the Treasury is where it began. No opportunity is given to strengthen the gold currency of the United States. No opportunity is given to negotiate for gold

abroad. The powers which the Secretary of the Treasury now has under existing law are taken from him by this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can come to no other conclusion from my standpoint than that this bill is a miserable makeshift. The President has asked Congress for bread for the people and the Republican party has given him a stone. It is no improvement on existing conditions. Existing conditions are preferable to the conditions that will occur under this legislation.

I can not for one give this bill my support. If its framers would simply deal with this proposition candidly, and say that the Government would pay that which it borrowed; if they would say what I believe they really mean—that it is their purpose and the purpose of the Congress of the United States to maintain inviolate the parity of all our money and to maintain at all hazards the fixedness and stability of our standard of value—I would vote for this bill, come from what quarter it might.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican party has disappointed the country. The Republican party has turned the head of its columns toward Sedan. The American people will not be satisfied with this proposed legislation. I know that men who agree with me are perhaps in a minority on this side of the House. I know that they are in a minority of a minority in the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures; yet I verily believe that the Executive who has appealed to this Congress to maintain the public credit and the national honor represents more completely the better thought of the country and the American people than any man living to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I take consolation in standing with those whom I believe to be right. The Republican party is making this great blunder; it is not responding to the necessities of the country. There will be a revival of democracy in these United States. The spirit of Andrew Jackson, who restored the gold currency to this country in 1834, still walks the earth to inspire patriotic men in this emergency. You may rely upon it that ultimately the country will come to the position that it is the duty of the American people and that it is absolutely necessary to their welfare and prosperity to maintain inviolate their standard of value.

I am not here, and never have been, to advocate striking down a silver circulation. There is not to-day a gold country in the world that does not largely use silver in its circulation. There is not a silver country in the world that uses gold at all. I wish, so far as I am concerned—and that is the opinion of those with whom I agree—that we may have the very largest silver circulation consistent with the unquestioned maintenance of our standard of value. This is our position, and, in my humble judgment, this will be the position of the Democracy in 1896. And when that revival comes, when there is recurrence to the time-honored principles taught by Jackson and Benton and Calhoun in 1834, when the gold currency was restored to the country, and again proclaimed in Congress in 1853, when it was made secure, the Democratic party will regain and hold the confidence of the American people, for it will stand for the liberty of the citizen, the liberty of the State, the liberty of commerce, honest government and sound money, the prosperity of the people, and the triumph of constitutional government. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MCMILLIN. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Before the gentleman from Virginia proceeds I desire to return the time which I have remaining to my friend from Georgia [Mr. TURNER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOPKINS). In whose time has the gentleman spoken?

Mr. PATTERSON. In the time of the gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has exhausted the time of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PATTERSON. I had ten minutes accorded me by the Chair, which I have not exhausted, and I desire to yield that time to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed grateful to my friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] for yielding me time to address this House upon the pending proposition.

The country has anxiously awaited the assembling of this Congress to ascertain what were the policies of the Republican party in dealing with the great difficulties which to-day confront us—what measures this party would offer to relieve the present distress.

Last Monday the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Republican leader of this House, stated that yesterday and to-day his party would present measures which they conceived would relieve the country and answer its present wants.

Two bills have been presented by this party for this purpose. You have, by the adoption of the rule of yesterday and to-day, deprived the House of all right to offer or vote upon any amendments to these propositions. This House is compelled to either adopt or reject them.

Before proceeding to a discussion of these measures, I desire to enter my protest against any such method of procedure. It is the first time since the organization of this House that measures of such magnitude as these of to-day and yesterday have been presented and the House deprived of all right of amendment. It is depriving this House of its most sacred right, the right to perfect legislation in accordance with its ideas and convictions. Deprived of this right, this House ceases to be a representative or a deliberative body.

If I mistake not, when the great Napoleon, as first consul, reorganized the Government of France he created a legislative body of 500, whose duties were confined to the consideration of such measures as he presented to them, and these measures could only be accepted or rejected, they could not be amended. They were compelled to partake of the viands spread before them or starve. They had no privilege of selection.

The Speaker of this House, the first consul of the Republican party, has transformed this House into a pretended legislative body the very counterpart of the one organized by the French despot to serve his ambitious purposes. We can only consider such measures as the Committee on Rules, of which he is chairman, reports, and the measure thus reported must be either accepted or rejected, the House can not amend them. The pretended legislative body of France was only a reflex of the imperial will of the first consul. This House by this tyrannical method becomes only a reflex of the imperial will of the Speaker. We can only get legislation fashioned by his hand. This House ceases to represent the country, but becomes only an instrument to give approval to the designs of the Speaker. It destroys the freedom of this assembly, which should be the model representative body of the world. You Republicans, by adopting these rules, say you owe your allegiance to the Speaker. I recognize my allegiance alone to my constituency. As you Republicans have nearly unanimously voted for these rules, which prevent all amendment, I presume you consider that these measures are perfection, so far as Republican thought and policy can make them. They contain all the country may expect from you. They embody all the hopes and promises of your party. It is your method of dealing with the present difficulties. Your bill passed yesterday did not receive a Democratic vote. The present one will not receive any Democratic support.

I shall state frankly and candidly my objections to your bills. I shall discuss them fully so that this House and the country may understand your designs and purposes.

If your measures become law, instead of lessening they will greatly aggravate the present difficulties.

I announce, and it can not be successfully contradicted upon this floor, that the design and the ultimate effect of your measures will be to take out of circulation and retire the legal-tender Treasury notes and greenbacks, amounting to $500,000,000, about one-third of the entire money of the country, without substituting anything in their place.

Your bills accomplish this in two ways: One by collecting a large surplus in the Treasury by taxation; and the other by providing for the sale of bonds to add to this surplus, until you have collected in the Treasury and withdrawn from circulation all the notes redeemable in coin.

Yesterday, under a pretense of a deficiency in the revenue, you passed a bill which you admit will collect in taxes from the people $40,000,000 a year. You provide that it shall continue in force until the 1st of August, 1898. Thus, under this bill, by your own admission, you will collect in money and put in the Treasury about $105,000,000.

On the 1st of December last the report of the Secretary of the Treasury showed that there was in the Treasury $177,406,386.62. He estimates that next year there would be, under the present law, a deficiency of $17,000,000 and the succeeding year a surplus of $7,000,000. Thus, under your bill of yesterday, you make the Government stretch forth its hand by taxation and collect from the already overtaxed and impoverished people $175,000,000 to lock up in the Treasury. But, as this would still leave out in circulation about $325,000,000 of coin notes, you come to-day and supplement your bill of yesterday by providing for the sale of bonds to get gold enough to redeem this amount of coin notes, which, when redeemed, will be kept in the Treasury and out of circulation. With a surplus of revenue over expenses, as you provide, there is no way of getting this amount of money in circulation again. Your bill does not provide for cancellation, but as this vast amount will be locked up in the Treasury, out of circulation so far as the people and business are concerned, it will be the same thing, equally as ruinous and disastrous. Thus this legislation means the destruction, so far as the people are concerned, of about $500,000,000 of the present currency without substituting anything in its place. I believe that this would result in untold disasters to the vast majority of the people. I believe it would precipitate a panic more frightful than any we have yet witnessed. I believe it would reduce the supply of currency so as to paralyze all business and manufacturing enterprises. I believe it would still further depress the prices of all products and

property. I believe it would add double burdens on the debtors and benefit only our foreign creditors and a few money lenders and speculators in this country. [Applause.]

I am not one of those who believe in contracted currency. I am not one who believes that we have at present a redundant currency. I think we should increase instead of decrease our currency. Those who advocate the gold standard and claim that we have too much currency at present are mistaken and base their conclusions on the per capita theory of money. They claim that we have more money per capita now than we ever had before, but there is no bigger humbug in the world than the theory that money should be in proportion to the population. We do not trade in people. Men are not bought and sold. We trade in property. As money is a standard of value and a medium of exchange, it should bear a proportion to the property and business of the country. The best measure of the business of a country is the value of its property.

Let us ascertain what was the relation between property and money under normal and natural conditions. The census of 1860 is the last census by which we can ascertain this. In 1860 we had the free coinage of both gold and silver. In 1870 we were on a greenback basis and had neither gold nor silver. In 1880 and 1890 we had demonetized silver. Thus the last census which can give us the proper relation, under normal and natural conditions, between property and money is the census of 1860.

In 1860 our property amounted to $16,159,616,068, and our circulation to $435,407,252. Thus we then had $1 for every $37 worth of property. In 1890 we had $65,037,091,197 of property and only $1,429,251,270 of currency. About the same proportion exists to-day. Thus at present we have only $1 for every $45 worth of property.

If we should make our currency bear the same proportion to property that it did in 1860, instead of decreasing our currency by retiring the greenbacks and other coin notes, we would have to increase it about 21½ per cent, or about $305,000,000. If we retired the greenbacks and coin notes, we would have only $1 to every $69 worth of property.

Now, the force of a dollar is limited. It can only give value to a certain amount of property and answer certain demands. Unless our currency is increased, the natural results will be that $45 worth of property will be reduced in value until it is only worth $37. The shrinkage in value of produce and property of all kinds shows that this inexorable law is working and depressing prices. Unless we reform our financial system, there will be a further and greater fall in prices.

To retire $500,000,000 of the currency, as here proposed, would produce a fall in prices frightful to contemplate. Values of all kinds of property would be swept away so surely and quickly that it would be difficult to determine who was solvent. The circulation in this country has been greatly exaggerated. On November 1 the Secretary of the Treasury estimated that the entire circulation amounted to $1,598,859,316. He fails to deduct from this the amounts held by the banks as a reserve.

On the 28th of September, 1895, all banks in the United States had in their vaults, in cash, $568,783,783.61. Their deposits on that day amounted to $4,886,899,331.28. Thus the banks owed on demand eight times more than they had in their vaults. Thus they had loaned far below the safety limit and would be compelled to keep that amount locked up in their vaults out of circulation. Deducting this from the amount given by the Secretary of the Treasury, it would leave about $1,030,000,000 in circulation.

Now, the census of 1890 shows that the annual taxes collected in the United States for State, city, county, and Federal purposes amounted to $1,040,473,013. Thus we have the amazing fact that the taxes collected in the United States each year are about $10,000,000 in excess of the real money in circulation. We are confronted with the fact that each year every dollar of money in circulation must pass through either the Federal, State, city, or county treasuries before it gets out again into circulation.

Retire the greenbacks and coin notes, as here proposed, and the taxes of the country each year will be double the actual circulation. The census of 1890 shows that the aggregate minimum indebtedness of the United States amounts to $20,227,170,546. Thus the indebtedness is twenty times in excess of the real circulation. Retire the greenbacks and coin notes and it will be forty times in excess of it. The annual interest charge in the United States, by the census of 1890, amounts to $1,166,101,303. Thus, at present, the annual interest charge of this country is about $130,000,000 in excess of the real circulation. Retire the greenbacks and coin notes and it will be more than double.

Thus, if this legislation proposed here to-day by the Republican party prevails the taxes and interest paid each year by the people will be four times more than the real circulation among them.

This would mean such a frightful sacrifice of property as in many cases would amount almost to confiscation.

A comparison of the censuses of 1870 and of 1890 will exhibit the great loss sustained by the farmer on account of a contracted currency and the partial introduction here of the gold standard. I will only make the comparison in my own State, yet those of nearly every other State are similar.

In 1870 the capital invested in farming in Virginia amounted to $246,132,550, and the value of the productions were $51,774,801. In 1890 the capital invested in farming in Virginia amounted to $294,488,569, and the value of the products to only $42,244,458. Thus in 1890 the farmers had invested in farming $48,356,019 more than in 1870, yet received $9,530,343 less for their products. In other words, the farmers, with an investment of 19 per cent more of capital, made 24 per cent less in profits in 1890 than in 1870. In these dry figures can be read the distress, the poverty, and the wretchedness that has overtaken the farmer. They portray more vividly than language how each year his profits have disappeared in falling prices until he is confronted with a load of indebtedness which he is powerless to remove.

My vision stretches far beyond these dry figures of the census and I see the actualities of life which they indicate. In the aggregate of taxes in excess of money I see the difficulties of the people in meeting taxation. I see a great sacrifice of property or else the tax collector's sale. In the vast pile of indebtedness, standing out on the census report like some large mountain peak, I see an accumulated mass of woe and wretchedness. I see mortgaged homes, the occupants expecting each day to be turned adrift, without house or shelter. I see large business houses, profitable to the country, overshadowed with debt and tottering on the verge of ruin. I see, as the collection of this vast indebtedness proceeds, further fall in the prices of all property, and that men who think themselves rich, in disappearing values, will find themselves bankrupt. [Applause.]

These conditions exist to-day. Retire the greenbacks and the coin notes without substituting anything in their place, as is here proposed, and all these evils will be doubly intensified.

The currency of a country must bear a proper proportion to its property, taxes, indebtedness, and business. Unless it does, low prices, bankruptcy, and general paralysis of business must follow.

The trouble with us to-day is that our currency is too small in comparison with our property, business, taxes, and debts. When measured by these it is smaller to-day than ever before known in our history. If the greenbacks and Treasury notes are retired, you will next witness an assault upon the standard silver dollars in our circulation, amounting to nearly $450,000,000. The same powers to-day seeking to destroy the greenbacks and Treasury notes have declared war upon these. No currency has their approval except gold and national-bank notes redeemable in gold. When they have destroyed the Treasury notes and greenbacks and silver, as is now contemplated, there will remain nothing except gold to redeem the national-bank notes in. The national banks can never bring any relief to the South and West, for every bank organized there will decrease instead of increasing the currency.

If permission were given the banks, as suggested, to issue notes up to the face value of the bonds, it would result in putting a still higher premium on United States bonds. A bank organized in the South or West would have to send $120,000 North to purchase bonds and would then only receive $100,000 back in currency. Thus there would be $20,000 less in money in circulation after than before the bank was organized. There is no relief in this for us, yet this is all the Republican party has to offer. It has ever stubbornly and persistently refused to extend any financial relief to the great South and West. The Republican party demonetized silver in 1873, when it was at a premium, without cause and without excuse. In 1875 it passed the resumption act, which provided for retiring and destroying the greenbacks. In 1890, when it again came into power, it repealed the Bland-Allison Act, passed by a Democratic Congress, which was coining 2,000,000 silver dollars per month and put in its place the Sherman Act, which bought silver and paid for it with gold without coining the silver. Last session of Congress the Republican party voted almost solidly against coining the $200,000,000 of silver bullion in the Treasury. To-day you have adopted a rule which prohibits us from offering as an amendment to your bill a proposition to coin this silver bullion in the Treasury. The passage of this would give all the relief claimed as necessary by you. It would coin $55,000,000 of silver seigniorage, which would more than supply any imaginary deficiency of revenue. The currency would be increased to that amount.

Out of the other silver bullion could be coined enough to retire all the Sherman coin notes which daily raid the Treasury for gold. This would reduce the coin notes raiding the Treasury to such an extent as to relieve it of all difficulties. Thus by this method the present troubles could be settled safely, and by an expansion instead of a contraction of the currency. But you Republicans are bitterly opposed to this. The Republican party in both the House and the Senate has ever opposed the free coinage of silver. It was a Democratic House of Representatives that passed the law in 1878 prohibiting the cancellation of the greenbacks and requiring their reissuance, thus saving $346,000,000 in currency to the people. It was a Democratic House of Representatives that passed

the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 and gave the people over 400,000,000 standard silver dollars. When the effort was made in the last Democratic Congress to retire $500,000,000 of greenbacks and Treasury notes, it was defeated by a large majority, and this money was preserved to the people. This bill, destroying this vast amount of money, to-morrow will pass this House by a large majority. The first act of legislation of the Republican party is destructive of the best interest of the people.

You Republicans have utterly failed to respond to the wishes and desires of the country. You have turned a deaf ear to everybody except the greedy and avaricious bondholders and money lenders. The country in the next election will hold you to a strict accountability. Many who have hitherto aided you with their suffrages will desert you, as your intention is now manifest to put this country upon a contracted gold basis. Your advent to power in all the departments of the Government will mark the complete establishment here of the gold standard.

The country now recognizes that the only hope for an enlarged currency, for the creation of a local currency to supplement the national currency, for a cessation of tariff agitation, for the remonetization of silver, is with the Democratic party. This party alone has saved them their present currency against your destructive hands. But for the patriotic efforts and success of the Democratic party we would have no greenbacks, no standard silver dollars to-day. The country now recognizes that, instead of expecting an increase of currency from the Republican party, it must save its present currency from the destroying efforts of this party. We are prepared for the conflict. The people of this country are determined to have financial relief, and they will bury with their condemnation this party and these men who, after being commissioned to come here, falsify their pledges and instead of being an aid are great hindrances in the consummation of this end. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield to me for one question?

Mr. SWANSON. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. HARDY. I desire to ask if you have read the bill before the House, and if it does not state emphatically that this bill is not to retire the greenbacks?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes, it does state that; but I would like the gentleman to tell me how he is going to get the greenbacks out in circulation again if they are not used to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government.

Mr. HARDY. We will do it as we have done before, by taking them and sending them out again——

Mr. LACEY. By buying Democratic bonds.

Mr. SWANSON. Is that your proposition? Then your proposition is to sell bonds on Monday and pay a premium for them on Tuesday. That is pretty financiering.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman stated in his opening remarks that there was a surplus in the Treasury to-day of $70,000,000, as stated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SWANSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARDY. I will ask the gentleman if that surplus is a part of the $182,000,000 that Mr. Cleveland has borrowed?

Mr. SWANSON. It is, and I will say to the gentleman if he had listened to my statement he would have learned there would have been $182,000,000 locked up in the Treasury, out of circulation to-day, but for the necessity of issuing it to meet current expenses.

Mr. HARDY. If it had not been for the Democrats there would not have been any deficit. [Great laughter.]

Mr. SWANSON. I will tell you the difference between you and Mr. Cleveland. You come here by taxation, in addition to a sale of bonds, and try to retire all the greenbacks, while Mr. Cleveland wishes to do so only by the sale of bonds.

Mr. HARDY. No, sir; I came here by votes.

Mr. SWANSON. I suppose that is what you came by.

Mr. HARDY. There were 38,000 votes polled in my district. How many did you get in your district?

Mr. SWANSON. I got over 10,000 and beat my opponent by over 2,000.

Mr. HARDY. How many votes were cast in your district?

Mr. SWANSON. I do not know, sir. I think there must have been——

Mr. HARDY. There were more votes cast in three districts in my State than in all Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman on his shrewdness in talking about the number of votes cast in his district instead of about the question before the House.

I will tell you gentlemen on the other side the difference between your plan and the President's. You say: "We will get all the chickens in a coop, but we will not clip off their heads;" the President wants to get them in the coop and clip of their heads. [Laughter. Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, as long as the present Administration is in power it seems that we must be constantly confronted with the question of issuing bonds. It is not a pleasant thing to contemplate. In former days the Republican party provided for the issuance of bonds to maintain the necessary reserve for the redemption of our Treasury notes.

No one then thought that the funds thus provided for would be used for anything except the keeping up of the reserve, and as long as the revenues of the Government equaled or exceeded its current expenditures there was no reason for any apprehension as to the misuse of the law of 1875. But now dear-bought experience has taught us that some more convenient form of bonds should be provided for, and at the same time the Government should be restricted in the sale of all bonds, so that private and scandalous contracts may not again startle the country.

I would be glad to be able to vote for the repeal of all laws authorizing the issuance of Government bonds, and I would do so if it were not evident that from time to time the issuance of such bonds may become necessary.

When under Mr. Cleveland's former Administration, under the tariff laws then in force, bonds were called in and paid off, and when during Mr. Harrison's term an immense amount of the national debt was paid off and extinguished, we gave but little thought to the question of what kind of interest-bearing obligations we should issue in the future.

But under the mismanagement of the present Administration, with the new revenue law in full force, it is plainly evident that more money may be needed in the future from the same source.

To-day the balance of cash in the Treasury is $175,452,183.80, including the shattered remains of the gold reserve. Mr. Cleveland has already issued $162,400,000 of bonds, which realized about $178,000,000. If this money had not been borrowed, instead of having a balance of cash in the Treasury and a part of the reserve, the whole of the reserve would have been gone, the cash balance would all have disappeared, and there would have been $3,000,000 of unpaid warrants. In fact, every pretext has been made use of to stand off and delay claims against the Government, or the showing would be even worse than this.

The sugar bounty of $5,000,000 has been tied up by the ruling of Comptroller Bowler, and by the delay in the payment of the lawful claims against the Government the balance in the Treasury is made to appear larger than it would have been had we paid current bills as our national honor requires.

Notwithstanding the tender of relief by a revenue bill from this House, it is evident that before relief could come from that quarter another bond issue is exceedingly probable under existing law. The Republican party is in no wise responsible for this condition of things, but as we are now in power in this body, it becomes our duty to make such improvements in the system of bonds that a bond-issuing Administration may do as little harm as possible.

The proposed bill provides two additional kinds of bonds at lower rates of interest than those provided for by the existing law; one kind to replace any loss in the coin reserve, and the other to supply any deficiencies in the current revenues.

And in addition to these provisions the Secretary of the Treasury is forbidden to sell any bonds under the present bill or under the resumption act of 1875 except at public offers.

The bill will give a more convenient and cheaper form of bonds than those provided for under the act of 1875, and will prevent any more private bond sales. If the tariff bill which we have just passed should become a law, we may have good reason to believe that not many bonds will become necessary hereafter. But in the impending probability of some further issues by Mr. Cleveland it is necessary that some such measure as the one now before the House should be enacted.

The Republicans are not favorable to bond issues. Such issues are a sign of financial disease. When an individual's expenses exceed his income he issues his promissory notes for the deficiency. To maintain his credit he must increase his income or decrease his expenditures or reform his financial condition in both directions.

Nations are amenable to the same laws. With un-American legislation we are met with an adverse balance of trade by the purchase of foreign goods in excess of our exports, and by an inadequate tariff the Treasury is met with a monthly deficit in the revenues.

Under this condition bonds will be necessary from time to time until by Republican policy the country can again resume its former prosperity.

However averse we may be to bond issues we must recognize the fact that under this Administration they will be a necessity. We may not like the remedy, but disease can not be abolished by the destruction of all medicine.

The proposed bill puts this bond-issuing Administration under bonds to the public. It forbids the secret and devious methods of the last bond sale.

If this bill should fail because of the votes of some of our Republican friends the result will be that the President will call in his favored syndicate for another inroad upon the Treasury. His remedy is to apply the leech.

When you go before the people in the next campaign and criticise the next bond issue your constituents will ask you if a bill was not introduced to change this method of selling bonds and if you did not vote against it.

It is argued by our Democratic opponents that the President does not want this bill to pass. This is a most excellent reason why we should vote for it.

Gentlemen upon the other side seem to be very much divided upon this question, and they also seem to be in great apprehension of a surplus in the Treasury. My friend from Virginia who has just taken his seat [Mr. SWANSON] has been questioning us as to what we will do if a surplus arises from the revenue bill which was passed on yesterday, and from the redemption of the greenbacks and their accumulation in the Treasury. The answer is very simple. We have never had any difficulty with a surplus. We bought bonds from time to time, as a surplus accumulated in the Treasury, and thus kept the money out among the people. But the question before us now is not as to whether bonds shall be issued, but as to the character of the bonds that the Treasury may issue under the exigencies of the circumstances that surround us. I am not one of those Republicans who have been inclined to criticise Mr. Cleveland merely for the issuance of bonds. I have never blamed him for the mere fact of the issuance of any bonds, but I have been inclined to criticise him and his party for having enacted legislation which rendered the issuance of bonds necessary, and also for the manner in which those bonds were issued. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before us, if it had no other merit, ought to pass a Republican Congress because of the provision which I will read, and to which I will briefly ask the attention of the House:

Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall offer any of the bonds authorized for sale by this act or by the resumption act of 1875, he shall advertise the same and authorize subscriptions therefor to be made at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States.

No such course was adopted when the last issue of bonds was made. Those bonds were sold secretly. A thing was done in the negotiation of those bonds that ought to be prohibited by law. Our Democratic predecessors in the Fifty-third Congress were invited, by a bill framed by the present Speaker of this House, to provide that the shady sort of transaction which had already taken place should not be repeated, but they refused to do so.

This House will not do its duty if it does not enact legislation substantially embracing the provision which I have just read. Bonds were issued by the Administration under a secret contract at 104½, and they were a few days after put up and sold at public sale to bidders who were required to take them at 113½. Gentlemen will remember that the President told us in his message that those bonds would not bring more than $104½ under the existing condition of the market unless we would strike out the word "coin" and insert "gold." Congress refused to do that, and the bonds were issued with the word "coin" instead of the word "gold." They were offered at public sale at 113½, and the whole amount of those bonds was subscribed twenty times over in twenty minutes, showing that the public put no such low estimate upon the nation's credit as Mr. Cleveland and his favored syndicate pretended to.

On the 1st day of last October the syndicate published their report, intended to defend the Administration. They claimed that they had made only about $4,000,000 upon the transaction, but gentlemen will remember how that computation was made. This estimate was made by figuring the difference between 104½ and 113½, and by deducting certain expenses which they claimed to have incurred in covering gold into the Treasury. But in that report the syndicate neglected one very important item. That was the fact that in the distribution of the bids they gave the individual members of the syndicate the preference to take all those bonds at 113½, so that when the bonds were afterwards sold to the public at 121½, and even as high as 122, the individual members of the syndicate got the benefit of the rise, so that the real amount of their profit would run up to ten or twelve million dollars, instead of four millions, as they reported it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is time that we should call a halt upon transactions like that. We read in the morning papers of the last day or two that Mr. Stetson, a former law partner of the President, and Mr. Morgan, the chief of the syndicate, have been paying a portentous visit to the capital of the United States, and that a bond issue is imminent. The visit of these gentlemen to this city bodes no good to the nation. We ought to provide as speedily as possible that no other bond issue shall be made on any such basis as that which disgraced the administration of the Treasury last time, and this bill which is now before the House will cover that point, and cover it fully. The bill provides, first, for a bond at a low rate of interest, 3 per cent, in order to replenish the gold reserve. The existing law authorizes the issue of bonds at 4 and 5 per cent. Some shorter term bond, redeemable at five and maturing at fifteen years, as this bill provides, ought to take the place of the long-time bonds of the act of 1875, but circumstances might arise rendering it impossible to float a 3 per cent bond at par, and therefore it becomes necessary, in the opinion of the Committee on Ways and Means, that the old law shall be retained. The second section of this bill provides a method of raising funds in case of a temporary deficiency in the revenues.

That, it seems to me, ought to be passed. It is not proposed by this bill to retire the greenbacks, but to maintain them. I, for one, believe that the retention of the greenback is essential to the maintenance of the parity of the money of this country; that if the Government "goes out of the banking business," as has been so often suggested, the result would be that the duty of maintaining that parity would fall upon the bankers alone, and I fear that they would not be equal to the task if it should involve any loss.

In 1893, when the Treasury came into the breach and sold bonds and maintained the parity of all our money—if that duty had fallen on the bankers would they have maintained that parity at a loss to themselves? Banks are not eleemosynary institutions; they are organized to make money; and instead of helping to maintain the parity in the panic of 1893 they even failed to pay their ordinary certificates of deposit in coin, silver, copper, or paper of any kind. I do not blame them for this, but it shows that we can not rely upon the banks to maintain the quality of our paper money if to do so would involve them in any loss. The greenback, on the other hand, has been maintained by the Government. The amount of the issue has not been excessive; and although it has cost something to maintain this currency, the result has been to equalize all the different kinds of money, and the saving of interest greatly exceeds any expense in which the Government has been involved by the issuance of these notes.

That condition of things has been recognized in this bill. The last Congress, the Republican side of it at least, voted almost unanimously for substantially the same proposition which is before the House at the present moment. When that proposition was offered there was scarcely a dissenting voice in regard to it on this side of the Chamber. Now that we have the power in this body to strengthen the public credit by tendering to the Treasury these two forms of bonds, it seems to me we ought to do so frankly and fully, and at the same time tie the hands of the Secretary as against any more such sales. Let us have no more dark-lantern bond syndicates.

Yesterday we sent over to the other end of the Capitol a revenue bill—a bill in regard to which the only complaint from the other side is that it may produce more revenue than the country will need at this particular time. We know full well that if we have a surplus we can get rid of it by the purchase or payment of bonds in carrying on the Government, but when a deficiency comes that deficiency is not merely a danger to the Government, it is a danger to every institution that has credit in the United States. If the Treasury is sick the whole body politic will also suffer. Our entire financial system is so interwoven that the credit of the nation is essential to the credit of its people.

We have been told that we should not stir up the tariff again in this Congress; that the American people need rest. Mr. Speaker, I deny that. It is not rest that the American people need; it is work; it is employment; and they have been out of that since the Democratic party came into power more than two years ago.

Mr. MILES. Who was it that suggested that the country needed a rest from tariff agitation? Was it not the man who is responsible for the measure pending before this House and the one which passed yesterday?

Mr. LACEY. To whom does the gentleman refer?

Mr. MILES. To the Speaker of this House.

Mr. LACEY. As I understand, the gentleman to whom reference is made has been charged with having some connection with the passage of the bill which went through the House yesterday, he having organized the "conspiracy" in the Committee on Rules by which that bill passed through this House. Now, if he is charged with saying that the country needed entire rest from tariff agitation, he certainly gave a full answer to that charge yesterday by aiding in the passage of that bill, which will give work to some portion of the American people.

Mr. MILES. Do you deny that he did say what I have stated?

Mr. LACEY. He did not say it in the sense in which my friend would imply.

Mr. MILES. Explain, then, the sense in which he used the language, if it was not in reference to the tariff. Was the language intended in some Pickwickian sense, as a friend near me suggests?

Mr. LACEY. The suggestion was simply this, that the tariff question should not be agitated in the present Congress in the form of a general revision, with a hostile President of the United States and an uncertain body at the other end of the Capitol. In this House, thanks to the people, there is Republican strength enough to pass such a bill as ought to be passed in the interests of the American people by a two-thirds majority. But that situation does not prevail elsewhere. An agitation such as would open up the entire question is not, therefore, now desirable. That I understand to be the full scope of the remark to which the gentleman

from Maryland [Mr. MILES] refers. But on the other hand it is necessary to increase revenues, and this side of the House has decided to do that in the line of a tariff bill which will give at least some partial relief to the Treasury on the one hand and to the people out of employment on the other. There will be some protection in its added revenue.

Mr. HYDE. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HYDE. Is there anything in this bill to prevent or arrest the continuance of the scandalous bond transactions which have been carried on in the past by the President, Mr. Stetson, and Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, as referred to by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. LACEY. I do not understand that under the Constitution we can pass an act for the punishment of anything which may have been done in that connection; such an act would be an ex post facto law. That act was committed last year.

Mr. HYDE. I ask whether this bill does anything to prevent the continuance of such transactions.

Mr. LACEY. This bill prevents any such wrong in the future, because it requires that hereafter bonds shall only be sold by being offered to the public.

Mr. HYDE. Does this bill contain any provision which will prevent those men from continuing to do as they have done?

Mr. LACEY. The gentleman has not read this bill very closely or he would understand that it provides that whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall offer any of the bonds authorized by this act, or by the resumption act, they must be offered at public sale. In this way the bill provides against the recurrence of the evils which even our friends on the other side must concede have existed in the last bond transaction. No one on either side ought to be proud of that transaction. No one on either side, I apprehend, will be found to advocate it.

Mr. COX. May I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. COX. When you provide in one part of this bill for the redemption of the greenbacks by the issue of bonds which are to be paid in coin, and at the same time provide for meeting deficiencies in the Treasury by the issue of certificates which are to be paid in lawful money, what do you mean? What are you driving at?

Mr. LACEY. I think I heard my friend ask that question a while ago of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], the framer of this bill, who certainly gave the gentleman a very full and satisfactory answer.

Mr. COX. The answer was not at all satisfactory. I hope I shall get from the gentleman from Iowa a better one. I am happy to say I did not get much information on that subject.

Mr. LACEY. If my friend did not understand then, I fear he will not understand now. But I will give him the suggestions which occur to me as to the purposes of the bill. There are two purposes of the bill. The first is to provide for the redemption of greenbacks in order to maintain them on a parity with gold and to keep up the necessary reserve fund of the Treasury——

Mr. COX. I understand that.

Mr. LACEY. The second is—and it is a circumstance not likely to arise if the tariff bill of yesterday becomes a law—but if it does become necessary to borrow money to pay the expenses of the Government, there will be no jugglery, no hocus-pocus about it; no sale of bonds for gold and the payment of gold out for greenbacks and the reissue of the greenbacks in the running expenses of the Government. But if there is a deficiency the money will be borrowed straight out with the certificates from the people, by issuing small-sized exchequer bonds, and when they are issued they will create a fund in the Treasury to be used for the current governmental expenses. I hope I have made it clear and plain to my friend from Tennessee at last.

Mr. COX. Now, you say you issue a certificate to pay the deficit of the Government expenditures. What will you pay them in?

Mr. LACEY. I have already answered my friend. These bonds are payable——

Mr. COX. Will you pay in gold, silver, or greenbacks?

Mr. LACEY (continuing). In the lawful money of the United States—gold, silver, or greenbacks.

Mr. COX. Why not make the bonds payable the same way?

Mr. LACEY. Because they are issued to raise coin.

Mr. COX. That is all right. You mean gold bonds, then?

Mr. LACEY. They are payable in coin, and are issued for the purpose of getting coin. That is the identical thing they are issued to procure. They must be paid in the same way, while the ordinary expenses of the Government are paid in the lawful money of the United States.

This bill appeals to the people in the hour of need. It is safer to rely upon the patriotic citizens of the United States than upon any speculating syndicates of foreign capital.

France appealed to her people in her hour of need when the Republic was only a few months old, and did not appeal in vain. We can as safely trust the people of this country.

Whether this bill shall become a law or not, it will meet with the approval of the sober judgment of the country.

It will furnish relief to the Treasury until a different Administration and a different policy shall relieve a depleted exchequer and a suffering people.

It forbids the retirement of the greenbacks and strengthens, without contracting, the currency.

It answers Mr. Cleveland's message in a practical and straightforward way. He demands the issuance of gold bonds, and insists that all efforts to maintain silver as money shall be abandoned. This bill returns a positive negative to his demand.

He asks for the contraction of the currency to the amount of $500,000,000, without even suggesting any circulating medium to take its place. To this extraordinary demand the bill gives answer.

The representatives of the people should recognize the difficulties of the situation, and the danger of another syndicated assault upon the Treasury and promptly pass this bill, which will render such methods impossible in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state the reasons why I, as a Republican, oppose this bill. [Applause.] I went over my district in California recently, and upon every stump in that district I proclaimed the undying hostility of the Republican party to the issuance of bonds in the time of peace. [Applause.] I proclaimed the undying hostility of the Republican party to the action of the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury in issuing bonds in time of profound peace to defray deficiencies in the revenues, caused by their own conduct, in making contracts with a bond syndicate, that would not bear investigation by a hostile Congress. [Renewed applause.] And I regard this bill as giving the lie to everything we said before the elections in reference to the issuing of bonds; and for one I can never by any act or vote of mine condone what I believe to be an error not merely of the heart, but of the head; not merely of general policy, but an error arising almost to the dignity of an offense against the commonwealth, of allowing the bonds of the United States Government to be taken and controlled in the manner they were by the Treasury of the United States and a bond syndicate in a time of profound peace. [Applause.]

This bill, in my judgment, stamps the seal of approval by the Republican party upon the action of these officers and upon the issuance of these bonds in the manner I have stated. It continues in force the laws which now authorize the selling of bonds at 4 per cent and at 5 per cent, and in addition to that gives authority to the Treasury to issue bonds at 3 per cent.

But ah! the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] says we ought to be patriotic, and that the American people will rise equal to the occasion and take the bonds at 3 per cent when they would be willing to give a foreigner 5 per cent on them. I am in favor of the protection of American industries, and if a man is rich and is willing to loan his money to the Government, I want him to have as good a rate of interest as would be given to the Rothschilds or to that great power across the ocean which is willing to aid us in the war which we may perhaps have with the once mother country of this nation. I am opposed to it also because it does attempt to retire the greenbacks—because it does retire the greenbacks, as I look at the law. I am one of those who believe the greenbacks to be the best currency we have ever had in the United States. I am old enough to remember the days before the war, and I remember that then when you went out of your own town, your own county, or your own State, into any other county or State in the nation, you were obliged to take a Thompson's Bank Note Reporter with you and change it every week in order to know whether you were getting good money or bad.

Now, the greenback goes current in any State of this American Union, and it ought to be protected and not injured in the house of its friends [applause], for we Republicans originated it. I believe this bill will retire the greenbacks because of the second section of the bill, which provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall have the right to issue short-term certificates with which to pay the necessary expenses of the Government. If he issues those certificates to defray the necessary expenses of the Government, and at the same time if he issues bonds and redeems the greenbacks, as he has a right to do, emphasized and almost demanded by this bill, what is to become of the greenbacks? He will not need them to defray the expenses of the Government, because he will have these short-term certificates, and the greenbacks will remain locked up in the Treasury vaults of the nation, and the currency will be contracted to that extent and nothing given in lieu. [Applause.]

I am opposed to this because it contradicts all the Republican platforms and all the Republican conventions and all the Republican speeches that ever I heard or made or wrote upon the question of the finances.

Yesterday, against my will, against my protest, I voted for a

bill which in my judgment was unnecessary, which in my judgment was not a Republican measure, which in my judgment did not meet the case, which in my judgment was not what we were sent here to do. [Applause.] Because I believe that the verdict of the nation, in 1894, was that we should have a protective tariff, and not a tariff for revenue only [applause]; that the election of 1894 stamped the seal of approval upon the McKinley bill and upon Bill McKinley himself, to the extent of indorsing the protective policy by him advocated. [Applause.] Therefore I was opposed to the bill which passed this House yesterday. I voted for it because the men who claimed to be the leaders of the Republican party said that it was right; for I am one of that unfortunate class called new members. I am simply kneeling at the feet of the political Gamaliels who run and control the Republican party here. [Laughter.] I am simply swallowing the drippings of the sanctuary, not the sweets of the inner table. [Laughter.] I admire the courage and revere the ability of these men, and yesterday I voted for that bill because they said it was right; but I was in the condition of the Irishman who had never seen any peaches before, who was given some to eat. He ate ravenously, and then he was asked how they tasted. Said he: "Sure, sir, they tasted very good, but the seeds scratched my throat going down." [Laughter.] And so, sir, my throat was scratched yesterday in voting for a Democratic tariff bill for revenue only. [Applause and laughter.] And if I know myself, never again during the short time that I occupy a seat upon this floor will I vote for any Democratic bills to help a Democratic President out of trouble. [Applause.]

Now, to-day we are called upon to undo all the work we did yesterday. To-day we are called upon to contradict everything that we said, everything that we did, and every vote that we cast yesterday. We were told yesterday by speeches upon the Republican side that the tariff bill which we then passed would give the necessary revenue to carry on the Government, that it made $44,000,000 in addition to that which we now receive. We were told by the distinguished gentlemen upon the Democratic side that we did not need the bill, that we have $70,000,000 in the Treasury already to pay the expenses of the Government. But we passed the bill, and now we were either wrong yesterday, and the Democrats were right, or we are wrong to-day in attempting to pass this bill; for after having passed the tariff bill to give $44,000,000 more of revenue, we now propose to pass a bond bill to give them $50,000,000 of certificates, and God knows how many hundred millions of dollars of short-time bonds, to build up a Treasury that we said yesterday—and voted also—a horizontal raise would fill up inside of a few months. [Applause and laughter.]

Now, I am not in favor of that kind of legislation. I am in favor of taking a stand and abiding by it. I am in favor of standing by what we believe to be right. In deciding this question I thank the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that he opened the debate by saying that this should not be decided upon a partisan basis, but should be regarded as a business proposition. I thank him for that, because it enables us Republicans—and I feel that there are many who agree with me—it enables those Republicans who feel as I do to vote against this bill and not fear that we shall be read out of the party by those who seek to control it. [Applause.] As a Republican I am against it. It is not a Republican doctrine. It is not Republican pap that we ought to drink at the present time. [Laughter and applause.] It is something which will do us no good. It is something which will do us harm. It can only be justified upon the ground that there is an emergency.

Every gentleman upon this floor who has spoken in favor of the bill has undertaken to tell us about a crisis. Why, as I listened to these gentlemen and heard them talk about the crisis they struck me as being men who wake up in the morning and look out of the window and see a nasty crisis right there in their front dooryard. [Laughter.] And when they go to bed at night, following the example of the women, will look under the bed to see whether they find any such crisis facing them there. [Laughter.] I deny for one that there is any crisis in the land. I believe that the wheels of industry are commencing to revolve again. I believe that we are on the eve of good times, and I for one am not willing to vote for a bill that violates every tenet, principle, and practice of the Republican party because some eloquent gentlemen have conjured up crises right under their bed, out of their own heads, and without facts to justify them. [Applause.]

I am opposed to this bill because it is absolutely unnecessary. Why? Because whether we tell the truth or do not, we might as well believe we tell the truth, even if we have a doubt about it. [Laughter.] We said yesterday, those Republicans who spoke upon the revenue bill, so called, said by their speeches, and those of us who silently followed our leaders who have taken us into trouble [laughter]—those of us who said by our votes that we indorsed those speeches said when you had this tariff bill which raised the revenues it gave $44,000,000 more revenue, and that was enough. All right. If we were correct yesterday, in the name of common sense what has occurred in twenty-four hours to change our minds? [Laughter.] Is it possible that anybody can see the shadow of the silver question arising upon the horizon to complicate this question and create this crisis of which we hear so much? I want to say to my friend from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON]—I know him not except officially, but trust we will be friends by reason of greater intimacy in the future—I say that for one, speaking only as one man, there is absolutely no fear comes into my mind at the use of the silver dollar by the people of these United States. [Loud applause on the Democratic side and by part of the Republicans.]

But there is nothing of silver in this. It is a pure, simple question of business, as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] said—pure and simple. Do we need it? If so, why? We do not need it for pure principles of patriotism. No man can exceed me in devotion to this country. No man will answer more quickly to the springs of patriotism when touched by the master hand of any man on this floor, Republican or Democrat. But what is there of patriotism in this? Nothing—absolutely nothing, except the privilege of loaning money at a decent rate of interest. I listened to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], learned, distinguished, and able as he is, and I heard him say that it is a patriotic duty to vote for this bill. Why? He gave no reason, except to say that it was a patriotic duty. I do not believe it is the patriotic duty of any man to increase his debts, either private or public. I believe it is the duty of the individual to keep his expenditures inside of his receipts. As Wilkins Micawber, him of almost historic fame, and the best financier in the world, according to his own lights—as Wilkins Micawber said:

> Income, £20 annually; expenditures, £19 19s. 11¼d.—result, happiness. Annual income, £20; annual expenditures, £20 ¼d.—result, unhappiness.

[Laughter.]

So let us keep our revenues equal to or not in excess of our expenditures, and there will be no need of any bond issue in time of peace. [Applause.]

But there was one argument presented by the gentleman from Ohio that I think ought to be repudiated by every Republican. He says that we ought to vote for this bill because the Democrats did not suggest anything better. Is that a business way of looking at a proposition? Let us look at the proposition itself regardless of everything else. Now, I do not regard it as the duty of the Democratic party on this floor to present anything. God knows they present themselves, and that is bad enough. [Great laughter.] We want no help from them. Our party is large enough and strong enough and great enough to evolve out of the wisdom of its own members measures that are sufficient to help the country. [Applause.] We ask no assistance from them, except to silently submit to the rules we adopt and the laws we pass. [Renewed laughter.]

Now, I think that this bill should be beaten. I think particularly the first section of the bill should be beaten. There is no party whip cracking here; every man can vote for himself and vote his own sentiments, either as a Republican, a Democrat, or a Populist. I ask all Republicans who believe in Republican principles, who believe in doing something because it is right, and not because it is expedient, to vote in favor of the motions that will be made against this bill, and to vote against it.

The Republican party always triumphs when it stands for the right. The Republican party always fails when it attempts to wrestle with the right and to let party expediency be brought to the front instead of deciding in favor of the right. We have been always against the issuance of bonds in time of peace. Let us adhere to the ancient landmarks of the party. Let us support Republican principles. Let us support Republican doctrines. Let us vote against this bill. In that way we will be assuming the responsibility of the occasion, and it is better for us to assume the responsibility and be right than to attempt to play peanut politics with the President of these United States and pass bills because they are expedient and may put him in a hole. [Laughter.]

I am not anxious to put the President of the United States or anyone else in a hole. I want to do that which is right. I want to do that which my party believes to be right. I want to do that which is for the benefit of the country. I want no politics in this question of finance, because there ought not to be any. I believe that every Republican upon this floor will be standing firmly by the landmarks of his party and will be deciding in favor of the right if he votes against this bill, and thereby announces now and forever that the Republican party of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth Congress will not denounce the Democrats for issuing bonds in time of peace, and then immediately turn around as soon as it comes into power and vote for the issue of bonds in time of peace. [Applause.]

Let us be consistent with our party record. Let us stand by the rule which we adopted many years ago, that we will not issue bonds in time of peace, but that we will pile up revenue and tariff rates, even if we have to reenact the McKinley tariff bill, until the

receipts of the Government exceed its expenditures. [Applause.] Gentlemen ask us what we can do under the circumstances except to pass this bill. Why, sir, to me, a poor, suffering, new member, it seems the easiest thing in the world to correctly answer this question. [Laughter.] Just strike out the words "four" and "five" in the existing law and insert "three," if there is any magic in a 3 per cent bond, and that gives you exactly this bill. What is the objection to that plan? You have a law on the statute book which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds at 4 and 5 per cent, but you say that that is wrong, and you say you do not want to retire the greenbacks. Very well, strike out "four" and "five" and insert "three" and you have accomplished all that you desire, and have not even by indirection attacked the greenbacks.

There is another way. Enact a bill which has been introduced, I believe, by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BAKER] requiring the customs dues to be paid in gold wherever imports are made from any country that requires gold upon its imports. That will give relief. Or, if you wish to do that which in my judgment will also give great relief, do what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] says we must not do—provide for the free coinage of silver. [Laughter.] That will relieve your difficulties.

Mr. DOVENER. I thought the gentleman would come to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman says he thought I would come to that. Of course he did, because he knows that it is right, and that is why I have come to it. [Laughter.]

Again, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that as a citizen I am opposed to this bill, as a humble taxpayer I am opposed to this bill, as a humble member of the Republican party I am opposed to this bill, and I hope that all Republicans here will vote against it, in order that we may all have the satisfaction of saying that we voted once this session in favor of the principles of the Republican party and not in favor of expediency. [Laughter and prolonged applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I apprehend that my friend and namesake from California who has just addressed the House has to some extent lost sight of the spirit of Republicanism in following too closely and too faithfully the letter of a formula of his own making not warranted by any party platform or tradition. We paid as we went and made both ends meet in the national housekeeping.

The general idea which my friend announces is correct, but the language in which he clothes it is misleading. It is not true that the traditional policy of the Republican party forbids the issuance of bonds in time of peace. That is not a correct statement. The Republican party has issued bonds in time of peace. It authorized the issuance of bonds for the resumption of specie payments in time of peace. The doctrine of the Republican party on that subject is this: It is not the custom or the policy of the Republican party to run the Government in such a way as to make it necessary to issue bonds to pay the current expenses of the Government in time of peace. The law authorizing the sale of bonds for the resumption of specie payments was placed upon the statute book by a Republican Congress and signed by a Republican President (General Grant) in 1875, and for four years we endured the hostility and the ridicule of our opponents, who said that it would be utterly impossible to resume specie payments in 1879; but, plodding faithfully and steadily in that direction, another Republican Congress and another Republican President, in 1878, in time of peace, mind you, actually sold the bonds, established the gold reserve, and redeemed our pledge of coin resumption on the 1st day of January, 1879. We did issue bonds in time of profound peace, and have never apologized for it. We have never been either repudiated by our friends or successfully assailed by our enemies for that action.

We do not make the point of extravagance in public expenditures, although there is much more ground for it than there was when they used it with such effect against us after the Fifty-first Congress.

Our first complaint is that the Democrats repealed a law which afforded both protection and ample revenue, and substituted for it a measure that failed either to protect the industries and wages of the people or to produce sufficient revenues for the public Treasury.

Our second complaint is that when the policy of tariff for revenue only had done its natural work and produced its inevitable result, when a deficit had succeeded a surplus, when the reserve was encroached upon and confidence shaken, then we complained, not in the abstract against selling bonds in time of peace—every State and municipality in the country does that—but, first, against selling bonds ostensibly to maintain the redemption fund and then diverting the proceeds to pay current expenses; and our third complaint is that the bonds were sold secretly to a mixed syndicate of American and foreign favorites for about $10,000,000 less than they were worth in the open market.

The syndicate delivered 3,500,000 ounces of gold at $17.80441 per ounce, which is .80024 per ounce less than the Government rate, so that it paid a premium of 4.494 per cent for the bonds. It received bonds amounting to $62,315,400, and paid the Government $65,116,275 in gold at its valuation. Immediately the new and larger syndicate offered the bonds to the public at 112.25; or $69,949,075 for the whole issue, making a profit of $4,832,800, including the commission to the management above stated, so that the final profits divided among the members who did not take any of the bonds themselves was 6.675 per cent on their investment. But many of them—it is not known how many—took part of the bonds offered to the public, and those who did so shared the further profit in the advance of the bonds from 112.25 to 120 in less than two months, and 122.5 in less than three months. These latter, therefore, realized in three months 18 per cent on their advance, or 6 per cent a month. If they held a little longer, the bonds were still going to the public in July at 123.75 to 124.12. At the highest point the profit over the price at which the Government sold was 19.63 per cent, or $12,557,461, and at 122½, at which price or higher the bonds were sold for several months continually, the profits were $11,720,929.

My friend from California hopes especially that the first section of the bill will be defeated. Let me read to him a part of that first section and ask him whether he seriously wishes to go upon record as voting against the proposition:

> Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall offer any of the bonds authorized for sale by this act or by the resumption act of 1875, he shall advertise the same and authorize subscriptions therefor to be made at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States.

Is my friend prepared to say that he denounces that part of this bill?

A vote against that section of the bill is a vote against amending the resumption act so as to compel the present Secretary of the Treasury to do what the Republican Secretary did as a matter of course in 1878, viz, to sell the bonds—if bonds must be sold—publicly in the open American market.

We are not honored with the confidence of the President or a special message on the subject. But everybody knows the Administration is about to sell more bonds, variously estimated at from $100,000,000 to $200,000,000. The papers are full of it. Here is a sample, which I read from the New York Tribune of this morning:

> TALK ABOUT THE BONDS—WALL STREET THINKS ANOTHER SYNDICATE HAS BEEN FORMED—NEITHER AUGUST BELMONT NOR J. PIERPONT MORGAN WILL CONFIRM OR DENY THE REPORT—IT IS BELIEVED THE ISSUE WILL BE PLACED IN THIS COUNTRY—EFFECTS ON STOCKS.
>
> All the talk in Wall street yesterday was about the forthcoming issue of Government bonds. It was believed that a contract had been entered into for the sale by the Treasury Department to a syndicate headed by J. Pierpont Morgan and August Belmont of $100,000,000 thirty-year 4 per cent coin bonds.

When Mr. Sherman, as Secretary of the Treasury, in 1878, created the gold reserve, large discretion was given to him (as it is given to the present Secretary); but he advertised the bonds for sale and sold them at market price, so that the Treasury got the benefit of every cent they brought. He placed them for sale in the United States and gave our own citizens thirty days' preference before any of them were offered for sale elsewhere. If the present Secretary had pursued that course in his issue of bonds there would have been little or no criticism of the way in which it was done, if the necessity for any bond sale were once admitted.

The strife between parties is not so much as to the amount of money to be collected as how it is to be collected. In the Fifty-first Congress and in the campaign following we were roundly denounced upon every stump as an extravagant, wicked, and utterly abandoned party; we were charged with being "a billion-dollar Congress." And upon that and other cries we were for the time being swept from power. Our opponents came in and took charge of the Government. They tried as conscientiously and as earnestly as men on this floor ever did to redeem the pledges of retrenchment, economy, and reform which they had made on the stump, to keep within the billion-dollar limit; but they could not do it. The real strife is not as to how much money we shall expend, but as to how that money shall be collected. In the early history of our party we took charge of this Government. It had then a bankrupt Treasury; its credit was so low that its bonds and other obligations were selling at a rate of discount which made the interest 12 per cent. In the course of thirty years of Republican supremacy we quadrupled the value of that credit; we reduced interest to 3 per cent; we paid over $2,000,000,000 of the public debt; and we did it in such a way that instead of impoverishing the people and reducing the amount of available property we quadrupled the wealth of the people of this country. We never made any of those advances by refusing to pay our honest obligations. No matter how they were incurred, no matter how they were forced upon us, if the debts were once made, if the bills were once incurred, we walked up manfully and either paid them, if we had the money, or gave our bonds, and thus pledged the public

faith of the nation for future payment. When a private individual or a nation has lawfully incurred expenses, no matter whether by blunders or crimes, there are only two ways to meet the condition honorably—either to pay cash or else to give a proper obligation to pay when able.

The facts of the situation now are that by circumstances over which we have no control, by the verdict of the American people, lawfully rendered on that fateful November day in 1892, the policy under which we prospered during a whole generation was reversed, and what was dearest to us as the corner stone of Republicanism was severely condemned as the "culminating atrocity" of legislation in the Democratic platform of 1892, and, for the time being, overthrown by the tariff act of 1894.

From that day to this the Government has been constantly running behind in its expenses, the amount reaching $133,000,000 in the course of about two years and a half. We find now that our revenues are not sufficient to meet our ordinary expenditures. Such has always been the result of Democratic policy, and never the result of Republican policy, as the following table will show:

Year ended June 30—	Customs revenue.	Excess of revenue over expenditure.	Excess of expenditure over revenue.
1858			$27,529,904.43
1859			15,584,511.10
1860			7,065,990.56
1861			25,036,714.50
1862			422,774,363.48
1863			602,043,434.22
1864			600,695,870.37
1865			963,840,619.33
1866	$179,046,651.58	$37,223,203.07	
1867	176,417,810.88	133,091,335.11	
1868	164,464,599.56	28,297,798.46	
1869	180,048,426.63	48,078,469.41	
1870	194,538,374.44	101,601,916.88	
1871	206,270,408.05	91,146,756.64	
1872	216,370,286.77	96,588,904.89	
1873	188,089,522.70	43,392,959.34	
1874	163,103,833.69	2,344,882.30	
1875	157,167,722.35	13,376,658.26	
1876	148,071,984.61	29,022,241.83	
1877	130,956,493.07	30,340,577.69	
1878	130,170,680.20	20,799,551.90	
1879	137,250,047.70	6,879,300.93	
1880	186,522,064.60	65,883,653.20	
1881	198,159,676.02	100,069,404.98	
1882	220,410,730.25	145,543,810.71	
1883	214,706,496.93	132,879,444.41	
1884	195,067,489.76	104,393,625.59	
1885	181,471,939.34	63,463,771.27	
1886	192,905,023.44	93,956,588.56	
1887	217,286,893.13	103,471,097.69	
1888	219,091,173.63	111,341,273.63	
1889	223,832,741.69	87,761,080.59	
1890	229,668,584.57	85,040,271.97	
1891	219,522,205.23	26,838,541.93	
1892	177,452,964.15	9,914,453.66	
1893	203,355,016.73	2,341,674.29	
1894	131,318,530.62		69,803,260.58
1895	152,158,617.45		42,805,223.18

The excess of expenditures from 1861 to 1865 were war expenses, and the excess of revenue over expenses during Cleveland's first Administration was because we still held the Republican Senate, so that the Democrats had to govern the country according to Republican laws.

The same contrast between Republican and Democratic policies stands out in its effects on the public debt. They increase debt; we reduce it.

The reduction of the national debt by four-year periods is given on March 1 of each fourth year as follows, cents omitted:

March 1, 1869	$280,430,492
March 1, 1873	403,948,484
March 1, 1877	65,204,017
March 1, 1881	73,646,781
March 1, 1885	480,161,932
March 1, 1889	341,448,449
March 1, 1893	236,527,666
Total reduction of	1,881,367,873

Then there was a change of policy and also a change of results. On March 1, 1895, the national debt had been increased by $105,328,774, and on December 1, 1895, by $57,273,470, making the total increase since March 1, 1893, $162,602,245.

The present Administration, in the exercise of a lawful authority which we placed upon the statute book, has sold bonds to meet those deficiencies. We complain only of the manner in which those bonds were sold; and we are trying now to prevent a recurrence of such abuses. We are proposing a measure which, instead of allowing bonds to be sold secretly to a foreign syndicate without advertisement and at a price $10,000,000 more than they were worth at that time in the market, requires our bonds to be sold in our own market at public sale—first to our own citizens.

This is not a question of bonds or no bonds. This Administration has already decided to issue more bonds no matter what action this House may take. By defeating this bill we in effect tell the President to go on selling bonds in the manner his Secretary of the Treasury has been doing under existing law. By passing the bill we say that these scandals must stop, and that if bonds must be sold to meet the obligations of the Government they must be short-time, low-interest bonds, and that they must be sold publicly at places convenient and accessible to our own citizens.

In the President's annual message to Congress this year there is no discussion of the tariff. He only refers to it incidentally when he expresses his satisfaction at the enormous increase of imports of South American wool since wool was put on the free list.

It never occurred to him to grieve over the corresponding decrease in our own wool product.

The difference between free trade and protection is well illustrated in our wool and woolen imports:

Imports for 10 months.	1894.	1895.
Raw wool ..... pounds..	83,223,270	211,057,038
Shoddy ..... do....	1,081,441	17,823,008
Carpets ..... square yards..	265,314	829,423
Clothing	$673,088	$1,296,210
Cloths ..... pounds..	5,317,056	34,573,887
Dress goods ..... square yards..	32,761,465	25,976,470
Knit woolens	$593,669	$1,988,349
Shawls	$69,553	$370,264
Yarns ..... pounds..	383,985	3,383,285
All other woolens	$542,235	$1,919,785

This turn in the tide of our commerce had three effects:

First. It cut off from the Treasury a stream of gold in the shape of duties heretofore paid.

Second. It sent to South America and Australia a stream of gold that should have gone to North Dakota, Arizona, Ohio, and other localities within this Union.

Third. It compelled us to find gold, and only gold, with which to pay the foreigner, instead of the paper and silver which are taken just as readily as gold in all commercial transactions among our own citizens.

The same drain on our wealth, and especially on our gold, to pay for cheap imports, and the same destruction of home industries, as we have seen in wool and woolens, has operated in the other schedules.

Nothing short of a reversal of this policy and a return to the Republican policy of living within our income—selling more than we buy, and not importing so extensively what can be advantageously produced at home—will ever bring permanent relief. That will do it. It has done it before and will do it again.

For thirteen years—from its creation in 1879 until we lost control of it in 1892—there was no run on the gold reserve. There will be none when the same conditions are again restored under Republican supremacy. That day can not come too soon to suit the American people.

Mr. WHEELER addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] desire to address the House?

Mr. WHEELER. I will take the floor now, if the Chair will recognize me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know how much time has been occupied, but the gentleman is a member of the committee, and is entitled to the floor if he asks it. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I should not have felt called upon to address the House upon this question had the discussion been confined to the propriety of the passage of the bill now before the House, which is so manifestly objectionable with its inconsistencies and unwise provisions, but the debate has taken a very wide range, involving the entire currency and coinage question. The gentlemen on this side of the House who have spoken upon the bill this morning are among the very few Democratic Representatives who are avowed advocates of the gold standard and currency contraction, and as the majority of the Democrats on this side believe that such legislation will be detrimental to the producing and industrial classes of our people, I feel that something should be said in the interest of this most numerous and deserving body of citizens.

There is no one in this House who regrets more than myself to differ from our distinguished President and Secretary of the Treasury upon any subject; but in a question like this, so entirely one of business and which so differently affects the people of different sections and different vocations, we must obey the admonition which appears in many of the messages which President Cleveland has sent to this body, that the duty of every member of Congress is to seek to advance the interests of the constituents he represents on this floor.

MONEYED MEN MADE RICHER BY THE GOLD STANDARD.

Not only do we not criticise, but we expect the gold or single standard to be advocated by those who represent constituencies

which largely include the creditor classes, money lenders, or those receiving salaries, annuities, or any character of fixed incomes. Their sole purpose is to reduce the amount of money of ultimate redemption and thus increase the purchasing power of the money they possess.

When the vast gold discoveries in California and Australia were made known, these same people demanded the demonetization of gold, and they were very earnest in their arguments that as silver was the harder of the two metals and less liable to abrasion, it should be adopted as the standard.

Holland, a great money-lending country, was the first to move. Gold was demonetized and silver was adopted as the standard in that country.

I read from the Encyclopædia Britannica, page 736:

The result of the gold discoveries in Australia and California was to greatly increase the supply of that metal, and, under the action of Gresham's law, to change the French currency from silver to gold, while Holland, to avoid the evils which were anticipated from the reduced value of that metal, adopted silver as the standard.

These astute people saw that the relative production of gold would rapidly increase as compared to that of silver, and they therefore hastened to demonetize the metal which promised the largest yield; but in 1873 the production of silver largely increased, and the moneyed people, solely for the purpose of decreasing the amount of money of ultimate redemption and increasing their own power, demanded the demonetization of silver.

UNSCRUPULOUS EFFORTS OF MONEYED MEN.

Money and moneyed people are unscrupulous in the extreme in efforts to carry out their purposes. This was appreciated by Macaulay, who often referred to the cupidity of the creditor class. This great writer said:

If large financial interests were interested in denying the law of gravitation that proposition would be ably disputed.

This expression of Macaulay's has been most forcibly exemplified by the action of the moneyed class for the past few years in this country and in England. They first induced the Executive, without regard to party, to advocate their views, and then proceeded to bring their power to bear upon Congress and the people. They have established a bureau in the city of New York, which has flooded the country with millions and tens of millions of documents advocating the gold standard. In addition to this they have arranged to print supplements to newspapers in cities of the South and West, which supplements are sent free to any papers which will circulate them with their issues. These supplements are filled with ably written, misleading, and, in many instances, utterly unwarranted assertions.

GOLD STANDARD BRINGS DISTRESS TO THE FARMER.

I repeat that while we do not criticise the gentlemen from New York and New England for advocating legislation which will double the fortunes of their constituents, they must not criticise the representatives of the producing classes for insisting upon legislation which is absolutely essential to their prosperity. While legislation reducing the amount of money in the country benefits those who own money, its inevitable result is to injure the great producing class. It is but natural that Mr. Cleveland should advocate the gold standard, because nearly all the people with whom he is associated would be benefited by such legislation. In his annual message the President said:

Everyone who receives a fixed salary would find the dollar in his hand ruthlessly scaled down to the point of bitter disappointment if not to pinching privation.

Mr. Cleveland has always lived in a city, his business relations have always been with people in cities, and he has had very little, if anything, to do with the millions of farmers and farm laborers throughout the country.

Secretary Morton, in a recent interview, also expressed the same idea, and added that he wanted the American dollar "to have the largest possible purchasing power."

We can understand why Mr. Morton takes this view. For the last two years he has been surrounded by people who draw fixed salaries, and it is plain to see that their comforts would be increased just in proportion as the purchasing power of their salaries is enhanced. Secretary Morton seems to forget that for money "to have the largest possible purchasing power" inevitably means that the wheat, cotton, corn, and all other products of the farm shall be sold at the least price possible, which means the utter degradation and ruin of the most valuable interests in our land, and that it would finally result in the absolute inability of the Government to employ these officials at any salary whatever. And he also forgets that the history of the world shows that Governments which legislate for the great producing classes become powerful, rich, and happy, while those which legislate in favor of the creditor and salaried classes deteriorate and decay.

The house of the Rothschilds has always striven to reduce prices. At the monetary conference at Brussels Baron Rothschild urged that the United States demonetize silver, and when reminded that such a course would produce a fall in the price of commodities, which would be followed by distress, this great capitalist of the house of Rothschild said:

I hold that wheat at 30s. a quarter instead of 45s. is rather a blessing than otherwise.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], for whom during the last fourteen years I have learned to entertain the most profound respect, tells us that silver coinage will reduce the value of everything in this country.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. The gentleman from Alabama is entirely mistaken as to my statement.

Mr. WHEELER. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will take back what he said.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. On the contrary, the "gentleman from Georgia" reiterates his statement with all due submission to the better judgment of his friend from Alabama. My statement was that if the Treasury paid out silver now on coin obligations it would precipitate a panic.

SECRETARY CARLISLE'S SUGGESTION.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I accept the gentleman's correction, but I can not agree with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia that any such effect would result from a proper exercise of the authority given by law to the Secretary of the Treasury. When it was proposed last winter to sell bonds to raise $65,000,000 in gold I prepared an amendment to the bill, which reads as follows:

That after the $65,000,000 in gold secured by this contract has been received by the Treasury the payment of all obligations which are payable in gold or silver at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury shall be paid partly in gold and partly in silver, in the proportion in which the two metals are held by the Treasury on the day the payments are made.

This is substantially what has been done and is now being done by the Bank of France and other European banks, and no panic has ever resulted and it has never disturbed the parity between the two metals.

On the 21st of last January Secretary Carlisle admitted the propriety and advisability of such action. In a printed report of that date he said:

If the policy of reserving to the Government, at the beginning of the resumption, the option of redeeming in gold or silver all its paper presented had been adopted, I believe it would have worked beneficially and there would have been no trouble growing out of it.

If it would have been judicious to have adopted this course at that time it would be judicious to do it now. I believe that Mr. Carlisle could well have added that no serious trouble would arise from such action now, and certainly no trouble would come from it compared to the serious trouble and distress which is inevitable if we continue the present system. At least we ought to try the experiment. Were it not that the rule adopted by the House prevents the possibility of proposed amendments, I would suggest one similar to the amendment which I proposed last winter. If the plan works well in France, where the ratio of silver to gold is 15½ to 1, why would it not work well here where the ratio is 16 to 1? Such was the plan contemplated by the legislation by which the currency obligations were created, and I am thoroughly convinced it would stop the presentation of currency obligations for the purpose of drawing gold from the Treasury. We would, therefore, prevent any further menace to the Treasury, and it would be done in a way most beneficial to the industrial and producing class of our country.

WHAT CAUSES A PANIC?

A panic in the commercial world is an effort on the part of numerous people to sell stocks, bonds, or other property for money. The reason why they do this is that they believe that the property they have will fall in value and they desire to change their property into money, which they believe will, at a future time, buy more of the same property. It is simply a very general belief that property will fall and that money will rise in value. In times of panic people who have money refuse to lend it, because they think it to their advantage to hold the money until values reach their lowest point, when it will be profitable for them to invest. At all times when money is withdrawn from commercial or manufacturing enterprises, it is simply because the owners of the money believe that that money is about to increase in value; in other words, that its purchasing power is about to be enhanced. They also fear that the property offered as security for the money which is sought for will fall in value and in a short time the security will be insufficient.

SUFFICIENT MONEY INCREASES PRICES.

The most potent elements in regulating values are supply and demand. When money is abundant the tendency is for it to fall in value, or, what is the same thing, for property to rise in value. This law is as certain and inevitable as the rising and setting of the sun. The history of the world shows that whenever any legislation is had which tends to decrease the amount of money prices of all kinds of property fall in value, or, what is the same thing, money rises in value; and, on the contrary, the history of

the world shows that all legislation which tends to increase the amount of money tends to increase the price of property, or, what is the same thing, decrease the value of money. This principle is asserted in every work on money and political economy which has ever been published, and I believe up to this date has never been denied or questioned. The reason of this is that mankind has but one purpose and one use for money, which is, to purchase either property or labor.

The report of the Monetary Commission, dated March 2, 1877, page 49, says:

At the Christian era the metallic money of the Roman Empire amounted to $1,800,000,000. By the end of the fifteenth century it had sunk to less than $200,000,000. During this period a most extraordinary and baleful change took place in the condition of the world. Population dwindled, and commerce, arts, wealth, and freedom all disappeared. The people were reduced by poverty and misery to the most degraded conditions of serfdom and slavery. The disintegration of society was almost complete. The conditions of life were so hard that individual selfishness was the only thing consistent with the instinct of self-preservation. All public spirit, all generous emotions, all the noble aspirations of man shriveled and disappeared as the volume of money shrunk and as prices fell.

While other causes are in a measure responsible for the fearful conditions of society during the Dark Ages, there is no doubt that it was largely due to the shrinkage of money and the fearful depreciation in value of property that followed. The report of the Monetary Commission seems to concur in that view It says (page 49):

History records no such disastrous transition as that from the Roman Empire to the Dark Ages. Various explanations have been given of this entire breaking down of the framework of society, but it was certainly coincident with a shrinkage in the volume of money, which was also without historical parallel. The crumbling of institutions kept even step and pace with the shrinkage in the stock of money and the falling prices.

This view is sustained from the fact that this almost barbarous condition of Europe continued until after the discovery of America and the development of the rich silver mines of Potosi during the ten years following 1546, when the average annual production of silver was about $17,000,000; and this inflow of the precious metals in Europe was the dawn of the new civilization. The Monetary Commission, in referring to the energizing influence caused by the reception of silver in Europe, says:

It needed the heroic treatment of rising prices to enable society to reunite its shattered links, to shake off the shackles of feudalism, to relight and uplift the almost extinguished torch of civilization.

The commission most forcibly emphasizes this view of the subject in these words:

That the disasters of the Dark Ages were caused by decreasing money and falling prices, and that the recovery therefrom and the comparative prosperity which followed the discovery of America were due to an increasing supply, the precious metals and rising prices, will not seem surprising or unreasonable when the noble functions of money are considered. Money is the great instrument of association, the very fiber of social organism, the vitalizing force of industry, the protoplasm of civilization, and as essential to its existence as oxygen is to animal life. Without money civilization could not have had a beginning; with a diminishing supply it must languish and, unless relieved, finally perish.

On page 51 the commission says:

It is in a volume of money keeping even pace with advancing population and commerce, and in the resulting steadiness of prices, that the wholesome nutriment of a healthy vitality is to be found.

I also read from page 53:

While the volume of money is decreasing, even although very slowly, the value of each unit of money is increasing in corresponding ratio, and property is falling in price. Those who have contracted to pay money find that it is constantly becoming more difficult to meet their engagements. The margins of securities melt rapidly away, and the confiscation by the creditor of the property on which they are based becomes only a question of time.

The report from which these extracts are taken is that of the monetary commission which was created by act of Congress, and consisted of three Senators, three members of the House of Representatives, and three secretaries.

[The hour of 5 having arrived, the Speaker announced a recess until 7 o'clock.]

The SPEAKER. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the House stands in recess until 7 o'clock this evening.

Mr. WHEELER. I suppose my time is reserved.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the floor.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House took a recess until 7 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House at 7 p. m. resumed its session, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] is recognized for thirty minutes, ten minutes in the time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] and twenty minutes in the time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], who had the floor when the House took the recess.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, a great issue is before the American people, and every effort is being made to obscure and counteract it. Personal appeals and personal ambitions, individual antagonisms and local prejudices, avarice, greed, bigotry, and proscription, and every other sentiment repugnant to the spirit of true democracy is invoked to deaden real patriotism and to sacrifice every man who, in the trying hour, has dared to stand true to the rights of the American people.

An amazing spectacle is presented by what is being done in public affairs to-day. A few days ago the President sent in to Congress a message which rang like a bugle call, summoning the representatives of the American people to resist the aggressions of the British flag, and now we have presented in this House a bill for the perpetuation of a British standard that has destroyed more values and brought more destitution and misery than all the ravages of war. And yet we are asked to fight the one and to glorify the other, and to surrender to national banks one of the highest functions of National Government! And the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] has invoked the mighty spirit of Andrew Jackson to consecrate a surrender to British gold. Yesterday we passed a bill to bring about high prices in all protected industries, and to-day we are asked to pass a bill to perpetuate low prices in all industries not protected.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are watching the proceedings of this Congress. They are tired of being made the puppets of the miserable policies that are being pursued, and the time is coming when they will say so in terms and tones that can not be mistaken. Politicians are inventing makeshifts, but the people will marshal their mighty columns upon the line of living issues, and the conflict that will be fought to a finish is the battle of the standards. That is the mighty question that sooner or later will tower above all others, and I feel that I owe to my country and to my party to keep it before the people—

1. That the great issue now before the American people is the battle of the standards and not simply a question of circulation.

The question is, Shall we continue under the single gold standard, fraudulently foisted upon us by the Sherman Act of 1873, or shall we return to the bimetallic standard given us by the fathers of the Republic in 1792?

2. That bimetallism does not mean the concurrent circulation of the two metals, designated as the standard of value, but simply the free coinage of both on equal terms, so that the debtor shall have the right to pay his debt with either.

3. That, with this option upon the part of the debtor, if at any time the law-designated amount of one of these metals should be worth slightly less than the other, the option exercised by debtors to pay in the less valuable would increase the demand for that metal and decrease the demand for the other, and thereby constantly tend to bring and keep the value of the two upon a parity, at the ratio designated by law.

4. That the three important functions of money are first, as a medium of exchange; second, as a measure of value; third, as a standard of value or standard of deferred payments, and that in the present issue its most important function is that of a standard of value.

5. That the standard of value is that amount of precious metal, designated by law, either gold or silver, that the holder of every dollar of representative money is ultimately entitled to receive, and with which all deferred payments can be made and future or time contracts be performed, and have their present value estimated.

6. That silver was made a standard of value by the act of 1792, declaring that dollars of the value of a Spanish milled dollar, containing 371¼ grains of pure silver, should be the unit of value. It was that declaration of the law, and not the mere coinage or circulation of silver dollars, that made silver a standard of value. That provision of the act of 1792 remained in full force until the Sherman Act of 1873 made gold the sole standard of value by declaring that the gold dollar "at the standard weight of 25.8 grains shall be the unit of value."

7. That consequently the gold advocates, who argue upon the one hand that silver was really demonetized long prior to 1873, because the coinage and actual circulation of silver dollars had practically ceased, and on the other, that silver has not been demonetized at all, because more silver dollars have been coined since the act of 1873 than ever before, either do not understand what they assume to discuss, or else are trying to deceive the people as to the real issue involved.

If stopping the coinage or cessation from circulation of the unit of value could have the practical effect of overturning the standard of value set up by an act of Congress, what has become of the gold standard since the act of September, 1890, forbidding any further coinage of gold dollars and their virtual retirement from circulation?

8. That so far from bimetallism meaning the current circulation of the "unit of value" coins of both metals, it is not necessary that there should be an actual coinage of either of such units; and to show how entirely distinct is a question of circulation from that of a standard of value I have only to refer to Lord Hershell's report of the Indian currency committee of 1893, now before me,

which points out that Scandinavia, Holland, and Canada have the gold standard, with little or no gold coin in circulation; that Canada and the Dutch East Indies have the gold standard, without even a mint or any gold coinage at all, and that Austria then had a gold standard, with mints closed against the private coinage of gold as well as silver, and a currency of inconvertible paper; and the West Indies a circulation based on gold, but consisting of token silver made legal tender to an unlimited amount.

9. That in order to estimate value, time, weight, or extension there must be a standard. Our standard of weight is the Troy pound of the mint. Our standard unit of all measures of extension is the yard, and is adjusted to the old bronze yard measure obtained from England in 1856, and kept at Washington. Our standard unit of dry measure is the Winchester bushel, containing 2150.42 cubic inches, and so on.

For all these things there has to be a standard, and with respect to all but money the idea of the standard is easily understood, as it simply measures the weight, extension, or capacity of things, but is not given or taken in exchange for what it measures. Money, however, is not only the measure, but also the equivalent of values, and is given and taken in exchange for what it measures. Among all civilized nations value is estimated by its price in money. Money is therefore a standard of value, and our law provides that the dollar shall be the unit of that standard.

10. That the standard of value is also the standard of deferred payments for all future or time contracts. To illustrate: As it is competent for an individual to say, "For this horse you now sell me I will pay you, one year hence, 50 bushels of wheat or 100 bushels of corn," so it is competent for the Government to say what shall constitute its "dollar," or standard of value, or deferred payments, so that all contracts for future payments shall be payable in so many grains of silver or so many grains of gold, designating the number of each to constitute a dollar or be the equivalent of its unit of value.

In the individual contract just referred to, one bushel of wheat was fixed on as equivalent to two of corn, or, in other words, the ratio was 2 to 1 as between the two things in which the deferred payment might be made. When payment became due, if it was easier to pay in 100 bushels of corn than 50 in wheat, the debtor would pay in corn, and if there was a large number of such contracts that would increase the demand for corn and tend to bring it upon a parity with wheat at the ratio of 2 to 1.

11. That the Sherman Act of 1873, having deprived silver of its function as a standard of value, the whole burden of the functions of primary money was thereby devolved on gold alone, thereby largely enhancing its purchasing power with respect to all commodities, including silver. This is clearly shown in the article entitled "Silver," in volume 22, Encyclopædia Britannica, page 81.

12. That at the very time that silver was degraded by being deprived of its function as a standard of value, the silver in a silver dollar was worth 3 cents more than the gold in a gold dollar.

It was demonetized then because it was too dear. It must be kept demonetized now because it is too cheap!

13. That so far from silver having decreased in value on account of its increased production and not from its demonetization, as claimed by the advocates of gold monometallism, carefully prepared tables of the world's production of gold and silver show that at no time in the history of the world has the output of silver as compared with gold been so small as it has been since 1852.

14. That from the discovery of America the output of the two metals was 31 per cent of gold to 69 per cent of silver.

That from 1801 to 1840 the output of silver to gold was more than $71 in silver to $28 in gold, and yet during all the time above referred to the principles of bimetallism kept them upon the average commercial ratio of less than 16 to 1.

That at present the comparative output is about $20 in silver to $15 in gold; so that it is perfectly evident that the widening in the difference of the commercial ratio between them has not been due to any increase in the output of silver.

15. That the old stock-in-trade argument that the movement in favor of the free coinage of silver is "in the interest of Western mine owners" is the same as if men interested in the unduly high price of bread were to denounce a movement to open the mills to corn as simply "in the interest of corn growers."

16. That from the earliest periods of history gold and silver have been money metals, just as wheat and corn are now food products, and closing the mints against the free coinage of silver depreciated its value and enhanced the value of gold just as naturally as it would decrease the price of corn and increase the price of wheat to close the mills against corn.

17. That with the mills open to both, and corn selling at 40 cents and wheat at 80 cents a bushel, if the mills were closed against corn its functions and value as bread material would be largely devolved on wheat, thereby lowering corn to about 20 cents and raising wheat to $1.

Such was the effect upon silver of the Sherman Act of 1873. It sent gold up and silver down.

18. That closing the mills against corn would not only injure every corn grower but every being that had been using cornmeal for food, and every such person would have to give more of his labor and more of his products in exchange for wheat, flour, or any form of bread. Closing the mints against silver has injured every man who exchanges his products or labor for gold or any form of money based upon gold.

19. Suppose it was proposed to repeal a wicked law that closed the mills against corn and made wheat the single standard or staple for food, what would be said of the men interested in keeping up the unnatural price of wheat who would fight the proposition for repeal and denounce it as simply a "measure in favor of corn growers"? They would simply be laughed to scorn or branded as extortioners and enemies of the people!

20. That with the mills open to both, the commercial ratio of corn and wheat would be 2 to 1. With the mills closed against corn, that ratio would be 5 to 1. Would it be just to say that before a law should be passed to open the mills to corn the Government should declare that so far as it was concerned and its influence could reach it should take five bushels of corn to equal one of wheat?

21. That, if opening the mills to corn would naturally lift it back to 40 cents and lower wheat to 80, and thereby restore the old ratio of 2 to 1, there is stronger reason for saying that reopening the mints to silver would restore it to the old ratio of 16 to 1, for no man in his sober senses would take 50 to 60 cents for silver which he could take to the mints and get 100 cents for by simply having it coined into a dollar.

22. That the argument so often advanced by the goldites that free coinage at 16 to 1 would make this country simply a "dumping ground for silver," and that we would have a perfect "deluge of silver," is utterly preposterous. The greatest part of the silver in the world, outside of the Unietd States, was coined at the ratio of 15½ ounces of silver to 1 in gold. Why would the owners of that silver pay the expense of shipping it here, having it melted and refined to our standard, and then give up 16 ounces of it to obtain what they could get for 15½ ounces in their own country? As to the danger of a "silver deluge," it is sufficient to say that the entire annual output of silver from the whole world, available for use as money, would barely suffice to pay the annual pension roll of the United States.

23. When goldites say that if we have free coinage our gold will leave us, ask them if it is not already doing that under the single gold standard, although we have paid a syndicate over $8,000,000 to watch over the Treasury for about six months and keep their friends from raiding it?

24. That when goldites say, if we have free coinage, bankers would buy up silver at 50 cents, and in that way pay off their depositors in "50-cent dollars," ask them where they would find the fool to sell them silver for 50 cents when he could get a dollar for it at the mints?

25. That when they say that at present the silver in a silver dollar is worth only 50 cents, ask them to tell you, if gold were demonetized like silver, what would be the bullion worth of the gold in that thin disk of yellow metal now called a "dollar"? With a supply of nearly four billions on hand, and an annual output of nearly twice the amount required for use in the arts, where would be the demand to make gold worth even 50 per cent of what it sells for now? Ask them also, if the silver in a silver dollar is only worth 50 cents, why do they propose to add to it 50 cents of fictitious value and make it equal to gold by mortgages upon the American people in the shape of Government bonds and the costly wages of a syndicate to act as watchmen for the Treasury?

26. When goldites argue that the single gold standard is already a fixed fact in our financial system, and that a change would injure "our business interests," tell them that no legitimate business should expect to prosper upon the sacrifice of the interests of the many to the few, and that the maintenance of the gold standard has already cost the American people many billions of dollars in reduced prices received for their exports and increase in their indebtedness.

27. When they talk about free coinage being simply "in the interest of mine owners," tell them that carefully prepared tables of the approximate annual losses caused by the decline in silver and the enhancement of gold show that such losses on cotton alone amount to $87,500,000, and on wheat alone, in sixteen States, to $68,050,000, aggregating on these two products $155,550,000, against $13,000,000 sustained by "Western mine owners."

28. When goldites point to Mexico and China as silver-standard countries, ask them what about gold-standard Egypt and Turkey and Liberia. Ask them also if it is not the standard of manhood and race and climate rather than the standard of value that makes the difference between all those countries and ours.

29. When they ask you if you want cheap dollars, tell them that any dollar is dear enough to you, and that a cheap dollar is simply one that you do not have to give up such a large amount of labor or products to get your hands on.

Tell them also that while silver dollars may be bulky, very few of us will need wheelbarrows to carry around what we get of them, and that a gold dollar is so little that it gets lost in a poor man's pocket, and its legs are too short to go around the corner to pay an honest debt, and it always runs and hides in time of need.

30. That as it is only the real or primary money whose free coinage is provided for by law that constitutes the "measure of values" by which is determined the price of labor and all its products, and as the amount of the precious metals in the whole world, available for use as money, is, in round numbers, $8,000,000,000, about equally divided between gold and silver, at 16 pounds of silver to 1 pound of gold, the natural effect of the demonetization of silver would be to lower the level of general prices about 50 per cent.

31. That gold being the standard and sole "unit of value," whatever increases the value of gold necessarily increases the value of 25.8 grains of gold, which constitutes the "unit of value," and whatever enhances the purchasing power of a gold dollar necessarily enhances the purchasing power of every dollar of representative money based on gold, or silver dollar artificially held up to gold by mortgages upon the people in the shape of Government bonds.

32. That it therefore follows that no plan that looks to an increase of circulation by means of State-bank or national-bank notes, or by an "enlarged use," or the "freest possible use" of silver, without restoring its ancient functions as standard money and a "unit of value," can be of any real and permanent benefit to the people.

If you want to benefit the people you must increase the volume of real money or broaden the base of your money of ultimate redemption, and that can only be done by the free coinage of silver or restoring its ancient function as a "unit of value."

33. That money is bought and sold the same as commodities, and its value or purchasing power is determined by the law of supply and demand, with the difference, however, that money, being the universal medium of exchange and standard of value, without which men can not procure what they want nor pay their debts, is always in a state of constant demand, such as nothing else is. Consequently, the smaller the supply of real or primary money in proportion to the amount of debts to be paid and labor and commodities to be exchanged for it, the greater becomes the purchasing power of every dollar and the lower the price of labor and of all commodities.

34. That business investments derive their profits from the prices obtained from their products or output, and that as dollars increase in value and products fall in price as dollars decrease in number, whatever diminishes the volume of real money or prevents it expanding to keep pace with the growth of the country and the demands of trade tends to stop investments and induce the hoarding of money and a plethora of it in the money centers to seek investment in Government bonds or stock gambling rather than in the channels of legitimate enterprises.

35. That with dollars constantly increasing in value, and other things decreasing, a man will not lend on or invest in land or a business plant, for fear that he will not be able to get his money back or realize on his investment. He would rather invest in Government bonds at a low rate of interest, or lock his money up and profit by its enhancing value than to take the risk of losing any part of his "fattening dollars."

36. That with not enough gold in the whole world to pay the interest on the amount of debts owed, and most of the great nations all grabbing for what there is, the value of gold is constantly enhancing, and therefore the single gold standard not only wrongs every debtor, but inflicts injury upon every productive enterprise and cuts down the demand for labor.

37. That earnings, not wages, are the test of the prosperity of labor, and that as earnings are wages multiplied by days of employment, plus number of those employed, there may be an increase in wages to those employed and yet a decrease in earnings on account of reduced hours and number of those employed, and such has been one of the results of gold monometallism.

38. That the same thing is true of the products of labor, the test of prosperous condition being the price obtained, multiplied by the amount of products sold.

A financial system, therefore, which forces a decrease in output or acreage in order to obtain an increase in price for articles of general necessity is both a blunder and a crime, and such is another one of the actual results of gold monometallism.

39. That there is no such thing as overproduction of cotton when millions of human beings are ragged for want of sufficient clothes; and there is no overproduction of grain when thousands are starving in sight of the elevators.

Let the farmers and producers have a reasonable profit upon all they can raise and produce, and there will be plenty of bread in the mouths of the hungry, and the ragged will have decent clothes.

40. That prior to the present Administration, no one ever heard of any real and prominent Democrats attempting to justify the Sherman Act of 1873, or bowing down to praise and glorify the single gold standard then set up, but many millions of honest Democrats have been denouncing it for years.

41. That when goldites talk about "ruinous inflation" and "panics" to result from free coinage, tell them that nature itself having imposed a limit to the output of gold and silver, there can be no such thing as an undue inflation from their coinage into real money, and that while panics may result from an undue inflation of bank notes or paper currency issued upon an insufficient metallic base, no one ever heard of a panic resulting from having too much real money of either silver or gold.

42. That when they say, on the other hand, that free coinage will cause a "ruinous contraction," by driving your gold out of circulation, tell them that your gold has already gone, and that the rest of the gold in this country is mostly locked up in vaults, and is practically out of circulation now, and that so far as free coinage causing gold to leave us under the operation of the "Gresham law" or the principle that "cheap money drives out dear money," tell them that so-called law simply amounts to this, that gold or silver—either one—like any commodity, will go where it can get the most for itself, and the gold we have now on hand we got here by paying more for it than anybody else would under the same circumstances. As gold goes where it can get the most for itself, it always gravitates to the level of lowest prices, and as "contraction" produces a fall in general prices, our goldite friends should explain the inconsistent idea of a "ruinous contraction" going on in this country and gold going out at the same time.

43. That Mr. Carlisle, in speaking of free coinage in his Memphis speech, said, "The immediate effect of such a policy would be a contraction to the extent of fully one-third of our present volume of currency by the expulsion of about $625,000,000 in gold," but in a few sentences afterwards he virtually contradicted that by saying, "The introduction into the currency of a country of any kind of money about which there is the least doubt will always operate to drive out the same amount or about the same amount of better money." This latter statement contradicts the first, but is nearer the real truth, and is based on the so-called "Gresham law," already referred to.

44. That the answer to the "Gresham law" sophistry is—

First. That as the opening of the mints to silver on equal terms with gold would naturally lift up silver and lower gold, the legal ratio would be established, and a gold dollar would not be any "better money" than a silver dollar, and the "Gresham law" would have nothing to work on.

Second. That granting the correctness of Mr. Carlisle's proposition that free coinage would not put silver and gold upon an exact parity, and that gold would be a little the "better money," still as the "cheaper money," silver, could only drive out about the same amount of gold, no contraction could take place.

45. That no gold dollar would leave without a silver dollar to take its place, and to whatever extent free coinage had lifted silver and lowered gold its purchasing power would fall, and general prices would rise, and the American people would get the benefit of it right here at home.

Not only this, but the very gold that went to Europe, leaving real money here to take its place, would increase the volume of real money there, and cause a rise in the very markets where our people have to sell their surplus cotton, wheat, and other products.

46. That when so-called "bimetallists" or "sound-money" men tell you that we can not have independent silver coinage at 16 to 1, that we must wait for other nations to join us, that we are not big enough to walk alone, tell them that for seventy years France virtually walked alone, and held gold and silver upon a parity at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and according to Mr. Carlisle himself, drew our silver to her standard. What was France, and all the aid she got from the so-called "Latin Union," compared to the mighty energies of this great Republic?

47. That in addition to all our vast volume of business and mighty productive energies we produce more silver than any other nation under the sun, and outside of Mexico and South and Central America we produce more than twice as much silver as all other nations of the earth combined. Why, then, should we expect any of them to join in, unless we shall take the lead, and raise the standard, and strike the first blow ourselves? Why should we stand halting and hesitating in the shadow of England, whose interests in this matter are diametrically opposed to ours? Her financial policy has controlled us too long already.

48. That whoever controls the purse will in the end control the sword.

That no nation can be entirely free that permits its financial policy to be controlled or dictated from without.

"Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow."

Let us strike the blow for financial freedom.

Let us be true to the mighty spirit of the men who gave the bimetallic standard to our fathers in the morning of our history. They were as great in the councils of state as they were in the camps of war.

Let us not follow after that England whose haughty crest was

laid low by Washington at Yorktown and by Jackson at New Orleans.

Let us be worthy of those grand old men who laid so deep and strong the foundations of the great Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. In Prescott's "Conquest of Peru," in speaking of the bounteous production of precious metals, he says (volume 1, pages 479, 480):

The effect of such a surfeit of precious metals was instantly felt on prices. The most ordinary articles were only to be had for exorbitant sums. * * * Every article rose in value as gold and silver, the representatives of all, declined. Gold and silver, in short, seemed to be the only things in Cuzco that were not wealth.

Now, on the contrary, it appears that any legislation we have had which decreased the money of ultimate redemption, has been followed by panics and the depreciation in value of all kinds of property.

THE PANIC OF 1857.

Prior to 1857, as is well known, nearly all the silver in circulation in the United States was in foreign coins, and a considerable amount of foreign gold coins were also in circulation. February 21, 1857, Congress enacted a law, section 3 of which is in these words:

That all former acts authorizing the currency of foreign gold or silver coins, and declaring the same a legal tender in payment for debts, are hereby repealed.

This very materially reduced the amount of money of ultimate redemption, and although at the date of the passage of the act the country was in a state of great prosperity, this contraction of the money of ultimate redemption soon caused the withdrawal of money from the channels of trade, because holders of money readily saw that money would increase in value, and there is no doubt that this law was, in a great measure, responsible for the fearful panic of 1857.

THE PANIC OF 1873.

When the war commenced the country was thrown upon a paper basis; but in 1873, while neither silver nor gold was in circulation, Congress enacted a law striking the silver dollar from the coins of our country, which was an announcement to the world that from that time the only money of ultimate redemption would be gold coin. We were then preparing to resume specie payments, and the moneyed people of the world realized that this act would largely reduce the money of ultimate redemption of the United States. This they knew would make money rise in value, or, what is the same thing, make property fall in value. The prudent and astute men, whether in this country or in Europe, immediately commenced withdrawing their money from the channels of trade, knowing, as they did, that at no distant day its purchasing power would be very largely increased; and this, of necessity, brought about a want of confidence in the value of nearly all kinds of property, and this was followed by what is called the panic of 1873.

Our gold-standard friends ask how it was possible for the demonetization of silver in February, 1873, to cause a panic during that year, when it is a historical fact that most of the members of Congress who voted for the bill, and President Grant, who signed the bill, were ignorant that its effect was to demonetize silver. My answer is, that while General Grant and many Senators and Representatives did not know that they were demonetizing silver, the moneyed men of the world did know it. It is a historical fact that the Rothschilds and the moneyed men of this country were largely instrumental in bringing about that enactment. They did it for the purpose of increasing the value of their money. They knew that would be the effect, and they immediately commenced to withdraw their money from the channels of commerce and kept it hoarded until they were enabled to buy stocks, bonds, and other property at panic prices.

Mr. Hooper, a member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, on April 19, 1872, admitted that Mr. Ernst Seyd, who, it is charged, was sent to this country for the special purpose of securing legislation by which the United States would demonetize silver, furnished many valuable suggestions which were incorporated in the bill. His exact words were:

Mr. Ernst Seyd, of London, a distinguished writer, who has given great attention to mints and coinage, after examining the first draft of the bill, furnished many valuable suggestions, which have been incorporated in this bill.

DEMONETIZATION IN 1873 FRAUDULENTLY ACCOMPLISHED.

Judge Kelley, of Pennsylvania, who was chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, in 1872, said (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 7, part 2, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 1605):

In connection with the charge that I advocated the bill which demonetized the standard silver dollar, I say that, though the chairman of the Committee on Coinage, I was as ignorant of the fact that it would demonetize the silver dollar, or of its dropping the silver dollar from our system of coins, as were those distinguished Senators, Messrs. Blaine and VOORHEES, who were then members of the House, and each of whom a few days since interrogated the other: "Did you know it was dropped when the bill passed?" "No," said Mr. Blaine, "did you?" "No," said Mr. VOORHEES. I do not think that there were three members in the House that knew it. I doubt whether Mr. Hooper, who, in my absence from the Committee on Coinage in attendance on the Committee on Ways and Means, managed the bill, knew it. I say this in justice to him.

Judge Holman on July 13, 1876, and again on August 5, 1876, especially asserted that he did not know the bill demonetized silver.

President Garfield, Mr. Blaine, Senator Thurman, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. Burchard of Illinois, Senator Bogy of Missouri, and many others who were members of that Congress made the same statement.

DISTRESS FOLLOWS DEMONETIZATION OF 1873.

The effect of this reduction of money of ultimate redemption caused great distress among the producing class and to our country. Everything fell fearfully in value. Cotton, which sold as high as 26⅜ cents in 1872, fell as low as 8¼ cents in 1878. This must have been caused by silver demonetization, as the increase in the crop had by no means kept pace with the world's need of cotton.

The crops for those six years were as follows:

Year.	Bales.
1872-73	3,930,508
1873-74	4,170,388
1874-75	3,832,991
1875-76	4,669,288
1876-77	4,485,423
1877-78	4,811,265

This great depression caused a universal demand throughout the country for the repeal of the iniquitous act of 1873 and the restoration of silver to the position contemplated by the Constitution.

Although silver coinage was most earnestly resisted by the moneyed men of New York and European centers, the act of 1878 was passed over President Arthur's veto by a two-thirds vote of both the House and Senate. This law provided for the coinage of at least 24,000,000 ounces of silver per year, giving us an annual increase of legal-tender money amounting to between forty and fifty million dollars. Almost immediately everything commenced rising in value. This is but natural, because the moneyed men of the world saw that the money of the United States was to rapidly increase, which would cause it to fall in value, or, which is the same thing, that property would rise in value.

GREAT PROSPERITY FOLLOWS COINAGE ACT OF 1878.

In order to show at a glance the marvelous decrease in the value of property caused by the demonetization of silver in 1873, and the phenomenal increase in the value by the partial remonetization of silver in 1878, I ask the attention of Congress to the following figures taken from the Financial Review of 1882, published under the shadows of Wall street, New York.

I place in the first column the selling price of the principal railroad stocks just prior to the demonetization of silver in February, 1873. In the second column I put the selling price of the same railroad stocks after the people had realized the baneful effects of the iniquitous act of 1873. I then put in a third column the selling price of the same stocks after the country began to feel the effect of the restoration of silver by the act of 1878.

	Price just prior to demonetization of silver, 1873.	Price after the demonetization of silver.	Price after the remonetization of silver, 1878.
Albany and Susquehanna	95	58	133
Chicago and Alton	122	85	156
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy	155	78	182
Chicago and Rock Island	118	63	148
Columbus, Chicago and Indiana Central	95	2	28
Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati and Indianapolis	94	22	101
Cleveland and Pittsburg	92	72	142
Delaware, Lackawanna and Western	103	30	131
Dubuque and Sioux City	63	39	88
Erie	69	4	75
Erie preferred	82	14	82
Harlem	122	118	250
Illinois Central	126	40	146
Lake Shore	97	45	135
Louisville and Nashville	79	29	109
Marietta and Cincinnati 1st preferred	28	2	24
Memphis and Charleston	55	4	93
Michigan Central	110	36	126
Missouri, Kansas and Texas	40	3	54
Morris and Essex	92	51	131
New Jersey Central	106	6	112
New York Central and Hudson River	106	85	155
Ohio and Mississippi	49	3	60
Ohio and Mississippi preferred	75	4	126
Panama	130	80	280
Pittsburg, Fort Wayne and Chicago	95	81	142
Rensselaer and Saratoga	104	87	146
St. Louis and Iron Mountain	97	5	86
Union Pacific	40	25	130

These figures show that the demonetization of silver in 1873 caused the withdrawal of money from the markets and a fall in the value of all kinds of property. It shows that railroad stocks fell in many cases to a mere fraction of their value prior to 1873,

and it also shows after the remonetization of silver in 1878 all property rose in a remarkable degree in value. It is no doubt true that the prices of these stocks were affected in some degree by other causes than the demonetization and remonetization of silver, but I insist that that was by far the most potent of all influences that bore upon them.

Other things besides stocks were affected in the same way. Wheat sold for $2.25 a bushel just prior to February, 1873, and after 1873 fell as low as 83 cents a bushel, and after the remonetization of silver it rose, selling as high as $1.59 a bushel.

We have seen that cotton was 26 cents just prior to demonetization, and that it fell to 8¼ cents after the demonetization, although the slight increase in the crops by no means was equal to the increased demand.

Now, after the remonetization of silver cotton rose to 12¼ cents in the face of the fact that crops increased from 4,800,000 bales in 1876–77 to 6,992,234 bales in 1882–83.

This is another proof of the detrimental effects of demonetization of silver and the energizing and beneficial effects of its remonetization. [Applause.]

LOW PRICE OF WHEAT CAUSED BY THE GOLD STANDARD.

I want to ask the members from the West who represent that numerous body of farmers who earn their living by raising wheat if they can attribute the present low price of wheat to anything but the gold standard?

I hold in my hand Clew's last financial circular. He quotes May wheat at 58 cents, when a year ago it was 60 cents. The visible supply of wheat was then 89,071,000 bushels, while to-day it is only 69,398,000 bushels. Now, with the visible supply 20,000,000 short, we see the price is 2 cents lower than it was a year ago. Let me tell the Western farmers that one great reason for the low price of wheat is that silver countries are usurping the market they once enjoyed.

India has increased her exports of wheat from nothing to 60,000,000 bushels; the Argentine Republic from nothing to many million bushels. Russia has increased her exports of wheat 100,000,000 bushels, and we have seen our exports of wheat fall from $210,000,000 down in one year as low as $42,000,000, and we have seen our exports of corn fall from $56,000,000 to $13,000,000. When the London merchant buys wheat from the United States he sends gold for it, and when he gets wheat from the silver countries he buys silver at 60 cents per ounce and sends it to silver countries, and when he pays 50 cents for wheat in India it only costs him about 25 cents in gold. That is one of the reasons why we are losing our market.

Mr. Bagehot, the editor of the London Economist, is the author of a work upon finance. Upon page 54 he said:

> The necessary effect of a depreciation of silver as against gold is to give a bounty on exports from India and the other silver-using countries to England. An English merchant can now buy many more rupees than he formerly could with the same number of sovereigns, and therefore he can import from India, though prices at Calcutta are not at a level at which it would have paid him to operate if he had not had that novel facility in getting rupees.

Nine years ago Mr. J. Shields Nicholson made the following statement to the royal commission on gold and silver:

> Now, it seems to me probable if the price of silver rose to its old level wheat could not be profitably exported from India until prices rose in a corresponding degree. For India, being a silver country, the price of wheat there is independent of the relative value of gold and silver. An exporter to England at present will give the Indian price in silver, and he can buy his silver for less gold, and thus competition will lower the price. If the price of silver rose the exporter from India must get more gold. Thus a rise of silver would, on this view, raise the price of wheat to a corresponding degree.

This was Mr. Nicholson's answer to the following direct question put to him by the chairman of the commission:

> Indian wheat is the very wheat that is complained of by Secretary Manning, Secretary of the United States Treasury, as having lowered the price of European and American wheat, and he attributes it all to the divergence of gold from silver. You do not think tying gold and silver again would raise the price of English and American wheat by 25 per cent?

Our distinguished Speaker understands this. Last year, in a speech, he said:

> It is evidently important for debtor nations, on which list we stand, first to raise the price of silver and thereby reduce that bounty on exports which Asia now enjoys.

I ask every man whose constituents are interested in wheat raising to give careful consideration to this expression.

GROUNDLESS ARGUMENTS OF GOLD-STANDARD MEN.

The gold-standard men try to make a strong argument out of the rise in the price of cotton during this year. This rise in the value of cotton was caused by the very small crop, the crop this year being estimated at only 60 per cent to 63 per cent of last year's crop. Such a decrease in the crop has a single precedent in this United States, and that was the decrease in the crop of 1865–66 below that of 1860–61. This caused an increase in price from 12 cents in 1861 to 44 cents in 1866, 32 cents in 1867, 25 cents in 1868, and 29 cents in 1869. Had it not been for the gold standard the great decrease in the crop this year would have caused cotton to rise to at least double its present price.

Some of the gold-standard people in a rather arrogant manner assert that the farmers and producing people of the country do not understand the money question and ought not to interfere with their management of the monetary legislation. I desire to say that the farmers and producing class understand this question just as well as it is understood by the bankers and money lenders. They know that when money is plentiful they receive good prices for their products and their families are comfortable and happy, and they also know that when there is a scarcity of money farm products are always low and they and their families are deprived of all the luxuries and many of the comforts and necessaries of life.

The first opportunity the people had to denounce the demonetization of silver of 1873 was in the election of November, 1874. In the fall of that year the Democrats went before the people promising them silver coinage, and upon that promise the Democrats in Congress were increased from 88 to 181. The first time the Democrats had an opportunity to express their views on this subject in a national platform was in 1876. They denounced the currency legislation of the Republican party and promised a thorough reformation on this subject, and upon that platform Mr. Tilden and a Democratic House of Representatives were elected. Pursuant to this promise of reform, the silver coinage law of 1878 was enacted.

In 1884 we elected Mr. Cleveland and a Democratic House of Representatives on a platform which said:

> We believe in honest money—the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution and a circulating medium converted into such medium without loss.

In 1892 we again went before the people with a platform which said:

> We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal.

This clause in the platform was emphasized in Mr. Cleveland's letter of acceptance, in which he said:

> The wants of the people arising from a deficiency or imperfect distribution of money circulation ought to be fully and honestly recognized and efficiently remedied.

The Democratic platform and Mr. Cleveland's letter were understood and explained by the public press throughout the United States to mean that silver should be coined on precisely the same terms as gold, and that there should be no discrimination against either metal. Upon this platform and pledge we elected a Democratic President, a Democratic House, and a Democratic Senate.

It is true that the platform declared that the metals must be of equal, intrinsic, and exchangeable value, or be adjusted through international agreement or by such safeguards of legislation as should insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals.

NO EXTREME LEGISLATION DEMANDED.

The people whom I represent do not demand any extreme legislation on this subject. They believe that gold and silver should be treated alike, in accordance with the pledge in the Democratic platform of 1892. Early in the session I introduced a bill which meets the requirements. If this bill should become the law, I believe it would go far toward relieving our country from the difficulties which now beset us.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to purchase all pure silver bullion and all pure gold bullion which may be tendered to the Government, at a price not exceeding the average market price of said gold and silver bullion in the six leading markets of the world, said average price to be determined by the latest reports in the possession of the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue in payment of such purchases of silver and gold bullion Treasury notes of the United States, to be prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury in such form and of such denominations as he may deem most suitable for the use of the people; and such Treasury notes shall be a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract, and shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received may be reissued; and such notes, when held by any national banking association, may be counted as a part of its lawful reserve.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be coined all of said gold and silver purchased under the provisions of this act, or so much thereof as it is possible to coin by using the fullest capacity of the mints of the United States. But it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to, as nearly as practicable, coin the same amount of dollars in silver as is coined in gold, and a sum sufficient to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby appropriated.

SEC. 4. That the Treasury notes issued in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be redeemable on demand, in coin, at the Treasury of the United States, or at the office of any assistant treasurer of the United States, and when so redeemed may be reissued.

SEC. 5. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury in redeeming the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of this act to redeem them partly in gold and partly in legal tender silver, in that proportion in which the two metals were in the Treasury at the opening of business on the day on which the Treasury notes are presented.

SEC. 6. That all laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this act are repealed.

This bill is subject to but very few of the objections which have been raised against silver coinage, and certainly has many features

which would commend it to all friends of the industrial classes. Besides, it would comply with the national Democratic platform's pledge for—

the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either.

It would give the people a gradual, constant, and much-needed increase in the money of the country, and go very far toward restoring prosperity, and it would stop, or at least lessen, the constant demand on the Treasury for gold.

There is now about $70,000,000 of gold and 14,000,000 standard silver dollars in the Treasury available for redeeming coin obligations; therefore for every $100,000 of coin obligations presented for redemption to-day the holder would receive about $84,000 in gold and about $16,000 in silver. I believe this would stop the drain upon the Treasury, and that it would not in any way impair the credit of the Government. But if the Secretary of the Treasury should deem it unadvisable to inaugurate this system without notice and with the gold in the Treasury as it is at present it certainly would not impair the credit of the Government for the Secretary to now announce that such a plan would be pursued after the Treasury had been replenished by the $100,000,000 loan that we are informed is about to be effected. With that condition of the Treasury the holder of $100,000 coin obligations would receive about $92,000 in gold and $8,000 in silver.

Although the Republican party turned over the Government to the Democrats on March 3, 1893, in a bankrupt condition, the belief that the pledge of the party with regard to the silver coinage would be fulfilled was rapidly restoring confidence in all channels of trade.

THE MONEYED POWER CAUSED THE PANIC IN 1893.

Up to the 27th day of April, 1893, confidence in the financial situation and the beginning of a great prosperity seemed apparent. On that day the bankers and moneyed men of New York had a meeting and laid their plans to force Congress and the Administration to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, and thus prevent any increase in the amount of money in the country. These bankers determined to accomplish this purpose even if they had, as they expressed it, to pinch business throughout the country and cause a money crisis. They were so confident of their power that they felt they could accomplish their purpose, and immediately afterwards restore the country from the condition of panic to one of confidence. The account of this meeting is given in the New York papers of April 28 and May 1, and I have never seen any of these statements denied or even questioned.

The New York Sun of April 28, page 7, has an article headed "Bankers meet Carlisle." It says:

Secretary Carlisle decided yesterday morning to have a talk with the New York bankers.

The article then gives a list of the distinguished bank presidents who were present, and says:

The conference between the Secretary and bank presidents lasted somewhat over an hour.

The article then gives many details, and says:

The Secretary went over the currency laws of the country and stated they were in bad shape and needed revision.

The article then says:

President Cleveland's advisers have told him that the only way to induce the Western and Southwestern Senators and Congressmen to consent to the repeal of the Sherman law is to demonstrate to their constituents that they are losing money every day that this law is in operation.

I call special attention that the article does not say that President Cleveland is engaged in this work, but that his advisers have told him, etc.

This purpose was sought to be accomplished by repeated assertions, which were printed all over the United States, that the repeal of the Sherman law would immediately raise the price of cotton to 10 cents a pound and wheat to $1 a bushel.

The article then says:

The missionary work in that direction has been started by a number of the bankers in the solid communities of the East. They are daily refusing credits to the South, Southwest, and West.

The New York Sun of May 1 also has a letter from Washington, dated April 30. The letter reiterates the purpose to revise the currency laws, and says:

There is to be an extra session of Congress to afford the opportunity at as early a date as possible.

The letter also says:

Bankers will be expected to work, not in New York only, but throughout the country, doing their utmost to pinch business everywhere in the expectation of causing a money crisis that will affect Congress powerfully from every quarter.

This assertion on the part of the New York bankers that they intended to do their utmost to pinch business everywhere with the expectation of causing a money crisis, had its effect. The entire world saw that the money power of the United States was to be exerted in demonetizing silver, and that to accomplish this they were to immediately commence withdrawing money from the channels of trade. From that time a depression commenced which finally culminated in a panic, which aided very much in inducing Congress to permanently demonetize silver. Prices fell and distress pervaded our entire land.

While very many men for whom I have the highest respect take a different view, my study of this question has led me firmly to believe that there is a struggle between the great army of producers on one side and the small fraction of money lenders and capitalists on the other.

My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing.

What is our country? It is a great and free Republic of 70,000,000 people. It is estimated that of these, at least 35,000,000 men, women, and children are maintained by farm labor, most of them being actually engaged in manual work upon the farms where they reside, and these farms, containing in the aggregate some 600,000,000 acres, are spread over every part of the United States. When farmers are prosperous all other vocations enjoy prosperity. The manufacturer has a good market for his wares, the merchant collects his debts, and the educator, the minister, the lawyer, the physician, and the followers of all other vocations are well paid. It is for the farmer, who is the creator of nearly all the wealth of the land, that I appeal.

THE PEOPLE'S EMPHATIC DENUNCIATION OF THE GOLD STANDARD.

To show that the people did not approve of this demonetization of silver in 1893, I will give the result of the elections in 1892, 1893, and 1894. Bear in mind that in 1892 the Democratic party voted for a candidate and platform which pledged them to "the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either." The election of November, 1893, was had just after the demonetizing act of November 1, 1893.

The advocates of high tariff can not say that the election of November, 1893, was at all affected by any tariff legislation, because no tariff legislation had been had, and no bill had even been reported from a committee of Congress.

In November, 1892, the Democrats carried New York by 45,518 under a platform pledging silver coinage. In November, 1893, after the failure of the Democrats to redeem that pledge, the Republicans carried New York by a vote ranging from 19,924 to 101,064, and in 1894 the Democrats went before the people in New York State with a gold-standard platform and a gold-standard candidate and were defeated by 156,105 votes. In 1892 the vote in Ohio between Cleveland and Harrison was about even. In 1893, just after the Democrats had failed to carry out their pledge regarding coinage, that party was defeated by 80,995 votes, and in 1894 the Democrats of that State went before the people with a gold-standard candidate and a gold-standard platform and were defeated by 137,087.

In Massachusetts the Democrats elected a Democratic governor in 1891 by 6,467 votes, and in November, 1893, a Republican governor was elected by 35,697, and in 1894 this Republican majority was increased to 65,377.

In Illinois, upon a coinage platform, the Democratic majority in 1892 was 26,993. In 1894 this was changed into a Republican plurality of 123,427.

I ought probably to have used the word plurality instead of majority throughout, but this makes no material difference in the argument.

New Jersey and other States which had been considered reliably Democratic went into the canvass in 1894 with a gold-standard platform and a gold-standard candidate, and were all overwhelmingly defeated. Even Maryland, which gave a majority of 21,130 for Cleveland in 1892, went before the people with gold-standard platform and candidates, and the State went Republican by 2,686. At the same election Mississippi declared herself for the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution and went overwhelmingly Democratic. It seems to me that these elections are a sufficiently emphatic expression by the people of their views regarding this question which so materially affects their interests.

PRIOR TO 1890 SILVER COINAGE WAS A CARDINAL DEMOCRATIC DOCTRINE.

Up to 1890, for a Democrat who represented any constituency except moneyed men and bankers to vote against silver coinage was regarded as the most unjustifiable betrayal of the cause he had sworn to defend. On June 5, 1890, 13 Democrats, representing constituencies of the Northeast, which included banking and moneyed men, made bold to vote with the Republicans against silver coinage; but, notwithstanding the efforts of their banking friends, the people rose in their might and swept them from public life. Every reason which made silver coinage imperative for the welfare of the people prior to 1890 exists to-day.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LACEY). The gentleman has fourteen minutes remaining.

Mr. WHEELER. I yield that time to my colleague, Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in justice to myself and my constituents, I feel it my duty to enter my protest against the passage of the bill now under consideration. The bill has been reported to this House by the members of the committee who represent the majority on this floor without first having been introduced in the usual and regular way. It is proposed to pass it to-morrow afternoon, with only a few hours' debate and under a rule that prohibits any amendments being offered.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, few measures have come before the House the effects of which are more far-reaching in their consequences and which, in my humble judgment, would prove more disastrous to the business, commercial, and agricultural interests of this country than those embodied in this bill.

The object of the bill—I mean the real object, not that which appears on the face of the bill—is to retire from circulation $346,681,016 of United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, and $146,088,400 of Treasury notes of 1890, amounting to a contraction of the currency of the country to the extent of $492,769,416. According to the statement of the Treasury Department, the total amount of money in circulation on June 30, 1895, amounted to $1,602,182,725. It is readily seen what an enormous contraction will take place if the greenbacks and Treasury notes are retired under the provisions of this act.

I know it is contended that this bill is merely a bill "to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiency of revenue." The first section of the bill provides for an issue of United States bonds, to an indefinite amount, for the purpose of redeeming greenbacks and Treasury notes when presented for redemption. And this section provides—

That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify an act approved May 31, 1878, entitled "An act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes."

The second section authorizes the issue of bonds in small denominations not to exceed $50,000,000 in amount, to provide for any temporary deficiency now existing or which may hereafter occur.

But let us consider the effect of the bill, if actually put in operation. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his annual report, says there is no deficiency in the Treasury. The daily statement of the condition of the Treasury shows an available cash balance of $109,183,928 exclusive of the gold reserve.

Yesterday a tariff bill was passed through this House by the Republican majority for the purpose, so it was stated, of supplying a deficiency in our revenues, and we are told that under the provisions of this bill the revenues received for a tax on goods imported into this country will increase the revenues of the Government $40,000,000, a sum largely in excess of the alleged deficiency.

Why are we then asked to authorize the issue of bonds to meet temporary deficiencies in the revenue?

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maine, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in his remarks threw a side light on the effect of the bill that explains the real object to be accomplished by its passage. In referring to the section of the bill that provides for the issue of bonds to meet temporary deficiencies in the revenue, he says:

Our object in so limiting their use is to separate as far as possible in the accounts the cash in the Treasury available for current expenses and the reserve that is retained for redemption purposes.

Again he says:

A reserve is a distinct thing, and it is of the utmost importance that it should be maintained without any attempt to divert it to other purposes, and the most important part of this legislation, I want to say to my friends on this side of the House, lies in the fact that if this bill shall pass it will compel the separation of the accounts, and the reserve will and must be treated as a reserve, not to be trenched upon to meet current deficiencies of revenues. And when there is any necessity to have money to meet a deficiency of revenue, then the resort must be had to another source to supply that deficiency of revenue.

This comes from the author of the bill, and it is but fair to presume that it is a correct interpretation of the results that will follow from its passage. With an available cash balance in the Treasury of over $100,000,000, with a tariff law which they say will increase the revenues $40,000,000 a year, and authority given to issue $50,000,000 in bonds to meet temporary deficiencies in revenue, with the general account and the redemption account kept separately, so that resort must be had to other sources than the redemption account to supply deficiencies in revenue; when these Treasury notes and greenbacks are once presented for redemption, how will it be possible for the Government to pay them out again so they may once more become a part of the money in actual circulation in the country? Under the provision of this bill the greenbacks and Treasury notes presented to the Treasury of the United States for redemption, will be locked up in the vaults of the Government, and though they are not actually burned up or destroyed, they will no longer be available for the people of the country to use in the transaction of their business and we will have a virtual contraction of the currency amounting to nearly half a billion dollars.

On the 12th of February, 1873, an act was passed revising and amending the laws relative to the Mint, assay offices, and coinage of the United States. This act, apparently a good law on its face, carried concealed in its folds the words that demonetized silver and deprived the people of this nation of the privilege of carrying their silver bullion to the mints and having it coined into money.

The present bill, Mr. Speaker, although from the title its real purpose may not appear, in many respects will be as disastrous to the masses of the people of this country as that enacted on the 12th day of February, 1873.

Should this bill become a law it will require not only the action of this House but the action of the Senate of the United States and the concurrence of the President of the United States to get the greenbacks and Treasury notes back into the hands of the people.

If we are to be guided in any degree by the history of the past we find many monuments there to guard and warn us against the policy of contraction.

In 1723 the Bank of England suspended, and great financial distress resulted to the people. The gold and silver coin of the American colonies was needed and England called it home to prepare the bank for redemption. England wanted our money and took it. There was no money left for the people of the colonies to transact their business with, and great financial distress, want, and bankruptcy followed.

Benjamin Franklin, the great philosopher and statesman, describing the result of this crisis, on page 185 of his autobiography, said:

I remember well that when I first walked about the streets of Philadelphia, eating my roll, I saw most of the houses of Walnut street, between Second and Front streets, with bills on their doors—to let, and many likewise on Chestnut street, which made me think the inhabitants of the city were deserting it one after another. Our junta debates possessed me so fully of the subject that I wrote and printed an anonymous pamphlet on "The nature and necessity of a paper currency." It was well received by the common people in general; but the rich men disliked it, for it increased as well as strengthened the clamor for more money, and they happened to have no writer among them that was able to answer it. Their opposition slackened, and the point was carried by a majority in the house. The utility of this currency became, by experience, so evident as never to be much disputed; so it grew soon to be £55,000, and in 1779 to £80,000, since which it rose to £350,000, trade, buildings, and inhabitants all the while increasing.

He ascribed as a chief cause of their prosperity after the issue of this money the fact that there was sufficient circulating medium to meet the wants of business and the needs of the people.

Since the time of Queen Elizabeth the dominating idea in the mind of every Englishman has been to control the commerce and own the money of the world.

After the Bank of England had resumed specie payments and they had a surplus of gold they began to look around for someone to borrow the money and pay them interest until they wanted it again. They came with it to America for that purpose, but found the American Colonies had a money of their own that supplied all their needs and no longer needed British gold. Then the English Parliament, in 1773, in order to create a vacuum into which their surplus gold could flow, enacted a law depriving the American paper money of its legal-tender qualities, and in 1775 declared it void.

This contraction of the circulating medium paralyzed all the industrial energies of our people. Ruin seized upon this once prosperous and happy people, want and suffering went into nearly every home, business languished and commerce ceased, discontent was urged to desperation, until at last "humanity arose and asserted its rights." Our forefathers declared their independence and threw off the British yoke.

Again, in 1837, a contraction took place. In 1833, 1834, 1835, and 1836 eight hundred State banks were supplying the people of the United States with money to engage in all kinds of speculation. The banks of Great Britain were doing the same for the people of England. On May 10, 1837, all the New York banks suspended specie payment. The President of the United States issued the "specie circular" demanding that the public lands be paid for in specie only. The banks failed, banking currency became worthless, and currency contraction took place. What money was left went into hiding, and the panic of 1837 resulted, with all its terrible consequences to the people of this country.

In a speech delivered in New York City in March, 1837, that peerless statesman and profound logician, Daniel Webster, ascribed the distress to the interference of the Government with the currency. At that meeting an address was prepared to the President which said:

The value of our real estate has within the last six months depreciated more than $40,000,000; within the last two months there have been more than 250 failures. A decline of $20,000,000 has occurred in our local stocks. The immense amount of merchandise in our warehouses within the same period has fallen in value at least 30 per cent, and within a few weeks not less than 20,000 individuals depending on their labor for their daily bread have been discharged by their employers because the means of retaining them were exhausted.

It takes but a few words to give the history of all these panics;

contraction of the currency from one cause or another; business paralyzed; want, poverty, and distress the necessary result.

Prior to the 21st day of February, 1857, we had a large amount of foreign coin in circulation in this country, variously estimated at from $100,000,000 to $200,000,000. This coin was made a legal tender for the payment of all debts, public and private. Up to that time and to all intents and purposes it was our own money. On the day last mentioned a law was passed depriving this foreign coin of its legal-tender powers, and as a consequence struck it down as money and contracted the currency to that extent. In this same year $7,000,000 of American securities were sold by English holders in New York and the gold taken to England to help the Bank of England maintain specie payments. Our home banks drew $20,000,000 of gold out of the Treasury and the Government had to issue paper money. This panic caused the failure of five or six thousand business men; there is no telling how many men it threw out of employment, nor how many millions of dollars it cost the people of the United States.

On the 12th day of April, 1866, an act was passed contracting the currency by the retirement of the legal-tender notes. Under this law $1,300,000,000 of actual currency was destroyed and converted into bonds, and on the 12th day of February, 1873, the act was passed demonetizing silver, and the panic of that year followed, in my judgment largely caused by the enormous contraction of the currency. It is unnecessary for me to go into the details of the direful results of this panic, which were far-reaching, and the personal distress and the business failures resulting must ever stand as a black page in the history of this great nation.

These are facts gleaned from the pages of our own financial history, that show that as surely as the night shall follow the day a serious contraction of the currency of any country will be followed by financial distress and disaster. This is not only true of our nation and our people, but it is true of all nations and all people.

And yet the gentlemen who have introduced this bill, who wish to drive it through this House without amendment and with but little opportunity for discussion, tell us that a great crisis is at hand and if relief is not given at once our boats will be driven upon the shores of bankruptcy and ruin.

The relief they propose is to pass a bill that will contract our currency nearly one-third of the amount now in circulation. In the light of the past, can we expect relief in the future by means of a remedy that has always proven disastrous heretofore? I think not. Mr. Speaker, the time for temporary expedients has passed. The gold reserve no more affects, as a matter of fact, the solvency of our bills payable than a drop of water affects the depth of the ocean. It is only dangerous in that it is being used to frighten the country. I am not in favor of maintaining it at all. It should be wiped out entirely. The Government of the United States should be taken out of the banking business, and we should at no time attempt to redeem, as a nation, one class of our money with another. Whenever we do so we discriminate against the solvency of one dollar in favor of the solvency of the other. But, Mr. Speaker, to accomplish that result I can never consent to strike down one-third of the money of the country without substituting some other money in its place. Such relief would be purchased at too dear a price, and, furthermore, it is not necessary. The bill prepared by the Democrats of this House as an amendment, which the majority have refused to allow us to introduce, provided for the substitution of silver dollars coined out of silver already belonging to the Government and in the Treasury for the Treasury notes. In this way the gold reserve can be abolished without contracting the currency one dollar, and the masses of the people will no longer be compelled to pay enormous taxes to provide free gold, not only to our own people, but the people of all countries, especially when the Governments of Europe keep their gold under lock and key and only allow it to be drawn on when they determine it is wise or expedient to do so.

We have no more money in circulation in this country than the necessities of trade require. A contraction of the currency, instead of relieving the present crisis, would in all probability produce another panic more destructive to our business interests than that through which we passed two years ago.

Mr. WELLINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I give my hearty support to this bill because I believe it is for the best interests of my country and that it is also in accord with the pledges made by the party of which I have the honor to be an humble member. Four years ago this great country of ours was prosperous. Four years ago our country seemed to enjoy unlimited credit and to have the unbounded confidence not only of the people of the United States, but those of every other civilized nation. We had the ability then to pay every debt that was incurred for the expenses of the Government, because its revenues were sufficient to meet such expenses.

There was then no question as to the redemption of the legal-tender note or of the note known as the Treasury note. Both forms of currency were held by the people; and very few of those notes were ever presented for redemption, because there was general confidence throughout the whole country. But there came the election of 1892; and upon that November morning when the people of the country awakened to the fact that the Presidency had been given to the Democratic candidate, that the Senate would be Democratic, and that the House of Representatives would be in accord with the Senate—that, in other words, the legislative power and the executive power were to be in the hands of a party that entered upon the possession of the Government with the avowed purpose of striking down that great system of American protection to which the Republican party has been pledged and under the banner of which the Republican party had won its victories—the people of the United States, whose course had been onward and upward on the great highway of success for over thirty years, finding after the election that this party with its purpose thus avowed was coming into power and that instead of this American system of protection it was about to introduce another system entirely at variance with it—a system which would turn the channels of trade, which would interfere with every species of business—when that was ascertained there arose something that comes whenever you have a great transformation in a country; there came the alarm of a people. Following that alarm came distrust, and in the wake of distrust there came want of confidence; and after that the cessation of credit. And when credit was wanting then the business interests of the country were almost at a standstill.

That being the condition of the business of the country, what resulted to the Government of the United States? There resulted a decrease of revenue. From the time that election took place and when that want of confidence arose, when the business of the country began to languish, when it was either at a standstill or very materially crippled, the internal revenue of the Government was decreased and the impost duties fell away. Thus we find that the revenue of the country was cut off. What was the result? Though we were in a time of peace, though there were no extraordinary expenditures, yet the very ordinary expenditures of the Government could not be paid from its revenues.

What next occurred? What occurs to an individual who lives beyond his means? He must do one of three things: Either he must accumulate about him a great mass of floating debt, or he must use some trust fund, which, perchance, may be in his hands, to make good his own deficiency, or, Micawber like, he must go out and issue his "I O U's" and "wait for something to turn up." So it was with this nation of ours. The moment its revenues became insufficient to pay the current expenses the nation was living beyond its means. The moment it was in that condition it became a debtor; and when it became a debtor and the Democratic party came into power, the first thing the Administration did was to touch a sacred fund that had been set aside for a special purpose.

This fund was not intended to pay the expenses of Government; it was a sacred gold reserve fund which had been placed in the Treasury by the Republican party for the redemption of the legal-tender and Treasury notes. That party had said that the limit of that fund which could not be encroached without danger was $100,000,000. But when the Democratic party came into power, having present needs pressing upon them, they resorted to the use of that fund. Having been above one hundred millions it was in the first months of that Administration rapidly dissipated. It fell to $100,000,000, and after that line was passed it decreased to ninety millions, to eighty millions, to seventy millions, to sixty millions, almost to fifty millions. What was that? It was a transgression of which a nation should never have been guilty.

At that very moment, Mr. Speaker, the Administration should have called a halt and something should have been done other than the taking of that fund. They did something more than that. They not only used during that period this sacred fund for the redemption of the legal-tender notes, but they did that which caused a lack of confidence on the part of our own people, as well as a lack of confidence on the part of Europe, from whom we had borrowed money. They said, "Here is a debtor who lives beyond his means and who uses a sacred trust fund on the first occasion presented, a fund which is set aside for the redemption of his obligation, and is using it for present purposes."

This condition of affairs caused a lack of confidence, and then for the first time the greenback began to be presented for redemption. It was not originally presented for redemption. That fund was not encroached upon by the redemption of the greenbacks in the first instance. It was used to pay the expenses of the Government, and when this was done confidence was lost, and then the outstanding obligations of the Government began to be presented for liquidation. This went on day by day and week by week, and thus the history of each month presented itself. Again and again the greenbacks were presented and the Administration found it must do something to replenish the Treasury. Then they issued the bonds, which were first taken by our own people; and later, under cover of the night, the Administration made a contract with

a foreign syndicate, and they placed more of the Government bonds. So it was that this transaction originated. And as we look it over now, as we take the sheets of the Treasury now and see the reports of its condition from day to day, we find that notwithstanding the Democratic party, through its Administration, has added $162,000,000 to the bonded debt of the United States, still this sacred fund has been repeatedly encroached upon and is again below the mark almost $40,000,000.

Now, again, the appeal comes that something must be done to remedy the situation. The President of the United States finds himself unable to control the situation and appeals to Congress, and says they should take cognizance of the matter and do something to remedy the existing condition of things. I favor, then, the passage of these bills.

We must do three things to remedy the situation. In the first place, we must see that there is enough revenue furnished to take care of the present expenses of the Government, because, so long as you have not revenue enough to meet present expenses, all the bonds which you may issue will not keep up that sacred reserve fund. But by the passage of the bill on Thursday I believe we will accomplish that result. I believe we will provide sufficient revenue. That bill was not such a bill as I, as a Republican protectionist, living in a border State, was willing to vote for had it not been that I knew it to be a revenue measure only, and necessary for this temporary purpose. I think the first duty of Congress—the first duty it owes to the people of the United States—is to protect the credit of the country; and so, Mr. Speaker, we are proceeding in this protection now. First, the bill was necessary to furnish revenue. In the second place, we must do something to make good that sacred coin gold reserve fund held for the redemption of the legal tenders and Treasury notes. This will be done by the pending bill, which authorizes the issuance of coin bonds, which shall be used in such amounts as are necessary for the redemption of the legal tenders.

It has been urged to-day in the course of this discussion that the legal tenders will be redeemed and that they will never come out to the people again, and for that reason that there will be a contraction of the currency to that extent. Just so long as there is a demand for the gold on the legal tenders they are in excess of the demand for them among the people. The moment they find in power a party that intends to protect the credit of the country, that intends to carry out the pledges to this country, that every dollar shall be as good as every other dollar, and that dollar shall be the highest dollar known to the world, just so long as they find a party to make that pledge good, you will find that the greenbacks will not be presented for redemption. It will be retained in circulation, because outside of the gold currency of the country the greenback is the best currency we have to-day.

Another thing. The $138,000,000 of notes issued under the Sherman Act are the currency of the country. They are issued upon the bullion in the Treasury of the United States that was purchased by the Government. Suppose these are presented and redeemed by the proceeds received from the sale of bonds? The effect would be the retirement of $138,000,000 of these notes, and I think it better to retire them than to retire the legal-tender notes.

Retire them, say, for instance. When you do that you free this $138,000,000 of silver in the Treasury of the United States, and Congress can then pass a law which will coin this silver into subsidiary coin and send it out to the people of the United States for use. We need subsidiary silver coin, and I want to say right here as a Republican that I believe that the silver thus made free should be coined in this manner, not into the 16 to 1 dollar, because I am opposed to that; but we can issue it in the shape of subsidiary silver. I believe that these are some of the benefits that can be accomplished by this bill. More will follow in the future. But this is the first step in the right direction. The great thing that we must establish, that we must build up, that we must maintain in the country is confidence in our purpose to do that which is right.

The Republican party has always been able to rise to the situation. Time was when there was an assault made on the lines of this party, when it was contended that an unlimited amount of greenbacks should be sent to the country, to pay the bonded obligations of the country. Then it was that a Republican President stood up between that idea and the Republican policy; and, thanks be to God and to Ulysses S. Grant, the party was saved that defeat. We rose to the height of the occasion, and we protected the credit of the country. I appeal to my party to-day, that we rise to the height of this occasion, and while it may be a Democratic President who makes this appeal, he is the President of the United States and we as Republicans owe it to our party and to our people to protect the credit of our country now and at all times. It is our first duty. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, we desire to enter our protest against the passage of this legislation. The States of the Northwest have always been loyal to the Republican party, and their representatives have been faithful supporters of the doctrine of protection. We believe in that doctrine as implicitly as do our Eastern friends, and we stand ready to cooperate with them in the passage of legislation for the purpose of raising revenue sufficient to pay the expenditures of the Government and for the protection of American interests. We will go to any reasonable length in that direction and are willing to abide by the decisions of our party on that question. We have always occupied this position. My constituency ask protection and need it as much as do the people of Pennsylvania or Massachusetts. While we are producers of so-called raw material, we recognize the fact that its production necessitates compensatory duties on imports of the manufactured product therefrom in order that the manufacturer of the East may have adequate protection. Realizing this and appreciating it in all its significance, and standing ready to hold up the hands of our Eastern brethren along these lines, even to the extent of the McKinley schedules, nevertheless, we must enter our earnest protest against the passage of a measure like that now before the House.

From the date of its birth the Republican party has been a party of protection; this principle has been one of its cardinal virtues; this has been proclaimed in its success and asserted in its defeat. It has not wavered when that principle was up for consideration; it has not faltered along these lines, and its triumphant success, again and again, has been due to its advocacy of this idea. Because the American people believe in a continuation of that principle we support it; but the American people have never proclaimed in time of peace the interest-bearing bond theory; that idea has never been sired by any political organization. The President of the United States and the bankers of New York alone have demanded it. The Democratic party and the Republican party each have again and again repudiated it.

Our friends on this side of the Chamber who propose this legislation insist that the Republican party must come to the rescue of the Government. We of the West believe there is another way of doing this without issuing bonds. We believe that under the law, under the plain letter and spirit of the written statutes, a remedy fully and completely presents itself to the Secretary of the Treasury, so far as maintaining the gold reserve is concerned. We believe he should pay with the kind of money which the law prescribes, gold and silver. This law has always been upon the statute books, and is so plain of interpretation that no man can misunderstand it. His failure to do that has brought about the condition of this endless chain which makes it impossible for the Government to maintain the gold reserve.

The committee now presents a measure for the relief of the situation which has never been approved by any political organization and is not now sired by any party; it is without pride of ancestry or hope of posterity; it is the monstrous proposition of retiring the greenbacks and Treasury notes by an issue of interest-bearing bonds. This is unquestionably the practical effect of it, because the bill provides that the proceeds of the bonds shall be used for the redemption of legal-tender notes, and for no other purpose. The situation is, therefore, simplified and narrowed down to the plain proposition to retire the greenbacks and Treasury notes with an issue of bonds in time of profound peace; in other words, a contraction of the currency to the extent of almost $500,000,000 when the country is sorely in need of more money. Our people do not believe in bond issues of any kind at this time, but look upon a measure of this kind as fraught with more evil in its consequences than any deficit which can confront us.

We believe that no permanent prosperity can come to this country until this problem is solved by the free coinage of silver. It is not my purpose to enter into a discussion of the merits of this plan now. The President says that this plan is an unsupported and improbable theory and contrary to the practice of other nations and the teachings of the wisest statesmen and economists of the world, both past and present, and that it runs counter to our own actual experience. He and the other advocates of a gold standard insist that we can not maintain the parity of the two metals by free coinage, and cites as a reason therefor the disparity which now exists. For two hundred years prior to 1873 the commercial ratio between gold and silver ranged between 14 to 1 and 16 to 1. During that time silver in most commercial countries enjoyed the same coinage privileges accorded to gold. During the last sixty years of that time Great Britain, the greatest commercial nation in the world, destroyed the use of silver as money; nevertheless, the parity was maintained until the United States joined hands with Germany and the States of the Latin Union in striking down the white metal. Then, and not till then, was the parity destroyed. The price of silver, like gold and every other product of human industry, was regulated by the law of supply and demand. Half of the demand which the world has had for silver as well as gold has been created by the money function which the world has given it. The great civilized nations of the earth, which by legislation had created half of this demand, destroyed it by antagonistic legislation, and then the advocates of a

single gold standard criticised silver for its failure to maintain its ratio. This criticism is unfair, illogical, and unjust. Had gold been treated in the same way it would be in as bad if not worse plight than silver is to-day. The President insists that our credit would be ruined if we adopted a free-coinage law, and in support of his position he cites the low price of silver as compared with gold. Any legislation short of free coinage must treat silver simply as a commodity; it occupies that position to-day in the financial affairs of our country; it is simply a material out of which money is made, but is not fundamental money in any sense of the word. We believe in a metallic basis for money; we believe that every dollar issued by the United States should be either itself made out of gold or silver or be redeemable in gold or silver. Silver to-day occupies the same position with respect to gold as does the paper currency, both measured by the gold standard.

Many so-called bimetallists pretend to favor the unrestricted coinage of both metals, but insist that this country can not do it alone, and that the great powers of Europe, particularly Great Britain, must consent by international agreement before we can safely resume the free coinage of silver. These pretended friends of silver have done it an infinite deal of harm in the past; they pretend to be its friends, while always failing to do anything practical to assist it. The President and other single-standard advocates attempt to sustain their position by referring to the fact that the ratio between the two metals in the United States has not been uniform since the establishment of our Government until 1873. There is nothing in this contention.

In 1792 Mr. Hamilton induced Congress to adopt the ratio of 15 to 1, and coinage on that schedule was adopted. However, there was very little of either gold or silver coined under this ratio, the Government coining less than two millions in gold and about a million and a half in silver. In 1803 France began the free coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 15½ to 1. This naturally made gold more valuable than silver and had a tendency to attract the yellow metal to France, and our currency, as a result, became chiefly silver. This was not entirely the case, but the premium of 3 per cent incident to the new ratio established by the French mint had a tendency and did largely attract gold to that country. In 1834 this Government adopted the present ratio of 15.988 to 1. The adoption of this ratio caused gold to depreciate about 3 per cent. As a result silver, to a great extent, retired from circulation in this country.

The commercial ratio between the two metals had nothing to do with this partial drawing apart, but it was the mint ratio fixed by the laws of two great money-using countries which affected this result; in other words, the demand was created for one or the other of these money metals as the legislation of one or the other of these great countries changed the ratio. During all of the period between 1816 and 1873 England did not recognize silver as money of ultimate redemption, but treated it solely as a commodity. It must be apparent to even the advocates of a single standard that the French law controlled the commercial ratio of gold and silver during all of this period, for France was then the greatest commercial nation which fixed this ratio by legislation. The friends of silver insist that, judging from this precedent, our country, the greatest consuming and producing nation on the face of the earth, can do the same thing. But the limited time given for the discussion of this measure will not permit of going into the great principles which underlie the free coinage of gold and silver on this occasion.

We believe that the Republican party can enact tariff legislation which will put this country on a cash basis. The only argument that has ever been advanced by members on this side of the House in support of this measure is that the President would not sign a tariff bill pure and simple, but might possibly sign one which had connected with it, in the way of contemporaneous legislation, a bond scheme. This so-called argument is absolutely no argument whatever and is unworthy the utterance of any member on this floor. It is not even entitled to the respect of an argument for its expediency. I am not much given to expediency in matters of legislation; but placing the cause of this bill on that ground alone (and that is the only virtue which can be claimed for it), it certainly has no merit.

It is a well-known fact that there is a substantial bimetallic majority at the other end of the Capitol and that this majority stands ready and willing to enact legislation in the interests of the cause of silver when the occasion presents itself. It is also a well-known fact to every member of this House who has cared to inform himself on the subject that the Senate will not permit a bond bill to pass. If this reaches the Senate in its present form a free-coinage bill will be substituted in lieu thereof. That will be the substitute which will come back to this House, and on that proposition the Senate will unquestionably stand. It therefore is absolutely impossible for the bill—this bill of expediency, promulgated by men who, in advance of the necessity for it, have proclaimed compromise—to ever reach the President of the United States, much less receive his signature. The argument of expediency, therefore, falls to the ground.

This legislation had its origin in the alarm of the President of the United States. What caused this alarm? The people are not afraid. There has been no cry of terror gone up from the mass of the people throughout the length and breadth of the land. We have not heard the voice of fear in the great city of Chicago or anywhere in the great Mississippi Valley, the granary of the world; it does not come from the mountains of the West. Whence has it come? From the interest gatherers and money changers of a single street in the city of New York, the direct lineal descendants of those whom Christ ejected from the temple. They are without a country and a nationality; they owe no allegiance to anything but gold; they are absolutely without courage and without patriotism; they bow down humbly to any kind of a yoke and would cheerfully permit any insult to their country and subject themselves to any kind of indignity so that they may have a continued opportunity to gather in their unearned profits.

They write us that already the stock exchange has witnessed a loss of $500,000,000 as a result of the action of the President and the Congress of the United States on the Venezuelan question. It is not true, but if it were true it is not a matter that would concern the American people. Those millions do not represent real values. They represent a fluctuation in values which was the direct result of speculation—gambling, if you are pleased to call it by its right name. These people are not even entitled to be dignified by the name of gamblers; they do not possess the courage of gamblers. A gambler will risk his all on the cast of a die or the turn of a card, and smile complacently when he sees it lose; but those stock gamblers whine and cringe like whipped curs when they lose a small percentage of that which they have dishonestly wrung from the people. If I read history aright these people have never come to the rescue when the interests of the Government were at stake; they have always faltered in the rear; their sympathies have always been foreign: they have not upheld the flag of their country by their money or by their strength. It was this same cry that Abraham Lincoln had to contend with during the war of the rebellion. The cause of secession received more aid and comfort in the city of New York than it did from the State of South Carolina. Many of the brave soldiers who went forth to battle for their country in its hour of need had to be sent back to quell riots and disturbances in the great city of New York during the trying times of the rebellion.

The people of the United States have not forgotten this. There has been no loss to the material wealth of the country from this scare. The gamblers are panic-stricken, but the people are not. As one man, with one voice, in this Congress and out of it, they upheld the dignity and honor of the United States. There is no discord anywhere except in the New York Stock Exchange. From there alone has come the demand for this legislation. Let us hearken unto the voice of the people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in the short time I have to devote to the subject of this bill I shall endeavor to correct certain misapprehensions or mistakes that exist in the minds of members concerning its import and effect. The occasion which has brought it forth is the message of the President of the United States, describing the necessity of the enactment of financial measures by this Congress and appealing to the patriotism of this body to provide some means for the relief of the Government in its impending difficulties in that respect. In addition to that, we have the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, in which he has stated as a matter of fact that from the 1st day of July, 1893, until the 1st day of December, 1895, the revenues of the Government have fallen below its expenditures to the amount of $130,221,023, making an average of upward of $50,000,000 a year during the period of time referred to in this manner by the Secretary.

The appeal that is made by the President in the special message, as well as this disclosure by the Secretary of the Treasury, clearly indicates the necessity of some action on the part of this House for the purpose of relieving the Government from its apprehended financial difficulty. It is true that the Secretary himself has denied the necessity of any aid or assistance on the part of Congress; but we have the acknowledged fact of this immense discrepancy between the revenues and expenditures, which appeals in stronger terms for the action of this House than any language that could be used by the Secretary urging it to aid and assist him in defraying the expenses of the Government. It is for the purpose of relieving the great emergency indicated by the message of the President and by the state of the Treasury receipts that this bill has been introduced.

I shared with many other gentlemen the apprehension which existed when the bill first came before the House, that all the greenbacks and Treasury notes that might be redeemed by the fund to be raised under authority of this bill would be retired and forever extinguished. That arose not simply out of the language of the bill itself or its general scope, but from the fact that these notes were to be redeemed. There was to be a redemption of them; and the Secretary of the Treasury, as well as the President of the United States, would have assumed, if the bill had remained in that form, that that provision meant a permanent retirement of

these bills so far as they should be redeemed. But in order to obviate the possibility that such an effect should be given to the bill, an important change was made in it as it was again presented in this House for final consideration and action, and as the bill now appears before the House there is no danger, no risk, of the retirement and extinguishment of the greenbacks or the Treasury notes.

You look at the language of the first section of the bill and find there that the security for the circulation under this bill is to be maintained. It is true the bill has provided additional means for raising money by the issuance of United States bonds, and that the money raised in this manner shall be applied to the redemption of the greenback currency and of the Treasury notes. That section has provided still further that under the proviso in this section this bill shall have no effect whatever in the way of restricting the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem and extinguish these notes. On the contrary, it is stated in the first section of the bill that the preceding law on the subject, which was passed for the purpose of preventing the retirement of these notes, shall remain in full force and effect, undisturbed by the language of this section.

I now call the attention of the House to the language of the law which was passed for the purpose of preventing the retirement of these notes, as indicating not only the possibility, but the entire feasibility of retaining all the greenback circulation in the hands of the people except such small amount as may find its way for the time being to the Treasury after this bill shall have become law. The language is this:

> And whenever any of said notes may be redeemed or be received into the Treasury, under any law, from any source whatever, and shall belong to the United States, they shall not be retired, canceled, or destroyed, but they shall be issued and paid out again and kept in circulation.

That is the language of the law of 1879, which this bill proposes to continue in force and effect, without any modification or restriction whatever. So that there is nothing here that is proposed to be enacted into law that will in any manner contract the circulation of the Treasury notes. The obligation of the Secretary of the Treasury is that, as these notes may come into his hands or possession, he shall reissue them and keep them in circulation.

Now, the main advantage of the first section of this bill consists in the further provision that when these bonds are to be sold upon the market for the purpose of replenishing the gold supply of the Treasury it shall not be done by mere private negotiation, as sales have been made heretofore, but that the bonds shall be advertised for the open market, and every individual shall be at liberty to become a competitor in the purchase of them, and to pay his gold into the hands of the Treasurer of the United States for the purpose of securing the redemption of the greenbacks, instead of putting the bonds into the hands of foreign dealers or of capitalists in this country intending to send them into foreign countries.

There is nothing, therefore, in this section of the bill that provides in any respect whatever, or permits by any device whatever, the contraction of the circulating Treasury notes of the United States, and members have fallen into a mistake who have endeavored to impress upon the House the idea that the enactment of this bill into a law would destroy the circulation of the Treasury notes or of the greenbacks. It is impossible that it should do so, for the reason that while the bill provides for the redemption of these notes it retains in full force and effect the preceding law which makes it the duty of the Treasury to circulate these notes again and to keep them in circulation.

Now, is there anything in the second section which restricts the action of the Secretary, or his authority, in reference to the circulation of these notes? Not one single word. On the other hand, the second section simply provides for meeting an emergency that may arise owing to a deficiency of the revenue received from customs duties, or from other sources, by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, as a means of providing "for any temporary deficiency now existing, or which may hereafter occur," to sell these small obligations for the purpose of raising money to meet the expenditures of the Government. Then it is provided also by the last sentence of the section that "the proceeds thereof shall be used for the purposes prescribed in this section and for no other." There is nothing, therefore, in the way of the continued circulation of the Treasury notes of the United States. There is nothing here to restrict in any way the authority of the Secretary or to relieve him from the duty of keeping these notes in circulation, notwithstanding their redemption and notwithstanding their payment into the Treasury. It is simply to relieve the Government in extraordinary emergencies, when there may be a temporary deficiency in receipts to meet its expenditures, that these small obligations may be sold and lawful money may be received in payment for them, and that money disbursed for the purpose of relieving the situation.

That is as far as section 2 goes, either by its language or by any fair construction of it, under any condition or circumstances that may arise.

We therefore have, in the contemplation of this bill, not only the sale of United States bonds upon a fair competitive notice published to the world, but, in addition to that, we have the further provision that when the bonds shall be sold and the money realized, and greenbacks or Treasury notes redeemed with that money, the Treasury notes are not to be locked up in the Treasury, are not to go out of circulation, but it is made the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to reissue those notes, and not only to reissue them, but, under the law as it stands, to keep them in circulation. And it is only when these notes shall prove to be insufficient to answer the purposes of the Government, or when some temporary emergency shall occur, or, in the language of the act, when "any temporary deficiency" shall arise, that resort can be had to the issuing of these small obligations under the second section of this bill.

There is consequently no danger whatever that there can be any contraction of the currency or that there can be such a piling up of the Treasury notes in the Treasury of the United States as by any possibility to amount to a contraction or a withdrawal of these circulating notes from the business of the country. The notes themselves are esteemed, confided in, and maintained by the people of the United States. There is no disposition upon their part to require their retirement. There is no disposition exhibited in this proposed bill to secure that end, but, on the contrary, it simply provides a means by which the gold reserve may be maintained intact sufficient to meet all the requirements of redemption as these bills may be presented at the Treasury, and at the same time to keep the bills, after their redemption in this manner, in circulation throughout the country, and only to resort to the other expedient provided for in section 2 when there shall be "some temporary deficiency," either existing at the present time or that "may hereafter occur," requiring to be met by the provisions contained in section 2.

There is consequently, I repeat, no danger to the business interests of the country, either by contraction of the currency or in any other respect, from the enactment of this bill into a law, and it is an entirely erroneous impression that it can by any possibility result in any diminution of the circulating medium which the people have esteemed so highly and confided in so generally, which has carried the Government through so many emergencies, and which is ready to perform the same service hereafter for the people of the United States. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPALDING. I wish to ask the gentleman from New York whether there is anything in this bill which in his opinion would necessarily retire the Treasury notes?

Mr. DANIELS. No, sir; the notes will all stand on the same footing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. BOWERS] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I am the judge of my duty as a Republican and as a representative of the people who sent me here, and I can not delegate that privilege to another. We excused ourselves as Republicans for our votes yesterday for a Democratic tariff "forrevenue only" bill by the claim that an emergency had arisen, that the President had appealed to us for help, and that we must act promptly. That emergency we claimed yesterday we had provided for, although we knew that the President would not sign such a bill, and we might as well have passed a genuine Republican protective tariff bill.

Now, what other emergency has arisen that requires this haste in authorizing the issue of "more bonds," while the President now has unlimited power to issue bonds and this bill in no wise restricts that power. On the contrary, it expressly states that it is in addition to the power already granted him. Indeed, we are told by the papers this morning that the President is now negotiating for the sale of $200,000,000 of bonds; that the sale will be concluded within a few days, either with the syndicate that took the other bonds or with Russia, irrespective of what this House may do. I ask what emergency has arisen to justify the passage of this bill? I know of none, except that the other day two or three stock gamblers in the city of New York failed, and we were told yesterday that one of these would probably get upon his feet before he was counted out. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, stripped of its wrappings, divested of all its attempted disguise, this bill appears to me a proposition to destroy the greenbacks, all of them. It either means that, or it means nothing. Gentlemen of the Republican side of the House, are you ready to do that? Are you ready to take even the chance of doing that? Who has asked you to do it? The people? No. There never has come to one of you any demand from the people anywhere in the United States that this thing be done. Who asks for it, I repeat? The Democratic President in his last frantic message to this House asks for it. That was the alpha and omega of that message, "Destroy the greenbacks and issue bonds." This demand is echoed by the bankers, the bond speculators, and stock gamblers of New York; and now we have the Secretary of the Treasury hoarsely bawling "Destroy the greenbacks!" and Wall street opens wide its ugly mug to swallow "more bonds."

It seems to me this bill comes in here in response to their demands, and a deaf ear has been turned to the voice of the people.

You know that the people of the United States are opposed to the destruction of the greenbacks. They remember that the greenbacks enabled them to carry to a successful conclusion the war for the preservation of the Union. They know that for twenty-five years thereafter the greenbacks continued to be the money of the people, of all the people. And we had no other money during the most prosperous era of the Republic. Those greenbacks during all those years were "sound money"; they were "honest dollars" up to the day that Grover Cleveland was inaugurated President of the United States and launched his cry, "Destroy the greenbacks and issue bonds." [Applause.] That is all there is against the greenbacks now—the Cleveland-Carlisle cry. Every one of you Republicans—and I want to talk to Republicans—I have no desire to talk to Democrats [laughter]; they seem to be going all right on this bill—every one of you Republicans, when upon the stump addressing your constituents, has denounced the President for doing exactly what you propose to do in indorsing this bill. Yet, in spite of that, we have now the astounding spectacle of Republicans not only indorsing the President in that for which they have heretofore condemned him, but proposing to give him greater power, the power to destroy the greenbacks and contract the currency of this nation to the extent of $346,000,000. That is what this bill means, if it means anything.

You know that this bill can not become a law. You know, every one of you, that it can not pass the Senate of the United States. No man believes that it will. But with the passage of this bill by the votes of the Republican majority here the mischief is accomplished, for you have become participants and sharers in the odium of the issue of all these bonds not with the Democratic party, but with the Democratic Administration. There is, you know a great gulf between these two. And you have got to meet that responsibility every one of you. You have got to spend all your time in the next canvass explaining, or trying to explain, why you did this; why, at this time, you sought refuge under the umbrella of Grover Cleveland, who has gathered you in as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with a most singular and contradictory state of things. The President, in a message this to Congress, sent in seven days ago, said, among other things:

> We are in the midst of another season of perplexity caused by our dangerous and fatuous financial operations.

Mr. Speaker, that sentence exactly characterizes Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Carlisle's financial operations during the last two and a half years. The country never saw anything of the kind before. The President in this extraordinary message goes on to say:

> I ask, at the hands of the Congress, such prompt aid as it alone has the power to give * * * to relieve the dangers of the present emergency.

Yet it is notorious that, at the very time he was writing these words to Congress, he was secretly negotiating for the sale of one hundred or two hundred million dollars of bonds to the same syndicate that cleared up so many million dollars profit from the other secret sale, and are now hungry for more. And these sales have been denounced by all the people of the United States.

He says further:

> The real cure for our recurring troubles can only be effected by a complete change in our financial system.

That's true, and the change needed is from his system, controlled and administered by English financiers and the shylocks of Wall street, to an American system administered by Americans.

For the quarter of a century previous to the second advent of Cleveland the financial system of this country was on an American basis, and every dollar, whether of gold, silver, or paper, which bore the stamp of the United States was an honest dollar, and prosperity continued under that system up to that unfortunate day when the band of foreign conspirators, having its headquarters in the foreign city of New York, came into power through the Cleveland Administration. And what a condition they have brought the country to in their struggle to displace the money of the Constitution with their robber dollars! Ah, sir, we had better have cheap and honest American dollars than the foreign costly and dishonest dollars, through which our industries have been prostrated, our people robbed, and the National Treasury looted.

This band of foreign mercenaries, who have neither patriotism nor any love of country, acknowledge no flag, are flooding the land with their so-called "sound-currency" publications. They conjure up the horrible phantom of a silver basis—that, they say, threatens this country—wherewith to frighten the ignorant. Sir, there is not upon the earth to-day a nation that is upon the so-called silver basis that has not prospered, while this nation has suffered untold miseries during all the time Cleveland and his colleagues have been trying to force this country to a dishonest gold basis.

We find this bond bill brought in by Republicans. They say it is in response to the appeal of the President, and the burden of their argument is, "We must support the President in this emergency," but up to this time no one other reason have they given for the passage of this bill. They talk continually about an "emergency," but not one of the supporters of this bill has deigned to tell what the emergency is. On the other hand, the Democratic party, as represented in Congress, appears to be unanimously opposed to the bill and declares that it is wrong, and that no emergency exists warranting it.

Mr. Speaker, when I have to choose in a case like this, I had rather stand with the Democratic party when it stands on the side of the people, as it does on this bill (for what reason, I care not) than to support a Democratic Administration that stands in with the gold gamblers of Wall street, and has stood with them since the day of its inauguration, to the irreparable injury of the people of the United States.

Pass this bill, gentlemen of the Republican side, and forever after hold your peace as to Grover Cleveland, for you will have exonerated him from every charge you have made against him respecting the sale of the bonds. You will have indorsed his Administration and he will have bagged more Republican lame ducks than he ever brought down at one shot before. And do not forget that day before yesterday, with his right barrel, he fetched a pure Democratic "tariff-for-revenue-only" bill out of a big Republican flock.

Still we may defend ourselves to some extent with the fact that the horizontal bill is some improvement upon the present "tariff for England's glory only." But how can a Republican excuse himself for voting for this bill?

Gentlemen say we must defend the credit of the nation. Sir, if we keep on defending it this way our occupation will soon be gone, for there will be no credit to defend.

Mr. Speaker, the frantic message sent us by the President is in strict accordance with his programme to place this country at the mercy of foreign financiers, the essential feature of which programme is to make *dollars dear and labor cheap*. That is Mr. Cleveland's platform, and he has been so successful that he has doubled the debt of every farmer and producer who was in debt when this Administration came in, and the logical, inevitable condition to which Mr. Cleveland's theories have brought the country has cut in two the day's pay of nearly every workingman in the country. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed to see Republicans seconding Mr. Cleveland in his work of subjugating the American workingmen and the American producers, putting them on a level with the cheap and pauper labor of Europe.

I repeat that not one reason has been advanced by its supporters for the passage of this bill. The Treasury report of this morning shows a balance of $170,000,000 on the right side. Leading Democrats on the floor of this House have told you to-day that it is not necessary; Democrats who have been through thick and thin the stanch supporters of the President have told you this; the Secretary of the Treasury denounces it, though this latter fact may aid its passage—may have been intended to.

And now, in conclusion, I want to say to you Republicans that when this bill is passed, if such a calamity is to overtake the Republican party, I beg that you will amend the title of the bill so that it shall show the purpose and effect of the measure. Make it read, "A bill to retire Republican Congressmen and Republican Senators from Congress." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I appeal to you Republicans in the words of the gallant Sheridan, when in the Shenandoah Valley he found his men flying before the enemy, "Face the other way, boys!" he shouted; "face the other way!" And they did and routed the enemy. I ask you Republicans to face the other way. Face the enemies of the common people. Stand with the people who sent you here. Stand with them in this fight made against them by the associated syndicates. [Applause.] Say in the spirit of Andrew Jackson, "By the Eternal, the greenback shall be preserved for the use of all the people!" [Applause.]

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WILSON] undertakes to answer for two great States so widely separated as Idaho, the State of his adoption, and Pennsylvania, the State of his birth, he must inform himself better concerning the sentiment of his native State before he attempts to make such assertions as he has made to-night on the floor of this House. When he says there is no sentiment in Pennsylvania in favor of this bill, and when he refers to the city of Philadelphia in particular, I wish to tell him (and that is my only excuse for asking to occupy ten minutes now in addressing the House) that when I returned to my home a few days since I met, not the stock gamblers of the New York Stock Exchange, to which he referred, but the manufacturers of the greatest manufacturing city in our country—I met the business men of that city, and it was they who stopped me on the street and said, "ADAMS, can't you do something at Washington to save us from the crisis that hangs over the country?"

Mr. Speaker, we have people in Philadelphia who are enthu-

siasts on party measures; we have people in Philadelphia who are "dyed in the wool" and always maintain the Republican doctrines. And yet I have heard them say in this emergency, "Sustain any measure to save us and to save the country from the crisis which is now impending and the difficulties that surround us; meet the Administration and render what aid can be rendered in the emergency." They ask us to meet the President who has called upon us for assistance; they say, "You have been returned with a tremendous majority to the House of Representatives by the people of this country and we call on you to stop the bad system existing; put an end to the vicious legislation; stop the financial terror which is sweeping over the land and enact good, wholesome financial measures to give the business and the manufacturing interests of the country a chance to recuperate."

Mr. BOWERS. On free wool?

Mr. ADAMS. That evil will no longer exist, I will say to my friend from California. I do not want to take time now to debate the provisions of the bill passed on yesterday, but it is a part of the remedial legislation which the loyal House of Representatives has been called upon to enact. Here it goes a step further in the pending bill.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is scarcely any opposition to the second section of the pending bill, so I shall address myself to the first section, the object of which is to maintain intact the coin redemption fund in the Treasury. Every civilized nation in the world considers it essential to its prosperity to have a reserve fund of gold to protect its currency, whether it be paper, gold, silver, or both metals combined. In our country the limit of that reserve has been fixed at $100,000,000 to secure the very miscellaneous and mixed currency which afflicts our people. But, unfortunately, America has gotten to be the gold pot of the world. When a nation needs gold to strengthen its currency it helps itself from the free pot of America. The bankers of Europe supplied Austria, which has lately reformed her currency upon a specie basis, with $12,000,000 in gold, on which they made a handsome premium. When they needed the gold all they had to do was to come to America and help themselves.

Under our present financial condition and under existing legislation, so long as they can gather greenbacks, all they have to do is to take them to the Treasury of the United States, demand and get for them our gold. The result of this is that we have to buy the gold back at an enormous premium in order to keep up the reserve. Again quite recently Australia needed $3,000,000 in gold, and the bankers supplied it. And here, again, we find that they came to America and depleted our reserve and supplied it from our stock. That is the case with all the nations in the world who need gold. Every nation in the world, except our own, can preserve its reserve fund. In England when gold is too freely exported the Bank of England raises the rate of discount and puts a stop to it. In France the man does not live who can go to the bank with a large check and get it cashed in gold. They will not give it unless he states that it is for mercantile transactions, or to be remitted in payment of a gold obligation.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will assist our Treasury to preserve its gold intact. And I wish to throw out one single suggestion which may assist in the consideration of this matter, and which has not been mentioned, so far as I have heard, in the course of this discussion. On last Friday, when the panic was at its height in New York, when Europe had been sacrificing our securities, owing to a breakdown, as was believed, in our credit, and the bankers needed gold to remit by Saturday's steamer, what was the effect? As is always the case on such occasions, the money market tightened, and it was impossible to secure greenbacks or Treasury notes of large denominations to enable them to withdraw the gold.

Now, this is the thought that I would develop, and show the House that if the bonds are issued and greenbacks go into the Treasury, the Secretary will have it in his power to retain in the Treasury greenbacks and the Treasury notes of the larger denominations, and issue then only the smaller notes. Banks can not draw our gold out if they must collect for that purpose bills of small denominations. Think of the labor of getting a half a million dollars out of the Treasury on dollar bills or bills of small denominations! Think of the time taken to count it, the cost of exporting it, and other matters in connection with such a transaction. If the large bills are kept in the Treasury it will not interfere with the business transactions of the country, for we all know that sums of large amount are always paid by checks. It will not interfere with the business of the country in any way. As a matter of fact, 94 per cent of the exchanges in the business of the country are by checks or drafts, and about 6 per cent only is actually paid by notes. Now, if the smaller bills are left out, it will not interfere with the large transactions which are made by check, and the smaller transactions, which are mostly in the retail business, will not be interfered with, because these transactions are mainly with small bills.

This bill, therefore, will put it into the hands and into the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to imitate foreign nations to a certain extent, and to throw an obstacle in the way of the bankers in depleting the Treasury of the gold reserve.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say further that I have heard a great deal that has been said here about how we will explain to our constituents our votes when we seek reelection. Well, I have a conscious feeling that I am doing what is for the benefit, not only of the people of my district, but for the whole country. I am not afraid, and never have been since I have been in public life, of going ahead and proceeding in that direction. Do what is right. The people of America have more sense than any other nation in the world, for we are better educated and have more intelligence and brighter ideas, and when the people realize that their representatives, in the light of the best knowledge at their command, are doing what is in their interest, my friend from California need have no fear but that the people will recognize his services and return him to Congress.

Now, gentlemen, I wish to say one word about what always comes up here in debate about the stock exchanges and the commercial marts and the gamblers of New York. Why, the stock exchange of New York and the commercial exchange which deals in the commodities of this great land are nothing but the thermometers that reflect the sentiments of the people, their hopes, their fears, and what they think of the current events that are passing. My friend from Idaho [Mr. WILSON] talks of the gamblers of Wall street. Does he forget that within a stone's throw of the stock exchange there is the great commercial exchange where cotton and petroleum and coal and the other products of this country are bought and sold? It was not only the stock-exchange gamblers that were paralyzed the other day. Did not the price of wheat fall? Is not the West interested in that? Did not the price of cotton fall? Has not the South an interest in that? When you paralyze the business of this country all interests are affected. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE). The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the bill now before this House presents two great problems demanding our attention. The first is how to maintain the gold reserve, and the second is how to provide for a temporary deficiency in the Treasury. The Republican party is pledged to maintain the gold reserve, and the Cleveland wing of the Democratic party is also pledged to maintain the gold reserve. That reserve is now being depleted. It has reached the danger point. And the question is, shall we allow the process of depletion to go on until a financial panic results from the failure of the Treasury to meet its obligations by redeeming greenbacks in gold? The first section of the bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury the power to issue 3 per cent bonds instead of 4 and 5 per cent bonds to maintain the gold reserve, and prohibits any bonds being sold secretly, but requires them to be sold on due advertisement.

Now, suppose we fail to pass the first section of this bill, and go home to our constituents, and they say to us, "How is it that you failed to pass the bill to maintain the gold reserve?" What answer will we make? Suppose we fail to pass the first section of this bill. What would be the result? The laws in force at this time are the same laws that Mr. Cleveland has acted under heretofore when he secretly sold bonds to foreign bankers, and if we fail to pass this section of the bill he will make another secret contract and sell more 4 or 5 per cent bonds to the foreign bankers. If we fail to pass this bill and go home and our constituents say to us, "Why didn't you stop that man Cleveland making his secret contracts with foreign bankers? Why didn't you stay his hand?" What answer will we be able to make? None. We shall be dumb as sheep before their shearers. It is our duty, while preparing to maintain the gold reserve, to maintain it in such a way that at the same time we will maintain the honor of the American people. [Applause.] And I say the honor of the American people is not maintained when we make secret financial treaties with foreign bankers, and get foreign gold when we could have gotten American gold.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GIBSON. No, sir; you may not. [Laughter.] Now, what do we want to do? We want to pass a measure that will enable the President of the United States to sell coin-bearing bonds in our own country, and we want to attach a provision to it that will prevent any more secret contracts with Belmont, Morgan, or Rothschild. [Applause.] And you gentlemen, you Republicans here who are antagonizing this measure may not know it, but you are playing into the hands of Rothschild. Every one of you are playing into the hands of Rothschild and into the hands of Wall street, and your constituents will hold you to a stern responsibility.

So far as I am concerned, I defy Rothschild, and I defy Morgan, and I defy Belmont; and I want an appeal to be made to the American people to see if they have not got the money in their

pockets to loan to our Government. I say the people who sustained this Government with their bayonets will, when the proper time comes and the proper appeal is made, sustain it with their gold. All you have to do is to appeal to them. And I want to say another thing here. I have been fighting a minority battle in Tennessee for many years, and I have learned that whenever I saw the Democrats take one end of the road I have found it safest to take the other end. [Applause and laughter.] And whenever I hear the Democratic party applauding a Republican speech I know that Republican is going astray. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] I want no applause from the Democratic side for any of my political utterances.

Mr. MILES. Don't be alarmed; you will not get any.

Mr. GIBSON. The failure to get any is what brought me here. [Renewed laughter and applause.] The man in my district who gets Democratic applause is doomed.

I want to say further that I represent a district in this House that never has sent a Democrat to the Congress of the United States in forty years, and while reason and patriotism reign in the brains of my constituents they never will. [Renewed laughter and applause.] What is more, I represent a section of Tennessee that put more Union soldiers into the Union army than there were voters. [Applause.] I don't want any more bonds issued, but, if any more are issued I want them to draw a lower rate of interest and run for a shorter time than the law now authorizes; and I want them issued openly and publicly, and in broad daylight, and not secretly or in the dark, and I want the highest and best bidder to get them; and, above all, I want every American citizen to have a fair chance to buy if he wishes.

The next section of this bill, Mr. Speaker, provides a remedy for any deficiency that now exists or may hereafter arise. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue certificates of indebtedness, not more than fifty millions in amount, payable in three years, at 3 per cent interest, to provide for any temporary deficiency in the Treasury. What is the situation of affairs to-day in the United States? Are not the public receipts insufficient to meet the expenses of our Government? Has not Mr. Cleveland unsheathed the sword in his message on the Venezuelan question, and did not the other side of the House vote with this side unanimously to appropriate $100,000 to pay commissioners to ascertain the true boundary of Venezuela? Now, we are in a fine plight to defy with an empty Treasury the greatest military and naval power on earth.

The second section of this bill provides that the President of the United States may borrow $50,000,000 should an emergency arise. If no emergency arises, no money will be borrowed; but if an emergency should arise, if our Treasury should become empty—what then? Run this great Government, pay the pensioners, and defend the American continent against European aggression, with an empty Treasury! Will we, Republicans, be doing our duty to our country if we refuse to help the President because he is a Democrat, and because he and his party are responsible for our financial distress? There is one trouble in this question—so many of us suppose it is a political matter when it is an American matter. On this side of the House we Republicans sometimes forget we are Americans, but on your side you Democrats always forget that you are Americans. [Laughter and applause.] This is not strictly a Republican question. It is an American question. We are responding to an appeal from a Democratic President, it is true; but while he is a Democrat, he is also President of the United States of America [applause]; and we Republicans always stand up for our Government. When the President of the United States raises the American flag, as he did in his Venezuelan message, the Republican party rallied around him to a man; and when he sends a special message here saying that he wants financial relief we come to him, not as a Democratic President, but as President of the United States of America. And in voting for this measure I vote for it in response to the appeal of the President of the United States, in support of my Government, and in support of the credit of my country; and I doubt not that my constituents will say unto me, "Well done, good and faithful servant." [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, we are supposed at this time to be engaged in legislation suggested by a special emergency. This emergency is supposed to have brought forth its first fruits yesterday, and the full fruition, it is supposed, will be reached to-morrow. The emergency is one suggested by the special message of the President sent to Congress last week. The fact that this House, with its tremendous Republican majority, has decided to forego the usual holiday recess and devote itself to legislation upon the suggestion of the President that a special emergency exists for legislation is an admission upon the part of the Republican party of this House that such emergency does exist, and that it ought at once to be met by that party, the responsible party here at this time.

The Republican party having gone thus far, having taken the President as authority for theexistence of the alleged emergency, are they not reasonably bound to consider well what he says in regard to the character of the emergency and the remedy which is demanded? Yesterday a bill was passed by this House largely increasing the duties upon imported articles, touching everything, I believe, in the schedules with a rise except sugar. That was done, we were told, to supply needed revenue, although the authority which has convinced the majority in this House that the special emergency exists has advised us that there is no need for additional revenue. Legislation far different is demanded by the President to meet the exigencies of the case, as he states it. Starting out with your concession that the President is right when he says an emergency for further financial legislation exists, and claiming, as you did, to be acting in response to the President's invitation, this House yesterday, to meet that emergency, did precisely what the President said was and is totally unnecessary.

The Republican party in this House, having again decided that the President is right in proclaiming the existence of the emergency, is now about doing, to meet that emergency, something more that the President has not asked or suggested. At the same time, as I believe, the Republican House, by this bond measure, is practically applying, covertly and hypocritically, under another name, the President's remedy—more bonds. The President believes it is necessary to redeem with gold the greenbacks and the Treasury notes issued under the Sherman bullion-purchasing law, and necessary, also, to provide for an increase of the gold reserve, by issuing and selling for gold bonds payable by their own express terms in gold. You Republicans, pretending to accept the Presidential invitation and to heed the Presidential warning, are providing now for bonds payable in coin, knowing that, according to the Presidential interpretation—not the law—these bonds will be paid in gold. You are then authorizing the President to pursue, upon a broader plane, the policy of issuing bonds to be paid in gold, although they may be paid, should be paid, under the law and by their terms, in silver as well as gold. While asserting a pretended conviction that the greenbacks ought not to be canceled or retired, and that the notes issued under the Sherman law ought not to be thrown into the waste basket, you yet attempt to inflict upon the country a law which would enable the Treasury authorities to retire the greenbacks and Sherman notes and keep them out of circulation, increase the bonded debt of the nation at will; to do precisely what gentlemen here advocating the passage of your bond bill say they are opposed to doing.

It was said yesterday in the discussion of the tariff bill that, as a great concession, a most sweet-smelling sacrifice upon the altar of patriotism, the Republican party was departing for the time being from its policy of protection, and proceeding upon Democratic lines, laying a tariff for the sole and very urgent purpose of raising revenue. The assumption is incorrect. If correct, it would be a disgraceful assumption and a disgraceful assertion. If your party is committed to the policy of protection and believes in it, why should you deny that in what you were doing you were moving on protection lines, in accordance with your professions and beliefs? Why should you, in passing a bill to greatly increase tariff duties, insist that you are not doing it for the sake of protection; that protection is not in it and of it; that yours is a bill framed upon Democratic principles to meet the requirements of an emergency for good legislation? Why such stultification?

As was well remarked to-day by the gentleman from California [Mr. BOWERS], if the tariff bill which you rushed through the House yesterday is to be productive of anything, if the "needed revenue"—you know very well that there is not the least danger of a Treasury deficit—if the needed revenue is to be supplied by means of your tariff bill, what need of this grant of limitless power, of boundless authority, to issue and sell bonds and lay additional obligations, taxes, and burdens upon not only the American people of to-day, but also upon the people unborn who shall dwell in this land in the distant future?

There was some talk here yesterday to the effect that your tariff bill was not McKinleyism.

McKinleyism is a term descriptive of a bill passed by the Fifty-first Congress and of the so-called protection embodied in it. But it is a misnomer. From what I have seen since I have been a member of this body, from what I have learned from others whose experience and observation are far greater than mine, I believe that law would be much better and more fitly named if it were called the Reed bill, if it were named after the genius of the Fifty-first Congress, and if credit were due—and from the Republican view much credit is due—it ought to be given to the man whose will power and whose brain power carried that bill, as they carried other bad measures, through the Fifty-first Congress, and promise to carry many through this Congress. The legislation that has occupied us here so far is distinctively Republican. It is Republicanism voiced by the dominant element of the Republican party. It is Republicanism framed and shaped by the man who was the ruling power of that party in the Fifty-first Congress, as he is its ruling power in this. What, then, is the use of talking

about this legislation not being Republican? Why talk about it falling short of McKinleyism? It is all of the McKinleyism, Reedism, Republicanism that you dare now to venture upon.

It is legislation upon the same old lines, dictated by the same great power—the foremost man of the Republican party—the Speaker of this House. It is Republican because it is protective in tariff and destructive in finance. Yours is legislation increasing the taxes of the people for the benefit of the manufacturers and the bond dealers and bondholders, and that is Republicanism. Why shrink from the responsibility of giving it its true name? Why try to deceive the people? Why claim to be rising above party when you are only decrying your own party principles and falling below your own professions and beliefs? In this present attempt at legislation you are seeking to perpetuate the policy of mortgaging this country to the grasping bond mongers while you suffer to lie idle and useless in the Treasury silver out of which there might be coined money enough to supply any deficiency in the revenue—if there really be any—as well as to give to the bondholders coin, as nominated in their bonds; silver coin partly, and not gold coin altogether. How simple and plain the remedy which would naturally suggest itself to the mind of a man from the walks of the common people.

There lies in the Treasury, unused, covered by dust and cobwebs, the material to make nearly two hundred millions of good sound silver dollars, "coin" dollars. Why juggle with this term "coin"? If you want "coin," why not make coin as the true policy of the Government has always been, as the will of the plain people now is—why not make "coin" out of silver as well as out of gold? Instead of providing for issuing $50,000,000 of emergency certificates, as you do in this bill, to supply the lack of needed revenues, as you profess, why not get out of the silver seigniorage, lying useless in the Treasury because you will not use it, fifty-five millions of good "coin" dollars? Why not coin the other silver that is in the Treasury, useless, too, because you will have it so, and take in the notes issued under the Sherman law, which you say are a constant menace to the peace, the safety, and the credit of this country? Why not retire those notes by coining that silver, and putting out the silver dollars, or, in their place, silver certificates, made a legal tender for all debts and dues, public and private?

I, for my part, have no patience with the state of mind which regards the money that is good enough for the people, the money that is used in all the transactions of the people, as unfit to be paid to the privileged class of wealthy holders of the bonds of this Government. Money which is good enough for the farmer, and the mechanic, and the laborer, good enough for all the people of this land in their business transactions, and which every citizen is compelled to accept at the option of his debtor, when tendered in payment of a debt, ought, in all good conscience, to be good enough for that extraordinarily favored class, the rich men who hold the bonds of this Government and yearn for more of them. If I had the power, if the mighty Democratic party—I speak of the rank and file, the mass of the party—could be heard and could put into law their voice and their will, the silver of this land would be coined as gold is coined. Silver and gold coinage would be restored as it existed in the days of our fathers, and there would still be afloat, as there ought to be, this currency of greenbacks, a currency that has met with favor among the people, and that has been found safe, sound, convenient, and altogether satisfactory in the commercial transactions of the country.

This policy of issuing bonds in time of peace—in any time except in stress of war, when the choice is between national overthrow and a resort to that desperate expedient of bonding the future as well as the present—this policy is un-American in its character, monarchical in its tendency, oppressive and demoralizing in its effect. If we could only abandon this policy, turn our faces against it and against all such cheap expedients as this that you now offer—apologized for by every man who advocates it, and thus condemned by friend and by foe—if we could turn our faces resolutely and effectively against this policy, if you would let us legislate for the people of the land instead of for Wall street, New York, and State street, London, how much better it would be for our countrymen! Then, indeed, the credit, the honor, and the glory of this country would be advanced and real patriotism would be exemplified.

What is the use of issuing these bonds? You do not even destroy by this bill the power to issue 4 per cent or 5 per cent bonds. "In addition" to those provided for by the resumption act, so your bill recites, the Treasury Department may issue bonds bearing only 3 per cent interest. There is no stoppage of the power of issuing bonds; there is no limitation placed upon it; you enlarge it. But the bill provides—mark the beneficent feature—that the sale of bonds shall be advertised! There shall no longer be secret dealings with syndicates, which I neither uphold, nor defend, nor apologize for. The bonds shall be advertised for sale. But the bond issues and the bond sales shall go on—such is the Republican decree—without check or limit, but in greater variety. You know that more bonds will soon be issued, and having the power to prevent the issue and being unwilling to exercise it, you lend your approval.

Why, $500,000,000 of paper money in this country may be withdrawn from circulation, with your consent, at the will of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury—those now in office, or any who may come into office—in order that the gold reserve may be preserved; in order that the people may have less money with which to conduct their business; in order that wheat may be lower and stocks and bonds higher; in order that the people who toil and make the wealth of this land may enjoy less of it, and those who gamble and traffic in the products of the toil of the millions may make more. That is the policy which Republicanism would fasten upon us, and upon our children, and children's children, to the remotest generation. And you call this patriotism!

The real question here is whether we shall resort to silver as well as gold; whether, if it be necessary to call upon the American people to sustain the credit of the American nation, there shall be issued obligations bearing interest, or whether this brave, generous, patriotic people shall be allowed to take, as they will take freely and in large quantities, notes issued by the Government fashioned to pass from hand to hand as money and draw no interest.

You provide for issuing $50,000,000 of special emergency bonds. Why not provide, if there be necessity for any such provision, for $50,000,000 of Treasury notes, to be added to the amount of money in circulation in this country, and to elevate to some extent the prices of the products of the people, now depressed to the point of absolute distress and ruin? You who will be responsible for the passage of this bill certainly can not dodge that responsibility by claiming that you have arisen upon the wings of patriotism far above partisanship.

There is lurking in this thing—all over it, on top of it, below it, around it—as much partisanship as could ever be injected into anything by anybody. And yet there still remains the question, Shall the people be deprived of their ancient right to have coined the silver of the country? Shall they still be compelled to pay interest on bonds when they would take the notes of their Government, to circulate as money, free of all interest? Shall the taxes upon the people be increased? Shall their substance be mortgaged against their will? Shall the power of the jobbers in money and bonds be made greater and their profits largely increased?

Shall we, at the very moment when we are flinging defiance in the face of England, fasten still more securely the financial yoke of the mistress of the ocean? Shall we say to-day to Great Britain, "It is an affair of ours whether you filch, as you have been filching all over the world, a slice of Venezuelan territory;" and the next day declare to her, "Upon your financial plan we, your debtors, shall build our own structure, and what you want us to do in this country we will do"? Mr. Speaker, whatever be the fate of this bill, whether men apologize and vote for it, under the persuasive influence of the party lash, or condemn it and vote against it, however it be dealt with here or elsewhere, it is after all an attempt to perpetuate the policy of issuing bonds; to perpetuate the gold standard; to deny the possibility, as far as you have the power of denying it, of bimetallism, and to leave our people powerless, as far as you have the ability to do so, to correct the evils which you have inflicted upon them.

Mr. Speaker, in the great State in which I live, and which I have the honor to represent, in part, upon this floor, unprecedented floods have lately swept away much of the substance of the farmer. The destruction has been great, and disaster prevails where but yesterday rich valleys were vast granaries. To-day many sturdy farmers are bereft not only of the fruits of last summer's toil but have seen the savings of a lifetime melt away in the wild waters. Whole communities, who taxed themselves to build bridges and other public improvements, have but the burden of taxation left to remind them of what they did and had and lost. I sympathize with these good people in their distress, wrought by the elements. I pity them in the added distress which your legislation will bring; for the flood of woes that you will let loose upon all the poor and unfortunate people of this land, if you persist in your past and present policy of mortgaging all that the people have and taxing them upon all they need, will amount to a deluge of far-reaching and long-enduring hardship.

Fellow-Representatives, are you willing to fasten perpetually upon our people the policy of the English with reference to a gold standard and the issuing of bonds? You have the power, why not pass a law now to prevent the issuing of any bonds at all? Why talk about the beneficent act you propose to pass, when you have it in your power to prevent the President and the Secretary of the Treasury from issuing bonds at all, from making any private or secret contracts with any bond syndicate, or involving this country in further obligations on account of bonds, principal or interest? Why not sweep from the statute books all power to make contracts with anybody, anyway, for the issuance of any bonds? I repeat, you have the power. Why not use it for the people? Upon this side of the House the vast majority of us will

join in any such effort; and the American people will say to us "Well done" far more heartily than they will say it to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON] for the vote he seems so willing to cast in favor of the pending measure.

Mr. DOVENER. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I will yield for a question.

Mr. DOVENER. I wish to ask if you maintained the same financial views——

Mr. DE ARMOND. Please go on with your question, my time is slipping away.

Mr. DOVENER. You entertained these same views in 1892, I suppose?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I did.

Mr. DOVENER. And you were then sent to Congress from your district by about 3,000 majority?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes.

Mr. DOVENER. Then there seems to have been another flood which passed over your district. You got here this time, I believe, by a majority of 92?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes, exactly 92; but that is quite sufficient to put me here with you, who, judging from the exhibition you are making of yourself, seem to have had too much.

Mr. DOVENER. Your people seem to have passed on your views on that question again.

Mr. DE ARMOND. A gentleman who has no more idea of the proprieties of debate and the decencies obtaining among gentlemen than to interrupt another who has the floor upon a grave and important question with a suggestion no weightier than yours, certainly got here by too many votes if he got here by 1. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Mr. Speaker, we have presented to us to-night for our consideration a plain business proposition, and as the representatives of the people it strikes me that we should debate this matter as a business proposition, entirely free from political considerations, entirely free from President making, but as a practical question to be solved by the application of common-sense ideas. What are the questions we are considering to-night? First, we are not considering a proposition which is the initiative of issuing bonds to pay the general expenses of our Government. Much of the debate has proceeded along that line. Gentlemen have expressed their displeasure at the idea of selling bonds, and they have treated this as a measure to sell bonds to provide general revenue for our Government. Some Republicans have discouraged the idea, and have talked to us as though the idea of authorizing the sale of a single bond was anti-Republican.

Now, what are we doing? Suppose we do nothing, how shall we stand? We have a gold reserve of $100,000,000, the creation of Republican legislation pure and simple, fought by the entire strength of the Democratic party in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate. We have upon the statute books of the United States a statute providing for the issuance and sale of bonds—a thirty-year bond at 4 per cent and a ten-year bond at 5 per cent—and that statute is of Republican origin, passed by a Republican Congress, and if we do nothing a Democratic Administration will proceed to execute Republican legislation by selling a 4 per cent or a 5 per cent bond and borrowing an unlimited amount of money to replenish a fund created by a Republican Congress.

Is there anybody upon this floor who dare stand up here and say to-day that he is in favor of the gold reserve and yet opposed to maintaining it? How do we expect to maintain the gold reserve unless the Secretary of the Treasury has power to do so, and how do we expect to maintain the credit of this country unless we confer upon the Secretary of the Treasury or the President of the United States ample authority to make use of all the powers of our country to maintain that credit and to say if we have not gold or silver or money to meet our obligations, that he will make use of the credit of our country the same as an individual would if he had no money? Dare anybody introduce a bill into this House to repeal the statute of 1875, which provides for the sale of bonds to keep intact the gold reserve? If so, let him stand up and have the hardihood to do so, and then to report to his constituents his action and see what the verdict will be.

The gentleman who last addressed the House [Mr. DE ARMOND] spoke tauntingly to the Republican party of its duty to wipe out this legislation providing for the sale of bonds. I have a poor memory, but poor as it is, I recollect when gentlemen upon the other side of this House had more than 100 majority for two sessions of Congress, and during most of that time their Executive was disposing of bonds under this law to keep intact the gold reserve, and not one of their number introduced a bill to repeal that statute.

Why do you taunt the Republicans upon this side when you dared not, when you had an overwhelming majority in Congress, to introduce a bill to repeal the statute which provides for the sale of bonds? Dare any man, Republican or Democrat, introduce a bill to repeal that statute? If not, then where do we stand? Dare any man stand up here, Democrat or Republican, and say he is in favor of wiping out the gold reserve? I take it for granted if any one thing is settled in this Congress it is that the greenback shall stay; that it shall not be wiped out or canceled; that it shall remain as a part of the currency of our country. If it does remain as a part of the currency of our country, dare any Representative in this body introduce a bill to wipe out the gold reserve which stands back of that greenback? If not, then we are confronted with this question: How shall we maintain that gold reserve at the least expense to this country? Shall it be by the sale of a 4 or 5 per cent bond or by the sale of a 3 per cent bond? I take it for granted that the Republicans of this House will unitedly stand in favor of keeping intact the gold reserve of $100,000,000 and will confer on the Secretary of the Treasury ample power to protect that in some manner. If not, there is no use of having a gold reserve.

We are not here to consider the question whether we will establish this gold reserve. It is established. We are not here to consider the original question of whether we will issue bonds to maintain it. That was done years ago, and I remember that the people of this country upon three several occasions have ratified the action of this House and of Congress in doing just what they did do. I remember in my great State of Ohio how in 1875 the Republican party met the Democratic party everywhere upon the stump, the Democrats maintaining that we could not resume specie payments in 1879, ridiculing the idea, and saying that $100,000,000 of a gold reserve would be wiped away as a cyclone would wipe away a pile of dry leaves. They said, "If you will establish a fund of $500,000,000, there will be some sense in it, but $100,000,000 is nonsense." I remember how in our State we fought it out with that party on two occasions, in 1875 and in 1877, and the Republican party was victorious.

The Republicans, aye, the people of this country, have ratified the action of the Republican party establishing the gold reserve and in the passage of a bill which provided for the sale of bonds. That bill was passed in a time of profound peace, to authorize the sale of bonds at 4 or 5 per cent. Now a Republican House comes here and proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell bonds at 3 per cent, and we are confronted with the statement that we are outraging the people by authorizing the sale of a bond, and we are told that the people will do so and so, that the people will respond to our action by their verdict.

We must remember that the people are calmly seated at home considering this question in the light of their own firesides. We must remember that the judgment of the people will be made up upon the actual facts and not according to the excitements of the moment to-night. The people's judgment is formed not from the crest of the topmost wave, nor from the lowest depths between the waves, but from the level of the great ocean of calm thought. They will approve our action when we do that which is wise in maintaining the credit and honor of our country. If we authorize the sale of a bond for 3 per cent, does anybody suppose that the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury would dare to advertise a 4 per cent bond?

Do any men fear, as expressed here by some Republicans and Democrats alike, that the Secretary of the Treasury, if this bill passes, will retire all the greenbacks? Think but a moment of what you talk about. Do you suppose any Secretary of the Treasury dare risk his own reputation, dare risk the safety of his own party, by piling up a surplus in the Treasury in the form of greenbacks and then issue these exchequer certificates and sell them on interest? Do you suppose anybody dare do that? But the very bill itself provides for the sale of bonds only to protect the gold reserve and that which is equivalent to it.

Do you suppose any Secretary of the Treasury dare do more than that? We must confer ample authority on the Secretary of the Treasury, and then hold him to a strict responsibility for his action. Give him no power, and when a wave strikes us we go to pieces. Give him ample power and hold him responsible, and then we will learn, as we have learned in the past, that the business of our country is secure. Give him power to sell these bonds at 3 per cent, and he dare not undertake to sell a bond at a rate above that until he has failed to sell 3 per cent bonds; nor dare he sell a bond when the gold reserve is intact.

No Secretary dare risk the honor and safety of his party by undertaking to sell a million dollars in bonds when the gold reserve is intact. No Secretary of the Treasury dare undertake to hoard greenbacks and sell certificates or bonds when the greenbacks are there ready to be paid out. There is no danger in that respect. There would be no hoarding of greenbacks nor selling of bonds except such as the exigency might require. What we propose to do to-night is to authorize the issue and sale of 3 per cent bonds at a lower rate and for a shorter time than the Republicans authorized the issue and sale of bonds in 1875.

Does anybody suppose that the people will not ratify the action of Congress in that direction? If we save anything in the shape

of interest and the length of time, do you suppose they will not ratify our action? The people will not stand by patiently and see us authorize the sale of bonds to bring ruin on the Treasury. This bill carefully excludes that idea. Certificates are only to be sold to bridge over the temporary necessities of the Treasury. Gentlemen over here are greatly afraid that what we are doing in this respect will be wrong.

Well, now, gentlemen on the other side, you need have no fear. If you have got this world of money in the Treasury, $77,000,000, that you talk of, with your own Executive for the next year and three or four months, you need not be afraid that any of these exchequer certificates will be sold. You tell us that there is plenty of money there. If so, there is no danger of the sale of certificates. Your Secretary of the Treasury will not sell them, and I assert, with history before us, that a Republican Secretary of the Treasury will not do it. Then where is there any danger? What we want to do is to provide ample power in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury to keep intact the gold reserve, to keep afloat the greenback, and then provide revenue from custom-house collections, as our Democratic friends have declared we should provide to pay the running expenses of this Government, and come back to where we stood from 1879 down to 1893, when no person presented a greenback for redemption in gold, when the credit of our Government was intact, and when all countries recognized the credit of this Government as being first class.

Now, let me say to you, do not undertake to bring politics and partisan feeling into a matter like this; for while we are discussing these matters we may be allowing the interests of our country to suffer, and the interests of our country ought to be cared for outside of politics and President making. I care nothing who shall be President, only so that he is a Republican, for I dare trust any Republican in that direction. [Laughter and applause.] Let us leave politics outside and look at this matter on business principles and as business men, and not do that which is destructive to the interests of our country. We may be doing that by refusing to confer upon the Secretary of the Treasury such power.

We may be doing that which is absolutely ruinous to us. We may be planting seed which in some far-off harvest year will be filled with ruin to our country. We must remember that in the moral, the political, and the financial world there is a seedtime and a harvest, as there is in the physical world. We go forth in the physical world and scatter seed, and we know when we are to expect to reap the golden harvest; but in the moral, the political, and the financial world we know that while a man may go forth and scatter the seed, nobody but God alone knows what the harvest will be. Let us plant to the safety and the honor of our country, and not to its dishonor.

Let us provide the means for protecting the safety, the honor of our country, and then trust to the people, where we dare trust, for the people finally are always right. [Loud applause.]

[Mr. TARSNEY withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, representing a district almost entirely agricultural, living in a city with almost 15,000 laboring men, I have looked at this bill and analyzed it from the standpoint of my relations to my own district as a part of our common country; and studiously investigating the bill in all of its provisions I have reached these conclusions as to what it accomplishes: In the first place, the bill does not require the issuance of bonds; second, it reduces the rate of interest if the issuance of bonds is made necessary at any time; third, it leaves the bonds with our own people and avoids putting us in the power of foreigners, and at great expense to the country; fourth, it does not retire the greenbacks, but does put it in the power of the Government to put the greenbacks out of the hands of Wall street and the raiders on the Government credit; fifth, it reproves the present Administration for selling bonds under the guise of keeping intact the coin reserve and in fact using the proceeds of the bonds to pay current expenses. It sets apart the proceeds of the bonds to protect the coin reserve and clothes the Treasury with power to secure ample funds for Government expenses; sixth, if the Executive desires to vault and tie up the greenbacks, he can do so now, under the act of 1878, and at great expense to the people of the country; seventh, and in conclusion, it reduces the rates of interest. It insures ample funds for Government expenses. It insures us against any depreciation of any of our money. It averts a financial crash and will secure stability for labor and capital. This bill, added to the one passed on yesterday, will secure funds for all purposes, will avert the issuance of bonds, and end the temptation to speculate on any of the people's money.

I say to my Republican associates, I appeal to them, to let the great interests of this country, in every part of it, know and feel sure that when the Republican party steps into power, it comes like a young athlete, strong and ready to grapple with the existing troubles and to devote itself fearlessly under all circumstances to the welfare of all our people. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal objections to the passage of this bill is that, in effect, it will retire the legal-tender notes of the United States from circulation.

The bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall use the proceeds arising from the sale of the bonds therein authorized for the redemption of the United States legal-tender notes, "and for no other purpose."

The chairman of the committee that framed this bill has interpreted the meaning of the words "for no other purpose." He says that the intention of the committee was to prevent the Administration from using the legal-tender notes after they are redeemed for the ordinary expenses of the Government, that the account of the redemption fund must be kept separate from the expense account of the Government, and that the redemption fund can not be used to meet deficiencies in the revenue.

How, then, under this bill, can the greenbacks, after they are once redeemed by the Treasury, again be put in circulation? It is generally conceded by those who have spoken in favor of the passage of this bill that it can only be done by purchasing outstanding bonds of the Government.

Even if that policy were carried out it would be a queer spectacle to see the Government sell bonds for redemption of greenbacks and then buy other unmatured bonds at a premium in order to again put the redeemed money in circulation.

But the policy of buying bonds in order to put in circulation the redeemed legal-tender notes would never be carried out. We know the attitude of the present Administration upon this subject. Secretary Carlisle, in his speech at the Boston banquet in November last, declared emphatically that the policy of the Government should be to retire all the outstanding legal-tender notes. That declaration foreshadowed the message of the President, which was read in this House three weeks ago, and which reiterated the same financial policy. In view of these declarations, how can it be seriously contended that, at least during the present Administration, a single bond will be purchased by the redeemed greenbacks in order to again put them in circulation?

After a policy is once adopted by the Treasury Department we know how strenuously it would be urged that a change of policy would unsettle existing conditions and weaken confidence.

There can be no evading the conclusion that if this bill becomes a law there will be locked in the vaults of the Treasury every legal-tender note that is redeemed by the Government.

Do you fully comprehend what is meant by retiring the greenbacks? The drain on the gold in the Treasury is for foreign shipment. This gold can only be obtained by redeeming legal-tender notes. By the redemption of legal-tender notes we lose not only the gold currency so withdrawn for foreign shipment, but we lose also from circulation the legal-tender notes so redeemed and locked up in the vaults of the Treasury. This double system of retiring our circulating medium would, if a large quantity of legal-tender notes were redeemed, produce such a rapid contraction of the currency as would produce a panic far more disastrous than the panic of 1893. Thus by this bill, instead of averting a panic, you are actually creating one.

The advocates of this measure say that, as the Secretary of the Treasury is already vested with the power to issue bonds to maintain the gold reserve, this bill is only intended to authorize a better bond. Better in what? It is answered, in making them short-time obligations and decreasing the rate of interest. Let us examine these contentions for a moment.

It is a recognized financial truth that the longer time a bond has to run the better price it will bring in the market. If the state of the market were such that a thirty-year 3 per cent bond would sell at par, it would be difficult, indeed, for a five-year 4 per cent bond to sell at any premium whatever.

So it is questionable, even if it were necessary to issue bonds, whether they should be short-time obligations.

It is also a well-known fact in financial circles that the rate of interest named in a Government bond is practically immaterial. If money in the market for United States Government bonds is worth only 3 per cent, then the amount which will be bid for a bond bearing a higher rate of interest will be such a premium as will make it a 3 per cent investment. It therefore appears that the advantages claimed for the bonds authorized by this measure are practically no advantages at all.

It seems remarkable to me that anyone should advocate the retirement of noninterest-bearing obligations by the substitution of interest-bearing bonds.

There are now in existence about $500,000,000 in United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, and United States Treasury notes issued under the Sherman Act. The Government is now saving annually at least 3 per cent on that amount, namely $15,000,000, by keeping the notes outstanding. To substitute bonds for these notes would require the payment of at least that much per annum besides contracting the currency to an alarming degree. The cost of keeping up the gold reserve, even if it were wise to do so, would not exceed one-third of that amount.

The people of the United States are opposed to the issuance of any bonds in times of peace. No act of any Administration has

ever been more universally condemned than that of the present Administration in issuing bonds, and yet by the passage of this bill we are giving to President Cleveland a vote of confidence.

The difficulty with the situation is not that we have too many legal-tender notes in circulation, but that the base upon which we have built our monetary system is too small to support the superstructure.

The money of ultimate redemption in most of the countries of the world is gold alone. The demands that are consequently made upon that metal are enormous indeed. The nations are almost in a death struggle among themselves over the small quantity of gold in existence. The United States, in order to maintainher gold reserve, has been issuing bonds and buying gold therewith in Europe. The Bank of England, by high rates of exchange, has been trying to prevent the exportation of gold. Austria has been grabbing for gold in order to resume specie payments on that basis. Germany has been guarding with vigilance her gold reserve. France, by her system of paying half in gold and half in silver, prevents the withdrawal of gold from her Treasury. It has recently been estimated that Russia, for war purposes, has accumulated in her treasury nearly $1,000,000,000 in gold. The accumulation of this vast sum by Russia is practically a withdrawal of it from circulation in the world. Russia is on an inconvertible paper-money basis, and hence needs little or none of it for circulation.

Every effort that each nation makes to acquire or retain gold acts as an increased demand for gold, and consequently increases the value thereof.

As gold is the unit or measure of value, its increase in value can only be ascertained in its increased purchasing power, and that can only be ascertained in the decline of the price of everything that gold will buy. It is this increased value of gold that has made all products and other property decline in price.

The only way to relieve the strain on gold and prevent the continual increase in its value is by adding to our monetary system another primary money which will bear its share of the burdens of commerce and credit and enlarge the base upon which all credit money is founded. Nature has designed only one other metal for that purpose by giving it qualities of indestructibility and density, together with limitation of quantity, and that is silver.

The sooner the Government realizes that it must restore silver to its time-honored position as standard money the sooner it will ascertain the true cause of its financial difficulties and the true road to national prosperity and wealth.

These organized raids that are being made upon the Treasury can all be stopped by the Government offering to redeem its notes one-half in gold and one-half in silver, as does France. There is no danger that a single legal-tender note or silver dollar will go to a discount by such action.

It is estimated that there are over $20,000,000,000 of debts owing in the United States, and that more than half of the same, besides taxes, are payable in lawful money. The minute that any legal-tender money should go to a discount of even one-half of 1 per cent, that minute all the persons owing obligations payable in lawful money would create an enormous demand for the same, and that very demand would immediately restore its value. Financiers would foresee the effect of such a demand and hence no discount would occur.

By this action the gold would remain in the Treasury and there would be no necessity for the issuance of interest-bearing obligations or of the passage of this measure.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, under the rule, I move that the House do now adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Pending the motion to adjourn, by unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MCCORMICK, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. TALBERT, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. BRUMM, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. SAUERHERING, until January 8, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. LOCKHART, for ten days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. RANEY, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. MORSE, for one week, on account of important business.

The motion of Mr. HENDERSON was agreed to; and accordingly (at 10 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLIS (by request): A bill (H. R. 2905) limiting the liability of stockholders of corporations in certain cases—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 2906) to establish a university of the United States—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2907) allowing trusses to certain pensioners—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2908) supplemental to an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2909) to extend the benefits of the pension laws to State militiamen and to the widows, children, and dependent relatives of deceased State militiamen who rendered service to the United States during the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SETTLE: A bill (H. R. 2910) to provide for the erection of a monument to Gen. Nathanael Greene on the battlefield of Guilford Court-House—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HATCH: A bill (H. R. 2911) to provide for a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Logansport, in the State of Indiana—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STRODE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 2912) granting to the Atchison and Nebraska Railroad Company and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, its lessee in perpetuity, the right of way over a part of Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian Reservation in the States of Kansas and Nebraska—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 2913) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 2914) directing the coinage of the silver bullion held in the Treasury, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 2915) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 2916) to facilitate the collecting of revenue, to provide for the construction and equipment of sampling works for the sampling and assaying of imported silver ores and other ores containing lead, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 2917) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay, from their own funds, for certain legal services rendered the "Old Settlers," or Western Cherokee Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUCK: A bill (H. R. 2918) amending an act of January 29, 1887, relative to soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 2919) providing for the adjustment and payment of the accounts of laborers and mechanics arising under the eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 2920) to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 2921) to repeal section 6 of an act entitled "An act to define the duties of pension agents, to prescribe the manner of paying pensions, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1870, and now being section 4784, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: A bill (H. R. 2987) for the erection of a monument to the late Timothy Green Benham, at Richmond, Staten Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 2988) to amend section 5191 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT: A joint resolution (H. Res. 57) authorizing the President of the United States to arrange a conference between the United States and nations possessing territory on the American Continent for the settlement of boundary disputes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A resolution to add to the standing committees of the House a committee on public health—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska: A memorial and joint resolution passed by the legislature of the State of Nebraska, praying for the pensioning of Union soldiers confined in so-called rebel prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2922) to correct the military record of G. W. Shirey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (by request): A bill (H. R. 2923) for the relief of John L. Broome—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 2924) for the relief of John Regan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2925) for the relief of Alfred M. Burnham, of Lynn, Mass.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 2926) for the relief of Lydia A. Newby, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2927) for the relief of David Baudy, late a private in Company L, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2928) for the relief of R. H. Sively, late first lieutenant Company G, Fifth Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2929) granting a pension to Lucinda B. Hull, widow of James E. Darrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2930) for the relief of Jennie E. Jones—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 2931) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. M. G. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 2932) for the relief of E. B. Bailey—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 2933) for the relief of the estate of William Campbell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER (by request): A bill (H. R. 2934) to increase the pension of Martha R. Hitchcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 2935) to extend letters patent No. 183716, for improvements in water-closets, granted October 24, 1876, to William Smith—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2936) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Horace J. Rowell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2937) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Cresse, late private Company A, Seventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteers, to $20 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2938) for the relief of Henry Lane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 2939) for the relief of John E. Welch, a citizen of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2940) for the relief of James and Emma S. Cameron for occupation and damages to property and for fuel taken and used by the United States Army during the war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 2941) granting increase of pension to Alfred P. Buss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2942) for the relief of heirs of Erskine S. Allin and the United States Regulation Firearms Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 2943) for the relief of John L. Rhea, executor of Samuel Rhea, deceased, and John Anderson, administrator of Joseph R. Anderson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2944) for the relief of William B. Caldwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2945) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Loudon, Loudon County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 2946) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of John Jenkins, late of Company B, Seventy-third Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2947) increasing the pension of Daniel D. Jennings, late of Company C, Sixty-fifth Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2948) increasing the pension of Thomas M. Chill, late private of Black Hawk war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2949) appropriating money to pay the claim of George W. McCray for improving Hanna street adjacent to the United States arsenal at Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2950) appropriating money to pay the claim of the Western Paving and Supply Company for paving streets adjacent to the post-office and court-house of the United States at Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 2951) for the relief of John F. Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2952) for the relief of J. M. Woolf—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2953) for the relief of John N. Dorr, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2954) for the relief of William H. Ogilvie—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2955) for the relief of J. C. Shelby—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2956) for the relief of William A. Kinsolving—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULING: A bill (H. R. 2957) for the relief of J. B. Johnson, of Paintcreek, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 2958) granting an increase of pension to Bushrod W. Musselman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 2959) granting a back pension to Capt. John M. Lindsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2960) to pension Oscar Dunham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 2961) for the relief of Angus McVigor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 2962) granting a pension to Carrie L. Greig, widow of Theodore W. Greig, brevet major of volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 2963) to increase the pension of George W. D. Wade—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 2964) to remove the charge of desertion against John Farrell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 2965) for the relief of John A. Fairfax, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 2966) for the relief of John Rhodes and wife—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2967) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Sebastian Beckert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2968) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Craig—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: A bill (H. R. 2969) to grant a pension to Mrs. Lucy A. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2970) for the relief of the Enterprise Manufacturing Company, of Akron, Ohio—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 2971) directing the Quartermaster-General to settle with the McMinnville and Manchester Railroad Company, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 2972) to pay John T. Ross the difference between his salary as assistant postmaster of the House of Representatives from the 24th day of March to the 2d day of December, 1895—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SORG: A bill (H. R. 2973) to relieve C. W. McGehen from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 2974) to correct the military record of Corydon Winkler, late private Eighth Company, First Battalion First Ohio Sharpshooters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STAHLE: A bill (H. R. 2975) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to place the children of Zenas Macomber, a Revolutionary soldier, on the pension list, namely, Hannah Hess, Nancy Hawkins, and John Macomber—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STROWD of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 2976) for the relief of the estate of Vasti Smith, deceased, of Wake County, N. C.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2977) for the relief of the estate of Vasti Smith, deceased, of Wake County, N. C.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2978) for the relief of Thomas R. Debnam, of Raleigh, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2979) for the relief of Thomas R. Debnam, of Raleigh, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2980) for the relief of Thomas R. Debnam, of Raleigh, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2981) for the relief of W. Dallas Haywood, of Raleigh, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAFT (by request): A bill (H. R. 2982) for the purpose of amending the military record of Cyrenus P. Bratt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 2983) for the relief of Thomas J. Kelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 2984) to place Francis A. Field, late captain Eleventh United States Infantry, on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 2985) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel J. Essex—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2986) to grant relief to Clifton McAllister—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: A bill (H. R. 2989) for the relief of the next of kin of Christian Reimers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2990) to authorize the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion as to William Rodamer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2991) for the relief of Tobias E. Lamb—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2992) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to remove the charge of desertion as to Thomas Dunn—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 2993) for the relief of John Kircher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2994) granting a pension to Martha M. Kersey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2995) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Willoughby, of Washington, Kans., and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2996) granting a pension to Mrs. M. C. Gurney, of Palmer, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2997) for the relief of George W. Warren, of Vermillion, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2998) for the relief of Margaret Theirer, widow of Jacob Theirer—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 2999) for the relief of Willis Benfield—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 3000) for the relief of George Isenstein—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A bill (H. R. 3001) granting a pension to Cynthia A. Lapham, widow of William B. Lapham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3002) to remove the charge of desertion against Louis B. Weymouth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3003) for the relief of Walter R. Gray—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3004) for the relief of Edwin O. Sargent—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 3005) for the relief of Nicholas Ganster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 3006) granting a pension to Mrs. Ann P. Slack, widow of the late Brig. Gen. James R. Slack, United States Volunteers, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3007) granting an increase of pension to Michael Pettis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3008) granting a pension to Martha M. Clawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: Petition of W. W. Smith, Samuel McAdams, and others, citizens of Illinois, favoring the payment of French spoliation claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petition of Clarence L. Smith and 253 other citizens of West Virginia, praying that the navigation of the Monongahela River be made free—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Memorial and evidence to support House bill for the relief of James and Emma S. Cameron—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, preamble and resolutions of the Logan (Ohio) Bushnell Club, upholding the Monroe doctrine, extending sympathy to Cuban patriots, and deprecating the failure of the current Administration to apply the principles of the Monroe doctrine to Cuba and other struggling peoples—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: Petition of W. S. Davis, G. E. Conrad, Fred. Miller, John D. Landis, and a large number of other honorably discharged soldiers and sailors of Johnstown, Pa., asking for an amendment of the act of June 27, 1890, reducing the limit of service from ninety days to sixty and thirty days—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEM: Papers to accompany bill for relief of William Cromie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension Emily Grove—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of George W. D. Wade, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of the bill to pension M. D. Box—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: Two petitions of citizens of Huntingdon County, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill No. 5246 of the Fifty-third Congress, to restrict immigration, and known as the W. A. Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McEWAN: Resolutions asking relief for Armenians and Kurds—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOODY: Resolution of citizens of Haverhill, Mass., approving the action of the United States Government in demanding of Turkey protection of the life and interests of American residents in that Empire, and urging the establishment of United States consulates in the Armenian centers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUSK: Petition for increase of pension for Mrs. Jane Dulaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SORG: Papers to accompany bill for relief of C. W. McGeehan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT: Resolutions adopted by the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, approving the course of the President as expressed in his message and of Congress on the Venezuelan question—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorandum in regard to the military record of Cyrenus P. Bratt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of David Whisler and 50 others, of North Manchester, Ind., for tariff on draft horses—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TYLER: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Jane Elizabeth Owen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Ohio: Papers relating to the claim of Francis A. Field, late captain Eleventh United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *December 28, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday was read and approved.

BONDS AND CERTIFICATES OF INDEBTEDNESS.

The House, under the order adopted yesterday, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say to the House that in the allotment of time thus far those in opposition to the bill have consumed so much that of their time there is remaining one hour, and to the other side there remain two hours; but the Chair thinks there has been some misapprehension with regard to it, and perhaps, if there is no objection on the part of the House, a fair division of the time would be an hour and forty minutes in favor of the bill, and the remainder to the other side, if that is satisfactory. The Chair would be very glad if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] would assume control of the time in opposition, as the Chair understands some arrangements have been made of that sort. Or if the gentleman from Georgia will make some indication to the Chair, the Chair will give recognition accordingly. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. DALZELL. I yield ten minutes to my colleague [Mr. BROSIUS].

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Speaker, our present situation is full of difficulty. The Treasury of the United States is in distress. The white flag is out. This Congress can not afford to pass by on the other side like the priest and Levite. We must render help, and do it speedily. It doesn't matter what misadventure caused the dilemma or by what route we arrived in the Dismal Swamp of our distress. It is our plain duty to get out of it as speedily as possible. Such a situation must make every member of this House sensible of the claims his country has upon him to assist—at least not to hinder—legislation calculated to afford relief.

Two propositions relating to the measure before the House seem to me to be fundamental and indisputable. We must maintain our gold reserve and we must provide the means of meeting the current expenses of the Government. On these two propositions there can be no controversy on this floor. We only arrive on the field of contention when we come to consider the mode of carrying out these propositions. In respect to the gold reserve, it may be said that the situation of the Treasury of the United States under our system is singularly unique. I think it is the only place where gold redemption is absolutely compulsory without qualification or limitation. It is the only custodian of gold on the face of the earth, that I know of, which is without the means of resisting incursions from foreign claimants or domestic speculators or hoarders. Its necessities compel it to surrender its gold on demand without means of replenishing the supply. As the stock diminishes the rush increases to get what remains, for a shrinkage in the reserve below what we are educated to regard as the apprehensive limit, namely, $100,000,000, clouds the credit of the notes that rest upon it and causes doubt and distrust in the public mind.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to every reflecting mind that we must replenish the gold reserve or suspend gold payments. There are but two ways known to any honest Government of obtaining gold or any other form of money—namely, by some form of taxation or by employing the credit of the Government to obtain money by borrowing. We have already availed ourselves of the former—the usual and ordinary method of obtaining revenue by the passage of the emergency revenue measure the other day; and, if our expectations of the success of that measure are not disappointed, it may be that we will not be required to have recourse to any considerable extent to any other measure; for it is the deliberate conviction of a large majority of this House and of the people of the United States whom we represent that the deficiency in the revenue of the Government is the chief sinner in the comedy of errors which has brought this country to its present unhappy condition. It is our conviction that the revenue deficit and the gold depletion are twin mischiefs. More than that, they are Siamese twins. One will live as long as the other survives. Kill the deficit, and gold depletion will instantly expire. [Applause.]

Nor is this the opinion of Republicans alone. Distinguished Democratic organs have declared the same view. The New York World of November 23 last said editorially:

The simple truth is that the gold reserve runs down as often as it is replenished because the revenues of the Government are not equal to its expenditures. The Treasury is paying out more than it receives, and is forced to make good the deficiency by borrowing. That is the fundamental fact in the case. The only permanent remedy is to be found in making the revenues equal to the demands upon the Treasury.

On December 4 the same paper said editorially:

There remains, however, the experience of fifteen years to suggest that if revenues were adequate the gold reserve would take care of itself. From 1879 to 1892 it did so.

And on December 7 it said:

The World has shown from the President's own figures that the repeated depletions of the gold reserve were compelled by a lack of adequate revenue; that more than a hundred millions of the gold got by the sale of bonds was used in paying current expenses, and that if the bonds had not been sold the Government would not have had money enough to meet its bills. We add now that the Secretary of the Treasury has himself borne witness to all this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just at this point it occurs to me to allude to a singular omission in the discussion the other day on the emergency revenue measure. We could not fail to note that none of the debaters appealed to the lamp of experience; no one turned on the light of history to illumine our pathway. This was a distinct loss to the discussion, for in this instance that light possesses a very high illuminating power. The history of deficits in the United States is very interesting and exceedingly instructive. I can not now allude to it with a view of forming the conviction which impelled the passage of the act the other day, though I may refer to it for the purpose of increasing the satisfaction with which we contemplate that action.

This is the third notable revenue deficit in this country in time of peace, and every one of them was produced by the same cause—that is, the ill-advised reduction of customs duties. And, singularly enough, every one of them was followed by similar consequences in one or another degree, and in every instance the situation was relieved by the enactment of a tariff bill. Let us look for a moment at the history of our revenue deficits.

Under the operation of the compromise tariff act of 1833, which provided for the scaling down of import duties, there was such falling off of revenue that by 1840 the Treasury was empty. A deficit existed for the first time in our history in time of peace, and it brought financial disaster, as it always does. To meet the difficulty a special session of Congress was convened in June, 1841, and President Tyler, in his message, said that by March 4, 1842, there would be a deficit of $11,406,132, and a further deficit by September, 1842, of $4,845,000. In his message of December, 1841, he reported a still further shortage, and declared that these accumulated deficits were the results of the great reduction of import duties by the legislation of 1833.

In 1842 an act was passed entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government." That was the tariff act of 1842. Under this act revenues revived. In a short time a surplus reappeared and financial troubles were conspicuous by their absence until the next revenue deficit occurred, which was in Buchanan's Administration. From 1843 to 1857 the revenue was adequate to meet expenditures, but in the latter year an act was passed so reducing the duties on imports that the revenue became totally inadequate to meet current expenses, and the second deficit in our history in time of peace occurred and continued increasing until the beginning of Lincoln's Administration. The growth of this deficit is an interesting study. The student of American finance will find by perusing the records of that Administration that on July 1, 1857, the public debt, less cash in the Treasury, was $11,350,270. On July 1, 1860, it was $61,140,497, showing a deficit of $50,000,000 in three years. By the time Lincoln was inaugurated the debt reached $90,000,000, and the deficit amounted to $70,000,000. Now, what was the condition of the country at that time in respect to finances and business? President Buchanan, in his annual message to Congress December 8, 1857, said:

We have possessed all the elements of national wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country, in its monetary interests, is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

In the same message, after describing the distress and want to which the people had been reduced, President Buchanan enlarged upon the inability of the people to purchase manufactured articles for lack of means, and that goods therefore ceased to be produced. The decay of our own industries so lessened the people's means of purchasing imported goods that imports fell off to such an extent that the revenue declined so that it was inadequate to meet the necessary expenses of the Government. To supply this deficiency Congress, by act of December 23, 1857, authorized the issue of $20,000,000 of Treasury notes. This proving inadequate, in June, 1858, a loan of $20,000,000 was authorized to meet the expenditures of the Government.

The conditions progressed from bad to worse until March 3, 1859, when the situation was so appalling that the President issued a special message to Congress, appealing in tones of touching pathos to preserve the credit of the country.

The Treasury was bankrupt, the credit of the nation was reduced to its lowest terms, and no provision was made for the necessary expenses of the Government.

Thus—

Says the message—

the country, which is full of resources, will be dishonored before the world, and the American people, who are a debt-paying people, will be disgraced by the omission on our part to do our duty.

This statement of the character of our distresses and the condition of our counrty in the Administration of James Buchanan could be truthfully applied to the Administration of Grover Cleveland without change save that of date. But the conditions of the country in the two periods are not more identical than are the causes which produced them.

Under this Administration another onslaught was made upon customs duties, and history has repeated itself. The deficit has already reached the alarming sum of $133,000,000, with a prospect of continuance.

But we have not relied wholly on the revenue measure already enacted. We propose a recourse to other means of relieving the difficulty. Someone says we already have the power to borrow money. Yes, but we want the power to borrow in a suitable fashion, conformably to the interests of the people. I do not think it a suitable way to borrow money to farm out the Treasury of the United States to European gold jockeys. It is not a suitable way, in my judgment, to employ the sleuthhounds of a joint foreign and American syndicate to hunt down gold to replenish our reserves. There is one suitable means, and that is to borrow what we need from our own people at the lowest rate obtainable. The popular character of this measure is one of its most attractive features. The people of the United States, in my judgment, ought to have the first opportunity to take every obligation of this Government in the negotiation of loans. If our people held to-day all of our indebtedness I doubt if the country would be in the trough of the financial sea as we are to-day. The interest that we are compelled to pay to the holders of our bonds abroad constitutes a foreign liability which is a burden upon the people whenever there is an adverse balance of trade that we must meet whether our gold is in the vaults of the Treasury of the United States or in those of the banks. France, with her fabulous debt of $4,000,000,000, finds no inconvenience in handling that debt, because it is owned and held by her own people.

So that if there was nothing else in this measure to commend it, the fact that it secured two distinct advantages not possessed by the present law—the low rate of interest and the giving to our own people the right to hold this indebtedness—pleads, it seems to me, trumpet-tongued in favor of the pending measure.

I have heard some apprehension expressed that this bill would operate to contract the currency by retaining the greenbacks in the Treasury. This does not seem to me a practical difficulty. I am quite willing that a limited amount of our greenback currency should be retained in the Treasury temporarily if it will afford relief in the present situation. Any contraction of the currency arising therefrom would be immediately supplied by the national banks, and when the relief measures have done their work and our financial ship is righted the accumulated greenbacks could be used in payment of any Government indebtedness, and they would then be as incapable of harm as they were for fifteen years after the resumption of specie payment.

It is obvious to everyone that to go on borrowing gold to meet an endless drain would be as vain a task as that of the daughters of Danaus, doomed to draw water from a well and pour it eternally into a perforated cask. Such a process of redeeming notes

that are never redeemed is not consonant with reason, and if there was to be no end to it it would be necessary to dispose of the greenbacks at once by redemption and cancellation and thus kill what has been termed the auriferous tapeworm that wriggles back and forth between Wall street or London and the Treasury of the United States.

I am now, as I always have been, and as I declared on this floor in the debate on the bond bill in the Fifty-third Congress, opposed to the cancellation of the greenbacks, excepting in so far as it may be absolutely necessary to afford relief from present distress. The people of the United States will not consent that five hundred millions of noninterest-bearing shall be converted into an equal amount of interest-bearing debt.

The last section in this bill will hardly admit of anything being said in its favor, because it is so manifestly in the line of public interest and public economy. Every Government, I suppose, on the face of the earth has lodged with it the power, when exigencies arise, to replenish its funds by a temporary loan by certificates of indebtedness or consols or something of that character, and we would have conferred this authority long ago upon the Secretary of the Treasury if we had ever anticipated the need of such a recourse. But in the plenitude of our ready money we never anticipated the possibility of needing to resort to temporary means of meeting emergencies of this kind.

But now the situation is changed and new occasions bring new duties. Our calamities are now our teachers and admonish us of the wisdom of no longer neglecting in health the sanitary precautions that may serve us in sickness.

I see no other way to succor the distressed Treasury than by the measures proposed, and this Congress is pledged to afford relief. It holds a commission which commands this duty. It was summoned distinctly for this purpose. It was elected to guard the Republic against further injury, to restore duties improperly taken off, to reinstate the specific basis of duties, and save the many millions of revenue lost by undervaluation under the ad valorem system. This is the mandate of the people of the United States and it must be obeyed. It can not be disobeyed without dishonor. That we are surrounded with difficulties which obstruct us in our duty will not excuse us for omitting proper effort to acquit ourselves of the obligations laid upon us. That other branches of the Government may fail to suitably meet their responsibilities will not absolve us from the obligation to meet ours.

I do not doubt that the circumstances in which a divided Government has placed us may to some extent limit our obligations and relieve us from duties which under other circumstances would lay heavily upon us. Legislation clearly within the commission we hold, and, had we a united Government, would be as clearly within our duty, must be postponed for the present. The inutility of attempting what can not succeed will be our warrant for inaction when action could not avail. But measures which are obviously necessary, that are imperiously demanded to relieve necessities which are pressing with extreme urgency and which the Constitution requires shall originate in this House, must be considered and passed at the earliest day practicable. In other words, the necessities of the hour measure our duty.

Now, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no politics whatever in this measure. The motive of this legislation contains but two ingredients—patriotism and business. The President of the United States has appealed to this House for succor to a distressed Treasury. It does not matter, it seems to me, that he has blundered in the diagnosis of the case and recommends a wrong remedy. Let us give the patient the right one. The doctor who would withhold a suitable prescription from a suffering patient because a quack had recommended a wrong one would hardly be worthy of his profession. Neither is there any occasion to canvass and dispute about the delinquencies of the Democratic party and their relation to the distresses of the country. I admit that they are great, that they are colossal—monumental. But what has that to do with the question of our duty to the country in the exigency that confronts us? The surgeon in diagnosing a gunshot wound does not need to know whether the gun was discharged by accident or design; the treatment is the same in either case. There are some things I am sure we can not afford to do merely for a party advantage. We can not afford to harm the country to help the party. We must be patriots before we are partisans.

There is but one word to-day that can express the supreme and overruling inspiration of this hour, and that word is "patriotism." There is but one word that can denote the action which that overruling inspiration commands, and that word is "duty." If we are insensible to the one or disobedient to the other, we are sure to convict ourselves of recreancy to a great public duty, and we can not expect to escape the sentence of dishonor.

Let us, therefore, legislate up to date. Let us pass this measure and afford suitable relief as far as we can under the circumstances in which we are placed by the misfortune of a divided Government.

After we have done wnat we can to effect this purpose and fail by reason of difficulties we have not the power to overcome, our effort to perform will be accepted as performance, and we will be acquitted by the people of the United States, and the responsibility will be placed where it rightfully belongs.

When our supremacy in the Government is complete and our power unhindered by Executive obstruction, it will be our duty to repeal or materially modify that destructive piece of legislation from which the President withheld his signature because it was not bad enough to escape the imputation of "perfidy and dishonor," to reorganize our monetary system as rapidly as time and experience reveal defects until we have as perfect a financial system as the wisdom of man can devise, to formulate and maintain a foreign policy which shall be as broad-gauged as our nationality, with a firmness equal to our national self-respect, with a dignity commensurate with our preeminence among nations, and with a contempt for bluster, bravado, and jingoism as profound as our country is great. This salutary work in the fullness of time will be done, and wisely done, by that great party which enjoys the preeminence of never having betrayed a trust or broken a pledge or deceived the people or denied its master from the day it followed the leadership of the glorious old Pathfinder to honorable defeat, through all its years of devotion and toil and victory down to this auspicious hour, when the people, recovering the dominion of reason and rejudging the judgment of 1892, call it again into confidence and favor, place the laurel upon its brow, the reins of power in its hands, and bid it guide the Republic through wise government into the pathway that leads to the sweet pastures of prosperity and the still waters of peace and plenty. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

What has been said in the course of this debate in advocacy of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 does not seem to bear a very close relation to the subject of "bonds" and "revenue"; yet it may have a remote connection with it. As the free coinage of silver under existing conditions, by the United States alone, would lead directly to silver monometallism, I desire to submit for the consideration of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL] and others of his way of thinking who are interested in the inquiry, whether our money unit under the act of 1792 was based upon one or both metals, the results of a study of that subject from its historical side; with a review of the arguments of the fathers who laid the foundations of our monetary system and who did not favor the idea of silver monometallism. I could not, of course, do this in the time at my command, but it will answer the same purpose to extend my remarks under the rule, and I will avail myself of the privilege.

Whether the money unit contemplated by the coinage act of 1792 was based on both metals or on one only may not be of great practical importance to-day, yet as a link in the chain of our monetary history, and as a subject of historical research commanding no inconsiderable attention at this time, it has value enough to warrant a desire to be right in our conclusions concerning it. In the interest of historic truth, therefore, and for no other purpose, I desire to bring into distinct review the acts and the arguments of the fathers of that day who had most to do with the establishment of our monetary system relating to the vexed question of our money unit. The data which such a review will supply may be useful in guarding against error, and in aiding those who are pursuing the inquiry to arrive at conclusions upon which an honest mind can rest with satisfaction.

WHAT IS A "MONEY UNIT"?

It may be desirable at the outset to try to have an intelligent notion of the meaning of the expression "money unit," about which much may be said without making it clear; and, indeed, when we come to define it, the less we say the less we are likely to obscure it. Some of the difficulty would no doubt vanish if we avoided confounding the abstract and the concrete contents of the expression. A numerical unit is a pure abstraction. It is expressed by a figure. We manipulate figures without respect to commodities of any kind. We can say three times three are nine without considering the concrete denotement of the numbers. It may be one or more of anything you choose, as one dollar or one apple. A numerical unit is not a creature of the law, but of the mind. A single thing is one by nature and not by legal enactment. So we can not reach the legal contents of the expression "money unit" from the merely numerical side.

When we advance a step toward the reality and add to the numerical abstraction the word "dollar," we have a concrete unit. Every unit of measure or weight or value must be a concrete unit; a unit expressed by a determinate amount or quantity or weight of the thing to be measured or weighed or estimated, to be taken as a standard of comparison for other determinate amounts, quantities, or weight of like kind, and without which no kind of exchange but primitive barter could take place.

A money unit then contains this group of ideas, namely:

First. A numerical abstraction—a symbol for purposes of notation.

Second. A determinate weight of precious metal or metals, as the case may be, which is fixed by law.

Third. The denomination "dollar," also a creature of the law, which expresses the value of the predetermined weight of precious metal which constitutes the unit.

The value inheres in the metal and not in the form of it. A certain number of grains of gold or silver in the form of a cube are just as effectually a unit of value as if in the form of a disk, for value resides in substance and not in form.

The struck coin is a thing apart. It is not the "money unit," but a thing of convenience in exchange, a certificate of weight and fineness. If it coincides with the unit in value, that is an incident which gives it no character different from other coins excepting in denomination. The unit, as a mere symbol, is only the money of the mind. The struck coin is the piece for payment, and contains the value which its name expresses. The former is in view when a contract of sale is made; the latter only comes into requisition when it is executed. One is for the arithmetic of exchange, to afford terms in which values can be expressed; the other is to effect exchanges of commodities whose value has been reduced to expression in the terms of the unit.

We have thus arrived at our definition of "money unit," namely, a given number of grains of precious metal possessing a determinate value, named "dollar" or "unit," by comparison with which the denominations of money are regulated, and in the terms of which, or the fractions or multiples thereof, general values are expressed.

THE FIELD OF DISCUSSION.

The field over which the discussion of the fathers ranged embraces several distinct inquiries:

First. "What should be the unit of value?"

Second. "Whether it should be based on one metal or both?"

Third. "Whether it should be represented by a coin of corresponding value?"

Fourth. "What coins should be struck to express values in the uses to which money was to be put?"

Each of these questions had distinct consideration and decision. The difficulties encountered by the Colonies and the Confederation, on account of the confused state of their money, were distinctly before the minds of the fathers when, under the Federal regime, they took up the subject of our money for deliberate and determinate treatment. Foreign coins of gold and silver were current in the country; their value varied in different States, and to know the meaning of "a pound" or "a shilling" you had to know what State you were in.

The Spanish silver dollar had, it is said, at least five different values in as many sections of the country. McMaster tells us it was not unusual for a traveler to pay bills with silver dollars in Boston at 6s. the dollar; the next week in New York at 8s.; some days later in Philadelphia at 7s. 6d., and still later at 32s. 6d. at Charleston. Gold, it seems, was not subject to so much variation. The value of the gold pieces expressed in dollars was pretty much the same the country over, and 24¾ grains of gold corresponded very nearly with the nominal value of the Spanish silver dollar in all the States.

Another cause of confusion was the clipping of the coin, which had been carried to such an extent that Washington suggested that before long every man would have to travel with a pair of balances in his pocket, or run the risk of being cheated. In such a state of monetary chaos it is little wonder that the people began to look to Congress for succor and that committees were appointed to consider and report upon suitable means of unifying the money of the country.

ROBERT MORRIS ON THE UNIT.

Confronted by the necessity thus presented of a suitable monetary system for the new Government, and instructed by the experience of the past, the fathers came to the consideration of the subject. The report of Robert Morris to Congress on a coinage scheme, made on January 15, 1782, was the first contribution of great value to the discussion of that day. That report, though it bore the name of Robert, is believed to have been wrought out chiefly by Gouverneur Morris. By way of preliminary, he observed the happiness we derived from unity in our system of weights and measures throughout America, and noted the advantages we enjoyed from having throughout the Union the same ideas of a mile and an inch, a hogshead and a quart, a pound and an ounce. But with respect to our money he lamented that the case was widely different, and that the ideas annexed to a pound, shilling, and penny were as various as the States themselves, rendering calculation a prerequisite to every commercial exchange. He then takes up the chief inquiry which concerns us in this paper, namely, "Whether the money unit should be affixed to both metals or to one only?" After comparing the merits of the metals and the arguments for and against each, he says:

There can be no doubt, therefore, that our money standard ought to be affixed to silver.

The argument that led up to this conclusion was that the scale by which everything is to be measured ought to be fixed as the nature of things will permit of. And a money standard affixed to both metals would not afford a fixed and certain scale, because if affixed to both it would in reality be affixed to neither—

For—

He says—

the demand which commerce might make for either of the precious metals in preference to the other would vary this real standard from time to time, and in every payment a man would get more or less of real value for his debt, according as he was paid in the coin of greater or less value in relation to the real standard.

Mr. Morris next considers what the "money unit" should be. He says:

The purposes of commerce require that the lowest divisible point of money, or what is more properly called the "money unit," should be very small, but there is no necessity that the unit be exactly represented in coin. It is sufficient that its value be precisely known.

This makes it quite clear that in his mind there was a distinction between the "money unit" and the sensible object which was to represent it.

Advancing his argument on this line, Mr. Morris says:

The money unit will be equal to a quarter of a grain of fine silver in coined money. Proceeding, then, in a decimal ratio, 100 would be the lowest silver coin, and might be called a cent, while the dollar, which contains about 373 grains of fine silver at the mint price, would be 1,440 units.

He does not propose the coinage of any piece of that name, but all current coins are to be rated to silver at a mint price, established at 22,237 units per pound. The great merit he claimed for his unit was that all the currencies of the States were reducible to it without a remainder.

MORRIS'S CONCLUSIONS.

The points distinctly made by Mr. Morris and to be carried with us in the further progress of the discussion are: First, that a money unit affixed to both metals could not be stable and certain; second, that the money unit should be attached to silver alone; third, that no coin need be struck to correspond with the money unit.

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S VIEWS.

The next important contribution to the discussion is "Thomas Jefferson's notes on the establishment of a money unit and of a coinage for the United States." These notes, it appears, were communicated to Congress simultaneously with Mr. Morris's report in 1782. Mr. Jefferson objected to Mr. Morris's money unit because it was too small, holding that the one thousand four hundred and fortieth part of a dollar as a unit would be inconvenient in commerce. He says:

It is inconvenient in its application to ordinary money transactions. The price of a loaf of bread, one-twentieth of a dollar, would be 72 units. A pound of butter, one-fifth of a dollar, would be 288 units. Ten thousand dollars would reqire eight figures, to wit, 14,400,000. A horse or bullock of $80 value would require a notation of six figures, to wit, 115,200 units.

Nowhere in his notes does Mr. Jefferson make any objection to the plan of Mr. Morris on the ground of there being no coined piece to correspond with the unit of value. He assented, also, to the suggestion that it was not essential that a coin be struck to correspond with the money unit. The decimal ratio, he thought, was ingenious and admirable.

In considering the unit of money he says:

Three circumstances are of principal importance:

"First. That it be of a convenient size to be applied as a measure to the common money transactions of life.

"Second. That its parts and multiples be an easy proportion to each other, so as to facilitate the money arithmetic.

"Third. That the 'unit' and its parts or divisions be so nearly of the value of some of the known coins as that they may be of easy adoption for the people."

It will be seen that in this enumeration of the important requisites of a "money unit" no mention is made of the metal in which the "unit" is to be represented. Gold would answer all the requirements equally with silver. He, however, goes on to say, "The Spanish dollar seems to fulfill all these conditions." His reasoning in support of this observation may be summarized as follows:

1. As a common measure it is of convenient size.
2. The value of any amount up to $10,000 is easily estimated by the mind, so also that of the tenth or hundredth of a dollar; and few transactions are above or below these limits.
3. It coincides in value with some of the known coins so nearly that the people can quickly estimate their value.
4. The dollar is a known coin and the most familiar of all to the mind of the people.

It will be observed that none of these reasons turn upon the metal out of which the unit is to be coined, and no preference is indicated on the ground of any intrinsic or even sentimental superiority of silver over gold. There is no suggestion that silver was the money of the poor and gold the money of the rich; no suggestion of a conflict of interests between Wall street and the rural districts, between the banker and the farmer; no thought expressed of favoring one metal by attaching the unit to it, or that men "desiring to injure business by making money scarce could

not so easily get hold of all the silver and hide it away as they could gold." The era of the demagogue had not yet come in.

JEFFERSON'S RECOMMENDATIONS.

In concluding his notes Mr. Jefferson submits the following recommendations:

That the money unit of these States shall be equal in value to a Spanish milled dollar; that it shall be divided into tenths and hundredths; that there shall be a coin of silver of the value of the unit, another of the same metal of the value of one-tenth of a unit, one other of copper of the value of one-hundredth of a unit; that there shall be a coin of gold of the value of ten units.

In a supplementary paper he says:

My proposition, then, is that our notation of money shall be decimal; that the unit of this notation shall be a dollar; that coin shall be accommodated to it from $10 to the hundredth of a dollar.

JEFFERSON'S CONCLUSIONS.

Remembering, for the purpose of comparison, the conclusions of Mr. Morris, those of Mr. Jefferson may be summed up thus:

First. That the minuteness of Mr. Morris's money unit was not desirable, though the decimal ratio was admirable.
Second. That the unit should be of the value of the Spanish milled dollar, and that a piece should be coined to correspond with it.
Third. That the money unit should be based on both metals.

In view of the foregoing, it seems difficult to conceive how any other conclusion is deducible from Jefferson's notes than that he believed that the money unit should be based on both metals. But happily he did not leave the matter there. In his letter to Hamilton of February, 1792, he says:

I will return you the report on the unit, which I have read over with a great deal of satisfaction. I concur with you in thinking that the unit must stand on both metals.

Morris found grave objections to Jefferson's recommendations. He thought they provided a money unsuitable to the wants of the people; that the dollar was more nearly related to the British money than to our own currency; emphasizing his objection by the suggestion that you might as well select for American farmers a scythe used among the Alps instead of one suitable to our own fields.

VIEWS OF THE GRAND COMMITTEE.

The next contribution to the discussion in consecutive order was the report to Congress of what was called the "Grand Committee on the Money Unit," in 1785. In this report the divergent views were considered and the conclusions of Mr. Jefferson adopted. They recommend the "dollar" as the money unit on the distinct grounds that the people were familiar with the value of a "dollar"; that it had been in general use and would conform to the national mode of keeping accounts.

On July 6, 1785, Congress received the report of the grand committee, and on the resolution "That the money unit of the United States of America be one dollar," the yeas and nays were called, and every member answered "yea."

BOARD OF TREASURY REPORT.

On the 8th of April, 1786, the Board of Treasury reported to Congress their conclusions on the expediency of a mint for the coinage of American money.

In their report they recommended a "silver dollar" as the money unit. In August, 1786, Congress adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the money unit of the United States, being by the resolve of Congress of the 6th of July, 1785, a dollar, shall contain of fine silver 375.64 grains.

After providing for the coinage of the dollar as the highest silver coin, and the divisions thereof, halves, double dimes, and half dimes, it provides—

That there shall be two gold coins, one containing 246.268 grains of fine gold equal to $10, and to be called an eagle. One containing 123.134 grains of fine gold equal to $5, and to be called a half eagle.

HAMILTON'S REPORT.

To this point had the evolution of our "money unit" arrived when Hamilton entered the debate with his celebrated report on the establishment of a mint. This was presented to Congress in April, 1791, and as the views therein expressed were subsequently embodied in the coinage act of 1792, he may be said to have given the subject its final form and finish and his views to have received the honor of acceptance by the American people. Mr. Hamilton, in this report, covers the entire ground of the previous discussion, and treats the subject with a firmness of grasp and clearness of insight into the principles of monetary science only possible to his amplitude of understanding and intellectual penetration. The first inquiry to which he addresses himself is, "What ought to be the nature of the money unit of the United States?" By way of preliminary he alludes to the then existing "unit" in the money of account, which he maintained was the "pound sterling," though it could not be said to be the "unit in the coins." In the absence of legislation, usage and practice, he thought, had given that character to the Spanish milled dollar. He, however, saw objections to the "dollar," because it had never had any settled or standard value according to weight or fineness, while gold, on the other hand, had a fixed price by weight and fineness. He says:

The greater stability of value of the gold coins is an argument of force for regarding the money unit as having been hitherto virtually attached to gold rather than to silver.

Then, again, he suggested that the variety of "dollars" then current, containing unequal amounts of fine silver, presented a difficulty in defining the particular "dollar" to which the "money unit" was to be applied, supposing it to be most applicable to that species of coin. Nor did he omit to point out the importance of applying the unit to a coin that would be comformable to the existing proportion between the two metals in this country as well as to that which obtains in the commercial world generally.

NO PREFERENCE FOR EITHER METAL.

He next applies his mind to the inquiry whether or not the money unit ought to be peculiarly attached to either of the metals in preference to the other, and if to either, to which of them. The argument in this part of the report advances with so firm and sure a foot that I must, at the risk of tediousness, reproduce a portion of it in Mr. Hamilton's own words.

After indicating that the resolutions of Congress of 1785 and 1786, declaring the money unit to be a dollar, and providing for both gold and silver coins, were not clear in their meaning, since they did not explain whether either of the two species of coins of gold or silver had any greater legality in payments than the other, and suggesting that a preference in the matter of payment was necessary to carry out the idea of attaching the unit exclusively to one metal, he says:

If each of them be as valid as the other in payments to any amount, it is not obvious in what effectual sense either of them can be deemed the money unit rather than the other. If the general declaration that the dollar shall be the money unit of the United States could be understood to give it a superior legality in payments, the institution of coins of gold and the declaration that each of them shall be equal to a certain number of dollars would appear to destroy that inference. And the circumstance of making the dollar the unit in the money of account seems to be rather a matter of form than of substance.

Contrary to the ideas which have heretofore prevailed in the suggestions concerning a coinage for the United States, though not without much hesitation, arising from a deference for those ideas, the Secretary is, upon the whole, strongly inclined to the opinion that a preference ought to be given to neither of the metals for the money unit. Perhaps if either were to be preferred it ought to be gold rather than silver.

But upon the whole it seems to be most advisable, as has been observed, not to attach the unit exclusively to either of the metals, because this can not be done effectually without destroying the office and character of one of them as money and reducing it to the situation of a mere merchandise, which, accordingly, at different times, has been proposed from different and very respectable quarters, but which would probably be a greater evil than occasional variations in the unit from the fluctuations in the relative value of the metals, especially if care be taken to regulate the proportion between them, with an eye to their average commercial value.

Later on in this report Mr. Hamilton recurs to the question of the "money unit," and concludes the discussion as follows:

The conclusion to be drawn from the observations which have been made on the subject is this: That the unit in the coins of the United States ought to correspond with 24¾ grains of pure gold and with 371¼ grains of pure silver, each answering to a dollar in the money of account. The former is exactly agreeable to the present value of gold, and the latter is within a small fraction of the mean of the two last emissions of dollars, the only ones which are now found in common circulation and of which the newest is in the greatest abundance. The alloy in each case to be one-twelfth of the total weight, which will make the unit 27 grains of standard gold and 405 grains of standard silver.

Each of these, it has been remarked, will answer to a dollar in the money of account. It is conceived that nothing better can be done in relation to this than to pursue the track marked out by the resolution of the 8th of August, 1786. This has been approved abroad as well as at home, and it is certain that nothing can be more simple or convenient than the decimal subdivisions. There is every reason to expect that the method will speedily grow into general use when it shall be seconded by corresponding coins. On this plan the unit in the money of account will continue to be, as established by that resolution, a dollar and its multiples, dimes, cents, and mills, or tenths, hundredths, and thousandths.

HOW HAMILTON DETERMINED THE WEIGHT OF THE SILVER DOLLAR.

It is worth noting in this connection how Hamilton determined upon 371¼ grains of fine silver as the most suitable amount for the silver dollar. He found that the Spanish milled dollars of different dates varied in the amount of silver they contained, one containing 374 and another 368 grains, and that neither one sustained to 24¾ grains of fine gold the ratio of 15 to 1, which coincided with the difference in the coined metals as established by custom in our market and in our currency. Taking the mean of the two Spanish pieces, however, he found that the proportion conformed very nearly to the ratio of 15 to 1, so that he had only to multiply 23¾ by 15 to obtain 371¼ as the proper weight in grains for the silver dollar.

He then gives the following schedule of coins which he thinks would be advisable until experience demonstrates the necessity for others:

One gold piece, equal in weight and value to ten units or dollars.
One gold piece, equal to a tenth part of the former, and which shall be a unit or dollar.
One silver piece, which shall also be a unit or dollar.
One silver piece, which shall be in weight and value a tenth part of the silver unit or dollar.

One copper piece, which shall be of the value of a hundredth part of a dollar. One other copper piece, which shall be half the value of the former.

He then says in conclusion:

It is not proposed that the lightest of the two gold coins should be numerous, as in large payments the larger the pieces the shorter the process of counting, the less risk of mistake, and consequently the greater the safety and the convenience; and in small payments it is not perceived that any inconvenience can accrue from an entire dependence on the silver and copper coins. The chief inducement to the establishment of the small gold piece is to have a sensible object in that metal, as well as in silver, to express the unit. The smallest of the two gold coins may be called the dollar or unit in common with the silver piece with which it coincides.

HAMILTON'S CONCLUSIONS.

Having in view the previous summing up of Morris's and Jefferson's views, the conclusions of Hamilton may now be placed for comparison beside those of his distinguished cotemporaries, as follows:

1. That up to that time the money unit had practically been attached to both gold and silver.
2. That coin should be struck in both metals to correspond with the money unit.
3. That the money unit should be based on both metals.

THE COINAGE ACT OF 1792.

It is suitable at this point to bring into view the section of the coinage act of 1792, which relates to the money unit, that it may be seen whether on a fair construction it expresses the Hamiltonian and the Jeffersonian view or the contrary one.

The ninth section reads in part as follows:

That there shall be from time to time struck and coined at the said mint coins of gold, silver, and copper of the following denominations, values, and descriptions, viz: Eagles, each to be of the value of ten dollars or units, and to contain 247½ grains of pure or 270 grains of standard gold; half eagles, each to be of the value of five dollars, and to contain 123¾ grains of pure or 135 grains of standard gold; quarter eagles, each to be of the value of two dollars and a half dollar, and to contain 61¼ grains of pure or 67½ grains of standard gold; dollars or units, each to be of the value of a Spanish milled dollar, as the same is now current, and to contain 371¼ grains of pure or 416 grains of standard silver.

SOME REFLECTIONS.

Having before us the foregoing review of the facts of the situation, the reasonings of the fathers of 1792 and the enactment which embodies their conclusions, we are in a position, each according to his own light and leading to subject, to suitable tests the validity of the views which have been from time to time advanced on the subject.

It will be seen that the act of 1792 is not as explicit in defining a "money unit" as the act of 1873, nevertheless the meaning which the language carries is free from doubt. The Spanish milled dollar was at that time a current coin. Its value was known, and that value was to be the "money unit," by the terms of which all values in commerce were to be expressed and in correspondence with which coins were to be struck. Some find a stumbling block in the fact that a coin of silver was struck and no corresponding one of gold identical in value with the ideal unit and bearing its name. But that has no tendency to prove that the "unit" was based upon that metal in preference to gold. Indeed, the contrary may be conclusively presumed from the absence of an express declaration to that effect. It will be remembered that Robert Morris, as already stated, proposed no coin corresponding with his money unit, while Hamilton thought it better to have such a coin in both metals. In many countries there are no coins struck corresponding with the unit of value. It is well known that in Great Britain the pound sterling is the unit of value, but no coin answering to that unit was ever struck. In France and the other countries of the Latin Union the "money unit" is the franc, yet no such piece of full legal-tender money was ever struck. Our existing money unit is indisputably a gold dollar, but we coin no answering piece of money. In Spain the unit of value is the silver peseta, equal to a franc, but it is not a full legal-tender coin. In Germany, where the gold standard prevails, the unit of value is the mark, but no gold coin answering to it was ever struck.

So the most superficial knowledge of the subject makes it obvious that the denomination of coins struck at the mint affords little aid in construing the act of 1792 as to whether the money unit was based on one or both metals, for it has no more logical connection with the unit than another question mooted at the time, namely, whether the coins should contain representations of English barbarities or selections from the proverbs of Solomon and the wisdom of Franklin?

HAMILTON'S REASONING.

No one can follow the reasoning of Mr. Hamilton without being sensible of its clearness and convincing power. It may easily be that were he arguing the question now he would put less stress upon the equality of legal-tender power in the two metals as evidence of an intention to attach the money unit to both of them. But the argument carried great force and cogency in the then state of monetary knowledge and experience. It was doubtless taken for granted by Hamilton, for Adam Smith had declared it only fifteen years before, that in all countries only the measure of value money was legal tender. That Jefferson was in substantial unity with his reasoning and his conclusions, adds distinctly to the credit of both. No two voices in all the land were more potential than theirs, and when united, as they were on the "double basis" of our money unit, it is hardly permissible to believe that their counsel was disregarded by Congress in legislating upon the subject.

CONCLUSION.

And therefore, at whatever conclusion others may arrive from an equally sincere consideration of the same data, I am of opinion that the reasoning of the fathers, the earliest consideration given the subject by Congress, the terms of the coinage act of 1792, their logical and grammatical construction, and the antecedent probability that the conclusions of Hamilton and Jefferson were intended to be embodied in the law, all unite to constitute an impregnable body of evidence in support of the view that the act was intended to attach the money unit to gold and silver alike. That 24¾ grains of fine gold and 371¼ grains of fine silver, coined or uncoined, each equal in value to the Spanish milled dollar, constituted our money unit, to be known by the denomination of "dollar" or "unit" (the words being used interchangeably), in the terms of which all values were thereafter to be expressed; that the given weight of one metal and the given weight of the other were alike the sensible objects answering the ideal unit; were equal in value, equal in legal-tender power, and possessed an equally incontestable title to the honor of being the basis of our money unit under the bimetallic system which the genius of Hamilton, the philosophy of Jefferson, and the wise statesmanship of their contemporaries established more than a hundred years ago.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield three minutes of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat amazed that so many complications are found or rather imagined in this very simple bill. The bill asks an answer of "yes" or "no" to two single questions. We are asked whether, in case of temporary deficiency, the Government shall be authorized to issue temporary loan certificates at low rates of interest. What American can answer anything but "yes" to that question? How that deficiency arose is not before us. We meet a condition and not a theory. The remedy is proposed by this bill, and we must grant it. So much for the second section of the bill.

The first section is equally simple. It does not authorize the issue of bonds; that was commanded by the resumption act of 1875. It does not change the legislation of 1878, as to the reissue of greenbacks. It says simply that when bonds are issued the interest shall be low, and that the subscriptions shall be open to the public. As I have said, this is but a single question. Low interest and popular subscription must go together. The people do not understand subscribing $120 in order to get back $100 in twenty or thirty years. Our people are ready to lend their money to the Government, I believe, at as low a rate as 2 per cent, but they wish what they lend to be paid back at the end of the term.

Now, there are two single questions to be answered, "yes" or "no." What need of amendment? Amendments would only bring in subjects on which we differ—subjects that have been argued on this floor and that we shall hereafter deal with but that are not within this bill. Amendments would only confuse the direct, the simple, the earnest, the immediate purpose of this bill—patriotic as well as simple—to give relief to the Government and people of these United States. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the essential spirit of the pending bill is a stern arraignment and severe rebuke of Grover Cleveland and the Democratic Administration for the last two and a half years. It is a condemnation of secret loans by unfriendly lenders from abroad, procured through the agency of usurious syndicates at home. It demands a halt here and provides that the loans in the future shall be domestic ones, available to the citizens of our own country. It will advertise to foreign nations for all time that this country can procure at home all the money it requires. This will be a salutary lesson, calculated to inspire the nations of the world with respect for our resources and powers.

The notion in the minds of some that this bill can be used by an unfriendly Administration to retire the greenbacks is a grossly mistaken one. The bill before us not only recites the act of 1878, which makes the reissue mandatory, but freshly declares that the act of 1878 shall be in full force and virtue. Indeed, legally and in terms, the pending bill makes the act of 1878 an operative and vital part. No Republican should refuse his assent to this bill. It domesticates our loans, reduces their cost, rebukes a reckless and improvident Administration, and provides measures of safety should a discredited Administration, by a wasteful policy, require further money in the short time it is destined to be inflicted upon our country. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCLAURIN].

Mr. MCLAURIN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the passage of

this bill, because its provisions will not only burden an already debt-ridden people, but will legalize a long series of usurpations by different Secretaries of the Treasury. The caption declares this a bill "to protect the coin redemption fund," while at the same time there is not a single line of law upon the statute book authorizing or providing any such fund. Judging from past experience, without doubt this language would be construed by the Secretary for the purpose of sequestering in the Treasury this vast sum of $100,000,000, which should be in the channels of business, giving life and vigor to our commercial transactions. This unauthorized fund has been maintained in absolute idleness for over twenty years, and at simple interest has cost the people more than $80,000,000. This is a covert attempt to legalize an unwarranted assumption, which alone should prevent the passage of the bill. Mr. Speaker, instead of this being a bill to protect the coin redemption fund, it is, more properly speaking, in my judgment, an act to provide for a deficiency in our revenues. The President has already issued over $160,000,000 of interest-bearing bonds for the alleged purpose of strengthening this reserve fund. In my opinion we might with profit inquire as to what has become of the proceeds of the sale of these bonds.

Mr. Speaker, is it not true that the one hundred and sixty millions of gold received from the sale of these bonds was drawn out of the Treasury through the redemption of United States notes or greenbacks? Is it not also true that these one hundred and sixty millions of United States notes or greenbacks have been paid out by the Secretary of the Treasury in the ordinary expenses of the Government? I repeat, has it not been the custom of the present Secretary to sell bonds for gold, to exchange the gold for United States notes, and then to use these notes in payment of our governmental expenses? Then why come here with a bill claiming to protect "the coin redemption fund," when in fact and in practice it is a bill to supply a deficiency in the revenue?

I believe in dealing with the people frankly and squarely, and if this bill is really to maintain a redemption fund, it should be so stated, plainly and distinctly, and then used for no other purpose whatever. If, on the other hand, as is now secretly practiced, it is to supply a deficiency in the revenue, I maintain that such a declaration should be made, in order that all may clearly understand its import.

Besides, I am decidedly in favor of curtailing rather than extending the discretionary powers of the Secretary of the Treasury in our financial affairs. The act of 1875, mentioned in this bill, provided for the sale of bonds at his discretion, at not less than par in coin, while the last issue of bonds by the Secretary of the Treasury was made for so many ounces of gold bullion. I merely mention this to show the character of the usurpation of power by the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Speaker, there is a vast difference between selling bonds for coin, which means both gold and silver, and bartering the obligations of the United States for gold bullion.

I assume that all of our present difficulties would be eliminated and further legislation upon this subject unnecessary if we had a Secretary of the Treasury who would obey the law now upon the statute book of the nation. There is to-day not a bond, coupon, obligation, or debt of any character against the United States which is not payable, principal and interest, in coin; and coin to-day means just what it has since the foundation of the Government—both gold and silver.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the vaults of the Treasury bursting with silver, with the great plain people struggling beneath a load of debt and distress, I assert that it is unfair, unjust, wholly uncalled for, that interest-bearing bonds, in time of peace, should be sold, to further impoverish our people, and through this interest levy tribute upon their hard toil, while there are lying idle in the Treasury one hundred and fifty millions of silver. [Applause.] Let the Secretary of the Treasury obey the law. Let him treat alike all obligations of the Government. Let him consider the debt of the humblest American laborer in the same light that he does the debt due the alien money lender. All are payable in coin, and all should alike be paid in coin.

If it could be announced to-morrow that an American policy of finance would be inaugurated and the further domination of alien money lenders resisted, the same enthusiasm and patriotic response would come from the people to the support of the Administration that was witnessed when the President so forcibly reaffirmed the Monroe doctrine, and notified England to encroach no farther upon American soil. A similar announcement on the financial situation would infuse new life into the Democratic party, from which hope has been crushed by the financial policy of the present Administration.

Let the United States, like France, begin the payment of silver for her paper money when presented for redemption, and the necessity for another bond issue would vanish. Let us also imitate the example of France in refusing to furnish gold for export. In doing this we would simply be putting into practice that grand rule of humane government, "equal rights to all, special privileges to none."

There is another point, Mr. Speaker, that seems to have been overlooked. It is claimed by the Secretary in his last report that there is in circulation among the people four hundred and seventy-five millions in gold coin. From the report of the Comptroller of the Currency it is learned that not over one hundred and fifty millions is held by the banks, leaving three hundred and twenty-five millions among the people. If the Secretary of the Treasury would expend as much energy in exchanging with the people greenbacks for this gold that he does in exchanging gold for greenbacks with alien financiers, I am of the opinion that the exigencies of the Treasury might be relieved without a further issue of bonds.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] advanced the proposition to secure this gold by an issue of interest-bearing certificates of indebtedness. In my judgment the object might be attained at far less expense by exchanging greenbacks which come into the Treasury for this gold coin among the people.

In order to meet the temporary deficiency in the Treasury, instead of interest-bearing obligations to become a burden upon the people, I would suggest certificates be issued against every idle ounce of silver in the Treasury. This would give instantaneous relief and would put into circulation among the people, without the burden of interest, a kind of currency that none would refuse and all be glad to get. These, in brief, are my objections to the bill. I believe they are valid.

I can see no good reason why the taxpayers, the producers and toilers of this country, should be forced to pay an interest tribute extending to generations yet unborn when the simple application of justice and common sense would obviate the necessity of it all. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I crave the attention of the House for ten minutes—not much time in which to talk about a matter of this importance.

The resumption act, passed in 1875 in a time of peace, was and is a Republican act. It authorized, I say to the gentleman from California, the issuing of bonds to establish and maintain resumption. Secretary Sherman issued $95,000,000 of bonds in 1878, and with the proceeds, $100,000,000 of gold, resumed specie payments on the 1st day of January, 1879. And from that time up to President Cleveland's second term there never was another dollar of those bonds issued or a necessity for their issue. The resumption fund remained intact.

Bear with me, Republicans and Democrats, while I speak of one other record that was made under wise administration and wise legislation. When that resumption act passed the Government of the United States was paying 6 per cent interest. From the time of resumption in 1879 until June 30, 1892—thirteen years—there never was for one day or one moment a deficiency of revenues to meet the current expenses. Aye, more; we met all those expenses, and paid besides $1,200,000,000 of the interest-bearing debt of the United States, nearly a hundred millions a year; and the annual interest charge of eighty-three and one-half millions per annum in 1879 dwindled to $23,000,000 and less in 1892. And, Mr. Speaker, under Republican economic policies, with the ever-present power to issue bonds, if necessary, in the Secretary of the Treasury, these great revenues have been gathered and our country was a perfect hive of industry from one end to the other, and prosperity existed for the entire thirteen years, such as the world has never known. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But some gentlemen now say, "We will not now give the Secretary any additional power to borrow money at a lower rate of interest," and the last gentleman who addressed the House, who is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MCLAURIN], says he would take from him the power he now possesses. Mr. Speaker, you can not give the Secretary too much power to borrow at the smallest interest, provided he wisely exercises it. I recollect when you Democrats proclaimed, in 1878, that you would give $100,000,000 to head the column that would break the Treasury. Mr. Sherman put $100,000,000 of gold in the Treasury for resumption, and back of that was the power to pledge the credit of the Government, that, thank God, had credit then for any amount. [Applause on the Republican side.] We were not called upon to redeem. But what is the matter now? In 1892 you elected your President on a platform that pledged you to break down the industries of the country, and your power spread like a pall over the body politic, and from the day of Grover Cleveland's election in November, 1892, to this time, deficiencies, distress, idleness, poverty, panic have attended your footsteps. [Applause on the Republican side.] With full power to construct, you did not construct. Instead of paying off a hundred millions of the debt every year, you have borrowed $180,000,000; and what for? In the name of "resumption" you borrow and use the funds to make up a deficiency that your revenue measures have produced! [Applause on the Republican side.] Now where are we? The President sends us a message saying that the gold is disappearing from

the Treasury. Yes, Mr. President, and a deficiency remains, and increases at the same time. But what are you Democrats doing? Why, you criticise, but offer nothing. You did not offer anything in the last Congress. Even when we proposed to give you something, you said "No." Now a Republican House—and, gentlemen, that is all that is Republican in this Government to-day—the Republican House of Representatives refused to adjourn over the holidays, and said, "We are chosen the doctors; we will give a remedy, so far as the House can give a remedy, that will reach the root of the disease." [Applause on the Republican side.]

What was the first thing to be done? It was to pass a bill which would make the revenues of this Government sufficient to meet the expenditures of this Government, and carrying with it incidental protection. And relief under that bill, if enacted, so far as deficiency and resumption are concerned, will come as surely as the water came when the rock was struck by Moses in the desert. But what have you gentlemen done on the other side? You have struck, fought against, criticised—God Almighty never made a set of men who could better tear down and criticise—while you are without an atom of power to build up, preserve, or increase. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] We passed our bill, and passed it at once. We knew that the President was not in good faith, yet we wanted to do what we could, whether he was in good faith or bad faith, to give the proper relief that we knew was required. We applied the remedy that was necessary. We acted, and acted promptly. Yet you Democrats complain of our speed. Why, my God! one of you gentlemen would have been talking on that side for a week if we had given you an opportunity. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Now, this bill is pending. What is there to do? Gold going out; deficiency increasing. We come with this bill and say we have here the condition brought about by Cleveland and Democracy. There can be no return of prosperity until in the White House, until in the Senate, and in this House, the Republican party is in the ascendency to write on the statute books our policy. [Applause on the Republican side.] When that condition comes, as come it will, Mr. Speaker, we will establish that policy which will bring relief and prosperity to the country. [Applause on the Republican side.] At present we can only do the best we can under existing circumstances.

In the meantime we will take no proper power from the Secretary of the Treasury. He ought to have all the power that is necessary, and if he abuses it a just public sentiment will hold him responsible. We will authorize, in addition to the 4 and 5 per cent bonds, which he can now issue, a 3 per cent, short-time, popular bond. We will make him offer these bonds—the fours, the fives, and the threes—to the American people first. We say by this act, if enacted into law, Mr. Grover Cleveland, you shall not in the secret hours of the night, without the knowledge of the people of the United States, assemble a syndicate of men and place the obligations of our Government, our public securities, in their hands at a profit to the syndicate of ten to twenty millions of dollars. We say our people, in our opinion, stand ready and able to give the relief, and should have the first opportunity.

Mr. BOWERS. Does not it look as if he were going to get the start of us?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now, gentlemen, what are we Republicans doing? We are proposing a measure of relief. What are you Democrats doing? You say, "No." Let me tell you how it looks to me: That already, before the last Cleveland message was sent to Congress, an agreement was made by him with the syndicate for another issue of bonds at a rate far below their value. Look here, my Democratic friends, you voted solidly against this proposition last winter when you could have had it, and you will vote solidly against it now. You free silver coinage Democrats, 16 to 1, are against it because you want to impair the value of the currency. You cuckoo Democrats are against it because the President has sent down his order for you to be against it. But as an evidence of Republican wisdom and patriotism, in my judgment, on this side of the House we stand ready to pass it. If the Senate passes it and the President signs it, it is well. If the Senate and President object we at least cast our mite, so far as we can, toward reassuring the people of the United States that we will protect the public credit and prevent improper contracts with syndicates. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill, for reasons different from many of the reasons which will be advocated by members of the Democratic party. I am opposed to the passage of this bill because I believe that its passage, instead of strengthening confidence in the financial ability and integrity of the Government, will shake public confidence and lead to panic or to financial depression. If I believed this were an honest measure of relief I should cast my vote in its favor, but I am opposed to it because it is not a gold measure, because the bond provided for is not a gold bond. I know that it is somewhat unpopular in this House for a member to avow that he is a monometallist, but I have been, and am to-day, and always shall be—until that vague, impossible international agreement which is hinted at shall be consummated—in favor of a single gold standard; that is, in favor of a standard invariable in nature, approaching most nearly the ideal of immutability or unchangeableness; and you will all agree with me that the precious metal, which has been dominant in the world as the standard of value for centuries past, is the only safe single standard.

But passing by that question, I may in the limited time accorded to me be enabled only to indicate the objections to this special measure. The views which I express on monometallism are my own views, but I think it is safe for me to assert that the sound-money Democrats are opposed to this bill for substantially the same reasons which I shall adduce.

The Republican party will bear the responsibility for the character of relief now offered to the country. The failure of this measure of relief—so called, but in reality no measure of relief—will not lie upon the shoulders of the Democratic party. The gentlemen upon that side, the Republican side of the House, will be responsible for the further depletion of the gold reserve and for the failure to maintain public confidence in the integrity of our financial system. In the first bill, the tariff bill, which was offered the other day, if you intended to give us relief, why did you not bring in a measure based on revenue lines only? Why did you not offer us a bill imposing duties on the great revenue-producing articles, such as tea and coffee, and imposing a stamp duty? Why did you offer us a bill protective in its nature and a bill which it would be impossible for any Democratic Executive ever to affix his signature to?

What are the objections to this measure? In the first place, you avoid the issue. The gold reserve fund was never created by positive law, and it is mentioned for the first time in the act of 1882 in the following words:

> The Secretary of the Treasury shall suspend the issue of such gold certificates whenever the amount of gold coin and gold bullion in the Treasury reserved for the redemption of United States notes falls below $100,000,000.

Why do you not call this a gold bullion and gold coin redemption fund in the title of your bill? Because you dare not take that issue; because you know that the members of your party on that side of the House will not pass a bill providing for a bond payable specifically in gold. You deny the Secretary of the Treasury the only relief he asks for.

The second section of this bill is comparatively unobjectionable, because that provides for certificates of indebtedness running a short time, in lieu of the short-time bonds asked by the Secretary, and the only objection to that section is that the amount is limited to $50,000,000. But the salient measure of relief demanded by the Secretary of the Treasury is that you issue what? Bonds payable in the first place in gold. In the second place, that those bonds be long-time bonds. What do you give him? You give him a coin bond, a bond which can not be floated. You give him a bond running for five years, then redeemable at the pleasure of the United States in coin, and at most payable in fifteen years. Then you deny him the great measure of relief which is imperatively demanded by the interests of this country. What is that? That the greenbacks shall be gradually retired and canceled. Why, a measure of this kind is absolutely futile. You are probably aware that it will not pass even in this House. It certainly can never receive the signature of a Democratic Executive. Now, what is to be done? What is the country entitled to? If the revenue is not to be increased on revenue lines, what other measure of relief should be granted? In the first place, a gold bullion and a gold coin redemption fund should be created expressly by statute. In the second place, that fund should be made to consist of either $100,000,000 or $200,000,000, and should be sacredly set aside for the redemption and eventual cancellation and retirement of the legal-tender notes. And then the provision of the act of May 31, 1878, requiring the reissue of the redeemed greenbacks should be repealed.

A further objection to this bill is found in the provision as to advertising. Of the first loan that was issued, of $50,000,000, only some $745,000 were taken by individuals. Of the second loan of $50,000,000 only $1,533,000 were taken by individuals, and these large loans must be taken in the main by institutions and by banks, and the advertising is futile, unnecessary, and undesirable from every commercial and financial standpoint.

The specific demand of the Secretary of the Treasury is contained in these words: That he shall have authority to issue from time to time bonds, payable in gold, bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, and having a long time to run, and to exchange the bonds for United States notes and Treasury notes upon such terms as may be most advantageous to the Government, or to sell them abroad for gold whenever in his judgment it is advisable to do so, and use the gold thus obtained in redeeming the outstanding notes.

So, if we were allowed to offer amendments, I should offer the following amendments:

I should alter the title so that it should read: "A bill to maintain and protect the gold coin and gold bullion redemption fund."

Gentlemen, you must remember that of the gold reserve fund now nearly one-half, or $31,000,000, consists of gold bullion, and the balance, some $35,000,000, consists of gold coin.

I should provide that authority should be given to issue, sell, and dispose of the bonds at not less than par in gold coin, inserting the word "gold;" and I should further provide that these bonds should be redeemable by the Treasury of the United States in gold coin, and should be payable in gold coin, and I should insert a section repealing the provision of the act of 1878 which requires the reissue of the redeemed greenbacks.

So that there could not be any doubt in the minds of the public as to our intention to preserve the integrity of our financial system.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate with much interest and some astonishment. Some gentlemen on that side oppose the passage of this bill because the bonds authorized are not made payable in gold. Others oppose it because it does not expressly provide that the bonds shall be payable in gold and silver instead of "coin." From these differences among the Democratic members of this House it would seem their party has lost that admirable quality of harmonious cohesion which it has always displayed when playing the rôle of a national "kicker," a rôle in which it has exhibited its greatest usefulness and won its chief renown.

On this side a few Republicans have expressed their disapproval of the measure for the reason that, as they claim, it is contrary to the policy of the Republican party, and further because the people are opposed to issuing bonds in times of peace, and that they fear the passage of the bill will authorize the retirement of greenbacks.

Before discussing these several propositions on which gentlemen are trying to justify their votes against the bill, and in order that we may know whether or not the Committee on Ways and Means acted wisely in reporting this bill to a Republican House as a means of tiding over the existing emergency, I desire to briefly call attention to a few facts that preceded the action of the committee.

On Friday of last week the financial condition of our Government became so alarming that the President deemed it necessary to address Congress on the subject, and in a special message he took occasion to ask that we take immediate steps to relieve a situation that threatened financial disaster and ruin to American interests. In that message, after referring to his last annual message, he describes the situation as follows:

> The contingency then feared has reached us, and the withdrawals of gold since the communication referred to, and others that appear inevitable, threaten such a depletion in our Government gold reserve as brings us face to face to the necessity of further action for its protection.

He then expressed the hope that the members of this House would forego the pleasure of spending the usual holiday recess at their homes, and by legislative enactment or declaration "do something not only to remind those apprehensive among our own people that the resources of their Government and a scrupulous regard for honest dealing afford a sure guarantee of unquestioned safety and soundness, but to reassure the world that, with these factors and the patriotism of our citizens, the ability and determination of our nation to meet, in any circumstance, every obligation it incurs, do not admit of question."

Appreciating the gravity of the situation, and in obedience to our sense of duty, and the wish of the people as expressed through the public press, this House complied with that part of the President's request by remaining in session. Almost immediately after that message was read at the Clerk's desk, one week ago to-day, the Committee on Ways and Means organized, and immediately addressed itself assiduously and in good faith to the remaining portion of his request by endeavoring to formulate such legislation as would meet the existing emergency and preserve our national credit.

Before deciding what could be done "to remind those apprehensive among our own people" of the financial soundness of their Government, and "reassure the world of the ability and determination of our nation to meet, in any circumstance, every obligation it incurs," it was necessary to ascertain the cause of our present unfortunate financial situation. With the Treasurer's report before us, showing that from July 1, 1893, to December 1, 1895, our Government expended almost $133,000,000 more than it received, and expended about $3,000,000 in the month of December in excess of its receipts, and that in addition to this enormous deficiency in revenue there was a deficiency in the gold reserve of about $40,000,000, making a total deficiency since July 1, 1893, of about $176,000,000, the majority of the committee soon reached the conclusion, long since arrived at by the people, that the primary cause of our difficulty was a deficiency in revenue, producing absolute insolvency. Thereupon the committee decided that the only adequate remedy was such legislation as would increase the revenue of the Government, making it equal to our expenditures. That bill passed this House Thursday of this week, and if it becomes a law will so increase the duties on imports as to net the Government in revenue $40,000,000 per year in excess of what we are to-day receiving.

To accomplish this on the line of the principles of the Republican party and in time to meet the existing emergency was out of the question for two reasons: First, because of the time and labor necessary to a just and equitable revision of our present tariff laws; and, second, that with a political mongrel at the other end of the Capitol, and a free-trade President at the other end of Pennsylvania avenue, no general revision of the tariff on the line of protection is possible. Under these circumstances it was thought the Republicans in this House would, for the time being, waive the principle of protection in the hope that thereby temporary legislation might be secured, notwithstanding the conflicting political views of the legislative and executive branches of our Government, that would at least enable the Government to save itself from absolute bankruptcy until 1897, when we all hope to see our Government again under the complete control of the Republican party, a party that has given to the American people a higher degree of prosperity and a more general diffusion of the comforts of life than any political organization that has ever controlled their affairs. [Applause.]

The bill which was presented by the committee for that purpose, and which has passed this House, was not drawn with any intention of embodying in it the principle of protection, nor could we hope in the time allowed to attempt to correct what Mr. Cleveland designated as the "outrageous discriminations" of the present law. To have done so would have involved so much time and created so much contention between conflicting interests that, metaphorically speaking, Rome would have burned while we were fiddling. I sincerely regret, Mr. Speaker, that one of the principal discriminations in our present tariff law could not have been corrected. I refer now to the injustice done to the farmers of our country in the framing and passage of that law. These great producers have suffered materially in consequence of that discrimination. There is abundant evidence in that section of the country which I have the honor to represent to show the hardships imposed upon those men whose chief products are barley, dairy products, and live animals, and I hope before the bill becomes a law, if it ever does, that it may be so amended that these several items may be relieved from the unjust discriminations to which they are subjected by the Wilson-Gorman tariff law.

In explanation of why these inequalities could not be removed in respect to the agricultural schedule, permit me to say that had a different course been pursued in respect to that schedule from that followed in respect to other schedules, it would have subjected the bill to the criticism of discriminating in favor of one interest as against other interests equally entitled to our favorable consideration, and thereby seriously jeopardized the speedy passage of the measure, a result more essential to the Government under the existing circumstances than the correction of the evils from which private individuals are now suffering in consequence of the inequalities and discriminations imposed by a Democratic Congress. To emphasize the fact that this was purely an emergency measure not intended by the Republicans of this House as the settled policy of their party, it was expressly provided that the bill, if it becomes a law, shall continue in force only until August, 1897, when it is to be hoped we may have on our statute books a tariff law framed in accordance with the principles and policy of our party. It is not alone, therefore, the incongruous political situation of the Government that makes it impossible at this time for the Republicans to legislate upon the line of protection to American industry and American labor, but also the fact that the exigency of our national Treasury is so urgent, and the delay incident to such action so inevitable, that our present dangerous financial condition would be aggravated rather than improved thereby.

But, Mr. Speaker, assuming that the emergency bill which has passed becomes a law, delay is certain before it will be effective as a revenue-producing law. In the meantime the daily statements from the Treasury Department will continue to show, as they have shown during the past two years, a deplorable condition of insolvency. Apprehension among the people will be quickly followed by universal alarm, resulting in financial distress and ruin. Under these circumstances our duty in the premises is plain. The gold redemption fund must be replenished and maintained. At present this can be done only by borrowing money. The daily deficiency in revenue must be supplied from some source other than existing laws.

No one pretends that our present unfortunate condition is permanent. All admit that it is only temporary, or, at most, can continue no longer than until the people have an opportunity to

remove their present incompetent Democratic rulers. Until then the credit and good faith of the nation must be maintained. Already this Administration has borrowed $162,315,400. About one-third of this loan can not mature before ten years, and draws 5 per cent interest, while the remaining two-thirds draws 4 per cent interest and will not mature before thirty years. No man with abundant assets whose finances were only temporarily deranged would for one moment entertain a proposition to mortgage those assets for a period of thirty years at a high rate of interest merely for the purpose of meeting a temporary emergency. A short-time loan bearing low interest is what he would aim to secure simply as a matter of business. According to the morning papers, and judging from the amendments proposed by the gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. BARTLETT], the Administration proposes, and no one doubts that the President now contemplates, making a large loan, probably $100,000,000, to run for a period of thirty years at 4 per cent interest. There is no man on this floor who believes it necessary to impose upon the American people this enormous interest charge of $120,000,000 to tide over the present emergency, and yet we all know it will be done unless we pass this bill and give the President authority to issue a five-year bond drawing only 3 per cent interest. A five-year loan, such as is authorized by this bill, will be as effective in meeting the emergency as a thirty-year loan would be.

By passing this bill, therefore, we afford the President an opportunity to save to the people in interest alone on the money he deems necessary and proposes to borrow the sum of $105,000,000. Surely no Republican can consistently vote against a proposition of that kind. Having passed a bill to increase our revenue, if we now pass the pending measure and thereby provide for the immediate necessity of the gold-redemption fund and for the daily deficiency in revenue, the Republican party will have discharged its duty to the country in so far as it is now possible for the representatives of that party in this House to accomplish that end. Then if the President wants the opportunity to make the contemplated loan on short time at a low rate he can, by the aid of his friends in the Senate, secure its passage as he secured the passage of another measure on a similar occasion. If he does not want it, or does not exert his influence to secure its passage, and issues a long-time, high-interest-bearing bond, the responsibility for such action rests on him and his party, not upon the Republicans of this House.

The fact that the bonds authorized by this bill are payable in coin can not in reason be urged against its passage. It will not effect their sale. The $162,315,400 of bonds already issued by this Administration are payable in coin. In fact, all bonds issued by the Government since the beginning of the war and now outstanding are payable in coin. To make this or future issue of bonds payable in gold would be construed by the world as an indication that the Government of the United States did not intend to pay its outstanding obligations in the best money of the world, and the result would be the depreciation of those obligations in the hands of the present holders. For the same reason the bonds should not be made payable in gold and silver, as suggested by some of the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber.

But, sir, the saving of $105,000,000 in interest is not the only merit this bill possesses. Under the act of 1875 the President has authority, through his Secretary, to issue and sell the bonds of the United States as he has done in the past, and he may select his law partner or any other friend as the purchaser of such bonds. No man will pretend to say that this is either just or right to the American people. Already, in expectation of another bond issue under secret contract to favorite individuals or syndicates, the agents of the Rothschilds, the Morgans, and the Belmonts are crowding the little offices of the great hotels of this city, waiting like vultures for an opportunity to again light upon their prey, as they did last spring. Is there a man on this floor who wishes to see the people of the United States again disgraced by the sale of their bonds to a malodorous foreign syndicate? Not one. And yet certain gentlemen on this side of the House propose to vote against the first section of this bill, which contains the following provision, to wit:

> Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall offer any of the bonds authorized for sale by this act or by the resumption act of 1875, he shall advertise the same and authorize subscriptions therefor to be made at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasury and designated depositories of the United States.

This provision if adopted will most emphatically emphasize the difference between the policy of the Republican party in respect to the sale of Government bonds and the policy of the Democratic party in that respect, as practiced by Mr. Cleveland. A vote, therefore, against this section may be more correctly said to be an indorsement of Mr. Cleveland's policy of selling bonds by secret contract to foreign syndicates on long time at high rates of interest than a vote in its favor can be said to be a surrender to Mr. Cleveland and an indorsement of what we as a party have in the past condemned.

This provision will not only compel the Secretary of the Treasury to offer the bonds issued under this act to the American people, but it will also prevent the sale of any bonds, whether issued under this act or under the act of 1875, by private contract to a domestic or foreign syndicate, until the people have had an opportunity to purchase them.

There is another objection urged against the passage of this bill by members on this side that deserves attention. It is claimed that this measure, if it becomes a law, will authorize the retirement of greenbacks and therefore should not pass. In answer to this let me say that there is absolutely no foundation for a claim of this kind. The bill under consideration expressly provides that "nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify an act entitled 'An act to forbid the further retirement of United States notes,' approved May 31, 1878." This proviso will continue in full force and effect the act which makes it unlawful for the Secretary of the Treasury or any official under him to cancel or retire any more of the United States legal-tender notes, and which also requires him when such notes are redeemed or received into the Treasury, under any law from any source whatever, to reissue and pay them out again, and thus keep them in circulation.

Another objection urged by some is that the people are opposed to issuing Government bonds in times of peace, and that to authorize their issue at such times is contrary to the policy of the Republican party. That the people disapprove of any increase of our public debt in times of peace is undoubtedly true. This sentiment is only natural; but when they know, as every man in this House does, that bonds will be issued in the near future, on the theory that it is necessary to replenish the gold reserve and maintain our public credit, then I say it is our duty to require such bonds to be issued on the most favorable terms possible, and afford to the people an opportunity to take them, if they so desire, instead of first tendering them to a foreign or domestic syndicate.

In reporting this measure the committee, therefore, have not violated the sentiment of the people referred to, nor have they transgressed the policy of the Republican party. It was in deference to that sentiment, as well as in deference to the individual judgment of the majority of the committee, that they reported a bill in line with the policy of the Republican party in the last House. The bill now under consideration is in form and substance almost identical with the bill presented by the present Speaker at the last session of the Fifty-third Congress and which received a vote of approval from every Republican in that House except two.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Has not that action of the Republican minority of that House been universally commended by the Republican press of the country?

Mr. TAWNEY. The action of the Republicans of the Fifty-third Congress in supporting that measure was not only universally commended by the Republican press, but approved by the people, and in every State in which an election has since been held the Republican party has been triumphantly victorious. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That measure was proposed, too, at a time when the conditions were exactly what they are to-day, a depleted gold reserve, a deficient revenue, and a proposed thirty-year bond issued at a high rate of interest. Proposing this measure, therefore, under these circumstances, will certainly meet with as much favor among the rank and file of the Republican party and will be received by the Republican press throughout the country in the same spirit in which it was received and commended at that time, and if it should become a law it will relieve a situation in our public finances which at the present time threatens more serious consequences to the people than they have yet experienced under the present Administration. That this is so, and to show to this House that the people are alive to the situation and recognize the importance of modifying, in effect, the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect to the issue and sale of Government bonds, permit me to read from a letter received this morning, written by a constituent, Hon. C. S. Crandall, a merchant of Owatonna, Minn., and a man of excellent judgment, who is in touch with the people in his community. In this letter Mr. Crandall says:

> I want to ask you, and through you the Republican majority of the House, to legislate for the people for a time. I want your committee to bring in and urge the passage of a bill providing for a coin bond to be issued in denominations of $100, bearing interest at 3 per cent. Such bonds presented to the common people of this country through the agency of the national banks, would be taken about as fast as they could be offered by the people of small means. The money hoarded in the stockings of the country would find a place for investment in such a bond, and the patriotism of the people would be increased and assured by making them partners in business with the Government. We would not have to send gold abroad to pay either interest or principal, and foreign holders could not injure the credit of the country and precipitate panics by putting them on the market at a depreciated rate either when war was threatened here or otherwise. Such a loan would benefit the people by giving a place for investing small savings. It would be the most popular and the best way to get needed money for the Government. * * * Let me thank you and your colleagues for attending to business at this time in a patriotic way.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON], who are the special representatives of the Administration on this floor, have told us that the bonds to be authorized by this act could not be sold if they were offered as a popular loan, for the reason that there is no gold in the country with which the people could purchase them. In answer to this let me read from another letter just received from a constituent, Mr. C. F. Greening, a reliable merchant residing in the village of Grand Meadow, Minn., a man who is abundantly able to carry out any proposition to the Government or to a private individual which he might make. This gentleman says:

It is plainly evident that something must be done to keep the gold reserve up, and there are two ways to do it. Either tariff, to act at once, or another bond issue. If bonds, make them a short-time coin bond, in small denominations—say $10 and up, a popular loan, 2 per cent. interest, redeemable after two years, at the pleasure of the Government, and a legal tender for any amount. Sell them at par and give the poor people a chance to invest, as the French Government does. I want some $20,000 of them now, and could sell $50,000 in a week and furnish the gold for them. For God's sake, and the sake of the American people, do not let the syndicates have them. * * * "Them's my sentiments," briefly expressed.

Yours, for the war, either with a gun or a ballot.

[Loud applause on the Republican side.]

If the little village of Grand Meadow can furnish $50,000 in gold in exchange for short-time low-interest-bearing bonds, it is safe to say that the State of Minnesota alone could furnish $50,000,000, or one-half the amount which the President contemplates borrowing for the purpose of maintaining the public credit.

This talk, therefore, about the people not being able to take a loan of their own Government and furnish the gold therefor is unjust and unpatriotic and deserves the severest reproach from the people who are thus misrepresented on this floor.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that in my judgment this bill should pass, because it will enable Mr. Cleveland to make the loan we are assured he intends to make for a period of five years instead of thirty, at 3 per cent interest instead of 4, and thereby save to the people about $105,000,000; because it will prevent the future sale of Government bonds to a syndicate of any kind and require the Secretary of the Treasury to first offer our bonds to our own people; because it will require him to keep the proceeds of the sale of bonds in the gold redemption fund and separate from the cash in the Treasury, to be applied to the redemption of the United States legal-tender notes, and to no other purpose; because it will enable the Secretary of the Treasury to immediately supply the daily deficiency in revenue caused by the free-trade legislation of the Fifty-third Congress, and, whether necessary or not, it will thereby assure "those apprehensive among our own people" of the financial soundness of their Government and "reassure the world" of our ability and determination to meet in any emergency every obligation we, as a nation, incur.

And, further, I believe we should pass this bill because it will again demonstrate to the world that the Republican party, born as it was out of the highest aspirations of a great people, is to-day, as it has always been, equal to any emergency the Government may be placed in, whether caused by disloyalty or by Democratic incompetency.

It therefore becomes us as the representatives of that party, and as the representatives of a great people, to discard our personal and political prejudices and bring to bear upon the vote we are about to cast our highest intelligence and the most sterling qualities of the most pure and lofty patriotism. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill which has been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means is intended to provide for the redemption of United States legal-tender notes and to supply a deficiency in our revenues. For one purpose it permits the sale of bonds, and for the other it authorizes the issuance of certificates of indebtedness; but for both purposes it increases our interest-bearing debt. Except for the special rule which prevents us, we would offer as a substitute for this measure a bill which we think would render it unnecessary to sell bonds to redeem these notes, and which would utilize our profit on the silver bullion now in the Treasury to meet any deficiency which might occur. No prudent man, in the management of his private affairs, would hesitate long in his choice between these two propositions. Certainly none of us, if acting for ourselves, would incur a debt to defray our ordinary expenses when we could employ assets which would otherwise remain idle; and as the representatives of the people it is our plain duty to use what we have instead of borrowing money and paying interest on it.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, the saving of interest is not the only, nor, perhaps, the greatest advantage in coining that silver. It would add $53,000,000 to the circulating medium of the country, thus giving some stimulus to commerce and industrial entreprise. Again, sir, it is a very sensible way—indeed, it is the most sensible way—to forever obliterate all trace of that evil policy which bought one metal to be stored as bullion and paid for it in the coin of another metal. The coinage of that silver is a logical sequence to the act repealing the law under which it was purchased. How else will we dispose of it, if we do not coin it? Shall it lie in the Treasury as a dead investment, or shall it be sold as a mere commodity in the open market, and thus still further depress the price of silver? Not a single word can be said in favor of selling it, or in favor of retaining it in idleness, while its use would prove a twofold good—economizing interest and enlarging the circulation.

The most uncompromising advocate of gold monometallism could consent to the passage of our substitute without in the slightest degree sacrificing his convictions. It does not involve the question of a standard; it does not attempt to restore silver to its former and proper privilege; it merely adds a certain amount of silver to what is already in circulation, and gradually converts the coin notes, which have been issued in payment for silver bullion, into certificates calling for silver dollars. We could concede the claim of our opponents that silver is a cheap money without injury to our case here, because the only point to be considered in passing on this question is the extent to which a discredited medium can be safely employed. No man who possesses any knowledge of the subject will pretend that this is susceptible of an exact definition or demonstration. The only infallible test is, that when it depreciates it is too abundant; but it is equally true that it can not be considered too abundant until it does begin to depreciate.

A great statesman—a leader of the Senate in the golden age of American statesmanship and a Senator who thought more profoundly and more clearly on financial questions than any of his contemporaries—recorded it as his belief that this Government could carry a paper circulation equal to twice its annual revenue without promising to redeem it in anything, by simply making it receivable for public dues. I am inclined, myself, to think that he was safely within the truth when expressing that opinion; but I fully realize that the question is too delicate in its nature and too far reaching in its consequences to justify us in blindly following the opinion of any man, however wise we may know him to have been. It is a question upon which Congress can not afford to try any rash experiment. But, sir, with the experience of this and other countries before us, we ought to find no insurmountable difficulty in judging how much of a less favored coin can be circulated on an equality with a more favored one. No conservative legislator would be willing to proceed contrary to this experience, but it would be an inexcusable timidity which would shrink from following a path that it points out as both safe and plain.

Looking first to our own country, it is found that we have to-day, in round numbers, four hundred and twenty-three millions in silver dollars and silver certificates. That they circulate on a perfect parity with gold no man has yet been bold enough to deny. For a time, it is true, the more ignorant advocates of a single standard asserted that this parity was maintained because the Government was pledged to redeem silver dollars and silver certificates in gold; but well-informed men, of course, have understood all the time that there is not the least semblance of an authority in the law for redeeming silver dollars in anything, or for redeeming silver certificates in anything but silver dollars. Perhaps the uninformed ones will agree with us when they learn that the Secretary of the Treasury himself supports this view and has declared in an official communication that the practice of his Department has conformed to the law in this particular. In response to a resolution of inquiry addressed to him by the Senate, Mr. Carlisle says:

The law providing for the redemption or exchange of silver certificates, which requires that such certificates shall be redeemed or exchanged, in kind, for standard silver dollars, has, so far as this Department has information, been strictly complied with by the Treasury of the United States and the various subtreasury offices, and no gold coin has been given in exchange for such certificates or standard silver dollars.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in the extract which I have just read, makes it perfectly plain that our silver circulation is not supported by gold, but that it supports itself.

Our adversaries rejoin, however, that even if it is true that four hundred and twenty-three millions of silver can be maintained at parity it does not follow that one hundred and seventy-seven millions more can be safely added to it. On this point we have no experience of our own to guide us, but the experience of a country similarly, though less favorably, situated is both valuable and instructive. France, with only 39,000,000 people, maintains a silver circulation equal to $650,000,000, every dollar of which is a full legal tender, and no dollar of which is redeemable in gold, and there is never the slightest disparity between their gold and silver coin. If the French Republic can circulate $650,000,000 worth of silver as a money of final payment at a ratio of 15½ to 1, certainly, with almost double her population, with four times her volume of business, and with more than twenty times her resources, we could circulate even a greater amount at a ratio of 16 to 1. And yet, sir, if every ounce of silver bullion in the Treasury were coined

into silver dollars we would then have less than $602,000,000 as against $650,000,000 for France. With an almost unlimited demand in private business operations, with a tax demand, Federal, State, county, and municipal, exceeding annually $1,000,000,000, and with a silver circulation of less than $602,000,000, no economic force could be generated sufficient to separate the value of our gold and silver coins and keep them separated.

COIN NOTES.

But, Mr. Speaker, as indefensible as is the action of the majority in preferring to sell bonds rather than to use the seigniorage, even that is more defensible than their conduct in denying to us an opportunity to propose our method of dealing with the coin notes issued in the purchase of silver bullion, and at the same time refusing to propose any method themselves. There is not a line in the pending bill calculated to relieve the Treasury so far as the notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, are concerned. It grants additional authority to provide for redemption of United States notes (though the law in that respect is already ample enough), but it contains no provision whatever for redeeming what are known as the Sherman notes; and this, too, in the face of the fact that in the present condition of the Treasury every time the Secretary redeems one of them in gold he does so in palpable violation of the law. What I mean to say by this is, that there is no gold in the Treasury except that which has been received for bonds sold under the resumption act, and the gold thus acquired can not be lawfully applied to purposes other than those specified in that act. It seems to me that there ought to be no difference of opinion on this point. The act of January 14, 1875, commonly known as the resumption act, under which alone the Secretary claims the right to sell bonds, is perfectly explicit, both in its terms and in its intention. Its title properly and briefly describes it as "An act to resume specie payments," and it provides three methods of resumption.

It first requires the Secretary of the Treasury to cause to be coined at the mints of the United States subsidiary silver coins with which to redeem and retire the fractional paper currency then in circulation. This section has been complied with and is now practically obsolete.

The second requirement was that the Secretary of the Treasury should redeem and retire United States legal-tender notes equal to 80 per cent of the circulating notes which should thereafter be issued to national banking associations until the legal-tender notes outstanding should be reduced to $300,000,000. This provision remained in force a little over three years and something more than $35,000,000 of these notes were canceled under it; but on the 31st of May, 1878, it was superseded by the act forbidding the further cancellation and retirement of those notes, and directing that when they passed into the Treasury they should be reissued.

The third requirement, and the only one which still continues in force, was that—

> On and after the 1st of January, 1879, the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem in coin the United States legal-tender notes then outstanding on their presentation for redemption at the office of the assistant treasurer of the United States in the city of New York, in sums not less than $50.

Having enjoined upon the Secretary of the Treasury this threefold duty, Congress next proceeded to supply him with the means of performing it, and incorporated in the same act this provision:

> And to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and provide for the redemption in this act authorized or required, he is authorized to use any surplus revenues, from time to time in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, and to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par, in coin, either of the descriptions of bonds described in the act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt, with like qualities, privileges, and exemptions, to the extent necessary to carry this act into full effect, and to use the proceeds for the purposes aforesaid."

There is no ambiguity here and no doubtful phraseology to be construed. It is perfectly plain to every thinking man who wants to understand its meaning. The Secretary of the Treasury was required to pay certain debts, and to enable him to do so he was authorized to sell bonds in order to obtain the money with which to pay those particular debts, but no others. The law itself reads:

> In order to prepare and provide for the redemption in this act authorized or required—

And in express terms limits his right to sell bonds—

> To the extent necessary to carry this act into full effect.

Not only is he thus restricted in the sale of bonds, but after he has sold them the law only authorizes him—

> To use the proceeds thereof for the purposes aforesaid.

What were "the purposes aforesaid"? Clearly the purposes set forth in the act. It would not seem necessary to pursue this argument further than this mere statement of the law; and I would not venture to detain the House in doing so except for the fact that men in high position and distinguished for their great ability are maintaining a totally different construction of it. This being true, I might feel greater hesitation in asserting my view of the law if it were not, that the one which I now entertain is the one which has been heretofore entertained by Democratic and Republican leaders alike. As recently as the Fifty-second Congress the question was specially considered by the Judiciary Committee of the House, and while the majority and minority differed as to the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to exhaust the surplus revenues before resorting to the reserve fund, yet there was not the slightest disagreement on the point that under no circumstances could he use any part of the reserve fund for any purpose except to redeem the United States legal-tender notes. The majority report declares that—

> There is no limitation upon the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to sell bonds for the purpose of redemption under this (the resumption) act, but the proceeds derived from such sales can not be used for any other than redemption purposes.

The minority report states, as the second of several conclusions—

> That the only fund actually provided (which is the reserve mentioned in the proviso of 1882) for the redemption of United States notes is the proceeds of bonds sold from time to time for redemption purposes, and that such proceeds may be used for that purpose, but for no other.

Pending the resolution upon which were submitted the reports from which I have just read, Mr. Foster, who was then Secretary of the Treasury, appeared before the Committee and presented a carefully prepared statement, in which he asserted—

> That the money derived from the sale of bonds is undoubtedly applicable only to the redemption of United States notes.

It thus appears, according to the unanimous opinion of all who have considered the question, including the immediate predecessor of the present Secretary of the Treasury, as well as according to the plain letter of the law, that the money received for bonds can only be paid out for greenbacks; and I assume that Secretary Carlisle himself holds this opinion. During the discussion of the Bland bill in 1878, Mr. Ewing of Ohio strongly opposed its passage on several grounds, one of which was that some Secretary of the Treasury would use the proceeds of bonds in buying silver bullion. Mr. Carlisle, then a member of this House, replied in an elaborate and somewhat celebrated speech, in which he took great pains to point out the fallacy of Mr. Ewing's position, and argued that the act authorizing the sale of bonds and the act requiring the purchase of silver bullion were not *in pari materia*, and the one could not be construed in connection with or as an amendment to the other. He asserted most positively that the act under which bonds could be sold expressly devoted their proceeds to the objects enumerated in it, and that under no fair construction could they be used for any other object. His very words were:

> As already stated, the resumption act provided for the creation and accumulation of a special fund for a special purpose—the redemption and retirement of the legal-tender currency—and whatever coin has been or may be procured under that act by the use of surplus revenues or by the issue and sale of bonds is dedicated to that one object.

ESTABLISHED POLICY ARGUMENT.

It is contended, however, that, inasmuch as the act of July 14, 1890, declares it to be the established policy of the United States to maintain the parity of the two metals, the Secretary of the Treasury has the right to sell bonds and to use the proceeds whenever he thinks it necessary to do so in order to preserve the equal value of our gold and silver coin. A more untenable and a more dangerous doctrine has never been advanced in the history of this country. Can a mere declaration of policy be construed into an authority to borrow money on the credit of the United States? That, sir, is a sovereign power. It is the second of those specifically enumerated in the Constitution, and conferred on Congress. It stands next in order, as it does in importance, to the great power to lay and collect taxes, and it can not be granted away as an inference or surrendered by an implication.

I do not doubt that it is the duty of this Government to keep each dollar which it has issued equal in value to every other dollar; but this, sir, is a duty the fulfillment of which devolves upon Congress, and not upon the Treasury Department. It is true that the so-called Sherman law makes the notes issued under it redeemable in coin and leaves it for the Secretary to determine whether it shall be gold or silver coin; but neither that law nor any other one invests him with the power to procure the coin for that purpose, and it is still left for Congress to supply him with it by taxation or otherwise. When this has been done, then so long as there remains any gold in the Treasury subject to a general appropriation I do not question the power of the Secretary to redeem these notes exclusively in gold, but he has no more right to divert the money belonging to a trust fund, or to sell bonds to pay this debt, than he has to pay any other debt of the United States.

Our Republican friends must traverse the record of their party before they can sanction the theory that an incidental declaration of a policy can be expanded into a power to encumber future generations by the sale of bonds. When our legal-tender notes were at a discount of 30 per cent Congress passed the act of March 18,

1869, entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," in which it was written—

that the faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment in coin, or its equivalent, of all the obligations of the United States not bearing interest, known as United States notes.

There was a formal, distinct, and unequivocal promise of the Government, coupled with a great disparity between our currency which was to be redeemed and the coin in which it was to be redeemed, but it never entered the brain of any living man to suppose that under that law the Secretary of the Treasury had the power to sell bonds. It was a promise which Congress had made and which Congress was expected to keep, but until Congress devised some suitable means the Treasury was powerless to act, and those notes continued at a discount for ten long years.

But, sir, the history of the Republican party is not more at variance with this claim than the utterances of the present Secretary of the Treasury. In the same speech from which I quoted a few moments ago, and while discussing the same phase of the same question, he announced this opinion:

This measure is not an amendment to the resumption act. It is entirely new and independent legislation upon a different subject and for a different purpose. The power of the Secretary of the Treasury to issue and sell bonds for any purpose whatever is neither diminished nor enlarged by it, and to say that he will attempt to substitute the obligation of the Government for a plain appropriation of money is simply to assert that he will deliberately violate his official oath and subject himself to impeachment and removal.

The Bland law, which was under discussion when Secretary Carlisle used this vigorous language, provided for the monthly purchase of not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 worth of silver, and appropriated "a sum sufficient to carry out that provision out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." The act of July 14, 1890, directed the Secretary of the Treasury to buy 4,500,000 ounces of silver each month, and to pay for the same in Treasury notes, and appropriated "a sum sufficient to carry into effect the provisions of that act out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." The principle of the two laws was the same, but there was this important difference in their detail—under the Bland law the silver was paid for with money already in the Treasury, while under the Sherman law it was paid for by the issuance of Treasury notes redeemable on demand in coin; but the appropriation to buy under one act and to redeem under the other was precisely the same, being "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." In other words, the appropriation for the redemption of the Sherman notes is identical with the appropriation for the purchase of silver under the Bland law, and if it is true, as Mr. Carlisle has so solemnly affirmed, that a Secretary of the Treasury would have deliberately violated his oath of office by using the money derived from the sale of bonds in buying silver under the Bland Act, he would be just as guilty if he used the proceeds of bonds to redeem the notes issued under the Sherman Act; for his authority in both instances is conferred in the same words.

Mr. Carlisle declares that the Government is obligated by good faith to redeem these notes in gold; but Mr. Carlisle has also declared that a Secretary of the Treasury who will treat the obligation of the Government as an authority to issue bonds, or to use the proceeds of bonds, "deliberately violates his official oath." I am aware, of course, that since he delivered the speech from which these quotations are taken the Secretary's economic views have undergone a change; but this question of law is independent of the question of policy, and a change in reference to one does not involve any modification as to the other. Secretary Carlisle may honestly believe that this Government ought to pay every one of its creditors in gold; but we have his own warrant for saying that in the present state of the law a Secretary of the Treasury who would use the gold received for bonds sold under the resumption act for any purposes other than those specified in that act "deliberately violates his official oath."

UNITED STATES NOTES.

Not only have we insisted, Mr. Speaker, that the seigniorage should be used instead of certificates of indebtedness to cover current deficiencies, and that the Treasury notes issued in the purchase of silver bullion should be converted as rapidly as possible into certificates representing silver dollars, but we believe it unnecessary to sell bonds for the redemption of the United States notes. Our friends on the other side admit that the sale of bonds can be avoided by redeeming these notes in silver; but they assert that whenever we refuse to pay gold to our note holders who demand it, our currency and our silver will instantly go to a discount. If this assertion were well founded, it might be conclusive; but it is not well founded. There is not in my mind the shadow of a doubt that the mere receivability of these notes would preserve their parity, and in expressing this opinion I express no sympathy with the pernicious doctrine of fiatism; for it is entirely consistent to affirm that the quality of legal tender in public dues can add an unlimited value to a limited volume of paper, and at the same time to deny that it can add even a limited value to an unlimited volume of the same kind of paper.

With only $346,000,000 of these notes in circulation, and with an annual demand on the part of the Federal Government against the taxpayers of the country of almost $500,000,000, it is utterly impossible that they should depreciate. These gentlemen seem to fear our proposition to redeem in silver much as a child fears the dark—not because they know there is any danger in it, but simply because they do not know enough about it to know whether it is dangerous or not. We do not fear it, because we do not think that the result is a matter of conjecture. We know what has been the result where our plan has been tried under less favorable circumstances, and we do not fear to test it under our more favorable circumstances. We know that the notes of the Bank of France are redeemable in coin, as our United States notes are, and that the option is with the bank there, as it is with the Treasury here, to pay in gold or silver coin as its convenience may suggest. We know, too, that the Bank of France never surrenders its option, and that in exercising it note holders are frequently refused gold and paid in silver; but notwithstanding this fact the credit of the Bank of France is superior to that of any similar institution on earth.

Twice within the last sixty years it has rescued the Bank of England from perilous situations. In the great panic of 1837, when the credit of the world was tottering, the Bank of France was able to spare to the Bank of England much needed assistance, and again in 1890, when the disastrous financial storm, originating in South America and sweeping across the seas to the four quarters of the globe, had wrecked in its mighty and resistless course the greatest private banking institution in the world, and was threatening to engulf all lands in bankruptcy and ruin, the Bank of France stayed the rising tide, and France herself passed unharmed through the terrible catastrophe. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, American Representatives will not doubt that this Government can easily sustain its credit under the same system which sustains and strengthens the credit of the Bank of France. Not only does the Bank of France protect its reserve against depletion, but I undertake to say there is not a well-managed bank in any civilized country on the earth which would encourage a run upon it by paying out one kind of money when it could terminate the run by paying out another kind. For two years there has been a persistent and systematic raid upon our Treasury, instituted and prosecuted for the sole purpose of compelling Congress to agree to the retirement of these notes.

That this is true the Treasury reports leave no room for doubt. From July 1, 1879, up to January 1, 1894, the Treasury had redeemed, in round numbers, $95,000,000 of United States notes, and from January 1, 1894, up to this time more than $247,000,000 have been redeemed. This statement of itself is sufficient to establish what I say, but it is not the whole proof. There are $346,681,016 of United States notes and $137,771,280 of Treasury notes issued under the Sherman Act; and though there are nearly half as many of the Sherman notes as of the United States notes outstanding, since January 1, 1894, only about $18,000,000 of Sherman notes and $247,000,000 of United States notes have been presented for redemption. During this fiscal year the redemptions have been over $69,000,000 of United States notes and less than $2,500,000 of Treasury notes. This discrimination is not accidental. It clearly discloses a concerted effort to force the retirement of the United States notes by first making Congress believe that they are distrusted, and then making the people believe that they can not be retained in circulation without frequent increases of the public debt. I have no respect for the patriotism or the honesty of men who will enter into a conspiracy of this kind, but it is certain that they have chosen very effective means to accomplish their end, and it is also certain that they will succeed, unless we can compel the redemption of these notes in silver. I repeat the statement for the sake of emphasizing it: Nothing is more certain than that either we must force the redemption of these notes in silver or else the advocates of a gold standard will ultimately force their retirement.

Gentlemen of the majority, your party might as well face this question and our party might as well face it. Indeed, all men of all parties might as well face it here and now, for they must do so sooner or later, and the longer it is postponed the more perplexing it will become. No intelligent man believes that the United States ought to become a gold banker for the world, and yet, sir, the dullest man can perceive that if we commit ourselves to the policy of redeeming our currency in gold alone we simply say to all of the nations of the earth that we will maintain a gold reserve from which they may draw at their pleasure. Whenever a silver-using country desires to establish a gold basis, or a gold-using country desires to replenish its stock, it can contract with the great banks of New York to furnish the amount which they require. The New York banks will then present our paper for redemption in gold which they will ship to their foreign correspondent. No country can endure this drain and no country but our own would attempt it.

Another and, as recent events have shown, a very serious danger is that when the great financial institutions of our trade centers combine to coerce the Government, the Treasury is utterly defense-

less under its present policy. As an illustration, let us suppose that the bankers unite to compel an issue of bonds. They begin at once to exchange their currency for gold, and when the Treasury stock falls below what they are pleased to call the "danger line," they straightway appeal to the Secretary to "restore confidence" by strengthening the gold reserve. The Secretary then announces a sale of bonds, for which he exacts gold, and the bonds are taken by the bankers, who pay for them with the same gold which they have already taken from the Treasury for that very purpose. Thus when the transaction is closed our non-interest-bearing notes have been converted into interest-bearing bonds. These notes are then covered into the Treasury, and when paid out again are ready to repeat the operation. It is no answer to say that this illustration is unfair because it supposes a deliberate conspiracy on the part of certain citizens against their Government, for we all know that it supposes nothing more than what has actually transpired twice within the last three years and what is transpiring this very hour.

But in order to obviate this criticism let us go a step farther and take a case in which there is no combination or agreement. Let us suppose that the gold reserve has been depleted in the settlement of international balances, and that the Secretary has decided to repair it by a sale of bonds. Accordingly he advertises a proposal to sell fifty millions, for which he demands gold, and immediately the men who expect to become bidders for those bonds begin to present their currency for redemption, and while the Secretary is preparing to sell bonds to put gold into the Treasury, intending purchasers are taking gold out of it in order to buy his bonds. And so he might stand there, in endless repetition, receiving gold from the sale of bonds and paying it out in the redemption of currency. In this way our bonded debt could be increased indefinitely, or until the people, alarmed at its rapid and enormous growth, would consent to the retirement of all Government paper. Many men believe this is the real object of the policy which is now being pursued. As for my part, I am thoroughly persuaded that it is, and I think that the proof is such as to convince any reasonable mind. Mr. Manning, a Secretary of the Treasury under Mr. Cleveland's former Administration, urged upon Congress the redemption and cancellation of the greenbacks. Mr. Carlisle, the present Secretary of the Treasury, in his report of 1893, renewed that recommendation, though he was somewhat less direct about it. He then said:

> So long as the Government continues the unwise policy of keeping its own notes outstanding to circulate as currency and undertakes to provide for their redemption in coin on presentation it will be, in my opinion, essential for the Secretary of the Treasury to possess the means or to have the clear and undoubted authority to secure the means which may, from time to time, become necessary to enable him to meet such emergencies as the one which has recently occurred in our financial affairs.

No rational person understood Mr. Carlisle to mean that the Government ought not to redeem its paper on presentation. Everybody who knew anything knew that what he reprobated as an "unwise policy" was the Government keeping its own notes outstanding to circulate as currency; and this opinion was confirmed when in his annual report for 1894 he unqualifiedly advised the destruction of the greenbacks. The Secretary, however, advises us to do openly what the Republicans are attempting to accomplish by indirection; for it is certain that the effect of the pending bill will be to accumulate the United States notes in the Treasury, and thus withdraw them from circulation as completely as if they were canceled and destroyed. The Secretary proposes to get them into the Treasury and burn them up, while this bill will get them in and keep them there, and the one method as effectually retires them from circulation as the other.

Not only do I feel certain that this would be the effect of the pending bill, but I am constrained to believe that this is its purpose. Upon no other reasonable hypothesis can its authors explain that provision which empowers the Secretary of the Treasury to issue new evidences of debt to cover the difference between our receipts and expenditures. It could not have been intended as a mere precaution, because as such it was totally unnecessary. The Treasury statement issued this morning shows a balance, over and above the gold reserve, of $109,000,000; and no man on this floor supposes that the deficiencies of the next three years will absorb this surplus. This fact, considered in connection with the further fact that these United States notes when once redeemed can only be put back into circulation when required to satisfy appropriations, induces me to believe that the real object of empowering the Secretary to use certificates of indebtedness is to enable him to keep the redeemed United States notes in the Treasury, and thus evade the act of May 31, 1878, which forbids their cancellation and directs their reissue.

It is not my habit to impugn the motives of men, but I feel justified in saying that the Republican leaders have not been candid in their treatment of this question. For months they have bitterly denounced the President for selling bonds in time of peace, and now, although they have the power to do so, they refuse to reverse the policy which has necessitated the sale of bonds. Not only so, but they are actually inviting additional sales by making it easier and more convenient to sell. There is no man on that side of the Chamber who values his reputation for intelligence and candor who would be willing to record it as his deliberate opinion that the sale of bonds could have been avoided under a policy of exclusive gold payments. During the last two years gold has constituted but a fraction of the Government's ordinary collections, and yet, since January 1, 1894, more than $247,000,000 in gold have been paid out in redeeming greenbacks. It was simply an impossibility for these redemptions to have been made without selling bonds, and you deceive yourselves if you think you can deceive the country about it. The people well understand that these notes must be redeemed in silver; or they must be retired; or our bonded indebtedness must continue to be increased. You have refused to require their redemption in silver. You do not dare to retire them, and you therefore must share the responsibility for future bond sales.

Your plea that the Secretary of the Treasury already has the power to sell bonds, and that you are merely permitting him to sell bonds bearing a lower rate of interest, is either a mere subterfuge or else you are strangely ignorant about transactions of this character. If our securities had a fixed price, then undoubtedly it would be important to stipulate the lowest possible rate of interest, but it is well known that, assuming the securities to be good, the premium or the discount, as the case may be, is regulated by the interest which they bear. A Government bond calling for 5 per cent interest will fetch a considerable premium, while one calling for 3 per cent would probably fetch no premium at all, and the difference in the premium would about equalize the difference in the rate of interest. It is easily within the memory of us all that when the ten-year bonds bearing 5 per cent interest were sold the premium which they commanded reduced the interest to less than 3 per cent, while the 4 per cent bonds, which run for thirty years, commanded only such a premium as made the interest on them about 3¾ per cent, showing that our best trade was with the short-time and high-rate bonds.

Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate for the framers of this bill that it can never become a law. If it were tried, it would signally fail to accomplish the object at which they aim, and would add another to the long list of mistakes which have been made in dealing with this important question. And still, sir, their failure would bring its compensations. It would serve to further demonstrate to our constituents the insufficiency of a single monetary standard. It would help to convince them that we must re-lay the foundations of our financial system, building, as our fathers builded, upon both gold and silver, which together constitute the only basis broad enough and strong enough to support the vast superstructure of credit which the genius and enterprise of the American people will rear upon it.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. HOPKINS. I yield five minutes to my colleague [Mr. MARSH].

[Mr. MARSH withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. HOPKINS. I yield five minutes of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that I am unable to accept the views of the gentlemen on this side of the House whose knowledge, experience, and judgment have justified their assignment upon the Committee on Ways and Means. In a matter of so much importance, affecting the financial integrity of the nation and every taxpayer therein, I am compelled to determine my action thereon in the forum of my own judgment and the court of my own conscience.

The limited time granted me by the courtesy of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] will hardly permit me to state my objections to the pending bill, much less to discuss the questions involved. The reserve fund created by the resumption act of 1875 for the purpose of maintaining the greenback has fallen below the danger line, and the President asks Congress to authorize him to issue and sell gold bonds in such quantity as shall enable him to cancel and retire the greenbacks. In keeping with this policy of the President, it has been charged upon the other side of the House that many if not all of the financial ills from which the country is now suffering are due to the creation and maintenance of the greenback currency. It is enough to answer that armies marched, that navies rode the sea, and that the integrity of the Union was preserved through the instrumentality of the greenbacks, and that twenty-five years of unexampled development and prosperity testify to the wisdom and courage of the Republican party in the enactment of the legal-tender greenback law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I stand for the integrity of the greenback. The friends of this bill claim that its virtue consists in this: First, that it authorizes the issue of bonds bearing a lower rate of interest and running

for a shorter time; second, that it compels the Secretary of the Treasury to advertise for bids instead of secretly contracting with some syndicate, and, third, that it prohibits the use of the proceeds of such bonds for any other purpose than the redemption of the greenbacks. They further claim that it prevents the retirement of the greenbacks so purchased. It may do so by implication, but I am one of those who believe that in expressed terms, and in words that can not be misunderstood, it should command the Secretary of the Treasury to so use such redeemed greenbacks that the people shall not be deprived of their use as a circulating medium. What have we to expect from an Administration hostile to the greenback currency? Again, there should be no occasion for the issue of an interest-bearing bond in time of peace. Our financial system is based upon such a revenue law as shall amply provide for the current expenses of the Government. The present deplorable condition is due to the financial policy which, beginning with the enactment of the so-called Wilson-Brice-Gorman bill, culminated in the disreputable sale of our bonds to the Wall street and English syndicate. I am unwilling by my voice or vote to add approval to any part or parcel of that financial policy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOPKINS. I yield five minutes to my colleague [Mr. CONNOLLY].

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not to my liking. Had I been making it, instead of saying "in addition to the authority now conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury," I should have said "in lieu of the authority now conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury." [Applause.]

But, sir, in the progress of this debate, I have observed upon one side of this Chamber such a spirit manifested upon this important question as leads me to believe that if this side of the House had presented a bill enacting that for all future time the gold dollar, the greenback dollar, and the silver dollar should be at par and equal with each other, those gentlemen would have been just as ready to oppose that as they are to oppose this.

I do not forget what my friend from Missouri [Mr. BURTON] said about the greenback, a kind of money consecrated by the blood of the people of this great land. They love it still. But the greenback to-day is like the man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho. It has fallen among thieves. [Laughter.] And as a Republican and a friend of that greenback, when the Secretary of the Treasury comes to me and to the people and says, "I want the authority to issue a lower rate bond to protect your Republican greenback and enable it to maintain its standard with the gold dollar," I think I am recreant to my trust, recreant to all the traditions of my party, if I refuse to give that power, to extend that helping hand.

But I am not willing to say, "You shall have it in a gold bond." I want to say that the bond that was good enough in 1875 to enable the Republican party of this country to make the greenback and the gold dollar stand equal, the one with the other, is good enough to-day, after thirty years of growth and prosperity under Republican rule have made the nation able to do it. It was able all the time until the last two years. No trouble was heard about the greenbacks, gold or silver. They were all equal. The people of this great land were content. No one sought to rob the Treasury. There was a reserve fund. I want to have that maintained. I want to have that consecrated greenback which my friend from Missouri [Mr. BURTON] and his people love; I want it to maintain its honor, its integrity, its respectability among the money of the world. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall, as a Republican, vote for this bill, although I believed at first I would not do it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, in presenting legislation to this House we must take the condition of affairs of the country as we find them. There is not a man in this House, nor a citizen in this broad land, who does not believe that it is important and necessary for the President and his Secretary of the Treasury to keep one hundred millions of gold reserve in the Treasury of the United States. We know that that reserve has already been reduced to less than sixty-five millions, and that in order to restore the one hundred millions the Administration is now contemplating the issuing of new bonds.

In this emergency we simply give him the power to issue a 3 per cent bond in addition to the authority of the Secretary to issue a 4 per cent bond running thirty years and a 5 per cent bond running ten years. We propose something in the pending bill that in my judgment will meet the approval of every Republican in the country. We provide that whether this proposed issue of bonds be 3 per cent, 4 per cent, or 5 per cent bonds, the sale of them can not be made in secret with a foreign syndicate. If this bill becomes law and the President issues any bonds for the purpose of maintaining the gold reserve, he must take the American people into his confidence, he must give to American capitalists an opportunity to bid for these bonds. There will be no more secret sales.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] this morning said that it was necessary to insert the word "gold" in the bond in order to float it in foreign countries. I say to him that the experience of this country since bonds were issued in February last shows that the position which was taken by the members of this House in the last Congress who opposed the issue of a gold bond was and is correct. Of the $62,400,000 of 4 per cent bonds that were sold to the Rothschilds-Morgan-Belmont syndicate, the majority of them have come back to America, and are held and owned in the United States. The Secretary of the Treasury in his last report to Congress says that the contract which required that one-half of the money received for the sale of the bonds should come from abroad was modified and the gold was taken from the vaults of capitalists in this country to replenish the Treasury instead of bringing it all from abroad.

Mr. Speaker, time has demonstrated that not only the patriotism of the country is sufficient, but that we have gold here enough to float any amount of coin bonds at 3 per cent instead of 4, and can maintain this reserve by an appeal to American patriotism instead of making a secret contract and employing the aid of a foreign syndicate. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, this is simply a business proposition. The gold reserve of the Treasury to-day, according to the reports in the newspapers, after the withdrawals that will be made for this date for export, is less than $60,000,000. The President and the Secretary of the Treasury, according to the same report, are now engaged in negotiating a loan with a syndicate representing foreign capitalists to add $100,000,000 to the bonded indebtedness of this country. The only authority of law with which they are invested now to make this loan is contained in the act of 1875, under which they can issue no bonds at a lower rate of interest than 4 per cent, and these 4 per cent bonds to run for thirty years. We had an exhibition last winter of what the Secretary thought as to the price of those bonds, and it would appear from his long-delayed report, presented a few days ago to the House, that he still believes that a no more advantageous sale of these bonds could be made now than was made then, or, in other words, that we must pay a commission of $10,000,000 for every $60,000,000 of bonds which he offers for sale. This is the present emergency which is presented to this Republican House. The question is, how shall we deal with it? We have presented this bill, which only changes existing law in two particulars. First, it adds another description of bonds, a coin bond, with interest at the rate of 3 per cent and the bond payable in five years and due in fifteen years from date. In the second place, it prescribes that all bonds issued for the gold reserve shall be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury after advertisement and after they are offered to our own people. Some gentlemen have had fears——

Mr. LINNEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I will, if you will be very brief.

Mr. LINNEY. I will be very brief. Here, on page 21 of the President's message, it is stated that $155,000,000 in silver certificates were issued for the purchase of silver bullion, that are now an obligation of the Government. Why did not the Committee on Ways and Means provide for their redemption by the coinage of the silver bullion we have purchased?

Mr. PAYNE. I understand that can be done under existing law to-day. We are taking care of one thing at a time. We are looking out now for the gold reserve.

Mr. LINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAYNE. We propose to see that every legal-tender note issued by the Government of the United States shall be redeemed in gold whenever it is presented to the United States to redeem. [Applause on the Republican side.] And after we get through with that we will take up the other questions as they come along.

Mr. LINNEY rose.

Mr. PAYNE. I have answered your question, and can not yield any more time.

Some gentlemen are afraid that this bill will tie up greenbacks. Have those gentlemen examined this bill? Have they examined the amendment that has been placed on this bill, or have not they sufficient intelligence, after reading the bill and reading the amendment, to know that we leave the law precisely where it has been since 1875, and that it is just as impossible to tie up a dollar of the greenbacks in the Treasury of the United States under this law as it was under the law of 1875?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I can not yield to a question now.

Some gentlemen think the bill introduced by Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire, requiring certain importers to pay duties in gold, would cure the difficulty. But this bill is an idle and empty delusion. Suppose this bill were a law, and I owed the Government $1,000 in duties. I provide myself with $1,000 in greenbacks, as now, go to the subtreasury and demand gold for my greenbacks, and then pay the duties with the same gold. The Treasury would then have the same gold and also the $1,000 in greenbacks, precisely as it would have under the present law.

If a Secretary of the Treasury can tie up the greenbacks under this bill, he can tie them up under the existing law; for we have taken the pains, after having expressed in the first bill our purpose, to meet every objection, and the law itself expressly makes applicable the law of 1878 to this issue of bonds.

My friend from California [Mr. JOHNSON] yesterday, in that speech of his which seemed to evoke so much applause and laughter from our enemy on the other side of the Chamber, says this bill is "un-Republican;" and why? Because he says he stumped his district a year ago last fall and said the Republican party were forever opposed to issuing bonds in time of peace. Did he forget, or did his people forget, that in 1875 the Republican party enacted this law to issue bonds in time of peace; that in 1878 the Republican Administration borrowed $95,000,000, yes, $100,000,000, to create this reserve fund in time of peace, and that we have preserved on the statute book all the time this law of 1875 for the express purpose of borrowing money to make good this gold reserve, whether it is needed in time of peace or in time of war? I thought, as I listened to the gentleman's talk and heard the applause from the other side, "God forbid that he should ever write a Republican platform for me to stand upon." [Applause on the Republican side.] They say it is unnecessary, and still we have to-day this depletion of the Treasury. Still we have the Administration appealing to us for our aid; still we have this condition of the Treasury that must be met, and met at once.

Now, to-day we get another message from the White House. It comes in a roundabout way, in the form of an interview with the Secretary of the Treasury and his criticism upon the measure now being debated and about to be voted upon in the House of Representatives. The Secretary of the Treasury, who wants to retire the greenbacks, says he does not want this bill and he wants to see it defeated in this House. Why, sir, last February, when the question of a gold bond was before the House, and this bill substantially was offered in the form of a substitute by the gentleman from Maine, now our Speaker, the Republicans unitedly voted for that substitute, and it met the approval of the Cleveland Democrats on the other side of the Chamber. It would have passed this House by a majority vote if telephonic connection had been discontinued for a few minutes between this end of the Avenue and the other. The Administration did not want this bill and does not want it now.

Republican members get up here now and tell us that we are following in the wake of this Administration. Now, since you have found out where the Administration is, gentlemen, you who have proposed to vote against this measure and who now find that the Administration is against it, will you follow in the wake of the Administration? [Laughter and applause.]

They do not want this bill, and why? If they have not already negotiated another $100,000,000 loan, made in a secret corner, made without advertisement, made without offering a bond to the people of the United States, they are about to do it; and they want this House to vote down this measure, so that they can say to the people of the United States, "We have appealed to Congress and Congress gives us no relief, and so we are obliged to go on and pass out the money of the people of the United States to a foreign syndicate in order to float a loan." They want this measure defeated as a cover to this transaction, that they may put the responsibility on this Republican House.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If this bill, with its limitations upon the Administration in the matters referred, should be voted down, may not that be claimed as being, to some extent, an approval of the system which has been pursued?

Mr. PAYNE. Why, sir, the Administration say they can not borrow money under the law as it now exists without paying this immense premium. They ask us for relief; and if we vote down the measure of relief offered here, we in so far approve what they say and make ourselves responsible for this outrageous swindle that the syndicates are imposing on the country.

The question has been asked—it was one that troubled the gentleman from Illinois—why not make these 3 per cent bonds a substitute for the bonds provided for in the law of 1875? Sir, we believe that 3 per cent bonds can be floated among the people of this country. The Secretary of the Treasury professes to believe that they can not be. We want the opportunity given for the people to subscribe. We believe there is a spirit of patriotism among the people of this country, and that notwithstanding the blight that has come upon business in the last few years, so that their savings have in many cases been withdrawn from the savings banks, we believe they still have money enough to take care of these loans of the Government. But suppose there should be a panic. Suppose that after we have confined the Administration to a simple 3 per cent bond they should not be able to float it. What would the Treasury Department do then if the provision for a 4 per cent or 5 per cent bond had been stricken out? Mr. Speaker, I want a law upon the statute book which will provide for this gold reserve under any emergency and in spite of any calamity which the Democratic Administration during the brief term of its continuance may inflict upon the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, as has been well said, the greenback is the child of the Republican party. It was born out of the throes of the civil war; it was nurtured and cared for by that party. Finally, it was crowned by that party with a crown of gold. And in these days of peace—thirty years after the war—when the greenback has worn that crown so proudly that anywhere on the face of God's earth it is worth 100 cents on the dollar—when the greenback is worth its face value wherever the five-pound note of the Bank of England is worth its face value—the greenback, having reached this state of perfection and when it is going on to accomplish its mission, some hand is extended to take away that crown of gold and trail it in the dust. Republicans to-day are asked to vote against this bill, and thereby to approve a Democratic Administration that has brought such destruction and ruin upon the business of the country that it would seem they are obliged to deal with foreign syndicates at a more than 10 per cent shave in order to sell Government securities. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RUSSELL] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has called upon Congress for aid. The call was no mere recommendation. It came in the form of a special message and came at an unusual time. It had the character of an imperative demand for relief. It bore all the punctuation marks of an Administration which was overcome with difficulties and weighted down with troubles grievous to bear. The Republican House of Representatives heeded the call of the President and promptly set to work to furnish the relief. It accepted the statement of the President that an emergency was upon the country, and it hastened to meet the emergency in the quickest and most practical manner possible. But the Republican House of Representatives stood positively and unequivocally on the position which the Republicans have all along held. It declared that the basis of all the difficulties which had beset this Administration in its financial career was the lack of sufficient revenue—a lack which the Administration itself produced by its unfortunate and un-American tariff policy.

The Ways and Means Committee maintained this position when the revenue bill was reported to the House. The Republican majority in the House emphasized that position when they with so great unanimity and enthusiasm passed the revenue bill two days ago. Thus the Republican House of Representatives, representing the great Republican party of this country, answered the appeal of the President so piteously made, and it occurs to me to-day that possibly the President is questioning with himself whether he was not too hasty and too submissive in his appeal. But it answered the Administration's call for relief by providing relief according to its own method and in the direct line of a Republican policy. It met the emergency in a practical way. These alternatives were presented: First, should we indulge in a big bluster about what we might do if we were possessed of complete power in both branches of Congress and in the Executive to carry out our revenue and tariff policies to their completion; second, should we promptly do business in a way which should furnish relief by an increased revenue obtained from customs duties on imported articles which a Democratic tariff had placed on the free list or reduced in tariff rate. Business is always better than bluster. An accomplishment to an extent which is possible and practical is often better than a profession which is impractical and impossible to carry out so promptly as to meet a certain condition.

Already the Republican press and the Republican masses are expressing approval of the prompt and businesslike way in which the Republican majority in this House in its action on Thursday met the emergency which the President had called to our attention. The Republican party has a wood pile of its own, and it has selected a pole from its own pile in extending relief to the sinking Administration. A fisherman hysterically floundering on a quagmire with his feet unsteady on the quivering underpinning of the marsh may not have so clear a conception of the proper method of his release from the situation which threatens to engulf him as some one standing on firm ground above the mire, who, for a long time, has been watching with interest and with solicitation the performances of the fisherman. So this Republican House of Representatives has extended relief in the form of additional revenue to this piscatorial Administration, and I want to say right here, the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to the contrary notwithstanding, that the prevalent belief in the country to-day is that the deficiency of revenue is the cause of our trouble. The laboring men, the business men, and the bankers outside of the Administration's syndicate hold that belief.

This Republican House of Representatives, having thus furnished the relief which, in its judgment, was first of all necessary, and having passed a revenue bill which insures revenue to meet our Treasury deficit, and as well brings benefit all along the line to

American industry, might have stopped there. The Ways and Means Committee, however, thought proper to present to this Republican House of Representatives the bill which is now under discussion. It thought proper to do so for these two principal reasons. First, the passage of this measure would permit, or rather I should say would direct, the Secretary of the Treasury, in case of further bond issue made necessary by the failure or delay of our revenue measure, to place those bonds at a lower rate of interest and on shorter time than the authority of existing law now permits him to do. Can anyone object to such a provision? It is businesslike, economical, and in the interest of the people. Second, the bill under consideration directs that any future bond issues shall be so advertised and negotiated as to afford the opportunity to American citizens to invest in them as a popular loan. The failure by a Republican House to pass a measure with such a provision as this would in effect be an approval of the Administration's syndicate performances in the former issues of bonds.

I would have the country understand the political division which exists in the legislative and executive branches of the Government. I believe they understand the situation. Here is a Republican House of Representatives, strongly disposed to the enactment of a protective-tariff law which shall fully and equitably protect every branch of industry and every form of labor in these United States, and this Republican House of Representatives is impatiently waiting the time when the enactment of such a law shall be made possible; here is a United States Senate, rather strongly disposed toward the enactment of a measure for the free coinage of silver; and here is a President, pretty thoroughly imbued with the free-trade idea. Such a situation confronted this Republican House of Representatives, and if the present emergency shall be met by the Senate and the Executive in the same spirit and with the same regard for practical and patriotic results as the Republican House has met it, the emergency will be relieved and the difficulties of our Treasury situation temporarily, at least, bridged over.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] is recognized for eighteen minutes.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, in the short time at my command I shall endeavor to recall to the House the real issue presented in the situation before us. The President of the United States has sent in a special message directing attention to our diminishing gold reserve and urging as a remedy for existing evils the issuance of bonds payable in gold and the retirement of the Sherman notes and Treasury notes now in circulation. He asks that Congress forego its usual holiday recess and legislate in the line indicated. These are plain propositions. Either you agree with the President or you do not agree with him. If his theory as to our obligations being payable in gold is correct, then we are confronted with an emergency, and prompt action should be had. If you do not agree with him in that respect, then no great haste is necessary. You should, as business men, adopt one theory or the other and act upon it. You should not play politics. You should not in hot haste do that which he has not asked and at the same time pretend that you are doing it in response to his message.

The President says there is plenty of money in the Treasury. The official statement published yesterday shows $175,470,249, including the gold reserve. He does not ask increased revenue. He does not ask authority to sell coin bonds. He asks to sell gold bonds, to retire the Sherman notes and the greenbacks outstanding, and to confer additional privileges upon the national banks. Either you favor these propositions or you oppose them.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Is the gentleman from Georgia in favor of them?

Mr. CRISP. I am not. [Laughter on the Republican side.] But whether you favor or oppose them you ought to act with candor and frankness. The Secretary of the Treasury says he is not in want of revenue and that he has on hand a surplus of funds amply sufficient to cover any deficiency for years to come. On the 5th of February last the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], now the Speaker, in discussing a bond issue then proposed, used this language:

> If the Secretary of the Treasury will not have revenue, and declares that he is face to face with a surplus, we must treat the case upon that basis. Otherwise we arouse party feeling and come to no arrangement on the subject.

The course pursued by the majority to-day is exactly the opposite of that then suggested by the gentleman from Maine. You refuse to treat upon the basis suggested by the Secretary; and yet you claim the pending proposition is strictly in response to the urgent demands of the executive department.

On this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, there is some division on the financial question, yet in our opposition to the pending bill we are united. Those gentlemen on this side who believe we should have the single gold standard are opposed to it because it will bring no gold into the Treasury, and gold is what the Treasury wants. Those on this side who believe that all our obligations are payable in either gold or silver coin at the option of the Government, to which class I belong, will vote against it, because they think there is no necessity for it. Thus we unite in our opposition. How is it on that side of the House? A number of gentlemen there support this bill and yet say the obligations of the Government should be paid in gold. Those who so believe owe it to their country, to their Treasury, and to themselves to vote to obtain gold with which to redeem and to pay. Last year the President negotiated a sale of bonds to obtain gold. Under existing law he can only sell coin bonds. He sent a message to Congress saying that if within ten days that body would authorize him to issue bonds payable in gold instead of coin, there would be a saving to the Government on that single transaction of some $16,000,000. The House refused to authorize the issue of gold bonds. Those of us who believe the bonds and obligations of the Government are redeemable in either gold or silver voted against it because we believed the Government should pay according to contract in the metal most convenient, but how can one who says our obligations should be paid in gold justify a vote against it?

I ask these gentlemen who say all of our coin obligations must be paid in gold, How do you justify voting against that proposition? How does the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. DOLLIVER, justify voting against that proposition? And the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR? How do they justify voting against a proposition which, from their standpoint, without changing the liability of the Government, would yet save to the taxpayers of the country $16,000,000? How does the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. TAWNEY, justify it? Or the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HOPKINS; the gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. JOHNSON; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CANNON; and the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HENDERSON? All of these gentlemen have discussed the pending proposition, and insist that the obligations of the Government are payable in gold. I ask them how can they justify their refusal to insert the word gold in those bonds, when by doing it they would have saved to the taxpayers $16,000,000? They say our coin obligations are payable in gold alone, and yet refuse to express it in the bond, when by so doing they could have saved this large amount to the people.

I opposed the proposition last year because I did not believe as they did, that all of our obligations were payable in gold. Had I so believed and refused to support it, I should have felt myself unworthy longer to represent an intelligent constituency. On the proposition last year to issue gold bonds you will find recorded in the affirmative the gentleman from Maine, Mr. DINGLEY, now the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; the gentleman from Maine, Mr. REED, now the Speaker of the House; the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE; the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. RUSSELL, and yet to-day all but one of these gentlemen have addressed the House in favor of the pending proposition, which is to issue coin bonds. Last year they voted with a number of Democrats to insert the word "gold." This year, when in the majority, they refuse to prepare and support a bill containing the word "gold," but report and support a measure providing for the continuance of coin bonds.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman from Georgia pardon a suggestion?

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman knows that I have but a very few moments. The gentleman has his own time remaining.

Mr. DINGLEY. As the gentleman has referred to a fact, it seems to be only just that an explanation should go with it.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman from Maine will have his own time in conclusion.

Mr. DINGLEY. Very well.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask again if this proposition is to be treated as a business one? Why will you not so treat it? I ask if the position you have taken is not simply a political one? What is to be accomplished by the issuance of these bonds? Authority is granted by existing law to sell coin bonds to maintain specie payments. The pending bill does not change the character of the money in which the bonds are to be made payable. It authorizes bonds at lower rates, when the Secretary of the Treasury tells us they could not probably be sold at par, and it provides for the issuance of $50,000,000 short-time bonds in case there shall be a deficit in the revenues, when the daily report of the Treasury shows that it is impossible there can be a deficiency of funds for the next two years. What, then, is the object of gentlemen on that side of the House? Why, sir, it seems to me that their object is simply to pretend to do something in response to the demand of the Executive, when they well know, as all men who look into the matter must know, they are doing nothing.

Mr. BOUTELLE rose.

Mr. CRISP. My own position—my friend from Maine inquires about that, I believe? He knows me well enough to know that I have no purpose to conceal my own views upon any question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not question that. I understand it perfectly. But I heard my friend from Georgia arguing, I thought, that we ought to follow the advice of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury and issue gold bonds.

Mr. CRISP. My argument was, that if you believed, as you claim, that the obligations of the Government were payable in gold, you ought to have had the courage to vote to insert the word "gold" in the bonds, thus saving millions to the people. My friend from Maine and others of the leaders on the other side of the House who believe all the obligations of the Government are payable in gold ought to be brave enough to say so in the bond itself.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But does the gentleman from Georgia think he is going to help the credit of the country, or to aid the Treasury to any extent, by proclaiming to the world his belief that he does not think the United States bonds heretofore issued are payable in gold?

Mr. CRISP. I am not parading my views. I am arguing as to the want of consistency of the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But the gentleman says he does not believe our bonds should be paid in gold——

Mr. CRISP. I do not.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Do you think that helps the Secretary to save the $16,000,000 which he says must be lost because of the distrust lest the bonds shall not be paid in gold?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, can I have the remainder of my time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia declines to be interrupted, and he has the right to the floor.

Mr. CRISP. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not the time—perhaps this is not the time, but if I had an hour at my command I might do so—to discuss in full my views as to what remedies ought to be applied to the existing condition.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not want to trouble the gentleman, but simply to say I thought he was expressing his views, but I find that I do not know whose views he is expressing.

Mr. CRISP. When the gentleman gets through I should like to proceed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say to the House that the gentleman from Georgia has the floor, and is entitled to it, and can not be interrupted without his consent. [Applause.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I supposed the gentleman had consented.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I will say, though—perhaps I owe it to myself to do so in view of what has gone before—that I do not believe the experiment of a single gold standard should be continued longer. I do believe in real bimetallism, and that we can reach it by providing for the free and unlimited coinage of silver. I do not believe we should retire the Sherman notes and the greenbacks, thus contracting the currency about $500,000,000, nor do I approve of the proposition to enlarge the privileges of the national banks. I believe we should repeal the 10 per cent tax on State-bank circulation, thus permitting the people of each State to have a good and ample local circulation. I believe our unit of value should rest on both gold and silver. I do not believe in oppressing the debtors of this country and of the world as they would be oppressed by basing our standard of value wholly upon one metal. [Applause.] I believe, Mr. Speaker, this view is shared by a large majority of the people of the United States.

Look for a moment at the history of our bond transactions and coinage laws; until 1873 the law permitted the unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at a ratio of 16 to 1, and made either coin a full legal tender in payment of all debts or dues, public and private. In that year, when silver bullion was at a premium as compared with gold, silver was demonetized, its legal-tender quality was destroyed, and its coinage discontinued. In 1869 an act was passed which pledged the Government to redeem all its outstanding obligations in coin of the then standard of weight and fineness. The act of 1870 authorized the issue of bonds payable in coin of the then standard value. The act of 1875 provided for bonds payable as were the bonds authorized by the act of 1870. In 1877, when bonds were to be issued under the act of 1875, silver had been demonetized and its coinage discontinued, and we find Mr. Sherman, then Secretary of the Treasury, inquiring of the Attorney-General whether the bonds issued under that act should be made payable in coin of the then standard or in coin of the standard of 1870. If they were payable in coin of the standard existing at the date of issue, they were payable in gold; if in coin of the standard of 1870, they were payable in either gold or silver, at the option of the Government. The Attorney-General replied that the bonds should be made payable in coin the standard in 1870. And later, to set all doubts at rest, Mr. Stanley Matthews, of Ohio, afterwards a judge of the Supreme Court of the United States, submitted the following resolution, which was considered in the House.

Mr. PATTERSON. The Senate.

Mr. CRISP. In the House and Senate both.

The preamble and resolution are as follows:

Whereas by an act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," approved March 18, 1869, it was provided and declared that the faith of the United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment in coin or its equivalent of all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had previously provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold or silver; and

Whereas all the bonds of the United States authorized to be issued by the act entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, by the terms of said act were declared to be redeemable in coin of the then present standard value, bearing interest payable semiannually in such coin; and

Whereas all bonds of the United States authorized to be issued under an act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, are required to be of the description of bonds of the United States described in the said act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt;" and

Whereas at the date of the passage of the said act of Congress last aforesaid, to wit, the 14th day of July, 1870, the coin of the United States of standard value of that date included silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains each, declared by the act approved January 18, 1837, entitled "An act supplementary to the act entitled 'An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,'" to be a legal tender of payment, according to their nominal value for any sums whatever: Therefore

Be it resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States, containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in violation of the public faith nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor.

This resolution passed the Senate—yeas 48, nays 18; passed the House—yeas 189, nays 79.

That resolution was passed, Mr. Speaker, at a time when silver was demonetized by the act of 1873, and there has never been a doubt from that day to this that our bonds and obligations could be legally, honestly, and honorably discharged in either gold or silver of the present weight and fineness at the option of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] is recognized.

Mr. DALZELL. Before I proceed I want to yield half a minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL].

Mr. MCCALL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the simple purpose of saying that I desire to print in the RECORD certain letters from constituents of mine upon the Venezuelan question, which is a kindred subject to that under discussion, and is at least indirectly responsible for the fact that the House is to-day discussing the condition of the Treasury. The intrinsic character of these letters as well as the high standing of their authors make it proper that I should put them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that other members of this House may be able to read and give them due consideration.

From S. M. Macvane, McLean professor of ancient and modern history, Harvard University:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *December 20, 1895.*

DEAR SIR: I take the liberty of writing to you, as my Representative in Congress, regarding the present alarming condition of our foreign relations.

In my opinion, the Administration has committed a criminal blunder in its appeal to warlike feelings. The House of Representatives, instead of interposing a demand for moderation and care, has given way to foolish excitement and reckless haste. It looks now as if, by a return of your bill with amendments, you may have an opportunity to reconsider the case. I beg you to do what you can to prevent the passage of the commission bill in any form. It can only complicate and retard a rational settlement. We have diplomatic machinery for dealing with foreign countries and for collecting information regarding any question that affects our interests. England can hardly recognize the commission. The very appointment of it would be an affront which she could hardly fail to resent. It would put the whole subject on a wrong basis; would create about it an atmosphere of irritation highly dangerous to the peace of the two countries. The chances are strong that it would draw us into a position from which no escape could be found short of war. The men who get us into a war with England over a question of boundary between the English colonists in Guiana and the Venezuelans will undoubtedly be held to a sharp reckoning. The people of British Guiana are as much Americans as the Venezuelans are. The one spot of South America in which men of our own blood and language have set up free government and the rule of law is as much entitled to our support as are the unruly Spanish of Venezuela. If they have carried Teutonic enterprise into the unoccupied wilds about the headwaters of the Essequibo, they have done no more, I think, than our own people would have done in the same circumstances. That their Government should have followed them can hardly surprise anybody who knows that there would otherwise have been no government there.

The absence of a settled boundary has always been primarily the fault of Venezuela in making demands so gross and sweeping that they could not be entertained. That England should now refuse to submit to arbitration the question of handing over her colonists in their new homes to the tender mercies of the Venezuelan rule seems to me highly creditable to her. That this other great Anglo-Saxon nation should threaten her with war for doing so can only be due to error and misapprehension. When our people understand the case they will know what to think of the President and any who weakly follow him.

Very sincerely, yours,

S. M. MACVANE.

Hon. SAMUEL MCCALL, M. C., *Washington.*

From B. O. Pierce, Hollis professor of mathematics and natural philosophy, Harvard University:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *December 22, 1895.*

MY DEAR SIR: As one of your constituents I beg you to do all in your power to save the country from the wicked folly of persistence in the policy of interference in foreign affairs into which "politics" have apparently driven Mr. Cleveland, and which may lead us into a criminal quarrel with a friendly nation.

I sincerely hope that the Republican Congress will not be stampeded into unwise action for fear that it may not seem sufficiently "patriotic" to the braggarts who just now are so much in evidence.

Sincerely, yours,

B. O. PIERCE.

Hon. SAMUEL W. MCCALL,
Washington, D. C.

From William James, professor of psychology, Harvard University:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, *Cambridge, Mass., December 21, 1895.*

MY DEAR SIR: As one of your constituents I urge you to use your influence in every way to mitigate the further results of the calamity which President Cleveland and Congress together have sprung upon the country.

The good fame that one hundred years have won for us, and that has made the rest of the world view us with an indulgence accorded to no other great power, the character, namely, of being safe, and always to be counted on as throwing our vast weight into the scale that stands for humanity and civilization, has in three days of delirium been flung so far away over the roof tops that fifty years of sane conduct will doubtfully buy it back. We have written ourselves squarely down as a people dangerous to the peace of the world, more dangerous than anything since France under Napoleon. The grotesque logic of the Cleveland-Olney communications is only matched by their gratuitously insulting form. Was there ever anything more infernally cynical than to make of an incident where we pretend to urge upon others the use of the humaner international methods the pretext and vehicle of a wanton and blustering provocation to war?

The President's fearful blunder was in coupling his direct threat of war with his demand for a commission. It is the passions aroused by that that so fatally complicate the situation. Had he simply asked for $100,000 for a judicial commission to enable us to see how to exert most justly our influence hereafter, it would have left all possibilities open. And meanwhile, had the decision of the commission so solemnly inaugurated been adverse to England, it would have been exceedingly difficult for the English Government to go on in an unjust course. The Liberal party would have made of it an issue—we should have covered ourselves with dignity and honor and appeared to the world, as we always have appeared hitherto (alas, no longer), the friends of a new and more civilized international order.

All these possibilities are lost. The threat compels England to disregard the commission's decision. It compels us to declare war if she disregards it. Compels, that is, under penalty of flagrant cowardice on the one hand, under penalty of confessing to a buffoon Government on the other. It is monstrous that so sharp and calamitous an issue should be abruptly sprung on two friendly countries by the very first public utterance of our Executive. It has made retreat with honor impossible to either side, and I fancy that such a thing has never been done in the history of nations before, except as a preliminary to a declaration of war already decided upon on other grounds. Congress must do what it can to minimize the evil.

Your constituents hold you responsible for your full share in all that may occur.

Respectfully, yours, WM. JAMES.

Hon. SAMUEL W. MCCALL,
House of Representatives.

From W. E. Byerly, professor of mathematics, Harvard University:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, *Cambridge, Mass., December 21, 1895.*

MY DEAR SIR: As one of your constituents I wish to beg you most earnestly to do your utmost to oppose the wholly indefensible and uncalled-for attempt of the Administration to interfere in a boundary dispute of long standing between the one free stable Government in South America and an irresponsible military despotism masquerading under the name of a republic.

The quarrel is between two South American States and has absolutely nothing to do with us, our interests, or any principle we have ever attempted to maintain.

For the sake of the people who inhabit, or who are to inhabit, the territory in dispute, all our sympathies should be with British Guiana rather than with Venezuela; but however we may sympathize, to take part in the quarrel is directly contrary to the traditional policy to which we owe most of our greatness; and to go out of our way in such a cause to insult and threaten a friendly power is as mad as it is wicked.

Very sincerely, yours, W. E. BYERLY.

Hon. SAMUEL MCCALL, M. C.

From Edwin A. Start, instructor in history, Tufts College:

TUFTS COLLEGE, MASS., *December 21, 1895.*

MY DEAR SIR: The grave crisis which the President has brought upon the country by his recent hasty message to Congress is sufficient excuse, I hope, for me in presenting to your consideration the contents of this note.

I can not but regret exceedingly the position assumed by the President in the matter of Venezuela and Great Britain. In holding that he is wrong in his position legally and ethically, I believe I am only in line with the best authorities in the country upon history and international law. The construction given to the Monroe doctrine by the Administration is untenable and is more calculated to destroy all the significance of that doctrine than to maintain it. You are familiar with the circumstances that brought forth from John Quincy Adams, with England's approval, the original assertion of the doctrine which bears the name of Monroe. Russia was about to establish colonies on the Pacific Coast—Russia, the head of the Holy Alliance—the new reactionary system which progressive Europe feared even more than America could. Reaction was in the air, and hence our Government said in substance, No more European colonies in America; no extension of European systems of government on the American continent. I think you will agree with me that this is all there is in the Monroe doctrine.

Now, the first part of this declaration is to-day useless, for no American soil remains open for colonization.

Is the difference between Great Britain and Venezuela included in the second count? It seems to me not. It may well be that Great Britain was ungracious in refusing arbitration, but we have had our own boundary disputes with Great Britain, and they were peaceably settled by the powers concerned. The extension of a dangerous monarchical system is not involved here. Great Britain is a country as free as our own. It is very questionable whether the disputed territory would not be better governed by Great Britain than by Venezuela. It is doubtful whether our interference in this matter forcibly would accomplish any higher good than to arouse again the slowly dying ill feeling between the two greatest nations of the earth.

But I did not write you for the purpose of arguing this case in law or ethics. Upon these points you are fully informed, and, as one who has supported you with entire good will, I feel perfectly confident that your judgment will be sound.

What I wished to ask was this: Has not the war spirit in Washington become a little feverish? Has not the chip on the national shoulder grown so large as to hide considerations of the utmost importance?

If the President, to mask his political defiance, reads into the Monroe doctrine principles that are not in it; if to make political capital in the hour of defeat and waning prestige he enunciates a new policy more jingoistic than that of the jingoes, is such action not calculated to bring a thoroughly dignified American principle into contempt, and to cause it to be hereafter discounted in advance in international diplomacy?

And what does war mean? European affairs have been nicely balanced for a long time—so nicely that a touch will disturb the equilibrium. Is it likely that Great Britain and the United States can fight out a bitter quarrel that is sure to involve the possession of the northern half of the North American Continent without leading to complications that would set the armies of Europe in motion? No careful student of affairs can look for any other result. Is any such point of national honor or interest involved in the present question as to justify giving the signal for such a stupendous outbreak of giant forces?

If we are to go on the way marked out by the President, on which Congress seems ready to follow, we must face, as the President does, the probable result. Great Britain has no less national pride and self-confidence than we, and is as little likely to back down. It may be that Great Britain will yield, but it is hardly safer for us to bank on that than on Secretary Carlisle's Treasury estimates.

The Republicans in the House lost a grand opportunity to puncture the pseudo-patriotic balloon that was so airily displayed before them. Why did not some one ask that the Treasury be heard from, or why the President had dropped his policy of cautious timidity and struck the note of war so boldly at a time when his Administration had seriously embarrassed the nation financially, and when his party was on the verge of ruin.

The shrewdest politician in the country seems to have played his boldest and deepest game. In the moment of defeat he has made a high bid for the Irish vote that is getting away from its Democratic moorings, and has diverted Republican attention from conditions that make war talk worse than ill timed.

I hope I am not asking too much when I request your careful consideration of these suggestions, and urge you to throw your influence on the side of a more deliberate treatment in Congress of the serious questions now before the nation. A nation, as a man, can better afford to recede from a wrong position than to maintain it.

The voters who rolled up the enormous vote that put a Republican majority in the House did not do it to see that majority meshed in the net set by the chief of the Administration of which the people disapproved.

Perhaps I should add that I am not a peace-at-any-price man. War for a real principle, for the maintenance of national honor, whether good policy or not, would call for the support of every true American; but for a great nation to bring on war without such a basis is wholesale crime. I believe, too, in a firm, even a "spirited," foreign policy, and am classed, I think, as a jingo, but I detest a jerky and petulant foreign policy, on the course of which neither our own citizens nor other nations can count.

Asking you to pardon so long a communication, I am, sir, with great respect,

Yours, very truly, EDWIN A. START.

Hon. SAMUEL W. MCCALL, *Washington, D. C.*

From Samuel E. Turner:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *December 21, 1895.*

DEAR SIR: As one of your constituents I write to express my deep regret that the House of Representatives has so far supported the policy of President Cleveland's message in relation to Venezuela.

The message has been stigmatized as a "crime against humanity," and in my opinion it is nothing less to give a new interpretation to the Monroe doctrine, insult a friendly, kindred nation, and threaten war—all in the same breath.

The precipitation of the Franco-Prussian war by Napoleon III might well be considered a righteous act compared with the precipitation of war with England by our Government.

I trust that your voice will be raised loud and clear against all measures that make for war and in favor of all that make for peace.

Very respectfully, yours, SAM'L E. TURNER.

Hon. SAMUEL W. MCCALL.

From Henry B. Blackwell:

OFFICE OF THE WOMAN'S JOURNAL,
Boston, December 23, 1895.

DEAR MR. MCCALL: The only foothold that the Anglo-Saxon race and free government have in South America is British Guiana, which is governed by a legislature of its own and is a republic in all but name, like the provinces of Canada. Venezuela is only a chaotic, semibarbarous Spanish-Indian military despotism—a republic only in name. This is not a case where the Monroe doctrine applies.

Yours, truly, HENRY B. BLACKWELL.

From Hon. William B. Durant:

BOSTON, *December 21, 1895.*

MY DEAR MCCALL: The sentiment of the business men in your district is, in my judgment, that the President has made a great blunder in his Venezuela message, and that the Republicans are injuring themselves by indorsing him.

Yours, very truly, WM. B. DURANT.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of this somewhat protracted debate I can not expect to offer anything new to the House. Nor shall I attempt to do so. It will be my purpose simply to gather up the threads of the argument, and to ascertain as nearly as may be where we now stand. The pending measure contains two simple propositions, easy of comprehension by any intelligent man. So far as the second proposition is concerned, I do not propose to discuss it. I do not understand that it would meet with any substantial opposition in this House upon either side of the Chamber.

The first proposition is simply to add to existing law the power in the hands of the President of the United States to issue another kind of bond. Under the act of 1875 the President has the power to borrow money and to issue bonds running thirty years and bearing 4 per cent interest, or bonds running ten years and bearing 5 per cent interest.

The proposition now before the House is to so add to his power that he may issue bonds bearing 3 per cent interest, payable in fifteen years, and redeemable after five years at the option of the Government.

Now, I am at a loss to understand how there can be any possible objection to placing this power in the hands of the President. If you assent that he may reach out thirty years into the future and mortgage the earnings of posterity at the rate of 4 per cent,

ought he not to have the much lesser power to issue bonds running only fifteen years and bearing interest at the rate only of 3 per cent? Now, as a plain, practical proposition, let me cite to you some figures. Since the calamity of this Democratic Administration has come upon us there have been issued $162,000,000 of bonds. One hundred million dollars of those bonds bear interest at the rate of 5 per cent and run ten years. Sixty-two million dollars of those bonds run thirty years and bear interest at the rate of 4 per cent. Upon the first issue we pay in interest $50,000,000. Upon the second issue we pay in interest $75,000,000. In other words, since this Democratic Administration came into power, bonds have been issued under existing law which place upon the shoulders of our people in the shape of interest $125,000,000. Now, if the bill that is now pending before this House had been a law upon the statute books we would have been compelled to pay only $24,300,000, or, in other words, if it had been a law it would have saved to the people of the United States $100,700,000. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I ask any gentleman on this floor to assign any good reason why we should not adopt this measure of economy in the interest of the people of the United States. Some gentleman suggested that he would strike out the provision of the act of 1875 and insert simply the provision of this act. But I want to suggest to my friend that no one can foresee the future conditions of the market nor the future condition of the country, and that no harm comes from giving to the President of the United States the margin that he will have if this bill becomes law supplemental to—additional to—the law of 1875.

I want to call your attention particularly and briefly to two important things in connection with this bill. In the first place, it proposes to make the American people the creditors of the American people. It proposes to pay such interest as we may be compelled to pay to our own people and not to foreign syndicates. It proposes to afford an opportunity to every man, woman, and child throughout this broad land, whether in city or in hamlet, to show their patriotism by investing their earnings, whether small or great, in the bonds of their own Government. [Applause on the Republican side.] It provides, in the second place, that the proceeds of any bonds that may be issued shall be a separate fund for redemption purposes, and confines them to that purpose alone. It prevents, so far as legislation can, the use of the proceeds of bond loans for paying deficiencies in the Treasury; and gentlemen may dismiss from their minds any doubt as to the question of its interference with the greenbacks. So far as the greenbacks are concerned, this law changes existing law not an iota. Then I put to you the question: If these things are so, what is the objection to this proposed form of relief in this the hour of the country's emergency?

It has been suggested that this bill is an indorsement of bond issues in time of peace. Not so. This bill does not compel the issue of any bonds. It provides only for the character of the issue when the emergency shall make it necessary.

It has been further suggested that bond issues in time of peace are not in accordance with Republican policy. This again is a mistake. The Republican party has always opposed, will always oppose, bond issues to meet revenue deficiencies, but it has always advocated bond issues when necessary to keep at par the American dollar, and so in 1878 it issued ninety-five and one-half millions. The Republican party believes, above all things, in the maintenance of all our money, whether gold, silver, or paper, at a parity. Its doctrine is parity of value in all our dollars. Now, I put another question: Who stands opposed to this proposed law?

Why, I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that never in the history of Congressional legislation since the Government was founded has such a spectacle been presented as is presented to the country today. The President of the United States tells us that the pecuniary safety of the Republic is threatened. The Secretary of the Treasury echoes his cry. The President says to us: Gentlemen, forego the pleasures of this holiday season and come to my aid with legislation. The Congress of the United States—the majority party of the Congress of the United States—promptly responding to the President's call, do forego the pleasures of the Christmas season, and are here endeavoring to carry to the President the relief that he sought; and what is the President doing? Exercising all the power of the Administration to defeat the legislation that we are endeavoring to secure. [Applause on the Republican side.] What is the Secretary of the Treasury doing? Publishing authentic interviews in a morning newspaper decrying the legislation that we propose to consummate.

Why, Mr. Speaker, I am amazed—and I mean just what I say—I am amazed that a gentleman who has been a member of this House, a member of the other House, and a Cabinet officer has so little regard for the proprieties and decencies of public life and the theory of our Government. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] Why does the Administration oppose this measure? I will tell you why. Because it wants nothing but "gold" bonds, and it wants to deal with nobody but foreign syndicates. [Renewed applause.] Already it is an open secret that upon condition of the failure of this legislation an agreement has been made with another syndicate for another loan of anywhere from $100,000,000 to $200,000,000 at 4 per cent. That is the reason why the Administration is opposed to this measure, and why it seeks to put upon our shoulders the responsibility of its failure. Defeat this measure, my fellow-Republicans, and the Administration will say to the world—will say to our own complaining people—we are forced to make this loan at 4 per cent for thirty years because the Republican Congress would not give us authority to make any other.

Now, if that be so, if I have spoken the truth up to this time, will you tell me any reason why any Republican on the floor of this House should play into the hands of the Democratic Administration? [Loud applause on the Republican side.] Do you want, by voting with the Democracy, to increase the burden of this people another $16,000,000? Do you want to enable the Administration to put a responsibility upon us that we ought not to bear? Fellow-Republicans, there are times when there is not only an excuse, but when it is a duty to speak plainly. I beg of you to stop and think, to think long and soberly and intelligently, before you join the Democratic forces upon the other side of that aisle. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] The issue is plainly drawn. There can be no mistake about where the dividing line is. "Under which flag, Bezonian?" Will you vote with the Democratic party of this House, or will you follow after the banner of your own party in the interest of the American people? [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is upon ordering the bill to be engrossed for a third reading.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask a vote on each section separately.

The SPEAKER. The order gives that right, and accordingly the vote will be taken on the first section. The Clerk will report the first section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to the authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury by the act approved January 14, 1875, entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," he is authorized from time to time, at his discretion, to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par in coin, coupon or registered bonds of the United States to an amount sufficient for the object stated in this section, bearing not to exceed 3 per cent interest per annum, payable semiannually, and redeemable at the pleasure of the United States, in coin, after five years from their date, and payable in fifteen years after their date, with like qualities, privileges, and exemptions provided in said act for the bonds therein authorized. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall use the proceeds thereof for the redemption of United States legal-tender notes, and for no other purpose: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify an act approved May 31, 1878, entitled "An act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes." Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall offer any of the bonds authorized for sale by this act or by the resumption act of 1875, he shall advertise the same and authorize subscriptions therefor to be made at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States.

Mr. CRISP. I demand the yeas and nays on that.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state to the House that it will greatly facilitate the voting if order is kept on the floor, otherwise the Clerk can not hear the responses, and the responses should always be prompt and loud.

The Chair would further suggest that there may be three roll calls, so that gentlemen must bear that in mind and govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. CRISP. It is only on the final passage that I desire the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing that the first section be engrossed and read the third time.

Mr. CRISP. I only desire the roll call on the passage of the section, and what I suggest is that it be considered as engrossed and read a third time, and then the vote be taken on the passage of the section.

The SPEAKER. Then, without objection, the vote will be taken on that question, and will be on the passage of the first section.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 136, not voting 48; as follows:

YEAS—171.

Acheson,	Boutelle,	Cousins,	Fowler,
Adams,	Brewster,	Curtis, Iowa	Gamble,
Aldrich,	Bromwell,	Curtis, N. Y.	Gardner,
Anderson,	Brosius,	Dalzell,	Gibson,
Andrews,	Brown,	Daniels,	Gillet, N. Y.
Apsley,	Bull,	Dayton,	Gillett, Mass.
Arnold, Pa.	Burton, Ohio	Dingley,	Griffin,
Avery,	Calderhead,	Dolliver,	Griswold,
Babcock,	Cannon,	Dovener,	Grosvenor,
Baker, Md.	Chickering,	Draper,	Grow,
Barrett,	Clark, Mo.	Evans,	Hadley,
Bartholdt,	Codding,	Fairchild,	Hager,
Belknap,	Coffin,	Faris,	Hainer, Nebr.
Bennett,	Connolly,	Fenton,	Halterman,
Bingham,	Cook, Wis.	Fischer,	Hanly,
Bishop,	Cooke, Ill.	Fletcher,	Hardy,
Black, N. Y.	Cooper, Wis.	Foote,	Harmer,
Blue,	Corliss,	Foss,	Hatch,

Heatwole,	Knox,	Northway,	Stone, C. W.
Heiner, Pa.	Kulp,	Overstreet,	Strode, Nebr.
Hemenway,	Lacey,	Parker,	Strong,
Henderson,	Lefever,	Payne,	Taft,
Henry, Ind.	Leighty,	Phillips,	Tawney,
Hicks,	Leisenring,	Pitney,	Tayler,
Hill,	Leonard,	Poole,	Thomas,
Hitt,	Lewis,	Pugh,	Tracey,
Hooker,	Lorimer,	Quigg,	Treloar,
Hopkins,	Loudenslager,	Reyburn,	Updegraff,
Howe,	Low,	Royse,	Van Voorhis,
Howell,	Mahany,	Russell, Conn.	Wadsworth,
Hubbard,	Mahon,	Scranton,	Walker, Mass.
Huff,	McCall, Mass.	Shannon,	Wanger,
Hulick,	McCleary, Minn.	Sherman,	Warner,
Huling,	McEwan,	Simpkins,	Watson, Ind.
Hull,	Meiklejohn,	Smith, Ill.	Watson, Ohio
Hunter,	Mercer,	Southard,	Wellington,
Hurley,	Miller, W. Va.	Southwick,	White,
Hutcheson,	Milliken,	Spalding,	Wilber,
Jenkins,	Milnes,	Sperry,	Willis,
Johnson, Ind.	Minor, Wis.	Stahle,	Wilson, N. Y.
Johnson, N. Dak.	Moody,	Steele,	Woodman,
Joy,	Mozley,	Stewart, N. J.	Wright.
Kiefer,	Noonan,	Stewart, Wis.	

NAYS—136.

Abbott,	Curtis, Kans.	Long,	Russell, Ga.
Aitken,	Danford,	Loud,	Sayers,
Bailey,	De Armond,	Maddox,	Settle,
Baker, Kans.	Denny,	Marsh,	Shafroth,
Baker, N. H.	De Witt,	McCall, Tenn.	Shuford,
Bankhead,	Dinsmore,	McClellan,	Skinner,
Barham,	Dockery,	McClure,	Snover,
Bartlett, Ga.	Doolittle,	McCreary, Ky.	Sorg,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Downing,	McCulloch,	Spencer,
Beach,	Eddy,	McDearmon,	Stokes,
Bell, Colo.	Ellett, Va.	McKenney,	Strait,
Bell, Tex.	Elliott, S. C.	McLachlan,	Strowd, N. C.
Black, Ga.	Ellis,	McLaurin,	Sulzer,
Bowers,	Erdman,	McMillin,	Swanson,
Broderick,	Graff,	Meredith,	Tarsney,
Buck,	Harris,	Meyer,	Tate,
Burrell,	Hart,	Miles,	Terry,
Burton, Mo.	Hartman,	Miller, Kans.	Towne,
Catchings,	Hendrick,	Miner, N. Y.	Tucker,
Clardy,	Hermann,	Mondell,	Turner, Ga.
Clark, Iowa	Hilborn,	Murphy,	Turner, Va.
Clarke, Ala.	Hyde,	Neill,	Tyler,
Cobb, Ala.	Johnson, Cal.	Newlands,	Underwood,
Cobb, Mo.	Jones,	Otey,	Walker, Va.
Colson,	Kem,	Owens,	Walsh,
Cooper, Fla.	Kendall,	Patterson,	Washington,
Cooper, Tex.	Kerr,	Pearson,	Wheeler,
Cowen,	Kirkpatrick,	Pendleton,	Williams,
Cox,	Kyle,	Pickler,	Wilson, Idaho
Crain,	Latimer,	Price,	Wilson, Ohio
Crisp,	Lawson,	Prince,	Wilson, S. C.
Crowley,	Lester,	Reeves,	Wood,
Culberson,	Linney,	Richardson,	Woodard,
Cummings,	Livingston,	Robbins,	Yoakum.

NOT VOTING—48.

Allen,	Barney,	Brumm,	Crump,
Arnold, R. I.	Berry,	Cockrell,	Fitzgerald,
Atwood,	Boatner,	Crowther,	Grout,
Hall,	Maguire,	Perkins,	Smith, Mich.
Harrison,	McCormick,	Powers,	Sparkman,
Henry, Conn.	McRae,	Raney,	Stallings,
Hepburn,	Money,	Ray,	Stephenson,
Howard,	Morse,	Robertson, La.	Stone, W. A.
Layton,	Moses,	Robinson, Pa.	Sulloway,
Linton,	Odell,	Rusk,	Talbert,
Little,	Ogden,	Sauerhering,	Tracewell,
Lockhart,	Otjen,	Shaw,	Woomer.

So the first section of the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. OTJEN with Mr. COCKRELL.

Mr. ODELL with Mr. TALBERT.

Mr. TRACEWELL with Mr. SHAW.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE with Mr. LAYTON.

Mr. BRUMM with Mr. HALL.

Mr. WOOMER with Mr. LITTLE.

Mr. RANEY with Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. STEPHENSON with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. ARNOLD of Rhode Island with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. BERRY.

Mr. POWERS with Mr. MONEY.

Mr. GROUT with Mr. BOATNER.

Mr. MORSE with Mr. RUSK.

Mr. HEPBURN with Mr. ALLEN.

On this question:

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. MCCORMICK with Mr. HARRISON.

For this day:

Mr. SAUERHERING with Mr. OGDEN.

Mr. CRUMP with Mr. LOCKHART.

Mr. LINTON with Mr. MAGUIRE.

Mr. RAY with Mr. MCRAE.

Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. MOSES.

Mr. PERKINS with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am paired with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BERRY]. If he were present, I should vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the passage of the second section.

The question being taken, it was decided in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. The second section having now been adopted, the bill is passed.

On motion of Mr. DINGLEY, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

HOLIDAY ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to make a motion which I will preface with a parliamentary inquiry. There is a desire on both sides of the House, as many gentlemen have been unable to go home for the holidays, that an opportunity to do so be afforded next week; and the general wish is that this object be accomplished by taking three-day recesses during the coming week, and not taking up any actual business until a week from next Monday. My parliamentary inquiry is, whether under the Constitution a recess can be taken from to-day until next Thursday, or whether that would be an adjournment for more than three legislative days. I do not know what the precedents have been. If the motion is permissible, I will move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Sunday is not taken into account in these cases, but——

Mr. DINGLEY. Can the House adjourn from to-day until Thursday?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the adjournment can not be to a later day than next Wednesday.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move, then, that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

Several MEMBERS. Wednesday.

Mr. DINGLEY. No; Wednesday will be New Year's Day. The idea is to take a three-day recess from next Tuesday, which would carry us over until Friday, and then another recess until Monday, with the general understanding that no business is to be transacted next week, but that business will be resumed a week from Monday. This, Mr. Speaker, will enable gentlemen who may desire to leave the city to do so safely; and I hope there will be no objection to that understanding. [Cries of "All right!"]

I move, then, that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Tuesday next.

Mr. CRISP. One moment, Mr. Speaker, before that motion is submitted. Let us have no misunderstanding. The general understanding is that we are to adjourn until Tuesday, then meet and immediately adjourn over until Friday, and on the assembling of the session on Friday to immediately adjourn until Monday, without the transaction of any business whatever; so that those who have business at home can go safely, and with the certainty that no business will be transacted next week.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is the understanding.

Mr. CRISP. That is satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. If that is the understanding, the Chair will endeavor to carry it out as far as possible.

Mr. DINGLEY. I ask a vote on my motion, that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT MANKATO, MINN.

Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit at this time for consideration a resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read, after which the Chair will ask if there is objection to its consideration.

The resolution was read at length.

It provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall be authorized and directed to supply marble floor tiling, subbase, and wainscoting in the first story of the above-named building, notwithstanding the provision of the act of March 3, 1875, known as the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SCRANTON. I object.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE, VAN HORN VS. TARSNEY.

Mr. TARSNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is represented and made to appear that since the completion of the record in the contested election case of Robert T. Van Horn *vs.* John C. Tarsney, from the Fifth Congressional district of Missouri, now pending in part 2 of the Committee on Elections of this House, and since the expiration of the time limited by law for the taking of evidence therein, new and material evidence pertinent to the issue in said contest, necessary to a just determination of the same and directly affecting the rights of the contestee therein, has been discovered by said contestee, and was not known to and could not

have been discovered by the said contestee before the closing of the taking of testimony in said contest under the law: Now, therefore,

Resolved, That said contest be reopened for the taking of further testimony therein; that the said contestee shall, within ten days after the passage of this resolution, give notice to said contestant, or his attorneys, of the time and place at which testimony will be taken on behalf of said contestee, and the names of the witnesses to be examined, and that the taking of such testimony shall begin not later than ten days from the date of said notice, and may continue on behalf of said contestee for a period of ten days and no longer; that upon the conclusion of the taking of said testimony on behalf of said contestee the contestant shall have the right to take testimony in rebuttal for a like period of ten days, first giving to the contestee like notice; that in all other respects the taking of testimony herein authorized shall be governed by the law regulating contested elections, save that testimony so taken shall be returned to said part 2 of the Committee on Elections of this House instead of the Clerk of this House.

Resolved further, That the testimony taken under the foregoing resolution shall be made a part of the record in said contested election case, subject to all legal objections.

Mr. TARSNEY. In support of the resolution and showing the materiality of the testimony, I send to the desk and ask to have read a copy of an affidavit upon the subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman proposes to refer this to the Committee on Elections?

Mr. TARSNEY. I do.

The SPEAKER. Is it necessary to read the affidavit?

Mr. TARSNEY. I think so, Mr. Speaker, as an evidence of the good faith and materiality of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I desire to be heard on that question before the reference is made.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the affidavit.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF MISSOURI, *County of Jackson, ss:*

H. E. J. Hartman, A. B. Zweifel, F. M. Harrison, J. T. Dwyer, J. J. Cassidy, W. H. Hunt, C. A. Hawk, and J. J. Franklin, being duly sworn, upon their oaths depose and say: That they are clerks employed in the office of the commissioners of election within and for Kansas City, Jackson County, Mo.; that they have examined the ballots cast in the fifth precinct of the Second Ward of said Kansas City at the general election held in said city on the 6th day of November, A. D. 1894; that of the first 200 ballots cast in said fifth precinct at said election and contained in the ballot box of said precinct, now in the custody of said commissioners of election, Robert T. Van Horn, Republican candidate for Congress in the Fifth Congressional district of Missouri at said election, received all of the votes upon the ballots bearing the following voting numbers, to wit: 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 85, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 171, 178, 178, 179, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200.

Affiants state that all of the foregoing numbers were Democratic ballots, and that the name of John C. Tarsney, the Democratic candidate for Congress in said Fifth Congressional district at said election, was erased and the name of said Van Horn written in lieu thereof; that the name of said Van Horn was evidently written on said ballots by two, and only two, persons; that each of said persons wrote said Van Horn's name upon about one-half of the ballots above enumerated and numbered; that the ballots above described and numbered and containing the name of said Van Horn as the candidate for Congress, are a part of the 200 ballots numbered by the judges and clerks of election in said fifth precinct as having been cast at said precinct in said election, and which appear upon the poll books of said precinct alphabetically and numbered consecutively from 1 to 200, both numbers inclusive.

Affiants state that the foregoing facts appear from an inspection of the ballots contained in the ballot box in said precinct as having been cast in said precinct at said election and the poll books used in said fifth precinct at said election, all of which are now in the custody of said commissioners of elections, at their office in Kansas City, Jackson County, Mo., and further deponents say not.

H. E. J. HARTMAN.
A. B. ZWEIFEL.
J. J. FRANKLIN.
JOHN J. CASSIDY.
W. H. HUNT.
F. M. HARRISON.
C. A. HAWK.
JOHN T. DWYER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of November, A. D. 1895.

C. EMIL JOHNSON,
Notary Public, Jackson County, Mo.

My commission expires July 10, 1899.
Notary's fee, 50 cents, paid.

Mr. TARSNEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House by making any extended statement upon this matter. I shall certainly avoid what would be manifestly improper, and shall not refer to anything that does not bear directly upon the resolution before the House. I will state that the record in the case shows that 200 ballots were counted in this precinct that were unquestionably illegal. The contestant has shown them to be illegal. I concede they were illegal. The evidence conclusively demonstrates that they were illegal, and those ballots, which it is admitted on all sides were illegal, are the ballots that are specified and numbered in that affidavit which has been read. At the time the testimony in this case closed it closed without the possibility of knowing for whom those ballots had been cast. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose now to ask this House to pass this resolution, because I myself was in doubt whether it was best to reopen this case and have the testimony taken under the general rules for taking testimony in contested cases, or whether it was better to have it referred to the Committee on Elections, for that committee either in full committee or by subcommittee to take this testimony. I shall therefore ask that the resolution, with the accompanying affidavit, the original of which is in my possession and which will be presented to the committee, be referred to the committee, and that they may report back to the House the best means of reaching the real truth concerning this matter. I shall be able to satisfy this committee that this is newly discovered evidence, that it was not within the knowledge of myself or my attorneys when the matter was open for investigation, and could not have been within our knowledge at that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this is in the nature of an application by a sitting member of this House for leave to take testimony in a contest that is being waged for his seat after the statutory time for taking testimony has expired. I recognize, of course, the fact that the statutory method of procedure is not exclusive. Indeed, it has been held that the provisions are not mandatory, and I think correctly so held. But it seems to me that the House ought not to undertake to exercise its unquestioned right to permit the case to be opened up, or even to refer a resolution to the Committee on Elections, in order that they may determine on the propriety of opening up the case and reporting the result back to the House, until there is some kind of a prima facie showing of necessity made to the House.

It is well enough to meet this question at the very threshold, because I am informed that there will be other applications of a similar character to this one, both by contestants and contestees, made to the House. It is therefore highly important that we should have the attention of members upon this subject, to the end that the precedent here established may not be made in haste, but may be one upon which we can depend in the future in matters of a like nature.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. Would it not be proper to refer such a resolution to the committee for the purpose of ascertaining whether there is a prima facie case?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. If the gentleman will permit me, I will answer that before I get through. This is an application upon the part of a sitting member. Of course if he be not entitled to his seat—and upon that point I express no opinion and have no opinion whatever—every minute of delay is giving him that to which he is really not entitled, and is keeping the contestant out of that to which he is entitled. I only mention this to show the gravity of the question and the importance of determining it correctly.

Again, the Committee on Elections No. 2 is ready and willing to discharge its duties to the utmost extent; but it may not be improper for me to say that the committee has eleven contests pending before it which will require a great deal of very hard work, extending over a protracted period. It is therefore important, I think, in matters of this kind that not even a motion referring this resolution to the committee should be adopted unless the House is reasonably satisfied of the propriety of such action. Now, before the House, of its own accord, would undertake, without a reference to a committee, to permit any party whose seat is contested to take testimony after the time has expired which the statute gives—and it seems to me, also, before it should refer a resolution to a committee, asking the committee to report as to the propriety of such action—there should be before the House some reasonable ground for believing, first, that the party asking it has not been guilty of any neglect, and, second, that the testimony when taken is relevant and will have a tendency to change the result.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, will my friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. I think my friend misapprehends the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I think not. I understand the gentleman to move to refer it to the Committee on Elections.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARSNEY] does not ask any action on the part of the House. He proposes to refer this resolution to the Committee on Elections, so that the committee can look at it and report the resolution back to the House if the committee find it advisable, and if not to dispose of it in committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Suppose that this is true. The point I am insisting on is this, that before a reference is made to the committee, before the committee is asked to examine into the question—and an examination of it will, as I understand it, possibly necessitate an examination of the whole case from beginning to end—before this reference is made the contestee had better make it appear to the House in some way that he has exercised some diligence, and that when the testimony is taken it will have some relevancy.

There is not a thing before the House—except the mere statement of the gentleman, and that is not made in detail—tending to

show that he has exercised any diligence. It is recited in the resolution—and that resolution in point of fact is not true—that "it appearing to the House" that he has discovered new testimony which he could not with diligence have discovered before. There is nothing here but the mere naked statement of the gentleman, and I imagine in a matter of this gravity there ought to be some statement under oath. And besides, it is stated there that a number of tickets which were Democratic tickets were found after the election in a ballot box which was in the hands of a legal custodian, and that they had across the name of the contestee a mark, and that there is written upon them the name of the contestant, all in the handwriting of two individuals.

Now, that may very well be and still the ballots be lawful ones. There is nothing in the affidavit just read and nothing stated by the gentleman from Missouri tending to show that under the election laws of Missouri these ballots would not be perfectly honest ballots.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRISP. Does my friend intend to object to the introduction of the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Not at all. But this is asking a reference of it to the committee.

Mr. CRISP. The Chair will refer it of his own motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it was not necessary for the gentleman from Missouri to present it, although he had a right, as a question of privilege, to so present it to the House for its action.

Mr. CRISP. The Chair will refer it to the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. It must be referred or not referred.

The SPEAKER. The matter having been brought before the House in this way, and having been discussed, the Chair thinks the House may dispose of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Just one second, and I will conclude.

Mr. CRISP. The House can not reject it. The question is what the committee will do when it is referred to it. That is all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Just a minute further.

Now, the resolution, if referred, is almost in the nature of an instruction. It states that, "It appearing to the House that the party has used due diligence," etc. Now, that is the very question that the committee should be called upon to determine, if this reference is to be made. I would much rather that some gentleman not a member of the committee had made this point. I do not want to interpose an objection which will deprive the gentleman from Missouri, or any other member whose seat is in contest, of a full opportunity to take any testimony that he may deem proper and necessary; but I simply want to call the attention of this House to what this will lead to, and to insist that a member should make out a prima facie case that would justify a reference before this labor is entailed upon the committee. It seems to me that, as a matter of practice, any gentleman who seeks to delay the determination of his case in order to take additional evidence ought certainly to make such a showing before it is granted him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the reference to a committee is not action of the House indorsing the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I beg pardon.

The SPEAKER. A reference to a committee by the House is not the action of the House indorsing the resolution. It is a reference to the committee for the purpose of ascertaining what the committee would recommend in the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That would simply obviate one of the objections I have stated, Mr. Speaker. I have no purpose to throw obstacles in the way of a gentleman who desires to take the testimony of witnesses as to newly discovered evidence.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman propose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I have tried to make my meaning clear. I call attention to the fact that, if there is any way to prevent it, there should be no reference at all of such a matter as this to an Elections Committee until such a prima facie case of necessity is made out as will justify the reference. But if the House or the Speaker desires to act with these statements before it, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the reference to the Committee on Elections No. 2. Without objection, the reference will be considered as made.

There was no objection.

CASE OF JOHN L. WALLER.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois rises with a privileged report, which he will present.

Mr. HITT. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the resolution of inquiry in relation to the imprisonment of John L. Waller, have instructed me to report it back with an amendment and to ask for its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if in his judgment not incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the House of Representatives all information which has been received by him or by the State Department, in regard to the arrest and trial of John L. Waller, a citizen of the United States, by French authorities in the Island of Madagascar, and his imprisonment in the Republic of France, including all correspondence between Edward Telfair Wetter, United States consul at Madagascar, and Mr. Edwin F. Uhl, of the Department of State, and all records, documents, and evidence in any way touching said matters in his possession, or in possession of the State Department.

The report (by Mr. HITT) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the following resolution—

"*Resolved*, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if in his judgment not incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the House of Representatives all information which has been received by him or by the State Department in regard to the arrest and trial of John L. Waller, a citizen of the United States, by French authorities in the Island of Madagascar, and his imprisonment in the Republic of France, including all correspondence between Edward Telfair Wetter, United States consul at Madagascar, and Mr. Edwin F. Uhl, of the Department of State, and all records, documents, and evidence in any way touching said matters in his possession, or in possession of the State Department"—

Beg leave to report the same with an amendment omitting the words, "including all correspondence between Edward Telfair Wetter, United States consul at Madagascar, and Mr. Edwin F. Uhl, of the Department of State," and recommend the adoption of the resolution with said amendment.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, that is a unanimous report of the committee, and on its adoption I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to; and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HITT. I am also directed to report back a similar resolution introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WOODMAN] with a recommendation that it lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be laid on the table.

FIRING ON SCHOONER HENRY CROSBY.

Mr. HITT. I am also directed to report back with an amendment a resolution in regard to the firing on the schooner *Henry Crosby*.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the following resolution—

"Whereas the schooner *Henry Crosby*, a vessel duly enrolled under the laws of the United States, and commanded by Abel F. Stubbs, a citizen thereof, was fired upon by troops of the Republic of Santo Domingo while at anchor flying the American flag at Azua, in said Republic of Santo Domingo, on the 10th day of December, 1893, and members of its crew shot and seriously wounded, and property belonging to the vessel destroyed; and

"Whereas the owners, officers, and crew of said vessel have petitioned the Department of State for indemnity for such injury and loss, and have received no relief:

"*Resolved*, That the President be requested to communicate to the House of Representatives, if not in his opinion incompatible with the public interests, the diplomatic and consular correspondence and the correspondence between the Government of the United States and the owners, officers, or crew, their agents or attorneys, and all other reports or correspondence relating to said attack and claim demanded"—

Report the same back and recommend its adoption with two amendments: First, strike out "was," in the fourth line of the preamble, and insert "is alleged to have been;" and, second, strike out, in the last line of the preamble, the words "and have received no relief."

Mr. HITT. This is a unanimous report. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendments reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs were agreed to; and the resolution as amended was adopted.

AFFAIRS IN CUBA.

Mr. HITT. I am further instructed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to report back a resolution in regard to affairs in Cuba, and to ask the adoption of the resolution with an amendment.

The report of the committee was read, as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the following resolution—

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be requested to furnish for the information of the House copies of all correspondence that has passed between our Government and the monarchy of Spain in relation to the warfare which is and has been taking place in the Island of Cuba between the inhabitants of Cuba and Spain since February last, and also any information he has as to the formation of the Republic of Cuba at Jimaquayu, in the Province of Camaquay, on September 16 last"—

Report the same back and recommend the adoption of the following substitute therefor:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be directed to communicate to the House of Representatives, if not inconsistent with the public interests, copies of all correspondence relating to affairs in Cuba since February last."

Mr. HITT. This report also is unanimous. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof the resolution reported by the committee as a substitute was agreed to.

THOMAS F. BAYARD.

Mr. HITT. I submit also a report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs upon preamble and resolution relating to Thomas F. Bayard, ambassador of the United States to Great Britain. The committee recommend the adoption of the resolution with amendments.

The report of the committee was read, as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the following preamble and resolution—

"Whereas Thomas F. Bayard, the ambassador of the United States to Great Britain, is reported by the London Times newspaper to have said in a public speech delivered in Boston, England, on the 2d day of August, 1895, 'The President stood in the midst of a strong, self-confident, and oftentimes violent people, men who sought to have their own way. It took a real man to govern the people of the United States;' and

"Whereas said Bayard is further reported by the press of this country to have said in a public speech delivered in Edinburgh, Scotland, on the 7th day of November, 1895, 'In my own country I have witnessed the insatiable growth of a form of socialism styled "protection," which has done more to corrupt public life, to banish men of independent mind from public councils, and to lower the tone of national representation than any other single cause. Protection now controlling, the sovereign power of taxation has been perverted from its proper function of creating revenue to support the Government into an engine of selfish profit allied with combinations called trusts. It thus has sapped the popular conscience by giving corrupting largesses to special classes, and it throws legislation into the political market, where jobbers and chafferers take the place of statesmen;' and

"Whereas it is not one of the functions of an ambassador to insult in the country to which he is accredited the people he is supposed to represent, and it is consistent neither with the character of the office nor with the dignity and independence of the people of the United States that their ambassador abroad should make violent partisan speeches on questions relating to our domestic policy upon foreign soil: Therefore

"*Be it resolved*, That the President be, and he hereby is, requested to inform the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public interests, what steps, if any, he has taken to ascertain whether said Bayard made said speeches, and if he has ascertained that he did make said speeches, what steps, if any, he has taken to recall or to censure said Bayard"—

Beg leave to report the same back with three amendments. Amend the second "whereas" of the preamble by striking out "said Bayard" and inserting "Thomas F. Bayard, ambassador of the United States to Great Britain"; also by striking out the third "whereas"; and amending the resolution so that it shall read—

"*Resolved*, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to communicate to the House, if not incompatible with the public interests, any information or correspondence showing whether Thomas F. Bayard, the ambassador of the United States to Great Britain, made said speeches, and if so, what action, if any, has been taken thereon by the President"—

And recommend the adoption of the preamble and resolution with these amendments.

Mr. HITT. The report which has been read was arrived at by the committee in passing upon the resolution purely as a resolution of inquiry; and from it is eliminated everything else. The two extracts from speeches stated to have been made are preserved for identification and description. Then follows the resolution in the ordinary form of a resolution of inquiry. And therefore, as we were substantially unanimous in our decision, except as to one gentleman, who refrained from voting, I will move the previous question, unless some gentleman desires to ask a question in reference to the matter.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: I do not desire to debate the resolution——

Mr. HITT. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I only wish to say that it is a resolution of inquiry, and that I am opposed to it. I do not approve of the resolution and shall not discuss it now; but when a response is sent to this House by the President or the Secretary of State the time will probably be more appropriate for giving an expression of my views on the matter. I simply state that I did not vote for the resolution, and do not approve of it; but its object is to obtain information for the use of the committee.

Mr. HITT. I will simply add, in explanation and justification of the action of the committee, that they were at the time they adopted the report under instruction and direction of the House to make inquiries regarding the subject-matter of this resolution. That was under a separate resolution adopted by this House; and this was framed to carry out the instructions given by permitting them to obtain the information necessary.

I now demand the previous question on the adoption of the amendments and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered; under the operation of which the amendments submitted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE RAM KATAHDIN.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I am requested to call up from the Speaker's desk Senate joint resolution No. 32, authorizing and directing the acceptance of the ram *Katahdin*, and thereby making the said ram a part of the United States Navy, for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The joint resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to accept the ram *Katahdin*, and to make said vessel a part of the United States Navy.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Clerk to read, in explanation of the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, a communication from the Secretary of the Navy upon this subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, D. C., December 23, 1895.*

* * * In answer to your request "for information as to the grounds which prevented the acceptance of the ram by the Department and a statement of the facts as to the manner of construction, and whether the ram does not furnish to all intents and purposes a substantial compliance with the contract, and whether in your (my) judgment it is not desirable that the ram be accepted and put upon the list of commissioned vessels of the United States Navy," I have to state as follows:

The ship is well built and has been completed in accordance with the contract, save in a few minor particulars, and is a desirable vessel for the Navy, being designed for harbor defense. The construction of the *Katahdin* was authorized as an experiment, and inasmuch as the proper method of applying the principles of naval architecture to a vessel of her type had never been demonstrated, the results that would be obtained were by no means ascertainable, and it was therefore largely conjectural as to what performance she would be capable of. The Bath Iron Works accepted the contract for this vessel upon faith in the Department's designs of hull and machinery; they complied with the letter of the contract and endeavored in good faith to carry out the desires of the Department in regard to particulars that had not been fully prescribed. They performed their part of the undertaking in the most satisfactory manner and did everything that it was possible to do to make the vessel fulfill the purposes of Congress in authorizing her construction and prove successful and efficient. Their success is evidenced by the fact that the power which the engines were designed to develop was exceeded, but it seems that the good workmanship applied on the hull could not offset the resistance to be met with on account of the peculiar lines of this type of vessel, and her failure to develop the required speed can in no wise be attributed to fault on the part of the contractors. Owing to the way the ram behaved on the trial when her engines were exerting their full power, the Department is of opinion that it would probably be impossible to make a ship of this kind run at 17 knots an hour with engines of any horsepower that could be put into her.

The vessel was sent to the navy-yard, New York, to remain there at the risk and expense of the contractors until the question as to her acceptance should be decided, and she is still at that yard.

The Department recommends that it be given authority to accept the vessel under the contract for her construction, the contractors to make good all uncompleted work necessary to put the vessel in the condition required by the contract. * * *

H. A. HERBERT, *Secretary.*

Hon. EUGENE HALE,
United States Senate.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, is this a report from the Committee on Naval Affairs?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. HENDERSON. A privileged report?

The SPEAKER. It is in the regular order.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, the communication just read from the Secretary of the Navy seems to me to explain clearly the necessity for this joint resolution. It is a measure in the interest of the welfare and defense of the country, and unless some gentleman desires to ask a question in reference to it I shall ask the previous question.

Mr. HENDERSON. Allow me first to see if I understand the purpose of the gentleman. Is this a proposition to accept a vessel from the contractors where the terms of the contract have not been complied with?

Mr. CUMMINGS. It is to accept a vessel when it was impossible for the contractors to comply with the condition of the contract.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then the Government and the contractors entered into an impossible contract?

Mr. CUMMINGS. The plans and specifications were drawn up by the Navy Department, supposing that an engine power of 4,500 horses would be able to give the vessel a speed of 17 knots an hour. The contractor increased the horsepower to 5,200 and still it was not sufficient to send the vessel through the water at the rate of speed required.

The provisions of the specifications for the construction of the vessel have been such that it was utterly impossible, as the Secretary of the Navy shows in his letter, for the contractors to obtain that speed.

Mr. HENDERSON. And the Government, I suppose, had its inspectors there all the time the work was progressing?

Mr. CUMMINGS. It is presumed that they had.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am only asking for information, because we have in my own town vessels under construction under the same circumstances and I want the House and the country to understand what we are doing here.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Let me say to the gentleman that this is the only ram ever built by any Government on the face of the earth that has attained a speed of over 16 knots an hour, and she will be able with that speed to destroy any battle ship ever built or owned by any foreign country at this time.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted this distinctly understood, as I have some interests to look after that may be of the same character. I have entire confidence in the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. McMILLIN. I was not able to hear the reading of all the report. I wish to ask the gentleman whether this is a proposition to accept the ship outright or to give the Secretary author-

ity to accept it when the conditions that were proposed originally are complied with?

Mr. CUMMINGS. It authorizes and directs the Secretary to accept it, and this resolution is offered at the request of the Secretary, as shown by the letter which has just been read.

Mr. McMILLIN. If I understand this, it does not make the acceptance peremptory upon the Secretary, but leaves to him the discretion?

Mr. CUMMINGS. It makes the acceptance peremptory, as I understand it. It authorizes and directs.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Secretary recommends that Congress accord him the authority to accept the ship. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the contractors in this case have been indorsed by the Secretary of the Navy, and by both the construction bureaus, as having performed all their part of the work with exceptional ability, and that in addition to what they have done, in the endeavor of the contractors to attain the rate of speed which was estimated for by the Department, but which it is proved impossible to attain, they have expended, outside of the specifications, more than $40,000 themselves, in order to try to bring this ship up to the contract rate of speed.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Certainly.

Mr. SAYERS. Then the only point upon which the contractors failed was that of speed?

Mr. BOUTELLE. The only point in which this vessel falls below the ironclad conditions of the contract—which proved to be more ironbound than any of the other contracts for ships—is less than 1 knot of speed; and Secretary Herbert, under authority of the Boards of Construction and Steam Engineering, states explicitly in his letter that not only are the contractors not at all responsible for the failure to get the speed required, but he states that the experiments with this ship, which is of entirely novel construction, so that no man was able to estimate accurately the degree of resistance that would be met by a vessel of this peculiar form—the Secretary states that the trial trip demonstrated that it was not only impossible to attain the rate that had been calculated in the plans of the Department, but that the contractors furnished 200 horsepower in excess of the specifications.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Four hundred horsepower.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Several hundred horsepower in excess; but the Secretary says that it has satisfied him, and that the Department is of opinion that it would probably be impossible to make a ship of this kind run at 17 knots an hour with engines of any horsepower that could be put in her. That is the only point in which they have failed to absolutely fulfill all the terms of the contract. The contractors had too much faith in the plans and specifications of the Department, which now prove, according to the statement of the Secretary, to have required in the contract practically a mechanical impossibility.

Mr. SAYERS. In all other respects it comes up to the requirements of the contract?

Mr. BOUTELLE. In all other respects the ship is reported as splendidly built, fulfilling every condition of the contract, and, in the opinion of the Secretary and of the chiefs of the bureaus, is a most desirable vessel to be added to the Navy of the United States.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. COX. Do I understand from the gentleman's statement that the Secretary of the Navy is perfectly satisfied with the vessel as constructed?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Yes, in every way——

Mr. COX. And asks that it be accepted?

Mr. BOUTELLE. And recommends to Congress in his letter that he be authorized to accept it, which he can not do under the technical conditions of the contract.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will say, in conclusion, that this resolution passed the Senate unanimously yesterday, and I hope that it will unanimously pass the House to-day.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I read from the Secretary's letter:

> The Department recommends that it be given authority to accept the vessel under the contract for her construction, the contractors to make good all uncompleted work necessary to put the vessel in the condition required by the contract. * * *

The resolution reads as follows:

> That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to accept the ram *Katahdin*, and to make said vessel a part of the United States Navy.

I should be glad to know the reason for the difference between the language of the resolution and the recommendation of the Secretary?

Mr. MILNES. Read the latter part of the resolution.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the gentleman permit me to answer my friend from Illinois? I desire to say in that regard that the uncompleted details are simply the last finishing touches which are always put upon a ship before she is turned over finally to the Government. They only amount in this case to a few hundred dollars, the final painting and some few minor details, which the contractors expect to fully complete to the satisfaction of the Department.

Mr. LOUD. Why is not that included in the resolution?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not know why it was not. It was probably an oversight, but there will not be any trouble about that. The contractors expect to go on and put this ship in exactly the order that was contemplated by the contract, with the exception of waiving the speed clause. That is all.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I will say in answer to my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that this resolution is perfectly satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy, and I presume that the word "direct" is put in there because he desires Congress to assume the responsibility.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The gentleman now says to the House, as I understand, after conversation with the Secretary, that the joint resolution meets with his approval.

Mr. CUMMINGS. It does. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered, and under the operation thereof the joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CUMMINGS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT MANKATO, MINN.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The joint resolution is as follows:

A joint resolution (H. Res. 60) concerning the completion of the United States court-house and post-office building at Mankato, Minn.

Whereas a clause in the sundry civil appropriation act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat., 395), relating to public buildings, provides: "No change in said plan involving an increase of expense exceeding 10 per cent of the amount to which said building was limited shall be allowed or paid by any officer of the Government without the special authority of Congress;" and

Whereas in providing (during the last recess of Congress) for a much-needed enlargement of the United States court-house and post-office building at Mankato, Minn., (still in process of erection) the limitations prescribed by the above-cited clause made it necessary for the Secretary of the Treasury to so modify the plans and specifications for said building as to provide a finish inferior to that originally intended: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to supply marble floor, tiling, subbase, and wainscot in the first story of the above-named building as shown and called for by the original drawings and specifications: *Provided*, That the present appropriation for said buildings and grounds shall not be exceeded.

During the reading of the resolution,

Mr. DINGLEY said: Mr. Speaker, this resolution has just been read, and unless there is a call for its being read again I think it is hardly worth while to reread it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may explain the joint resolution.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in 1891 an appropriation of $100,000 was made for the erection of a court-house and post-office in the city of Mankato, Minn. The contracts for the substructure and for the superstructure were let at different times. When the substructure was completed it was seen that the building proposed was too small not only for the future needs of the city, but even for those of the present. We were embarrassed by that fact and seriously contemplated coming to Congress to ask for a larger appropriation.

Upon inquiry at the office of the Supervising Architect, I discovered that the estimates of cost on which was based the plan of our building called for Indiana limestone, Portland cement, and other materials that would have to be brought from a distance.

But, Mr. Speaker, Mankato is literally "founded on the rock," rock that has no superior for beauty and durability, rock which is shipped for building and bridge purposes to all parts of the country; and right within the city limits is produced the finest natural cement in the world. Having convinced the Supervising Architect of these facts, I secured from him an order substituting our home stone and cement for those previously contemplated.

Then, on account of the proximity of these two important items to the proposed building, we secured surprisingly low bids for the superstructure.

Here was our opportunity to have our building enlarged without appealing to Congress for more money. At my request, the Supervising Architect made a plan for an addition to the building. To expedite matters, a committee, consisting of the contractor, one of our leading citizens, and myself, came down here last summer. After a conference the contractor and the Architect reached a conclusion whereby the enlargement of the building could be made within the appropriation. When the matter was submitted to the law division of the Architect's Office we encoun-

tered the law recited in the preamble to the pending resolution, that no addition could be made involving an expenditure greater than 10 per cent of the original estimate. The addition would involve an expenditure of about 12 per cent; and so, to get the addition and yet not exceed that 10 per cent, the contractor and the Architect agreed that the lobby of the building should be finished in wood instead of in marble. They did this hoping that by the time that point was reached in the construction of the building Congress would have convened and we could get its consent to an expenditure of money that had already been appropriated. This is the object of the pending resolution. I direct attention to the fact that we ask for no added appropriation, and that when the building is completed there will be $2,000 or $3,000 to be returned to the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I understand from the gentleman that the authority he asks will not entail the expenditure of over $100,000 in all?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. It will entail an expenditure of about $98,000 in all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Pending that motion, the Chair submits the following report from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, and will cause to be laid on the table the House resolution relating to the ram *Katahdin*.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 2264) fixing the times for holding the circuit and district courts of the northern district of Iowa and of the southern district of Iowa;

A bill (H. R. 2720) to make Palm Beach, Fla., a subport of entry and delivery; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 56) to transfer certain offices of the United States in the Territory of Utah to the officers of the State of Utah.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HURLEY, until January 6, 1896, on account of important business.

To Mr. HUBBARD, until January 6, 1896, on account of important business.

To Mr. DANIELS, for five days, on account of New Years.

To Mr. TRELOAR, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WHITE, for ten days, on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine moves that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday next, December 31, at 12 o'clock m.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 3009) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3010) defining cheese, and also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of "filled cheese"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERDMAN: A bill (H. R. 3011) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for Pennsylvania soldiers who were the first to arrive on April 18, 1861, for the defense of the city of Washington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 3012) to fix the pay, allowances, tenure of office, and rank of the veterinary surgeons of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 3013) to amend section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to improve the merchant marine engineer service, and thereby also to increase the efficiency of the Naval Reserve—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 3014) revising and amending the statutes relating to patents—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3015) for the further protection of the revenue arising from customs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 3016) to prevent desecration of the United States flag—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 3017) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," approved March 2, 1893—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 3018) to amend the act approved March 3, 1891, granting the right of way upon the public lands for reservoir and canal purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 3019) to segregate and return to the unreserved public domain mineral and coal lands upon the White Mountain Indian Reservation in Arizona—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3020) authorizing the Territorial auditor of Arizona to issue warrants in certain cases—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: A bill (H. R. 3021) to protect the pensioners of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT: A bill (H. R. 3022) providing for the purchase of additional property for the use of the post-office and other Government offices in the city of Brooklyn, State of New York—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 3023) to appropriate the sum of $100,000 to erect a public building at Guthrie, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 3024) to license billiard tables, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LOW: Joint resolution (H. Res. 58) authorizing and requiring the Secretary of War to contract for the building of the Harlem Kills Canal, New York City—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HARMER: Joint resolution (H. Res. 59) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHICKERING: Resolution to provide for a clerk to the Committee on Railways and Canals—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HARMER: Resolution authorizing the employment of C. W. Coombs as an additional messenger—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: Memorial by the Eighteenth legislature of Arizona in regard to Indian depredations—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 3025) for the relief of Charles O. Palmer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT: A bill (H. R. 3026) removing the charge of desertion from the record of John W. Ploss—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 3027) for the relief of Coleman Watson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARKE of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 3028) for relief of estate of Francis S. Jones, of Marengo County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3029) for the relief of W. H. Ketchum, of Mobile, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 3030) for the relief of James H. Birch—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3031) granting a pension to Daniel Fike—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 3032) for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Waters, of Horn Island, Mississippi—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 3033) to increase the pension of Elizabeth T. Beall, widow of Benjamin L. Beall, late colonel First United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 3034) for the relief of John Viands, of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3035) for the relief of George W. Graham—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3036) for the relief of the estate of Daniel

Ott, deceased, late of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3037) for the relief of Howard F. Smallwood, of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3038) for the relief of A. B. Rohrbough—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 3039) for the relief of John T. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3040) to restore to the pension roll the name of Mary F. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3041) to rerate the pension allowed to J. H. Braynard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3042) granting a pension to Zenas W. Tolman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 3043) providing for the relief of First Sergt. Bernard W. Hopper, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3044) removing the charge of desertion now standing against Samuel B. Alexander, late of Company A, Twentieth Kentucky, who enlisted under the name of Jordon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: A bill (H. R. 3045) to remove from the rolls of the Army the charge of desertion against Neil Patton, late of Battery F, Second United States Artillery, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3046) for the relief of Frederick Van Guilder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3047) for the relief of Samuel A. Lundborg—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 3048) for the relief of R. H. Hoffman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3049) for the relief of Maurice G. Griffith—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 3050) for the relief of Peter H. Donohew—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3051) for the relief of Lucy A. Branham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3052) for the relief of the heirs at law of George Boone, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3053) to increase the pension of W. J. Boone, of Clark County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3054) for the relief of Moses Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD (by request): A bill (H. R. 3055) to increase the pension of Louise K. Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILNES: A bill (H. R. 3056) for the relief of George Collom, Company A, Seventy-second Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3057) for the relief of James G. Barker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3058) for the relief of Barker Williams and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3059) for the relief of Sarah A. Moore—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 3060) granting a pension to Mrs. Evalyn Van Vliet from March 8, 1891, to March 1, 1895—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRICE (by request): A bill (H. R. 3061) for the relief of Fanny B. Randolph and Dora L. Stark—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. QUIGG: A bill (H. R. 3062) for the relief of Dr. Edward R. Duffy, late United States surgeon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STAHLE: A bill (H. R. 3063) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Gartman, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 3064) granting a pension to Daniel Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TUCKER (by request): A bill (H. R. 3065) removing charge of desertion from military record of Allen Dannel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3066) for the relief of Abraham Stover, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3067) for the relief of David W. Speck, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3068) for the relief of James W. Smith, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3069) for the relief of James A. Snyder, executor of Jacob Snyder, deceased, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3070) for the relief of the estate of George W. Taylor, deceased, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3071) for the relief of Mrs. S. M. Cale, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3072) for the relief of Amanda Lam, administratrix of the estate of James Lam, deceased, of Rockbridge County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3073) for the relief of Mrs. Maria D. La Rue, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3074) for the relief of Mrs. Maria D. La Rue, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAFT (by request): A bill (H. R. 3075) for the relief of John A. Lynch—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TURNER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3076) for the relief of Abraham Andes, Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3077) for the relief of Paul C. Bowman, administrator of Anna C. Bowman, deceased, of Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3078) for the relief of Henry Doll, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3079) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Hammon, deceased, Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3080) for the relief of Michael Good, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3081) for relief of John Fox, of Peter, Page County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3082) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Hoover, deceased, Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3083) for the relief of Mrs. Vienna Roy, Warren County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3084) for the relief of the estate of Jacob B. Snapp, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3085) for the relief of the estate of Gideon Tobin, deceased, of Page County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3086) for the relief of George W. Thompson, Clarke County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3087) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Sheetz, deceased, Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3088) for the relief of the estate of Joseph D. Crabill, deceased, Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3089) for the relief of Samuel H. Sowner, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3090) for the relief of the estate of Isaac Hurn, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3091) for the relief of Morris Lutz, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3092) for the relief of Samuel E. Long, of Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3093) for the relief of Jacob Dolman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3094) for the relief of Mrs. Amelia Downey, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3095) for the relief of Josiah and Jeremiah Kibler, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3096) for the relief of Jonathan Holler, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3097) for the relief of Catherine Flick, of Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3098) for the relief of David Ritenour, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3099) for the relief of Joseph Blosser, of Page County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3100) for the relief of Anthony Roberson, of Clarke County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3101) for the relief of Martin Buckholder, administrator of Abraham Buckholder, deceased, late of Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3102) for the relief of the estate of Mary E. Milley, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3103) for the relief of David Swartz, of Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3104) to carry into effect the finding of the Court of Claims in favor of Daniel T. Wood, of Frederick County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3105) to carry into effect the finding of the Court of Claims in favor of Lucy A. M. Jones, of Rappahannock County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 3106) for relief of John Breen, lately postmaster at Gladwyne, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 3107) to remove the political disabilities of Anderson Merchant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 3108) to grant a pension to Jesse Durnell, late second-class pilot on gunboat *Lexington* and transferred to gunboat *Marmora*—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 3109) disposing of one condemned brass cannon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3110) to provide for the restatement, readjustment, settlement, and payment of dues to army officers in certain cases—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3111) to carry into effect a finding of the Court of Claims in favor of William Garrett, late of Montgomery County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3112) granting a pension to Josephine Foote Fairfax—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3113) granting a pension to Margaret A. Kidwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolutions of the Grocers and Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia, for a canal from the Delaware River to New York Bay—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas: Petition in behalf of Mrs. Margaret Kidwell, of Lincoln County, Kans., for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the St. Louis Merchants' Exchange, in favor of the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Resolution of the Grocers and Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the construction of a ship canal connecting the Delaware River with New York Bay—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Resolutions of the Presbytery of Cincinnati, concerning Armenian troubles—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition and papers to accompany claim for relief of James H. Birch—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of H. F. Thurston and 60 others, denouncing the treatment of the Armenians and asking for relief—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: Petition and evidence to support House bill No. 986, granting a pension to Hiram P. Pauley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: A letter of certain Representatives of the House recommending the retention of Charles W. Coombs as messenger during the Fifty-fourth Congress—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LOW: Memorial of the J. C. Watson Company and 101 others, requesting that this Fifty-fourth Congress will authorize the Secretary of War to contract with Charles Stoughton and his associates for the entire work of constructing a canal through the Harlem Kills, New York, 15 feet deep and 300 feet wide, for a sum not exceeding $1,450,000—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of James Garvie and 110 others, Santee Indians, praying Congress to enact into law House bill No. 280, regarding sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REYBURN: Resolutions on the Cuban revolution—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: Papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to Michael Pettis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAFT: Memorial from the Presbytery of Cincinnati, in regard to the Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TUCKER: Papers relating to the claim of Isaac S. Myers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WANGER: Resolutions of Grocers and Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia, favoring a ship canal from New York Bay to Delaware River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of Thomas M. Hobbs, of Limestone County, Ala., asking for remuneration for stores and supplies taken from him by the United States during the late civil war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, record of Francis W. Seeley, to accompany House bill No. 2484—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Gen. A. S. Webb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Lewis Hyde, of Colbert County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers accompanying House bill No. 703, for the relief of Mary I. Graham—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 30, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

VICE-CONSULS AT ERZERUM AND HARPOOT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of the 21st instant relative to the refusal of the Turkish Government to grant exequaturs to the vice-consuls of the United States at Erzerum and Harpoot, I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 30, 1895.

JUDGMENTS IN INDIAN DEPREDATION CASES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the act of Congress "to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," a list of judgments not heretofore reported to Congress or appropriated for, rendered in favor of claimants since the passage of the act of March 2, 1895; which, with the accompanying list, was referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. R. 32) authorizing and directing the acceptance of the ram *Katahdin*, thereby making said ram a part of the United States Navy.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 2264) fixing the times for holding the circuit and district courts of the northern district of Iowa and of the southern district of Iowa;

A bill (H. R. 2720) to make Palm Beach, Fla., a subport of entry and delivery; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 56) to transfer offices of the United States in the Territory of Utah to officers of the State of Utah.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Boston (Mass.) Baptist Ministers' Conference, remonstrating against the appropriation of moneys in aid of contract schools; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PEFFER. I present a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by L. W. Hampton Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Newport, Mo., praying for legislation to protect pensioners against the dropping of their names from the pension rolls without due legal proceeding, and also asking that widows be protected against unreasonable delay in securing the pensions due to them under existing law. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PEFFER. I have a paper that I take to be in the nature of a petition, and I so present it. It is in the form of a resolution of Lincoln Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Topeka, Kans., tendering their services as veteran soldiers of the Republic to the President of the United States in case we should have any armed unpleasantness with our neighbors on the other side of the Atlantic. I move that the paper be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Grocers and Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the construction of a canal to connect the Delaware River with New York Bay; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. ALLEN presented the petition of Le Grand Byington, of Iowa City, Iowa, praying for a repeal of all bond and national-bank laws, and for the unlimited coinage of gold and silver and the issue of legal-tender money; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Santee Sioux tribe of Indians, praying for the passage of House bill No. 280, to prohibit the sale

of intoxicating drinks to Indians, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented a petition of the Milwaukee Worsted Mills, of Layton & Co., of the National Knitting Company, and members of the Milwaukee Wool Merchants' Association, all of Milwaukee, Wis., praying that increased rates of duty be imposed on wool and woolen goods; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KYLE presented a petition of sundry members of the Santee Sioux tribe of Indians, praying for the passage of House bill No. 280, to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CALL presented a petition of sundry citizens of Manistee, Mich., containing over five hundred signatures, praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VOORHEES presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 1139) granting an increase of pension to A. S. Loudermilk; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BUTLER. I present a petition of sundry citizens of Newbern, N. C., praying that lumber, both rough and dressed, be restored to the dutiable list. I move that the petition be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BACON presented a petition of the Savannah Cotton Exchange, of Savannah, Ga., and a petition of the city council of Savannah, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation providing additional defenses for the harbor of Savannah and other seacoast cities; which were referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the petition of D. L. Burrows and 95 other citizens of Groton; the petition of Charles W. Carter and 112 other citizens of Norwich; the petition of Samuel Fessenden and 107 other citizens of Stamford; the petition of H. B. Harrison, N. D. Sperry, and 67 other citizens of New Haven, and the petition of Henry C. Robinson and 30 other citizens of Hartford, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the purchase by the United States of certain lots adjoining old Fort Griswold, in the town of Groton, Conn.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BRICE presented the petition of C. Poolk, of Dayton, Ohio, praying that a duty be placed on imported Portland cement; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Rev. Washington Gladden, pastor, and the members of the First Congregational Church, of Columbus, Ohio, praying for the adjustment of international misunderstandings by arbitration; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the board of directors of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., and indorsed by the Plymouth Woolen Company, of Plymouth, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation for the protection of the woolgrowers of the United States, and that duties compensatory and protective be imposed on manufactures of wool; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of C. F. Hovey & Co. and sundry other dry goods merchants of Boston, Mass., praying that no change in the tariff laws shall take effect before March 1, 1896, to the end that merchants may have time to complete existing contracts; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PAPER ON TRADE WITH ARGENTINA.

Mr. VOORHEES. I have a communication from Señor Don Vicente J. Dominguez, chargé d'affaires of the Argentine legation at this place, on the subject of commercial relations between that country and ours, especially in view of pending tariff legislation, which I ask may be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Chair be kind enough to announce what was the request of the Senator from Indiana?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senartor from Indiana requested that the paper he presents be referred to the Committee on Finance and printed.

Mr. HOAR. What is the paper?

Mr. VOORHEES. It is a communication from the chargé d'affaires of the Argentine legation (now in charge of the legation in this place in the absence of the minister) on the subject of the pending and proposed tariff legislation.

Mr. HOAR. To whom is it addressed?

Mr. VOORHEES. It is addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to interpose any objection to anything the Senator from Indiana desires, as I hope he knows very well——

Mr. VOORHEES. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. But I think the Senate has heretofore been pretty strict in refusing to receive petitions or communications of any sort from citizens of a foreign government unless they come through the Department of State. It would seem to me, without much reflection, that the principle is peculiarly applicable to communications from the accredited representatives of foreign governments, and it appears to me that the Senate can not properly receive such a communication. Is there not something in the rules on the subject?

Mr. VOORHEES. If the Senator from Massachusetts will allow me, I will state what perhaps I should have stated when I first presented the paper. The writer of this communication informs me, in writing to me this morning, as he did verbally on Saturday last, that he had communicated with the Secretary of State, Mr. Olney, and that Mr. Olney had sent his communication to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I ventured to say to him that the Committee on Finance, of which I am chairman yet for a little while—only a little while—has charge of that subject; and thereupon, acting upon that suggestion, he has sent the whole subject to me, I will say, with the understanding that it would go to the Finance Committee. That is all.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to read—it has been handed me by another Senator—the fourth clause of the seventh rule of the Senate?

> No petition or memorial or other paper signed by citizens or subjects of a foreign power shall be received, unless the same be transmitted to the Senate by the President.

It seems to me this document comes clearly within that rule.

Mr. VOORHEES. The Senator from Massachusetts knows I do not wish to violate the rules. I know less of them, however, than he does.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. VOORHEES. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. If, as I understood the Senator, the Secretary of State has sent this communication to the Committee on Foreign Relations——

Mr. VOORHEES. Yes.

Mr. HALE. Everything that the Senator desires to accomplish may be done if that committee reports it to the Senate for reference to the Committee on Finance. That cuts the whole knot.

Mr. VOORHEES. I suppose it is as much a violation of the rule just read to communicate the paper through the Committee on Foreign Relations as through the Committee on Finance. I do not see the difference.

Mr. HALE. But I understood the Senator to say that the Secretary of State had sent the communication to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MORGAN. The Secretary of State has not sent a communication from any diplomatic agent of the Government of Argentina to the Committee on Foreign Relations. He wrote a note to the chairman of that committee informing me that such a communication, or some communication on this subject, had been received from the chargé d'affaires of the Argentine Republic; but he did not communicate the paper itself to the committee. Thereupon I wrote to the Secretary and asked him his opinion in regard to the power and jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States in considering a question of that sort on a presentation made by a foreign government. The matter stands in that situation. The rule quoted by the Sentor from Massachusetts is of course obligatory upon the Senate of the United States. I suggest to the Senator from Indiana that he withdraw his motion for the present and see whether the Secretary of State intends to send in the communication.

Mr. VOORHEES. I will let the motion stand over without action. I ask that the subject may go over just in the shape it is.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under the fourth clause of Rule VII, which has been read, the paper, in the judgment of the Chair, can not be received as presented, but on the suggestion of the Senator from Indiana the matter will go over for the present.

Mr. MORGAN subsequently said: With respect to the papers that were presented this morning by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] in regard to the tariff question as affecting the Argentine Republic, I find I was in error in one particular. I thought all the papers were new, but I find there are but two of them which have not been hitherto presented in some form to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. The Secretary of State sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations a communication addressed to him by Señor Dominguez, the chargé d'affaires of the Argentine Republic, relating to the tariff on wool. Since the communication was sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations there has been no meeting of that committee; and as chair-

man of it I did not consider that I had the right to bring the paper before this body without the authority of the committee. If the executive department choose to make a communication to the Senate or to either House of Congress upon a matter of this kind, of course that communication ought to have been addressed directly to Congress; and not being a member of the executive government at all, but merely a Senator and chairman of a Senate committee, I concluded it was my duty to await the action of the committee before I brought that paper before the Senate, if at all. The chargé d'affaires, however, must have understood and did understand, no doubt, that the paper had been communicated to the Senate through the Committee on Foreign Relations. The other two papers to which I refer are new and have not heretofore been under consideration by the Senate or by any of its committees, as I understand.

I wanted to make this explanation so that the Senator from Indiana might be set entirely right, for I observe in the papers he has submitted to the Senate that there is a copy of the communication which was sent to me as chairman of the committee, and a copy of that communication is made the predicate for the presentation of the additional papers. That is all that I find it necessary to say about it at the present time, merely to clear up what might otherwise be considered as a matter of delicacy between the Senator from Indiana and the chargé d'affaires of the Argentine Republic.

I will say this further about it, Mr. President, that, doubting whether such legislation as is suggested by the communication itself, if it was enacted by Congress, would be an interference with the favored-nations clauses of the various commercial treaties that we have, I asked the Secretary of State for his opinion upon it, that I might submit that, in conjunction with this communication, to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The subject will immediately pass out of my hands when the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] succeeds in the chairmanship of that committee, and I desired to make this explanation before the committees were reorganized.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE PUBLIC LANDS AND THEIR WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, under the direction of the Department of the Interior, 6,000 copies of a paper contained in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Director of the United States Geological Survey, entitled "The public lands and their water supply," together with the accompanying maps and illustrations, of which number 1,500 copies shall be for the use of members of the Senate, 3,000 for the use of members of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 for the use of the Geological Survey.

NATIONAL AND STATE SOLDIERS' HOMES.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 500 copies of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Soldiers' Home and 500 copies of the report of the Assistant Inspector-General of State Homes, for the use of the officers of said National and State Homes; 150 copies of each of said reports to be bound in the usual form.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1220) to amend chapter 6 of Title XXXII of the Revised Statutes, relating to mineral lands and mining resources; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1221) to encourage the export of American manufactures; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1222) to amend the act entitled "An act to remove certain burdens on the American merchant marine and encourage the American foreign carrying trade, and for other purposes," approved June 26, 1884; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1223) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1224) to regulate promotions and dismissals in the Executive Departments at Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1225) granting a pension to Henry G. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1226) to correct the military record of John W. Canary; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1227) granting a pension to Elizabeth New, widow of Jethrow New; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1228) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Miles; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 1229) for the relief of Julius A. Kaiser; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 1230) to extend the limits of the port of entry of New Orleans; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1231) for the relief of Fanny B. Randolph and Dora L. Stark; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HARRIS. By request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia I introduce two bills which, with the accompanying letter from the Commissioners in each case, I ask may be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (S. 1232) to license billiard tables, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (S. 1233) to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine and surgery in the District of Columbia was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PROCTOR (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1234) to authorize the extension of the Columbia Railway, and for other puposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1235) for the relief of the heirs of Lewis Smith, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1236) amending chapter 2 of the Revised Statutes, relating to trade-marks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. ALLEN. At the request of my colleague [Mr. THURSTON], who is necessarily detained from his seat to-day, I desire to introduce a bill and have it referred to the Committee on Finance.

The bill (S. 1237) to regulate the issuance of Government bonds, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin introduced a bill (S. 1238) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Philip Pflueger, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Wisconsin Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 1239) relating to the distillation of brandy from prunes, plums, and pears, and amending section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROACH (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1240) to fix the pay, allowances, tenure of office, and rank of the veterinary surgeons of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1241) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of a hospital, to be known as the Sanitarium Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, at Hot Springs, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 1242) to amend section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to improve the merchant marine engineer service, and thereby also to increase the efficiency of the Naval Reserve; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1243) for the construction of a dry dock at Key West, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1244) to relieve James Messer from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1245) granting a pension to Adelaide C. Palmer, widow of Thomas H. Palmer, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WALTHALL introduced a bill (S. 1246) to make an equitable adjustment of the grants of land to the several States of the Union for seminaries of learning or universities; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1247) to establish and provide for the maintenance of a free public library and reading

room in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1248) for the relief of Walter S. Kimmel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1249) granting a pension to John Heinz; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1250) to amend chapter 132, United States statutes, second session Fifty-third Congress; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1251) to regulate the compensation of the United States district attorney for the district of Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1252) fixing salaries for the clerks of the United States circuit and district courts for the district of Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1253) granting a pension to Joseph Koehler; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1254) granting an increase of pension to Enoch J. Lewis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1255) to declare the jurisdiction of circuit courts of the United States in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 1256) to increase the limit of cost for the erection of a public building in Camden, N. J.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1257) for the relief of Barker Williams and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1258) for the relief of James G. Barker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1259) for the relief of James K. Bowman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1260) for the relief of Johan H. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1261) for the relief of John Reed, alias Michael Flannagan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1262) for the relief of Sarah A. Moore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1263) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Sanscrainte, late of Company B, Fifteenth Regiment Michigan Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1264) granting a pension to William A. Buck; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1265) for the relief of Emmart, Dunbar & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1266) for the relief of Daniel W. Boutwell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 1267) for the relief of Henry T. Woody; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1268) for the relief of Daniel K. Shields; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1269) granting an increase of pension to John S. Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1270) granting a pension to Theodore Birkhauser; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1271) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore English; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1272) to enlarge the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the bill may be read at length and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The bill was read the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be enlarged to a number equal to the States of the Union; and one member from each State, who shall be a resident thereof, shall be appointed and hold his office as now provided by law for the existing members of the Commission.

SEC. 2. Said Commission shall hold regular sessions in the city of Washington four times annually, and all its acts and proceedings shall be authenticated by votes adopted by a majority of the members and duly recorded. It shall choose annually by ballot a chairman and secretary and an executive committee of five, of which the chairman shall be a member and the chairman.

SEC. 3. All the power and authority conferred by law upon the Interstate Commerce Commission as now constituted shall be held and exercised and the resulting duties shall be performed by the Commission as enlarged by this act; and whenever said Commission is not in session, the executive committee shall hold and exercise such power and authority and perform such duties with the same force and effect as if said Commission were in session.

SEC. 4. The members of the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be paid a compensation of $10 per day each when the Commission is in session, not, however, to exceed $400 in each year; and, in addition, their actual traveling expenses to and from the place of session by the nearest route, and an allowance, for subsistence while going and returning and remaining in session, of $3 per day. The chairman, secretary, and members of the executive committee shall respectively receive, in lieu of the above allowance, the salaries provided by law for the members and officers of the Commission as now by law constituted.

SEC. 5. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1896, but the members of the Commission may be nominated and confirmed and appointed before that date.

Mr. CULLOM. I was not present when the bill was introduced and I do not know where it came from, but it is a pretty sweeping measure and I think it ought to be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CHANDLER. Approving the diligence of the Senator from Illinois, I desire to say that my request was that the bill might be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1273) for the relief of the estate of John Ericsson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1274) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Stephen S. Bennett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1275) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frank Bolio; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1276) granting a pension to John L. Britton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1277) for the appointment as lieutenants on the retired list of certain survivors of the Lady Franklin Bay expedition; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1278) for the relief of John A. Spielman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1279) granting a pension to Richardson M. Penn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HARRIS. At the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, I introduce a joint resolution. The joint resolution provides for an appropriation, and inasmuch as the Committee on Appropriations deals with the appropriation bills for the District, I will ask that the joint resolution, after a second reading, be referred, with the accompanying letter, to the Committee on Appropriations.

The joint resolution (S. R. 36) to provide for the payment of the force of Truck Company D in the District of Columbia was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRICE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 37) directing the Secretary of War to cause an examination to be made of the physics and hydraulics of the Great Lakes and their outlets; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SQUIRE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHOUP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase revenue to

meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of the revenue; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SEWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

PAPERS WITHDRAWN AND REFERRED.

On motion of Mr. PASCO, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the claim of Mary E. Boyd, of Florida, now in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, be withdrawn from the files of that office and referred to the Committee on Claims.

DEEP WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. BRICE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed at the Government Printing Office, at the earliest day practicable, 3,000 copies, in separate form, of the Proceedings of the First Annual Convention of the International Deep Waterways Association, for circulation as a miscellaneous document, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

DAMS AT OUTLETS OF THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. BRICE submitted the following resolutions; which were read:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to transmit to the Senate any and all information that he may have on the question of the subsidence of the waters of the Great Lakes during the last few years, and to what extent, if any, the deepening and widening of the natural channels connecting them have contributed to that result; and

Be it further resolved, That he be directed to report to the Senate whether, in his opinion, it will be practicable to control the water of the Great Lakes and maintain them at a uniform level from the head of Lake Superior to the foot of Lake Erie by a system of dams or other works placed at their respective outlets; and if so, to furnish an estimate of the kind of dam or dams or other works that will be required at the respective outlets, together with the probable cost thereof, and the time necessary for the construction of the same.

Mr. BRICE. Let the resolutions lie on the table for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

CORTHELL'S LECTURE ON ISTHMIAN ROUTES.

On motion of Mr. COCKRELL, it was

Ordered, That 3,000 copies of Mr. E. L. Corthell's lecture be printed for the use of the Senate, in addition to the usual number heretofore ordered.

REPRINT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1890.

Mr. GORMAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That there be printed, for the use of the Senate, 500 copies of the act to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes, approved October 1, 1890.

REPRINTING OF FINANCIAL MESSAGES, ETC.

Mr. GORMAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That there be printed, for the use of the Senate, 500 copies of House Executive Document No. 257, third session Fifty-third Congress, being message of the President of January 28, 1895, on condition of the national finances; House Executive Document No. 291, third session Fifty-third Congress, being message of the President of February 8, 1895, on the issue of bonds, and House Report No. 1824, third session Fifty-third Congress, being report of the Committee on Ways and Means on issue and sale of bonds.

MONEY ISSUES.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate of the amount of outstanding paper money, currency, silver certificates, gold certificates, legal-tender notes, and Treasury notes, respectively, issued by the Government of the United States from March 4, 1789, to the present time, and the respective acts of Congress, by titles and dates, under which they were issued, properly classifying the same.

Mr. COCKRELL. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that the resolution ought to include the one and two year notes of 1862, the 7.30 notes, and the compound-interest notes. I do not know that the language will embrace those. All ought to be included. I suggest to the Senator, if he will permit a suggestion, that he allow the resolution to lie over until to-morrow or later in the day, so that we can look at it.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well, let the resolution go over for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over.

ARMENIAN OUTRAGES.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That 5,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 33, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session, being a message from the President of the United States in regard to injuries inflicted upon the persons or property of American citizens in Turkey, etc., be printed for the use of the Senate.

ARMOR FOR NAVAL VESSELS.

Mr. CHANDLER. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be directed to inquire whether the prices paid or agreed to be paid for armor for vessels of the Navy have been fair and reasonable and as low as the prices charged by the same manufacturers to foreign governments; also whether any prices paid have been increased on account of patent processes used for the introduction of nickel, or for cementation by the Harvey process; and if so, whether the increases in price are fair and reasonable; whether the issuance of any of the patents was expedited at the request of the Navy Department; whether such patents were properly issued and were for inventions not previously known or used, and who were and are the owners of such patents; whether any officers of the Government were interested therein; or at the time when any contracts were made were or have since been interested in the patents or employed by the owners thereof; and whether any legislation is necessary to further promote the manufacture and cheapen the price of armor for vessels of the Navy.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GORMAN. Let it go over until to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection. The resolution will go over under the rule.

TELEPHONE SERVICE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. ALLEN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to inform the Senate of the number of telephone companies now doing business in the District of Columbia and the city of Washington, the name of each of said companies, when and where they were incorporated, respectively, and to what extent they are severally capitalized, and the number of telephones of each company now in actual use in the said District and city; also the names of all other telephone companies now seeking to do business in the District of Columbia and the city of Washington, when and where each was incorporated, and their capitalization, respectively, together with the price charged for telephones now in actual use for business purposes and for residences.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF ORLANDO, FLA.

Mr. CALL. I offer a resolution by request of the president and some of the officers of the First National Bank of Orlando, Fla., for the purpose of obtaining information to be communicated to the Committee on National Banks with a view to legislation. I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate the correspondence and other papers in his possession relating to the First National Bank of Orlando, Fla., and the receiver last appointed, and the transactions connected with said bank under his administration.

NOTICES OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I give notice that at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the appointment of the standing and select committees for the present Congress.

I also desire to give further notice that at some appropriate time after that, this afternoon, I shall ask the courtesy of the Senate to permit me to have taken from the table the resolution I offered some time since, instructing the Committee on Finance to place a duty on wool, for the purpose of enabling me to submit some remarks thereon.

COAST DEFENSE ESTIMATES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Vermont, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PROCTOR December 21, 1895, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to inform the Senate what amount of money can be advantageously used for the purpose of coast defense prior to July 1, 1897, and what portion of said amount should be made available during the present fiscal year; also, an estimate of what portion of the amount would be required for sites for fortifications, and how much for engineering, and how much for ordnance work, and whether the requisite number of heavy guns can be supplied from the Government shops, and if not, whether the deficiency can be manufactured by private plants in this country.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that be passed over. I hope the Senator will not insist upon its consideration this morning.

Mr. PROCTOR. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over as requested.

PAYMENT OF COIN OBLIGATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from North Carolina, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. BUTLER December 21, 1895, as follows:

Whereas it was the purpose of Congress to keep gold and silver coin at a parity by investing the Secretary of the Treasury with the discretion of paying the coin obligations of the Government as they mature in either metal: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed when liquidating either the interest or principal of the Government's coin obligations

to make such payment in gold coin whenever the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold is less than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, and to continue to pay in such gold coin until the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be equal to the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, but when the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be greater than the market value of 412½ grains of pure silver he shall pay said coin obligations as they mature in silver coin, and continue to pay the same in silver coin until the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver shall be equal to the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold.

Mr. CULLOM. I suppose that resolution ought to be referred to the Committee on Finance, and I move that it be so referred.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion submitted by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BUTLER. I hope the Senator will withdraw his motion. I should like to make a few remarks on the resolution before any action is taken upon it.

Mr. CULLOM. I withdraw the motion, as I understand the Senator desires to speak to the resolution before its reference.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will go over, retaining its place.

CORPORATE INFLUENCE IN POLITICAL AFFAIRS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. CALL December 24, 1895, as follows:

Resolved, That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be charged with the duty of investigating the subject of the efforts of corporations in the State of Florida, or of the president and directors thereof, to control the election of members of Congress from the State of Florida, or to influence the legislation of Congress; also to investigate and report to the Senate whether corrupt means, bribery, or free transportation have been or are being used to influence such elections in the State of Florida; also to inquire and report to the Senate whether the use of such influences or means is consistent with the preservation of the Republic of the United States and the rights and liberties of the people, and to report a bill for the prevention of such practices.

Mr. CALL. I ask that that resolution be allowed to go over without losing its place.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

PAN-AMERICAN UNION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution submitted by Mr. ALLEN December 24, 1895:

Whereas recent events have shown that European nations are making an aggressive attempt to obtain a greater foothold on the American Continent; and

Whereas such an attempt shows the necessity of a closer union of the American Republics: Therefore

Be it resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States of America should, as speedily as possible, invite all American Republics to enter into a closer union, to be known as the Pan-American Union, for the purpose of promoting the general, industrial, and commercial welfare of the members thereof, and secure said respective Republics from European or other foreign encroachment. Such union should be made of lasting benefit to the people of the several Republics forming it and a unit of value should be established and maintained therein, which shall be a full legal tender and circulate freely between the various Republics and the people thereof.

Mr. ALLEN. Let that be passed over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AFFAIRS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution submitted by Mr. CALL December 24, 1895:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and are hereby, directed to furnish, as soon as practicable, for the information of the Senate, a statement showing—

First. The names of all streets, avenues, alleys, and reservations in the limits of the cities of Washington and Georgetown which are partially or wholly unpaved, and the total length thereof so unpaved; also the length thereof unsewered; also the length thereof without water mains, together with the estimated cost of fully improving the same.

Second. An estimate of the full amount required to carry out the provisions of the act of March 2, 1893, to provide a permanent system of highways in the District of Columbia outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown; the total number of feet of land in streets, avenues, and reservations required to be condemned in each subdivision or piece of land and the value of the same; the number and estimated value of buildings required to be condemned to carry out the provisions of said act in such districts as are prepared by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; the total number of feet of land in streets, avenues, etc., in each subdivision or piece of land that will be abandoned, and the amount and nature of improvements of such streets, avenues, etc., the amount of said improvements at public and private expense. Also an estimate of the cost of fully improving said streets, avenues, and reservations by grading, paving, sewering, and laying water mains, building bridges, culverts, etc., in such streets, avenues, and reservations as are to be condemned by the provisions of said highway act; an estimate of the value of property held by the United States, and the assessed value of private property held in the county, outside of Washington and Georgetown.

Third. A statement showing the amount of taxes collected in the cities of Washington and Georgetown and the county, respectively, by years, from 1878 to 1894, both inclusive, and in like manner the amount expended in each of said sections by the District of Columbia for the same period.

Fourth. The amount of the revenues of the District of Columbia applied by the Treasurer of the United States to liquidate any undue debt of the District of Columbia to the United States or other parties from 1878 to 1895 and from what fund taken and to what debt applied, and if any of such revenue has been refunded and the amount and time of such refunding; an estimate of the amount of the revenues of the District of Columbia that will remain above the appropriation asked for at the end of the years 1895 and 1896.

Mr. CALL. I ask for the present consideration of that resolution, which was submitted at the request of a labor association of the District of Columbia.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. Was that resolution introduced this morning, or was it laid before the Senate, having been previously introduced?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It comes over from a previous day.

Mr. HARRIS. Has the resolution been printed?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It has been printed.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope the Senator from Florida will not ask for its consideration this morning. I wish to look at it before the Senate takes action upon it. That it involves an immense amount of clerical work is the only possible objection I can now see to it, but I should be glad to examine it before it is acted upon.

Mr. CALL. I comply with pleasure with the request of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. As I stated, the resolution comes to me from citizens who are members of a labor association in the District of Columbia, and, as I understand, it represents their views.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over without prejudice.

BATTLE SHIPS FOR THE NAVY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution, submitted by Mr. QUAY December 27, 1895:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether, in his opinion, it would be advantageous to the naval service to now contract for six battle ships, instead of for the two at present authorized, on the basis of the bids now before the Navy Department, modified as might be in the opinion of the Department to the public interest.

Mr. HALE. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. QUAY. I should be glad if the Senator from Maine would explain why the resolution should go to the Committee on Naval Affairs. It is a mere request of the Secretary of the Navy that he should furnish information in his possession relative to the construction of these ships, a question which at the present juncture interests the whole country. I do not see that it is necessary that the Committee on Naval Affairs should be called upon to pass on that question.

Mr. HALE. If it is only a resolution of inquiry——

Mr. QUAY. That is all.

Mr. HALE. I thought it was a resolution of direction. If it is only a resolution of inquiry, I have no objection to it.

Mr. QUAY. That is all it is.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

INCREASE OF COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. CALL on the 27th instant, as follows:

I give notice under the rule of an amendment in the Senate rules in paragraph 9, line 9, page 153, Rule XXV, by striking out the words in the lines "A Committee on Commerce, to consist of thirteen members," and inserting the following:

"*Resolved*, That the Committees on Naval Affairs, Military Affairs, Judiciary, Foreign Relations, Appropriations, and Interstate Commerce shall each consist of fifteen members.

"Second. That until each of the Senators shall be assigned to one of the before-mentioned committees no Senator shall be a member of more than one of the said committees.

"Third. That five members shall constitute a quorum of the said committees.

"A Committee on Commerce created, which shall be charged with all questions which concern the foreign commerce of the United States and the improvement of the tide-water harbors of the United States.

"A Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which shall be charged with the consideration of all bills for the improvement of rivers and inland lakes and harbors, which shall consist of fifteen members, of which five shall constitute a quorum."

Mr. CALL. I ask that that resolution may lie over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on the first day of the session I introduced a joint resolution reciting the declaration made by Mr.

Monroe in his message of December, 1823, and giving to that declaration the formal sanction of Congress. I had not intended to address the Senate upon that resolution until it had received the consideration of the Committee on Foreign Relations and, as I ventured to hope, been favorably reported by them. But since then the President has sent in his message on the Venezuelan difficulty, and Congress, without a dissenting voice, has authorized the commission which the President requested. This action on the part of the President and of Congress has led to a great deal of discussion and much wild talk. Those persons in this country who, for one reason or another, believe that we should never do anything which can clash with English interests have filled the air with their cries and lamentations. It is true that they are more vocal than numerous, but they are very vocal indeed. This outcry, coupled with London's attempt to frighten Congress by producing a stock panic, has tended to confuse the issue and to mislead many persons. When men usually sane cable to London such frantic nonsense as that the Senate is controlled by a jingo mob in the galleries, by "the gentlemen of the pavement," like the French convention during the Reign of Terror, it seems as if a little cool explanation of the real situation would not be out of place. I shall therefore venture to ask the attention of the Senate while I state very briefly the case upon which the President and Congress, charged with the heavy responsibility of government, have acted without a dissenting voice. I shall try to show what the Monroe doctrine is, what it means to the United States, and that it is vitally involved in this Venezuelan controversy. I shall also show that this is not a petty question of a South American boundary, but one in which, so far as it concerns us, the safety and the honor of the United States and its place in the scale of nations are all deeply involved.

These are the gravest questions which can confront any people, and must be treated by those charged with the conduct of public affairs with dignity, calmness, and firmness. Wild denunciation of public men responsible for the nation's peace and safety and bound to protect her rights are as wholly out of place on the one hand as bluster, threats, and violent language are on the other.

The war scare and the war talk do not come from those charged with the responsibility of government, but from outside these walls and chiefly from the stock market and the meetings of the advocates of peace. No responsible public man, let me say now, desires war or seeks in any way to promote it. We do not believe, here at least, that there is any danger of war, but we are all agreed that honorable peace can be most surely maintained by a firm and temperate upholding of the rights and interests of our country.

Two cardinal principles have always governed the United States in their relations with foreign nations. Although in late years these two principles may have been lost sight of, they have never been departed from. The first was laid down by Washington in what was known at the time as the neutrality policy. The doctrine then declared was that we intended as a nation to hold ourselves entirely aloof from European politics, to form no entangling alliances, and to take no part in the affairs of Europe. To-day this proposition seems like a truism, but when it was declared by Washington with reference to the great struggle then going on between France and the rest of Europe it aroused a storm of opposition.

As British colonies we had necessarily been involved in European affairs wherever England was engaged. A war in Europe, whether dynastic or territorial, reached always to the American Continent. The question of the Spanish succession filled New York and New England with the horrors of Indian warfare, and when Frederick the Great faced all Europe in arms, Pitt declared that he would conquer Canada upon the plains of Germany. Thus the colonists of North America had come to look across the Atlantic to know whether they would have war or peace, and the habits of thought of one hundred and fifty years were not effaced by the fact that we had achieved our political independence.

When the struggle of the French Revolution began, Americans, still under the influence of the colonial traditions, felt with a natural sympathy that they should join hands with the nation which had helped them to gain their independence. But if this view was natural, it was also colonial. Fortunately for us, we had at the head of our Government a great statesman, who saw, with that clear vision which no passion could dim, that the policy befitting the colonies was wholly unsuited to a nation. As a part of the British Empire the struggles of Europe were vital to us. As the United States of America, as a free and independent nation, we had no concern with them. So Washington laid down the principle of neutrality in the European wars then raging and maintained it in the midst of obloquy and attack. It was left to a later generation to appreciate rightly the far-reaching wisdom and the high courage which dictated the action of our great first President. When Washington went out of office and gave to the country his Farewell Address he stated the principle which he had carried into action in words which can not be improved and which have been the guide of all succeeding statesmen in the United States upon this point from that day to this:

> The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.
>
> Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.
>
> Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.
>
> Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own stand to go upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

In the years immediately following the retirement of Washington the Government of the United States, despite the change of parties in control of the administration, adhered strictly to Washington's policy. For the protection of American citizens abroad they fought a naval war with the Barbary States, but held rigidly aloof from any connection with European affairs during the troublous times of the First Empire. After the downfall of Napoleon, however, matters in Europe took a new turn. The Holy Alliance, consisting of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, was formed with the avowed object of restoring and maintaining the old forms of absolutism which had really been destroyed in the French Revolution, although the statesmen of the Holy Alliance were unable to understand it.

At the congress of Aix la Chapelle in 1818 the views of the Holy Alliance as to the necessity of suppressing all movements against absolutism were strongly advocated. In 1820 another congress was held at Troppau and later at Leybach, and there it was proposed to unite in repressing the revolution which had broken out in Naples. England protested and Austria suppressed the revolt alone. In 1822 another congress met at Verona, this time to deal with the affairs of Spain. There was an insurrection in the Peninsula itself and the Spanish-American colonies were in open revolt. Again it was proposed that the great powers should unite in suppressing these revolutionary movements, and again England declined to take part.

A French army crossed the Pyrenees and suppressed an insurrection in Spain. The Holy Alliance desired to go still further and reduce the revolted colonies to subjection. Against this Canning vigorously protested, and it was to this he referred in later times when he made the famous declaration that he had called in the New World to redress the balance of the Old. In pursuance of this policy, Mr. Canning, in August, 1823, proposed to our minister, Mr. Rush, that England and the United States should publish a joint declaration to the effect that, while these two Governments desired no portion of these colonies for themselves, they would not view with indifference any foreign intervention in their affairs or their acquisition by any third power. Mr. Rush replied that the United States would join in this declaration, provided that England would acknowledge the independence of the Spanish colonies. This Mr. Canning declined to do at that moment, but he, at the same time, announced to the Prince de Polignac that Great Britain would not permit any European intervention in Spanish-American affairs. It is interesting to observe that the first public proposition looking to the exclusion of Europe from the Western Hemisphere was made by Great Britain and accompanied by a renunciation, on her part, of any desire to acquire new territory there herself.

The schemes of the Holy Alliance made it clear to American statesmen that the time had come when the United States must adopt and declare her policy with reference to the relations of Europe with the Western Hemisphere. Just at the time when Mr. Canning was making his proposals to Mr. Rush, in July, 1823, John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, said to Baron Tuyl, the Russian minister, that "we should contest the right of Russia to any territorial establishment on this continent, and that we should assume distinctly the principle that the American continents are no longer subjects for any new European colonial establishments." The question of our policy in regard to the relations of Europe with the Americas, owing to the projects of the Holy Alliance, had assumed such gravity and importance that President Monroe asked the opinions upon it of Madison and Jefferson. Mr. Madison replied that our relations to the new Republics were such as to call for our efforts to defeat the meditated crusade. Mr. Jefferson said:

> The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation; this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us. And

never could we embark on it under circumstances more auspicious. Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. Our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cisatlantic affairs. America, North and South, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe, and peculiarly her own. She should therefore have a system of her own, separate and apart from that of Europe.

The words of Jefferson may be commended to the attention of those persons who think the operations of a foreign power in South America of less importance than the temporary price of stocks.

The result of the consultations thus held by President Monroe and of the views of Mr. Adams, which he strongly urged, appeared in the following passages of the President's message of December 2, 1823:

In the discussions to which this interest has given rise and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power.

* * * * * * *

In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers.

* * * * * * *

We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere; but with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

These extracts contain what has ever since been known as the Monroe doctrine. The principle which it laid down was the necessary corollary of Washington's neutrality policy and covered three points. First, no more European colonies on these continents; second, no extension of the European political system to any portion of this hemisphere; third, no European interposition in the affairs of the Spanish-American Republics. That part of the declaration which related to European intervention was received by Great Britain with approval, and was warmly praised by Mr. Brougham, Sir James McIntosh, and Lord John Russell, some of whose remarks have been already quoted to the Senate by the Senator from Illinois in his able speech upon this question. In the succeeding Administration President Adams, who may be considered as the real author of the Monroe doctrine, and Mr. Clay, then Secretary of State, attempted to draw closer the bond between ourselves and the South American Republics by the Panama Congress, and Mr. Adams reiterated the Monroe doctrine in his message of March 15, 1826. In the course of the debate upon sending the delegates to the Panama Congress, Mr. Webster spoke as follows:

I look on the message of December, 1823, as forming a bright page in our history. I will neither help to erase it or tear it out; nor shall it be by any act of mine blurred or blotted. It did honor to the sagacity of the Government, and I will not diminish that honor. It elevated the hopes and gratified the patriotism of the people. Over those hopes I will not bring a mildew; nor will I put that gratified patriotism to shame.

The Panama Congress, owing to the question of slavery, came to nothing so far as the United States was concerned, but the passages which I have quoted show sufficiently the view taken of the doctrine by our leading statesmen at the period of its declaration. In 1845 President Polk reiterated the Monroe doctrine, and spoke as follows:

The existing rights of every European nation should be respected; but it is due alike to our safety and our interests that the efficient protection of our laws should be extended over our whole territorial limits, and that it should be distinctly announced to the world as our settled policy that no future European colony or dominion shall, with our consent, be planted or established on any part of the North American Continent.

Three years later President Polk in a special message called the attention of Congress to the appeal of the white population of Yucatan for help against the Indians. They offered to transfer Yucatan to the United States. The President stated that while he did not recommend the acquisition of Yucatan, he advised its temporary occupation in order to prevent its passing into the hands of any European power, which would be an infringement of the Monroe doctrine. A bill was introduced for the occupation of Yucatan, and was opposed by Mr. Calhoun on the ground that the Monroe doctrine was only intended for the temporary purpose of resisting the schemes of the Holy Alliance. The war in Yucatan came to an end, and the bill never reached a vote. The incident is of interest only as showing that Mr. Polk's Administration sustained the Monroe doctrine in its widest application, and that Mr. Calhoun is the only American statesman of any standing who has tried to limit its scope.

Thus far I have merely sketched the history of the doctrine to show the view taken of it by all our Administrations and by all our statesmen, with one exception. I now come to the only attempt which has been made by an outside power to break down the Monroe doctrine and set it at naught. In 1861 Great Britain, France, and Spain entered into a convention to unite in compelling the payment of certain claims which they held against Mexico. When the allied troops disembarked at Vera Cruz it was discovered that the Emperor of the French intended to go much further than had been agreed upon, and to do nothing less than place an Austrian prince upon the Mexican throne. Thereupon England and Spain withdrew, and France was left to carry on her design alone. At that time our hands were tied by our great civil war, but we at once demanded explanations from France, and continued to protest against her conduct. During the entire period of the French occupation we recognized only the Government of Juarez. Mr. Seward consistently pressed our views upon France, and the proceedings of the French were denounced in Congress with so much indignation that in 1863 we were on the verge of war. The moment the civil war was over Mr. Seward at once demanded the withdrawal of the French troops. Our hands were free, and General Sheridan, with a powerful army, was ordered to the Mexican boundary. Under this pressure, after some months of diplomatic delay, the Emperor was forced to give way. The French troops were withdrawn, and the Emperor's Mexican conspiracy, which had begun with treachery and bad faith, ended in humiliation, failure, and the execution of the unfortunate Maximilian. When Napoleon sent out his expedition English writers hastened to declare that he had done a great political service by extinguishing the Monroe doctrine, but when our war was over and we had forced the French armies from Mexico and destroyed the wretched empire they had tried to set up, it was plainly seen that the Monroe doctrine had been signally vindicated and that an attempt to infringe it had brought nothing but shame and disaster to the European power which had made the experiment. Sir Edward Creasy, a distinguished English historian with a greater sense of truth than those writers who had exulted over the buccaneering enterprises of the French, speaks as follows in his First Platform of International Law:

The United States (occupied by their own civil war which was then raging) did not actually send troops to oppose the French in Mexico, but they steadily refused to recognize Maximilian, or any government except a republican government, in Mexico; and the language of their statesmen exhibited the fullest development of the Monroe doctrine.

Since 1823 there have been many cases in which the Monroe doctrine has been cited and discussed, but until the present time the French invasion of Mexico has been the only instance in which it has been openly disregarded and actually infringed by a European power. A second case has now arisen, and the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine is again threatened as it was by the French in 1862. This second attack upon the principle of the Monroe doctrine comes from Great Britain, and is made under cover of a boundary dispute with Venezuela, while Lord Salisbury in his letter to Mr. Olney openly assails the validity of the doctrine itself. To understand the importance of this controversy and how deeply the very existence of the Monroe doctrine is involved in it, it will be necessary to trace very briefly the history of the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela, which has now reached a crisis affecting most gravely the honor, the interests, the rights, and the well-settled policy of the United States.

The dispute over the boundaries of Guiana is an inheritance bequeathed to Venezuela and Great Britain by Spain and Holland. The successful revolt in 1810 of the South American colonies of Spain established the independence of what is now known as Venezuela. That independence was finally recognized by Spain in a decree on the 27th of May, 1845, in which Her Catholic Majesty Doña Isabel II expressly renounces the sovereignty of the American territory known "under the old name of Captaincy General of Venezuela, now Republic of Venezuela." Among the thirteen provinces enumerated in this act of renunciation and cession is the Province of Guiana, which measures 20,149 square leagues, while the remainder of the Republic measures only 15,803 square leagues. It is the controversy over the control of this vast expanse of territory, rich in minerals, fertile in soil, and drained by navigable rivers, which has now reached such an acute stage.

Great Britain's claim is derived from Holland. By the treaty of the 13th of August, 1814, the establishments of Demerara, Essequibo, and Berbice were ceded to Great Britain, and the supplemental agreement called for by the terms of the treaty subsequently confirmed this partition. Unfortunately, the lines of demarcation between Venezuela and British Guiana were not specifically defined in either of the treaties above mentioned—a circumstance England has not overlooked. It therefore becomes a question of paramount importance in any examination into the merits of this controversy to determine by other means the territorial jurisdiction of Spain in 1810 and of Holland in 1814. The earlier treaties, documents, and ordinances are happily ample and

explicit upon these points. Lord Salisbury now puts forward a claim to title based on conquest and military occupation in 1796, but as the treaty which confirmed these conquests only describes them as the establishments of Berbice, Demerara, and Essequibo, this new claim does not affect the argument except as a mere assertion.

It is hardly worth while to do more than barely allude to the fact that the northern part of South America belonged to Spain by virtue of original discovery. There is no principle of the law of nations now better established than the doctrine of discovery. Calvo, an eminent authority upon international law, says:

> The discovery of America and those (discoveries) which have been made at the close of the Middle Ages in Asia and Africa have introduced into international law a new mode of acquisition and possession. We speak of the priority of discovery, of the first occupation, and of colonization.

It is beyond dispute that what is now Venezuela and British and Dutch Guiana was originally Spanish territory.

Columbus discovered the mouth of the Orinoco in 1498. In the following year Alonzo de Ojeda, a Spanish subject, made further discoveries in the same region. In 1500 Vicente Yanez Pinzon, a companion of Columbus, explored the principal mouths of the Orinoco. In 1531 Diego de Ordaz navigated this river as far as the mouth of the Meta. These acts of discovery and exploration on the part of Spain were soon followed by colonization. For many years her only rival in South America was Portugal, and in the treaty of 1750 between these two powers Portugal bound herself to recognize and support the right of Spain to territory lying between the Amazon and the Orinoco. Thus Portugal, the only country that can claim with Spain the honor of original discovery, solemnly recognized the justice of the Spanish contention to what is now disputed territory. It is interesting to note in this connection that a few years later (5th of March, 1768) a royal cedule fixed the Amazon as the southern limit of Spanish Guiana.

It was not until the northern coast of South America had been substantially preempted by discovery that Holland began to seek a foothold in that part of the New World. During their long war of emancipation the Dutch had succeeded in planting several colonies in Guiana. When Spain, whose vassal Holland had been, became a party to the treaty of Munster in 1648, she legalized the Dutch pretensions. By article 5 each power was to retain territory already possessed and held in the East and West Indies and on the coast of Asia, Africa, and America. It was further stipulated that neither power should molest or disturb the garrisons and strongholds of the other. This treaty proved to be a fruitful source of misunderstanding and irritation. Each power soon came to accuse the other of violating its provisions.

Dutch expeditions beyond the Essequibo were repulsed and driven back by the Spaniards repeatedly, and there is no evidence to show that Spain ever acquiesced for a single moment in the Dutch pretensions to a rood of land west of the Essequibo. On the contrary, when the director-general of the Dutch colony of Essequibo, on the 30th of September, 1758, sent a note of protest to the Spanish authorities complaining that the Spanish troops had molested and driven the Dutch away from a post which stood on one of the banks of the Cuyuni, a vigorous response was returned, saying "that the river Cuyuni and its dependencies belonged to His Catholic Majesty, and that consequently, as the Dutch had entered the Spanish dominion, he would make no restitution."

The river referred to there, let me say, is far to the east of the Orinoco and Point Barima, where the Schomburgk line ends.

It does not appear that the Dutch sought to continue further these diplomatic amenities. That they made spasmodic attempts at further extension is unquestioned, and on these Lord Salisbury in his reply to Secretary Olney appears to rely, but it is equally certain that none of their attempts ever attained anything like the dignity of permanent and recognized settlements, or were ever admitted by Spain. Indeed, in 1788 Antonio Lopez de la Puente, who had been sent by the Spanish governor of Guiana to explore the Cuyuni River as far as the limits of the Dutch colony, presented his report. In it he said:

> That having descended the river as far as the curve which it makes, in order to pour into the Essequibo, where the possessions of the Dutch colonies commence, he found the first Dutch houses at the mouth of the Masaruni, i. e., precisely at the curve, no new territories having been encroached upon by them up to that time.

This, then, was the situation in 1791 when, on the 23d of June, a treaty of extradition was concluded at Aranjuez between Spain and Holland. The objects of this treaty, as defined in the preamble, were for "the mutual restoration of deserters and runaways between their respective colonies" and to "put a stop to desertion and its pernicious consequences." The first article of the treaty recites that "complaints of desertion have been more frequent, to wit, between Puerto Rico and St. Eustace, Coro and Curaçao, the Spanish establishments on the Orinoco and Essequibo, Demerara, Berbice, and Surinam." An examination of the map to-day shows that the British province of Berbice extends from Surinam to the River Berbice, Demerara from the Berbice to the Demerara, and on the same principle the province of Essequibo would extend from the Demerara to the River Essequibo, which may or may not include the valley watered by that stream. We have just seen, also, from the preceding report (1788) that the Dutch establishment of Essequibo did not extend beyond the mouth of the Masaruni and certainly it is a fair inference to assume that the Dutch themselves did not put forward any serious claim to territory virtually beyond the Essequibo.

This presumption is further supported, indeed, by Dutch testimony of the most unimpeachable sort. No less an official than Mr. Six, secretary of the Dutch East India Company, sent in 1794 a communication to Señor Corral, the Spanish minister to Holland, in which he makes the following significant admission:

> The captain, pilot, and crew of the Spanish merchant ship *Neustra Señora de la Concepcion*, after having been perfectly well treated by the governor-general of Surinam, were conveyed to Moroco, west of the Essequibo, as having been Spanish territory, so that they could thence go as on their own land to the nearest Spanish-American town.

Clearly, then, the River Moroco, by common consent and by the admission of the Dutch in 1794, was a Spanish possession, and the Moroco is far to the east of the Orinoco and the Schomburgk line. There could be no dispute by the Dutch to territory beyond the Moroco. Their broadest claim in 1794 was confined to the few leagues between the Moroco and the Essequibo.

Of the Dutch colonies enumerated in the treaty of Aranjuez three, to wit, Essequibo, Demerara, and Berbice, as stated at the outset, were substantially ceded to England by the treaty of London of the 13th of August, 1814. By this act of alienation England succeeded to the title of Holland. England is entitled to every foot of territory that was Dutch in 1814, and to nothing more. Venezuela is heir to the rights of Spain and nothing more. No act of aggression or encroachment since can change or alter the relative position of the two countries. No new rights have accrued to either side since the 13th of August, 1814.

What Holland's claim included in 1791 and 1794 we have already seen. It is absurd to say that any Dutch aggressions beyond the Essequibo subsequent to 1794 and prior to 1814 conveyed to Holland any color of title by prescription. A period of something less than a quarter of a century is hardly "time immemorial" within the meaning of the rule. Neither will it be seriously contended that such Dutch occupation of disputed territory as did occur was "peaceable." It is manifest, then, that any title by prescription must be invalid.

Still less is it necessary to fortify Spain's claim by any supplemental quotations from further ordinances and decrees. It may be said in passing, however, that the list is by no means exhausted. Among other additional and confirmatory evidence that the Spanish boundary terminated only with the Essequibo, reference may be had to the following documents: Note of Gregorio Espinosa, governor of Cumana, 1st of February, 1742; order of 4th of February, 1779, giving directions for establishing settlements in the eastern part of Guiana; report of Felipe de Inciarte, 1st of November, 1779; royal mandate of 1st of October, 1780, demanding the aforesaid Inciarte to drive the Dutch away from land at the northwest of the Essequibo as "trespassers."

Having determined at some length and with reasonable precision the western limitations of Dutch Guiana, to which, and to which only, England succeeded in 1814, it now becomes pertinent and proper to inquire how far England has respected or rather ignored these boundaries and to trace step by step her aggressions upon the soil of her weaker neighbor. For many years the question of boundary between Venezuela and England was held in abeyance. Venezuela for a long time was a part of the old Colombian Confederation and too busy with her own internal problems to pay much heed to the more remote question of the boundary of her eastern frontier. Perhaps the earliest, as it certainly is one of the most significant, incidents of this whole controversy occurred in 1836. On the 26th of May of this year Sir Robert Ker Porter, the then British minister at Caracas, requested the Venezuelan Government in an official note to place light-houses and other marks at Point Barima, at the mouth of the Orinoco River, as an aid to navigation. This voluntary act of Sir Robert Ker Porter was a most complete admission of Venezuela's sovereignty over the Orinoco.

The modern British claim that the Dutch had occupied Point Barima long before the treaty of Munster probably did not occur to Sir Robert. Indeed, it seems altogether likely that he only had in mind the treaty of Aranjuez of 1791, already alluded to, in which the Dutch themselves distinctly recognized "the Spanish establishments on the Orinoco." This dispatch was a part of the archives of the British legation at Caracas for half a century, and it was not until 1887 that the then British minister, on being confronted with it, took the pains to disavow this act of his predecessor on the ground that it was without the "knowledge or authority of the British Government." Indeed, about the time that Sir Robert dispatched his now famous note, there are various other

acts which go to show that the agents of the British Government were unaccountably ignorant of what have since come to be "undoubted British rights" in Guiana.

In the latter part of the same year (1836) the British governor of Demerara, in a note printed among the Parliamentary papers, made the startling statement that the Pomaron River, west of the Essequibo and east of the Moroco, could be taken as the limit of the English colony. Further, in September or October of 1840, an Englishman was arrested and tried for having killed an Indian. His counsel succeeded in showing that the crime had taken place in the territory of the Moroco, whereupon the British tribunal promptly acquitted him on the ground that it had no jurisdiction, the act having been committed in a foreign territory. Thus we see that in 1840 a British court in Demerara had judicial cognizance of the fact that the territory of the Moroco was Venezuelan territory and outside British jurisdiction. The governor of Guiana informed his Government of these facts in a dispatch dated 23d of August, 1841. It is not known that the British Government, either then or since, in any way disavowed these acts of its accredited agents.

Meanwhile the reports of the discovery of rich gold fields in the territory of the Yuruari reached London, and the English ministry soon began to display a lively concern in the boundary question. In 1841, Mr. (afterwards Sir) Robert Schomburgk, who was sent out first under the auspices of the Royal Geographical Society to explore the country in 1834, surveyed and laid out a line of demarcation. It does not appear that Venezuela was invited to cooperate in a work which affected her interests so vitally. The British consul, it is true, informed Venezuela of Schomburgk's mission, but the vigorous protest of the latter Government went unheeded and ignored. Schomburgk continued his survey and staked out the famous "Schomburgk line." This survey included the whole seaboard between the Essequibo and the Amacuro (which finds its outlet at the mouth of the Orinoco) and a vast section in the interior. One of its conspicuous features was the erection of a sentry box and the planting of a British flag at Point Barima at the mouth of the Orinoco. The Venezuelans, not without a touch of humor, have uniformly contented themselves in all of their published maps by referring to this line as "capricious," and Schomburgk in his original map and report speaks of his line as the British claim, not boundary.

It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the British Government of that period took much the same view, for Lord Aberdeen, then prime minister, in reply to the urgent remonstrance of the Venezuelan minister at London, said, on the 11th of December, 1841, that the survey had been undertaken merely as a "preliminary step" to further discussion between the two Governments, and not, as the Venezuelan Government seemed to fear, "with the intention of indicating dominion or empire on the part of Great Britain." He added that he was glad to learn that Venezuela had been able to ascertain that Point Barima had not been occupied by the British authorities. A few weeks later, on the 31st of January, 1842, Lord Aberdeen gave force and effect to this disclaimer by ordering the removal of all the marks set up by Engineer Schomburgk.

I have here certain letters which I ask leave to print with my remarks. I will not weary the Senate by reading them. The first one expresses the views of Lord Palmerston in 1840. Lord Palmerston would suggest for the consideration of Lord John Russell that—

A map of British Guiana should be made out according to the boundaries described by Mr. Schomburgk; that the said map should be accompanied by a memoir, describing in detail the natural features which define and constitute the boundaries in question.

That is very apparent from Schomburgk's report; in fact, he mentions it in his memoir, that he laid the line according to the natural boundaries of the territory as he conceived them. He was a botanist and an explorer.

The letter referred to is as follows:

FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 18, 1840.*

SIR: I am directed by Viscount Palmerston to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 6th instant, inclosing copies and extracts of dispatches and their inclosures from Mr. Light, governor of British Guiana, relative to the expediency of an arrangement being made with the Brazilian, Venezuelan, and the Netherlands Governments by which the boundaries of British Guiana may be accurately defined.

With reference to that part of your letter in which you state that Lord John Russell considers it to be important that the boundaries of British Guiana should be ascertained and agreed upon, if possible, and that Mr. Schomburgk's researches in those parts have qualified him in a peculiar manner to be of use, should the service of any person acquainted with the geography of British Guiana be required for fixing the boundaries of the British territory, I am to state to you that the course of proceeding which Lord Palmerston would suggest for the consideration of Lord John Russell is that "a map of British Guiana should be made out according to the boundaries described by Mr. Schomburgk; that the said map should be accompanied by a memoir, describing in detail the natural features which define and constitute the boundaries in question, and that copies of that map and memoir should be delivered to the Governments of Venezuela, of Brazil, and of the Netherlands as a statement of the British claim; that in the meanwhile British commissioners should be sent to erect landmarks on the ground in order to mark out by permanent erections the line of boundary so claimed by Great Britain." It would then rest with each of the three Governments above mentioned to make any objection which they might have to bring forward against these boundaries, and to state the reasons upon which such objection might be founded, and Her Majesty's Government would then give such answers thereto as might appear proper and just.

Lord Palmerston further considers that it would be expedient that the *Brazilian* should be required to withdraw from Pirara, and that the officer in command should be informed that any claim which Brazil may imagine itself to have to that village should be stated by the Brazilian Government to that of Great Britain in order that it may be discussed and settled between the two Governments.

I have, etc.,

LEVERSON.

JAMES STEPHEN, Esq.

Mr. LODGE. I have also a letter from Lord Aberdeen, dated the 31st of January, 1842, in which he speaks of removing the marks which had been put up, and explains that he is very glad to meet the wishes of the Government.

The letter referred to is as follows:

LEGACION DE LOS E. E. U. U. DE VENEZUELA,
Foreign Office, January 31, 1842.

The undersigned, Her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the note addressed to him on the 10th instant by Mr. Fortique, plenipotentiary of the Republic of Venezuela, representing the alarm and excitement which have been created in Venezuela on account of the marks fixed by Mr. Schomburgk at different points of his survey near the mouth of the Orinoco, and renewing his request that Her Majesty's Government will order the removal of these marks.

The undersigned begs to inform Mr. Fortique in reply that, in order to meet the wishes of the Government of Venezuela, Her Majesty's Government will send instructions to the governor of British Guiana directing him to remove the posts which have been placed by Mr. Schomburgk near the Orinoco.

But the undersigned feels it his duty distinctly to declare to Mr. Fortique that, although in order to put an end to the misapprehension which appears to prevail in Venezuela with regard to the object of Mr. Schomburgk's survey the undersigned has consented to comply with the renewed representations of Mr. Fortique upon this affair, Her Majesty's Government must not be understood to abandon any portion of the rights of Great Britain over the territory which was formerly had by the Dutch in Guiana.

The undersigned begs to renew to Mr. Fortique the assurance of his high consideration.

ABERDEEN.

Mr. LODGE. I have also another letter of Lord Aberdeen, written on March 30, 1844, in which he discusses first the British claim to all the territory as far as the Orinoco, but closes by saying that they will yield to Venezuela from the line of the Orinoco practically to the Pomaron. He says:

Being convinced that the most important objects for the interest of Venezuela is the exclusive possession of the Orinoco, Her Majesty's Government is ready to yield to the Republic of Venezuela a portion of the coast sufficient to insure her the free control of the mouth of this her principal river and prevent its being under the control of any foreign power.

The letter referred to is as follows:

[Extract from Lord Aberdeen's reply to Dr. Fortique.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, *March 30, 1844.*

In 1674 the West India Company, formed in 1627, was dissolved, but a new company was formed and authorized, restricting their rights to trade with certain parts of Africa, the Island of Curaçao, and the colonies of the Essequibo and Boneverone (Pumaron), the latter extending, as above stated, as far as the Orinoco.

Pursuing the examination of the authorities, which in more modern times confirm these datas, it will be found that in the History of South America by Bolt, published about the middle of the last century, Dutch Guiana is described as extending from the mouth of the Orinoco at 9° as far as the Marawaina to 6° 20′ latitude north, that in a map of said coast published in 1783 by Faden, the Orinoco River is established as the western limit of the Dutch according to their pretensions, and that in a more recent chart published by Jeffery's in 1798, the Barima River is described as being the division between the Dutch and Spanish lands. The undersigned must declare that these authorities can not be rejected as being English, and therefore, having an interest in this question because, although at the date of the last cited chart the Dutch colony was under the protection of Great Britain, it was restored to the Batavian Republic in 1802, and there is no reason to doubt the testimony of Faden and Bolt, or to accuse them of partiality.

It is doubtful whether the same could be said of La Condamine Bellin and other French writers, whose Government always showed itself to be jealous of the progress of the Dutch in the neighborhood of the settlement of Cayenne.

But, in reality, no doubt can exist that the mouth of the Orinoco was not only claimed by the Dutch as the western limit of their possessions, but also that from the very beginning they effected its military occupation and retained possession of it. Hartsinck says, "The first rivers found in Dutch Guiana coming from the Orinoco are the Barima, about 1 mile in width, where in olden times we had a fort." There exist documents of the West India Company showing that directors recommended to the commander of Pumaron to keep the Barima fort in good condition. Colonel Moody found the ruins of these fortifications when, in 1807, the English occupied the coast and were preparing to send some forces to Angostura to destroy buccaneers that were pillaging the coast of Dutch Guiana, and also to fortify that place again. Mr. Schomburgk, when in the discharge of a commission, found the remains of the fort and also of cultivation in the neighboring territory.

The undersigned does not deem further evidence necessary to show how erroneous are the assertions of Señor Fortique when he states that the Essequibo has been considered as a dividing line between the two countries, and that territory lying between that river and the Orinoco has been considered by the world as belonging exclusively to Spain. These statements make the undersigned feel justified in doubting whether Señor Fortique would be supported by his own countrymen in his views, taking into consideration that in the maps of the provinces of Venezuela published four years ago by an officer of the Republic the extreme limits of the Venezuelan eastern claim is the Moroco River, and in truth, to judge from the exaggerated pretensions found in this work on other points, the author is not inclined to sin on the side of generosity with respect to the neighboring British colony.

Were the undersigned inclined to act on the spirit of Señor Fortique's communication, it is evident, by what he has said, that he ought to claim on behalf of Great Britain, as the rightful successor of Holland, all the coast from the Orinoco to the Essequibo, and such claim, aside from all questions of right, would certainly be much less injurious to Venezuela than the pretensions of Señor Fortique as to England, as Venezuela has no settlements on the disputed territory, and the admission or acknowledgment of the Esse-

quibo as the limit of the Republic would, of course, mean that Great Britain should deliver about one-half of the colony of Demerara, including Point Cartabo and the Island of Tkykoveral, where the Dutch founded their first settlement on the Majarini, the mission of Barlika Grove, and many settlements now existing on the Arabisi coast as far as 50 miles from the capital.

But the undersigned believes that the negotiations would not be free from difficulties if the claims that can not be sustained are presented, and shall not, therefore, follow Señor Fortique's example, but state here the concessions that Great Britain is disposed to make of her rights, prompted by a friendly consideration for Venezuela, and by her desire to avoid all cause of serious controversies between the two countries.

"Being convinced that the most important object for the interest of Venezuela is the exclusive possession of the Orinoco, Her Majesty's Government is ready to yield to the Republic of Venezuela a portion of the coast sufficient to insure her the free control of the mouth of this her principal river and prevent its being under the control of any foreign power." With this end in view, and being persuaded that a concession of the greatest importance has been made to Venezuela, Her Majesty's Government is disposed to lay aside its rights upon the Amacuro as the western limit of the British territory, and to consider the mouth of the Guiama River as the boundary of Her Majesty's possessions on the coast side. Moreover, Her Majesty's Government will consent that the boundary in the interior be fixed by a line from the mouth of the Moroco to the point where the rivers Barama and Guiama meet, as far as the Aunama, whose upward course will be followed until the stream approaches the point nearest the Acarabisi; then following the downward course of the Acarabisi as far as its confluence with the Cuyuni, it will pursue the upward course of the latter as far as the highlands contiguous to the Boraima Mountains, where its waters are divided between the Essequibo and the River Branco.

Great Britain is then disposed to cede to Venezuela all the territory lying between the above-mentioned line and the Amacuro River and the chain of mountains where it has its head, upon condition that the Government of Venezuela shall engage itself not to alienate any portion of said territory to any foreign power, and also upon condition that the tribes of Indians now living in said territory shall be protected against all ill treatment and oppression.

The undersigned has the honor to renew to Señor Fortique the assurance of the highest consideration.

ABERDEEN.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we are told now that Great Britain will not consider any question arising to the east of the Schomburgk line, which terminates at Point Barima on the mouth of the Orinoco. At that time Lord Aberdeen, as may be seen in his letter, considered that of vital importance to Venezuela. He was ready to withdraw all their claims, whether they were large or small, to the land in that neighborhood and west of the Moroco practically, in order that Venezuela might control that great stream.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether he is quite sure that the first exploration made by Schomburgk was under the auspices of the Geographical Society, or whether he did not go out from the United States, where he was occupying the position of clerk in a tobacco store in New York, being a botanist and otherwise interested in natural objects, upon a private exploration. After he had made the exploration he made his report to the Geographical Society, whereupon they gave him authority to make it more definite, and after that the Government of Great Britain took up the subject.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that Schomburgk, as he states, was in business in this country, a clerk in a shop. He went to an island, some West Indian island or an island in the neighborhood of South America, of which he made a survey and a map. He sent it to the Geographical Society at London. It was so very well done that the society invited him to make explorations on the mainland. In 1834 he went to Guiana under their auspices. It is so stated in the Parliamentary paper which prints extracts from his letters. He went there in 1834 and explored Guiana, and made a report and wrote a memoir. In that expedition he practically laid down the line as he thought it ought to be.

Then the British Government, hearing of this memoir, ordered those portions of it printed which related to the boundary, and they sent him out officially in 1840 to mark out the boundary, which I think it is apparent he had really already surveyed. The Parliamentary paper containing the report or the extracts from his memoir (it is a very rare one; I have never seen more than one copy of it) states in a note that those are extracts from his letters and memoir, and in those he constantly refers to the natural boundaries. He devotes most of his space to discussing the boundary of Brazil on the south, where the serious trouble then was. He devotes very little space, comparatively speaking, to the question of the Venezuelan boundary. He then went out in 1840, as I have said, and officially ran the line which bears his name. He returned to London in 1844, when he was knighted for his services, and, I believe, subsequently came to South America as a British consul.

Mr. DAVIS. Did he only lay down one line?

Mr. LODGE. I think so. There is what is called an extension of the Schomburgk line, but I think Schomburgk himself laid only one line.

A few weeks later the marks of which I have spoken were removed. In other words, the British Government of that day disavowed the Schomburgk line within which we are now told Great Britain can not assent to arbitration. It required half a century, however, to bring into clearer relief just what really was intended in referring to the Schomburgk line as a mere "preliminary step" to future negotiations. Lord Aberdeen repudiated the Schomburgk line in 1841. In 1890 Lord Salisbury, then prime minister, repudiated the act of his predecessor, Lord Aberdeen. This is what he said in a note on the 10th of February to the Venezuelan minister of foreign affairs:

Her Majesty's Government can not accept as satisfactory any arrangement not admitting as English property the territory included within the line laid down by Sir R. Schomburgk.

We can see in this way how that line, from being the mere suggestion of an explorer, based on natural objects, has now become an immutable right beyond which discussion is out of the question.

Popular feeling in Venezuela had been greatly excited by the event connected with the Schomburgk incident. It was in response to repeated instructions from Caracas that the Venezuelan minister in London finally succeeded in opening negotiations. The attempt was abortive in any immediate results. The Venezuelan Government proposed the Essequibo as a frontier, and based its argument upon the ancient maps and treaties. In response Lord Aberdeen proposed the Moroco. This proposition would probably have been accepted as a compromise had it not been accompanied by some offensive and humiliating conditions which forced Venezuela to reject it. Instructions, however, were issued to Señor Fortique, the Venezuelan minister, to suggest suitable modifications, but his sudden death virtually suspended further negotiation for a period of thirty years.

Occasional notes were, however, interchanged, and of these quite the most significant was one addressed by Belford Hinton Wilson, the British chargé d'affaires at Caracas, on November 18, 1850, to the Venezuelan minister of foreign affairs. Mr. Wilson, it appears, had become somewhat alarmed "in relation to the existence of a propaganda to mislead and excite public opinion concerning the boundary question." He therefore took this opportunity of saying (I quote from his published letter):

The Venezuelan Government, in justice to Great Britain, can not mistrust for a moment the sincerity of the formal declaration which is now made in the name and by the express order of Her Majesty's Government, that Great Britain has no intention to occupy or encroach upon the territory in dispute.

The territory in dispute lies between the Orinoco and the Essequibo; most of it between the Schomburgk line and the Essequibo. It was the territory in dispute, according to the authentic utterance of Her Majesty's Government in 1850, and now it is territory which must not even be discussed.

A similar assurance from Venezuela was asked for and promptly given. This was of course pending the settlement of the boundary question.

It was not until 1876 that negotiations were again opened, the initiative being taken, as usual, by Venezuela. Dr. José Maria Rojas was sent to London as minister resident, with explicit instructions to terminate the dispute, if possible, in a way honorable to Venezuela. Intimation was conveyed to the British foreign office, in accordance with the spirit of these instructions, that a line of compromise rather than one of strict right would be considered, so anxious was Venezuela to bring about a final settlement. After several years of unremitting endeavor Dr. Rojas was at length rewarded by receiving from Lord Salisbury on the 10th of January, 1880, a statement "of the claim of Her Majesty's Government by virtue of ancient treaties with the native tribes."

This revised line of demarcation was found to include not only the old Schomburgk line, but a vast and valuable tract beyond it. Lord Salisbury promised in conclusion to consider in the "most friendly spirit" any proposition which the Government of Venezuela might see fit to make for the establishment of a limit satisfactory to both nations. The reference to ancient treaties with the native Indian tribes was justly regarded by Venezuela as being involved in a good deal of obscurity. The claim, which was now set up for the first time, was certainly a novel one. The particular treaties and the particular tribes referred to were known to Great Britain alone. Likewise the manner in which these tribes came to be recognized as free and independent, possessed of the attributes of sovereignty, was another diplomatic secret, which was safely guarded within the precincts of the British foreign office. As a matter of fact, the Indians had been for centuries subjects of Spain and Holland, and had long since lost all right to make a treaty with anyone.

In accordance with Lord Salisbury's suggestion that Venezuela submit some proposition "for the establishment of a limit satisfactory to both nations," Dr. Rojas proposed the Moroco, Lord Aberdeen's old divisional line, but shortly afterwards the Beaconsfield ministry fell and Lord Granville became minister of foreign affairs. In a note dated September 15, 1881, Lord Granville declined to accept the Moroco as a boundary, but suggested a

line which should begin at a place on the seacoast at a longitude of 29 miles to the east of the right shore of the River Barima. This proposition was in turn rejected by Venezuela. A few years later a final adjustment of all difficulties between the two countries seemed at length to be in sight. The British Government consented to unite the boundary question with the question of additional duty on merchandise coming from the Antilles and certain indemnity demands made by British citizens against Venezuela.

It was proposed to pave the way to an adjustment of all issues and controversies by one treaty. "The proposal to settle by arbitration questions which may arise between the countries," wrote Lord Granville to Gen. Guzman Blanco, on the 15th of April, 1885, "meets with the entire concurrence of Her Majesty's Government." An actual convention was drawn up, but before it could be signed the ministry changed. Lord Salisbury, who resumed the foreign portfolio, expressly repudiated the arbitration agreement made by his predecessor, and the negotiations abruptly ended. According to Lord Salisbury, to refer all disputes and controversies to arbitration "would be without precedent in the treaties made by Great Britain."

The next attempt to reopen the question came in the following year, when the Venezuelan legation renewed its efforts to secure some satisfactory compromise and suggested arbitration as the means. Lord Rosebery, in July, 1886, replied by proposing a frontier which would include the River Guaima in British Guiana. Coupled to this memorandum was a demand for the free navigation of the Orinoco, which made it impossible.

Meantime the British aggressions in the disputed zone, the region which Great Britain had solemnly promised not to occupy while in dispute, began to be more and more aggravated. Beginning with October, 1884, various marks of British sovereignty were repeatedly set up or posted. Fortifications were thrown up at Barima Point. The Venezuelan commissary at the mouth of the Amacuro was arrested and tried for the alleged ill-treatment of a Portuguese subject. Venezuela protested that the status quo of 1850, not to occupy the territory in dispute, was being flagrantly violated. No heed was paid to this remonstrance. There was under such circumstances but one honorable course for Venezuela to pursue. She broke off diplomatic relations with Great Britain on the 20th of February, 1887.

Even this, however, did not terminate the efforts of Venezuela to arrive at some understanding with her powerful adversary. She has since made several futile endeavors to refer the whole question to friendly arbitration. The last one was made as late as the spring of 1893, by Dr. Michelena, the confidential agent of Venezuela at London. It went the way of all the others. Lord Rosebery, in 1893, was plainly convinced that his demands of 1886 were too moderate; he reenforced them by conditions more objectionable than ever. In 1850 Great Britain herself suggested nonintervention in the disputed belt; in 1893 it was quite impossible for England to consent to arbitrate the greater part of this identical territory which had for so many years constituted "an integral portion of British Guiana."

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me for just a moment?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Massachusetts seems to have given the subject great consideration, and I desire to ask him if he can inform the Senate whether Venezuela has ever at any time refused to submit the matter to arbitration?

Mr. LODGE. Never.

Mr. HILL. I asked the question because of a published interview said to have been given out by Mr. Lincoln, in which it was stated that at one period Venezuela had refused arbitration.

Mr. LODGE. I have never met with any instance in which she refused arbitration by itself. So far as I am aware—and I think I have examined all the correspondence—she has sought arbitration constantly. She has rejected some of the compromises offered by Great Britain in which arbitration may have been a feature, but on other grounds. She rejected, for example, one compromise offered by Great Britain, because Great Britain insisted upon the free navigation of the Orinoco. But I do not think that Venezuela has ever rejected arbitration as an independent proposition. On the contrary, she has always sought it.

It will be observed from the brief outline of the dispute which I have given that no new rights have come to England or to Venezuela since 1814, i. e., since the declaration of President Monroe. They have the rights of Spain and Holland, respectively, nothing more and nothing less, and are entitled to exactly what those inherited rights give them. In 1836 a British minister acknowledged that Point Barima belonged to Venezuela by asking the Venezuelan Government to erect a light-house there. In 1840 a British court in Demerara declared the territory of the Moroco, far to the east of the Orinoco, to be Venezuelan territory. In 1841 an English engineer laid out a perfectly arbitrary line running from the mouth of the Orinoco in a southerly direction until it reached the southern boundary of British Guiana. Lord Aberdeen disavowed this line and proposed another starting at the River Moroco and going farther into the interior; Lord Granville proposed another reaching further to the west; Lord Rosebery another inside the Schomburgk line, but coupled with the free navigation of the Orinoco. In 1893 he proposed a second line, and meantime Lord Salisbury had extended the British claim while he was secretary for foreign affairs.

The Statesman's Year Book will show, if anyone cares to examine it, that the British claim upon Venezuela advanced in one year 33,000 square miles. Every British minister has offered a different line within which Great Britain would not consent to arbitrate, and every British minister has gone beyond his predecessor in making fresh claims to territory beyond the line which he offered and about which he would arbitrate. At first sight this seems to denote inconsistency on the part of the British Government, but in reality their course has been just the reverse. There is apparently just as much support for one line as another when they pass beyond the valley of the Essequibo. From Schomburgk down, every line was entirely arbitrary, and the constantly growing claims beyond the various lines offered was in entire keeping with the policy of the British Government. Their object was to get as much new territory as they could if the matter ever came to a settlement, which they have used every artifice to delay.

I do not personally believe that Great Britain has a good claim to a foot of land beyond the Essequibo, for Indian treaties are altogether too flimsy to support any serious contention, and the claim of recent settlement is impossible, as that would entitle England to any vacant land anywhere in North or South America on which a British subject had settled.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether in his researches he has discovered any trace of the Indian treaties alluded to by Lord Salisbury?

Mr. LODGE. I have not. They must be concealed in the British case.

But it is not my purpose to pass upon the merits of either the British or the Venezuelan claim. All I have desired to show is that there is a dispute as to the ownership of the territory lying west of the Essequibo, and that neither England nor Venezuela holds an uncontested title to any portion of it. That disputed territory either belonged to Holland or it did not. If it did, England ought to have it, and there would not be the slightest disposition on the part of the United States to interfere with her possession of it. If it did not, it belongs to Venezuela, and Venezuela ought to have it. The question is one for the arbitration of an impartial tribunal, and by the decision of such a tribunal the United States would cheerfully abide.

But if England, with no authority but a disputed claim, seizes territory and declines arbitration upon it, her action does not differ from seizing and holding new territory in the Americas by the right of conquest. The boundary dispute does not touch the essence of the question, which is the acquisition of new territory in this hemisphere by a European power. Such pretexts can always be found. If England can seize territory under a claim which has grown larger with each succeeding year, there is nothing to prevent her taking indefinite regions in South America. If England can do it and is allowed to do it by the United States, every other European power can do the same, and they will not be slow to follow England's example. We have seen them parcel out Africa, and if we do not interpose now in this case the fate of large portions of South America will be the same. We shall have formidable rivals all about us; we shall be in constant danger of war; and we shall be forced to become a military power with great armies and navies.

The seizure of this South American territory by England is an absolute violation of the Monroe doctrine. I have heard it said that no one knows what the Monroe doctrine is. Mr. President, it is as simple in principle as the Declaration of Independence, to which Jefferson compared it. It is not a doctrine of international law, and the attempt to discuss it or to oppose it on that basis is a waste of words. Like the independence of this country, it is a question of fact and not of law. The independence of this country is unquestioned, because, having declared it, we compelled the world to recognize it. In the same way we have always acted on the declaration of Mr. Monroe as the guiding principle of our foreign policy. We shall now, I hope, declare it again with the formal sanction of Congress, representing the people of the United States. It is idle to argue either for or against it as a matter of international law, for it requires no such support.

We declare the Monroe doctrine as a principle which we believe essential to the honor, the safety, the interests of the United States. We declare it as a statement of fact, and we must have it recognized as our independence and national existence are recognized by all the world. It must be recognized, because we sustain and support it, and we can no more permit it to be a matter of discussion with other nations than we can afford to discuss with them our national welfare or our forms of government. It em-

bodies for us the same principle as the balance of power so jealously maintained by the nations of Europe. They will not allow that to be disturbed, and we hold to our balance of power with equal tenacity.

The Monroe doctrine interferes in no wise with the rights which the principles of international law give to all nations. It does not touch the question of reparation for injuries inflicted upon the subjects of any European power by any of the Central or South American States. We cherish that right jealously ourselves; we do not deny it to others. If the subjects of any European power suffer wrong at the hands of any of the Governments of South or Central America, that power is entitled to demand the fullest satisfaction and redress. But, Mr. President, the question of reparation must not be mixed up with the acquisition of territory. Lord Salisbury, with the ingenuity for which he is distinguished, has made a claim for reparation upon Venezuela on account of the arrest by the Venezuelan authorities of certain British subjects. He turns to us and to the rest of the world with the inquiry as to whether the Monroe doctrine is to interfere with the right of every power to protect its citizens in South America.

To such a question there can be but one answer, and Lord Salisbury is assured beforehand of the sympathy of all nations on that point. But the whole case has not been stated in that question. Those British subjects were arrested on the disputed territory, on the land which the British Government, by its accredited representative, solemnly pledged itself not to occupy until the question of ownership was finally settled. If that territory belongs to England, those men were wrongfully arrested. If it belongs to Venezuela, they were rightfully arrested. If Venezuela pays now the indemnity fixed and demanded by England, and admits that she does so because these men, being on British territory, were wrongfully arrested, she gives her whole case away. The Monroe doctrine does not interfere with any nation seeking reparation for injuries to its subjects, but it does interfere if a demand for reparation is to be made the pretext for the seizure of territory by a European power on the American Continent.

The Monroe doctrine, as I have said, is very simple. It is merely the declaration that no foreign power must establish a new government, acquire new territory by purchase or force or by any method whatever, or seek to control existing Governments in the Americas. That is the principle which Mr. Monroe declared. If there is any dispute as to the meaning of his language, it is not needful to dwell upon it. That is what the American people believed he meant. That is the way American statesmen have interpreted it, and that there may be no future misunderstanding, that is what we should declare it to be and to have always been by this resolution.

Mr. President, we have neglected too long our foreign policy and the great interests of the United States which lie beyond her borders. We have permitted this English advance upon Venezuelan territory to go unchecked for years. The time has now come to end this state of things. We want this matter settled, and settled by arbitration, because if it is settled otherwise it is a blow to a principle vital to the welfare and the dignity of the United States. But, Mr. President, there is more in it than this. If we neglect our foreign affairs, England does not neglect hers.

At the last session of Congress I called the attention of the Senate and of the country to the manner in which England had absorbed the islands of the Pacific and to the necessity of our controlling the Hawaiian Islands, a necessity which becomes more pressing with each succeeding day. I ask you now to look at the Caribbean Sea. I ask you to note the strong naval station which England has established at Sta. Lucia. Follow a line thence to the westward and you find Trinidad, the development of which has been strongly pushed of late years, then Jamaica, and finally British Honduras. That line faces the South American coast. This territory claimed from Venezuela is being pushed steadily to the westward along that coast, and the point at which it aims is the control of the mouths of the Orinoco, one of the great river systems of South America. The purpose of all these movements is written plainly on the map. If successful they will give Great Britain control of the Spanish Main and make the Caribbean Sea little better than a British lake.

We are a great nation, Mr. President, and we have a great nation's duties and responsibilities. The path which we should follow lies clear before us. We must be the leaders in the Western Hemisphere. We must protect our coasts and hold the commerce of that hemisphere. We do not meddle with the affairs of Europe. Neither Great Britain nor Europe must be permitted to interfere with our affairs or gain new territory here. We seek no quarrels with any nation. We have not been the aggressors in any of the difficulties which are now lowering upon the horizon. But, Mr. President, I think there is no mistaking the temper of the American people. For thirty years they have been absorbed in healing the ravages of civil war and in completing the conquest of the great continent which was our inheritance. That work is done. The American people have begun to turn their eyes toward those interests of the United States which lie beyond our borders and yet so near our doors. They see those interests have been neglected. They see another nation hemming them in with fortifications and encroaching upon regions which must remain what they have always been—American. They are resolved that there shall be an end to these things. They are resolved that the United States shall not sink in the scale of nations, that it shall not be menaced even by that nation to whom we are united by the bonds of blood and speech, but that it shall fulfill abroad as at home the great destiny to which it has been called. The American people, in my judgment, believe in and cherish the Monroe doctrine and will not suffer it to be infringed.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that the people of England have the least desire to engage in hostilities with the United States any more than we seek or desire hostilities with them. Nor do I think that they take any serious interest in this disputed Venezuelan territory or realize even now that the question involves for us a principle which we consider vital to our safety and our welfare. We have no desire to interfere with any rightful possession of Great Britain in South America, but we can not allow her to set up claims to American territory and then seize and hold that territory by force. If she can do it successfully in Venezuela she can do it in Mexico or Cuba; if she can do it other nations can also. We do not ask her to give up her rightful territory or retreat an inch. All we ask is that she shall submit this disputed boundary to the arbitration of an impartial tribunal. We have nothing to gain ourselves by the decision of that tribunal, but in the reference to arbitration there is involved a principle which we regard as vital. We can not believe that any English ministry seriously intends to force hostilities on the United States, and yet their recent policy is, to say the least, unfortunate.

We have seen British forces at Corinto. We know the attitude they assume in Venezuela. They are attempting to take land on the Alaskan boundary. They have just denounced the modus vivendi and reopened in that way the perilous dispute of the northeastern fisheries. It is not by accident that these events have all occurred or all come to an acute stage within the past year. They are not due to us, for we have committed no aggression upon anybody. Of all these difficulties which are now upon us, the most immediate is that involved in the dispute with Venezuela. They tell us that this territory is remote and worthless. It is remote, perhaps, but it is not worthless, for if it had been the Venezuelan possession of it would be undisturbed. But it matters not whether it is worthless or valuable. The tea tax was trivial, but our forefathers refused to pay it because it involved a great principle, and the attempt to collect it cost Great Britain her North American colonies. The American people believe to-day just as firmly in the principle of the Monroe doctrine. They deem it essential to their honor, their safety, and their interests as a nation, and they are prepared to defend it when it is assailed.

Mr. President, who is responsible for the unhappily strained relations between England and the United States? As I have pointed out, we have not been the aggressors on any of the points now in dispute, whether in Alaska or Venezuela. What, then, has strained our relations? Is it not peremptory refusal to arbitrate this question of boundary? Who gave that refusal? Great Britain. We have appointed a commission, not to arbitrate between Great Britain and Venezuela, but to inform us, after careful investigation, what the true divisional line, in their opinion, should be. Who has drawn an arbitrary line of boundary and declared that they would not arbitrate to the east of it? Not the United States, but Great Britain. Ultimatums are what strain relations, and they have come from Great Britain and not from us. I believe that this question will be peacefully settled by the good sense of the representatives of England and the United States, but I am very clear that such settlement can only be reached by action on the part of Congress and of the President which shall be as firm as it is temperate and which shall maintain the Monroe doctrine absolutely and at all hazards wherever it justly applies. That doctrine is as important to us as the balance of power is to Europe, and those who maintain the latter must not attempt to break down the principle which guards the integrity of the Americas and protects them from the interference and control of foreign powers.

STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Before the Senate proceeds to the appointment of the standing and select committees, I offer a resolution which I send to the desk, and preliminary to its consideration I ask unanimous consent for the suspension of the rules at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which will be read for information.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the names of the following select committees of the Senate be changed, as follows:

The "Select Committee to Inquire into all Claims of Citizens of the United States against the Government of Nicaragua," to the "Select Committee on

the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal"; the "Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial," to the "Select Committee on International Expositions"; the "Select Committee to Investigate the Geological Survey," to the "Select Committee on the Geological Survey"; the "Select Committee on Forest Reservations." to the "Select Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game," and the "Select Committee on Corporations in the District of Columbia," to the "Select Committee on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia."

Resolved further, That each of the new select committees above provided for shall be entitled to a clerk at the rate of $1,440 each per annum; and the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay such clerks the salaries aforesaid from the appropriation of clerks to committees from the dates that they shall severally qualify.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which will be read for information.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the following, commencing with January 1, 1896, shall constitute the standing and select committees of the Senate of the United States for the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The list of committees is a part of the resolution. Perhaps it is not necessary to read it at this time. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I understand unanimous consent has been given to suspend the rules for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes; for its consideration.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the list be printed in the RECORD in connection with the resolution.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. The paper which the Senator from Oregon holds in his hand is a part of the resolution which he has sent to the desk?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. GORMAN. Let it be read.

Mr. HARRIS. I think it had better be read. It will not take long, and the Senate will then comprehend exactly what is proposed.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Very well; let it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The list will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the following, commencing with January 1, 1896, shall constitute the standing and select committees of the Senate of the United States for the Fifty-fourth Congress:

STANDING COMMITTEES.

On Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Proctor (chairman), Hansbrough, Warren, Gear, Butler, George, Bate, Roach, and Irby.

On Appropriations: Messrs. Allison (chairman), Hale, Cullom, Teller, Quay, Pettigrew, Perkins, Cockrell, Call, Gorman, Blackburn, Brice, and Faulkner.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate: Messrs. Jones of Nevada (chairman), Gallinger, and Jones of Arkansas.

On the Census: Messrs. Chandler (chairman), Hale, Allison, Cullom, Pettigrew, Turpie, Berry, White, and Murphy.

On Civil Service and Retrenchment: Messrs. Pritchard (chairman), Lodge, Morrill, Dubois, Elkins, Gordon, Irby, Walthall, and Chilton.

On Claims: Messrs. Teller (chairman), Mitchell of Oregon, Stewart, Allen, Burrows, Warren, Pasco, Caffery, Chilton, Bacon, and Martin.

On Coast Defenses: Messrs. Squire (chairman), Hawley, Proctor, Burrows, McBride, Butler, Gordon, Irby, Mills, White, and Smith.

On Commerce: Messrs. Frye (chairman), Jones of Nevada, Quay, McMillan, Squire, Elkins, Nelson, McBride, Vest, Gorman, White, Murphy, Berry, Pasco, and Caffery.

On the District of Columbia: Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Gallinger, Hansbrough, Proctor, Pritchard, Baker, Wetmore, Harris, Faulkner, Gibson, Smith, Martin, and Bacon.

On Education and Labor: Messrs. Shoup (chairman), Kyle, Perkins, Mantle, Clark, George, Caffery, Murphy, and Lindsay.

On Engrossed Bills: Messrs. Cockrell (chairman), Allison, and Baker.

On Enrolled Bills: Messrs. Sewell (chairman), Dubois, and Caffery.

On Epidemic Diseases: Messrs. Vest (chairman), Harris, Irby, Jones of Nevada, Gallinger, Quay, and Butler.

To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service: Messrs. Peffer (chairman), Hoar, Gallinger, Gray, and Vilas.

On Finance: Messrs. Morrill (chairman), Sherman, Jones of Nevada, Allison, Aldrich, Platt, Wolcott, Voorhees, Harris, Vest, Jones of Arkansas, White, and Walthall.

On Fisheries: Messrs. Perkins (chairman), Proctor, Frye, Wilson, Butler, Call, Gibson, Hill, and Mitchell of Wisconsin.

On Foreign Relations: Messrs. Sherman (chairman), Frye, Davis, Cameron, Cullom, Lodge, Morgan, Gray, Turpie, Daniel, and Mills.

On Immigration: Messrs. Lodge (chairman), Chandler, Squire, Sewell, Peffer, Nelson, Hill, Voorhees, Faulkner, Harris, and Gibson.

On Improvement of the Mississippi River and its Tributaries: Messrs. Nelson (chairman), Gear, Baker, Carter, Blanchard, Bate, and Palmer.

On Indian Affairs: Messrs. Pettigrew (chairman), Platt, Shoup, Stewart, Mantle, Wilson, Allen, Jones of Arkansas, Morgan, Roach, Blanchard, and Chilton.

On Indian Depredations: Messrs. Wilson (chairman), Kyle, Shoup, Sewell, Mantle, McBride, Lindsay, Faulkner, Cockrell, Bacon, and Martin.

On Interstate Commerce: Messrs. Cullom (chairman), Chandler, Wolcott, Aldrich, Carter, Gear, Gorman, Brice, Lindsay, Smith, and Chilton.

On Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands: Messrs. Warren (chairman), Kyle, Stewart, Thurston, Peffer, White, Jones of Arkansas, Roach, and Brice.

On the Judiciary: Messrs. Hoar (chairman), Teller, Platt, Mitchell of Oregon, Davis, Clark, Thurston, Pugh, George, Vilas, Hill, Lindsay, and Daniel.

On the Library: Messrs. Hansbrough (chairman), Wetmore, and Voorhees.

On Manufactures: Messrs. Wetmore (chairman), Cameron, Clark, Gibson, and Smith,

On Military Affairs: Messrs. Hawley (chairman), Proctor, Shoup, Sewell, Warren, Elkins, Bate, Cockrell, Palmer, Mitchell of Wisconsin, and Walthall.

On Mines and Mining: Messrs. Stewart (chairman), Pettigrew, Wilson, Mantle, Warren, Bate, Call, Mills, and Tillman.

On Naval Affairs: Messrs. Cameron (chairman), Hale, Perkins, McMillan, Chandler, Dubois, Blackburn, Gibson, Smith, Bacon, and Tillman.

On Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments: Messrs. Butler (chairman), Dubois, Lodge, Wilson, Wetmore, Smith, Cockrell, Hill, and Caffery.

On Pacific Railroads: Messrs. Gear (chairman), Stewart, Davis, Wolcott, Frye, Brice, Morgan, Faulkner, and Murphy.

On Patents: Messrs. Platt (chairman), Pritchard, Clark, Wetmore, Call, Mills, and Berry.

On Pensions: Messrs. Gallinger (chairman), Shoup, Peffer, Hansbrough, Hawley, Lodge, Baker, Palmer, Brice, Vilas, Mitchell of Wisconsin, Lindsay, and Roach.

On Post-Offices and Post-Roads: Messrs. Wolcott (chairman), Mitchell of Oregon, Chandler, Burrows, Carter, Butler, Vilas, Irby, Hill, and Blanchard.

On Printing: Messrs. Hale (chairman), Hansbrough, and Gorman.

On Private Land Claims: Messrs. Harris (chairman), Pasco, Berry, Turpie, Hale, Platt, and Baker.

On Privileges and Elections: Messrs. Mitchell of Oregon (chairman), Hoar, Chandler, Burrows, Pritchard, Gray, Pugh, Turpie, and Palmer.

On Public Buildings and Grounds: Messrs. Quay (chairman), Morrill, Squire, Mantle, Warren, Gear, Vest, Daniel, Gordon, Blanchard, and Murphy.

On Public Lands: Messrs. Dubois (chairman), Pettigrew, Hansbrough, Wilson, Carter, McBride, Allen, Berry, Pasco, Vilas, and Tillman.

On Railroads: Messrs. Clark (chairman), Gallinger, Gear, Elkins, Nelson, Thurston, Berry, Gordon, Palmer, Blackburn, and Blanchard.

On Relations with Canada: Messrs. Carter (chairman), Hoar, Hale, Pettigrew, Perkins, Murphy, Pugh, Mitchell of Wisconsin. and Tillman.

On the Revision of the Laws of the United States: Messrs. Burrows (chairman), Pritchard, Thurston, Daniel, and Call.

On Revolutionary Claims: Messrs. Pugh (chairman), Bacon, Bate, Cameron, and Aldrich.

On Rules: Messrs. Aldrich (chairman), Hoar, Mitchell of Oregon, Teller, Blackburn, Harris, and Gorman.

On Territories: Messrs. Davis (chairman), Shoup, Squire, Sewell, Elkins, Thurston, Hill, Blackburn, Bate, Call, and White.

On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard: Messrs. McBride (chairman), Aldrich, Clark, Sewell, Allen, Irby, George, Turpie, and Gordon.

SELECT COMMITTEES.

To Investigate the Condition of the Potomac River Front at Washington: Messrs. George (chairman), Martin, Blanchard, Frye, Sherman, and Perkins.

On the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal: Messrs. Morgan (chairman), Palmer, Martin, Hawley, Mitchell of Oregon, Squire, Sewell.

On Woman Suffrage: Messrs. Call (chairman), George, Hoar, Quay, and Peffer.

On Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress: Messrs. Voorhees (chairman), Pugh, Morrill, Cullom, and Allison.

On the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians: Messrs. Gray (chairman), Pasco, Teller, Platt, and Davis.

On Transportation and Sale of Meat Products: Messrs. Blackburn (chairman), Vest, Wolcott, Wetmore, and Allen.

To Establish the University of the United States: Messrs. Kyle (chairman), Sherman, Hawley, Frye, Nelson, Jones of Arkansas, Turpie, Walthall, and Mitchell of Wisconsin.

On International Expositions: Messrs. Thurston (chairman), Pettigrew, Sherman, Cameron, Hawley, Warren, McBride, Vest, Gray, Daniel, Gibson, Voorhees, and Lindsay.

On the Geological Survey: Messrs. Elkins (chairman), Wolcott, Allison, Walthall, and Mills.

On National Banks: Messrs. Mantle (chairman), Dubois, Burrows, Mitchell of Wisconsin, and Chilton.

On Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game: Messrs. Allen (chairman), Kyle, Teller, Mantle, Morgan, Roach, and Tillman.

On Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia: Messrs. Jones of Arkansas (chairman), Gorman, Aldrich, Hoar, and McMillan.

To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands: Messrs. Baker (chairman), Carter, and Roach.

Mr. GORMAN. I desire to call the attention of the Senator who offered the proposition to one omission. There is one place on the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads which has not been filled by this side. I make this statement so that it may be thoroughly understood if the resolution shall be adopted.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I understand if the resolution is adopted there will be a vacancy to be filled by the minority.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, it has been the universal custom of the Senate that the party in the majority should control the majority of the committees of this body and the chairmanships of all the committees, except perhaps eleven, which are usually allotted to the minority, and so with the majority of the membership of the committees, leaving, for instance, the membership of the minority in a committee of seven to consist of three, and in a committee of nine, of four. To that there is no objection. It is the proper and ordinary way of conducting the business affairs of the Senate. But owing to the fact, as was well known prior to the assembling of this Congress, that neither of the great parties, Republican or Democratic, was likely to have a clear majority of the Senate, a resolution was passed continuing the old committees until otherwise ordered by the Senate. On this side of the Chamber we are perfectly well aware of the fact that the Democrats are in a

minority in this body. We have not a clear majority of all the Senators elected, and we do not know as yet that the Republicans have a clear majority. That can only be tested and demonstrated by a vote upon this proposition. If the other side have a clear majority, they are unquestionably entitled to the adoption of this resolution and the entire change of all the principal committees of this body. Then the country will understand perfectly who is to be held responsible for the conduct of business in this body. With a view of ascertaining that fact, I shall demand the yeas and nays on the adoption of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, on which the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. ALDRICH'S name was called). I am requested to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] stands paired on this vote with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY].

Mr. CAFFERY (when Mr. BLANCHARD'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. BLANCHARD] is paired on this question with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD]. If my colleague were here, he would vote "nay."

Mr. BRICE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], but an arrangement has been made by which that pair has been transferred to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY], and I vote "nay."

Mr. CARTER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WALTHALL (when Mr. GEORGE'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. GEORGE] has a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE]. My colleague would vote "nay" if present.

Mr. MCBRIDE (when his name was called). As has been announced, I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MCMILLAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea," and he would vote "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to the fact that a transfer was made of that pair by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE] a moment ago.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I think not.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the Senator from Oregon is mistaken. It was the transfer of a pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY], and not to his colleague [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I beg pardon.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I understand it as the Senator from Tennessee has stated it.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS]. If he were here I should vote "yea."

Mr. PRITCHARD (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD]. If he were here I should vote "yea."

Mr. SHOUP (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am requested to announce that the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON] is paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. BACON. As has already been announced by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR], he is paired with my colleague [Mr. GORDON]. I simply desire to say that if my colleague were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. PASCO. I am requested to announce that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] is paired with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON].

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 28; as follows:

YEAS—30.

Allison,	Frye,	Morrill,	Sherman,
Baker,	Gallinger,	Nelson,	Squire,
Burrows,	Hale,	Perkins,	Teller,
Cameron,	Hansbrough,	Pettigrew,	Warren,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Platt,	Wetmore,
Clark,	Hoar,	Proctor,	Wilson.
Dubois,	Lodge,	Quay,	
Elkins,	Mantle,	Sewell,	

NAYS—28.

Bacon,	Cockrell,	Kyle,	Pasco,
Bate,	Daniel,	Martin,	Pugh,
Berry,	Faulkner,	Mills,	Roach,
Brice,	Gorman,	Mitchell, Wis.	Smith,
Caffery,	Harris,	Morgan,	Vest,
Call,	Hill,	Murphy,	Voorhees,
Chilton,	Jones, Ark.	Palmer,	Walthall.

NOT VOTING—27.

Aldrich,	Davis,	Jones, Nev.	Stewart,
Allen,	Gear,	McBride,	Thurston,
Blackburn,	George,	McMillan,	Tillman,
Blanchard,	Gibson,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Turpie,
Butler,	Gordon,	Peffer,	Vilas,
Carter,	Gray,	Pritchard,	White.
Cullom,	Irby,	Shoup,	

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, it is due to the Populist party, represented in this Chamber, that a very brief statement as to their position be made to the Senate.

During the Fifty-third Congress it was very common for Republican Senators and Democratic Senators to classify us as "Democratic Populists" and "Republican Populists," respectively. The classification was altogether improper. It is due to the Senate and to the country to state that the Populist party, while not numbering a great many in this Chamber, are as thoroughly and completely a party organization as either the Democratic or the Republican party. We want it distinctly understood by the Senate and by the country that we have no political affiliations whatever with either of the old parties. While our personal relations with Senators on both sides of the Chamber are what they should be, yet, so far as our political principles and our political sympathies are concerned, we are just as averse to being known as "Republican Populists" or "Democratic Populists" as either of the old parties are to being known as having any tendency to Populism.

When this Congress convened we realized that there was a clear majority in the Senate in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver. We believed that Senators who declared themselves in favor of silver meant what they said, and that they were not Democrats first and silver men second, or Republicans first and silver men next, but we believed that they were sincere, and that they were perfectly willing to unite in bringing about the passage of a free silver measure in this body. To that end we promptly sent out letters to every man in this Chamber who had declared himself in favor of free silver, inviting Senators, regardless of their political affiliations, to meet in a caucus and organize the Senate upon free silver lines. With the exception of two or three Senators, no one was there but the members of the Populist party. When it came to the question of the reorganization of the Senate, we felt that as a matter of policy it was due our party that we take no part in it whatever. We felt that the Republican party, as between the Democratic party and itself, was in the ascendency here. We felt as though the responsibility for the legislation of Congress should pass to the Republican party in both Houses as speedily as possible, and that the country should understand that the Republican party is now in the majority, or in the ascendency, in both branches of Congress, and is therefore responsible for legislation in the future. We felt that it was due to ourselves as a party that we take no hand whatever in the organization of the Senate, and that we should refrain from voting, permitting the Republicans and Democrats to settle the question of the organization between themselves.

I want to repeat, Mr. President, so that no man, woman, or child in this country may misunderstand what is said, that the Populist party in this Chamber and in the other branch of Congress and in this country is a distinct political entity, having its organization in every State and Territory of the Union, having a vote within 200,000 of the number that landed Mr. Lincoln in the Presidency in 1861. We are a distinct organization, and propose to maintain our organization throughout this and future Congresses.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am inclined to ask the Senator from Nebraska if his organization, composed of six members, as I understand it, in this body, did not deliberately, with a full knowledge of the fact that they held the balance of power as between the two great political parties represented here, determine by their silence to allow the Republican organization here, that has two or three more votes than the Democratic, to take absolute control of the management of the affairs of this Chamber, and if by that silence he does not understand and hold that they are as responsible for the act as if they had cast their votes instead of sitting here silent?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I take very great pleasure in answering the question of my distinguished friend from Tennessee. When we came to consider this question we realized, as the Senator well knows, that we held the balance of power in this Chamber. We realize it now; and I will say to the Senator we are going to utilize it to the fullest extent as we go along.

We could pursue one of two courses. That was plain to any man. We could either vote against the adoption of this resolu-

tion, and by that means join our forces to the Democratic party, which we did not propose to do, or we could refuse to vote, and by our negative action of course we could permit the Republican party to take charge of this Chamber. We saw fit to do the latter. Evil was the result either way [laughter], and we chose what we considered the lesser evil.

Let me say, Mr. President, in all kindness and all fairness, the Democratic party has proven itself absolutely incapable of legislation. [Laughter.] The Democratic party came into this Chamber in March, 1893, with a clear majority of its own, not relying in the slightest degree upon the Populist vote.

Mr. GALLINGER. In both Houses.

Mr. ALLEN. I never undertook to do anything in better faith in my life than I did when I came into this Chamber to support the reform movements of Mr. Cleveland. I did not care whether he was a Democrat, a Populist, a Republican, a Prohibitionist, or what he was. If he could give to the homes of this country relief, as he professed he could and would, I was for Mr. Cleveland and for his measures. The Democratic party claimed to be for tariff reform. I believe in tariff reform myself; I believe in lightening the burdens of taxation upon the people of this country. When the measure came before the Senate for its consideration, it was loaded up with protection; it was loaded at both ends and in the center with protection in a very crude and imperfect form. Every time a measure has been introduced here and brought up in this Chamber which looked to the enlargement of the volume of money, the Democrats, who have professed to be in favor of monetary reform, voted against it. They have talked one way and voted another, until this country has passed into an indebtedness of over $163,000,000 in the last eighteen or nineteen months, and is going still deeper in debt.

I have no faith in that portion of the Democratic party represented by Mr. Cleveland and his friends. I have no faith in their capacity or in their disposition to relieve this country.

I want to say, Mr. President, that I have no faith in the Republican party's capacity or disposition to relieve the country—not the slightest. [Laughter.] These gentlemen have all talked about the Democrats, and will talk about them and about the Populists; but I want to say to them that the do-nothing policy which they have inaugurated in the other branch of Congress and which they have inaugurated in this branch will work their ruin, and I want the responsibility to begin now, so that the people of this country in the next six months will see the do-nothing policy on the part of the Republican party result in as much disaster as the policy pursued by the Democratic party. Now, I hope I have satisfactorily answered the question.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I thought a few moments ago that perhaps a word of response would be appropriate to the suggestion made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] when the resolution was under consideration, to the effect that while it was not quite certain as to whether the Republicans were in a majority in the Senate, if we succeeded in adopting the resolution that then, as suggested by the Senator, of course it must be taken for granted we are in a majority, and must be held responsible for the legislation of the Senate. The answer to that has been fully made by the speech by the Senator from Nebraska to which we have just listened and the suggestion made by the Senator from Tennessee.

The truth is, Mr. President, the Republicans of the Senate are not in a majority. They were not in the majority before this resolution was presented; they are not in the majority now. Whether they ever will be in a majority during the present session of Congress remains to be seen. The Senate is composed, when its membership is full, of 88 Senators. That membership now consists of 87, which constitutes the present Senate, as there is one vacancy, namely, from the State of Delaware. Of these 87 the Republicans have 42 members, the Democrats have 39, and the Populists have 6. If that state of the case gives a majority of the Senate to any political party in the Senate, then it requires some kind of figuring that I have no knowledge of.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Oregon permit me to put a question to him?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly; two of them.

Mr. ALLEN. The adoption of the resolution gives to the Republicans the control of every committee in the Senate.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. No.

Mr. ALLEN. Therefore——

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. No, Mr. President.

Mr. ALLEN. Well, every important committee. The Finance Committee, for instance.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Not every important committee. There are eleven committees, some of them quite important committees, in some of which the Democrats have control and in all of which there is a Democratic chairman.

Mr. ALLEN. Let me put to the Senator another question.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. The resolution gives the Republican party control of the Finance Committee, from which must come monetary measures for the relief of the country.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. No, Mr. President, the Senator is wrong there again. As I understand the present complexion of the Finance Committee, and as fixed by the resolution just adopted, it is composed of six Republicans, six Democrats, and one Populist—thirteen in all.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Therefore the Populist party, so ably represented by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, has the balance of power in the Committee on Finance——

Mr. ALLEN. We are satisfied with that.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. As it has the balance of power in the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not want the Senator from Oregon to undertake to escape responsibility for his party. This is a government of the committee, by the committee, and sometimes for the committee. Every important committee in this Chamber is completely in the control of the Republican party, and I hope the distinguished Senator from Oregon will not now undertake to back water and say that the Republican party will not be responsible for what measures are presented here.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The Republican party is responsible for measures passed through the Senate whenever they have enough members of their party to pass a measure through the Senate, and only then.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will indulge me further, I will state that you have power now to present those measures to the Senate for us to vote on.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly; we can present them.

Mr. HOAR. So can any individual Senator.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. But so long as the Republicans of the Senate have but 42 votes in this body they are powerless against a majority of the Senate to pass any measure.

Mr. ALLEN. I think, if the Senator will indulge me one moment further——

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. Whenever you present a respectable measure, designed for the relief of the people of this country, you can safely count on the Populist vote to help you pass it.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I hope so, and I hope more than that. I hope when the Republican party presents a respectable measure in the Senate, and one that is right, and I trust they will never present any but such, not only the Populist members, but every Democrat will vote for it. I should hope so. Still, perhaps, it is hoping against hope.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. I simply want the Senator to make his statement a little more distinctly and more in exact accordance with the facts. It is the uniform custom of the Senate for long years past that the majority party, claiming the right to organize and control the action of the body, has invariably given to the minority party some ten or twelve of the minor and least important committees.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly; that is true.

Mr. HARRIS. And that is what the majority party with its Populite contingent has done to the Democratic party now. [Laughter.]

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will suspend until order is restored. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Oregon will proceed.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I desire to state that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], representing the Populist party in the Senate, has stated the case precisely, so far as the organization of the committees is concerned. The Populists of the Senate absolutely refused to take part. They even refused to make suggestions as to assignments on committees. Their statement was, "You Republicans and Democrats can settle these matters yourselves. We are a very small minority here; there are but six of us; we will take no part one way or the other." We, however, assigned them to places on committees——

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. In one moment. We permitted them to retain substantially the same places they held under the Democratic assignment two years ago. Four of the chairmanships, I think, were left precisely as they were before. That of Mr. PEFFER, I think, was changed to another committee.

Mr. HARRIS. The question I wanted to ask the Senator is, whether that position of nonaction and silence when they came to a yea-and-nay vote in this Chamber was not quite as satisfactory to the Senator from his Republican partisan standpoint as if he had pledged the members of that party to stand here and vote with the Republican party upon all questions?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am always bound to be satisfied with whatever the majority of the Senate does, so far as that is concerned; but so far as I am concerned personally, when I offered the resolution I was not advised before the vote was taken as to whether the resolution would receive a majority of the votes cast or not.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Tennessee, not designedly, I am sure, has made some remarks which are calculated to give a very wrong impression to the country and which exaggerate altogether the importance of what has been done. The rule of the Senate long ago, and the rule for which, I have no doubt, the Senator from Tennessee voted when it was adopted—but whether he did or not, the rule of the Senate long ago provided that the committees of the Senate should be organized by pluralities and not by majorities.

Mr. HARRIS. I am aware what Rule XXIV is.

Mr. HOAR. I dare say the Senator knows everything under the sun.

Mr. HARRIS. Oh, no; I do not profess to know everything.

Mr. HOAR. I am speaking for the information of the country at present.

Otherwise, when there happened to be three parties in this country of so many diverse opinions represented here, none of them having a majority, the Senate can not act. Now, everything that is necessary to the proceeding by the Senate in due order to legislate is provided for by that rule, which is that the plurality shall organize the committees. If there were ten parties in the Senate, nine of them having eight members apiece and the other one having but nine, the nine members, from the necessity of the case, organize the committees.

Now, when the committees are organized everything has happened which is necessary to a complete provision for the due and orderly transaction of the public business. The committees meet. They have no chairman. That is required to be done by a majority. But without a chairman, a committee, having met, can designate one of its members to present to the Senate what it agrees on, whether it has a chairman or not. So if every Populist had voted "no" against the resolution it was equally in the power of the Republican party to have made all of the committees of this body just as it pleased, and for those committees to go on and frame and present business for the country. The election of a chairman is a mere matter of personal convenience.

Mr. PALMER. I should be glad to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a single question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. PALMER. Does the Republican party decline to be responsible for the committees that have been organized?

Mr. HOAR. That question does not relate to anything that I am saying at present. I would rather complete first what I have to say. I will come to the Senator's question afterwards.

There is a further fact which gentlemen familiar with the constitutional organization of this body, as the Senator from Tennessee, ought to know, and which the Senator from Tennessee does know. It is in the power of every individual Senator in this body to present any measure to the body he chooses. The power of amendment is unlimited. A bill presented by an individual Senator has the same right on the Calendar to be considered and dealt with by the Senate under our rules as a bill presented by the most important committee of the Senate. Not only does that right exist, but, as I was about to say, the right of amendment, there being no previous question here, is absolute and untrammeled, important as the right of free and untrammeled speech itself. So the Populist party has the same power, whether the committees are made up as we propose or not, that the Republican party has, or that the Democratic party has. There is no difference whatever on that point. The election of a chairman is a mere matter of convenience involving the right under our rules to occupy the committee room for private purposes, and involving the right, I suppose, to appoint the clerk of the committee, though I believe he may be appointed by the committee itself if it chooses to take the matter into its own hands.

Mr. ALLEN. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that while it is in our power to present such measures as may seem proper, yet the world knows, or ought to know, that the committee rooms are burial places for the best measures that have ever been presented in this Chamber; and that the Republican party, having control of the important committees, has it in its power to bury every Populist measure in this Chamber and never let it see daylight again.

Mr. HOAR. So have the Populist party and the Democratic party the power to bury every Republican measure. The Senator——

Mr. ALLEN. Can the Senator from Massachusetts——

Mr. HOAR. Now, let me go on. The Senator is not rising to correct anything I say, but to make a speech of his own.

Mr. ALLEN. I merely want to ask the Senator a question. I do not wish to interrupt him unnecessarily. Can the Senator from Massachusetts as a representative Republican promise us that those measures will be reported back in one form or another to the Senate?

Mr. HOAR. That is a very different question.

Mr. ALLEN. I thought so.

Mr. HOAR. Whether I promise or whether anyone promises, no Republican and no ten Republicans have authority to make a promise that the committees shall report measures that they do not believe in. What I say is that there is not a measure of public policy on any important or unimportant matter which it is not in the power of any individual Senator to present under as good circumstances as if it were reported by a committee, either by presenting it himself as a separate measure or by moving it as an amendment. If he can get a majority of the Senate to favor it, it passes. If a majority of the Senate are against it, it fails. The matter of the chairmanship has nothing to do with the matter of important political power or the advantage given to measures in this body.

Now, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] talks about the Populist party as a contingent or addition to the Republican party. Mr. President, take the political doctrines of the Senator from Tennessee and the political doctrines of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] who sits next to him, and they have voted together in the past and will vote together in the future ten times where the Senator from Nebraska votes with me or the majority of Republicans once. That is a ridiculous, idle, and utterly unfounded suggestion on the part of the Senator from Tennessee. In the present condition of this country it is very absurd to talk about political parties in this matter. The divisions which exist in this country to-day are in regard to certain doctrines concerning which the party lines or party fetters or obligations sit very lightly on the shoulder of any Senator in this body. They vote according to their individual opinions and the opinions of their constituents.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] asked me if I supposed the Republican party are not willing to be responsible for the action of the majority of the committees of this body. I suppose they expect to be responsible within all reasonable bounds; that is, if a committee report, as they ordinarily will, measures based on the principles which the Republican party believe in, they will accept the responsibility. An individual Republican may not do so, and he is not responsible.

But what I rose to say and what I wish to repeat is that such responsibility as grows out of the framing and presenting measures of committees and the election of committees in this body is a responsibility which the rule puts upon pluralities and not upon majorities, and the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Illinois, and the whole country know as well as I do that the Republican party is not in the majority in this Chamber.

Mr. PASCO. Mr. President, the impression made by the Senator from Massachusetts ought not to go out uncorrected. He seems to suggest that the resolution which has just been carried by a majority of the Senate could have been carried equally as well by a plurality. Now, while that may be true with reference to the individual memberships of the committees——

Mr. HOAR. I did not say so. The Senator will pardon me.

Mr. PASCO. That is the impression that will go out from the Senator's remarks, whatever his exact words may have been.

Mr. HOAR. No; I said that as to the construction of the committees, except the chairmanships——

Mr. PASCO. But this was not a construction of committees. This was the appointment of chairmen of committees as well as filling up the membership, and the Senator did not speak with his usual candor in referring to the action as one that could have been carried through as well by a plurality as by a majority.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Florida pardon me? I am afraid my honorable friend did not hear what I said.

Mr. PASCO. I did.

Mr. HOAR. I expressly stated that the chairman required a majority, and went on to state that the power of the chairman had nothing to do with the matter of framing measures or the construction of a committee as far as it was a political agent.

Mr. PASCO. I listened very carefully to what the Senator said and for what he did not say. As a matter of fact, it ought to be understood by the country that the resolution required a majority vote, and that it could not have been carried through the Senate without a majority vote. It was not simply a question, as the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts would seem to indicate, as to who were to form the membership of the committees, but it included also the question as to who should be chairmen of those committees, and that really was the most important part of the resolution.

I do not feel willing that this matter should pass without comment, and the impression should not go out to the country that

the resolution would have been equally as effective if the Populist members of the Senate had voted, and had voted against it. As a matter of fact, it required their votes or their silence to carry through this reorganization. In order that this matter may be made more apparent, I ask that the Secretary may read the rule, so that it may show clearly that the chairmen of committees must be selected by a majority vote, and that the vote which we have just cast was for the selection of chairmen as well as for the membership of the committees.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

RULE XXIV.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES.

1. In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof. All other committees shall be appointed by ballot, unless otherwise ordered, and a plurality of votes shall appoint.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I regret that I am compelled, so soon after entering this body, to take issue with those who have served here so long and so prominently. But some things have been said reflecting on the People's Party which I, representing that party in part as I do, can not allow to go unchallenged. For instance, such a statement as that made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], who seemed to take peculiar pleasure in trying to brand or stigmatize the People's Party as an annex of some other party. It is due the People's Party, and it is due the Senate, that the facts shall be known as they are. I propose to state the facts.

The People's Party Senators had not decided what position they would take with reference to the organization when we came here from our homes. We knew that we held the balance of power. We had a consultation to decide what was best. After consulting, viewing the situation fully, we decided that it was our duty to take advantage of the situation and to use the power which we had, this balance of power, to try to effect some reforms that we believe are necessary to relieve the oppression of the people and restore prosperity to the country. It was, of course, understood that we should make no bargains or trades with either party for patronage or spoils, but we decided unanimously that we would cooperate with such Senators in both of the old parties who would stand together with us against the monopolists and the gold combine and make a square fight to give the people of this country such remedial legislation as is necessary to give new life to agriculture, manufacturing, and to every honest industry.

We decided further that we not only would express our willingness to do this, but that we would invite such Senators to cooperate with us on this line. We knew that a number of such Senators agreed with us as to the results that should be secured, yet disagreed with us as to some of the methods of getting this relief. But there is one remedy (one plank of the People's Party platform) on which a majority of the Senators in this body are understood to agree, and that is the free and unlimited coinage of silver on equal terms with gold. So we decided to ask those who were elected as free-coinage men to cooperate with us. The first step toward legislation was to organize the Senate. We sent a written invitation to 52 silver Senators.

I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] if he did not receive an invitation as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 30, 1895.*

Hon. I. G. HARRIS.

DEAR SIR: There will be a meeting of Senators friendly to silver in the Marble Room of the Capitol on Monday, December 2, at 11 a. m., to consult with a view of organizing the Senate on silver lines. You are respectfully invited to attend.

Signed by W. M. STEWART, W. V. ALLEN, W. A. PEFFER, and myself. Senators KYLE and JONES of Nevada were not present; they came in that night and indorsed it. Did not the Senator from Tennessee get such an invitation?

Mr. HARRIS. Does the Senator desire an answer?

Mr. BUTLER. I do.

Mr. HARRIS. I give it with pleasure. I did receive, I imagine, a copy of the paper the Senator reads, and the only remark I care to add is that up to this hour there has been no period of my life when I was willing to join in the organization of a great political party based upon one single idea. I have never been quite willing to organize a political party upon a single idea or a single proposition. Yet I am as earnest an advocate of the utilization of the free and unlimited coinage of silver as any one of the gentlemen who attached their names to that paper.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman says that he will not help to organize or fight for one idea. I think he had better try to get his party to organize and stand for at least one idea, for it has not a single idea to-day. It would be to his credit and to his party's credit if they had one idea—just one. They have deserted the ideas and principles they claimed to cherish. They have deserted them bag and baggage and gone over to the Republican camp in everything but name. Yes, if they had stood by the teachings of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson there would have been no People's Party to-day. The People's Party came into existence to defend and uphold the very principles which your party has deserted. It came into existence to defend and to put into practice the great, true principles of Democracy and Republicanism as represented by Jackson, Jefferson, and Lincoln, and because your party, both old parties, have deserted and gone over to the side of the monopolists and gold bugs. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will show his devotion to silver and the people when he votes for President in the next campaign, even if he will not help us to organize the Senate against the gold bugs.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BUTLER. You may.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator speaks of combining with other organizations. I hope it is not impertinent if I ask the Senator if he does not hold the seat he occupies upon this floor by a combination between the Populists and the Republicans of the State that he in part represents?

Mr. BUTLER. I will answer the question with pleasure. I hold my seat by such a cooperation for the simple reason that the party in my State which you belong to got to be so corrupt the people in the State rebelled against its management. Your party could to-day be in full power in North Carolina if it had stood by its pledges and promises. A cooperation of all who opposed its methods was made, but that combination could not have driven the Democratic party from power in North Carolina if that party had been true to its pledges, true to its promises, and true to its people. It not only deserted the principles of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, thereby disgusting the great rank and file of the party, but it tried to keep itself in power by stealing and perjury at the ballot box, by ballot-box stuffing and manipulating the returns. This made fair elections—the purity of the ballot box—the overshadowing issue in North Carolina politics.

A large majority of the voters of the State joined in a movement to correct these abuses. The Democratic party held the election machinery and under a vicious election law determined to count enough votes in the last election to keep them in power. But the revolt of the people against the Democratic machine was greater than the leaders anticipated. They stole over 30,000 votes, but fell 20,000 short of having enough. Yes, we freed North Carolina, and, I trust, forever, from such corrupt methods. This was done with the help of men who had been Democrats all their lives.

I trust that I have given the Senator from Tennessee a full and satisfactory answer to his question.

Mr. President, to return to the point, this invitation was sent to the Senator from Tennessee and to 51 other Senators on this floor. Fifty-two Senators on this floor got that invitation. What was the position of the People's Party? If those 52 men, elected as silver men, men pledged to vote against the gold standard, had accepted our invitation, we could have organized the Senate and put every committee in the hands of the friends of silver. This would have enabled us to have brought forward and passed a free coinage bill and also to have repealed the law under which President Cleveland is about to issue more bonds. We were anxious to do this. But only a few Senators from the two old parties accepted our invitation.

The Senator from Tennessee declined that invitation. Which course was it the duty of the People's Party Senators to pursue? We had to do one of three things. I want to be understood. We had either to vote with the Democrats to organize the Senate, or vote with the Republicans to organize the Senate, or to stand alone. We decided to vote with neither side. We had invited the men on both sides who claimed to agree with us on financial questions to cooperate with us, and both sides had refused. But the Senator from Tennessee makes the point that we refused, and by not voting—mark his words—we virtually voted for the Republicans. I believe I state him correctly. Now, let us see what we would have done by voting. By voting for candidates of our own, as we wanted to do, we found that we would simply deadlock the Senate, and the result would be what? Virtually to vote for the Democrats. Now, mark that. We would be just as much voting for the Democrats as if we had cast our ballots for them, and the Senator from Tennessee knows it, and he would be forced to admit it if he dared to say anything now.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina a question.

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to ask him if he regards my colleague, Senator KYLE, as a member of the Populist party in this body?

Mr. BUTLER. Senator KYLE is a Populist, but I believe he did not act entirely with the other People's Party Senators in the programme I am now speaking of.

Mr. PETTIGREW. He voted with the Democrats on the resolution, and I simply wanted to know where to classify him.

Mr. BUTLER. Senator KYLE——

Mr. KYLE. Will the Senator from North Carolina allow me just one word?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. KYLE. I should like to inform my colleague, and all members of the Senate present, that the junior Senator from South Dakota is independent all the way through and is not bound by any caucus.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] says he was elected as an independent and that he is acting as an independent.

The Senator from South Dakota is a mighty good Populist, for he votes the Populist doctrine every time. I wish there were more here like him.

Now I will proceed with what the five did. I repeat that if we had voted as the Senator from Tennessee says we ought to have voted we would virtually have been voting for the Democrats, and he knows it. I wish to state right here that there are two reasons why we did not do so. The first reason is that we expected that the Senator from Tennessee and others on the other side who have made such loud professions for free silver and for financial reform would at least be among the foremost if not the foremost to join hands with us in trying to organize the Senate for silver and the people and against the gold-standard monopoly.

Mr. President, we were sorely disappointed, and on top of it we see interviews in the newspapers from gentlemen on the other side saying the country will go to perdition if we do not have free coinage, and yet in the same interviews saying that if their party nominates a gold bug for President next time they will bow down and lick his feet and vote for him. There is something I wish to say now and to say with emphasis. I would not say it, for I dislike to say unpleasant things, but for the fact that I believe the situation in this country is so perilous with respect to the welfare of the people that I ought to say it. It is this: Free coinage would have been secured long ago if it had not been for those who claim to be free-coinage men, but who sacrifice it for party success. If these men would stand for free coinage, party or no party, the people of this country would have had free coinage before now. It is the men who talk free coinage in campaigns, but bow to the party lash in their national convention, when gold bugs, who have prevented the passage of free-coinage legislation, tell them which way to vote. Such men are the worst enemies of free coinage, although they profess to be its friends.

Mr. President, there is one other reason. If the Democratic party had more votes here than the Republicans, we would have acted just as we did. Why? Because by not voting we would have allowed the party that had the most votes to take the offices, since they would not help us. We decided that we would not help a minority that would not help us to organize, but that between the two sides we would allow those who had the greater number of votes to take the organization before we would help those who were in the minority to take it—a minority that had refused to raise its hands to help free coinage when we called upon them to help us.

There is something else. I do not think the members of the party which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] represents can afford to ask for Populist help so long as they stay inside of that party, with its present views and leadership. I wish to say that in my humble opinion his party does not deserve the support or the help of the People's Party. It had a majority in the last Congress, and yet on the statute books to-day there is a Republican law giving the President the power to issue bonds. He issued bonds under your teeth here in the last Congress. And we understand now that he is in another dark-lantern trade negotiating with private individuals for the sale of more bonds under a law that the Democratic party has denounced but refused to repeal when it had the power. We suppose the President will make another deal that will put millions of the people's money into private pockets. The People's Party is opposed to such infamous laws and to such infamous transactions. Therefore the Democratic party does not deserve Populist support any more than the Republican party, on its record, deserves Populist support, and neither party will get it. We have simply stood by the principles. We have let the two old parties fight it out. The Republicans had the most votes, and they got the organization. If the Democrats had had the largest number of votes they would have secured it. We have been consistent. You gentlemen must make the best of your records you can.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I do not think there is need of much more speech to show the situation. There is nothing mysterious about it, there is nothing undiscerned, and the discussion to-day has disclosed it entirely. The Republican members of the Senate, a plurality, but with no power of carrying into execution any measure, whether of organization or of legislation, simply propounded a list of committees as touching their side; the Democrats propounded a set upon their side, and the Populists were left substantially as they were in the Senate during the last Congress, which was Democratic.

Now, those propositions were brought before the Senate, and nothing could more clearly disclose what is the situation now and what will be the situation hereafter than the vote and the discussion. The list of committees as reported by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], representing the Republican side, and with the control of the committees substantially given to the Republican side, received on a yea-and-nay vote 30 votes. The opposition, whatever it may have been, to the committees so constituted received 28 votes, and 5 Populists sat silent. Had they voted with the Democratic party, which was solid, the vote would have stood 30 yeas and 33 nays, and the Republican programme would have tumbled and fallen to the ground.

So it must be, Mr. President. The country must see and must understand that in the case of any proposition framed by the majority of a committee, Republicans though they may be, and presented to the Senate, the same thing that occurred to-day will occur again and again recurringly. The Populist members have the balance of power. If the Republicans report what is called a sound-money measure and hold their votes for it and the Democrats vote against it and the Populists vote with the Democratic party, the Republican programme falls and is naught. If the Republicans on any committee formulate a measure of another class, something that does not pertain to sound money, and present it here, the result will depend upon the Populists.

I welcome the fact, however, that after all the discussion and after all question about where the responsibility lies, we have to-day brought it out of the domain of discussion and speculation into the domain of the concrete and the demonstrable. That is shown by the vote here to-day.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I am very glad to hear the Senator from Maine say that this proposition has now come to the concrete, as the concrete of the whole matter is that the Populists remained silent and permitted the Republicans to take charge of the committees of this body, because the Committee on Finance, as now constituted, has on it a majority of free-coinage men. It has been stated here that that committee is composed of six Republicans and six Democrats, with one Populist; but the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] is put upon the committee with the knowledge and understanding that it gives the committee to the free-coinage advocates in this body. That is the concrete of the whole business. Without that arrangement we never would have seen our Populist friends sit here dumb as oysters while the programme was being carried through.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] to the fact that the complexion of the Finance Committee is not altered by the change in the committees, except that the number is increased. It is well known that a majority of the Finance Committee as organized are in favor of the free coinage of silver, every Democrat on the committee being understood to be in favor of it. As respects the selection of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] or the selection of the new Democratic member of the committee, we do not deceive each other, no matter what we may say here. It is known that the Finance Committee was and is in favor of the free coinage of silver, and it is also known that practically no organization of the Senate could be made without that being the case. Therefore we are to-day dealing with leather and prunella with respect to the whole question. We came here with a perfect knowledge on the part of both sides of the Chamber that neither the Republicans nor the Democrats had a majority control in this body, and that the decent and orderly conduct of business required that there should be such an organization of the Senate as would assign new members, who come in on both sides of the Chamber, to proper and effective places with relation to the business of the Senate.

It was also found, in the adjustment of the committees, that certain committees which hitherto had nine or eleven members were too small, in the judgment of both sides of the Chamber, to take into consideration the varied interests of the people of the United States. It was necessary, in the nature of things, that there should be some composition of the situation whereby the committees should be organized. They had to be organized either by a union of the independent party, called the Populist or People's Party, with the Republicans or with the Democrats, or by that party taking the organization which had the largest number in membership on this floor. The Republican party, as shown by the vote here to-day, notwithstanding the fact that one Populist voted with the Democrats, had a plurality of 2 as against the Democratic party. If the Populist Senator had not voted with the Democrats we would have had a plurality of 3 in this Chamber as against the Democrats.

It may be well for gentlemen upon the other side of the Senate and upon this to seek partisan advantage out of the condition, but those who read and see what is done in this Chamber will understand that the whole arrangement has practically been made under

the necessities of the situation. When my friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] this morning sent to the desk the resolution providing for the organization of the committees, it required the unanimous consent of this body—of every Democrat and every Populist in it—to deal with the question to-day. It could not have been dealt with except by a common and general understanding that it was wise to deal with it and to deal with it as we have done. I believe this is the first time (certainly it is the first time within my experience in this Chamber) that we have ever had a yea-and-nay vote upon the organization of committees. It arose from the fact that neither of the great parties has a majority in this Chamber, and the minority party, as between the Republicans and Democrats, sought by a yea-and-nay vote to ascertain how the Populist members of the Senate would vote or whether they would vote at all.

I shall not go into the minutia of what would have been the effect if they had voted one way or the other. Nobody is to be fooled about the matter. As Mr. Lincoln said, "You can fool all of the people some of the time and part of the people all the time, but you can not fool all the people all the time." The people of this country understand the play here to-day. They know that neither of the old parties has a majority in this Chamber; that neither of them in the concrete, as the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] say, has the power of legislation here. None of the great questions which are the subject of controversy between political parties in this country can be settled by this body unless Democrats vote with the Republicans or Populists vote with the Republicans, or unless Republicans vote with the Democrats or with the Populists. Therefore, to charge party responsibility upon either side, either in the committee room or in the Chamber, is playing with the whole question as respects our responsibility.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I confess my amazement at the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], who, with his party friends on the other side of the Chamber, has been most anxious to assume responsibility by taking charge of the main committees of this body, and yet, before the committees are organized, proclaims to the country that they have no power to carry out the decrees of their party.

From this time henceforth Senators on the other side of the Chamber are responsible for the action of both branches of Congress. The Republicans came here knowing that they had not a clear majority in the Senate. By common consent provision was made at the last session of Congress for this very condition of affairs, knowing that it was absolutely necessary to make such concessions as had never before been made in the Senate, for such a condition, where a few gentlemen hold the balance of power, had existed but once before in the history of this body. In that condition, as I understood it and as I supposed the other side meant it, the resolution was adopted, in order that this great body might adjust its committees on more liberal lines as between the two parties, on a line which would have secured for the country the consideration of measures in committee by the best thought of both sides of the Chamber, without reference to the third party.

Mr. President, after all, the country will hold either the Republicans or the Democrats responsible for the Government for the next two years. It is a divided responsibility. With an overwhelming majority of the Republican party elsewhere, a gentleman who was elected as a Democrat in the Executive branch, and this Chamber in the condition in which it was, partiotic action suggested at the last session that we would meet it here by cooperation on both sides. But the desire for power, the anxiety to control committees and keep the legislation in their hands, have made the Republicans take a step which possibly will not give them the power of legislation, but they have taken the responsibility. Meet it. Meet it as we did in the last Congress, when we had but a single vote in the majority. Meet it, and take the responsibility.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Maryland a question?

Mr. GORMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland, because these are generalities and not practical matters, if he will suggest a single measure or doctrine or principle which to-day it is within the power of the Republicans in this body to pass without the aid of Democratic votes?

Mr. GORMAN. That is true.

Mr. HOAR. There is none.

Mr. GORMAN. I admit it. But the Senator from Massachusetts knows as well as I do that when you take possession of every great committee of the body, putting Democrats in the minority on every single committee where legislation originates save one, you—a minority, as you claim, in this body—have placed yourselves in a position to frame legislation, to stop legislation.

It is the responsibility of the majority which you have assumed. If you had carried out the idea that was suggested by the resolution passed at the last session of Congress, organizing the committees under this condition of affairs by more liberal concessions to both sides of the Chamber, bringing together the best thought, shaping the committees so as to secure the services of the men who, as Democrats and Republicans, understand it and have the best interests of the country at heart, I think we would have had better legislation than we shall have now. But by the action which has been taken the great Finance Committee, as has been stated on the other side to-day, is controlled by the Populist party.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from Maryland allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GORMAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. HALE. The question I desire to ask is pertinent to the Senator's allusion to the Finance Committee. He has twice referred to what might have happened beneficently if another procedure had been taken and if the best thought of the Senate had been brought together on the committees. Before the Senator sits down, I wish he would explain to the Senate what he means by that statement. What issue is it? Is it the money question, is it the tariff question, or what? And upon the money question, let him explain to the Senate, if he desires the better thought, perhaps the conservative thought, of the country to be more prominent, how it happens that when the membership of the Committee on Finance, which must report all financial measures, was increased, so that the Democratic party was entitled to an additional member, having already on it five silver men, it proceeded to put on another silver man. If the Senator refers to that subject when speaking of the sound thought of the country, let him explain to the Senate and the country why it was that the Democratic party, in making up its composition of the Finance Committee, did not give preference to the sound-money men on the other side of the Chamber. With one supporter of the Administration for sound money and sound thought, to use the Senator's language, going off the committee, why did the Senator and his associates fill the place of a sound-money man with a silver man when they had to put on a new man?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

Mr. GORMAN. I yielded only for a question. I shall detain the Senate but a moment longer.

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to have the term "sound money" defined?

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, 42 Republicans on the other side of the Chamber assumed that they were in the majority in this body.

Mr. HALE. Oh, no.

Mr. GORMAN. They assumed that they had the right to control the majority of the committees of this body, and, as is usual where a party is in the majority, they proceeded to assign to the Finance Committee seven members and gave to this side six. It is no matter of mine how they selected their seven. They did select one from Nevada, another from Colorado——

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Nevada was an old member.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, he was an old member; but the Senator from Maine knew his views, because they are better known throughout the country than those of any other Senator. I am not going into the manner of the selection.

Mr. HALE. Let me make one suggestion.

Mr. GORMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. HALE. The Senator knows that in filling up the Democratic minority of that committee if his side had put on two what we call sound-money men, antifree-silver men, then the sound-money or antifree-silver men would have had a majority of the committee, and when they declined to do that, declined to put on one sound-money man, the whole control of the committee went to the silver men.

Mr. GORMAN. That was not the point. I do not care anything about the individual views of the members of the committee.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. GORMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. TELLER. In reply to the Senator's suggestion relative to the Democrats selecting for the Finance Committee sound-money men, or what I would call "unsound-money" men, I want to say for a number of us here that there would have been no reorganization of the committees if that had been done.

Mr. GORMAN. That is true, and that is the full explanation. That is precisely what the country ought to know. That is the reason why the distinguished Senator from Nebraska sat quietly in his seat. It is a mistake, in my judgment, that you have made on the other side of the Chamber, but you have made it; the attention of the country has been called to it by this debate, and you ought to stand up and take the full responsibility, for it is yours; it is not any longer ours.

Before I take my seat I want to say that, while I think, in the interest of this body, the reorganization is an error of judgment, I think, in the interests of the country, you ought to have subordinated your desire for control until you had a fair majority, for there are pending a number of important questions which affect not only the business interests within our own bounds, but interests as far-reaching as the bounds of the world. I trust that from this time out, notwithstanding you have the control, full oppor-

tunity will be given for the consideration of these measures; and I believe there are a number who, while they think a great error has been committed, will be ready to cooperate with the Senators who have charge of these great committees in so framing legislation and in so conducting our affairs that the best interests of the country will not be put in jeopardy.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope the Senator will soon recover his composure and not continue to show the anxiety which he and other Senators upon the other side of the Chamber have been manifesting these many days past concerning the Republicans of the Senate and the fearful responsibility which they say has been imposed upon the plurality in the Senate of voting for their own propositions. That responsibility the plurality will endeavor to bear with composure.

The Senator the other day said something about a combination by which the Republicans were to obtain control of the Senate, and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] to-day has spoken of a "contingent" of the Republican party, referring to the members of the Populist party. I do not think those suggestions are wise. I do not think that it is wise for the Senator to criticise the method, if there has been any method, by which the Republicans have come into the control in the main of the committees of the Senate, and by which they will, I hope, at some future day elect a President pro tempore of the Senate, much as I dislike to spare from the performance of that high function the respected Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, if the method by which the Republicans are now in such power as has been given to them does not compare favorably with the method by which the Democratic party obtained and retained power in the last Senate, then I am mistaken. I shall not at this hour go into a review of the two methods. I leave them to the verdict of the future.

There has been no combination that I know of; there is no "contingent" of the Republican party in this Senate that I know of.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the honorable Senator permit me a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. Has there not been a perfect and complete understanding for the last three or four weeks between the Republican and Democratic parties in the Senate that the Republican party should organize?

Mr. CHANDLER. I should say no, Mr. President. There have been conferences between the chairman of the committee on our side and the chairman of the committee on the other side with reference to the way and manner of arranging the committee lists, which has always been the custom, but we have always understood that a vote in the Senate would be insisted on.

Mr. ALLEN. What does the distinguished Senator from Maryland mean when he says in substance, not in words perhaps, that all through the months past "the very best thought of this Chamber"—whatever that may be, from what source it may come I do not know, of course—but "the very best thought of this Chamber on both sides has cooperated and will continue to cooperate in the control of the Senate in the future"?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will pardon me, I will come to that in a moment.

The inquiry has been made as to the motive which actuated the Senator from Nebraska and the other Populist Senators in their decision to refrain from voting. The answers have been given, and I trust our friends on the other side of the Chamber, led by the Senator from Tennessee, who showed curiosity, are satisfied on that point as to the motives which actuated the Populists.

So far as I am concerned, I repeat that there has been no combination, and there is no contingent of the Republican party in this Chamber. The real regret of the Senator from Maryland seems to be that the Republicans have not in fact made a combine with somebody on the Democratic side of the Chamber, and the Senator from Nebraska well asks, What was that combine which was proposed? Does the Senator from Maryland wish it to be understood that the Republicans have been considering all these months any proposition from him, or any considerable number of Senators upon his side, to organize this body by an arrangement between the Republicans and the Democrats? Is it the trouble with the Senator that there has been any such proposition pending as that, and that it has been declined on this side of the Chamber and a combination made with the Populists?

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator knows perfectly well that no such suggestion has been made to him or to anybody else. The Senator from New Hampshire knows perfectly well that we were content, and have been to-day, to give unanimous consent for any resolution his party desired to offer to take the committees whenever they wanted them.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator stated distinctly that it was a matter of regret to him that there had not been some arrangement made by Senators on his side of the Chamber—the Democrats he meant—with the Republicans on this side of the Chamber with reference to the organization of the Senate. The Senator, it is true, left his statement in a somewhat nebulous form, so that it has naturally puzzled the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] to deal with it. The Senator said it was to be an organization which should comprise "the best thought" of this Chamber. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine well asked the Senator from Maryland to state upon what idea, upon what principle, it was that he desired to have this Democratic-Republican organization of the Senate made. Was it connected with the silver question, the Senator from Maine asked.

The question was pertinent. Why, Mr. President, if the Republicans of this Senate had not seen fit to come in and vote for a resolution appointing committees mainly Republican, allowing the Populists to vote or not vote as they pleased, and to take whatever result might come, but had, instead, been willing to recognize the Senator from Maryland as the great leader of "the best thought of this country" and had undertaken to negotiate with him and such Democratic associates as he could command upon the principle of opposition to the free coinage of silver, we should not have found enough sound-money Senators upon the other side of the Chamber to negotiate with to equal the six Populists.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Maryland referred to "the best thought" on both sides of the Chamber, and the Senator from New Hampshire now designates the Senator from Maryland as "the leader of the best thought in the Chamber." Will he be kind enough to designate what Senator upon the other side of the Chamber is the leader of the best thought there? Can the honorable Senator point out the leader of the best thought on the Republican side?

Mr. CHANDLER. I am afraid, Mr. President, the number who would be entitled to be counted as "the leaders of the best thought" on this side of the Chamber would not be larger than that on the other side of the Chamber; certainly not larger than the Populist party in this body, and the only Senator that I know of on either side of the Chamber who is willing to rise and assume to represent the best thought of the Senate and of the country is the Senator from Maryland. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I did not intend to talk more than a moment. I rose for one thing—simply to say to those Senators who are so agonized and distressed at the responsibility which has been this day assumed by this side of the Chamber that the responsibility will be cheerfully undertaken. We shall take it with the incidental comforts and pleasures and benefits which go along with it, with an equanimity which will be astonishing to the Senator from Tennessee. [Laughter.] The Republican party is not afraid of responsibility; it never has been afraid of responsibility in all its history.

The facts connected with the organization of the Senate have been brought out by the Senator from Maryland to-day by insisting upon a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of the resolution appointing committees. I trust the Senator is entirely satisfied with his exploration. I assure him that we upon this side of the Chamber are more than satisfied; and, with the 42 Republican votes which there now are in this Chamber, soon to be increased by 2 more, and possibly by 1 other, we shall go on proposing measures to this body, getting them through if we can; while, if we can not, the responsibility for the failure will rest solely upon the members who vote in the negative.

Mr. President, the process of transferring responsibility to the Republican party, painful as it is to Senators upon the other side, is going on with astonishing rapidity. I hope that the Republicans of this body—I hope that the Republicans of the country will not only use their powers wisely, but that they will deal courteously with their opponents on every occasion. Indeed, Mr. President, I now come to the foremost object which was in my mind when I rose to speak. I have been under many obligations in the last two years to the Senator from Maryland and to the Senator from Tennessee for courtesies extended in debate and otherwise. They have been exceedingly gracious not only to me, but to all Senators upon this side of the Chamber, so far as I am aware. They are now a little troubled, a little excited, a little downcast, as they contemplate the heavy responsibility which they say the recent vote has cast upon us, but I am sure that in a day or two they will recover their customary amiability, gentleness, and sweetness, and we shall see them in the minority as kind, as charming, and as courteous to us as they always have been while they have been in the majority. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I want to state to the Senate, because I think I owe the statement to the Senate, that if I had had the remotest thought that the innocent question which I propounded to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] would have provoked the rant of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] and the volubility of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] I should have restrained myself and refrained from asking the innocent question of the Senator from Nebraska; but having witnessed the result and having inflicted the Senate with these things, I think I owe an apology, and I serve notice on

the Senator from Nebraska that I shall never ask him another question, no matter what the provocation. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLS. If the debating society is over, I wish to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Senator to yield to me for one moment.

Mr. MILLS. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. I want to make a statement, that it may go into the RECORD, to show the true facts of the eleven committees given to the Democratic minority. The Democrats have a majority on only one of those committees, and that is the Committee on Private Land Claims. On one other, the Committee on the Reclamation of the Potomac Flats, there is an equal division, and on the other nine committees the Republicans and Populists have a majority.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The Senator will allow me to say that the proportion is just the same as it was in the last Congress.

Mr. COCKRELL. The same as it was before?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Exactly.

Mr. GALLINGER. In the line suggested by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] concerning the minority committees, I want to make the statement that the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, on Claims, on Coast Defenses, on Contingent Expenses, on Commerce, on Education and Labor, on Finance, on Fisheries, on Immigration, on Indian Depredations, on Indian Affairs, on Pacific Railroads, on Pensions, and on Post-Offices and Post-Roads have an equal number of Republicans and Democrats, and the Populists hold the balance of power in all those great committees.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I understand, the plurality have treated the Populists just as the Democrats treated them in the last Congress; they have treated the Democrats just as the Democrats treated the Republicans in the last Congress, and the Republicans have treated themselves just as the Democrats treated themselves in the last Congress. That is all.

PROPOSED HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I offer a resolution which I ask to have read and lie upon the table, to be brought up to-morrow morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn to-morrow it shall be to meet on Tuesday, January 7, 1896.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table.

DUTY ON WOOLS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I desire to give notice that to-morrow, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of a resolution I offered some days since, and which is on the table, for the purpose of submitting some remarks upon it.

Mr. BERRY. On what resolution does the Senator desire to speak?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. On a resolution submitted by me some days ago looking to an instruction of the Finance Committee in reference to the tariff on wool.

Mr. BERRY. All right.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-six minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 31, 1895, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 30, 1895.

MEMBER BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATION.

Joseph H. Outhwaite, of Ohio, to be a member of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification, vice Byron M. Cutcheon, resigned.

POSTMASTERS.

Edward M. Scott, to be postmaster at Seaford, in the county of Sussex and State of Delaware, in the place of Severn A. Brown, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Claude S. Hazelrigg, to be postmaster at Mount Sterling, in the county of Montgomery and State of Kentucky, in the place of George C. Everett, resigned.

Fred K. Bastian, to be postmaster at Fulton, in the county of Whiteside and State of Illinois, in the place of John C. Martindale, whose commission expired January 9, 1895.

Nathaniel R. Davis, to be postmaster at Barry, in the county of Pike and State of Illinois, in the place of George L. Booth, whose commission expired December 23, 1895.

Howard H. Thomas, to be postmaster at Polo, in the county of Ogle and State of Illinois, in the place of Harrison W. Coursey, whose commission will expire January 19, 1896.

Julius F. Kerberg, to be postmaster at Sanborn, in the county of O'Brien and State of Iowa, in the place of Chauncey F. Owen, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

J. H. Watson, to be postmaster at Indianola, in the county of Warren and State of Iowa, in the place of Thomas T. Anderson, whose commission expired December 23, 1895.

Lou S. Flournoy, to be postmaster at Ruston, in the county of Lincoln and State of Louisiana, in the place of William H. H. Mullin, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

George H. Walling, jr., to be postmaster at Machias, in the county of Washington and State of Maine, in the place of Daniel A. Curtis, whose commission will expire January 6, 1896.

Michael J. Green, to be postmaster at Watertown, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of George H. Tarlton, whose commission expired February 14, 1895.

William Killefer, to be postmaster at Paw Paw, in the county of Van Buren and State of Michigan, in the place of Kirke W. Noyes, whose commission will expire January 6, 1896.

Alfred L. Brock, to be postmaster at Moorestown, in the county of Burlington and State of New Jersey, in the place of Walter S. Reeve, whose commission will expire January 6, 1896.

Edmund P. Looker, to be postmaster at Boonton, in the county of Morris and State of New Jersey, in the place of J. H. Hoffman, deceased.

Sarah Hodgdon, to be postmaster at Deming, in the county of Grant and Territory of New Mexico, in the place of James P. Byron, whose commission expired December 23, 1895.

Thomas J. Buchanan, to be postmaster at Marietta, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Sigmund E. Wisner, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Alexander M. Cornmesser, to be postmaster at Bellwood, in the county of Blair and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of William A. McDermitt, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Ellsworth M. Daron, to be postmaster at Steelton, in the county of Dauphin and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of William H. H. Seig, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Thomas C. Humphries, to be postmaster at Berkley, in the county of Norfolk and State of Virginia, in the place of Jeremiah E. Hozier, whose commission expired December 22, 1895.

George W. Ford, to be postmaster at Pullman, in the county of Whitman and State of Washington, in the place of John T. Lobaugh, whose commission will expire January 27, 1896.

David J. Brothers, to be postmaster at Kaukauna, in the county of Outagamie and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Thomas Reese, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry S. Chase, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 10th of May, 1895 (subject to the physical examination required by law), vice Lieut. James W. Carlin, promoted.

Ensign Clarence S. Williams, to be a lieutenant (junior derg)a in the Navy, from the 10th of May, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry S. Chase, promoted.

Commander Nicoll Ludlow, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 21st of May, 1895, vice Capt. John A. Howell, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Chapman C. Todd, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 21st of May, 1895, vice Commander Nicoll Ludlow, promoted.

Lieut. Gottfried Blocklinger, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 21st of May, 1895, vice Lieut. Commander Chapman C. Todd, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Le Roy M. Garrett, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 21st of May, 1895, vice Lieut. Gottfried Blocklinger, promoted.

Lieut. Perry Garst, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 7th of June, 1895, vice Lieut. Commander Robert E. Carmody, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles C. Marsh, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 7th of June, 1895, vice Lieut. Perry Garst, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Joseph N. Hemphill, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 15th of June, 1895, vice Commander Oscar F. Heyerman, retired.

Lieut. James K. Cogswell, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 15th of June, 1895, vice Lieut. Commander Joseph N. Hemphill, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John B. Blish, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 15th of June, 1895, vice Lieut. James K. Cogswell, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles W. Jungen, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st of August, 1895, vice Lieut. Charles W. Ruschenberger, resigned.

Lieut. Commander Abraham B. H. Lillie, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 1st of September, 1895, vice Commander John K. Winn, retired.

Lieut. Frederic Singer, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st of September, 1895, vice Lieut. Commander Abraham B. H. Lillie, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles Harlow, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st of September, 1895, vice Lieut. Frederic Singer, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William A. Gill, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 4th of October, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Charles F. Norton, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Thomas W. Ryan, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 12th of October, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Randolph H. Miner, resigned.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles S. Ripley, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 5th of November, 1895, vice Lieut. Downs L. Wilson, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Walter J. Sears, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 5th of November, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Nicholas J. L. T. Halpine, retired.

Ensign Wilford B. Hoggatt, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 21st of May, 1895, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) Le Roy M. Garrett, promoted.

Ensign Albert M. Beecher, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 7th of June, 1895, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles C. Marsh, promoted.

Ensign Frank K. Hill, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 15th of June, 1895, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) John B. Blish, promoted.

Ensign Roger Welles, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 1st of August, 1895, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles W. Jungen, promoted.

Ensign John D. McDonald, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 1st of September, 1895, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles H. Harlow, promoted.

Ensign Walter O. Hulme, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 4th of October, 1895, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) William A. Gill, promoted.

Ensign Henry E. Parmenter, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 12th of October, 1895, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) Thomas W. Ryan, promoted.

Ensign Hilary P. Jones, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 16th of October, 1895, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) James C. Drake, resigned.

Ensign William R. Shoemaker, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 29th of October, 1895, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) Joseph Beale, resigned.

Ensign Isaac K. Seymour, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 5th of November, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles S. Ripley, promoted.

Ensign Charles M. Fahs, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 5th of November, 1895 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) Walter J. Sears, promoted.

Ensign Charles P. Plunkett, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 5th of November, 1895, vice Lieut. (Junior Grade) Houston Eldredge, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 30, 1895.

CHIEF OF CONSULAR BUREAU.

Robert S. Chilton, jr., of the District of Columbia, to be chief of the consular bureau of the Department of State of the United States.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Thomas H. Craven, of New York, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York.

POSTMASTERS.

Felix C. Bennett, to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Green and State of Wisconsin.

John F. Anderson, to be postmaster at Lockhart, in the county of Caldwell and State of Texas.

A. B. M. Thompson, to be postmaster at Webster Groves, in the county of St. Louis and State of Missouri.

David A. Frayser, to be postmaster at Vinita, in the county of Cherokee Nation, Ind. T.

Gideon A. Hendrick, to be postmaster at Stanton, in the county of Montcalm and State of Michigan.

Edward F. Rakow, to be postmaster at Burlington, in the county of Racine and State of Wisconsin.

Hugh J. Mulholland, to be postmaster at South Kaukauna, in the county of Outagamie and State of Wisconsin.

Frank P. Bogardus, to be postmaster at Ypsilanti, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan.

Edward Arnold, to be postmaster at Decatur, in the county of Van Buren and State of Michigan.

Peter Brady, to be postmaster at Bellevue, in the county of Huron and State of Ohio.

Mary J. Huntington, to be postmaster at Delta, in the county of Fulton and State of Ohio.

John S. Ellen, to be postmaster at Willoughby, in the county of Lake and State of Ohio.

William Keough, to be postmaster at Jonesville, in the county of Hillsdale and State of Michigan.

Willis M. Dent, to be postmaster at Montgomery, in the county of Fayette and State of West Virginia.

A. Hewett Hill, to be postmaster at Eustis, in the county of Lake and State of Florida.

Josiah B. Willis, to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Madison and State of Kentucky.

Griffith B. Thomas, to be postmaster at Point Pleasant, in the county of Mason and State of West Virginia.

Lloyd Reed, to be postmaster at Clarksburg, in the county of Harrison and State of West Virginia.

James H. Edwards, to be postmaster at Weston, in the county of Lewis and State of West Virginia.

Peter F. Clark, to be postmaster at Aberdeen, in the county of Chehalis and State of Washington.

Charles Reed, to be postmaster at Menasha, in the county of Winnebago and State of Wisconsin.

Michael J. McNamara, to be postmaster at Cudahy, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin.

Rufus E. Bean, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire.

John Richardson, to be postmaster at Hoquiam, in the county of Chehalis and State of Washington.

Gilbert S. Meem, to be postmaster at Seattle, in the county of King and State of Washington.

Eugene A. Ayers, to be postmaster at Swanton, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont.

Willis F. Hardy, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire.

John O'Loughlin, to be postmaster at Laconia, in the county of Belknap and State of New Hampshire.

Daniel C. Spaulding, to be postmaster at Morrisville, in the county of Lamoille and State of Vermont.

Oscar McGregor, to be postmaster at Richford, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont.

Charles N. Brady, to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Orleans and State of Vermont.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 31, 1895.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 60) concerning the completion of the United States court-house and post-office building at Mankato, Minn.; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (S. R. 32) authorizing and directing the acceptance of the ram *Katahdin*, thereby making said ram a part of the United States Navy; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate sundry petitions of citizens of Monroe County, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PEFFER presented the memorial of John H. Stevenson and sundry other citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., remonstrating against the issuance of interest-bearing bonds, and praying for the free and full coinage of gold and silver; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition, in the nature of resolutions adopted by the American Protective Association of Nebraska, in State council assembled, praying that the Government acknowledge the people of Cuba as belligerents and have them accorded the privileges known in diplomatic circles as belligerent rights; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I present petitions of 280 citizens of South Dakota. The petitioners ask to be allowed to enter the Sioux Indian Reservation in that State under the homestead law, without paying the purchase price of $1.25 per acre, as now required by

law. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of sundry citizens of Tower City, N. Dak., praying that the Government of the United States make every possible effort to relieve the suffering of Armenians in Turkey; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MANTLE presented resolutions adopted by Washington Council, No. 1, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Butte City, Mont., indorsing the message of the President of the United States on the Monroe doctrine; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of the Grocers and Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the construction of a ship canal to connect the Delaware River with New York Bay; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Meade Post, No. 1, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the enactment of legislation reviving the rank of Lieutenant-General; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1095) for the relief of Enoch Vernon, a citizen of the United States, reported it favorably, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs; which was agreed to.

CRIPPLE CREEK DISTRICT, COLORADO.

Mr. GORMAN. I am instructed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] on the 9th instant, to report it without amendment. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to; as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed at the Government Printing Office, at the earliest day practicable, 5,000 copies in separate form, with paper covers, of the paper entitled "Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado," constituting pages 1 to 209 of part 2 of the Sixteenth Annual Report of the United States Geological Survey, with the accompanying illustrations, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,500 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies for distribution by the Geological Survey.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 1280) to repeal section No. 61 of the act of Congress approved August 28, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAMERON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1281) granting a pension to Joseph Heimen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1282) to provide for the relief of injured and disabled employees of the Railway Mail Service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1283) to amend the charter of the Belt Railway Company of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1284) making appropriation to pay the Santee Sioux Indians in Nebraska and South Dakota for lands, unpaid annuities, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1285) to promote the efficiency of the militia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1286) for the relief of Abner D. Lewis, of Fayette County, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 1287) to place Francis W. Seeley on the retired list of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1288) for the relief of John Stull; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1289) to facilitate the procurement of evidence and to compel the attendance of witnesses in matters before the registers and receivers of the local land offices of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1290) to facilitate the determination of land matters in the Department of the Interior; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1291) granting an increase of pension to Celeste A. Boughton, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Horace Boughton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1292) to furnish artificial limbs to pensioners under the law of June 27, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 1293) to establish an army post in King County at or near the city of Seattle, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1294) for the relief of Louisa A. Bozorth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 1295) to regulate the course of study at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1296) to commission passed assistant surgeons in the United States Navy, and to provide for their examination preliminary to their promotion to the grade of surgeon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1297) to provide for the purchase of lands adjoining the United States naval station, Port Royal, S. C.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1298) to cancel and redeem United States legal-tender notes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1299) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Field; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1300) for the relief of Hannah Newell Barrett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1301) granting a pension to Mary J. Hill; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1302) granting a pension to Thomas Madden; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1303) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Holly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1304) granting a pension to Cyrus A. Bowers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

Mr. SQUIRE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED DUTY ON RAW SUGAR.

Mr. PERKINS. I offer a resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent for its consideration at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas the conditions of soil and climate in the United States are so peculiarly favorable to the growth of the sugar beet and sugar cane that the manufacture of sugar should be the most important industry of the country; and

Whereas under the operation of the tariff law of 1890 the sugar industry was greatly encouraged and promoted, to the benefit not only of the persons directly interested, but of all of the people of the United States; and

Whereas the operations of said law were fast making the manufacture of sugar the most important industry of the country, causing vast tracts of land to be put under cultivation, and affording employment to many thousands of persons in field and manufactory; and

Whereas the effect of the changes made by the tariff law of 1894 has been to stop the development of this great industry, to retard its progress, to hamper it in every way, to discourage the planting large tracts of land by reducing the price of raw material, to take away the means of livelihood from farmers and farm laborers, and to close the manufactories against the laborers who had been employed therein; and

Whereas without some further protection granted by Congress for a few years, or until the industry becomes solidly established, it will not be possible to long continue the cultivation of the sugar beet or even, perhaps, of the sugar cane, or to manufacture sugar in this country in competition with foreign farmers and manufacturers who employ cheaper labor than can be procured in the United States; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Finance Committee of the Senate a bill to increase the revenue by laying additional duties on a large number of articles, but not on sugar: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and it is hereby, instructed to report an amendment to said revenue bill providing for an additional duty on raw sugar equal to the proposed increase on other articles enumerated in the said bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BERRY. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection, and the resolution will go over under the rule.

THE GOLD RESERVE.

Mr. SHERMAN. I offer a resolution which I ask to have read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That by injurious legislation by the Fifty-third Congress the revenues of the Government were reduced below its necessary expenditure and the fund created by law for the redemption of United States notes has been invaded to supply such deficiencies of reserve; that such a misapplication of the resumption fund is of doubtful legality and greatly injurious to the public credit, and should be prevented by restoring said fund to the sum of not less than $100,000,000, in gold coin or bullion, to be segregated from all other funds, to be paid out only in the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes, and such notes when redeemed to be reissued only in exchange for gold coin and bullion.

Mr. SHERMAN. I shall desire on Friday probably, if it is the pleasure of the Senate, to make some remarks upon the resolution. Let it go over until that time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY.

Mr. MORRILL. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Friday next, for the reason that the Committee on Finance desire the time on Thursday to consider the bond and tariff bills.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to.

COAST DEFENSE ESTIMATES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Vermont, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PROCTOR December 21, 1895, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to inform the Senate what amount of money can be advantageously used for the purpose of coast defense prior to July 1, 1897, and what portion of said amount should be made available during the present fiscal year; also, an estimate of what portion of the amount would be required for sites for fortifications, and how much for engineering, and how much for ordnance work, and whether the requisite number of heavy guns can be supplied from the Government shops, and if not, whether the deficiency can be manufactured by private plants in this country.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PAYMENT OF COIN OBLIGATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from North Carolina coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. BUTLER December 21, 1895, as follows:

Whereas it was the purpose of Congress to keep gold and silver coin at a parity by investing the Secretary of the Treasury with the discretion of paying the coin obligations of the Government as they mature in either metal: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed, when liquidating either the interest or principal of the Government's coin obligations, to make such payment in gold coin whenever the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold is less than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, and to continue to pay in such gold coin until the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be equal to the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, but when the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be greater than the market value of 412½ grains of pure silver he shall pay said coin obligations as they mature in silver coin, and continue to pay the same in silver coin until the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver shall be equal to the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not notice the Senator from North Carolina in the Chamber at present, and I suggest the propriety of letting the resolution pass over without prejudice until he comes in.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], coming over from a previous day.

Mr. CALL. I ask that all the resolutions introduced by me which are on the Vice-President's table may lie over without prejudice until to-morrow morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

PAN-AMERICAN UNION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. ALLEN December 24, 1895, as follows:

Whereas recent events have shown that European nations are making an aggressive attempt to obtain a greater foothold on the American Continent; and

Whereas such an attempt shows the necessity of a closer union of the American Republics: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States of America should as speedily as possible invite all American Republics to enter into a closer union, to be known as the Pan-American Union, for the purpose of promoting the general industrial and commercial welfare of the members thereof and secure said respective Republics from European or other foreign encroachment. Such union should be made of lasting benefit to the people of the several Republics forming it, and a unit of value should be established and maintained therein, which shall be a full legal tender and circulate freely between the various Republics and the people thereof.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to have that resolution lie upon the table subject to call.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

ARMOR FOR NAVAL VESSELS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire, coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. CHANDLER December 30, 1895, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be directed to inquire whether the prices paid or agreed to be paid for armor for vessels of the Navy have been fair and reasonable and as low as the prices charged by the same manufacturers to foreign Governments; also whether any prices paid have been increased on account of patent processes used for the introduction of nickel, or for cementation by the Harvey process; and if so, whether the increases in price are fair and reasonable; whether the issuance of any of the patents was expedited at the request of the Navy Department; whether such patents were properly issued and were for inventions not previously known or used, and who were and are the owners of such patents; whether any officers of the Government were interested therein; or at the time when any contracts were made were or have since been interested in the patents or employed by the owners thereof; and whether any legislation is necessary to further promote the manufacture and cheapen the price of armor for vessels of the Navy.

Mr. CHANDLER. At the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], I desire to modify the resolution by striking out the words which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 4, after the word "reasonable," strike out the words "and as low as the prices charged by the same manufacturers to foreign Governments"; so as to read:

That the Committee on Naval Affairs be directed to inquire whether the prices paid or agreed to be paid for armor for vessels of the Navy have been fair and reasonable; also whether any prices paid have been increased on account of patent processes, etc.

Mr. MILLS. What are the objections, I will ask the Senator, to retaining the words he proposes to strike out of the resolution? It seems to me their retention would enable us to get information about the prices abroad and in this country, too.

Mr. CHANDLER. I struck the words out at the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN]. I have no objection to having them stricken out. The information desired on that point can be ascertained just as well without inserting the language in the resolution. The Senator from Maryland, to whose opinion I attach high value and who thought it would be injudicious to have those words retained in the resolution, can make the explanation as to the reason of his request.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, the facts connected with the sale of armor to the Russian Government by one or two firms in this country are perfectly well known, and have been reported to Congress, I think, by the Navy Department. At all events, they are perfectly well understood, and the matter was disposed of at the last session of Congress.

The facts, as I understand, are these: The Russian Government asked for bids for armor for one vessel. There was a very great desire in the country on the part of manufacturers of this class of steel to have the United States compete with England or Germany, and a very low bid was put in for a very small amount, only enough, I think, for one vessel. There was some criticism about it, as it was at a lower price than the same material had been furnished to our Government as a rule. Indeed, it was furnished at a loss, merely to give the United States a standing with the Russian and other foreign Governments, and merely to finish the one vessel. An attempt was made immediately afterwards to apply the same rule as to payments for similar material furnished to the Government of the United States. The matter was thoroughly considered by both Houses and disposed of, it being decided unfair and unjust, if not destructive, to the firms who entered into that Russian contract to apply the same rule to their dealings with us. Therefore I see no necessity of going over that matter. It is perfectly well understood and perfectly open.

As to the remainder of the resolution directing the Committee on Naval Affairs to inquire into all the matters suggested, there is apparently connected with it an intimation that there has not been a careful business conduct of the offices of the Navy Department, and a further intimation that some officers of the Government have been interested in patents relating to these different processes. If the information which has reached the author of this resolution is sufficient in its character to warrant the belief on his part in the statements which have been made in the press and otherwise, such an inquiry should be made, and I have no ob-

jection to it. I regret, however, that it is thought by anybody necessary to make such an inquiry. I have believed—and I have been associated with the appropriations to a considerable extent—that under no Administration, certainly in the last twelve years, has there been anything except the most careful conduct of affairs by the Navy Department. Both political parties have united in promoting the affairs of the Navy Department. We have given great discretion to the Secretaries of the Navy, and the result of their work has been a marvel not only to this country, but to the world. No intimation whatever, on any of the Secretaries of the Navy, Democratic or Republican, has been made of a want of honesty or integrity or intelligence in the conduct of the affairs of that Department. Just at this time, with the peculiar atmosphere with which we are surrounded, I for one regret that it is thought necessary even to make an inquiry into the honesty and integrity of naval officers or of the Navy Department. At the same time, the distinguished Senator who has offered this resolution has had experience in that Department and knowledge of the business connected with it, and if, in his judgment, such an inquiry should be made, I certainly have no objection. But I suggested privately to the Senator from New Hampshire that, in my judgment, if the item as to the sale to the Russian Government, about which there is no question of fraud and no question as to the integrity of the practice or of the Department, were included, it would probably embarrass our entire operations.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I agree entirely with what the Senator from Maryland has said about the history of transactions in the Navy Department for the last twelve or fourteen years. I regret very much that any information has come to the Senator from New Hampshire which constrains him to institute this inquiry. I do not by this mean to say that information has not come to him which justifies the inquiry, but I regret its existence.

One of the most pleasing spectacles that we have witnessed in these years is the harmony with which Congress has acted and stood by the different Secretaries of the Navy in the great work of building up this branch of our naval establishment, and incidentally connected with it the still greater work of building up the plants throughout the country by which we are able now not only to build every ship, but to produce every article that is needed in its construction, its armor plate, and every pound of the ordnance that thunders from the decks of the ship. Fifteen years ago we could do nothing of this kind. In these fifteen years had there not been unity of action between the two parties, nothing could have been done in the direction in which we have proceeded. But it has been the pleasure of this body and the duty of this body and of the other branch of Congress to uphold the hands of the different Secretaries of the Navy.

The Senator from New Hampshire himself is to be credited with the initiation of this great work and partially building, not entirely completing, some of the best ships that are to-day in the Navy. His successor, a most eminent gentleman, a most successful administrator of the Navy Department, had his hands upheld by all Republicans here and in the other branch. When he was succeeded by another distinguished gentleman from New York, a Republican, our Democratic friends on the other side reciprocated the treatment awarded on this side to his predecessor, and in turn the present Secretary, long distinguished in the other House for his service as chairman of the Naval Committee there, has in his important work been sustained by both branches of Congress.

It has been believed and I have believed that these great transactions have been done not under cover, not in the night, but openly and aboveboard, and with integrity transfused through every branch of the service. I regret very much that now anything has arisen that in any way would disturb the confidence which Congress has had in all the branches of the Navy Department and that the country has shared, and in which the country has felt so much pride. If there is anything it ought to be brought out. I hope the investigation will demonstrate (and I know if it does no one will be more rejoiced than the Senator from New Hampshire) that there is nothing.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I concur in every word that has been said by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Maine, including the regret which they expressed that there is any occasion, if there be occasion, for the adoption of this resolution.

I take the responsibility of offering the resolution and of saying that facts have come to my knowledge which require investigation, and also which require publicity, if the facts are as I understand them, in order that in future contracts for armor for the vessels of the Navy, which we hope to build and ought to build in considerable numbers during the next few years, everything may be above suspicion and above reproach.

Unless it is necessary to secure the adoption of the resolution, I do not propose to bring into the Senate and put on record any statement of fact which would injure any officer of the Navy or other officer of the Government. If Senators are inclined to learn a part of the foundation of this proposed inquiry they can do so by reading in the New York Times of November 18, page 1, in the New York Times of November 19, page 1, and in the New York Times of November 20, page 4, statements which justify and require, in my judgment, this investigation.

Certainly we shall be the more likely to make judicious contracts and to secure the large appropriations for the increase of the Navy which ought to be made, if this subject can be cleared from the doubt and the suspicion that now rest upon it in connection with the publication made in the newspaper to which I have alluded.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

MONEY ISSUES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. ALLEN, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate of the amount of outstanding paper money, currency, silver certificates, gold certificates, legal-tender notes, and Treasury notes, respectively, issued by the Government of the United States from March 4, 1789, to the present time, and the respective acts of Congress, by titles and dates, under which they were issued, properly classifying the same.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to strike out all after the word "directed," in the first line of the resolution, and to insert as a substitute what I send to the desk. Let the resolution be read as it would stand with the substitute agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate a statement containing a copy of each obligation issued by the Government since March 4, 1789, with a reference by title and date to the laws, respectively, authorizing such issues, and showing the amount of each issue and the amount now outstanding, properly classified, and including Treasury notes of every kind, bonds, and certificates for currency, silver and gold.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 60) concerning the completion of the United States court-house and post-office building at Mankato, Minn., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

NANCY G. ALLABACH.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. CAMERON. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 894) granting a pension to Nancy G. Allabach. It will take but a minute. It is a little pension bill.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Will it lead to any debate?

Mr. CAMERON. None at all. If it does I will withdraw it.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Nancy G. Allabach, widow of Peter H. Allabach, late colonel One hundred and thirty-first Pennsylvania Volunteers, and to pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DUTY ON WOOLS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a resolution offered by me on a previous day, for the purpose of enabling me to submit some remarks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Oregon on the 20th instant will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, instructing the Finance Committee to incorporate into any bill for raising revenue that may come to that committee from the House of Representatives certain provisions relating to wool.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution submitted by me on the 20th instant, relating to an increase in the duties on wool, be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Oregon on the 20th instant will be read.

The resolution was read.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I offer a substitute for the resolution, which, as it is quite lengthy, I ask may be printed in the RECORD, the reading of all except the first part to be omitted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The first part of the proposed substitute will be read, and it will be printed entire as requested.

The proposed substitute is as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and they are hereby, instructed to incorporate into any bill for raising revenue which may come to that committee from the House of Representatives at the present session the

following provisions, either as a substitute or as an amendment, and report the same to the Senate at their earliest convenience:

That from and after the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all wools and hairs imported from foreign countries, and mentioned in Schedule K herein contained, the rates of duties which are by said schedule and paragraphs respectively prescribed, namely:

SCHEDULE K.—WOOL.

First. All wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, llama, and other like animals shall be divided, for the purpose of fixing the duties to be charged thereon, into the following classes:

Second. Class 1, that is to say, Merino, mestiza, metz, or metis wools and including all other wools having any admixture of Merino blood, immediate or remote, Down clothing wools, and wools of like character with any of the preceding, including such as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Buenos Ayres, New Zealand, Australasia, Cape of Good Hope, Russia, Great Britain, Canada, and elsewhere, and also including all wools not hereinafter described or designated. Also Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Down combing wools, Canada long wools, or other like combing wools having any admixture of English blood, immediate or remote, and usually known by the terms herein used, and also all China wools, and similar wools and all hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, llama, and other like animals.

Third. Class 2, that is to say, Donskoi, native South American, Cordova, Valparaiso, native Smyrna, Russian camel's hair, and including all such wools of like character from Turkey, Greece, Egypt, Syria, and elsewhere, excepting improved wools hereinafter provided for, and not including any wools hereinbefore mentioned. But no wool shall be deemed of this class because imported from the places named.

Fourth. From the standard samples of all wools and hair which are now or may be hereafter deposited in the principal custom-houses of the United States, under the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be selected under his direction the standards for the classification of wools under this act, and he shall have the authority to renew these standards and to make such additions to them from time to time as may be required, and he shall cause to be deposited like standards in other custom-houses of the United States when they may be needed.

Fifth. Whenever wools of class 2 shall have been improved by the admixture of Merino or English or other blood, or by domestication or breeding, from their original native character, such improved wools shall be classified for duty as class 1, as the case may be.

Sixth. The duty on all wools and hair which shall be imported washed or otherwise cleansed shall be twice the amount of the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed; and the duty on all wools and hair which shall be imported scoured shall be three times the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed.

Seventh. Unwashed wools shall be considered such as shall have been shorn from the sheep without any cleansing; that is, in their natural condition. Washed wools shall be considered such as have been washed with cold water on the sheep's back. Wool washed or cleansed in any other manner than on the sheep's back as aforesaid shall be considered as scoured wool. And all wools having less than 12 per cent of grease, yolk, dirt, or other foreign matter shall be deemed washed, and wools having any admixture of Merino blood, immediate or remote, and having less than 60 per cent of grease, yolk, dirt, or other foreign matter shall be deemed scoured, and all other wools having less than 40 per cent of grease, yolk, dirt, or other foreign matter shall be deemed washed.

Eighth. The duty upon wool of the sheep or hair of the camel, goat, llama, alpaca, and other like animals which shall be imported in any other than ordinary condition, or which shall be changed in its character or condition for the purpose of evading the duty, or which has been skirted, sorted, or otherwise increased in value by the rejection of any part of the original fleece or otherwise, shall be twice the duty to which it would be otherwise subject.

If any bale or package of wool or hair specified in this act imported as of any specified class, or claimed by the importer to be dutiable as of any specified class, shall contain any wool or hair subject to a higher rate of duty than the class so specified, the whole bale or package shall be subject to the highest rate of duty chargeable on wool or hair of the class subject to such higher rate of duty, and if any bale or package be claimed by the importer to be shoddy, mungo, flocks, wool, hair, or other material of any class specified in this act, and such bale contain any admixture of any one or more of said materials, or of any other material, the whole bale or package shall be subject to duty at the highest rate imposed upon any article in said bale or package.

Ninth. The duty upon all wools and hair of the first class shall be 12 cents per pound, and upon all wools or hair of the second-class 8 cents per pound.

Tenth. Wools and hair on the skin shall pay the same rate as other wools and hair, the quantity and value to be ascertained under such rules as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, but the quantity shall include all, without reference to the length of the staple.

Eleventh. Wools and hair of the camel, goat, llama, alpaca, or other like animals, in the form of roping, roving, or tops, and all wool and hair which have been advanced in any manner or by any process of manufacture beyond the washed or scoured condition, not specially provided for in this act, shall be subject to the same duties as are imposed upon manufactures of wool not specially provided for in this act.

Twelfth. On noils, shoddy, top waste, bur waste, slubbing waste, carded waste, roving waste, ring waste, yarn waste, garnetted waste, and all other wastes composed wholly or in part of wool, and on carbonized noils, and carbonized wools, the duty shall be 30 cents per pound.

Thirteenth. On shoddy, mungo, flocks, and rags, composed wholly or in part of wool or hair, and on cattle hair, the duty shall be 15 cents per pound.

Fourteenth. There shall be levied, collected, and paid upon sheep and lambs imported from foreign countries, except as hereinafter provided, the rates of duty following: On mutton sheep, $2 per head; on stock sheep other than bucks and on lambs, $1.50 per head; on bucks, including lambs for stock sheep, $3 per head.

Fifteenth. Any animal imported specially for breeding purposes shall be admitted free: *Provided*, That no such animal shall be admitted free unless pure bred of a recognized breed, and duly registered in the book of record established for that breed: *And provided further*, That certificate of such record and of the pedigree of such animal shall be produced and submitted to the customs officer, duly authenticated by the proper custodian of such book of record, together with the affidavit of the owner, agent, or importer that such animal is the identical animal described in said certificate of record and pedigree. The Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe such additional regulations as may be required for the strict enforcement of this provision: *Provided also*, That for the period of two years from and after the passage of this act native Mexican ewes shall be admitted free of duty.

Sixteenth. On and after the 30th day of June, commencing one year after the 30th day of June following the passage of this act, the duty prescribed in this act shall be annually increased one-half cent per pound for four years on unwashed wools and hair, and 1 cent on washed and 1½ cents on scoured wools and hair.

Seventeenth. There shall be levied and collected duties on Peruvian cotton, otherwise called vegetable wool, 15 cents per pound, and on other raw cottons 2 cents per pound.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President, this resolution is in the nature of an instruction to the Committee on Finance to incorporate into any revenue bill that may come to that committee from the House of Representatives the provisions of the McKinley tariff act of 1890 relating to duties on foreign wools, with such modifications only, however, as the history of the operation of that act clearly demonstrated to be advisable, not only in the interest of the Government as a means of raising revenue, but also of the sheep and wool industry as a measure of adequate protection.

Since the presentation of the resolution by me a revenue bill has passed the House of Representatives, come to the Senate, and been referred to the Committee on Finance, where it is now awaiting the consideration and action of that committee. As this measure is now within the jurisdiction of the Senate, it will be entirely proper, I take it, to refer to it, analyze its provisions, and suggest amendments. Before doing so, however, I may be permitted to say that, perhaps, since the organization of our Government no important agricultural and manufacturing interest, which for nearly the entire history of that Government had been encouraged and promoted by the vitalizing application of the protective principle, has received such a staggering and deadly legislative blow as was inflicted on the wool industry of the United States by what is known as the Wilson tariff act of 1894. That the effect of the one schedule of this ruinous act by which wool was placed on the free list has already, within the last year, drained our country of many millions in gold to pay for foreign wool, and occasioned a loss to the woolgrowers of this country on wool and sheep alone of more than $100,000,000, are facts susceptible of practical demonstration. And it is equally true if that legislation is permitted to stand on the statute books of this country a few years longer our sheep and wool industry, and especially and within a remarkably short space of time that of the Pacific Coast States and Territories, by reason of the great disadvantage under which it labors by reason of heavy freight rates from ranch to market, will be wholly annihilated.

The advantage which the Australian woolgrowers have over those of the Pacific States and Territories in the one matter of freight rates places the latter at the mercy of the former in the markets of Boston and other Eastern cities. Wool is shipped from Australasia to Boston, including freight, commissions, and all other charges of handling and transportation, for 1 cent per pound; while freight rates alone from most of the shipping depots west of the Rocky Mountains range from 1.3 to 2.5 cents per pound, but this does not include the cost of transportation and charges connected therewith in getting wool from the sheep ranches to the railroad and water depots, to say nothing of commissions which invariably attach to the shipper before his product reaches the manufacturer.

According to a statement in a recent issue of the Chicago American Sheep Breeder the ocean rates on foreign wools are as follows:

From South America to the three principal United States ports, New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, the cost is about $1.17½ per 100 pounds; from Turkey, 70 cents per 100 pounds; from South Africa, $1.15 per 100 pounds; from Russia, 55 cents per 100 pounds; from China, 65 cents per 100 pounds by sailing vessel and 30 cents by steamship; and from London, England, the great dumping ground of the free wools of the world, the current rate is about 25 cents per 100 pounds.

That is but one-quarter of a cent a pound from the great English wool depot.

The opportunity is now presented to correct the flagrant wrong of 1894 and to arrest by appropriate legislation the paralyzing and destructive influence of a policy which has tended with amazing rapidity and startling effect to stimulate and build up the sheep and wool industry of the Argentine Republic, Australia, China, Canada, and other foreign countries, and at the same time destroy this industry in our own country. Last year Congress legislated in the interest of alien lands and alien peoples, and in direct antagonism, in the main, to the interests of American industry and American labor. Let us in these closing hours of the present year call a halt and in our legislative capacity endeavor to rise to the level of the occasion and the demand of the times and legislate in the interest of and for the promotion of the industries and interests of our own people. Let our legislation be in the interest of the labor and capital of our own country, and not for the benefit of alien labor and foreign capital.

Let us not be content with dealing in governmental abstractions. While we would guard with unerring vigilance and with a firm voice and a steady, determined purpose defend at every hazard every vital principle of our Government involved in international and domestic policy affecting territorial rights and interests, it is well if at the same time we would wipe from our statute books every vestige of legislation by whomsoever placed there which stands as a menace to the promotion and healthy growth of the great industries of this country, and which tends to degrade the husbandman, the tiller of the soil, the day laborer of America, to the level of the menial hordes of Asiatic and other foreign countries.

THE POLICY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

The history of legislation in Great Britain bearing upon the wool and woolen industry, running through a period of more than three centuries, sometimes ill advised and oftener otherwise, shows in a most remarkable manner the disposition upon the part of the British Parliament and sovereigns of that Kingdom to protect and encourage the growth of these industries by legislative and imperial decrees, and at the same time indicates in the strongest possible sense the importance placed by the people of that country and their rulers upon the wool industry as a vital element in the promotion of civilization. In all of these various acts which in any manner had any relation to the subject of wool or woolen manufactures the intention was always clearly manifest of promoting home production and home industry at the expense, not only of alien foreign countries, but also very often of her own colonial dependencies.

Prior to the time of Edward III English wool was in large demand on the Continent, where it was excelled only by the Spanish wools, which for ages preceding had supplied Europe with the best cloth-making material known to man, and during this time the export duty levied on wool constituted an important part of the revenues of Great Britain. But Edward III, regarding the policy of permitting wool to be exported from England as a restraint on the development of English woolen manufactures, prohibited by royal decree, under pain of life and limb, the further exportation of English wool, and imposed high rates of duty on imported wool. He imported weavers, dyers, and fullers from Flanders, and, for the purpose of setting an example, he himself wore Flemish cloth.

This character of legislation continued down until the reign of Elizabeth, when the free exportation of English wool was permitted; but in 1660 the absolute prohibition of the export of English wool was again decreed, and this continued for a period of one hundred and sixty-five years, until 1825, when this prohibitory law was repealed. And it is interesting to note the reasons assigned by history for the long continuance of this embargo upon English wool. It is that there existed a belief upon the part of English rulers and of the English Parliament that England possessed the monopoly of the finest kinds of wool, and that by withholding it from foreign competition the home manufacturers would command the markets of the world. It is true this prohibitory policy, which for a time responded to the purposes had in view and stimulated home manufactures, in the end had a contrary effect. It so stimulated the production of wool that eventually, the export being prohibited, it far exceeded the demand for English consumption, and as a necessary consequence the price of the raw material fell.

Smuggling in wool became one of the recognized illicit industries of the time, and, as a result, the industry became disarranged. Then it was that most unusual, extraordinary, and, in a sense, ridiculous measures were resorted to by the English rulers for the purpose of promoting woolen manufactures and stimulating the demand for English woolen products. The manufacture of woolens was absolutely prohibited in Ireland. The most ghastly of these acts, intended to stimulate the demand for English woolens, was an act passed during the reign of Charles II, to the effect that all dead bodies should, under pains and penalties to be inflicted on the relatives of the deceased, be buried in woolen shrouds. And it is a remarkable historical fact that this somber enactment remained unrepealed on the statute books of England for a period of one hundred and twenty years, although it is proper, perhaps, to state that it had long prior to its actual repeal fallen into innocuous desuetude.

So important, indeed, was wool considered by the English people and by the Parliament and sovereigns of Great Britain, as an influential and powerful factor in the development of the civilization of the age, that the historian makes this declaration:

Wool was indeed the flower and strength and revenue and blood of England.

And further:

Until the development of the cotton trade, toward the close of the eighteenth century, the woolen industries were beyond comparison the most important sources of wealth in the country.

But as time went on not only the production of English wool, but the capacity to produce sufficient to meet the English demand fell off, as was the fact in 1825, when the British Parliament provided that colonial wool might be imported free of duty, the duty on colonial wool having been for a long period prior to that date, since 1802, as high as 6d. per pound, and in 1844 the duty was remitted on all foreign wools.

Thus it will be seen the Parliament of Great Britain, with the varying conditions of her manufacturing industries and her domestic and foreign trade, changed from time to time the customs policy of England, but always with an eye single, whether the policy was one of protection or free trade, of export or import duty or no duty at all on wool, to the protection, encouragement, and growth of her agricultural and manufacturing interests rather than the matter of revenue alone.

THE CONDITION OF THE TREASURY.

The present condition of the Treasury, occasioned mainly by the failure of the Wilson tariff act of 1894 to produce sufficient revenue to meet current expenses, and the mad effort to maintain the single gold standard and absolutely eliminate and destroy bimetallism by saddling the taxpayers of this country with hundreds of millions of high interest bearing bonds, has compelled the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to appeal to the Congress in the midst of the holiday season in terms and in tone sounding much like Cæsar's appeal to Cassius, in his extremity:

Help me, Cassius, or I sink!

Whatever may have been the cause or combination of causes which resulted in this unfortunate condition of affairs, the appeal of the President is one which no patriotic man, whatever may be his politics, can disregard.

At all times, under all circumstances, upon every occasion, the credit of this Government must be sustained. Every one of its obligations must be promptly met when due and demanded, at the time, and in the kind of money specified in the contract. Not one of these obligations, even though it cost millions, must be permitted to go to protest. The President's hands must be and will be sustained by Congress in every proper way. The House of Representatives has promptly responded with a revenue bill, and it is here for the consideration and action of the Senate. It should receive the prompt consideration and action of the Senate. But we should not proceed with such a degree of haste in its consideration as to cause us to overlook for one moment great industrial interests which can just as well as not, now that the opportunity is suddenly presented through the emergency to which I have alluded, be properly guarded and protected. While, therefore, providing at the earliest possible moment legislation which will produce sufficient revenue to relieve the Administration of its present embarrassment, other important questions should not be lost sight of in the performance of our patriotic response to the President, and we should so legislate as to relieve from imminent danger of destruction some of the great industries of the country so mercilessly stricken down by the Wilson tariff act.

This necessitates an inquiry into the effect which the operation of the existing tariff act has had, not only on the revenues of the Government, but also on the industries and labor of the country. This I shall attempt to do at this time only in the briefest and most perfunctory manner, and shall postpone more elaborate discussion until the bill is reported from the committee.

THE POLICY OF THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION.

The policy of the present Administration, including, of course, the Wilson tariff act, so far from providing a means of raising revenue, has proven beyond all controversy to be a policy of deficits. For the two fiscal years ending July 1, 1895, the revenues of the Government have been less than the expenditures to the extent of $128,324,524.30, as follows:

First four months, surplus	$329,672.32
Fiscal year 1894, deficit	69,803,260.58
Fiscal year 1895, deficit	42,805,223.18
First four months fiscal year 1896, deficit	16,045,722.66
Total deficit Cleveland Administration	128,324,524.30

But not only so. During the year about to close the deficiency has been constantly growing until now, since July 1, 1893, it reaches the enormous sum of over $133,000,000, $20,000,000 of which amount has arisen during the last six months, and no less than about $2,000,000 of this amount during the present month of December; and still the gap between receipts and expenditures not only does not contract, but continues to expand. And yet the President and the Secretary of the Treasury tell us that none of the fearful embarrassments in which the Administration finds itself in carrying on the ordinary operations of the Government are attributable to a lack of revenue.

This, it seems to me, is a most remarkable claim on the part of the President and the Secretary. And based on such a claim, untenable as it would seem in every particular, the demand is made upon Congress to retire $346,000,000 of legal-tender notes and $140,000,000 of Sherman Treasury notes, all redeemable in either gold or silver coin, by an issue of nearly $500,000,000—to be accurate, $486,000,000—of interest-bearing bonds, not redeemable in coin, but in gold coin. No such character of bonds was ever issued by this Government in all its long history, not even when involved in the terrible convulsions of civil war. And this claim that there is no lack of revenue and this demand for authority to issue bonds come, moreover, after the Secretary of the Treasury has within the past twenty months issued and sold a fraction over $162,000,000 of 5 per cent ten-year, and 4 per cent thirty-year bonds, from which was realized over $182,000,000, and out of one issue of $62,000,000 of which the New York and London syndicate realized some $11,000,000 of profits.

What has become of this money? This is a most pertinent inquiry at this time. If it is claimed that no part of this vast sum

was necessary or was not used to meet current expenses, then that is, it occurs to me, a somewhat disingenuous statement, and one not borne out by the facts. It is simply a play upon words. What are the facts?

With the $182,000,000 realized from the sale of these bonds the redemption of about $182,000,000 of United States legal-tender notes was made; but owing to a lack of sufficient revenue arising from customs duties and excise taxes to meet the current expenses the Secretary was compelled to and did immediately reissue and pay out for the purpose of meeting current expenses about $133,000,000 of the $182,000,000 of these legal-tender demand notes so redeemed. It is undoubtedly true the Secretary had the right under the law, and moreover it was his duty under the law, to reissue these legal-tender notes when required to meet current expenses, but still the great fact confronts us that had our revenue laws been so constructed—and they were not—that a sufficient revenue to meet expenses would have been brought into the Treasury from month to month, then the necessity for the immediate reissue of these $133,000,000 of legal-tender notes to meet current expenses would not have existed.

As the revenue was insufficient to meet such expenses, the immediate reissue of this vast amount of legal-tender notes afforded immediate further opportunity to the New York and London syndicate to draw gold from the Treasury. This opportunity is created by the vicious policy of the Treasury Department, to redeem all notes and demands in gold coin, although by the very terms of such demands they are redeemable, not in gold coin merely, not in silver coin, but in coin; that is, in either gold or silver coin.

The redemption of $133,000,000 legal-tender notes in gold coin arising from the sale of bonds, and immediately paying out this vast sum to meet the current expenses of the Government, is simply equivalent to selling bonds for gold and applying the proceeds in payment of current expenses to meet a deficiency occasioned by a lack of monthly revenue from customs duties and excise taxes for such purpose. When, therefore, the President and his Secretary of the Treasury insist there is no need for raising more revenue by increasing customs duties, they are simply emphasizing a demand upon their part for another issue of interest-bearing bonds. And we are now told the Administration, without awaiting the action of Congress to enact legislation that will supply the requisite revenue to meet expenses, and which would operate as a check on the demands of the gold syndicate, will, before the close of the present year, less than twelve hours of which now remains, issue to that syndicate another $100,000,000, or perhaps greater amount, in bonds, and thus add this additional amount of interest-bearing debt of this Government to that which has already been increased since this Administration came into power to the extent of $168,202,879.55.

The revenue bill recently passed by the House of Representatives and now pending in the Finance Committee of the Senate will, it is estimated, even without amendment, bring in an increase of $40,000,000 a year. Amended, as in my judgment it should be and will be if my vote will accomplish the purpose, by affording wool, lumber, barley, hops, and other agricultural products reasonable and proper protection, it will give an additional revenue annually of $60,000,000, and will at once place a padlock on the "endless chain," so called, by which gold is drawn from the Treasury, will stop all necessity or pretense of necessity for the further issue of bonds in time of profound peace, and will at the same time rescue from impending ruin the wool and other agricultural interests of this country.

This House bill is called "an emergency revenue bill"; and so it is; a bill made absolutely necessary by the condition in which our Treasury has been plunged, mainly by the lack of efficiency of the Wilson tariff act to bring in revenue to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government; and second, by the failure upon the part of the Secretary of the Treasury to meet the avaricious and Government-wrecking demands of the gold syndicate in the manner he should have met such a raid on the Treasury, and that is by exercising the discretion with which the law clothed him, to redeem the notes presented, or offer to redeem them, in coin, not necessarily in gold coin, but in either gold or silver coin, in either of which such notes are by law redeemable.

Such a brave and patriotic stand as this upon the part of the Secretary of the Treasury, authorized as he was and sustained as he would have been by the supreme law of the land, and as I believe, outside of those enveloped by the tainted atmosphere of the Wall and Lombard streets gold syndicate, by the intelligent and patriotic sentiment of the American people, would, in my judgment, have stopped all demand for the redemption in any considerable quantities of legal-tender or Treasury notes. And furthermore, in my judgment, the financial credit and standing of the Government would not have been in the slightest manner adversely affected by such a course; most certainly would such a policy not have affected the financial standing of our Government infinitely as much as does the policy which compels the issue of $50,000,000 or $100,000,000 of bonds every six months in time of profound peace, and which places this country and our Government virtually in the hands of a receiver, composed of a foreign syndicate.

Why even the New York bankers, those of them outside of the enchanted circle of the gold syndicate and who are not permitted to share in its benefits, thoroughly understand this whole business. They know full well it was not the Sherman law, that it is not the greenback that drove or is driving gold from the country by the tens of millions, which has depleted the Treasury of gold, led to bond issues, and involved our Government in deplorable embarrassments. They know, and now frankly admit, that one of the great causes of these financial embarrassments is the insufficiency of our revenue laws, and inferentially they do not hesitate to say that one other great cause is our failure to give full recognition to the money metals of the Constitution, and withholding from one of them the full equal mintage privileges accorded to the other and full legal tender purchasing power and debt-paying functions.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Oregon allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I wish to ask whether it is not a fact that ever since 1879 it has been the custom under all Secretaries of the Treasury to pay the greenbacks in gold when demanded?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. That perhaps has been the custom, but it is a very bad one, in my judgment.

Mr. COCKRELL. Beginning in October, 1891, and never before.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Beginning in October, 1891? Is that the fact?

Mr. COCKRELL. That is the fact.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Then I stand corrected by the Senator from Missouri.

I know that has been the custom during recent Administrations, but I am firmly of opinion that if the demand for the redemption of those notes, coming as it did to a large extent within the last few years, had been promptly met by the Secretary of the Treasury, whoever he might have been at the time, by a statement of the gentlemen presenting the notes to this effect: "I am authorized to redeem these notes either in gold or silver coin; it is not convenient to redeem the whole amount in gold, and therefore I shall either redeem half in gold and half in silver, or all in silver or all in gold, as it suits my convenience and as I am authorized to do under the law," then a stop would have been put at once to any considerable demand for the redemption of the legal-tender notes. That is what I think about it.

Mr. HILL. It is not a question as to what policy the Senator from Oregon thinks ought to have been pursued. That to which I desire to call attention is a question of fact—what has been done by all Secretaries of the Treasury since 1879; and upon that I disagree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL].

I do not recall any criticism of that policy upon the part of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] during his career in the Senate with reference to the Republican Secretaries of the Treasury who pursued that course.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator from Oregon allow me?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. In October, 1893, in response to a telegram sent by me to Secretary Carlisle, he stated that the first Treasury notes of 1890 were redeemed in gold in 1891 by Secretary Foster.

Mr. HILL. I assumed that the Senator was not talking about Treasury notes. We were talking about what are called United States notes—the greenbacks.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I was talking about both. They are both alike so far as the power of redemption is concerned.

Mr. HILL. I assumed that the Senator was talking about United States notes. Now I will ask the Senator from Missouri whether it is not true, so far as the United States notes are concerned, those which are commonly called greenbacks, that since 1879 they have always been redeemed in gold by all Secretaries of the Treasury, when gold has been demanded?

Mr. COCKRELL. They were never presented and there was no demand for gold, and the Senator can not show by the records that such was the case. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] since that time proposed to redeem, retire, and cancel every one of the greenback notes with silver dollars. The amendment is here on record in which he proposed to substitute silver dollars for every one of the greenbacks.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am very much obliged for this contribution.

Mr. COCKRELL. In addition, I wish to say that in January, 1895, Mr. Secretary Carlisle stated to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that if in the beginning the Secretaries of the Treasury had exercised the discretion of paying in silver and gold conjointly it would have operated well

and would have been a great benefit, but that according to all the prophecies it would be dangerous now to reverse the policy.

Mr. HILL. I should like to ask either the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Oregon whether Secretary Foster did not redeem any of the United States notes in gold. Will the Senator from Missouri state as a fact that Secretary Foster did not redeem any of the United States notes and redeem them in gold?

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know. Possibly he may have done so.

Mr. HILL. I understood the Senator to say that it had not been done.

Mr. COCKRELL. It was not done upon demand, and I repeat it. No Secretary of the Treasury, until October, 1891, ever yielded the option to the holder of the note and paid gold regardless of consequences.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will allow me, my point is that the Secretary of the Treasury has repeatedly done so; that it has been the custom to redeem the greenbacks in gold when gold was demanded.

Mr. COCKRELL. The option was never given to the holder of the note until 1891.

Mr. HILL. I am not speaking of what ought to have been done; I speak of it as a fact. I assert that it is the fact, and the records will show it.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am very much obliged both to the Senator from New York and the Senator from Missouri for their contributions to the question.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to make a suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I will yield for a moment.

Mr. STEWART. On the 17th of November, 1891, Secretary Foster, at a dinner at Delmonico's, was interrogated by the bankers, particularly by those bankers who export gold, as to what was to be done under the act of 1890. The provision of the act which puzzled them, and which they regarded as a barrier to the Secretary in his operations, made it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to coin sufficient of the bullion purchased to provide for the redemption of the notes issued under the act. That was the matter which was under consideration at the dinner.

Secretary Foster informed the bankers that it was the policy of the Government to pay gold whenever demanded and that it would do so. Then the President of the United States, in his annual message, referring to this matter, stated that that policy had done much to sustain the business of the country and would be carried out to the full power of the Government. Then the Austrian deal followed.

Mr. HILL. I am glad the Senator from Nevada has made that statement, for it shows that the Secretary of the Treasury not only redeemed the greenbacks in gold, but also the United States Treasury notes.

Mr. STEWART. I did not say anything about greenbacks.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Coming back to the question of revenue and the view taken by leading New York bankers who are not in sympathy with the gold syndicate, I desire to attract the attention of the Senate to the following article, which I find in the Chicago Inter Ocean of November 26 last:

THE NEW YORK BANKERS ON CARLISLE'S FINANCIAL POLICY.

Eli Perkins passed through Chicago yesterday, fresh from Wall street. When asked what the shrewd bankers who handle billions of money were saying about Carlisle and the deficit in the revenue, he said:

"Hepburn, of the Third National; Cannon, of the Chase National; Garland, of the First, listened to Carlisle respectfully, but they didn't take any stock in his theory that greenbacks were the cause of the bad times. Mr. Cannon said to Mr. Carlisle in a private conversation afterwards:

"'No, Mr. Carlisle, we made the innocent Sherman bill a scapegoat once, when we now know the hard times were caused by lowering the tariff. The Government is doing a losing business. We are not earning enough to pay our expenses. We have run behind $300,000,000, and we might as well be honest and say so. Why make another scapegoat out of greenbacks?'

"'We have been using greenbacks,' said the president of the Second National Bank, 'for thirty-three years, and always had prosperity. We had greenbacks and the Sherman bill when we paid off $2,000,000,000 of the national debt. We had prosperity all that time. Now, what we want to do is to raise the revenue high enough to meet our expenses. We must put back that tariff again. We must own up that we have made a wretched mistake and right it as soon as we can. We must quit politics, let money alone, and fix the revenue.'

"George W. Williams, of the Chemical National, said he was sick of dodging the real cause of hard times. He said, with A. P. Hepburn, of the Third National, that we had better put the tariff back on wool and woolen goods.

"'Yes,' said Henry Clews, 'the $81,000,000 we have paid to Asia for wool during the last year took $81,000,000 in gold out of the country, and that gold had to come out of the Treasury. If we had paid that gold to Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, we would have been better off—it would have been here. We are not politicians on Wall street,' continued Mr. Clews, 'we are business men; and when the expenses of the Government in four years are $400,000,000, less our receipts, we must expect gold to go out to pay the balance.'

"'The importers in New York,' said Mr. Perkins, 'are laughing at Carlisle. They know they are buying about all their woolen cloth in Bradford. They know the Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut worsted mills are loaded with unsold goods on which they will have to lose money, and that most of these mills are stopped. They know that the lace factories in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, which made Nottingham lace under the McKinley tariff, are idle, while the Nottingham factories are getting Carlisle's gold. They know the Jersey potteries are stopped and will have to cut wages again before they ever start, and gold that they used to get is going to England and Germany.'"

"Then the Sherman bill and Carlisle's greenback scare are both hoaxes, you think?" was asked.

"Why, of course. But Carlisle hates to admit it. He hates to admit that the Wilson tariff is a failure and if continued long enough will destroy the nation's credit, make wages still lower, stop our mills, and clean the last gold dollar out of the Treasury. Everything we buy in Europe must be paid for in gold, or money as good as gold, and if we buy more stuff from them than we sell we must balance up with gold.

"Yes," continued Mr. Perkins, "we have let the low-wage nations into our eleven-billion-dollar market, and we will never supply their market until we have their low wages, plus the freight. Our 7,000,000 bales of cotton, at $50 a bale, are worth $350,000,000. Our meat and grain is worth $400,000,000. What do we do with the $750,000,000? Why, we send it back to Europe for kid gloves, wool, champagne, silks, laces, pottery, tin, and glass, when we can, and used to, make them at home. The Wilson bill gives Europe our market, but we don't get theirs. We are balancing up with gold, and Carlisle and Grover lie and say hard times and loss of gold were caused by the silver bill and are still caused by the poor old greenback."

While, therefore, believing Congress, irrespective of party, should come to the relief of the Government and the President and Secretary of the Treasury, not, however, by authorizing a further issue of bonds, but by a revenue bill that will provide the necessary revenue, and thus avoid the necessity for a further bond issue, I am heartily in favor of the bill as it passed the House, but with amendments of the character I have suggested. Furthermore, I would favor an amendment striking out the provision which limits its operation to two and a half years. The bill, of course, shall have my support, whether we shall succeed in amending it or not; but there are, aside from its failure to give proper protection to wool and other agricultural products, certain vices in the measure which, in my judgment, should be eliminated, or at least which ought not to receive the sanction of the Republican party, and nothing except a great emergency would excuse, much less justify, the Republican party in giving them its sanction.

First, the horizontal feature of section 4 of the bill is highly objectionable, as it in a measure recognizes—

First. The ad valorem system adopted in the main by the Wilson bill;

Second. The classification of rates in the schedules covered by said section;

Third. It fails to deal fully, as it should, with the free list of the present law; and

Fourth. The act, in my judgment, should not be limited to two and a half years or any other time. If it is a good thing it ought to come to stay; if it is a bad thing we ought not to enact it at all.

The first section of the bill as it passed the House imposes a duty on all imported wools of classes 1 and 2, as defined in the McKinley Act, approved October 1, 1890, and subject to all the conditions and limitations thereof, and on all hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals, except as otherwise provided, and on all noils, shoddy, garnetted waste, top waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, yarn waste, and all other wastes composed wholly or in part of wool, and on woolen rags, mungo, and flocks, a duty equivalent to 60 per cent of the duty imposed on each of such articles by the McKinley Act of 1890.

This provision, should it remain unchanged and become a law, will, it is claimed, give a specific duty of 6.6 cents per pound on these classes of wools, the duty under the McKinley Act being 11 cents. This section further provides that on all wools and Russian camel's hair of class 3, as defined in the McKinley Act, and subject to all the conditions and limitations thereof, there shall be levied, collected, and paid the several duties provided by such act.

This relates to carpet wools, and it restores the full duty of the McKinley Act of 32 per cent ad valorem.

This whole section should, in my judgment, give way to the provisions incorporated in my resolution of instructions to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SQUIRE. I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon whether the all-controlling and important fact in the consideration of a tariff measure at this time is not as to what kind of a tariff measure can probably be enacted into law, considering the fact that we have a Democratic Executive; and whether, taking that fact into consideration, it is not probable that the action which has been taken in the other body has been taken directly with the view of meeting the emergency as to the condition of the Treasury, in view of the fact that the Executive has well-known views on the subject of the tariff, and the great improbability of a thorough and proper Republican measure being enacted into law at this time?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. In answer to the Senator from Washington, I will state that I have no right to know, and if I did know I should have no right to state, what were the motives which influenced the House of Representatives in its action. I only believe that so far as the Senate is concerned we should proceed to do our duty as we understand it, and enact such legislation as we, in our judgment, think ought to be enacted, without reference to the views either of the House of Representatives or of the President of the United States.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. VEST. Has the Senator made any estimate as to the

amount of increased revenue that will be derived from the increased duties upon the wool schedule?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. As levied in the bill which was passed by the other House?

Mr. VEST. Yes; as the bill comes to us.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I have made no estimate myself, but I take the estimate of the House committee, which is about $40,000,000.

Mr. VEST. Not upon the wool schedule.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. On wool alone?

Mr. VEST. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I did not understand the Senator. About $12,000,000 on wool.

Mr. VEST. I think it is $18,000,000.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I think it is $12,000,000.

Mr. VEST. I thought possibly the Senator had made an estimate. I beg leave to state that I differ entirely with the estimate made by the House committee on the wool schedule.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I think it is about $12,000,000, but I may be mistaken. I have not the report before me.

Mr. VEST. My recollection is that it is $18,000,000. However, I only read the report once. But that is a very important consideration in regard to legislation of this kind, and I thought, as the Senator was speaking specifically on the subject of wool, that he had made some estimate of the amount of duties to be derived from this increase.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I speak of the figures of the House committee's report.

HOW THE PRICE OF WOOL HAS BEEN RUINOUSLY AFFECTED BY THE WILSON TARIFF ACT.

The effect of the wool policy of the present Administration must be regarded as commencing to operate, subject, however, to the checks that policy received in the next Presidential election, as of the date of President Cleveland's annual message of December 6, 1887, when he gave sanction to the declaration in favor of free wool contained in the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the previous year, December 6, 1886. That policy, with others of like nature, however, was repudiated and rejected by the American people in the election of Benjamin Harrison as President in November, 1888. Hence the price of wool, while materially depressed in 1888 by this declaration of a free-wool policy upon the part of the President and his Secretary of the Treasury of the previous year, was not affected adversely materially beyond this single year of 1888 immediately following this declaration.

But the price again advanced at once on the election of a Republican President and continued at living rates until the result of the election of 1892 was known, when Mr. Cleveland was again called to the Presidential chair, when prices again went down, and the decline in the price of American wools in the last two years has been an average of 39 per cent. True, this decline can not be wholly charged to legislation placing wool on the free list, but it is chargeable mainly to the combined operating causes of the increase of foreign sheep and the withholding of all duties of foreign wool. Of course there has been a general decline in the prices of all commodities the world over, occasioned in a great measure, as I believe, by the erection and maintenance of the single gold standard. The difference in the decline of the price of foreign wools and that of American wools in the past two years, the decline in the former being 12 per cent and in the latter about 39 per cent, will demonstrate pretty clearly to the satisfaction of any unprejudiced mind to what extent the decline in the price of American wools is chargeable to the free-wool policy of the present Administration.

The following table, taken from the wool circular of Justice, Bateman & Co., of Philadelphia, of date January 1, 1895, is both interesting and instructive, and as an argument against a free-wool policy is unanswerable:

The following table, giving the prices of a few grades of American wool and the corresponding grades of foreign, is arranged to show a comparison of prices here and in Europe on January 1, 1893 (which was immediately preceding the attack upon the McKinley wool duties), and January 1, 1895 (more than four months after the duties were removed). The table also shows the percentage of decline which has taken place in domestic and in foreign wool. The greater fall in prices of American over foreign wools was owing to the removal of the duty on wool. In other words, foreign wools have declined in two years from about 10 to 14 per cent, while the same kind of American wool during the same time has declined about 38 to 40 per cent.

	Quotations Jan. 1, 1893.	Quotations Jan. 1, 1895.	Percentage of decline.
In Philadelphia:			
Ohio XX, washed	28½	17½	38.6
Ohio medium, washed	33½	20	40.3
Fine Territorial	17	10	41.2
In London:			
Average Port Philip, grease	17½	15	14.3
Average Australian, crossbred	19	17	10.5
Average Cape, grease	12	10½	12.5

I also beg to insert at this point, from the circular of Justice, Bateman & Co., the following statement and table of prices showing rates at different dates.

PRICES THEN AND NOW.

After one year's experience with free wool prices are still lower than at this time last year, when the new tariff law went into effect, as will be seen by the following Table A, giving a number of the principal grades of American wool, none of which are higher, while the majority are from 1 to 2 cents per pound lower than at this time last year:

TABLE A.—*Comparison of prices September 1, 1894 (when the free-wool bill was passed), with September 1, 1895 (one year after).*

	Sept. 1, 1894.	Sept. 1, 1895.	Lower.
Ohio:	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
XX washed	20½	18½	2
Medium	22	21	1
Coarse	23	22	1
Fine unwashed	14	14	
Indiana and Missouri:			
Fine unwashed	12½	12	½
Medium unwashed	16	15	1
Coarse unwashed	17½	17½	
Oregon and Colorado fine (shrunk 70 per cent)	10	10	

In order to show how domestic wool prices compare after one year of actual practice with each of the last two tariff laws, we publish in Table B the prices for the principal grades of American wool on October 1, 1891, when the McKinley law had been in force one year, and the prices at this date, when the Wilson law with free wool has been in force one year. In the outside column is the number of cents per pound that wool is lower after one year of actual trial with free trade than after one year of actual trial of McKinley protection. Below the quotations for American wool will be found the London quotations of similar grades of foreign. It will thus be seen that the leading grades of American wools under free trade were from 7½ to 15 cents per pound lower on fleeces and from 15 to 27½ cents per pound lower on scoured under one year of free trade than under one year of the McKinley law, while foreign wools were either unchanged or only from 1 to 2 cents per pound lower.

TABLE B.—*Comparison of prices for leading grades of American wool September 1, 1895 (about one year after the passage of the Wilson free-wool bill), with prices for the same grades in October, 1891, about one year after the passage of the McKinley law.*

American wool (Philadelphia and Boston prices).	Oct. 1, 1891 (one year of McKinley law).	Sept. 1, 1895 (one year of free wool, Wilson-Gorman law).	Lower
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
XX Ohio washed	30½	18½	12
Ohio—			
Medium washed	36	21	15
Coarse washed (one-fourth blood)	33	22	11
Fine unwashed	21½	14	7½
Indiana and Missouri—			
Fine unwashed	20	12	8
Medium unwashed (one-half blood)	27	15	12
Coarse unwashed (one-half blood)	25	17½	7½
Oregon and Colorado fine (shrunk 70 per cent)	18½	10	8½
XX Ohio scoured	65	39½	25½
Ohio medium scoured	60	35	25
Ohio one-fourth blood scoured	44	29	15
Oregon and Colorado fine scoured	61	33½	27½

For the purpose of showing the effect of the Wilson tariff act upon importations, I beg to submit the following table, taken from an article prepared by Albion E. Shepard, of Texas, believed to be reliable, and indorsed by the National Wool Growers' Association:

Table showing the increased importations of wool and woolens in the first year of the present "tariff for revenue" over the last year of a "tariff for protection"—excess of imports of raw wool, manufactures of wool, shoddy, etc., reduced to raw wool.

Imports of raw wool for first year free-wool law, ended August 31, 1895 ..... pounds	249,496,058		
Imports of raw wool for last year McKinley law, ended August 31, 1894 ..... pounds	58,678,677		
Excess of imports of raw wool			Pounds. 190,817,381
Imports of manufactures of wool, exclusive of shoddy, waste, etc., for the first year of the free-wool law, ended August 31, 1895	$45,858,428		
Imports of manufactures of wool, exclusive of shoddy, waste, etc., for the last year of the McKinley law, ended August 31, 1894	$15,884,260		
Excess of imports of manufactures of wool, exclusive of shoddy, waste, etc.	$29,974,168	=	89,922,504
Imports of shoddy, waste, rags, noils, etc., for the first year of the free-wool law, ended August 31, 1895	$17,666,563		
Imports of shoddy, waste, rags, noils, etc., for the last year of the McKinley law, ended August 31, 1894	$210,404		
Excess of imports of shoddy, waste, rags, noils, etc	$17,456,159	=	Pounds. 52,368,477
Excess of importations of raw wool, manufactures of wool and shoddy, waste, etc., represents in pounds of American unwashed wool displaced by foreign wool			333,108,362
American wool clip sheared in June, 1895			264,000,000
Excess of imports of wool over American wool clip of 1895.			69,108,362

The following table, from the Bureau of Statistics, illustrates the effect of the Wilson Act on foreign importations of wool and woolens. This table covers but ten months of each year. The foregoing covers the full year ending August 31 of each year:

Imports for ten months.	1894.	1895.
Raw wool ..... pounds..	83,223,270	211,057,088
Shoddy, etc ..... do....	1,081,441	17,823,008
Carpets ..... square yards..	265,314	829,423
Clothing ..... dollars..	673,088	1,296,210
Cloths ..... pounds..	5,317,056	34,573,887
Dress goods ..... square yards..	32,761,465	25,976,470
Knit woolens ..... dollars..	593,669	1,988,349
Shawls ..... do....	69,553	370,264
Yarns ..... pounds..	383,985	3,383,285
All other woolens ..... dollars..	542,235	1,919,785

THE RUINOUS EFFECTS OF THE FREE-WOOL POLICY.

The damaging effects of this free-wool policy have been exemplified in a multiform manner. It has damaged flockmasters, who, having become discouraged by reason of the policy, have driven their sheep to the slaughterhouse and abandoned the business, thus diminishing rapidly and vastly the number of sheep and the amount of wool produced, and, as a further result, throwing out of employment hundreds of thousands of men, herders, shearers, and others connected with the industry.

Again, it has, while reducing the product, reduced the price. January 1, 1894, according to reliable statistics, we had in this country 45,048,017 head of sheep, while on April 1, 1894, there were 43,501,904, and the estimated number at the present time is only about 40,000,000, or a decrease in the number of sheep in this country in the last two years, under the free-trade wool policy of this Administration, of over 5,000,000 head.

According to the official report of the comptroller's office of the State of Texas the number of sheep in that State in 1893 was 3,366,257, valued at $4,776,848; while the number in 1895, the present year, is but 2,386,822, of the value of but $2,442,162, or a falling off in number in the last two years of 979,435 and in value of $2,334,686.

But still further. According to this same report the average price per pound of wool in the State of Texas in 1892 was 15.72 cents; while in 1893 the average price was but 9.82 cents; in 1894, 7.44 cents, and in 1895, 7.89 cents.

In the State of Ohio, according to the memorial of the National Woolgrowers' Association, there were on January 1, 1894, 3,765,704 head of sheep; while on April 1, 1894, under the threat of free wool, this number was reduced 112,271; and in the past two years it is alleged the woolgrowers of that State have lost in the value of sheep about $6,000,000 and in the value of the wool clip of 1894 below a fair price more than $2,000,000.

In the State of Oregon, according to the report of the Department of Agriculture, the value of sheep has decreased from $5,903,182 in 1893, but two years ago, to $2,945,905 in 1895, or a decrease in value in two years of free-wool policy of $2,957,297.

The following table shows the values, respectively, of sheep in the three years 1893, 1894, and 1895 in nine States and three Territories:

THE EFFECT OF FREE WOOL ON VALUE OF FLOCKS.

The official reports from the Department of Agriculture show the following values of flocks, January 1:

Locality.	1895.	1894.	1893.
Montana	$4,227,400	$4,891,895	$6,528,560
New Mexico	2,692,898	3,689,169	4,101,948
Utah	2,998,885	3,098,480	5,036,022
Oregon	2,945,905	4,433,403	5,903,182
Nevada	1,316,667	1,164,162	1,347,092
Colorado	1,984,058	2,396,295	3,105,803
Arizona	901,081	1,209,681	1,306,978
North Dakota	616,701	754,073	1,173,699
South Dakota	532,969	759,642	1,066,608
Idaho	1,299,770	1,753,981	1,910,655
Washington	1,304,360	1,989,796	2,328,130
Wyoming	2,004,107	2,606,284	3,300,255
Total value	22,824,801	28,746,861	37,108,932

Decrease from value in 1894	$5,922,060
Decrease from value in 1893	14,284,131

FREE WOOL DOES NOT GIVE CHEAPER NOR BETTER CLOTHING.

We are told free wool gives the poor man cheap woolen clothing, but the very same law that provides for free wool and takes from the farmer and woolgrower all protection imposes a duty of 42.82 per cent on woolen manufactures—this upon the basis of the importations of 1893—thus giving protection to the manufacturer of nearly 50 per cent, and on the Democratic theory that the tariff is a tax to be paid by the consumer, imposing a tax to this amount on the backs of the people who wear woolen goods.

As bearing upon the question of free wool bringing cheap clothing and better clothing by excluding shoddy, the theory having been urged that foreign wool would be so cheap that the temptation to make shoddy would be removed, it is a fact worthy of note that shoddy importations have been overwhelmingly increased under the free-trade policy, and much of it doubtless finds its way into our domestic product.

The following extract from the memorial of the National Wool Growers' Association (Senate Document No. 17, present Congress), which bears upon the subject of imports of shoddy, is interesting, and I ask to incorporate it in my remarks:

The total imports of shoddy, waste, rags, etc., under the McKinley law were as follows, in pounds:

October, 1890		406,681
November, 1890		9,396
December, 1890		47,492
January, 1891		5,319
February, 1891		10,001
March, 1891		59,542
April, 1891		22,701
May, 1891		11,576
June, 1891		21,828
Total for nine months		594,536
Year ending June 30—		
1892		262,992
1893		333,376
1894		143,002
July, 1894	12,008	
August, 1894	4,854	
September, 1894	1,653	
Total for three months		18,515
Total imported under McKinley law		1,352,421

And the following, on the subject of shoddy, is from the wool circular of Justice, Bateman & Co., November 1, 1895:

"In our last circular we showed an increase of over 17,000,000 pounds in the imports of shoddy, waste, etc., during the first year of the Wilson law.

"The entire amount of these wool adulterants imported under the four years of the McKinley law was but slightly over 1,300,000 pounds, but the imports in the first year of the Wilson law were over 17,600,000 pounds. The increase in the year ended September 30, 1895, over the previous four years was over 16,300,000 pounds, a quantity greater than all the clean scoured wool that was produced last year from our two largest woolgrowing States."

The Philadelphia Press of November 2, 1895, gives the following:

"A prominent woolen manufacturer, writing on this shoddy question, says:

"'The wool contained in all forms of waste is washed and scoured wool, and most of it has been one or more times spun, woven, and, in the case of shoddy, worn out, and perhaps respun and rewoven and reworn out.

"'While these facts deprive the wool of its staple or length, destroy its adhesive "kink," and render the cloth which is made of it relatively "rotten" and worthless, at least so far as it is used in the way of warp, they do not deprive it of the advantage it possesses relatively to new wool of having been washed and scoured, and therefore counting each pound as 3 pounds in its rivalry with unwashed and unscoured wool in the quantity of cloth it will make. Hence every pound of these "wastes" displaces 3 pounds of American wool in the quantity of cloth it will make, and only 1 pound of American wool in the length of time the cloth will wear. The real price of the shoddy for each pound of the raw wool which has entered into it is therefore only 4 cents a pound, instead of the 12 cents which the Record thinks makes it so respectable.

"'American farmers and the American Congress are likely to say before long whether 4-cent wool in 12-cent shoddy is the sort of stuff which they care to see substituted for American flocks. What it will mean in clothing will be that American working men and women will soon be clad in woolen clothing which will fall off their backs in the first rain. General Sherman declared that this was the kind of clothing the free-trade tariffs of 1846 and 1857 gave the soldiers when they first went into the Army in 1861. But by the time the war closed, he said, they were all clad in American woolens, made of American wool, which would defy a hundred storms.'"

The eminent secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, in an article in the bulletin of the association for June, 1895, says:

"Practically all the wool that passes into daily consumption comes back again into the mills in the course of time, revamped as shoddy or mungo or 'wool extract,' to again pass into consumption in a cheaper grade of goods. The life of the wool fiber is long; it is converted and reconverted until it finally disappears. No approximate estimate is possible of the amount of old wool which takes the place of the new, but it is enormous, and grows larger yearly as the mechanical methods of handling it improve."

THE PERILS OF GOODS MADE OF FOREIGN RAG SHODDY.

A reliable authority treats of the perils of goods made from these adulterants as follows:

"Shoddy always was, now is, and always must be, an unwholesome article of dress. It is made from waste woolens, the rags worn by foreign lepers, discarded from hospitals, or worn out on the backs of beggars being no small part of its makeup. No shred of wool is too frayed, too coarse, or too dirty for conversion into shoddy. The rags of the mop that has cleansed the floor of the most loathsome saloon on which the drunkenest of the lowest class of residents of a great city have trodden and spat, the cast-off stocking of the dirtiest tramp, the skirt of the most diseased drab that walks the streets in nightly quest of whom she may allure, all go to the shoddy mill, and all come out as material for the manufacture of 'cheap clothing, all wool.'

"Under tariffs that were as protective of health as of industry heavy duties were laid on the importation of foreign shoddy and of the foreign rags from which American shoddy is made. All this is changed, so that during the twelve months ended August 31, 1895, the vast amount of 17,666,563 pounds of shoddy and of rags for its manufacture were imported to the United States, against no more than 201,404 pounds in the preceding year.

"From this plague and possible pestilence that the Wilson bill has invited to our shores delivery is needed. Heavy duties should be laid upon foreign shoddy and foreign rags, or, if the President refuse to sign a bill designed to prevent further increase of this dangerous class of importation, Congress at

least should enact a law that will compel venders of shoddy-made goods to label them as shoddy. No one should be in danger of infection to himself or family by the purchase of garments made of contaminated shoddy, but purchased as 'cheap all-woolen goods.'"

THE INEQUALITIES OF THE WILSON TARIFF ACT.

The Wilson tariff act of 1894, said to have been enacted in the interest of the people and to reduce taxation, takes from foreign wool duties to the amount of a fraction over $8,000,000, but imposes a tax of over $40,000,000 on the sugar which every man, woman, and child in the country consumes more or less of every day, and this is called a reduction of customs taxation in the interest of all the people.

But not only so. The Wilson tariff act, while denying to the farmer all protection on wool, imposes duties equal to ad valorem duties on clean rice of 83.89 per cent; cotton manufactures, 36 to 45 per cent; woolen cloths, flannels, etc., 40 to 50 per cent; dress goods, 50 per cent; carpets, 30 to 40 per cent; bar iron, 27.22 per cent; iron ore, 22.97 per cent; iron beams, 49.76 per cent, and pig iron, $4 per ton.

THE EFFECT OF THE WILSON ACT ON AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

The effect of the Wilson tariff act during the short time it has been in operation, in increasing agricultural importations and diminishing agricultural exports, is clearly indicated by the following table from the latest Statistical Abstract.

Agricultural imports.

	Last year of McKinley law.	Last year of Wilson law.
Animals	$966,359	$2,121,524
Breadstuffs	2,297,027	2,895,297
Eggs	161,328	341,284
Flax	1,101,347	2,545,610
Feathers	910,981	3,077,955
Fruits	4,659,364	5,335,499
Hay	846,739	1,658,331
Hemp	266,352	632,468
Hides	10,480,562	24,623,269
Hops	582,875	601,188
Provisions	$1,824,709	$2,037,535
Rice	2,566,089	3,497,166
Seeds	2,361,813	7,146,504
Tobacco	13,005,715	14,389,381
Vegetables	3,083,400	3,858,770
Wool	6,299,934	32,589,791
Total	51,414,844	107,343,522

Agricultural exports.

Hay	$924,916	$800,000
Hops	3,752,215	1,849,898
Vegetables	2,072,974	1,775,551
Oil cake and meal	9,442,045	8,070,032
Seeds	8,038,558	2,972,242
Corn	31,207,331	19,032,404
Wheat	67,793,497	52,339,232
Flour	78,062,212	59,226,244
Provisions	169,831,131	155,493,283
Total	371,124,879	301,558,885

Our loss in the export trade on these sixteen agricultural products is about 20 per cent, while there has been an increase in the imports of these products coming in direct competition with the like products of the American farmer of nearly 100 per cent.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART. From the tenor of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, in speaking of the decline in the price of wool, it might be inferred that he attributed all of that decline to the reduction of the tariff. There has been a decline in all commodities in this country in the past three years to a very large extent, and I suppose 15 or 20 per cent would be a moderate estimate. I inquire of the Senator if wool would not be affected as other commodities, the tariff to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Undoubtedly, and I distinctly stated, as the Senator would have known if he had listened carefully, that I did not attribute the decline in the price of wool wholly to tariff legislation.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Nevada makes the Senator from Oregon state that there has been a decline in the price of wool since the passage of what is called the Wilson Act. Does he make that statement?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. That there is a decline in the price of wool?

Mr. VEST. Yes; in the market of New York—the principal market.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I certainly do, unqualifiedly.

Mr. VEST. In all classes of wool?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The tables which I shall incorporate in my remarks fully bear out my statement.

Mr. VEST. That there has been a decline in all classes of wool?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Yes; in all classes of wool, and particularly in those classes in which this country is most interested.

Mr. VEST. Since the passage of the Wilson Act, as compared with the prices in preceding years?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. VEST. As compared with prices under the McKinley Act, which of course had effect up to the time the Wilson law went into operation in August, 1894? Do I understand the Senator to state that the prices have fallen since that act took effect?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I say the prices have fallen, and they commenced falling, as the statistics show, as soon as the threat of free wool was made by the incoming Administration; in fact, as soon as it was known that Mr. Cleveland had been elected President of the United States a decline followed. There have been some occasional upward spurts in the price of wool, but, taken on the whole, there has been a decline in price of 39 per cent in American wools.

In 1892 we imported only $36,000,000 worth of woolen goods, while in the present calendar year the importations will exceed $60,000,000.

According to the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, the production of wool in this country in 1894 was 54,000,000 pounds less than it was in 1892.

A CHINESE DANGER.

It is not, perhaps, generally known that the wool industry of America is being seriously threatened, not only from the rapid increase in the production of sheep in the Argentine Republic, Australia, Canada, and some European countries, but also in China.

Twenty-five years ago there were no imports into this country of China wools. In 1870 there were 9,016 pounds of China wool imported, of the value of but $1,312, the import price per pound then being 10.45 cents; whereas in the present year (1895) the imports of China wool have reached 26,089,418 pounds, of the value of $1,699,414, the import price per pound being 5.15 cents. This China wool, moreover, has been demonstrated to be equal to our low-grade of merino wool.

The following table indicates the rapid increase in Chinese wool imports:

Year.	Quantity.	Value.	Import price per pound.
	Pounds.		*Cents.*
1870	9,016	$1,312	10.45
1880	66,751	9,188	13.76
1890	8,587,575	814,264	9.48
1893	20,753,893	1,812,250	8.74
1894	10,186,264	818,157	8.03
1895	26,089,418	1,699,414	5.15

THE WILSON ACT HAS DRIVEN MILLIONS OF SHEEP TO THE SLAUGHTER-HOUSE.

The annual increase in the slaughter of sheep in this country during the last two years has been immense. The four great slaughterhouses of the West are Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Omaha. In 1886, prior to the passage of the McKinley Act, the aggregate number of sheep slaughtered at these four points was but 979,000, while in 1894 the number was 3,564,000, or nearly treble the number of only eight years before. In 1885 Chicago alone slaughtered only 743,000 sheep, while in 1894 2,766,000 were killed, or nearly four times the number of nine years previous.

The four great Eastern cities, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, slaughtered 3,274,000 sheep in 1890, but increased the number slaughtered four years later, in 1894, to 4,079,000.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS NOT BENEFITED BY FREE WOOL; EUROPEAN MANUFACTURERS BENEFITED BY IT.

The manufacturers of this country must surely realize by this time that their interests are not advanced by free wool. It is recently authoritatively stated that 1,000,000 pounds of South American wool and half a million pounds of Montana wool were recently exported from Boston to Bradford, England. Why is it? Simply because our manufacturers have been unable to compete with foreign mills. Our factories are not prospering, not running, as a rule, on full time, but on short orders, while the English mills are running on full time and on full orders for home consumption and export. The price of foreign wool has been advanced, and they are thus enabled to ship wool from Boston to Bradford.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me an observation?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator makes the suggestion that probably the manufacturers of woolen goods in this country have ascertained that free wool is not desirable. I want to say to the Senator that a little time ago some of our New England manufacturers were clamoring for free wool, but at the present time it is

an impossible thing, I think, to find a single one of them who does not want the duty on wool restored.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to say furthermore that two months ago I met an intelligent Englishman in the city of Manchester, N. H. He said to me that he was representing certain woolen manufacturing establishments in England, and he knew of a great many large establishments in that country that would not accept an order for woolen goods to be delivered prior to January 1, 1897. He said their mills were running day and night, and they did not care very much for additional orders, while our woolen mills in New England are on the verge of bankruptcy, and are praying that the duty on wool may be restored, and of course they believe that we ought to have a compensatory duty on woolen manufactures.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his statement. It confirms all for which I contend.

THE MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE WOOL INDUSTRY.

It will not do to underestimate the magnitude or attempt to minimize the importance of the wool industry in this country. It is of infinitely too much importance in a variety of senses to be overlooked in legislation. An industry which engages more than 1,000,000 men, aside from hundreds of thousands of employees, owning over 40,000,000 sheep, of the value, under normal conditions, of more than $150,000,000, and including lands and fixtures for sheep husbandry, with a total capital of $500,000,000, giving to labor, including services of flockmasters, $85,000,000 annually, with an annual product in wool, mutton, and pelts, at fair prices, of more than $110,000,000, is one which deserves a better fate than receiving a fatal legislative blow at the hands of the American Congress, as it certainly did in the free-wool provisions of the Wilson tariff act.

CONCLUSION.

Had the wise provisions relating to wool incorporated in the act of March 2, 1867, been permitted to stand, with only such modifications from time to time as the changed condition of the country warranted—had the modification of 1883 never been made, it is more than probable that our annual product would to-day be equal to our consumption. Estimating on the basis of the increase of sheep in this country during the sixteen years that act was in operation, it is confidently claimed by those thoroughly conversant with the subject that now, instead of 40,000,000 sheep, we would have in this country not less than 110,000,000, producing, instead of 264,000,000 pounds, the product of 1895, 650,000,000 pounds of wool. What a saving of gold which goes to foreign countries each year to pay for imported wool this would have been, to say nothing of the manifold blessings an industry of that character and magnitude would be to the people of this country.

But a glance at the other side of the ledger, based on strong probabilities also, will show a widely different state of affairs. Continue the free-wool heresy indefinitely, and what inevitably must be the result?

First, the sheep industry of this country, now discouraged and languishing, will eventually and at no distant day be entirely annihilated, except, perhaps, as to occasional small flocks on still smaller farms. The mutton supply of our country will vanish. Instead of importing, as we do now, one-half the wool we consume we will soon be compelled to import all.

Another result will undoubtedly follow. The foreign flock masters, having thus obtained absolute control of our market, will advance the price of wool; the woolen manufacturers of the country will be at the mercy of the foreign wool producer; the price of woolen cloth will advance, and our country will be annually drained of millions of gold to pay for foreign wool.

I desire to have printed as a part of my speech, and as its conclusion, a communication signed by William Lawrence, president of the National Wool Growers' Association, of date December 26, 1895, received by me this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, such will be the order of the Senate.

The communication referred to is as follows:

WOOLGROWERS—JUDGE LAWRENCE ON THE WOOL TARIFF—AN INTERESTING STATEMENT ON IT—THE PROPOSED TARIFF AND THE AMOUNT OF PROTECTION IT GIVES.

BELLEFONTAINE, OHIO, *December 26, 1895.*

To the Woolgrowers of the United States:

The National Wool Growers' Association held a session of five days in Washington, D. C., commencing December 4, and agreed on a memorial to Congress, printed as Senate Document No. 17, which can be procured from members of Congress. It did not reach the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in time to enable them to fully consider it, and the committee, deeming it necessary to speedily report a tariff bill, declined to give the woolgrowers an oral hearing. The bill reported by the committee and passed by the House this day prescribes as duties on merino wool 60 per cent of the rates of the McKinley Act of 1890, or 6.6 cents per pound unwashed, and on class 3 wools the ad valorem rate of that act, 32 per cent on the only wools that will be imported under the bill if it becomes a law.

To those who do not understand the operation of the act of 1890, the new bill apparently gives the specific rate mentioned. The McKinley Act gave a duty of 11 cents per pound on unwashed merino, 22 cents per pound on washed, and 33 cents on scoured. Most people supposed this gave protective benefit to the woolgrowers of these rates, and certainly Congress intended, and woolgrowers so expected. But it is shown in the memorial (page 49) that the "protective benefit" was in practice on merino similar to that grown in Ohio only 6 cents on washed and 13½ on scoured, in competition with the Australian merino. This was the result of two causes, first, the fatal "skirting clause," which added all of 2 cents to the value of each skirted pound, and saved most of the expense of "sorting," shown to be nearly one-tenth of the pay roll in some factories. (Memorial, page 47.) The second cause was the light shrinkage in scouring of Australian merino.

Thus the nominal duty of 11 cents on unwashed was in practice only equal to 6 cents in favor of Ohio washed, and not more than 4 or 5 cents on much of the wools of Texas and the Western States. The nominal duty of 6 cents in the new bill will only give a protective benefit of 3.6 cents on Ohio washed merino, and from 2 to 2.5 cents on much of the Texas and far West State wools. This is no protection at all. Inadequate protection is no better than free wool. Evidently the Committee on Ways and Means for want of time and mature consideration did not understand this, or their bill would have been so framed as to give some measure of protection.

The report of the Committee on Ways and Means says their bill will give "6.6 cents per pound on unwashed wool." This proves they did not understand its effect.

But this is not the worst feature of the bill. When Mr. McKinley reported the tariff bill of 1890 it proposed specific duties of 2.5 cents and 8 cents, according to value on third-class wools. The bill reported by Senator ALLISON in 1888 as a substitute for the Mills free wool bill proposed specific duties of 2.5 cents and 6 cents, according to value. But certain carpet manufacturers succeeded in getting an ad valorem duty of only 32 per cent in the act of 1890 on such wools as are now chiefly imported as third class. These wools produce more ruin to our woolgrowers than all others. They supplant our American merino and the long wools of the mutton breeds. Their imports in the fiscal year 1895 were 144,488,265 pounds, while the imports of all other wools for consumption were only 121,237,612.

These wools are of such light shrinkage that they would equal nearly 200,000,000 pounds of our unwashed merino. Of these imports in 1895 there were of China wools 26,089,418 pounds, at an import price of only 5.15 cents per pound. This is a new and the cheapest source of supply, almost unknown prior to the act of 1890. The import price of all third class from August 28, 1894, to June 30, 1895, was only 9.13 cents. The duty of 32 per cent on China wools would be less than 1.65 cents per pound, and, on an average of all, would be only 2.92 cents, and this is on wools shrinking in scouring not over 40 per cent; so that the protective benefit of the new bill on our unwashed merino is less than 2 cents per pound.

The China wools, by reason of light shrinkage, would supplant the use of 40,000,000 pounds of unwashed merino. The memorial, page 38, produces evidence that these wools are used in the manufacture of clothing goods, and that "fashion" has made it popular to use the very coarse wool goods.

American woolgrowers can not compete with these wools, imported at these low prices and with these low duties. The report of the committee says "the duty on carpet wools is left at 32 per cent ad valorem, as we raise very few carpet wools." The law does not describe any "carpet wools," because all wools are now used to make clothing goods. We do raise carpet wools, and can raise all needed, as shown in our memorial, page 76. The report says the bill is framed "mainly on revenue ground." Why, then, did not the committee adopt as a temporary expedient the less than low revenue rates of the bill in our memorial, page 218? The committee bill does give protective rates to iron and other industries, but not to wool.

The report says the bill gives manufactures "a compensatory duty equivalent to the duty on wool." The fact is it is largely more than an equivalent. Woolgrowers are discriminated against. Since the McKinley Act was passed the prices of wools in all foreign countries have declined materially. See memorial, page 60, etc. This, of course, was not foreseen when the McKinley bill was passed.

A new law should meet these new conditions. By reason of the combined operation of these causes—(1) the skirting clause; (2) the light shrinkage of Australian merino; (3) the new and enlarged use of third-class wools for clothing goods, formerly used only for carpets, and (4) the decline in the world's wool prices—the McKinley Act ceased to accomplish the purpose intended by it. Under it prices of wools constantly declined, and the inevitable result would soon have been a failure to secure prosperity to American sheep husbandry. Even in Texas, where the cost of growing wool is as low if not less than any other State, sheep declined in numbers from 4,218,812 in 1890 to 2,859,269 in 1894.

These new and unexpected results and conditions call for increased protection, not for reduction. The duties of the act of 1890 are now even less than low-revenue duties. No other industry has suffered from such a combination of causes of ruin, and hence the new bill should have recognized this fact and made provision accordingly. The new tariff bill gives the ruinous ad valorem duties to woolgrowers, the specific duties to all other industries. Why continue this unjust discrimination?

Under the new bill most other industries can live by reducing wages, but under it the wool industry is doomed to ruin only a little less speedy than by free wool. Woolgrowers in every State are urged to send delegates to appeal to the Senate to amend the bill. I remained in Washington for three weeks, until refused a hearing before the committee on December 24. I will return again to Washington on January 20, when the National Woolgrowers' Association will again meet. I am in receipt of letters so numerous that I can not answer all, and take this method of stating what has been done and what remains to be done. Papers friendly to justice for woolgrowers are requested to present the facts to their readers.

If the new bill becomes a law, wool growers can never get adequate wool duties. It is an outrageous wrong to woolgrowers. Enough of Eastern wool manufacturers to defeat us will repeat the cry, "Give the tariff a rest!" while they prosper and our wool industry will be in ruins.

The Ohio Wool Growers' Association will meet at Columbus January 15, 1896, to act on the subject. Let there be a full attendance at this the most important meeting ever held.

WILLIAM LAWRENCE,
President of the National Wool Growers' Association.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

Mr. ELKINS. Will the Senator from Minnesota permit me to offer a resolution?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

SALE OF BONDS.

Mr. ELKINS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that hereafter no bonds of the United States shall be sold at private sale or under private contract. And in case of any sale of bonds under existing laws, the same shall be made only after due advertisement of such sale and proposals invited, and then only to the highest bidder.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. VEST. Let the resolution be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the resolution will be printed, and go over under the rule.

Mr. VEST subsequently said: I ask that the resolution offered by the Senator from West Virginia be read. I could not hear the reading of it, and that is the reason why I asked that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be again read.

The Secretary again read the resolution submitted by Mr. ELKINS.

Mr. HILL. I think the terms of the resolution might in some way reflect upon the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], who, when Secretary of the Treasury, was constantly making these private contracts; and he being absent, I think the resolution had better lie over.

Mr. ELKINS. I think the Senator from New York ought to allow the Senator from Ohio to speak for himself. If the Senator wants to object to the resolution, let him do it openly.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely competent to speak for himself.

Mr. ELKINS. I think so.

Mr. HILL. But the Senator from West Virginia does not seem to quite see the point of the criticism.

Mr. ELKINS. I do not, I confess.

Mr. HILL. I can not explain it further than I have done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution offered by the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HILL. Let it lie over.

Mr. SEWELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the resolution will lie over.

THE FINANCIAL SITUATION.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask leave to submit a few remarks on the resolution of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], which I understand to be still before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will proceed.

Mr. NELSON. It is conceded on all sides that our currency is in an unstable and embarrassed condition. Various causes are assigned for the disorder and various remedies are prescribed. The silver men affect to believe that the source of the difficulty lies in the suspension of the free coinage of silver, and on all occasions, out of season as well as in season, they urge, as an ample and plenary relief, the unconditional and unlimited free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, regardless of the course that other nations may take in the premises. The President and Secretary of the Treasury, on the other hand, ascribe all our financial ills to our paper currency, especially to our Treasury notes, commonly called greenbacks; and they urge and insist that substantial relief can be obtained only by the permanent retirement of these notes, even if it has to be done without substituting other paper currency in their stead.

Since we resumed specie payment in 1879 the integrity of these notes has, in part, been sustained by a gold reserve, the amount of which has been fixed by custom rather than by law at $100,000,000. And it is this fact—that these notes have been used as the apparent instrument to effect large withdrawals of gold from the Treasury—that forms the basis and ground of the claim for their permanent retirement.

While these notes have been the instrumentality they have not been the real cause for such withdrawals. The causes are other, lie deeper, and have not been confessed nor disclosed by the President or Secretary. Neither of them has pointed out the true source and origin of the gold withdrawal.

The right of issuing proper money and making it a legal tender is one of the most important attributes of sovereignty, inherent in every free and independent nation, and it is a right which no nation should ever forego or abdicate. This is the lesson of history, and one of the important and never-to-be-forgotten lessons taught us by our great civil war.

The people prefer in their daily business and for their everyday wants a paper rather than a metallic currency. Our own conscious experience in the transaction of commerce and trade, the great volume of our check and clearing-house currency, and the make-up of our circulating medium leave no doubt on this point.

On the 1st day of November, 1895, our total money circulation was $1,598,859,316, and was made up of the following items:

Gold coin	$475,181,593
Silver:	
Standard dollars	58,354,092
Subsidiary	63,832,759
Notes:	
United States	$338,986,280
Treasury, act July 14, 1890	114,526,669
National-bank	207,364,028
Certificates:	
Gold	50,417,659
Silver	333,456,236
Currency	56,740,000

While the foregoing statement shows that there was gold coin to the amount of $475,181,593 in circulation—that is, outside of the Treasury vaults—yet scarcely none of it was in active use in traffic or in transit from hand to hand like other money, but nearly all of it was hoarded by the banks, national and State, as a part of their reserve.

If the people are content with and desire to use a convertible paper currency as money, as working capital, with a proper gold redemption reserve, the use of the excess of paper over the gold reserve is, under ordinary and normal conditions, a saving and a profit which ought to inure to the Government and to the whole people and not to private parties.

Treasury notes are the noninterest-bearing demand notes of the Government, redeemable on presentation in gold. They maintain themselves in circulation under normal conditions, not so much because the Government has the actual gold on hand to redeem on demand at one and the same time every outstanding paper dollar as because of confidence in the resources, the Administration, the business methods, and the integrity of the Government.

The gold in the vaults is only a part of the reserve for the outstanding circulation. The chief reserve is confidence in the Government. It is so with the National Treasury; it is so with the banks. And whenever the Government handicaps itself so as to suffer a loss of confidence, so as to diminish this reserve, the burden shifts to the metallic reserve, and that becomes the chief point of tension; and this is precisely what the Government has done within the last three years.

From the time of the resumption of specie payment, in 1879, till the year 1894, the receipts of the Government largely exceeded its expenditures. The aggregate of such excess for the five years next preceding 1894 was $242,611,467. Since that time—since the end of the fiscal year 1893 up to the end of December, 1895—the expenditures of the Government have exceeded its income to the extent of $128,390,388.70.

From the time of the resumption of specie payment until the end of the fiscal year 1894 the balance of trade, under our then existing system of tariff protection, was, with the exception of a slight adverse balance for three years, largely in our favor. The total aggregate of such balance of trade in our favor for the entire period was $1,622,683,859, which was equal to an annual average of $101,417,741.

Since 1894 the balance of trade has been against us. For the ten months ending October 31, 1895, the aggregate of such balance was $31,057,171. In short, since 1894 the country has labored under an adverse balance of trade and under an insufficient revenue, both superinduced and brought about by the tariff law of 1894.

In 1893 an era of hard times set in, which has continued with but slight improvement ever since. I shall not here undertake to enumerate the various causes which brought about this condition. Some were, undoubtedly, of a political nature, and arose from a change of Administration and a threatened change in the then existing revenue and tariff system. The situation, too, was aggravated by a forced inflation of silver currency under the act of 1890, but this cause was removed more than two years ago by the repealing act of November, 1893. This act would have perhaps afforded substantial and permanent relief had the industrial situation not been threatened and afflicted with another danger.

In 1894, notwithstanding the great depression still existing in all industrial and manufacturing enterprises, and at a time when, above all others, confidence and rest from disturbing and hostile legislation were needed, the country was afflicted with a long-drawn-out legislative tariff contest, which finally culminated in the so-called Wilson-Gorman tariff law of 1894. And it is under this law and as a result of the same that we now have an insufficient revenue, and, worst of all, an adverse balance of trade. This legislation and these results have undermined that confidence which is even more valuable than a gold reserve.

As long as we had an ample revenue and an ample balance of trade in our favor there was but a limited and moderate withdrawal of gold. Public confidence guarded the vaults of the Treasury. From July 1, 1879, to July 1, 1892, the total withdrawal was only $43,310,896, while during the year ended January 28, 1895—the year of the tariff agitation and tariff legislation—there was a withdrawal of over $172,000,000. And since that time, except during the period when the country was under the protecting wings of the bond syndicate, who reaped a golden harvest of over $8,000,000, the withdrawals have been at an equally rapid rate.

So that now we are again face to face with another bond issue, on perhaps even more unfavorable terms than the last one; and at a time when another loan was so imminent the money-loaning syndicates have been favored with a war scare to give them a plausible and apparently fair excuse for exacting higher rates and more severe terms.

From July 1, 1892, till December 1, 1895, the withdrawals of gold from the Treasury amounted to the sum of $360,266,512, and the entire export of gold from the country during that period amounted to $305,617,419, showing that only $54,649,093 of the withdrawals found a lodgment and were hoarded in this country. Thus it appears that this heavy and continuing demand upon our gold supply comes not from our own people, but from foreign countries, and it comes from there not so much from want of confidence—for they are to-day as anxious to take our Government bonds as ever—as to meet an adverse balance of trade. And by this balance of trade I mean not only the matter of merchandise, but I also include the whole system of credits. The balance of trade between our country and foreign countries is the difference between what we pay them and what we receive from them upon all current transactions, whether in credits or in merchandise.

It is estimated that we have to pay Europe yearly from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 in dividends and interest on mortgages, stocks, and bonds. Add to this an adverse balance in the matter of merchandise alone of upwards of $40,000,000 a year, and also take into account the large sums spent abroad by American tourists, and it is safe to say that even under normal conditions we have an adverse balance of at least $100,000,000 a year which we have to liquidate in the universal money of the world—gold. This balance is often abnormally increased when investors, either as a matter of speculation or for the purposes of change, or through a panicky feeling, call in or sell their stocks, securities, and bonds. This adverse balance of $100,000,000 a year or more upon credits alone we overcame and more than liquidated by the balance of trade in our favor upon goods and merchandise in the five-year period next preceding 1894, which balance, as I have already pointed out, was more than $100,000,000 of annual average.

It was this fact, the fact that our merchandise exported in those years more than liquidated the credit balance against us, that limited the withdrawals of gold in that period to such a moderate quantity as compared with the period following.

Our currency system was no better then than now—in fact, not as good, for we were then laboring under the load of a forced silver inflation, a burden of which we were relieved more than two years ago. Is it not clear—clear to all candid minds who are disposed to look beneath the surface of things—that it is this ever-increasing adverse balance of trade that is the ultimate and controlling force which impels gold withdrawal and disturbs our financial system? It is this hostile balance of trade, and not the now downtrodden greenback, that caused the great outflow of gold in 1894 and 1895. Had the balance of trade been ever so little in our favor, the stream of gold would inevitably, as by the law of gravitation, have flown our way. Our claims against foreign countries in those two years have been insufficient to liquidate their claims against us, and we have had to make up the difference in gold; hence the outflow.

Manifestly and palpably, then, our greenbacks have been the instruments and not the real cause of gold withdrawals. Had these instruments not existed, others would have been found. The burden would simply have shifted to other shoulders.

Our national-bank notes are, under existing laws, redeemable in greenbacks, or in so-called Sherman notes; in fact, in any legal-tender money. But if the greenbacks and the Sherman notes are retired, are destroyed, then the national-bank notes will become redeemable in gold, and their 25 or 15 per cent reserves and their 5 per cent redemption fund will all have to be made up of gold, and they will have to bear nearly all the gold burden which the Treasury now bears on behalf of the greenbacks and the Sherman notes.

International balances would still have to be liquidated in gold, and importers and others having occasion to use gold for shipment abroad would then, armed with national-bank notes, draw the money from these banks instead of from the Treasury, as now. The burden which this great Government of ours, with all its resources and great credit, has staggered under would be more than the banks could bear. Within two or three years, under the existing adverse balance of trade, they would succumb and inevitably have to suspend specie payment, for in four or five years at the present rate the entire gold supply would escape from the country and the banks could not, like the Government, replenish their vaults by the recurring sale of bonds to foreign syndicates, for the "endless chain," of which we have heard so much, would still exist, but not where the Administration places it. It will exist until the balance of trade upon the aggregate of all our transactions with foreign countries is restored to our favor. Selling bonds to foreign syndicates increases the credit balance against us by the annual interest charge and ultimately by the principal—to meet which, unless we can overcome it with a merchandise balance in our favor, we shall have to ship gold abroad.

The outward flow of gold can not be stopped permanently either by the sale of bonds to foreign syndicates nor by the retirement of the greenbacks and other Treasury notes. The flow can only be permanently and steadily checked by restoring the ultimate balance of trade in our favor. For years to come Europe must of necessity continue to have upon our stocks, mortgages, and bonds a large credit balance in her favor. This balance we should meet and overcome, not by the shipment of gold, but by the balance of traffic in merchandise in our favor. Our tariff and revenue laws should be so adjusted as to leave us a creditor rather than a debtor nation, with a merchandise balance sufficient to meet and liquidate the adverse credit balance, and with a revenue ample to meet all the expenses of the Government. Ample revenues and a clear balance of trade in our favor can alone stop the flow of gold and effect permanent and substantial relief.

To shift the entire gold burden from the Government to the banks at this time would be a most hazardous experiment. In the present situation and under existing conditions no institutions and no interests are more vitally interested in the continued existence of the greenback dollars or would be so injuriously affected by their permanent retirement as our own national banks. They can now say what they could no longer say if the policy of the Administration should prevail, "I know that my redeemer—the greenback—liveth."

To retire at this time the greenbacks and the 1890 coin notes would not only lead to the dangerous consequences I have already pointed out, but to make such retirement without making suitable provisions for a sound paper currency of equal volume to take the place of the retired notes would lead to a contraction of our currency almost as fatal and as dangerous as the contraction which would result from the isolated free coinage of silver on the ratio of 16 to 1. In the one case $500,000,000 of paper currency would be driven out of circulation—a currency, too, much better liked by the people at large than any other—and in the other case $560,000,000 of gold would disappear and the parity of our currency would be destroyed. But while I believe it would be hazardous, especially at this time, and unjust and unwise to shift the entire gold burden from the Treasury to the banks, yet I think that as a matter of justice and fair play, and as a matter of self-interest and self-protection, the banks should share a part of the gold burden with the Treasury.

The Government has granted to them a part of its sovereign attribute, that of issuing notes and circulating them as money, and with this prerogative they should also carry the burden justly incident to a sound paper currency, that of redeeming their notes in gold. They are in a shape to assume this burden now, for with a circulation of about $213,000,000 they carry a gold reserve of over $160,000,000. Let them convert the 5 per cent redemption fund into a gold fund, and maintain it as such, and let their 25 and 15 per cent reserve be a permanent gold reserve. By this plan they would merely be carrying the gold burden incident to their own paper, while the Government would still be carrying the gold burden incident to $346,000,000 greenbacks, $141,000,000 coin Treasury notes, and $343,000,000 silver certificates.

In round numbers, out of a total paper currency of $1,000,000,000, the banks would be carrying about one-fifth of the gold burden and the Government four-fifths. It is strange that neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor the Comptroller of the Currency, while they have advocated so many currency reforms, have never thought of advising or recommending that the banks bear their just, fair, and proportionate share of the gold burden.

In consideration of the banks assuming this burden, they should be permitted to carry a circulation equal to the par value of the bonds deposited, and the tax upon their circulation should be reduced to one-fourth of 1 per cent. The banks ought to be willing for the purpose of fortifying the Government in protecting and maintaining our vast paper currency on a parity with gold, especially at this juncture, to assume their fair proportionate share of the burden.

Aside from a few extremists here and there, the great body of the American people are not hostile to the banks. We sometimes, some of us, feel that they are not always as patriotic as they might be, and that sometimes they are a little selfish and lack a little of the milk of human kindness. But be this as it may, for better or worse, they are a part of our financial system, and we are anxious to have their cooperation and aid, especially now, in maintaining the integrity and greatness of our common country at home and abroad. Now is the accepted time.

As a feeble, but honest and well-meaning spokesman of the common people, I hope that the banks will rise to the emergency that is now upon us, and will be willing to bear their just share and portion of that gold redemption burden incident to the integrity of our paper currency. Take your share of the burden voluntarily and with good grace, and then the American people will never

permit the Administration to cast the entire gold burden of the country on your shoulders.

Mr. President, on behalf of the common people of this country I beg leave to enter this brief, plain, and unvarnished plea to the indictment preferred by the Administration against our greenbacks—that currency that was so near and so helpful to us in the days of our greatest adversity, the days of 1861–1865.

During the delivery of Mr. NELSON's remarks,

The PRESIDING OFFICER said: The Senator from Minnesota will kindly suspend for a few minutes. It becomes the duty of the Chair, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, to place before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed.

Mr. MILLS. I ask so, too.

Mr. HOAR. What is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the unfinished business will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during the sessions of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is asked that the Senator from Minnesota may finish his remarks.

Mr. PEFFER. And that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And that the unfinished business may go over without prejudice. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Minnesota will proceed.

After the conclusion of Mr. NELSON's remarks,

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon said: I move that the resolution which I offered be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

SALE OF BONDS.

Mr. SEWELL. I withdraw my objection to the resolution offered a short time since by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS].

Mr. ELKINS. The Senator from New Jersey having withdrawn his objection to the resolution, I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from West Virginia has offered this most extraordinary resolution at this time. An objection was made by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] to its present consideration, and then subsequently withdrawn. The Senator from West Virginia desires its present consideration. I desire simply to state why I do not think it should be entertained, and I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a moment. The other House has passed a bill which is now in the possession of the Finance Committee of this body. I do not know whether it is to be reported within a very reasonable time or not.

Mr. ALDRICH. Unquestionably it will be reported either adversely or favorably.

Mr. HILL. I said within a reasonable time.

Mr. ALDRICH. Unquestionably.

Mr. HILL. That leaves a pretty wide margin, Mr. President. The Senator from West Virginia undoubtedly thinks that there may be some delay possible in the reporting of that bill, because he has seen fit to offer this resolution now. I read a clause from that bill:

> Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall offer any of the bonds authorized for sale by this act or by the resumption act of 1875, he shall advertise the same and authorize subscriptions therefor to be made at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States.

That covers all the points suggested in the resolution now presented for consideration. I conceive no good reason why the resolution should be taken up at this time and pending the consideration of the bill which we are assured by the Senator from Rhode Island is very soon, in some form or other, to be reported to the Senate.

Mr. President, for that reason and because of the further reason that if it should be considered I desire to offer some remarks to the Senate upon the general subject involved in the resolution and in the bill, and there is no time to-day—for those reasons altogether I object to the consideration of the resolution to-day.

Mr. ELKINS. If in order to do so, I shall move to take up the resolution notwithstanding the objection of the Senator from New York.

Mr. ALDRICH. I take it for granted that a motion to take up the resolution would not now be in order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Such a motion can not be entertained. The resolution having been introduced to-day, an objection carries it over.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 3, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 31, 1895.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read, corrected, and approved.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under Rule XXIV, clause 2, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report in reference to commerce passing St. Marys Falls Canal, Michigan, during the season of 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Attorney-General, transmitting a list of judgments of the Court of Claims in Indian depredation cases; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Letters from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the findings filed by the court in the following-named cases; which were referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed:

George H. Woolwine, administrator, against The United States;
William B. Lynch, administrator, against The United States;
H. Harrison Beeler against The United States;
David P. Atkinson against The United States; and
N. W. Nelms, administrator, against The United States.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LEWIS for two weeks, on account of important business.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed, under the direction of the Department of the Interior, 6,000 copies of a paper contained in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Director of the United States Geological Survey, entitled "The public lands and their water supply," together with the accompanying maps and illustrations, of which number 1,500 copies shall be for the use of members of the Senate, 3,000 for the use of members of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 for the use of the Geological Survey.

It also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there be printed 500 copies of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Soldiers' Home and 500 copies of the report of the Assistant Inspector-General of State Homes, for the use of the officers of said National and State Homes; 150 copies of each of said reports to be bound in the usual form.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. COX, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw the papers filed before the Committee on War Claims in the matter of the Episcopal Church at Franklin, Tenn., without leaving copies, there being no adverse report.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McMILLIN: A bill (H. R. 3114) to amend the internal-revenue laws of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 3115) to establish a foreign commerce commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLIN: A bill (H. R. 3116) to repeal the tax on the circulation of banks other than national banks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 3117) fixing the compensation of the United States district attorney and the United States marshal for the district of Minnesota—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3118) to amend chapter 132 of the statutes of the United States of America, passed at the second session of the Fifty-third Congress and approved July 12, 1894—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 3119) to erect a post-office building in the city of Mount Sterling, Montgomery County, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3120) for dredging and widening the channel of the Big Sandy River, in Kentucky, between Richardson, in Lawrence County, and Pikeville, in Pike County—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3121) to provide for holding terms of the circuit and district courts of the United States for the district of Kentucky at Jackson, in said district, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3122) to complete the lock and dam at the Three Forks of the Kentucky River, in Kentucky—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 3123) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1895—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3124) to amend section 34 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3125) to provide for the construction of a public building at Butte City, Mont.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3126) providing for disposal of lands on abandoned portions of the Fort Assinniboine Military Reservation, in Montana, and for the relief of certain settlers thereon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 3127) to do justice to all Union soldiers and sailors who were confined in rebel prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 3128) authorizing appeals in certain cases from the decisions of the Comptroller of the Treasury—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 3129) to establish and provide for the maintenance of a free public library and reading room in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 3130) to provide for a military peace establishment—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 3131) granting pensions to acting assistant surgeons, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 3132) to amend section 5191 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3133) to amend section 3 of an act "fixing the amount of United States notes, providing for a redistribution of national-bank currency, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3134) to amend sections 8 and 10 of an act entitled "An act to enable national banking associations to extend their corporate existence, and for other purposes," approved July 12, 1882—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3135) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend sections 5191 and 5192 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1887—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3136) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Grand Haven in the State of Michigan—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Joint resolution (H. Res. 61) to provide for the payment of the force of Truck Company D, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 3137) for the relief of the heir or heirs of John Howard Payne—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BENNETT (by request): A bill (H. R. 3138) removing the charge of desertion from the record of John T. Faulkner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 3139) for the relief of M. R. William Grebe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 3140) for the relief of Samuel B. Younglove—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3141) for the relief of George W. Dunning—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 3142) for relief of S. D. Herndon and to place his name on regular pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 3143) granting a pension to James O'Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 3144) for the relief of Thomas J. Miller, of the State of Washington—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3145) for the relief of Robert Williams, sergeant of ordnance, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3146) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue an honorable discharge to H. R. Calkins, late of Company B, First California Veterans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3147) granting to soldiers and sailors of late war military land warrants—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 3148) to do justice to the Home Guards of Scott County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HATCH: A bill (H. R. 3149) increasing the pension of Frank Hight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3150) increasing the pension of George Lambert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3151) increasing the pension of John Nicodemus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 3152) granting a pension to Charlotte A. Welton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3153) granting a pension to William H. Byrum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3154) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Campbell, of Donegal, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3155) granting a pension to Annie E. Park—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 3156) for the relief of Jacob Kern—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 3157) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Harris Handshoe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3158) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of R. L. Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3159) for the relief of the soldiers of the Three Forks Battalion of Kentucky—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3160) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of W. H. Kindrick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3161) for the relief of Mrs. Joyce B. Shoemaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3162) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of John W. Faulkner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3163) removing the charge of desertion from William L. Peeples—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3164) granting a pension to Russel M. Reynolds—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3165) granting a pension to Henry W. Schroder—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3166) granting a pension and arrearage of pension to George B. Merchant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 3167) for the relief of Julius Austrian—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 3168) to increase the pension of John D. Terry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCMILLIN: A bill (H. R. 3169) for the relief of Howard Female College, Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3170) for the relief of George W. Conatzer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3171) for the relief of Jackson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3172) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Granville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3173) for the relief of Miles F. West, of Macon County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 3174) for the relief of Joseph K. Pitts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3175) for the relief of James W. Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 3176) to remove the charge of desertion against James Crowley, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3177) granting a pension to Mary Allard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER: A bill (H. R. 3178) for the relief of R. H. Hoffman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 3179) for the relief of the estate of Elias N. Conway, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 3180) for the relief of Mathias Pedersen—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3181) for the relief of Barnaby Du Charme—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 3182) granting an honorable discharge to Wylie Scoggins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3183) to increase the pension of Mrs. Grace Harrington—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3184) to appoint a commission to report and determine upon certain damages done to citizens of Lauderdale County, Ala., by the building of the Muscle Shoals Canal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3185) to pension John Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 3186) for the relief of John Sachs and Frederick Rhine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3187) to pension Frances Jones, widow of Lieut. Col. Toland Jones, of One hundred and thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3188) for the removal of the charge of desertion against William Wardell, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 3189) to increase the pension of J. S. Cochenour—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of Stewart Sanderson, of Shelby, N. Y., praying for a test of a steam ram invented by him—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: Petition of Hon. T. O. Torroson and 445 others, asking for an appropriation for the harbor at Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of Anderson Merchant, requesting the removal of his political disabilities—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Sallie K. Lawing, asking that she be granted a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petition of C. E. Babcock and 27 others, of Necedah, Wis., in favor of the passage of the bill to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska: Memorial and resolution of the State council of the American Protective Association of Nebraska, praying the acknowledgment of belligerent rights of the Cuban insurgents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TERRY: Petition of Francis H. Conway, as administrator of the estate of Elias N. Conway, deceased, for relief, and Exhibits A 1 to A 7, inclusive—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McLAURIN: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, S. C., urging the passage of the bill introduced by Senator SQUIRE, "providing for fortification and other seacoast defenses"—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of G. L. Jones and others, of Shell Lake, Wis., for the nationalization of transportation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *January 3, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last was read and approved.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in compliance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 24, 1891, the annual report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification for the year ended October 31, 1895; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 24, 1895, calling for information with reference to the continued improvement of the Columbia River between the mouth of the Willamette River and the city of Vancouver, in the State of Washington, a letter from W. P. Craighill, Chief of Engineers, together with a copy of a report with map from Maj. James C. Post, Corps of Engineers, upon the subject; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN RIVER CANAL, FLORIDA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 9, 1895, calling for information as to the condition of the canal on Indian River authorized to be built by the State of Florida, a letter from W. P. Craighill, Chief of Engineers, together with a copy of the report from Maj. Thomas H. Handbury, Corps of Engineers, upon the subject; which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

Mr. HAWLEY. The law provides for an annual report of the National Academy of Sciences, and there is also a permanent statute providing for the printing thereof. I have the honor to send to the desk the annual report for 1895.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will lie on the table and be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PEFFER. I present the petition of J. W. Evans and other citizens of Kansas, praying that the inclosed bill to retire national-bank notes and to substitute Treasury notes in their place be enacted into a law. I move that the petition and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PEFFER. I also present a petition of C. P. Taylor Post, No. 378, Department of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation allowing a service pension of $8 a month for soldiers of the late war who served ninety days or more and received an honorable discharge. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. I present a petition of citizens of Portage, Berlin, Oshkosh, Fond du Lac, Neenah, Menasha, Appleton, Kankauna, Depere, and Green Bay, representing the manufacturing and commercial interests of the Fox River Valley in Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the use of water in Lake Winnebago and the Lower Fox River. The petition contains much valuable information, and I move that it be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Duncannon, Pa., extending their sympathy to Armenian subjects in Turkey, and promising a hearty support to our Government in any steps that may be necessary to vindicate the principles of humanity; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Amesville, Ohio, and a petition of the Chicago (Ill.) Congregational Club, praying that protection and security be granted to American citizens in Turkey and that redress be obtained for injuries committed upon them; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Methodist preachers' meeting of Columbus, Ohio, representing 25 pastors and 10,000 members, praying that an investigation of the labor problem be made with a view to industrial arbitration; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Methodist preachers' meeting of Columbus, Ohio, representing 25 pastors and 10,000 members, praying that the age consent in the District of Columbia be raised from 16 to 18, and that the ninety-day divorce law of Oklahoma Territory and the divorce law of Arizona Territory be repealed; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Methodist preachers' meeting of Columbus, Ohio, praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law and the enforcement of a law for compulsory education at the national capital; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Patrons of Husbandry of California, praying for the construction and control of the Nicaragua Canal by the Government; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

Mr. CHANDLER. I present sundry petitions of citizens of Alabama, one from Jasper Parker and 16 other legal voters of Coffee County, another from M. A. Conan and 30 other legal voters of Etowah County, another from E. M. Kirby and 38 other legal voters of Jackson County, and another from Thomas Brigden and

44 other legal voters of Walker County, praying for the establishment of a republican form of government in Alabama, which, they say, does not now exist. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Seattle, Wash., concerning the improvement of the waterway connecting the waters of Puget Sound at Salmon Bay with Lakes Union and Washington by enlarging the waterway into a ship canal. The petitioners represent the great commercial importance of the completion of the improvement already begun. An appropriation has been heretofore made for the improvement, and they ask for an additional appropriation of $500,000 for the continuance of the work by the Government, giving the reasons therefor. I move that the petition be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a petition unanimously adopted by the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., requesting Congress to grant belligerent rights to the people of Cuba who are struggling for their independence, thereby placing them on an equality with the Spanish. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present the petition of Francis O'Bannon, of Fredericktown, Mo., verified by his affidavit, praying for a reference of his claim for military stores to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act. The petition is accompanied by letters from the Quartermaster-General and the Commissary-General, and the affidavits of Thomas Williams and Emanuel Smith. I move that the petition and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for protection to woolgrowers and duties compensatory and protective on manufactures of wool; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Duncannon, Pa., extending their sympathy to Armenian subjects in Turkey, and promising a hearty support to our Government in any steps that may be necessary to vindicate the principles of humanity; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VEST presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., praying Congress to grant belligerent rights to the people of Cuba struggling for their independence; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY.

Mr. MORRILL. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next. Mr. President, permit me to say that I hope at that time the Committee on Finance will be able to report both the House bond bill and the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1305) to grant a service pension to officers and enlisted men who served in the late war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1306) to authorize and encourage the holding of a transmississippi exposition at the city of Omaha, in the State of Nebraska, in the year 1898, and making an appropriation therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on International Expositions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1307) authorizing the retirement of certain officers of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 1308) granting a pension to the widow of the late Rear-Admiral John Jay Almy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLARK introduced a bill (S. 1309) to amend section 11 of an act approved July 10, 1890, entitled "An act to provide for the admission of the State of Wyoming into the Union, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1310) granting an increase of pension to Shubeal Gould; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1311) granting an increase of pension to Dudley F. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 1312) to aid in the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. William Smallwood and the soldiers of the Maryland Line in the war for American independence; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1313) for the relief of Anna M. Anderson and Charles Y. G. Anderson, executors of George W. Anderson, deceased, late of Washington County, Md.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1314) for the relief of Francis Scala; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1315) to redeem outstanding certificates issued by the board of audit and the board of public works of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HALE. I introduce a bill to facilitate the construction and maintenance of telegraph cables in the Pacific Ocean for the use of the Government in its foreign intercourse. It is a more elaborate form of the movement initiated in the last Congress. I ask that the bill may lie on the table, and I shall call it up early next week for the purpose of making some explanation before it is referred.

The bill (S. 1316) to facilitate the construction and maintenance of telegraphic cables in the Pacific Ocean for the use of the Government in its foreign intercourse was read twice by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1317) to grant certain lands to the city of Colorado Springs, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1318) granting a pension to Samuel K. Williams; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I file with the bill a report from the Auditor for the War Department explaining the military record of the beneficiary. I move that the bill and accompanying paper be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1319) for the relief of Francis M. Owens; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present a letter of the Secretary of the Navy of December 30, 1893, with a copy of a letter of the Judge-Advocate-General of the United States Navy of July 19, 1893, and the military record of Mr. Owens in the Eighth Kentucky Cavalry, with affidavits of H. L. Keesee, captain, and John L. Lamb, second lieutenant, Company B, North Cumberland Battalion Kentucky State Troops; the affidavit of C. H. Dyer and J. H. Lasasta as to Mr. Owens's character, and certificate of the assistant adjutant-general of Kentucky as to his enlistment and muster out of said company and battalion. I move that the bill be referred, with the accompanying papers, to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1320) to confirm the title to certain lands in William Morgan and Harrison Moore and to require the issue of patents therefor; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present certain papers—a report from the Commissioner of the General Land Office and an abstract of the title to the lands situated in the State of Kansas. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1321) for the reorganization of the Medical Department of the Navy on the basis of the organization of the Medical Department of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1322) granting a pension to William A. Buck; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1323) granting a pension to Maria Somerlat, widow of Valentine Somerlat; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1324) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of William H. Howard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1325) confirming to the patentees, their heirs and assigns, portions of sections 3, 4, 5, and 6, in township 2 south, of range 20 east, of the sixth principal meridian; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1326) for the relief of Eli Fox, George C. Fox, and Thomas Levick; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1327) granting a pension to Stalnaker Marteney; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1328) granting pension to soldiers and sailors of the late war, and providing pensions to their widows and minor children; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TURPIE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1329) granting a pension to John R. Watson;
A bill (S. 1330) granting a pension to James Gilmore;
A bill (S. 1331) granting a pension to David Melton;
A bill (S. 1332) for the relief of Michael Lynch;
A bill (S. 1333) granting a pension to George Heishman;
A bill (S. 1334) granting a pension to Sarah J. Hunton; and
A bill (S. 1335) for the relief of John Veeley.

Mr. MILLS introduced a bill (S. 1336) for the relief of John Mellifont and Ellen Riordon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1337) relating to the sale of gas in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 1338) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Durham, in the State of North Carolina; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BRICE introduced a bill (S. 1339) authorizing and directing the International Deep Waterways Commission to make certain additional inquiries and investigations and a report; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1342) granting pension to Lena D. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1343) granting an increase of pension to Enoch G. Adams; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 1344) providing for the selection of the lands within Fort Pembina Military Reservation, N. Dak., by the State of North Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 1345) setting apart a portion of the Fort Keogh Military Reservation in the State of Montana, for the purpose of an industrial school for Indian children, for the establishment of such school, for an appropriation for its establishment and maintenance, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1346) to reimburse the State of Montana the sum of $120 for fees erroneously expended in certain land selections; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HOAR. I introduce (by request) a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to confer the right of suffrage on women. While I am in favor of conferring the right of suffrage on women, I have supposed that it would be hardly worth while for Congress to make a proposal of that kind to the States, which would require the assent of three-fourths of the States, until a larger number of the States have adopted it for themselves, as they have a right to do. But I introduce the joint resolution out of respect to the petitioners.

The joint resolution (S. R. 38) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

Mr. SQUIRE. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be read at length.

The joint resolution (S. R. 39) making an appropriation to defray the joint expense of locating the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and the British North American territory was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in view of the expediency of forthwith negotiating a convention with Great Britain for marking convenient points upon the one hundred and forty-first meridian of west longitude where it forms, under existing treaty provisions, the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and the British North American territory, and to enable the President to execute the provisions of such convention without delay, when concluded, the sum of $75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available, under the direction of the President, to defray the share of the United States in the joint expense of locating said meridian and marking said boundary by an international commission.

Mr. SQUIRE. Mr. President, I will state in explanation of the joint resolution that the people of the Pacific Coast desire a speedy settlement of the boundary question in Alaska. I have had representations made to me on that subject of the most urgent character. People whose homes are in the State of Washington are engaged in mining in the Territory of Alaska. They are engaged in transporting supplies for their subsistence while conducting their operations in mining. Others are engaged in trading as merchants between the ports on Puget Sound and the ports of Alaska.

From a report publihsed by the Coast Survey in 1893 I quote the following extracts, as showing the extent and importance of this great Territory:

It is regrettable that our sources of information for late Alaskan statistics are confined to the brief summaries of the governor's reports, and that for a comprehensive study of all the wealth-producing industries of the Territory we have to go to the publications of the census for 1890.

The extraordinary growth of this but partially explored Territory, with its valuable resources on land and the almost limitless wealth in its waters, demands greater attention than has heretofore been accorded it, and makes imperative that general and comprehensive aids to its navigation and commerce be supplied.

This vast region contains about 600,000 square miles, being about twelve and a half times the area of the State of New York. It has approximately 26,000 miles of shore line, which exceeds that of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts of the United States by over 11,200 miles, while the islands along its coast are estimated to be 1,100 in number. A course parallel with the trend of its shore from Cape Muzon, its most southerly point, to Point Barrow, its most northerly one, is about 2,800 miles. The Aleutian chain of islands is about 1,100 miles long, and Attu, the most westerly one of this group, is about 2,200 miles west of Sitka.

There are immense forests in Alaska, densely covering every part of the country and climbing steep mountain sides to heights of 2,000 and 2,500 feet above sea level, and which extend as far west as Kadiak Island, being a continuous stretch of a thousand miles.

They consist mainly of spruce, hemlock, and cedar, one variety of the latter, the yellow, being very valuable in the construction of small vessels on account of its durable qualities.

The commerce of Alaska is and doubtless always will be carried on by water, owing to the peculiar formation of the country; and being so varied and largely conducted by nonresidents and by vessels hailing from so many different ports, it is difficult to obtain an exact idea of its extent. The internal commerce is carried on through about 126 agencies, located in 104 towns and settlements, situated along its coast and among its islands.

The exports consist mainly of furs, ivory, Indian curios, gold and silver bullion and ore, and the products of the whale, cod, and salmon fisheries.

During the earlier occupancy of the country its commerce depended almost exclusively on the fur trade, but since other industries dependent upon the actual necessities of man sprang up this important factor, although of great value, has already fallen to a third place in importance. From 1868 to 1891 the total value of the furs exported is estimated at $50,124,500, and the annual yield for the last-mentioned year amounted to about $1,605,000.

In 1892 there were sixteen gold and silver mines in operation, and up to that date the total output amounted to about $6,000,000. The traffic dependent upon the necessities of the small army already engaged in this comparatively new enterprise is considerable and will undoubtedly increase.

The salmon industry commenced in 1878, and from that date up to 1890 the pack had amounted to $9,612,000. In 1878 the entire product was valued at $59,416, while that of 1890 was $2,731,000. The salmon-canning industry of this country is confined to the waters of California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska. In years past the Columbia River has been the principal source of supply, but the run in all the sections south of British Columbia has become smaller from year to year. In the year 1887 the total pack for the entire Pacific Coast was 969,200 cases, of which the Columbia River furnished 430,000. In 1890 the output of the western coast was about 1,223,955 cases, of which Alaska alone furnished 688,322, or more than half the entire product of the United States. The capital invested in the Alaska salmon fisheries, including permanent improvements, vessels, etc., is something more than $4,000,000. There were, in 1890, 37 canneries between Dixon Entrance and Bristol Bay, 25 of which are west of Sitka, and about 6,000 persons were employed during the fishing season, using 66 vessels for the purpose.

Judging from the rate of increase during the past ten years and the enormous field yet to be developed, the commerce depending upon this single industry will be one of the most notable interests of the Pacific Coast. Three-fourths of it is now beyond the region reconnoitered, and is rapidly crowding northward into unchartered localities enormously rich in fish. It is interesting to note that the two newer industries, mining and salmon fishing, have grown so rapidly that while in 1880 both these industries were insignificant and completely overshadowed by the fur trade, by 1890 their products amounted in value to $15,000,000, or more than twice the purchase price of the Territory.

The Pacific and Arctic whaling catch, though not confined strictly to Alaskan waters, is conducted by American vessels, and all but a very small percentage of it is secured in waters contiguous to the Alaskan coast. The total value of oil, bone, and ivory of the catch between 1874 and 1890 was $11,204,465. There are about fifty vessels engaged in this industry, their port of call being Port Clarence. The charts of the tracks and rendezvous of these vessels are simply compilations of early explorations and are very crude and inaccurate.

Of the food fish of Alaska the cod-fish stand next in commercial importance to the salmon. The eastern part of Bering Sea is a great reservoir of cod, and the area within the limits of 50 fathoms depth is no less than 18,000 square miles. In this sea fishing must be done as it is off Newfoundland, without harbors of refuge, but in a much less depth of water. The fishing banks along the south shores of the Aleutian chain will add about 45,000 more square miles, making a total of 63,000 square miles, this being about four times the area of the banks in the region of Newfoundland. Though over twenty years have elapsed since the inception of this industry, it must still be considered in its infancy. The value of the catch during the last twenty-seven years has amounted to about $8,900,000. It is carried on without regard to the abundant supply, but solely in accordance with the demands of the local and limited market on the Pacific coast of America.

It is evident, with the numerous transcontinental railways and with the increasing population along their lines and growing tributaries, that the demand will constantly and permanently increase, so that this interest will alone crowd the waters of the Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea with sails.

In this report too much stress is not laid on the importance of the fishing industry alone, and this will be appreciated if we reflect that a great historical fact has been epitomized in the statement that "Amsterdam is built on herring bones."

Sundry questions have arisen to cause grave solicitude and anxiety on the subject of the boundary line. It has even been intimated to me that there is a strong probability that some conflict or strife may take place between the miners I have referred to or the others who are engaged in taking in supplies and those who would collect duties from them on the frontier.

Mr. President, I believe that this question is an important one; even more important, perhaps, than the decision of the Venezuelan boundary, because this question relates to the boundaries of our own country. It relates to peace between our own citizens and the citizens of the adjoining British possessions. In my judgment, it is the duty of this Congress to facilitate in every proper way the adjustment of the question relating to this boundary line.

It may be appropriate to give here a brief sketch of the history of the boundary survey. In 1872 General Grant, then President of the United States, anticipating that a postponement of the definite marking of the boundary might involve future disputes, recommended in his annual message the creation of a commission for settling the boundary line. But the matter was allowed to drop, and nothing was done until President Cleveland, about fifteen years later, again brought the subject forward by a reference to it in his message.

In 1887 the Department of State inserted an item of $100,000 in the estimates for a preliminary survey of the boundary, but on this item no action was taken.

In 1888, however, an appropriation of $20,000 was made for a preliminary survey, to be conducted by the Coast and Geodetic Survey in accordance with projects to be approved by the Secretary of State. Under this act two parties were organized in the spring of 1889 to ascend the Yukon and its affluent, the Porcupine, to determine by astronomical observations the intersection of the one hundred and forty-first meridian with these rivers. The party on the Porcupine accomplished its purpose during the following winter, while the party on the Yukon was compelled by adverse circumstances to spend two winters there.

Small appropriations were annually made under the same wording as the act of October 2, 1888, referred to above, until the year 1892, when a convention was concluded at Washington, on July 22, 1892, for conducting a coincident or joint survey "with a view to the ascertainment of the facts and data necessary to the permanent delimitation of said boundary line," that is, from latitude 54° 40′ north to the point where it encounters the one hundred and forty-first meridian west of Greenwich.

Under this convention commissioners were appointed by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain, respectively.

It was prescribed that the commissioners should complete their duties within two years from the date of their first meeting, but as this was found impracticable the time was extended to December 31, 1895, by supplementary convention of February 3, 1894.

The total amount appropriated under this convention was $60,000, and the surveys were conducted on behalf of the United States under the direction of the Superintendents of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The Alaskan boundary is conveniently divisible into two sections: The first where it follows the contour of the coast from the southernmost point of Prince of Wales Island until it strikes the one hundred and forty-first meridian at or near the summit of Mount St. Elias; the second where it is formed by the one hundred and forty-first meridian, which it follows from that intersecting point to the Frozen Ocean.

The determination of the exact limits of the first coastwise section is in progress, or has been in progress until recently, through a preliminary survey by American and British expeditions acting separately or coincidentally, as convenience might dictate, under the provisions of the convention of July 22, 1892, and the supplementary convention of February 3, 1894, between the United States and Great Britain. The object of this preliminary survey has been to obtain for the information of their respective Governments affirmative data from which they may by conventional agreement determine the true boundary described in the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1825, and redescribed in the first article of the treaty between the United States and Russia of March, 1867, whereby the Russian territory of Alaska was ceded to this country.

As before stated, this preliminary examination had been taking place until the 31st day of December, 1895, to which date it was extended by supplementary convention of February 3, 1894. It seems that, referring to the President's message, a further extension of time will be necessary, as well as an additional appropriation for the completion of this work.

It has been erroneously stated in the public prints, as I am informed upon good authority, that some agreement has been signed by the respective commissioners in the past few days. This seems to be a misapprehension. These commissioners were not created for the purpose of coming to any agreement. They had no power relative to coming to any such agreement so as to bind their Governments. They were simply to examine and report for the information of their respective Governments, and to furnish the necessary data to afford the basis for a treaty between the United States and Great Britain relative to the southeastern boundary of Alaska. I doubt not there should be an appropriation for the continuation of the work of the commission, and I believe it is expected that the present commission will be continued by a convention between the two Governments extending the term of its existence and its labors.

As the Alaskan coast is steadily becoming settled and an extensive development of interests of great magnitude is taking place, it seems needful that provision be made for the settlement of both these boundary questions. The second question, and the one to which the joint resolution refers more particularly, is in relation to the one hundred and forty-first meridian. It seems as to this that all the preliminaries are completed, so that a conventional agreement can now be made between the United States and Great Britain. The theoretical existence of this boundary on the one hundred and forty-first meridian is an undoubted fact, and is not at all in question, but the physical location of the boundary line remains to be established. I am informed by those who have given this subject great attention that the ascertainment of a given meridian at any given point is a work depending upon the precision of the scientific instruments employed and the accuracy of the astronomical and geodetic observation, so that it needs much time and care to reduce the remaining amount of error to so small a degree that it will be practically immaterial and of no consequence. Such observations and surveys were undertaken by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in 1890 and 1891, and the points where the one hundred and forty-first meridian crosses the Yukon River, also where it intersects Forty Mile Creek, and again where it passes by the summit of Mount St. Elias, have been marked with some degree of accuracy. Similar surveys in some quarters under British auspices are believed to give nearly coincident results. I am informed that there is a difference of perhaps not more than 450 feet between the location by the respective Governments on the Yukon River where that is intersected by the one hundred and forty-first meridian, and that there is but a slight difference at the intersection of the meridian with what is known as Forty Mile Creek, where active mining operations are conducted.

It seems to be practicable to reach an agreement along this line, inasmuch as the difference is so slight. These surveys by the respective Governments have been independently conducted, and no international agreement has yet been made to mark those or any other parts of the one hundred and forty-first meridian by permanent monuments.

The going in of the miners and the development of the country has been such that the valley of the Yukon is becoming a highway through the hitherto unexplored wilds of Alaska. This region has great mineral resources recently discovered, especially at or near the junction of the boundary meridian with the Yukon and its tributaries. What is known as the Porcupine River is another of the tributaries upon which surveys have been made. The outposts of civilization and enterprise are springing up, and under these circumstances it seems exceedingly important, and, indeed, necessary that the jurisdictional limits of the respective Governments in this new region should be determined. It is understood that Her Britannic Majesty's Government has already proposed a joint delimitation of the one hundred and forty-first meridian by an international commission of experts, and if Congress should create this commission, and make provision therefor, the necessary result can be accomplished with no unreasonable delay by means of the convention which is contemplated to that end.

I fear that there has been at times a degree of indistinctness in the conception of my fellow-citizens in regard to the Alaskan boundary question. There has been a mixing of the two separate and distinct questions, the one relating to the one hundred and forty-first meridian and the other relating to the line starting from the southernmost end of Prince of Wales Island and following along the contour of the coast (I mean the mainland), at a distance of not more than 30 geographical miles from the ocean. There has been a degree of uncertainty and confusion in the public mind on this subject—a commingling of the questions. They are easily separated. The question that is dealt with in the joint resolution I have introduced this morning relates solely to the boundary line along the one hundred and forty-first meridian. As to the other question, I understand that the examination which has been made by the commission in reference to southeastern Alaska is purely preliminary and relates principally to the character and description of the region.

The people of the city in which I reside have recently forwarded to me a very carefully prepared report, going into the history of this whole Alaskan boundary question. It shows the interest of my people in this question. It has been prepared with much care and research. I deem it to be of great value and interest at the present time, when this subject is so prominent in the public mind. I believe there is one error in the paper toward the close, in which it is stated that it is understood that the reports provided for by the convention referred to "have been submitted to the respective Governments and await further action, in pursuance of the terms of the convention of 1892 and the supplemental convention of 1894." The report of the commission may have been pre-

sented to the Canadian Government, but I have to-day learned that it has not yet been presented to the Government of the United States, and, as I before stated, this report can only present data for the information of the respective Governments, upon which, when the entire examination shall be completed, the two nations may be duly advised, so as to enable them more intelligently to enter into a treaty. With the exception of this paragraph, I believe the representations set forth in the following report are mainly correct. I ask that the report which was made by a committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle be appended and made part of my remarks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, without objection.

The paper referred to is as follows:

ALASKAN BOUNDARY—SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT.

To the BOARD OF TRUSTEES,
Chamber of Commerce, Seattle, Wash.

GENTLEMEN: Since the report submitted to your honorable body under date of April 1, 1895, the committee has pursued its search for further information which would tend to assist the Government of the United States to firmly maintain the integrity of our Alaskan possessions. The boundary line of the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada dividing the Territory of Alaska from the Province of British Columbia and the Northwest Territory of Canada has, by reason of its extraordinary length, developed two subjects for investigation, which may be pursued and determined separately, while the permanent delimitation of the entire boundary involves the satisfactory settlement of each. The one comprehends the physical location of the one hundred and forty-first meridian as produced northwardly from Mount St. Elias to the frozen ocean.

The controversy over the above-mentioned part of the boundary has, by the separate efforts of the Governments of the United States and Canada, been brought more nearly to a determination than that over southeastern Alaska, and which, it appears to the committee, will be attended with more vexatious incidents. This report, therefore, is submitted in support of the eastern boundary of the strip which begins south of Mount St. Elias and runs southeasterly as far as Portland Channel, and which boundary it is emphatically contended has been conceded by Canada for more than sixty years, and ecrtainly, as far as the investigation of the committee has extended, has never been questioned by that Government until comparatively a recent date.

It is necessary, for a clear understanding of the points at issue, to carefully peruse the description of the boundary line as expressly defined in Article I of the convention concluded March 30, 1867, between the United States of America and Russia. The line of demarcation as set forth therein is as follows:

"ARTICLE I.

"His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias agrees to cede to the United States, by this convention, immediately upon the exchange of the ratifications thereof, all the territory and dominion now possessed by his said Majesty on the continent of America and in the adjacent islands, the same being contained within the geographical limits herein set forth, to wit: The eastern limit is the line of demarcation between the Russian and the British possessions in North America as established by the convention between Russia and Great Britain of February 28–16, 1825, and described in Articles III and IV of said convention in the following terms:

"'Commencing from the southernmost point of the island called Prince of Wales Island, which point lies in the parallel of 54° 40′ north latitude, and between the one hundred and thirty-first and the one hundred and thirty-third degree of west longitude (meridian of Greenwich), the said line shall ascend to the north along the channel called Portland Channel as far as the point of the continent where it strikes the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude; from this last-mentioned point the line of demarcation shall follow the summit of the mountains situated parallel to the coast as far as the point of intersection of the one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude (of the same meridian), and finally, from the said point of intersection, the said meridian line of the one hundred and forty-first degree, in its prolongation as far as the frozen ocean.

"'IV. With reference to the line of demarcation laid down in the preceding article, it is understood—

"'First. That the island called Prince of Wales Island shall belong wholly to Russia,' (now, by this cession, to the United States).

"'Second. That whenever the summit of the mountains which extend in a direction parallel to the coast from the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude to the point of intersection of the one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude shall prove to be at a distance of more than 10 marine leagues from the ocean, the limit between the British possessions and the line of coast which is to belong to Russia as above mentioned (that is to say, the limit to the possessions ceded by this convention) shall be formed by a line parallel to the winding of the coast, and which shall never exceed the distance of 10 marine leagues therefrom.'"—*United States Statutes at Large*, volume 15, pages 539–540.

The wording of the description of the boundary line, as above given, is identical with that contained in the convention between Russia and Great Britain of February 28–16, 1825, in Articles III and IV thereof, save the following words "(now, by this cession, to the United States)," which occurs in the first paragraph of Article IV above.

The diplomatic language used in the Russian-English convention of 1825 is here given, in order that the accuracy of the translation may be compared, and is as follows:

"ARTICLE III.

"La ligne de démarcation entre les Possessions des Hautes Parties contractantes sur la côte du continent et les îles de l'Amerique nord-ouest, sera tracée ainsi qu'il suit:

"'A partir du point le plus méridional de l'île dite Prince of Wales, lequel point se trouve sous la parallèle du 54 degré 40 minutes de latitude nord, et entre le 131 et le 133 degré de longitude ouest (méridien de Greenwich). La dite ligne remontera au nord le long de la passe dite Portland Channel, jusqu'au point de la terre ferme ou elle atteint le 56 degré latitude nord; de ce dernier point, la ligne de démarcation suivra la crête des montagnes situées parallèlement à la côte, jusqu'au point d'intersection du 141 degré de longitude ouest (même méridien); et, finalement, du dit point d'intersection la même ligne méridienne du 141 degré formera dans son prolongement jusqu'à la Mer Glaciale la limite entre les Possessions Russes et Britanniques sur le continent de l'Amérique nord-ouest.'

"ARTICLE IV.

"Il est entendu, par rapport à la ligne de démarcation déterminée dans l'Article précédent:

"'1. Que l'île dite Prince of Wales appartiendra toute entière à la Russie.

"'2. Que partout ou la crête des montagnes qui s'étendent dans une direction parallèle à la côte depuis le 56 degré de latitude nord au point d'intersection du 141 degré de longitude ouest, se trouverait à la distance de plus de 10 lieues marines de l'océan, la limite entre les Possessions Britanniques et la lisière de côte mentionnée ci-dessus comme devant appartenir à la Russie, sera formée par une ligne parallèle aux sinuosités de la côte et qui ne pourra jamais en être éloignée que de 10 lieues marines.'"

The subject of the controversy between Russia and Great Britain which culminated in the convention of 1825, above referred to, was the celebrated ukase of September 4, 1821, issued by the Emperor Alexander, and which prohibited foreign vessels not only from landing upon the coasts and islands of the northwest belonging to Russia, but also the coast and islands of Siberia, or to approach them in less than 100 Italian miles. It was intended to protect all commerce, whaling, and fishery at such places from foreign competition, as an exclusive franchise, in all such industries at such places, was thereby granted to Russian subjects.

Mention is here made of this ukase because of the diplomatic correspondence which ensued and was carried on for several years between the British and Russian Governments, in which the settlement of this identical boundary line was the most prominent subject of the controversy.

Throughout this most interesting correspondence the intent of the high contracting parties is clearly and unmistakably laid bare as to the physical location of the eastern boundary of the Alaskan strip, and when read together with the description set forth above, annihilates the pretensions of Canada to any of the canals, bays, or inlets to which claims are now being set up.

The alleged claims of the Dominion of Canada to portions of the Alaskan strip arises, first, from the strained construction given to the description of the boundary line as hereinabove set forth; and, second, from a real or pretended belief in the existence of a fact which is emphatically controverted by the engineers of the United States.

CANADIAN CLAIMS.

The Parliamentary papers and the leading journals of the Dominion of Canada, and particularly of the Province of British Columbia, vigorously contend, in support of the construction referred to, that—

First. That "Behm Canal," and not "Portland Canal," is the channel intended through which the boundary line commencing at the southernmost portion of Prince of Wales Island "shall ascend to the north * * * as far as the point of the continent where it strikes the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude."

Second. That the eastern boundary line, in its extension from the point where it strikes the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude, shall follow an alleged range of mountains, arbitrarily crossing and cutting off the heads of bays and inlets the ownership of which by the United States has hitherto been unquestioned.

Third. That the said eastern boundary line is not a line following the sinuosities of the coast, and giving to the terms "windings of the coast" an interpretation which concedes to British Columbia not only parts of the inland waters, but a large area of the most valuable portions of the coast-line strip known as southeastern Alaska.

Fourth. That neither Portland nor Behm Canal was named when the British-Russian convention of 1825 was acted upon.

That these, among other points inimical to the proprietorship of the United States, are vigorously contended for by the press of Canada and are supported by semiofficial utterances may be safely inferred from the following facts:

Twenty of the mounted police of the Dominion of Canada passed through the city of Seattle last July to enforce customs regulations of that Government in Alaska.

Mr. William Ogilvie, the well-known Canadian surveyor, and who had charge, in part, of the corps of engineers engaged in the "joint or coincident survey" hereinafter spoken of, is quoted as to the boundary line through "Portland Canal" as follows: "This, by the way, * * * is objected to by the Province of British Columbia, and with reason, for in strict conformity with the wording of the article of the treaty a northerly line from the southernmost point of Prince of Wales Island would never reach Portland Canal at all, but would go up the channel known as Behm Canal."

Provincial Premier Turner (Province of British Columbia), in a recently published interview, says: "From what I learned during my stay in England, it is plain to me that if something is not done immediatly this country [Canada] runs a great risk of losing forever a great and valuable block of territory that was stipulated as being part of British America at the time of the enactment of the British-Russian treaty of 1825. The Americans have quietly issued maps in which this territory, in reality belonging to Canada as much as historic Quebec, is represented as forming part of Alaska, and, sorry to say, some of our own map makers have fallen into the snare, and, taking it for granted that the American claim is a valid one, have 'corrected' Canadian maps accordingly."

The very latest official map of the Province of British Columbia, issued under governmental authority and purporting to be compiled under direction of Hon. G. B. Martin, chief commissioner of lands and works at Victoria, British Columbia, shows the boundary line as proceeding up through Behm Canal, and, further, places in British Columbia the heads of the most valuable bays and inlets and an area of valuable territory heretofore regarded as and tacitly conceded by Canada to be the possessions of the United States, a part of which has been the subject of recent special legislation by our Federal Government.

The committee has earnestly and diligently endeavored to ascertain upon what sound reasoning these pretensions are founded and in what manner the Dominion of Canada can logically establish its claim to this rich territory, as said claim is manifested by official maps and the foregoing assertions.

An exhaustive examination of the evidence that is material or relevant, which the committee has been able to obtain, leads to the conclusion that these claims, with the exception hereinafter mentioned, are founded on neither fact nor reason, and that the controversy, when once clearly understood, will be in a great measure stripped of its perplexities. The exception referred to is whether or not there exists a range of mountains "which extend in a direction parallel to the coast, from the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude to the point of intersection of the one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude," within the 10 marine league limit.

To set forth in extenso the evidence which in the judgment of the committee would establish the conclusion that the Canadian claims are untenable would demand a report of too great length, and a reference to the same will be sufficient to invite the confidence of the Chamber in its reliability.

First. In the first place, the charts and maps of both Governments, for near a quarter of a century, show the boundary line is drawn thereon to follow the sinuosities of the coast, equidistant therefrom, beginning at the head of Portland Canal and reaching to Mount St. Elias; and that this line, so drawn, has been recognized by the civilized world from 1825 to about 1884, and has been so recognized by British Columbia on the official maps of that Government as late as the date last mentioned.

Second. That this line was so recognized at the time Alaska was purchased by the United States from Russia in 1867, and United States troops were soon thereafter stationed at Fort Tongass, at the mouth of Portland Canal, and United States customs officials maintained at said point as late as 1889, meeting with no protest from the Canadian Government or other powers of the world.

Third. That Behm Canal and Portland Canal were both well known at the time of the convention of 1825 between Great Britain and Russia, and that Portland Canal was so named by that eminent British navigator, Capt. George Vancouver, in 1793, and was one of the subjects of diplomatic correspondence between England and Russia for several years immediately preceding the convention of 1825.

Fourth. That for many years prior to the purchase of Alaska by the United States, that powerful English commercial institution, the Hudson Bay Fur Company, paid the Russian Government an annual stipend for the privilege of trading in the very inlets that the Dominion of Canada now claims; that the compact between that company and the first-named Government it is believed can be found among the Russian archives.

Fifth. That if written evidence of such a compact can not be found, there are now living witnesses who can testify that the Hudson Bay Company paid the annual compensation referred to as late as the year 1857, as the following letters from the Rev. William Duncan and the Indian secretary of the Metlakahtla Indians will show:

ON BOARD CITY OF TOPEKA, ALASKAN WATERS, *May 3, 1895.*

Before leaving home for a trip to Sitka I received a letter from Mr. Miner Bruce, the explorer, asking me to write you any particulars I might happen to know regarding the question of the boundary between Alaska and British Columbia. Most likely the little information I have on the subject is already known to you, but it can do no harm to write what I know.

First. In 1857 I was located at Fort Simpson, and was in constant daily intercourse with the officers of the Hudson Bay Company, who had a monopoly of the country at that time. From this intercourse I learned that all the country north of Portland Canal belonged to Russia, and for the privilege of trading with the Indians from that point, and as far as Chilcat, the Hudson Bay Company paid a rent to the Russian Government of 1,000 otter skins each year. It is not at all likely that a company of such proportions as the Hudson Bay Company would consent to pay rent for territory of which there was uncertainty as to ownership. That company would most assuredly be well acquainted with the maps which assigned the territory to Russia, or it would have never made the agreement with Russia which it did. Nor did those officers during all the years I was in daily intercourse with them ever hint at a doubt as to the boundary from which Russian claims started.

Second. I have known lawbreakers to escape to Tongass from justice, being, while there, out of the jurisdiction of British Columbia.

Third. When the United States purchased Alaska, a corps of soldiers was stationed at Tongass and continued there for years in undisputed control.

Fourth. On my migrating with over 800 Indians from British Columbia in 1887, we had to call at Fort Tongass and give an account of our belongings. I paid the customs officers over $1,000 to bring my goods into Alaska. The customs authorities resided at Tongass, just over the inlet called Portland Canal.

Yours, truly, WM. DUNCAN.

J. B. METCALFE, Esq., *Seattle, Wash.*

METLAKAHTLA, ALASKA, *May 31, 1895.*

DEAR SIR: Since the report reached us of the controversy which is going on between Canada and the United States concerning the boundary line between British Columbia and Alaska, we have met to discuss the matter.

The information which we have to offer on the subject is:

First. When we left our old home in British Columbia we were regarded as foreigners by the Canadian authorities.

Second. In the summer of 1887, when we migrated to Alaska, Fort Tongass, just over Portland Inlet, was a port of entry. We had to pay duty to a custom-house officer residing there on all dutiable articles we brought over to this country.

Third. We employed three small steamers to convey over our belongings, one of which the custom-house officer at Port Simpson tried to detain as coming from a foreign country. We had to receive our clearance papers at Port Simpson before coming over to Alaska.

Fourth. Having got over to Annette Island, the Canadian Indian agent at Metlakahtla, British Columbia, ceased to have any control over us, which would not have been the case (such was the animus of the man) if the boundary line had been doubtful.

We remain, truly yours,

THE PEOPLE OF METLAKAHTLA, ALASKA,
D. LEASK, *Secretary.*

J. B. METCALFE, Esq., *Seattle, Wash.*

Sixth. That the Rev. Mr. Duncan, having become engaged in a controversy with his religious superiors sent out to overlook his charge of the Metlakahtla Indians, appealed to the Congress of the United States for a haven for himself and his 800 Indians away from their control or molestation, and that by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1891 (chapter 561, section 15, United States Statutes at Large, volume 26, page 1101), Annette Island was set aside for his use. The new Metlakahtla is now a thriving community, with churches and schools, and self-sustaining industries carried on by these Indians, and that Canada had not at that time announced the present claim or any claim to this island.

Seventh. That it can be shown that the process of the British Columbia courts were never attempted to be served on the north side of Portland Canal on offenders against British Columbia laws.

Eighth. That it is conceded by the press, and also officials of British Columbia, that some one has blundered and that the official maps of that province, recognized by Canada, have to be "corrected," and say that "the Dominion officials have followed, sheep like, in the track of the United States diplomatists. Luckily, their stupidity in lazily copying the blunder of the public servants of the United States did not legalize what is manifestly an error. It is not too late to correct the mistake that has been made." The utterance of Premier Turner is to the same effect, "The Canadians will have to repudiate some of their own maps."

The foregoing references are made to show that the facts therein set forth reasonably constitute a tacit admission by Canada of the proprietorship of the United States in the now contested territory, since during all the time mentioned the open and well-known possession thereof and the exercise of governmental control over the same by the United States has never been, until recently, assailed nor questioned.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE CONVENTION OF 1825.

The committee has heretofore alluded to what appears to be an illogical construction given to the terms of Article III and IV of the convention of 1825, which are identical with those of Article I of the convention of 1867, wherein the description of the boundary line is recited. A careful perusal of the description fixes the initial point at Cape Chacon, at the southernmost point of Prince of Wales Island. The first call of the description then reads, "The said line shall ascend to the north along the channel called Portland Channel, as far as the point of the continent where it strikes the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude."

The southernmost point of Prince of Wales Island is on the line of 54° 40′ north latitude, and the entrance of Portland Canal is due east from said point about 50 or 60 miles. The Canadian contention is that Behm Canal is meant, because you can only "ascend to the north" from the initial point through that channel. Literally this is true, but the construction disregards the object to which the line is carried by the words "shall ascend to the north along the channel called Portland Channel." The familiar doctrine that courses and distances will be controlled by monuments does not seem to have been taken into consideration.

Again, it is contended that Portland Canal is not intended, because Portland Canal does not "strike the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude," and that Behm Canal does, and was therefore intended. This interpretation is also unwarranted by the language used, for the plain reading shows that the line is the subject, and not the canal. In other words, the line "shall ascend to the north," etc., as far as the point of the continent where it, the line, strikes the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude.

The boundary line from this point northwesterly to Mount St. Elias, as shown by the official map of British Columbia, is arbitrarily drawn, and seems not only to hold in contempt the language of the description in Article IV, before mentioned, but takes no note of the physical facts. The language, it appears to the committee, can sustain no other interpretation than that "whenever the summit of the mountains which extend in a direction parallel to the coast * * * shall prove to be at a distance of more than 10 marine leagues from the ocean, * * * the limit * * * shall be formed by a line parallel to the windings of the coast, and which shall never exceed the distance of 10 marine leagues therefrom." How this line, which must follow the summit of the mountains which extend in a direction parallel to the coast, and where no mountains exist within the prescribed 10 marine leagues, must be parallel with the "windings of the coast," can, with uncontrolled license, sever the heads of the great bays and inlets, spring from shore to shore, and leap across the great arms of these inland waters, the committee has not yet been able to grasp.

To the words "ten marine leagues from the ocean" is also given the construction that this distance should be measured from the outlying islands. This can not be sustained, because the point where the line strikes the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude at the head of Portland Canal is about the prescribed distance, and it then follows the windings of the coast of the continent and not that of the islands.

The committee is persuaded that this entire interpretation can be safely overthrown and the contention of the United States established before any impartial tribunal. An examination of the diplomatic correspondence carried on between the distinguished representatives of the Russian and British Governments conclusively establishes the intention of both the high contracting parties as to this very line. This correspondence was carried on from the cities of St. Petersburg and London for the space of several years, and culminated in the convention of 1825. At the beginning of these communications the Russian chancellor directs the Russian ambassador at London as follows:

"In order not to cut the island of Prince of Wales, which, according to that arrangement, should rest with Russia, we would propose to take the southern frontier of our domain to 54° 40′ of latitude, and to make it abut on the continent at the Portland Canal, of which the embouchere into the ocean is off the island of Prince of Wales, and its origin is in the continent between the fifty-fifth and fifty-sixth degrees of latitude."

This proposition is practically maintained throughout the many negotiations which occurred, and is fairly admitted by the British plenipotentiary in his final communication to his Government at the time of the execution of said convention.

As to the disagreement upon the facts: If the reports in the press of British Columbia be true, it is strenuously contended that there exists a range of mountains within the 10 marine leagues limit, and it is stated that the main efforts of the Canadian engineers are directed to the establishment of that range. In this connection, the committee called upon Mr. Phillip A. Walker, one of the corps of engineers which has been engaged on the part of the United States in surveying the disputed territory, and he informed us a few days since that the result of their labors established, without doubt, that no range of mountains exists.

The output from the resources of Alaska since its purchase by the United States runs into the millions far in excess of its purchase price, and its commerce with the States is now great, and increasing yearly. The Alaskan trade with the city of Seattle in the past year has reached nearly a million dollars, and with the present increase of trade will double within the next year.

The committee respectfully submits the above as some of the results of its labors, and believes that no efforts should be spared by this chamber to bring to the aid of our Government all evidence which will enable it to establish our rights over the disputed territory.

The convention of 1892 between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland provided for the appointment of commissioners by the high contracting parties "with a view to the ascertainment of the facts and data necessary to the permanent delimitation of the said boundary line," etc. To secure such facts and data a coincident or joint survey of the territory adjacent to the boundary line was agreed upon, and the commissioners were to make a joint report to each of the two Governments upon such facts as they were able to agree upon, and to jointly or severally report to each Government such points as they were unable to agree upon. As soon as the reports shall have been received, then the high contracting parties further agree that "they will proceed to consider and establish the boundary line in question."

The committee learns through the press dispatches that the reports provided for by the above convention have been submitted to the respective Governments, and await further action, in pursuance of the terms of the convention of 1892 and the supplemental convention of 1894.

Sincerely hoping that the efforts of the committee may aid a peaceful and satisfactory solution of the controversy, this report is herewith respectfully submitted.

J. B. METCALFE,
Chairman of Committee.

Mr. SQUIRE. I trust that early action may be taken upon the joint resolution. I do not deem it necessary that it should be referred to any committee for action, but if it is thought best it may be referred.

Several SENATORS. Let it be referred.

Mr. SQUIRE. Very well. I move that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

PROOF OF LOYALTY IN BOUNTY LAND CLAIMS.

Mr. GEORGE introduced a bill (S. 1340) to repeal in part and to limit section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask for the present consideration of the bill, and I desire to call the attention of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to what I am about to say.

During the last Congress a similar bill, a copy of which I hold in my hand, passed the House of Representatives. It was referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and reported favorably without amendment July 16 of last year.

The object of the bill is to remove a bar now created by law and to enable soldiers of the United States who served in the Mexican war and are entitled to pensions to get them without making proof of loyalty as required by section 3480 of the Revised Statutes. The sole effect of the bill, which I have shown to the Senator from Massachusetts, is to allow men who served the United States in a military capacity, and who by law are entitled to bounty lands, except where they have forfeited them, under the statute to which I have referred, for want of loyalty to obtain them. I ask that the bill be read at length, and then I shall ask unanimous consent of the Senate that it may be considered and passed.

The bill was read the second time at length, as follows.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, so far, and no further, modified and repealed as to dispense with proof of loyalty during the late war of the rebellion as a prerequisite in any application for bounty land where the proof otherwise shows that the applicant is entitled thereto.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. Has the bill been considered by a committee?

Mr. GEORGE. It was passed by the other House during the last Congress, and referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and reported favorably by that committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. At the present session?

Mr. GEORGE. At the last session. The bill is in the exact words in which it was reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate after it had passed the House of Representatives in the last Congress.

Mr. HOAR. I understand that the Revised Statutes of the United States (in that respect following a previous statute) prohibit among other things the issuance of any bounty land warrants not only without full proof of loyalty, but proof that the claimants were in sentiment desirous of the suppression of the rebellion. The bill introduced by the Senator from Mississippi dispenses with that proof so far as it relates to bounty lands. In the nature of the case, as the bounty lands were all taken substantially before the war of 1860, the committee did not see any reason why the statute should be enforced against the few old soldiers who did not get their bounty lands at the time. The committee were unanimous in the last Congress, and I myself do not see any objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. It will give me pleasure to support any measure of reconciliation or conciliation which has the favor of both the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Mississippi at the same moment.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, I do not suppose that there are a half dozen cases where old soldiers of the Mexican war will be the beneficiaries of this act enabling them to get these bounty lands. I presume there will be no objection to the passage of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUE OF BONDS.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 1341) to prohibit the further issuance of interest-bearing bonds without the consent of Congress; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill. The matter is so simple, so plain, and yet so important that the Senate, I think, will agree to pass the bill, and I make the request.

The bill was read the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the issuance of interest-bearing bonds of the United States for any purpose whatever, without further authority of Congress, is hereby prohibited.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HILL. That bill will lead to some discussion. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] is ready, I think, very soon to address the Senate upon the whole general financial question. I think it would be unwise to precipitate the discussion upon this particular measure. I ask the Senator from North Carolina to withhold his request for the present. Perhaps after the Senator from Ohio concludes his remarks it might be advisable to take up the bill. I merely make that suggestion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. There should be no objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think the bill ought to go to the Committee on Finance, and I object to its consideration.

Mr. BUTLER. I have no objection to the request made by the Senator from New York except to say that this is a matter which needs no discussion because it is distinctly understood now. Every Senator knows now as well as he will know a year from now how he will vote on this question. It has been discussed ably, pro and con, as I see from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for years. There are two distinct sets of opinion in this country as to this plain, simple bill. It is as plain as that two and two make four or do not make four. Therefore it needs no discussion. I have no remarks myself to make upon it unless there should be some remarks presented against it. It is perfectly plain. Everyone knows how he would vote now. This country is appalled with the fact that we are about to have a tremendous issue of bonds.

It is seriously questioned whether under the present law the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury have the power to issue bonds. The bill says simply that the bonds shall not be issued without the consent of Congress. Can any Senator object to referring this matter to Congress? Congress is the power invested by the Constitution with the control of our finances. Can any Senator object to Congress being consulted about so important a matter?

The bill requires no discussion, Mr. President. But, as the Senator from New York has made the request, I will let the bill go over until we can hear the Senator from Ohio, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for its consideration. I ask that the bill may lie on the table for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. GEAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase the revenue to meet the expenses of the Government and provide against a deficiency; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of the revenue, the amendment proposing to provide for the issue of legal-tender Treasury notes of the United States to be exchanged for gold and bearing interest at the rate of 3 per cent; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BURROWS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

SOLDIERS' HOME REPORTS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, in addition to the number authorized by resolution adopted December 30, 1895, 600 copies of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and 600 copies of the report of the assistant inspector-general of State Homes for the use of Congress, 200 copies of each report to be for the use of the Senate and 400 copies of each report for the use of the House of Representatives.

THE GOLD RESERVE.

Mr. ALLEN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate if the sum of $100,000,000, or any part thereof, has at any time since the establishment of the so-called gold reserve been actually segregated or set apart from the other currency or money in the Treasury Department, in gold coin or gold coin and gold certificates or either, for the redemption of the legal-tender notes and different forms of paper money of the Government, and when and by what act of Congress, giving the title of the act and the date of its approval, said so-called gold reserve was established, and if not established by act of Congress, state by what authority, if any, it was established.

PNEUMATIC DYNAMITE GUNS.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to inform the Senate what disposition has been made of the appropriation made in the act "making appropriations for the support of the Army," approved September 22, 1888, for pneumatic dynamite guns, whether any batteries have been established under said act at any of the ports of the United States, and whether it would be possible to establish such a battery at Fort Warren, Boston Harbor.

EQUIPMENT OF MONITORS.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be directed to inform the Senate what it would cost to equip with guns and machinery and to put in suitable condition for purposes of harbor defense all monitors not now in commission or undergoing repairs.

ISLANDS OF ST. CROIX, ST. JOHN, AND ST. THOMAS.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be directed to inquire and report to the Senate whether the islands of St. Croix, St. John, and St. Thomas, in the West Indies, can be now purchased from the Danish Government, as provided by the treaty signed at Copenhagen in October, 1867, and whether if these islands are not purchased by the United States it is probable that they will be sold by the Danish Government to some other power.

MESSENGER FOR INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Be it resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to appoint a messenger for the Committee on Interstate Commerce, who shall be paid at the rate of $1,440 per annum, from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, until otherwise ordered.

GEN. NAPOLEON J. T. DANA.

Mr. HAWLEY. The bill (S. 4) for the relief of Gen. Napoleon J. T. Dana has been introduced and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. A bill in precisely similar terms was passed in the last Congress. I move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

PAYMENT OF COIN OBLIGATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution, submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. BUTLER December 21, 1895, as follows:

Whereas it was the purpose of Congress to keep gold and silver coin at a parity by investing the Secretary of the Treasury with the discretion of paying the coin obligations of the Government as they mature in either metal: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed, when liquidating either the interest or principal of the Government's coin obligations, to make such payment in gold coin whenever the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold is less than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, and to continue to pay in such gold coin until the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be equal to the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, but when the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be greater than the market value of 412½ grains of pure silver he shall pay said coin obligations as they mature in silver coin, and continue to pay the same in silver coin until the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver shall be equal to the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I will not ask for the present consideration of the resolution, although I believe if the resolution were passed and observed by the Secretary of the Treasury there would be no necessity for the issue of bonds, even from his standpoint. I believe it is all due to a disregard of the law as some of us understand it, and as a majority of the people, I think, understand it. But inasmuch as we have a bill now before the body to prohibit the further issue of bonds without the consent of Congress, and inasmuch as the Senator from Ohio wishes to speak today on the financial question, I ask that the resolution go over subject to call, without losing its place.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, in the absence of objection.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], coming over from a previous day.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the several resolutions introduced by me may lie over under the rule without prejudice, retaining their place.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to the Senator from Florida to ask that the several resolutions introduced by him lie on the table subject to his call, instead of having the Chair lay them before the Senate every morning. I hope he will adopt that course.

Mr. CALL. I suppose that is just what will be done. The resolutions will lie over without losing their place.

Mr. HARRIS. Under that order it is the duty of the Chair to lay the resolutions before the Senate every morning during the morning hour, when under the other order the resolutions lie on the table subject to his call.

Mr. CALL. I have no objection to that course.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands the order. The resolutions will lie on the table until called up by the Senator from Florida.

PROPOSED DUTY ON RAW SUGAR.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PERKINS December 31, 1895, as follows:

Whereas the conditions of soil and climate in the United States are so peculiarly favorable to the growth of the sugar beet and sugar cane that the manufacture of sugar should be the most important industry of the country; and

Whereas under the operation of the tariff law of 1890 the sugar industry was greatly encouraged and promoted, to the benefit not only of the persons directly interested, but of all of the people of the United States; and

Whereas the operations of said law were fast making the manufacture of sugar the most important industry of the country, causing vast tracts of land to be put under cultivation, and affording employment to many thousands of persons in field and manufactory; and

Whereas the effect of the changes made by the tariff law of 1894 has been to stop the development of this great industry, to retard its progress, to hamper it in every way, to discourage the planting of large tracts of land by reducing the price of raw material, to take away the means of livelihood from farmers and farm laborers, and to close the manufactories against the laborers who had been employed therein; and

Whereas without some further protection granted by Congress for a few years, or until the industry becomes solidly established, it will not be possible to long continue the cultivation of the sugar beet or even, perhaps, of the sugar cane, or to manufacture sugar in this country in competition with foreign farmers and manufacturers who employ cheaper labor than can be procured in the United States; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Finance Committee of the Senate a bill to increase the revenue by laying additional duties on a large number of articles, but not on sugar: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and it is hereby, instructed to report an amendment to said revenue bill providing for an additional duty on raw sugar equal to the proposed increase on other articles enumerated in the said bill.

Mr. PERKINS. I desire to offer an amendment to the resolution which I think will relieve it from any objection by Senators, and as thus amended I shall ask the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the resolution by striking out all after the preamble and inserting:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and it is hereby, requested to consider the advisability and expediency of reporting an amendment to said revenue bill, providing for an additional duty on articles embraced in Schedule E, relating to customs duty on sugar, equal to the proposed increase on other articles enumerated in said bill, or for a specific tax upon the same.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask that the amendment be adopted and that the resolution as amended, with its preamble, be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. BERRY. I move that the resolution, without adopting the amendment, be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MILLS. The resolution and amendment?

Mr. BERRY. I moved that the resolution and amendment be referred.

Mr. PERKINS. I have no objection, so that the subject-matter can be brought to the consideration of the Committee on Finance. There is no reason, in my opinion, why there should not be a duty levied upon sugar, and as there is an emergency for revenue, such a duty would bring in a revenue which would be less a burden upon our people than any article that is named in the schedule. If the Senator from Arkansas is willing, let the whole subject-matter be referred to the Committee on Finance without further discussion.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. BERRY. That was my motion. I think there is a very great objection to an increase of revenue by a duty on sugar, or an increase of duty on any other article. I do not want to adopt the resolution and thereby commit the Senate to that course this morning. Therefore, I move that both the resolution and amendment be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance. The Senator from California can modify his resolution in the manner suggested.

THE GOLD RESERVE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. SHERMAN December 31, 1895, as follows:

Resolved, That by injurious legislation by the Fifty-third Congress the revenues of the Government were reduced below its necessary expenditure and the fund created by law for the redemption of United States notes has been invaded to supply such deficiencies of reserve; that such a misapplication of the resumption fund is of doubtful legality and greatly injurious to

the public credit, and should be prevented by restoring said fund to the sum of not less than $100,000,000, in gold coin or bullion, to be segregated from all other funds, to be paid out only in the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes; and such notes when redeemed to be reissued only in exchange for gold coin and bullion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I intend to do what I have rarely if ever done in the Senate, read a speech to this body. I have felt that on account of the importance of the subject-matter and the necessity of brevity it would be better for me to reduce my remarks to writing, and I have done so in order to save the time of the Senate more than for any other purpose.

The President, in his annual message to Congress, confined himself to two important subjects, one our foreign relations and the other the condition of our national finances. He followed it by another message on the application of the Monroe doctrine to the controversy between Great Britain and Venezuela.

While Congress has heartily, perhaps too hastily, but with entire unanimity, supported him in maintaining the interests and honor of our country in the field of diplomacy, it has not and will not approve his recommendations on the more important subject of our financial policy, and especially of our currency. He has mistaken the cause of our present financial condition in attributing it to the demand for gold for United States notes instead of to the deficiency of revenue caused by the legislation of the last Congress. He places the effect before the cause. He proposes as a remedy the conversion of the United States notes and the Treasury notes into interest-bearing bonds, thus increasing the interest-bearing debt nearly $500,000,000. He proposes a line of public policy that will produce a sharp contraction of our currency, add greatly to the burden of existing debts, and arrest the progress of almost every American industry which now competes with foreign productions.

The President is supported in these views by Mr. Carlisle, his able Secretary of the Treasury, in his report to Congress. It is with diffidence I undertake to controvert their opinions; but my convictions are so strong that they are in error that I hope the strength of the facts I will submit to the Senate will convince it that the true line of public policy is to supply the Government with ample means to meet current expenditures and to pay each year a portion of the public debt. The gold reserve provided for the redemption of United States notes can then be easily maintained without cost except the loss of interest on the gold in the Treasury, but with a saving of interest on United States notes and Treasury notes of five times the interest lost by the gold held in reserve. A vastly greater benefit than saving interest is secured to our people by a national paper currency at par with coin supported by the credit of the United States and redeemed on demand in coin at the Treasury in the principal city of the United States.

The only difficulty in the way of an easy maninteance of our notes at par with coin is the fact that during this Administration the revenues of the Government have not been sufficient to meet the expenditures authorized by Congress. If Congress had provided necessary revenue, or if the President and Mr. Carlisle had refused to expend appropriations not mandatory in form, but permissive, so as to confine expenditures within receipts, they would have had no difficulty with the reserve. This would have been a stalwart act in harmony with the President's character and plainly within his power. All appropriations which are not provided to carry into effect existing law are permissive, but not mandatory, and his refusal to expend money in excess of the revenues of the Government would not only be justified by public policy, but would have been heartily approved by the people of the United States. He knew as well as anyone that since the close of the civil war to the date of his inauguration the expenditures of the Government had been less than its receipts. I have here a table which shows the receipts and expenditures each year from 1866 to 1893.

Receipts and expenditures of the Government from July 1, 1865, to June 30, 1895.

Fiscal year—	Total revenue.	Total expenditures, including premium.	Excess of revenue over expenditures.
1866	$558,032,620.06	$520,809,416.99	$37,223,203.07
1867	490,634,010.27	357,542,675.16	133,091,335.11
1868	405,638,083.32	377,340,284.86	28,297,798.46
1869	370,943,747.21	322,865,277.80	48,078,469.41
1870	411,255,477.63	309,653,560.75	101,601,916.88
1871	383,323,944.89	292,177,188.25	91,146,756.64
1872	374,106,867.56	277,517,962.67	96,588,904.89
1873	333,738,204.67	290,345,245.33	43,392,959.34
1874	289,478,755.47	287,133,873.17	2,344,882.30
1875	288,000,051.10	274,623,392.84	13,376,658.26
1876	287,482,039.16	258,459,797.33	29,022,241.83
1877	269,000,586.62	238,660,008.93	30,340,577.69
1878	257,763,878.70	236,964,326.80	20,799,551.90
1879	273,827,184.46	266,947,882.53	6,879,300.93
1880	333,526,610.98	267,642,957.78	65,883,653.20
1881	360,782,292.57	260,712,887.59	100,069,404.98
1882	403,525,250.28	257,981,439.57	145,543,810.71
1883	398,287,581.95	265,408,137.54	132,879,444.41
1884	348,519,869.92	244,126,244.33	104,393,625.59
1885	323,690,706.38	260,226,935.11	63,463,771.27
1886	336,439,727.06	242,483,138.50	93,956,588.56
1887	371,403,277.66	267,932,179.97	103,471,097.69
1888	379,266,074.76	267,924,801.13	111,341,273.63
1889	387,050,058.84	299,288,978.25	87,761,080.59
1890	403,080,982.63	318,040,710.66	85,040,271.97
1891	392,612,447.31	365,773,905.35	26,838,541.96
1892	354,937,784.24	345,023,330.58	9,914,453.66
1893	385,819,628.78	383,477,954.49	2,341,674.29
1894	297,722,019.25	367,525,279.83	*69,803,260.58
1895	313,390,075.11	356,195,298.29	*42,805,223.18

* Excess of expenditures over receipts.

From this official statement it appears that each and every year during that long period there was a surplus, which was applied to the reduction of the public debt bearing interest. This debt amounted August 31, 1865, to $2,381,530,294. On the 1st of March, 1893, it was $585,034,260, thus showing a reduction of the interest-bearing debt of $1,796,496,034. The public faith was pledged to this reduction in our loan laws and by the act creating a sinking fund, and, though in some years we did not comply with the terms of the sinking fund, yet in other years we exceeded its requirements, and prior to this Administration the aggregate reduction of debt was greater than the law required. Now, for the first time since 1866, we have deficiencies of revenue. Since the 1st of March, 1893, to the 1st of December, 1895, the national debt has been increased $162,602,245. I insert an official table showing in detail the reduction of the public debt in periods of four years from August, 1865, to March 1, 1893, and its increase from that date to December 1, 1895.

Decrease of the national debt from its highest point, August 31, 1865, to December 1, 1895.

Periods.	Debt bearing interest.	Debt on which interest has ceased.	Debt bearing no interest.	Total.	Decrease.	Increase.
August 31, 1865	$2,381,230,594.96	$1,503,020.09	$461,616,311.51	$2,844,649,626.56		
March 1, 1869	2,164,994,050.00	6,422,463.64	392,802,620.50	2,564,219,134.14	$280,430,492.42	
March 1, 1873	1,755,801,000.00	3,093,240.26	401,376,408.97	2,160,270,649.23	403,948,484.91	
March 1, 1877	1,697,697,500.00	8,629,860.26	388,739,271.85	2,095,066,632.11	65,204,017.12	
March 1, 1881	1,660,935,000.00	6,598,725.26	353,886,124.92	2,021,419,850.18	73,646,781.93	
March 1, 1885	1,182,149,050.00	5,401,395.26	353,707,422.67	1,541,257,867.93	480,161,982.25	
March 1, 1889	844,106,220.00	2,047,245.26	353,655,953.47	1,199,809,418.73	341,448,449.20	
March 1, 1893	585,034,260.00	2,335,305.26	375,912,187.37	963,281,752.63	236,527,666.10	
March 1, 1895	685,043,860.00	1,779,300.26	381,787,366.92	1,068,610,527.18		$105,328,774.55
December 1, 1895	747,361,960.00	1,676,180.26	376,845,857.64	1,125,883,997.90		57,273,470.72
Total					1,881,367,873.93	162,602,245.27
Net decrease					1,718,765,628.66	

The President, in his recent annual message, complains that the law of October 6, 1890, known as the McKinley Act, was "inefficient for the purposes of revenue." That law, though it largely reduced taxation by placing many articles on the free list and granted a bounty for the production of sugar, yet did not reduce revenues below expenditures, but provided a surplus of $37,239,762.57 June 30, 1891, and $9,914,453.66 June 30, 1892, and $2,341,674.29 on the 30th of June, 1893, when Mr. Cleveland was President and a Democratic majority in both Houses of Congress had been elected, all pledged to repeal the McKinley Act and to reduce duties. That the McKinley Act did not produce more revenue in 1893 and 1894 is not a matter of surprise. Any tariff law denounced by the party in power, with a promise to repeal it and to reduce duties, would prevent importations under the old law and thus lower the revenue. Early in December, 1893, at the first regular session of Congress during Mr. Cleveland's term, a bill was formulated, and as soon as practicable passed the House of Representatives.

That bill met the hearty approval of the President. If it had become a law as originally presented, the deficiency in revenue

proved the House bill, added other duties and changed the scope of the measure. With these amendments it became a law. The President refused to sign it, expressing his opposition to the Senate amendments, and yet now supports it when deficiencies have been greatly increased, when the public debt is increasing, and doubts are expressed as to the ability of the Government to maintain its notes at par with coin. The President makes no mention in his message of these deficiencies; no mention of the issue of interest-bearing bonds to meet them. The Secretary of the Treasury is more frank in his statement. He reports a deficiency of $69,803,260.58 during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1894, and for the year ended June 30, 1895, $42,805,223.18, and for the six months prior to December 1, 1895, $17,613,539.24; in all, $130,221,023.

No complaint was made that the McKinley law "was inefficient for the purposes of revenue" when the Wilson bill was pending. The objection to the McKinley law was that it was a "protective tariff," and the Wilson bill was a "revenue tariff." I have a statement showing the receipts and expenditures under each law each month, the McKinley law from its passage to the election of Cleveland, and the Wilson law from its passage to December 1, 1895. During the twenty-five months of the McKinley law the average monthly surplus was $1,129,821. During the existence of the Wilson law the average monthly deficiency was $4,699,603. If the McKinley law was, in the opinion of the President, inefficient for revenue, he should have said of the Wilson law that it was bounteous in deficiencies.

Receipts and expenditures under McKinley law up to election of Fifty-third Congress and President Cleveland (October 1, 1890, to November 1, 1892), twenty-five months.

Month.	Receipts.	Expenditures.
1890—October	$39,222,174	$35,690,720
November	28,678,674	40,460,337
December	31,106,164	18,043,047
1891—January	36,810,233	21,470,967
February	29,273,173	29,445,669
March	29,027,455	29,062,737
April	25,465,231	23,791,107
May	27,289,305	27,690,326
June	31,631,849	33,628,103
July	34,158,244	38,100,294
August	28,773,281	19,537,484
September	27,165,554	22,267,037
October	28,448,562	30,650,810
November	26,802,887	26,156,047
December	27,646,515	30,424,724
1892—January	30,383,478	34,175,350
February	30,698,944	25,952,725
March	29,836,606	27,784,217
April	26,971,224	30,059,631
May	28,228,398	31,732,793
June	30,958,617	27,922,412
July	34,314,331	36,333,976
August	33,479,058	31,440,254
September	31,797,628	28,192,423
October	31,288,540	31,187,962
Total	759,456,825	731,211,184

Surplus, $28,245,641.
Average monthly surplus, $1,129,821.

Receipts and expenditures under Wilson law up to meeting of Fifty-fourth Congress (September 1, 1894, to December 1, 1895), fifteen months.

Months.	Receipts.	Expenditures.
1894—September	$22,621,228	$30,323,018
October	19,139,240	32,713,039
November	19,411,403	28,477,188
December	21,866,136	27,136,460
1895—January	27,804,399	34,523,447
February	22,888,057	25,636,035
March	25,470,475	25,716,957
April	24,247,836	32,990,676
May	25,272,078	27,918,982
June	25,615,474	21,683,029
July	29,069,697	38,548,063
August	28,962,696	32,588,184
September	27,549,678	24,320,481
October	27,901,748	34,503,425
November	25,986,503	27,112,708
Total	373,796,648	444,290,692

Deficiency, $70,494,044.
Average monthly deficiency, $4,699,603.

I beg the attention of Senators to the statistics I have presented. They are authentic and official. During the first year of the Wilson law the agricultural imports, all of which are such as are produced in the United States, the most common products of our farms, were of the value of $107,342,522. During the last year of the McKinley law the imports of the same farm products were of the value of $51,414,844. So, under the Wilson law the imports of agricultural products, which we produce in the greatest abundance, were doubled in amount as compared with the amount imported under the McKinley law.

Notably, during the same time, the importation of two articles (that we can produce in the United States) under the Wilson law were wool, valued at $32,589,791, and hides, $24,623,239. Under the McKinley law wool valued at $6,299,934 and hides valued at $10,480,562 were imported. Importations of wool were increased under the Wilson law sixfold. It is no wonder that our sheep are being destroyed. The importation of hides under the present act increased two and one-half fold. The American farmer was thus deprived of his home market.

Other importations made during a year under the Wilson law of articles which we can readily produce in this country were valued at $263,684,513, while under the McKinley law the value of the same articles imported was $172,743,601.

The enormous importations under the Wilson law, for which we had to pay gold, necessarily diminished the exports of the United States. Our chief reliance in our foreign trade is to export our products, mainly agricultural, in sufficient quantity or more to pay for our imports, so that the balance of trade shall be in our favor. Under the Wilson law we exported in a year agricultural productions valued at $301,578,885, while during the last year of the McKinley law we exported similar productions valued at $371,125,299.

Statement showing the imports and exports of leading farm products during the first year of Wilson tariff compared with last year of McKinley tariff.

[Compiled from official publications of Treasury.]

AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS.

Articles.	Last year of McKinley law.	First year of Wilson law.
Animals	$986,359	$2,121,524
Breadstuffs	2,297,027	2,895,297
Eggs	161,328	341,284
Flax	1,101,347	2,545,610
Feathers	910,981	3,077,955
Fruits	4,659,364	5,333,499
Hay	846,739	1,658,331
Hemp	266,352	632,468
Hides	10,480,562	24,623,269
Hops	582,875	601,185
Provisions	1,824,709	2,037,535
Rice	2,566,089	3,497,166
Seeds	2,361,813	7,146,504
Tobacco	13,005,715	14,389,381
Vegetables	3,083,400	3,858,770
Wool	6,299,934	32,589,791
Total	51,414,844	107,342,522

AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS.

Hay	$924,916	$800,000
Hops	3,752,213	1,849,898
Vegetables	2,072,974	1,775,551
Oil cake and meal	9,442,045	3,070,033
Seeds	8,038,558	2,972,242
Corn	31,207,331	19,032,404
Wheat	67,793,499	52,339,232
Flour	78,062,212	59,226,244
Provisions	169,831,131	155,493,282
Total	371,125,299	301,578,885

Statement showing imports of manufactures during first year of Wilson law compared with last year of McKinley law.

Articles.	Last year of McKinley law.	First year of Wilson law.
Glass and glassware	$5,004,469	$7,066,125
Earthenware	6,302,686	9,793,131
Leather and manufactures	9,206,212	15,213,076
Wood and manufactures	16,870,581	19,070,141
Woolen manufactures	15,838,204	51,747,902
Textile grasses, manufactured	18,737,663	26,399,108
Silk and manufactures	22,741,982	30,911,884
Cotton manufactures	21,310,629	34,781,538
Iron manufactures	19,005,999	24,030,799
Chemicals	37,725,176	44,645,815
Total	172,743,601	263,684,513

It will thus be seen that under the McKinley law we exported more and under the other act less, the difference amounting to about $70,000,000. Therefore, the balance of trade necessarily turned against us.

Mr. GEORGE. Which two years are compared?

Mr. SHERMAN. We compare the last year under the McKinley Act with the first year under the Wilson Act; they follow each other.

I could pursue the analysis of these two laws further, but I have said enough to explain the preference by the President of the

Wilson bill. He believes in large importations at the lowest cost, without regard to the industries and labor of our countrymen, while I believe in a careful discrimination and the imposition of such duties on articles that compete with home productions as will diversify our employments and protect and foster impartially all industries, whether of the farm, the workshop, the mine, the forest, or the sea. I have not been satisfied with any tariff law made during my public life, though I have shared in framing many. I prefer a law that will impartially protect and encourage all home industries, and regard the McKinley law as infinitely better than the Wilson law, which I believe is the cause of all the evils which we now encounter by adverse balance of trade, by exportation of gold and derangement of our monetary system. The Wilson law has produced a deficiency in every hour and day that it has been on the statute book, while the McKinley law has always produced a surplus until after the incoming of this Administration, and if administered since that time by friendly agents would have furnished the Government all the revenue needed.

The deficiency of revenue was the primary cause of the demand for gold for United States notes. The gold hoarded for resumption purposes was not separated from the money received for current revenue, and this revenue being insufficient to meet expenses, the gold accumulated for redemption purposes was drawn upon to make good deficiencies. This created a doubt of the ability of the Government to maintain the parity of United States notes with coin, and led to their presentation for redemption in coin. The draft on the Treasury for coin during this Administration has been greater than the amount of deficiency of revenue during the same period. In every aspect in which the subject presents itself to my mind I come to no other conclusion than that the deficiency of revenue and the consequent encroachment upon the redemption fund is the cause of our present financial condition and that the only remedies are either a radical reduction of expenditures or an increase of taxation, and perhaps both. I do not believe that the condition requires a suspension of public works or a postponement of measures now in progress to strengthen the Army and Navy.

It is strange that the President in dealing with our financial condition should ignore entirely the pregnant and controlling fact that during his term of office thus far three issues of bonds have been made, amounting in the aggregate to $162,315,400, to meet current expenses in time of profound peace. He attributes all our financial difficulties to the continued circulation of United States notes and Treasury notes, debts bearing no interest, amounting to nearly $500,000,000. His statement of the origin and history of the United States notes is strongly tinged with prejudice, for though these notes were irredeemable for a time, they were convertible into bonds bearing interest payable in coin. They replaced notes issued by banks chartered by the several States.

They were the best possible substitute for coin, and, in connection with the bonds of the United States, they furnished the means by which alone the Army and Navy could have been sustained during the war. After the war was over the question of the retirement of United States notes was mooted, but no party or section of our country demanded a cancellation of these notes, but differed as to the amount to be retained in circulation. The Democratic party then demanded the largest amount named, while a new party called the "Greenback party," demanded an unlimited issue without any provision for their redemption in coin. The Republican party provided, by the resumption act of 1875, for the reduction of United States notes to the maximum of $300,000,000, and their redemption in coin on and after the 1st day of January, 1879.

This reduction was arrested by Congress when the amount of United States notes had been reduced to $346,681,016, when both Houses of Congress had Democratic majorities. Provision was made for the redemption of the United States notes by coin on demand and for their reissue, and authority was given to sell United States bonds for that purpose.

From the 1st day of January, 1879, to the election of Mr. Cleveland in November, 1892, there was no disturbance of the orderly receipt and exchange of gold and currency. The gold deposited in the Treasury in exchange for bonds in the summer and fall of 1878 amounted to $95,500,000. The ordinary current revenue in the Treasury conducted the vast operations of the Government without friction or trouble for nearly fourteen years. United States notes were at par with coin not only in every part of the United States, but in every country in the world. During all that long period United States notes were presented for redemption, but in amounts comparatively insignificant. I have here a table, prepared by the Treasury Department, by which it appears that during thirteen years, from the 1st of July, 1879, to the 1st of July, 1892, the redemption of United States notes in gold averaged less than $3,000,000 a year, while during the last three and one-half years the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes exceeded $100,000,000 for each year. During the first thirteen years gold was exported in large quantities, but it was not drawn from the reserve; but during the past three and a half years $360,000,000 was drawn from the reserve and $305,000,000 exported. The balance, with the domestic supply of gold, was hoarded in the United States. I here insert a table showing the redemption of notes each year and the exports of gold.

Redemptions in gold of United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890, and exports of gold from January 1, 1879, to December 1, 1895.

Fiscal year—	United States notes.	Treasury notes of 1890.	Total.	Exports of gold.
1879 (6 months)	$7,976,698		$7,976,698	$4,587,614
1880	3,780,638		3,780,638	3,639,025
1881	271,750		271,750	2,565,132
1882	40,000		40,000	32,587,880
1883	75,000		75,000	11,600,888
1884	590,000		590,000	41,081,957
1885	2,222,000		2,222,000	8,477,892
1886	6,863,699		6,863,699	42,952,191
1887	4,224,073		4,224,073	9,701,187
1888	692,596		692,596	18,376,234
1889	730,143		730,143	59,952,285
1890	732,386		732,386	17,274,491
1891	5,986,070		5,986,070	86,362,654
1892	5,352,243	$3,773,600	9,125,843	50,195,327
1893	55,319,125	46,781,220	102,100,345	108,680,844
1894	68,242,408	16,599,742	84,842,150	76,978,061
1895	109,783,800	7,570,398	117,354,198	66,131,183
1896 (5 months)	53,926,457	2,043,362	55,969,819	53,899,201
Total	326,809,086	76,768,322	403,577,408	695,044,046

The recent report of Secretary Carlisle shows that prior to 1891 the demand for coin for United States notes during a period of thirteen years, from July 1, 1879, to July 1, 1892, was only $43,310,896, while the receipts of gold for United States notes during the same period amounted to $160,000,000. Gold was deposited and any kind of paper money was demanded. The withdrawals from the Treasury from July 1, 1892, to December 1, 1895, have amounted to $360,266,512.

I will read what he says in his report:

> The withdrawals from the Treasury between July 1, 1879, and July 1, 1892, amounted to $43,310,896, while the gross exports during the same time amounted to $389,354,757, showing that $346,043,861 was supplied from sources outside of the Treasury—

He is speaking of gold—

> but the withdrawals from July 1, 1892, to December 1, 1895, have amounted to $360,266,512 and the gross exports have amounted to $305,617,419, from which it appears that the Government has furnished a sum equal to the whole export and $54,649,093 in addition. While the Government has thus been compelled during the last three and a half years not only to furnish gold from the Treasury for export to other countries, but also a large amount for the use of our people at home, its receipts of gold on account of customs and other taxes have been constantly diminishing since July 12, 1890, and have now entirely ceased.

I have a graphic map attached to the Secretary's report of 1894, which shows the amount of gold in the Treasury from 1879 to July 1, 1894. It steadily and almost continuously increased from $140,000,000 on the 1st of January, 1879, to $300,000,000 on the 1st of January, 1891. It then steadily decreased to the 1st of July, 1894, when it was reduced to $125,000,000, and, though replenished by the large sale of bonds, it was reduced December 31, 1895, to the sum of $64,204,651.

During the first term of Mr. Cleveland, when he was powerless to affect our currency and tariff policy, the Senate being Republican, the gold increased from $240,000,000 on the 1st of April, 1885, to $320,000,000 on the 1st of April, 1889. This gold came into the Treasury without cost in exchange for United States notes or gold certificates.

It is just to Mr. Carlisle to say that he attributes the withdrawal of gold to silver legislation, yet the Bland-Allison Act was in force from 1878 to 1890, when the accumulation of gold occurred, and the great body of gold was withdrawn after the act of July 14, 1890, was repealed. In 1880, while I was Secretary of the Treasury, the Government received over $60,000,000 of gold in exchange for silver certificates and United States notes; and yet this was done after the Bland-Allison Act was in force and the silver certificates had been issued under that act. United States notes and silver certificates were more convenient to purchase cotton and corn, and when maintained at parity with coin will always be preferred in large commercial transactions as well as in the current business of life.

In view of these official facts can any fair man doubt as to the cause of our financial condition? What other cause can be stated than that unwise legislation reduced our revenues below our expenditures, impaired confidence in our ability to maintain our currency at par, and compelled the Government to sell bonds provided for the redemption of United States notes in order to meet

would have been much greater than now; but conservative Democratic Senators, with the aid of Republican Senators, greatly imdeficiencies? What other remedy is there for our financial difficulties except to borrow money on the best terms possible to pay current deficiencies and to provide additional revenue for future wants? To this extent and for these purposes I am willing to support this Administration, however much I may disagree with its general policy.

But the President is not satisfied. He demands the retirement and cancellation of all the United States notes and Treasury notes by the sale of bonds of the United States bearing interest. In his annual message he says:

In anticipation of impending trouble, I had, on the 28th day of January, 1895, addressed a communication to the Congress fully setting forth our difficulties and dangerous position, and earnestly recommending that authority be given the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds bearing a low rate of interest, payable by their terms in gold, for the purpose of maintaining a sufficient gold reserve, and—

Here is the important part—

also for the redemption and cancellation of outstanding United States notes and the Treasury notes issued for the purchase of silver under the law of 1890. This recommendation did not, however, meet with legislative approval.

He might have said that it was rejected by both Houses of Congress, each containing a majority of his political friends. With the experience of fourteen years, the people of the United States, as well as their representatives, were almost unanimously in favor of a currency so easily maintained at par in coin by the promise of the United States to pay it in coin and by holding in the Treasury $100,000,000 gold coin for its redemption when presented. No one contemplated that this reserve would be used to pay current expenditures. In all our legislation since the war ample means were provided to meet current expenditures without trenching upon this reserve, and it was not encroached upon until Mr. Cleveland became President. Instead of demanding more revenue, he urged the reduction of duties and secured the passage of a law which reduced the revenue and forced the Treasury to encroach upon the redemption fund to meet current obligations. If this policy is adopted to compel the people of the United States to surrender the best paper currency they have ever enjoyed, it will fail. If revenue is wanted to meet current expenditures, it will be furnished, either by taxation or by borrowing, or by both; but to create deficiencies in order to compel the cancellation of United States notes by the issue of bonds will not, in the language of the President, "meet with legislative approval."

Mr. Cleveland in his message complains that when notes are presented for redemption and are redeemed the law requires that they—

Shall belong to the United States, they shall not be retired, canceled, or destroyed, but they shall be reissued and paid out again and kept in circulation.

The right to reissue is a necessary incident to a circulating note. The United States does what every bank does. By this provision it furnishes a note for circulation better than any other yet devised by mortal man.

He also says:

The Government was put in the anomalous situation of owing to the holders of its notes debts payable in gold on demand which could neither be retired by receiving such notes in discharge of obligations due the Government, nor canceled by actual payment in gold. It was forced to redeem without redemption and to pay without acquittance.

It seems to me that when the Government redeems its note the former holder of the note has no right to say whether it shall be reissued or not. The last sentence is without meaning. After the United States redeems its note the holder has nothing more to say, and when the United States pays out a note it always takes a receipt, which is an acquittance.

The President says that—

In April, 1893, for the first time since its establishment, this reserve amounted to less than $100,000,000, containing at that date only $97,011,330.

This significant statement made as to the earliest days of his Administration should have excited in the mind of the President an inquiry into the cause of the reduction of the reserve. The real reserve for redemption purposes was the proceeds of $95,500,000 bonds and no more. In addition to this reserve it is necessary to have on hand to meet current expenditures the sum of from twenty to forty million dollars. At certain periods a large balance is accumulated to pay the interest of the public debt and other large disbursements for the Army and Navy. Any excess should be at once applied to the reduction of the principal of the public debt. This line of public policy was continued from the 1st of January, 1879, to the 4th of March, 1893, including the first Administration of Mr. Cleveland. During this period many times more gold was deposited in the Treasury than was paid out. Large amounts of gold were deposited in the Treasury for gold certificates. The public debt was largely diminished. Not a shadow of doubt had been cast upon the ability of the Government to redeem its notes or to maintain its reserves. The minimum never fell below $100,000,000. I have here an official statement of the net gold in the Treasury each month to November, 1895.

Net gold in the Treasury.

Month.	Gold coin and bullion.	Month.	Gold coin and bullion.
1878—June	$103,562,523	1887—March	$181,939,848
July	108,161,640	April	180,902,431
August	117,325,856	May	186,667,774
September	112,602,622	June	186,875,669
October	117,965,674	July	186,306,330
November	118,282,355	August	193,274,194
December	114,193,360	September	192,717,947
1879—January	116,674,226	October	202,859,832
February	116,886,279	November	211,880,526
March	117,162,166	December	208,608,130
April	118,809,680	1888—January	202,955,184
May	121,300,140	February	212,869,914
June	119,956,655	March	218,818,253
July	120,320,583	April	213,239,994
August	126,537,690	May	200,301,129
September	154,763,795	June	193,866,247
October	157,140,114	July	194,592,280
November	147,247,977	August	206,383,036
December	146,194,182	September	197,713,116
1880—January	143,340,027	October	191,074,575
February	136,995,458	November	199,339,134
March	135,766,551	December	233,885,219
April	130,726,640	1889—January	194,655,264
May	120,699,196	February	196,245,980
June	118,181,527	March	197,874,422
July	115,274,646	April	191,589,112
August	120,018,180	May	192,252,715
September	127,764,733	June	186,711,560
October	133,278,253	July	182,218,164
November	143,981,139	August	180,654,670
December	150,213,716	September	189,196,423
1881—January	148,052,809	October	187,572,386
February	166,808,853	November	187,496,672
March	167,639,263	December	190,833,052
April	164,358,554	1890—January	177,386,285
May	157,893,879	February	187,988,948
June	157,412,141	March	185,287,715
July	149,163,355	April	186,235,572
August	164,098,402	May	190,544,854
September	169,122,025	June	190,232,405
October	167,785,609	July	184,092,074
November	173,025,684	August	185,837,581
December	167,429,348	September	147,981,732
1882—January	159,972,569	October	156,315,624
February	168,585,554	November	162,439,381
March	161,290,437	December	148,972,935
April	149,997,982	1891—January	141,728,097
May	148,932,626	February	149,712,824
June	143,477,370	March	148,118,150
July	140,062,590	April	141,742,241
August	144,311,881	May	133,207,164
September	147,831,667	June	117,667,723
October	148,435,473	July	121,113,024
November	144,809,314	August	132,471,409
December	131,989,758	September	132,523,222
1883—January	125,648,195	October	127,674,422
February	135,107,161	November	129,193,224
March	141,308,204	December	130,740,631
April	139,439,242	1892—January	119,574,905
May	133,718,103	February	122,122,113
June	138,271,198	March	125,815,040
July	142,705,435	April	119,909,757
August	149,625,435	May	114,231,883
September	151,115,603	June	114,342,367
October	157,353,760	July	110,444,391
November	157,235,708	August	114,156,316
December	155,429,599	September	119,395,509
1884—January	144,350,736	October	124,006,120
February	144,038,203	November	124,409,657
March	142,259,357	December	121,266,663
April	139,624,821	1893—January	108,181,713
May	142,006,908	February	103,284,219
June	133,729,954	March	106,892,224
July	119,048,061	April	97,011,330
August	122,465,717	May	95,048,641
September	130,514,382	June	95,485,414
October	134,670,790	July	99,202,933
November	138,015,071	August	96,009,123
December	141,688,432	September	93,582,172
1885—January	125,187,595	October	84,384,863
February	127,346,553	November	82,959,049
March	125,793,257	December	80,891,600
April	117,927,395	1894—January	65,650,175
May	115,810,533	February	106,527,068
June	120,298,895	March	106,149,136
July	126,078,596	April	100,202,009
August	126,371,928	May	78,693,267
September	133,113,324	June	64,873,025
October	142,338,589	July	54,975,607
November	146,391,486	August	55,216,900
December	147,991,809	September	58,875,317
1886—January	136,086,610	October	61,361,827
February	144,164,038	November	105,424,569
March	151,379,525	December	86,244,445
April	155,865,308	1895—January	44,705,967
May	156,304,709	February	87,085,511
June	156,793,749	March	90,643,307
July	158,933,005	April	91,247,145
August	157,732,289	May	99,151,409
September	157,917,211	June	107,512,363
October	158,537,179	July	107,236,487
November	163,930,220	August	100,329,837
December	170,912,414	September	92,911,974
1887—January	168,475,361	October	92,943,179
February	175,130,262	November	79,333,966

The reserve would not have fallen below the minimum of $100,000,000 during and after 1893 but for the known policy of the President to reduce duties on imported goods, followed soon by the enactment of the tariff law now in force, resulting in a large reduction of revenue and in deficiencies that could only be paid out of the resumption fund.

It is but fair to state that the resumption act of 1875 did not segregate the resumption fund from the general balance, nor did it provide that notes redeemed should be held in place of the coin paid out. The then Secretary of the Treasury, in his annual report to Congress on the 6th of December, 1880, pointed out these defects in the resumption law. He said:

> The Secretary expresses the utmost confidence that without new legislation the entire amount of United States notes now authorized and outstanding can be easily maintained at par in coin, even if the present favorable financial condition should change; but in order to accomplish this the coin reserve must be kept unimpaired, except by such payments as may be made from it in redemption of notes. Notes redeemed should be temporarily held, in place of the coin paid out, especially if it appears that the call for coin is greater in amount than the coin coming in due course into the Treasury or the mints.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> It is suggested that Congress might define and set apart the coin reserve as a special fund for resumption purposes. The general available balance is now treated as such a fund; but as this balance may, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be unduly drawn upon for the purchase or payment of bonds, it would appear advisable that Congress prescribe the maximum and minimum of the fund.

This advice, given in 1880, was not needed, at least until the present Administration came into power, and now it is very sorely needed by them. Congress neglected to enact into law the measures proposed, but neither the Congress nor the Secretary of the Treasury anticipated that the time would come when this fund would be applied to pay current deficiencies in the revenue amounting in two and a half years to $162,000,000. Both the President and the Secretary say that no provision had been made by law for the happening of such deficiencies and that their only resort was the general fund in the Treasury, composed of the resumption fund and the general balance in the Treasury. But it is due to truth to say that in February, 1893, a short time before the close of the Fifty-second Congress, when Mr. Carlisle was a member of the Committee on Finance of the Senate and it was known that he was to be Secretary of the Treasury, and when the probabilities of a deficiency became apparent, that committee, upon my motion, with the approbation of Mr. Carlisle, reported an amendment to an appropriation bill as follows:

> To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to provide for and to maintain the redemption of United States notes according to the provisions of the act approved January 14, 1875, entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," $50,000; and, at the discretion of the Secretary, he is authorized to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par in coin, either of the description of bonds authorized in said act, or bonds of the United States bearing not to exceed 3 per cent interest, payable semiannually and redeemable at the pleasure of the United States after five years from their date with like qualities, privileges, and exemptions provided in said act for the bonds therein authorized, to the extent necessary to carry said resumption act into full effect, and to use the proceeds thereof for the purposes provided in said act and none other.

This amendment is practically and substantially the bill now pending in the Senate. The amendment was adopted by the Senate. It went to the House of Representatives and was there referred, without a vote, to a committee of conference, which rejected it, and, as it was understood at the time, with the approval of Mr. Carlisle, who said it was unnecessary. No deficiency at that time existed, but it was manifest that the policy of the incoming Administration would create a deficiency. If that amendment had become a law the Secretary could easily have maintained the reserve and met deficiencies as they occurred by the proceeds of the bonds described in it.

Nor would deficiencies have occurred had not the President and both Houses of the Fifty-third Congress, then in political sympathy, united in passing a law reducing the revenue below expenditures for the first time since the close of the war, and compelled the executive authorities to apply a fund created for the redemption of United States notes to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government. This demonstrated fact is the source and fountain of all our present financial difficulties.

I do not wish to criticise the sales of bonds authorized by the resumption act to meet these deficiencies. Under the circumstances the Administration was justified in doing this, even to the impairment of the resumption fund, but it ought frankly to say that the cause of the invasion of the resumption fund was the deficiency of revenue created by faulty tariff legislation by the last Congress.

Such a deficiency is discreditable to the United States, with its vast wealth and resources. There is no difficulty in collecting by taxation all and more money than is necessary for its expenditures. It is humiliating to read in the newspapers of the day that our Government is negotiating for money from associated bankers, and, like a distressed debtor in view of bankruptcy, is offered by a friendly power its accumulated gold to relieve us from our supposed financial distress. The true remedy is to supply additional revenue by taxation in some form, and, until this can be effected, to borrow from the people of the United States enough money to cover past and future deficiencies. This done, gold will readily be exchanged for United States notes, as was done from January, 1879, to the election of Mr. Cleveland.

The two defects in existing law relating to redemption are mentioned by the President.

First. That the notes presented for redemption must be reissued. It seems from the newspapers that he has found the power to hold notes redeemed until they can be exchanged for coin, a discovery that he should have made sooner.

Second. That the resumption fund is a part of the general balance in the Treasury and may be applied to current expenditures.

Congress neglected to cure the defects pointed out by me as Secretary of the Treasury in December, 1880, but I hope will correct them now at the request of the President. It was not then anticipated that a deficiency of revenue would occur or that if it did occur the Government would use a fund specifically pledged for another purpose to meet current liabilities. Notes once redeemed should only be reissued for gold coin, and such reissues should be mandatory when coin is deposited in the Treasury. With this provision of law the scarcity of currency would create such a demand for it that coin would be freely deposited in exchange for the more portable and current notes of the United States.

The resumption fund should be segregated from all other moneys of the United States and paid out only in redemption of United States notes. With such provisions in the law the resumption fund could not be invaded to meet deficiencies in the revenue. They should be provided for by bonds or certificates of indebtedness of small denominations at a low rate of interest, which would be readily taken by the people through national banks, subtreasuries, and post-offices.

There seems to be a misapprehension of the difficulties of maintaining the redemption of United States notes. The nominal volume of these is $346,681,016. This is the reduced volume from the maximum outstanding during the civil war of $450,000,000. But this sum of $346,000,000 includes all the notes lost and destroyed by casualty since the first issue in 1862. The amount thus lost has been estimated from twenty to forty million dollars, reducing the notes outstanding to $320,000,000, or less. The national banks in certain large cities are required to keep on hand in lawful money of the United States an amount equal to at least 25 per cent of the aggregate amount of their notes in circulation and their deposits, and all other banking associations are required at all times to have on hand in lawful money of the United States an amount equal to at least 15 per cent of the aggregate amount of their notes in circulation and of their deposits. Under this law the national banks now hold for the redemption of their notes and the security of their deposits the sum of over $93,000,000 in lawful money almost exclusively in United States notes, and this money can not be withdrawn by any bank without reducing their notes in circulation and their deposits from four to six fold the amount of their withdrawal. The actual amount of United States notes now in circulation among the people can not exceed $227,000,000, and this is scattered among 65,000,000 people who cherish this money with confidence and faith as the best money they have ever had. With a provision in the law that notes redeemed with coin shall not be reissued except for coin the value and stability of our currency can never be endangered.

As the term "lawful money" includes gold coin there is a disposition by timid banks to convert their United States notes into coin, thus aiding in depleting the redemption reserve. This has been done to the extent of forty to fifty million dollars. This ought to be prevented by a provision of law that the bank reserve of lawful money shall be United States notes or Treasury notes only. The banks can redeem their notes with Treasury notes and United States notes, because the law expressly makes those notes a legal tender for that purpose. It is a bad sign when the banks seek to embarrass the Government in order to convert their greenbacks into gold, and I trust it will be discontinued. It has not gone further than the amount I have mentioned, which is about $40,000,000.

National banks are the creation and instruments of the Government and ought not to be allowed to discredit the money with which they can redeem their own notes, nor should the Government itself be permitted in any way to weaken the credit and confidence of the people in their paper money by using it for current expenses in excess of current revenues.

It is a practical fraud for the Government to use these notes for such purposes, and it never has been done except during this Administration. Every dollar thus taken is an impairment of the redemption fund. It is the misapplication of a fund specially created by law for another purpose. The effect is to destroy confidence in the credit and safety of our paper currency. It has led to the demand for gold coin for United States notes. I do not believe that has been the design of the executive branch of the Government, but that has been its effect and should be prevented by the immediate action of Congress. The resumption fund is

the safeguard of the money of the people, and its use for any other purpose is a practical repudiation of the public faith.

The President complains that the notes are presented and paid, reissued, and paid again and again, making a continuous circuit. When did this circuit commence? The only answer is, when this Administration, supported by the last Congress, created a deficiency. Why does the circuit continue? It is because the deficiency continues. The Government resorts to the financial policy of Micawber. It gives its bonds and thinks the debt paid. But the circuit continues. The money received for current revenue is paid to cover deficiencies and is returned for gold, and then more bonds. The Secretary hopes that in two or three years there will be no deficiency. What is the ground for this hope? It is that a new Administration will provide more revenue, and then the circuit will be broken. Why not apply the remedy now?

If deficiencies occur Congress should immediately supply the means to meet them, and Congress, and not the Administration, must be the judge of the mode and manner of relief. The invasion and misapplication of the resumption fund is of infinitely greater injury to our people than the imposition of ten times the amount of taxation.

It is said that the law for their continued reissue is mandatory. That is not a fair construction of the law. The plain meaning of it is that the redemption of the notes shall not cause their cancellation. They are placed on the footing of bank notes. What solvent bank would reissue its notes when there was a run upon it? It would hold them until the demand ceased. The Government ought to exercise the same prudence. The President is of the opinion that the United States notes and Treasury notes should be retired and give place to bank notes. This is a question for Congress to decide. It is certainly not of that opinion now, nor was the last Congress of that opinion. Outside of a few large cities where banking facilities are abundant and business is conducted by checks and commercial paper, there is no desire for the retirement of national paper money. It is not right for the executive authorities to discredit this money by using it for current deficiencies. It was the use and dispersion of the redemption fund that created the circle of which he complains.

I believe that under existing law the aggregate sum of United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of 1890, amounting to about $460,000,000, can be easily maintained at par with coin if the two amendments I have mentioned are adopted by Congress. These notes are a legal tender for all debts, public or private. They are a debt of the United States without interest and without other material cost to the Government than the interest on the cost of the coin or bullion held in the Treasury to redeem them. They are preferred by the people to any other form of paper money that has been devised. They have all the sanctions of law and all the security that has been or can be given to our bonds. They have the pledge of the public faith that they will be redeemed in coin. The substitution of these notes for State-bank paper money was one of the greatest benefits that has resulted from the civil war. These notes have all the sanction, protection, and security that has been or can be given to our national-bank notes, with the added benefit that the large saving derived from them inures to the people of the United States instead of to the bankers.

Another reason, founded upon belief, is that the national banking system could not long endure if the United States notes were withdrawn. I will not on this occasion discuss this, nor any other of the numerous financial questions involved, such as the policy of requiring the duties on imports to be paid in gold. Imports are purchased with gold, are paid for in gold, and we may require gold for duties. The disposition of silver certificates is a much more serious problem. They are in express terms redeemable in silver dollars. Ought they not to be redeemed by silver dollars? While the silver dollars are maintained at par with gold it would seem that there was no injustice in paying the silver dollars for silver certificates. Then comes up the question of free coinage of silver, which I regard as the most dangerous policy.

All these are vital questions I do not wish to mingle with the pressing recommendation of the President in his last annual message "that authority be given the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds of the United States bearing a low rate of interest payable by their terms in gold for the purpose of maintaining a sufficient gold reserve and also for the redemption and cancellation of outstanding United States notes and the Treasury notes issued for the purchase of silver under the law of 1890." He recommends the exchange of gold interest-bearing bonds for the legal-tender notes of the United States, and the substitution of national-bank notes as our only currency. He is supported in this by large and influential classes of our fellow-citizens, most of them engaged in banking or classed as capitalists. Their arguments mainly rest upon the difficulties encountered by this Administration in maintaining a reserve in coin to redeem United States notes. They forget that during a period of fourteen years when the revenues of the Government exceeded expenditures and when the public debt was being reduced with unexampled rapidity there was no difficulty in maintaining our notes at par with coin. There is scarcely a doubt but that in all conditions of trade or finance, except the contingency of war, the whole mass of United States notes and Treasury notes now in circulation can be maintained at par with coin if it is supported by a reserve of gold coin or bullion or silver bullion at market value in due proportions equal to one-third or one-fourth of the amount of such notes.

A careful study of the systems of banking, currency, and coinage adopted by the principal nations of Europe convinces me that our system, when cured of a few defects developed by time, founded upon the bimetallic coinage of gold and silver maintained at par with each other, with free national banks established in every city and town of importance in the United States, issuing their notes secured beyond doubt by United States bonds or some equivalent security, redeemable on demand in United States notes, and the issue of an amount of United States notes and Treasury notes equal to the amount now outstanding, with provision for a ratable increase with the increase of population, always redeemable in coin and supported by an ample reserve of coin in the Treasury, not to be invaded by deficiencies of revenue, and separated by the subtreasury system from all connection with the receipts and expenditures of the Government—such a system would make our money current in commercial circles in every land and clime, better than the best that now exists in Europe, better than that of Great Britain, which now holds the purse string of the world.

It is not given to man to foresee with certainty the future; but if we may judge the future by the past, the growth and progress of our country will continue, the diversity and extent of our industries will expand, the vast plains of our broad territory will be teeming with population. The rapid growth of our cities, unexampled in the history of mankind, will continue. A century spans the life of this Republic; what will the next century do? I have seen great changes in my life, but those who come after us will see greater changes still. I may on some proper occasion hereafter give the reasons for my faith in our present financial system. All I ask now is that you will not disturb it with your deficiencies, you will not rob it of its safeguards, you will not return to the days of wildcat money, you will not lessen the savings of prudent labor or the accumulations of the rich. Time makes all things even. Let us give to the executive authorities ample means to meet the appropriations you have made, but let us strengthen rather than weaken our monetary system, which lies at the foundation of our prosperity and progress.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this morning I introduced a bill and asked unanimous consent for its present consideration. At the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], I allowed it to pass over until after the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] had addressed the Senate upon the financial question.

The burden of the speech of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], to which the Senate has listened with so much attention, is to charge the responsibility for the present bad financial condition of this country upon the Democratic party. Of course there will be replies to this charge. The People's Party would like to reply; the Democratic party would like to reply; but if we go into a discussion of this question of responsibility now we may prolong the discussion, and while it is prolonged the President may issue more bonds without the consent of Congress. The people are not interested now so much about who is responsible for the wrongs already committed as they are interested in stopping the fresh wrong that the President is now about to commit. This is no time to be playing politics—to be sparring for party advantage. It is the time to act. If we are opposed to this issue of bonds that the President is about to make, let us be honest and say so.

The Democratic Senators should at this hour put patriotism above party instead of wasting time in replying to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] as to who is responsible for the country being bankrupt. They should rise to the duty of the hour and pass this bill which I have offered calling upon the President of the United States and his Secretary of the Treasury not to issue more bonds without the consent of Congress. Every Senator should vote for this resolution; we can pass it in an hour, and we ought to do it.

I say we can not afford to discuss other questions here for party advantage when we see in the morning papers that the President is about to issue $200,000,000 of interest-bearing bonds. We are informed that he will wait a day or two to hear from Congress. Let us not keep him waiting. Let us give him our opinion, and do it unanimously. Let us tell him not to issue any more bonds without the consent of Congress. Let us call upon him not to bankrupt this country with debt. Let us repeal the Republican law under which this Democratic President is about to commit another great wrong upon the people. Let us call upon him to preserve the credit of this country by not plunging it deeper in debt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to

lay before the Senate the unfinished business, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during the sessions of Congress.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not want to talk about funerals to-day. I am trying to prevent a funeral. I am trying to keep the liberty and prosperity of the people from being murdered. If this policy of contracting the currency and piling up debt in times of peace is not stopped, we will all soon be forced to attend the funeral of our republican form of government. If Congress will pass this bill (to prohibit the further issue of bonds without the consent of Congress) then the President will be forced to refer this whole matter to Congress.

Mr. President, there are two things which it is highly important for this Congress to consider now, and which in my judgment are more important than the questions raised by the Senator from Ohio or any other questions at this time: First, shall there be more interest-bearing bonds issued? Second, if they are to be issued, how, in what manner, and at what price? Congress is the sole power that should decide these questions. The Constitution delegated this power solely to Congress, and we have no right or power, in my opinion, to delegate it to another branch of the Government. In my opinion Congress has not done so; but the President claims that he has the power under an old law, the resumption act of 1875. Therefore if this bill is not passed the President will use his own judgment and go into this big transaction without the advice or consent of Congress. I am not willing to trust the judgment of the President. His bad judgment in the last bond deal cost the people of this country $16,000,000, and besides brought shame and disgrace upon this country.

The bill which I have introduced covers the resolution submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] requiring that the bonds, if sold at all, shall be sold at public sale after having been duly advertised. That is proper; but it does not go far enough. This whole matter should be in the hands of Congress. This is the effect of the bill which I offer. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

A bill (S. 1341) to prohibit the further issuance of interest-bearing bonds without the consent of Congress.

Be it enacted, etc., That the issuance of interest-bearing bonds of the United States, for any purpose whatever, without further authority of Congress, is hereby prohibited.

Mr. BUTLER. This bill is perfectly plain and simple. Everybody understands what it means. It needs no discussion. It should be passed at once, and every Senator should vote for it.

It is perfectly clear from the wording of the bill that it makes no difference what a man's opinion may be about where the responsibility lies for the issuance of bonds. If they are necessary, he can not oppose this bill. It makes no difference whether a man is in favor of bonds or opposed to bonds, he can not oppose this bill. The bill is purposely drawn so as not to raise a discussion of those questions to-day. It is important for this bill to pass at once. How can any Senator object to it? It simply provides that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury shall get the advice and consent of Congress before issuing any more bonds. If there is any necessity to issue bonds, can not Congress trust itself to act? Do Senators think that Congress is not as patriotic as the President? Is not the credit of the country as safe in the hands of Congress as in the hands of the President? If it is not the right and duty of Congress to decide when a bond issue is necessary, then Congress had better delegate all of its power to the President and go home and let Cleveland make all the other laws. If Congress sits still and allows the President to issue these bonds, then Congress is just as responsible for the wrong as the President himself. This is a dangerous power which Congress has permitted the Executive to exercise.

The distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] said last year on the floor of the Senate—I quote from memory—that so long as the present law, the resumption act of 1875, remained on the statute books the President and the Secretary of the Treasury could, in his opinion, continue to issue bonds "so long as water runs down hill, so long as time lasts, unless Congress should prohibit them from doing so." That is his interpretation of the law. And it is on this interpretation of the act of 1875 that the President is about to issue more bonds. If this interpretation of the law is correct—which I deny—then the law should be repealed at once. If the President has the power to issue bonds without limit, then it is the most dangerous power that was ever given to any one man. It gives him the power to mortgage the whole country to foreign shylocks without asking the consent of the people or of Congress. Shall Congress intrust such tremendous and dangerous power in the hands of any one man? Nearly every Senator on this floor has criticised the President's course in the last bond deal. I hope that no one would approve such a shameful transaction, except those who made money out of it.

The new bond deal that the President is about to make is as great a swindle as the former one. Will Congress sit still and see this country mortgaged to death and besides see millions of the people's money filched into private pockets? It is our duty to stop this scandalous wrong, and to stop it now.

Let us pass this bill, and then the whole question of issuing bonds will come up before Congress, where it belongs. Then, if Congress finds that there is a necessity to issue bonds (which I do not believe), it can provide regulations, limitations, and conditions like those proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] in his resolution, or such others as may be necessary to prevent scandal and save the people's money. Certainly there can be no objection to this. Under the rule of the Senate this bill can not be voted on to-day without unanimous consent. Our duty in this matter is so plain that there is no need of discussion. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on this bill now, and I hope that there will be no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York now in the chair objects to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a few remarks in reply to some statements made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] while he was on the floor a few moments ago.

I confess that I was much surprised to hear the Senator from Ohio state that the present embarrassed condition of the Treasury was due to the tariff law passed by the Fifty-third Congress, and which went into effect on the 28th day of August, 1894. Let us appeal to the facts and see whether it is the Fifty-third or the Fifty-first Congress which is responsible. The Fifty-first was a Republican and the Fifty-third a Democratic Congress. I meet his charge with a countercharge that the guilt attaches to the skirts of the Fifty-first Congress, and the Senator from Ohio has as large a share of that responsibility as any citizen of the United States. He was a member, and a very influential member, of the Committee on Finance of the Senate then, as he is now.

When the Democratic Administration went out of power on the 4th day of March, 1889, it turned over to the Republican Administration the following funds:

Agency account	$64,502,445.02
Net balance in the Treasury	165,846,471.10
Total	230,348,916.12

In addition to this it turned over to the Republican Administration $100,000,000 of gold belonging to the so-called reserve fund. In addition to this there was a fund held in trust for the redemption of national-bank notes. This last fund, amounting to $54,207,975.75, was covered into the Treasury during the administration of President Harrison. On the 1st day of March, 1893, the available funds in the Treasury, exclusive of the $100,000,000 gold reserve, was—

Agency account	$38,365,832.90
Net balance in the Treasury	24,084,742.28
Total	62,450,575.18

The remainder of that large sum had disappeared by the 1st of March, 1893. On that day the receipts for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1892, amounted to $259,430,096, and the expenditures to $259,620,556, showing a deficit of $190,460. That deficit did not result from the Fifty-third Congress. It was not then in being. The Wilson tariff was not then in existence. This was the legitimate product of the McKinley law, which went into effect October 1, 1890, and remained in force till the 28th of August, 1894. It is very strange for a Senator so distinguished and so well informed as the Senator from Ohio to rise in his place here and condemn the Wilson tariff for reducing the revenues so as to produce a deficit when he knows and every Senator knows that the falling of the revenues occurred under the McKinley law, and that law was enacted with the deliberate intention to reduce the revenues.

When I say that it was the deliberate intention of the supporters of that measure to get rid of the enormous revenues turned over to them in March, 1893, and reduce the incoming revenues, I speak by the card. I will read from the report of the distinguished author of the McKinley Act, one of the boldest of the protectionist leaders, and a gentleman who never shunned responsibility for the just results of his political actions. If he is to be the standard bearer of his party in the coming contest, I am sure he will stand upon the doctrine that it is the duty of Congress to prohibit importations in order to give increased prices to domestic producers. When he presented his bill to Congress it was not entitled "An act

to raise revenue," but "An act to reduce revenue." Our bill was an act to reduce taxation. His object was to raise taxes and reduce revenues by prohibiting the importation of the articles from which the revenues were to be raised.

That was then and is now the policy of the Republican party. There are two ways of raising revenues from imports—one by high and the other by low rates of duty. A 50 per cent duty on $100,000,000 of imports will bring $50,000,000 of revenue, and 25 per cent duty on $200,000,000 of imports will bring the same revenue to the Treasury. The first is the Republican, the last the Democratic contention. The Republican policy is to exclude importations as far as it can be done and yet obtain enough revenues for Government expenditures. In their eagerness to restrict in 1890 they overshot the mark, embarrassed the Treasury, and now charge the results to us. Our dutiable imports for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1890, three months before the passage of the McKinley law, amounted to $507,571,764, and brought revenue to the Government amounting to $229,668,584.

On the 30th of June, 1894, two months before the Wilson tariff law went into effect, our dutiable imports amounted to $257,645,703, bringing revenue to the Government amounting to $131,818,530. The dutiable imports had fallen off $249,926,061, and the revenues $97,850,054. And all this was before the Wilson tariff bill was born, and yet, in the face of these official returns, the Democratic tariff bill is charged with the guilt that attaches to this "humiliating" spectacle. In 1889, when Mr. Cleveland turned over the administration to Mr. Harrison, the revenues exceeded expenditures by $87,761,080. On June 30, 1893, the excess was only $2,341,674, and the Republican arithmetic charges the loss to the Cleveland Administration and the Wilson tariff. The next year, still under the McKinley tariff, the expenditures exceeded the revenues by $69,803,260. And the country is told that this is all due to the Wilson tariff and the Cleveland Administration. On the 30th of June, 1895, with ten months of the Wilson law, the excess of expenditures over receipts was $42,805,223.

The revenues under the Wilson bill had reduced the deficit $26,998,037. And if the Supreme Court had not declared unconstitutional the provisions of the Wilson law which imposed the tax on income there would have been no deficit at the end of that year, and a large surplus at the end of the fiscal year 1896. The revenues derived from customs the first year of the Wilson law exceeded the revenues derived from customs under the McKinley law the year preceding by $20,340,087, and with these figures standing in the official reports of the Government, known to all, the Wilson bill is arraigned and accused of producing a deficit in the National Treasury. This "humiliating" spectacle, to use the adjective of the Senator from Ohio, was the product not of the Wilson but of the McKinley law. In the report of Mr. McKinley, when he presented his bill to the House, he says:

> The exact effect upon the revenues of the Government of the proposed bill is difficult of ascertainment. That there will be a substantial reduction, as we shall show, admits of no doubt. It is not believed that the increase of duties upon wools and woolen goods and upon glassware will have the effect of increasing the revenues. That would, of course, follow if the importations of the last fiscal year were hereafter to be maintained, which, however, is altogether improbable. The result will be that importations will be decreased, and therefore the amount of revenue collected from these sources will be diminished. In every case of increased duty, except that imposed upon tin plate (which does not go into effect until July 1, 1891) and upon linen fabrics, the effect will be to reduce, rather than enlarge, the revenues, because importations will fall off. It was the aim of the committee to fix the duties upon that class of manufactured goods and farm products which can be supplied at home, so as to discourage the use of like foreign goods and products and secure to our own people and our own producers the home market, believing that competition among ourselves will secure reasonable prices to consumers in the future, as it has invariably done in the past.

Here was the policy of restriction of importation and reduction of revenues boldly proclaimed by the author of the tariff act of October 1, 1890. The purpose declared was to raise prices to consumers, not revenue to the Treasury. The law executed its purpose effectually, cut off importation, cut down revenues, raised prices, lowered wages, and sent distress throughout all the branches of our national industry. We told them in the Senate and House that they would raise prices, but not revenue. And now when the Treasury has been emptied of more than two hundred millions of surplus money and a deficit in receipts is presented, we are held up to the public as responsible for the miserable condition of our finances. There was not a Democratic Senator or a Democratic Representative who did not vote against the passage of the law that produced these pernicious results.

In the Fiftieth Congress when a Democratic House sent to the Senate a bill "to reduce taxation," the Senate, then with a Republican majority, adopted a substitute increasing taxation for the purpose of reducing revenue. The Finance Committee then said that it was necessary "to reduce the national revenues, which are now excessive"; "that no valid reason could be given why we should, under existing circumstances, continue to collect annually a sum approximating $60,000,000 in excess of the amount required to administer the Government economically and to keep the pledges of public faith." They said that reducing rates would get more money; that the acts of July 14, 1870, May 1 and June 6, 1872, were acts reducing rates. It was estimated, they said, that the reduction of revenues would exceed $57,000,000, but they increased the revenues more than $8,000,000. It was not increase but decrease of revenue they wanted, and when they got the power, as they did in 1890, they reduced the revenues, convulsed the business of the country, bankrupted the Treasury, and now say to the country that Democrats did it.

I have shown from the official reports of the Government that a Democratic Administration inherited this "humiliating" condition from its Republican predecessor. I will now show that a Cabinet officer admitted it to the Senate and House before the Democratic Administration came into power. In February, 1893, Secretary Foster was flitting between the Senate and House asking Congress to come to his relief. The McKinley bill had filled the pockets of manufacturers, but it had emptied the vaults of the Treasury. He was begging for authority to sell bonds to raise revenues to supply the deficiency made by the McKinley law. The Senator from Ohio came to his relief and had an amendment authorizing him to sell bonds put into an appropriation bill. This was nearly two years before the Wilson law. Mr. Foster went before the Ways and Means Committee of the House with his grievance, and appealed to them for assistance. When before that committee Mr. TURNER of Georgia asked him this question:

> Taking into consideration all these conditions which you anticipate, what, in your judgment, would be a fair conjecture of the condition of the Treasury at the end of the next fiscal year?
>
> Secretary FOSTER. I should say the next fiscal year would show a deficit.

When asked by Mr. TURNER of Georgia for an approximate estimate he replied:

> I will only say this, that if I was to have the management of the Treasury I should insist upon an increase of revenue to the extent of $50,000,000.

Here was an anticipated deficit of the next year of fifty millions. Who did it? Certainly not the Wilson Act. It was not the Fifty-third Congress, not yet in existence, but the Fifty-first Congress that passed the McKinley Act. The Secretary was then appealing for authority to sell bonds to raise revenues to meet the current expenditures of the Government. It was then too late to wait for Congress to increase revenues by decreasing taxes. Money must be bo henrtorwed. The authority to sell bonds was placed in the appropriation bill, and the Secretary sent the following letter to the Chief of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing:

> TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
> *Washington, D. C., February 20, 1893.*
>
> SIR: You are hereby authorized and directed to prepare designs for the 3 per cent bonds provided in a Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill now pending. The denominations which should first receive attention are 100s and 1,000s of the coupon bonds, and 100s, 1,000s, and 10,000s of the registered bonds.
>
> This authority is given in advance of the enactment in view of pressing contingencies, and you are directed to hasten the preparation of the designs and plates in every possible manner.
>
> I inclose a memorandum for your guidance in preparing the script for the body of the bond.
>
> Respectfully, yours, CHARLES FOSTER, *Secretary.*
>
> The CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

Inclosed in the letter were the following words to be printed on the face of the bonds:

> WASHINGTON, *April 1, 1893.*
>
> This bond is issued in accordance with the provisions of section — of an act entitled "An act making appropriation for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1893, and is redeemable at the pleasure of the United States after the 1st day of April, A. D. 1898, in coin of the standard value of the United States on said March 3, 1893, with interest in such coin from the day of the date hereof at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of October and April in each year.
>
> The principal and interest are exempt from the payment of all taxes or duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority.

The Secretary was in trouble; the Treasury had taken an overdose of McKinleyism. He urged his engraver and printer "to hasten." There were "pressing contingencies." Who made these "pressing contingencies"? Who had emptied the Treasury? The McKinley law, that public indignation swept from the statute books in 1894 and which a Republican Congress is now trying to reenact. The Senator from Ohio disowns the petted child of his party and charges the tariff law of 1894 with all the ills of the three years preceding. There was no Wilson law in February, 1893, when he was crying to Congress:

> Help me, Cassius, or I sink!

The authority to sell bonds asked for by the Secretary was refused by the House, and in a few days Mr. Foster turned over the Treasury and the deficit to Mr. Carlisle to deal with as best he could. The receipts for the four months preceding the 1st day of March, 1893, he says in his report, were $4,094,021.38 less than the expenditures. This was the condition that confronted him on entering upon his trust. The deficiency estimated by Secretary Foster at $50,000,000 for 1894 turned out to be $69,803,260.58. In 1895, with ten months of the Wilson law, the deficit went down to $42,805,223.18. The revenues are now increasing under the Wilson law. The revenues from customs already exceed $83,000,000

for the first six months of this fiscal year, and are estimated at $172,000,000 by June 30. The deficit will be reduced by that time to $17,000,000, and by June 30, 1897, it will be converted into a surplus.

These are the plain facts, and in spite of them the Senator from Ohio, the Nestor of the Republican party, deliberately arraigns a Democratic Administration for bankrupting the Treasury. This is a strange performance. After the Democratic people in the Senate and House, in the press, on the stump, and everywhere predicted this result and did everything in their power to prevent it, they are now solemnly charged with having produced it! I was a member of the House of Representatives when the McKinley bill passed that body over the protest and vote of every Democrat in it. In opposing its passage I said then:

I want you to meet the people whom you have "not hesitated" to tax from 1 to 200 per cent on the necessaries of life. We will content ourselves by giving our votes against it, and when you leave this House and Senate with this enormous load of guilt upon your heads and appear before the great tribunal for trial may "the Lord have mercy on your souls."

I thought I could see that keeping out imports would increase taxation, increase prices of manufactures, reduce wages and Government revenues. I thought I could see in the near future a day of reckoning, and it came. When I saw sugar, that was bringing to the Treasury more than fifty millions of revenue, put on the free list, and the Treasury charged with bounties for sugar production amounting to many millions, I felt sure the collapse would come. It did come, and when the people spoke their words of condemnation they did not speak with bated breath.

Now, Mr. President, when the Treasury is working out of the disaster in which it was placed by the McKinley law, when our revenues are increasing, it is being proposed to reenact into law the same duties and produce again the disasters from which we are emerging by the aid of smaller rates and larger revenues.

It is astonishing to me to see Republican leaders now proposing an "emergency" bill in order to help the Treasury to obtain more money by the same means they employed in 1890 to prevent the Treasury from getting so much money. In 1890 they said there is too much revenue. We will raise duties, prohibit importation, and reduce revenues. Now they say there is not enough revenue. We must replenish the Treasury. How? By the same means we used in 1890 to reduce the revenues.

The Secretary does not ask for more revenues. The President does not recommend increase of revenues. Republican statesmen in both Houses were grievously disappointed when the message of the Executive omitted mention of it. The message was criticised all round because the President did not invite them to send him a McKinley tariff. So they had to get up an "emergency" bill, when there was no emergency. They are repeating the rôle of 1890. Every well-informed Senator and Member of the House knows that duties ranging from 50 to 150 per cent are not revenue duties. One of the most distinguished Secretaries of the Treasury we ever had held that a majority of articles were at the revenue point at 20 per cent; under the present tariff, duties on woolen goods are above the revenue point. Many of them are over 50 per cent. Yet it is proposed as an emergency measure to put a duty on wool and a compensatory duty on woolen goods to restrict their importation and get more money.

I hope this bill will not pass. I do not believe it can pass without the support of our Populist friends, and I do not believe it can obtain their support. But if it does pass, and the people shall be again plunged into the horrors entailed on them by the McKinley law, I suppose our Republican friends will say "the Wilson bill did it." I will not enter upon the discussion of the different rates and phases of the new tariff bill. I will wait till the "emergency" comes out of the committee and enters the arena of discussion. I may then have something to say of the new idea of increasing revenues by prohibiting imports.

SALE OF BONDS.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I wish to call up the resolution I introduced on Tuesday last.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator from West Virginia permit me to ask what has become of the resolution of the Senator from Ohio?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has gone to the Calendar.

Mr. VEST. I ask that that resolution may lie on the table, in order that it may be called up again when the Senate reassembles, as I desire to speak upon the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. What was the suggestion of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. ELKINS. I wish to call up the resolution I introduced on Tuesday last.

Mr. FAULKNER. I understand that my colleague proposes to call up the resolution for the purpose of submitting some remarks.

Mr. ELKINS. And to try to pass it, if I can.

Mr. FAULKNER. I shall not object to the resolution being taken up for the purpose of remarks, but I would object to its being called up for action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from West Virginia accept the suggestion of his colleague?

Mr. ELKINS. Yes, sir; I will call it up for remarks just now——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And not for passage?

Mr. ELKINS. Hoping to pass it later on. I ask that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from West Virginia, which will now be taken up only for the purpose of some remarks. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. ELKINS December 31, 1895, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that hereafter no bonds of the United States shall be sold at private sale or under private contract. And in case of any sale of bonds under existing laws, the same shall be made only after due advertisement of such sale and proposals invited, and then only to the highest bidder.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, inasmuch as there seems to be some misapprehension or some misunderstanding in the minds of Senators as to the import of this resolution, I will try to explain it. It does not raise any question as to the policy of selling bonds. It does not question the action of the President of the United States in proposing to sell bonds. The simple question raised by the resolution is one as to the plan or method of selling bonds and as to what is best for the Government under the circumstances.

It appears from the newspapers that the President is about to conclude a contract at private sale for the disposal of $100,000,000 of 4 per cent bonds of the United States. My contention is that a sale of Government bonds under a private contract will not result as beneficially to the Government as if they should be sold after due notice and advertisement to the highest bidder. In other words, I think it best and to the interest of the Government that the bonds be sold directly to the people rather than at private sale.

LAW AND POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT IN SELLING PUBLIC PROPERTY.

We have on the statute books of the United States a law in regard to the disposition of public property in charge of officers of the Government. It has been the policy of the Government uniformly that in the sale of public property notice should first be given of the time and place as well as the conditions of sale, and that it should be to the highest bidder. The House bill which is now pending before the Finance Committee meets this question pointedly, and provides that in any sale of bonds it shall be done by advertisement.

Here we have the expression of the House of Representatives by a large majority on this subject. If a public officer of the Government, a quartermaster or any other officer in charge of public property, can not sell even one hundred or one thousand dollars' worth of property without giving notice of the sale and inviting proposals, or if an officer can not buy without first giving notice and asking bids, why is it or how is it that the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury should be hedged around by some privilege lifting them out of this policy or general rule? Surely if an officer of the United States can not sell a small amount of property without public advertisement and due notice, why should the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury be permitted to sell $100,000,000 of public property without giving notice of the time and place of the sale and inviting bids from the people?

This, sir, is the question raised by the resolution. I contend that the uniform policy of the Government of the United States and the law as well in regard to subordinate officers should be carried out in case of a sale of bonds. In all matters of public concern officers of the Government from the President down should take the people into account and take them into their confidence, especially in a transaction as large as one involving $100,000,000.

WAR LOANS.

Now, Mr. President, we are not without precedent in the matter of floating Government bonds. We can go back to the period during and following the war for precedents. Nearly all the great loans of the Government in the time of its peril were popular loans. The great war loans were generally floated on a commission to bankers, and in most cases these commissions did not exceed 1½ per cent.

It is said the total amount of commissions paid for floating the war loans, aggregating more than two thousand five hundred millions, was about $5,500,000, while the profits to the syndicate that purchased the sixty-two millions of bonds in February, 1895, under private contract with the Secretary of the Treasury, is estimated to be greater than this vast sum. Of the 5-20 loan of 1862 five hundred and fourteen millions was placed with the people, and the great 7-30 loan of 1864–65, amounting to $829,992,500, was a popular loan. As I understand, the cost to the Government in the way of commissions of floating these two great loans with the people, amounting to more than one thousand three hundred millions,

was about one-half of the estimated profits made by the syndicate on the purchase of the sixty-two millions they bought in February under private contract.

These loans were first advertised. They were floated on the basis of a commission, and not by selling outright to a syndicate under private contract. If the Government, when it was in peril, could make popular loans on the basis of 1¼ per cent commission why can we not do the same now in a time of profound peace?

The commissions paid for floating the great war loans were in most cases about 1¼ per cent, and in those times I remember very well that this was considered a fair commission. I insist now that $1,000,000 would have been ample commission for selling the $62,000,000 of bonds of the Government that were sold at the last sale.

Now, Mr. President, I am not here to say how much the syndicate made under the private contract entered into last February. The trouble is we do not know the facts, and that is one of the objections to such a contract. The people should know all the facts. We only have the rumors and what is said in the newspapers. We have estimates. We can figure if the syndicate got these bonds at 104½ and sold them at 117—it is simply a matter of arithmetic to determine what the profit was. I only give the result of figuring on this subject. According to the estimates, it took more money to float the last loan of $62,000,000 of bonds than it took to float all of the great war loans combined. Are Senators prepared to sit here and not protest? We are a part of this Government as well as the President, and if we do not protest, if we do not indicate that we have some ideas as to the method of selling our bonds, he can readily turn to the country and say, "Congress was in session, and nothing was said—no objection was made."

LAST BOND SALE UNDER PRIVATE CONTRACT NOT FAVORABLE TO THE GOVERNMENT.

But, Mr. President, we are not without experience altogether in this matter. We have had under the various Secretaries of the Treasury sales of bonds from time to time; and I think I can assert, without fear of contradiction, that generally they have been made to the people after due advertisement and notice. I remember when the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] was Secretary of the Treasury and had occasion to float some loans that he insisted and contended that for thirty days the people should have the right to subscribe before a syndicate could take the bonds even on a commission.

If the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States are to be believed as to the condition of the Treasury, the Government is not in a position to lose $5,000,000 or $10,000,000 by selling bonds under private contract to a syndicate. The Government needs this money if it is in a state of bankruptcy, as charged. No transaction in the history of the Government invited such adverse criticisms and comments all over the country as the bond transaction in February, 1895. Americans were humiliated to see a syndicate virtually take possession of and enter into a contract to manage the finances of the Government for six months. The best opinion of people on this subject was that this Government should have made the profit that the syndicate made; and I hold now that the people would have bought bonds from the Government just as readily as they did from the syndicate, only the opportunity was not offered them.

I am told—I do not know how true it is—that this contemplated loan of $100,000,000 has been already oversubscribed in New York, and the syndicate is even now counting on 10 per cent profit that it will make off the Government. Are we as American Senators to sit here silently and not protest against a transaction of this kind?

It is said in the New York Tribune of January 1, which I will read from, that one banker coming from New York to Washington and returning with the privilege to float this loan charged $1,000,000 for getting the contract, besides the profit that he and his colleagues in the syndicate will make, which will be about $10,000,000. These vast sums are beyond the comprehension of the plain people of the United States. Where are we drifting if a few men, under a private contract with the President, can make millions and tens of millions in a few days? And it is easy to be made if the great Government of the United States, the richest in the world, stands behind them with its wealth and enormous credit.

On this subject of the profits of the syndicate, I do not want to insist on my own judgment in the premises, but I want to read from the New York World, the leading Democratic paper in the United States. It gives every item of profit and every item of expense, and it figures out that on the transaction that was made and concluded in February there was $8,000,000 profit, and on the transaction that is now under consideration, the sale of $100,000,000, there will be $12,000,000 profit. The total will be $21,168,757. The World also in its issue of to-day offers to take $1,000,000 of the new loan at, I think, 117, and we all know Mr. Pulitzer, its able editor and owner, is amply able to make good any offer he makes.

[From the New York World of January 1, 1895.]

MORGAN ET AL.'S PROFITS FOR 1895.

If this new loan is negotiated the account of J. Pierpont Morgan and his associated gold brokers with the Government of the United States will show the following handsome book profits for the year 1895:

HOW THE ACCOUNTS STAND—FIRST TRANSACTION—LOAN OF FEBRUARY 18 LAST.

Face of loan	$62,315,000
Morgan-Belmont paid 104.49 as premium	2,797,943
United States got	65,112,943
Morgan-Belmont got from bankers' syndicate, at 112¼	69,948,587
Morgan-Belmont syndicate's first profit	4,835,644
Bankers' syndicate got from public, at 118	73,531,700
Bankers' syndicate's second profit	3,583,113
United States lost by transaction and the bond syndicate made an apparent clear profit of	8,418,757

SECOND TRANSACTION (PROPOSED)—DECEMBER 31.

Face of loan (with $100,000,000 more in prospect)	100,000,000
Morgan, as syndicate manager, pays about 104¼ premium	4,750,000
United States will get	104,750,000
Morgan syndicate will get from public a premium of 117½ (yesterday's market price)	117,500,000
Morgan and other bankers' profit	12,750,000
Morgan and other bankers' profit in February	8,418,757
Total for 1895 if new contract is accepted	21,168,757

I know it will be said this is newspaper talk; but will any Senator deny it? The allegation is made. How is anyone going to deny it any more than I can prove it? The trouble is, as I said before, this comes from the vicious system of allowing even so great a man, and so great an officer as the President of the United States, to make a private contract to float a great loan. I hold that it would be far better not to sell Government bonds to a syndicate under a private contract, even if the Government should not make as much as is would realize under advertisement at public sale. The people would then have the satisfaction of knowing just what we are doing, and how the business of the Government is being conducted.

Can any Senator or any citizen tell anything about these enormous profits? The people should be taken into the confidence of the Executive. Public servants have no right to conclude such great transactions without letting the people know all of the facts. It seems to me that it would have been wiser and safer for the President to have said, as Congress was in session, "Whbelievllie e there is a great emergency, a great crisis, approaching us, I am here only as the Executive. I send to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, for their approval at least, or for such action as they may think proper, this private contract that is about to be made and entered into with the bankers for the disposal of $62,000,000 of bonds."

This contract should never have been made when Congress was in session except with its approval. The President should have given all the facts and asked the representatives of the people to divide with him this great responsibility. In a Republic there should be nothing secret, nothing hidden from the people by their public servants.

Now, Mr. President, I mean no reflection upon the Executive, nor upon his able Secretary of the Treasury. I mean no harsh criticism. I respect both of these great officers and have the fullest confidence in the purity of their motives. I stand here as a Senator and a business man interested in this Government simply to say that the method they propose, in my judgment, is not the best one and not in the best interests of the Government of the United States. Nor have I any reflection to make against the syndicate. It is composed of great and powerful men, great bankers, men of the highest integrity, character, and responsibility, known throughout the world. They are business men and will make money in an honorable way whenever an opportunity is offered.

Mr. President, to show you how strong the credit of the Government is and how eagerly this loan is sought for, I read from the New York Advertiser:

It is said that the price to be paid for the bonds will net the Government about 3¾ per cent.

* * * * * * *

The all-important point about the new deal is that the syndicate does not guarantee to maintain the Treasury gold reserve as it did in the other agreement. This was the cardinal feature of the previous loan.

* * * * * * *

So eager were the banks and other larger financial institutions to get an allotment that before 3 o'clock, if report is to be believed, the first $100,000,000 was more than subscribed.

Another paper says the bonds were subscribed for three times over.

The same bonds sold day before yesterday at 117¼. Complaints have been made by the bankers from Boston, from Philadelphia, and from all the great cities that they did not have a chance to take part of the bonds. How is it that only a few bankers have this right and privilege? Now, if the banks will subscribe to take these bonds from a syndicate, why will they not take them from the Government? It may be said that time is necessary, that we must have this money to-morrow, or next day, or the next day.

Why did not the Executive and Secretary of the Treasury advertise this loan thirty days in advance? Why wait until this moment and then make a private contract and let the profits be, as estimated, ten or twelve million dollars?

There have been three sales of bonds under the Cleveland Administration. The first two were under advertisement, in which bids were invited from the public, and were 5 per cent ten-year bonds. The first sale was January 17, 1894, for fifty millions of bonds, which were sold for $58,660,000, or about 117. The next sale was in November, 1894, and consisted of fifty millions of bonds, which were subscribed for three times over, 297 bids being received. The amount realized netted the Government $58,538,530, or about 117. The third sale was made February 8, 1895, under private contract. No bids were asked. The bonds amounted to $62,315,400, and were 4 per cent thirty-year bonds, for which the Government received only $65,116,244.62, or about 104½.

The following summary shows the results of the three bond sales—two to the public under advertisement, and one under private contract to a syndicate:

Date of bond.	Rate of interest.	Period of bond.	Amount issued.	Amount realized.	Price.
Feb. 1, 1894 ..	5 per cent..	10 years....	$50,000,000	$58,660,917.63	117
Nov., 1894 ...	.....do.....	.....do.....	50,000,000	58,538,500.00	117
Feb. 1, 1895 ..	4 per cent..	30 years....	62,315,400	65,116,244.62	104½
Total....	----------	----------	162,315,400	182,315,662.25	--------

It will be noted that the bonds sold to the public under advertisement brought about 12½ per cent more than those sold under private contract to a syndicate.

On these bonds issued the country will be called upon to pay $124,778,480 in interest.

Mr. President, I protest that the credit of this Government is too good to turn over its finances to a syndicate and sell its bonds at a price which readily commands 10 per cent profit to the syndicate.

This Government is not bankrupt; the country is not bankrupt. There is some trouble in the Treasury, and as this is not a political question I am not here to give my reasons why I think there is an embarrassment in the Treasury. I have my views and my notions on the subject, but this is not the time to set forth my particular views. I simply say that there is some trouble, but there is no danger of this country going into bankruptcy. It was virtually in the hands of a receiver for about six months, I admit, and I congratulated myself as an American citizen when it passed out of the hands of the receiver. Now, I want to keep it out of the hands of receivers; I want no more syndicates to float loans under private contracts. I want the people to have a chance at the loans; it is their Government and it is their credit and their money that is at stake.

Mr. President, what are the debts of the various countries of the world? The debt of Great Britain is $3,350,000,000 in round numbers. Each citizen of that Empire owes $87.79. The debt of France is $4,446,000,000, and each citizen of that Republic owes $116.38. Germany's debt is $1,957,000,000, and each citizen of that Empire owes $23.61. The United States owes $915,000,000, and each of her citizens owes $14. Note this great difference. I state a fact well known, that according to the last census we are immeasurably the richest nation on the globe. The estimate, under the last census, shows our wealth to be $65,000,000,000. Now, how does it come, in view of these facts, that we are in such straits that we have to make private contracts with a syndicate to float our loans? I used to think that only third-rate powers, South American Republics, and the Turkish Empire, were obliged to call in the Rothschilds to administer upon their finances, but it has happened that my own Government, the richest in all the wide world, all at once had to call on the Rothschilds for help.

CLEVELAND'S WORDS AND CLEVELAND'S ACTS.

A distinguished statesman, when a candidate for the greatest office in the gift of the people, and after his triumphant election, used a great many expressions which are familiar to many of us, such as "public office is a public trust," "the communism of pelf," "the rich growing richer and the poor growing poorer," "the greed of avarice," "the rapacity of corporate power," "the oppression of labor by organized capital," going so far in his appeals to unjust passion and prejudice as to invoke the ugly memories of Homestead. I want to know where the force or aptness of these expressions come in, in the face of a private contract made by him when he got power by which millions were made by a few men in a short time.

Mr. President, there is no surer way, no matter how pure the motive, to plant the seeds of discontent, unrest, impatience, and suspicion among the people than private arrangements authorized by high officials by which a few persons get millions at the expense of the many. The safety of the Republic rests upon the respect, the affections, and the loyalty of the plain people for our Government and its Administration. Nothing should be done to take from them this respect or to forfeit their confidence.

Mr. SQUIRE. I desire to offer a resolution on this subject.

Mr. ELKINS. I should like to have a vote on the pending resolution.

Mr. HILL. The resolution is before the Senate merely to enable the Senator from West Virginia to make some remarks.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let the resolution which the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE] wishes to offer be read for information.

Mr. ELKINS. I did not understand the Senator from New York.

Mr. HILL. I simply said the resolution of the Senator from West Virginia is not before the Senate for action.

Mr. ELKINS. I move that the Senate take up the resolution for present consideration, and I will state the reason. I am afraid the contract will be entered into if we do not adopt the resolution.

Mr. SQUIRE. I ask that the resolution which I sent to the desk may be read.

Mr. ELKINS. I ask for a vote on the motion to take up the resolution.

Mr. HILL. In the first place, the Senator from West Virginia makes two or three motions at the same time. Will he now distinctly tell us what motion he makes? What is the motion before us?

Mr. ELKINS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution. That is clear.

Mr. HILL. That is distinct and clear.

Mr. HOAR. The question is not debatable.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. The motion is not debatable.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable, but the Chair will hear the Senator from New York. The resolution offered by the Senator from West Virginia will again be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. ELKINS on the 31st ultimo, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that hereafter no bonds of the United States shall be sold at private sale or under private contract. And in case of any sale of bonds under existing laws, the same shall be made only after due advertisement of such sale and proposals invited, and then only to the highest bidder.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. ELKINS. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. HILL. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARTER (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. If he were present, I should vote "yea." Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MCMILLAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], who is absent on account of the illness of his sister. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

Mr. PRITCHARD (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. SQUIRE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], who is absent.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when the name of Mr. VILAS was called). My colleague [Mr. VILAS] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. WETMORE (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WILSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], who is absent, is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. With the consent of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], I transfer my pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], and both the Senator from Alabama and I can vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MORGAN. I vote "yea."

Mr. BRICE. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], but by agreement I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SHOUP. I am paired with the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE]. I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MITCHELL] that I transfer my pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], which will enable the Senator from Wisconsin and me to vote.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. Very well.

Mr. SHOUP. I vote "yea."

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. I vote "nay."

Mr. DUBOIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to inquire whether the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted, the Chair is advised.

Mr. DUBOIS. I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], but I take the liberty of transferring my pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], leaving the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] paired with the Senator from Nevada. My vote may stand.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 6; as follows:

YEAS—48.

Aldrich,	Cockrell,	Hoar,	Pettigrew,
Allen,	Cullom,	Jones, Nev.	Proctor,
Allison,	Davis,	Kyle,	Pugh,
Baker,	Dubois,	Lodge,	Roach,
Bate,	Elkins,	McBride,	Sherman,
Berry,	Faulkner,	Mantle,	Shoup,
Burrows,	Frye,	Martin,	Teller,
Butler,	Gallinger,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Call,	George,	Morrill,	Vest,
Cameron,	Hale,	Nelson,	Voorhees,
Chandler,	Harris,	Peffer,	Walthall,
Clark,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Warren.

NAYS—6.

Brice,	Chilton,	Mitchell, Wis.	Murphy.
Caffery,	Hill,		

NOT VOTING—31.

Bacon,	Gorman,	Palmer,	Stewart,
Blackburn,	Gray,	Pasco,	Thurston,
Blanchard,	Hansbrough,	Platt,	Tillman,
Carter,	Irby,	Pritchard,	Vilas,
Daniel,	Jones, Ark.	Quay,	Wetmore,
Gear,	McMillan,	Sewell,	White,
Gibson,	Mills,	Smith,	Wilson.
Gordon,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Squire,	

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution submitted by Mr. ELKINS.

Mr. HILL. I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HILL. Not quite yet, please. I will say to our friends upon the other side, who are anxious for a vote, that in due time a vote can be had upon this question, and the yeas and nays can be ordered if desired.

Mr. ELKINS. Let us have them now.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as to the propriety of the adoption of the motion I have made, it strikes me there can be no question. I can see no reason why the Senate should vote to take up a resolution like this for the simple purpose of referring it, when at any time that motion can be made.

The Senate Finance Committee has this very subject before it. It has been engaged for at least a day in its consideration, and nothing has yet been brought forth. It was suggested this morning by the distinguished chairman of the committee that we might expect something on Tuesday next in regard to this very subject, because it is embraced in one of the very bills which the committee is considering. The Senate, in consideration of the fact thus told that the Finance Committee is to consider the subject, has agreed that when it adjourns to-day it will be to meet on Tuesday next, so that to-morrow and Monday the committee can take up and dispose of this question. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] says the matter is being actively considered; that every consideration it requires is being given to the subject. Every Senator here knew the situation, and knew it yesterday, so far as concerns the fact that the matter is being considered by the Finance Committee.

There is more, sir, than this single question involved in that bill. I do not think the Senate can take up and properly consider at this time this portion of the relief which is demanded. The question whether bonds shall be sold at public or private sale is one that should go with the determination of that bill, and should not be determined by piecemeal. This seems to me so clear that there ought not to be any question about it.

Mr. President, this is not even a bill for the purpose of determining whether bonds shall hereafter be sold at public or private sale. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] has not introduced such a bill. The resolution, if it is passed, will simply be like the Pope's bull against the comet; it will amount to nothing. It is simply an expression of the sense of the Senate. There is no sense in the resolution, in my judgment, and it would be nonsense upon the part of the Senate at this time and under the circumstances to proceed to pass the resolution.

What is it that is contemplated? Let me read the resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that hereafter no bonds of the United States shall be sold at private sale or under private contract. And in case of any sale of bonds under existing laws, the same shall be made only after due advertisement of such sale and proposals invited, and then only to the highest bidder.

It is not only not a joint resolution, but it is not even a concurrent resolution. It is merely an expression of the Senate alone.

I suppose the argument will be presented that the resolution, if passed, is expected to have some weight with the executive authorities of the Government. I do not know whether it will or will not have any weight, but I think it is uncalled for at this time, because you propose to express your sentiment upon a question when you have not yet enacted that sentiment into law. You propose to tie the hands of the executive authorities of the Government. Are they not embarrassed enough already? Are not their duties circumscribed enough already? Is there not enough difficulty pertaining to the financial question thus thrust upon the executive department of the Government without now putting this further restraint upon it?

Mr. President, let us see what is proposed here. It is proposed to prevent the executive authorities of the Government from exercising the powers which have been exercised by all such authorities of the Government since the conclusion of our war. Our friends upon the other side now have considerable criticism to make with respect to the propriety of selling bonds to syndicates. Under existing law the Secretary of the Treasury has a right to sell bonds at public or private sale. No one questions that right. That is the law, because there is no restrictive provision to the contrary, and under existing statutes that course can be pursued. In the absence of any express prohibitory legislation, and under this particular exigency of public affairs, it is proposed not to legislate, but that one House shall simply say that it is its sense that no bonds shall hereafter be issued except at public sale. I can not believe that Senators upon the other side who give a few moments' thought to the subject are prepared to vote for the resolution.

This denunciation of syndicates is rather a new thing. I have studied the records and speeches made by Senators years ago, when, back in 1877 and from that time on, contract after contract was made with syndicates, and I do not discover that then Senators, some of whom are now members of the Senate, put forth any criticism whatever. I have not time to analyze the particular contracts which have already been made. That is not the real question here involved. The question is simply whether we, by the passage of the pending resolution, shall express the sentiment that the present Secretary of the Treasury of the United States ought not to be vested with the powers which all other Secretaries of the Treasury have had upon the subject of the disposition of bonds.

We upon this side of the Chamber may differ among ourselves on the question of the free coinage of silver—a respectful and honest difference—but I think, sir, that we have nothing to gain, and I think it would be unbecoming, at least upon the Democratic side of this Chamber, for us to vote a want of confidence in the Democratic Secretary of the Treasury or the President of the United States upon this question. I merely say that the present executive authorities of the Treasury are entitled to the same rights that Republican Secretaries of the Treasury have always had under the Government. If you want to legislate, put it in the shape of a bill; but I see no occasion for it. I think the present situation is complicated enough. I think the times are critical enough without adding this new embarrassment to our authorities.

I have no special sympathies with the syndicates that are formed in the city of New York. It is not the first time, though, that similar syndicates have had contracts made with them, and we are yet to be pointed to a single denunciation made years ago by men who are now so flippant in their criticism of present syndi-

cates. I hold in my hand the contract of June 9, 1877. Here are the parties to it:

This agreement entered into this 9th day of June, 1877, between the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of the first part, and Messrs. August Belmont & Co., of New York, on behalf of Messrs. N. M. Rothschild & Sons, of London, England, and associates, and themselves; Messrs. Drexel, Morgan & Co., at New York, on behalf of Messrs. J. S. Morgan & Co. of London, and themselves; Messrs. J. & W. Seligman & Co., of New York, on behalf of Messrs. Seligman Bros., of London, and themselves; Messrs. Morton, Bliss & Co., of New York, on behalf of Messrs. Morton, Rose & Co., of London, and themselves; and the First National Bank of the City of New York.

There is a familiar sound to the words "the First National Bank of the City of New York."

Mr. ELKINS. Will the Senator from New York allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. ELKINS. That contract was entered into after thirty days' notice had been given.

Mr. HILL. The contract from which I have quoted?

Mr. ELKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HILL. I am not speaking of notice. I am speaking of the fact that there was a syndicate, and that the men who composed it——

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from New York will find that there was an express stipulation in that contract that during thirty days the bonds should be offered to the people of the United States, and, thank fortune, the people of the United States subscribed for nearly all that it was desired to issue. There is a clause in the contract—I am not quite sure, but I think it is near the end—requiring the syndicate which proposed to take the loan to offer the bonds at par for thirty days at public subscription, which was done all over the country.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator from Ohio mean to say, with reference to the particular contract from which I have read, that in fact the syndicate did not take the bonds?

Mr. SHERMAN. What is the date of the contract?

Mr. HILL. June 9, 1877.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think the Senator from New York will see that there is an express stipulation in the contract that for thirty days the bonds should be offered at par.

Mr. HILL. That is not my question.

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh.

Mr. HILL. The question is, whether in fact the syndicate did not take the bonds.

Mr. SHERMAN. No; they did not take the bonds, for the people took them before the thirty days expired.

Mr. HILL. I know that those who desire to secure bonds—syndicates—sometimes put the people forward and have the bonds taken in their names. I recollect a bond sale in the city of New York, where the agents of bankers, their clerks, servants, and others, took their places in the line for the very purpose of taking what is called a popular loan. They called it a popular loan, but, in truth, it was taken by the bankers themselves. I venture the assertion that within a very short period after this date these very same bonds largely found their places in the pockets of the syndicate.

I know it is said that a "popular" loan is popular. I wish, sir, it were possible for this Government to float its bonds through what is known as a popular loan. I wish it could be done; I should prefer it. But I am willing to leave this question to the determination of the officials whom we have selected to transact the financial business of our Government. I am not willing to set myself up as a judge and to say that in this critical period of our history it is wise or just for us to hamper and restrict them.

Who knows, except on chimerical conjecture, whether the bonds would be taken at what would be regarded as a reasonable rate of interest? I know Senators say it can be done. That is easy to say. We around this circle have not the gold. That is very certain. Who knows whether the people have gold stowed away? It is gold which we must have for the bonds. That is conceded. It is said that undoubtedly the people have money in the savings banks; undoubtedly the people have money stored away; that they have many Treasury notes and many United States notes stored away. I have no doubt a popular loan would appeal to them. But what would be the practical effect of it? I wish it were otherwise, but I fear the practical effect of a popular loan would be that the people who desire to invest in the bonds would get the greenbacks from their savings banks, take them to the subtreasury in the city of New York, and for the purpose of purchasing the bonds procure from the Government the very gold that is now needed in the Treasury. It has been suggested, on the other hand, that it is usual in contracts with bankers or a syndicate to provide that they shall not take the gold out of the Treasury of the United States. That is one of the express provisions.

These are the facts that put difficulties in the way. Senators may understand it differently. Senators may say, "Oh! it is an easy thing to float this great Government's bonds." It may be so. With the exception of one or two Senators, we have no one here with practical experience upon this question. I am willing to trust the present Secretary of the Treasury upon this particular point. I think we can afford to give him the same authority that other Secretaries of the Treasury have had for years.

Here is the contract of April 11, 1878:

This agreement, entered into this 11th day of April, 1878, between the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, of the first part, and Messrs. August Belmont & Co., of New York, on behalf of Messrs. N. M. Rothschild & Sons, of London, England, and associates, and themselves; Messrs. Drexel, Morgan & Co., of New York, on behalf of Messrs. J. S. Morgan & Co., of London, and themselves; Messrs. J. & W. Seligman & Co., of New York, on behalf of Messrs. Seligman Bros., of London, and themselves; Messrs. Morton, Bliss & Co., of New York, on behalf of Messrs. Morton, Rose & Co., of London, and themselves; and the First National Bank of the City of New York.

Mr. TURPIE. I wish to ask the Senator from New York who was the Secretary of the Treasury at that time?

Mr. HILL. Everybody knows, I suppose, that it was the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the Hon. JOHN SHERMAN. And I have not heard in his very able speech to-day, which I listened to with great attention, as I always listen to the utterances that come from him, a single word of criticism of the Secretary of the Treasury upon the particular contracts that have been made. The Senator differs with the President and the Secretary of the Treasury upon other questions, and he frankly stated those differences to us. They are questions about which honest men may well differ. But I have not heard from him any word of criticism in this respect, and I am loath to believe that when the time comes he will propose by his vote to cripple the present Administration, either by the adoption of the pending resolution without sense or by the passage of a bill. I think that in his generosity he will say: "We can trust these officials of the Government to do what is right upon the subject."

I have hastily glanced over the contract of April 11, 1878, and I do not discover the provision to which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] referred. I asked the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE], who is a practical man, to go through the contract and see whether there is any provision of the kind which compels the syndicate to offer the bonds to the public.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from New York is now speaking of another contract, made a year after the one to which I referred. The first contract was of the date of June 9, 1877.

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes; there are lots of such contracts here, all made with the same "favored" parties, as has been stated by Senators upon this floor.

Mr. SHERMAN. When I answered the Senator from New York I spoke with reference to the contract of 1877.

Mr. HILL. I will turn to that contract.

Mr. SHERMAN. My impression is that the contract of 1878, which preceded resumption, provided for what are called the ten-dollar certificates, which were sold to the people to the extent of forty or fifty million dollars. I have sent for the book and will furnish the Senator with the statement.

Mr. HILL. The size of the bond does not make any difference; that is not the question. It is not the question which is under discussion here. The question discussed here is whether there was a syndicate and whether that syndicate had substantially the complete disposition of those bonds. The question is, whether the Republicans, having by an "unholy alliance" obtained control of the body, will now attempt to hinder, embarrass, and restrict the Secretary of the Treasury in the disposition of bonds. I think it would be an unwise step. I do not believe the people would approve of it. I am inclined to think that the people believe the bonds should first be offered to the general public. I have already said that I should prefer to have that course pursued. But I do not know the dangers, I do not know the risks, I am not so fully acquainted with the precise situation as are the officials of the Government.

I know of no reason why Mr. Carlisle should seek to do favors for these men in New York. Who are they? Who is this man Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, of New York? He is a man who is a liberal contributor to the Republican cause; he is a man in that city who in every Presidential election comes to the front with the sinews of war to keep the Republican party in power. Is it to be said, is it to be whispered, is it to be intimated even, that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury are anxious to do him a favor?

I should say, in justice to Mr. Morgan, having such political opinions as he may, that it was substantially through him and these same men that the great war loans of the Government were carried. These are the men on whom we relied in the "times that tried men's souls," when the war for the Union was in progress, but now, because they and some of their descendants, although, so far as I am aware, Mr. Belmont has nothing to do with the proposed loan, if there is to be one, propose to take this loan, criticism is passed upon them.

I do not speak for the syndicate. I do not know who, with the exception of Mr. Morgan, compose it, and I know but little upon the subject; but I do state here that I do not believe there has been a contract made with or a promise given to any of these gentlemen on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury. I know it is said in the newspapers—and the newspapers are ordinarily reliable—that contracts are about to be made. Yet I discovered only yesterday that it was stated by Mr. Morgan in the public prints that he had no assurance that the Government was going to make a loan; that he had no contract with it. Of course, some preparation is necessary. Or is it so easy to raise fifty or a hundred million dollars that all you have to do is to step over into Wall street and ask for it? Does it not require careful preparation? Does it not require hoarding of funds? Does it not require able financiering? I think it does.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE] has now read the contract more carefully than I have had the opportunity to do, because I did not intend to discuss this question to-day, although I had the book before me expecting to discuss it when the bill finally came before the Senate properly reported. He informs me that there is nothing about certificates there; that it is a plain, simple contract with the syndicate, nothing more and nothing less, in which the Government gives them a commission on the sale of the bonds. The contract prevents the Government from selling any other bonds to other parties during its pendency.

I do not point to that contract—and the Senator from Ohio, of course, understands me perfectly well—for the purpose of intimating that there is anything wrong in it. On the contrary, I believe that it was, in all probability, for the best interests of the Government. I should have resisted then, if I had been a member of this Senate, as I resist now, any restriction upon the hands of a Republican Secretary of the Treasury, because, however I may differ with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], I respect his financial judgment in most matters, and I certainly believe that he would not make a contract which he did not think was for the best interests of his country. I simply refer to these contracts; and there are more of them here—plenty of them. Here is one of January 1, 1879, between the same parties. The contracts are always with the same parties. Why?

We hear a blast from the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], and he asks, why can not the people have something to say about these bonds? How many bonds, for which gold would be paid, does the Senator from West Virginia think would be taken by people in his State? Not many, Mr. President. If the loan were confined to such States gold bonds could not be floated, and no one knows it better than does the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. You must make the contract for gold with the people who either have it or can secure it.

Those are the men who in those days controlled the sale of bonds. They are the same men—every one of them, with the exception of August Belmont—prominent, active, influential, contributing Republicans, including the far-famed First National Bank of the City of New York. I speak of these matters for the purpose of showing that there is no reason for this squeamishness, this undue sensitiveness about bonds being floated by a syndicate, as though it were something new and unprecedented in the history of this Government.

Mr. HARRIS. What is the peculiarity about the First National Bank of New York, to which the Senator from New York refers?

Mr. HILL. Has not my friend read—I know he has—the report, I think it was of some investigating committee made years ago, in which it was claimed that undue favoritism was extended to the First National Bank of the City of New York, for which it was said they were liberal contributors to Republican campaign funds? But I am not going into the details of that matter.

Mr. ALLEN. Let us have them.

Mr. HILL. I prefer not to be drawn into it. It is not necessary to discuss that matter now.

These names are very familiar to the country—Mr. Seligman, Governor Morton, Morgan & Co. All of those gentlemen are prominent, active men in Republican politics. This is the syndicate which in those days had substantial control and disposition of issues of bonds and of securing the large amounts of gold necessary.

Mr. ELKINS. Will the Senator from New York allow me to interrupt him for just a moment?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. ELKINS. I want to do justice to the First National Bank of New York. I deny that its officers or directors are liberal contributors to the Republican campaign fund, and I deny that they are Republicans. One of them is a Democrat, one is an Independent, and one is a Republican. There are no better men in the country than they are.

Mr. HILL. They are first-class men.

Mr. ELKINS. If they have an opportunity to make money they will make it whether in a syndicate or out of it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have the book now——

Mr. HILL. One Senator at a time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have the book now containing the contract of June 9, 1877, to which the Senator from New York referred, and here is the express provision.

Mr. HILL. To which provision does the Senator from Ohio refer?

Mr. SHERMAN. It will be remembered that the bonds were to be sold by the syndicate at one-half of 1 per cent commission, and no more. The syndicate were to stand all the expense of the loan—the printing of the bonds, transportation, etc. Besides that, the contract contains, in the eighth clause, the stipulation which I shall read. I quote from page 62 of the volume:

> Eighth. It is also agreed that the parties of the second part shall offer to the people of the United States, at par and accrued interest in coin, the 4 per cent registered consols and 4 per cent coupon consols of the denominations of $50 and $100 embraced in this contract for a period of thirty days from the public notice of such subscriptions and in such cities and upon such notice as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe prior to the opening of the lists, and, further, to offer to the subscribers the option of paying in installments extending through three months.

That was the stipulation. It was a contract made with the syndicate, by which they were to sell $50,000,000 of bonds. They were to have one-half of 1 per cent in the way of commission, and it was provided that they should pay all of the expenses, which amounted to a considerable sum. This proposition was submitted to the people, and the great body of the $50,000,000 of bonds was subscribed for by them under the eighth clause of the contract. Has the Senator from New York a copy of the book I hold in my hand?

Mr. HILL. I have it before me.

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has pointed to a provision in the first contract to which I called attention.

Mr. SHERMAN. Give me the date of the next contract, and I will turn to it.

Mr. HILL. I have before me now the contract of January 1, 1879.

Mr. SHERMAN. That was after the resumption of specie payments. I will state what everybody knows—it is a matter of public notoriety—that as a part of the law under which those bonds were sold there was provision made for the sale of the ten-dollar certificates, in the expectation that they would be bought by people all over the country and converted into bonds of a higher rate if they chose. The whole issue was taken with great rapidity by the populace. People formed in long lines at every place where those bonds could be purchased.

Mr. HILL. That is an instance of popular demonstration to which I alluded—bankers' clerks, presidents' clerks, directors' clerks, and their men.

Mr. SHERMAN. Each person could get only $100 worth at one payment.

Mr. HILL. That is very true. That is the reason they crowded the sidewalks. That was a farce as a popular loan.

April 11, 1878, is another one to which I referred. The one of January 1, 1879, seems to be a plain contract with the syndicate. Does the Senator from Ohio mean to say that he at no time made a contract with the syndicate in which the syndicate did not absolutely take the bonds?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do say most emphatically that the large portion of the bonds at every sale were taken by the popular subscription provided for in the contract.

Mr. HILL. Then the bonds must have been taken outside of the terms of the contract, and the subscriptions must have been given by the bankers themselves. Of course if bonds are sold to bankers and they desire to sublet them and sell them by piecemeal to the people, there is nothing to prevent them from doing it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Instead of that being done——

Mr. HILL. But the point I make is that there is nothing in the subsequent contracts—and there were other contracts—which requires any such thing to be done.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that the provision which I have read is a part of the contract with the syndicate. It is embodied in the contract with the syndicate as one of its clauses.

Mr. HILL. In the contract of 1877, not afterwards.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have not looked at the contracts subsequent to that time.

Mr. HILL. It is not in the contracts made afterwards.

There are more of these contracts scattered all through this volume. The finances were conducted ably and intelligently by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I concede that. He knows, and the Senate knows, and the country knows that I am not here casting any reflection upon him. I know there was some criticism in the newspapers at the time. There was not very much, but there

was some. I know it was said that the members of this syndicate were favorites of the Secretary of the Treasury. I know such charges were echoed throughout the country in the public prints and on the stump. Such things are incident to political contests in this country; they are incident to the disposition of millions of dollars of bonds. Of course every banker can not have his supply of the bonds.

In the first place, there have to be some parties who are upon the ground floor, if I may use the expression. There must be, first, the original members of the syndicate, some parties who go outside and induce subscriptions by other bankers. They are incident to the formation of every syndicate. The question for the Secretary of the Treasury to determine is merely, will this syndicate furnish the gold promptly, as agreed; and, secondly, will the syndicate take the bonds at a reasonable rate of interest and pay a certain premium? What disposition they make of the bonds afterwards to other bankers is of no consequence.

I do not know at what rate the proposed bonds can be floated. I can see no reason why the present officials of the Government should especially cater to the wishes of these New York bankers. I know of no relations between them which would justify the suspicion that there is anything wrong. On what ground can it be said that they have made an unjust or unfair contract? Sir, read the words of the President of the United States in his recent annual message. Differ with him as we may upon questions of interparty policy, differ as you may with him upon the question of the tariff, yet you must respect his courage; you must respect, I think, his good judgment, when he assumes in his message the responsibility for the sale of the bonds made in February last. He has given you in full in that message the reasons why he thinks it saved the credit of the Government. He assumes the responsibility. He is willing to endeavor to save the credit of this Government again if it shall be necessary so to do.

Mr. President, what is the play that is going on? The President sent in his message some ten days ago and over. There has been some necessary delay, of course, by reason of the reorganization of the committees. It was said here this morning that every Senator knows how he wants to vote upon this question. It was said that it did not require any discussion, that the Senate Finance Committee have had before them a bill involving this very question. Does anybody know what is to be reported? Is anybody authorized to say that a provision similar to this is to be reported? Is anybody here authorized to rise and say that different kinds of bonds are going to be authorized by the new bill? I doubt the authority of a single member of the Finance Committee to make any such statement. They honestly and sincerely, of course, do not know, I presume, what will be reported.

The executive authorities of this Government are bound to act. The gold reserve is gradually being drawn down; the gold is being siphoned out of the Treasury by people who evidently want it for divers purposes—some for the very purpose, undoubtedly, of purchasing bonds again. The credit of the country is endangered. The Senator from Ohio, of course, will not differ with me upon the question of the propriety of having that fund restored to its full sum of $100,000,000. He thinks it ought to be done, unquestionably, and I think the country wants it done. Unless some better legislation shall be proposed here, the President of the United States and his Secretary of the Treasury have but a single duty to perform, and that is to proceed to sell bonds. Now, upon the eve of what it is said is to be done, on the eve of and prior to any proposed legislation, this resolution is brought into the Senate to express the sense of the Senate upon this subject.

I do not propose at this time to discuss the question as to what should be done with the greenback currency. If I had the authority I am inclined to think I should solve it by a method that was suggested yesterday in a New York newspaper. Before I would be annoyed with this proposed legislation, before I would be hampered by the present situation of the Treasury, I should proceed under the law of 1875, and I should issue bonds sufficient in amount, say two hundred millions—a heroic remedy, it is true—for the purpose of solving the question. An issue of $200,000,000 of bonds would substantially give to the Secretary of the Treasury the control of the financial situation. It would prevent this constant siphoning of the gold out of the Treasury. It would so contract the currency temporarily that the bankers would be coming to the Secretary of the Treasury and asking him to "give us greenbacks for gold." Some such heroic remedy, in my opinion, ought to be applied.

Mr. GEORGE. Would that not at once depress the price of cotton and wheat?

Mr. HILL. Temporarily it might depress prices, it is true; but if this situation continues the prices of those articles will be depressed in the near future any way.

What legislation is proposed to take the place of the present law? Nobody knows. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] says he is opposed to retiring and canceling the greenback currency. I heard him express the same views in February last in this Chamber, and he is consistent upon that point. Others say they are opposed to the retirement of this currency. I can not for the life of me see why this currency should be retained. I am opposed to paper money. I believe it was issued during the war as a mere temporary expedient. I go further. I doubt its constitutionality.

I know how the Supreme Court of the United States finally mustered up the courage to say that it was constitutional, but I have never heard the reasoning of Salmon P. Chase upon that question overthrown. I have read it carefully, as we have all read it, and in that opinion he lays down in substance the principle that this Government has no right to make money of its promises to pay; that nothing is money in this country except that which is coin, the gold and silver of your Constitution. I think that is good Democratic doctrine. It may not be good Republican doctrine; I do not know. Our friends upon the other side may determine that question for themselves.

I believe that this Government ought not to enter into the banking business, so far as attempting to provide a paper currency for the people. I am not now speaking of the national-bank system, which involves a different question. I am speaking of the strain, the effort, the struggle, the burden upon this Government for the purpose of doing what? To maintain substantially an irredeemable paper currency. I say irredeemable because when it must be constantly redeemed and never extinguished, never paid, it is in legal effect an irredeemable paper currency. It has all the indicia, all the features of that kind of currency. I think it is a dangerous experiment on the part of the United States to endeavor longer to float this currency. I think it ought to be canceled; I think it ought to be retired. I am not now going to detain the Senate with suggestions as to what should take its place. In my judgment, there are plenty of methods by which that vacuum may be supplied.

Mr. GEORGE. Suppose you destroy both the greenbacks and silver; what would the currency be?

Mr. HILL. In the first place, you have in the Treasury a large amount of silver bullion from which, when the greenbacks are disposed of, there can be little or no danger by its coinage either into standard silver dollars or fractional currency. The very message of the President of the United States, when he vetoed the bill for the coinage of the bullion, stated that one of the reasons was that the bullion was there pledged as security for the redemption of those notes. But when those notes are themselves canceled, disposed of, destroyed, done away with, there can be no good reason why the bullion in the Treasury should not be coined.

But, Mr. President, I do not propose now to discuss the gold and silver question proper. The simple question before the Senate is, whether we should pass this resolution or whether it should not be referred to the Finance Committee; whether it is wise for us two or three days before we are to act upon this question to pass a resolution as to what our sense is upon this subject. I think it unwise; I think it uncalled for.

Mr. President, I do not believe the President of the United States would pay the slightest attention to this resolution, and he ought not to do so. His duty is to be determined by existing laws. His duty is to be determined by the statutes as he finds them. His duty is to be determined by the condition of the Treasury of the United States. He can not fall back and justify himself simply upon the ground that the Senate has said by a simple resolution that these bonds should not be disposed of in a certain way.

Now, Mr. President, I have said all I care to say for the present upon this subject. If we are to have a vote to-day upon the resolution, I shall in that case have a few more remarks to make.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has fallen into great errors simply because he has not had time to read what he is citing. The first contract that was made under the Administration of President Hayes was the first one in April, 1877. That has been read. It expressly reserved the right of the people to take as many of the bonds as they would take. The second contract to which he referred had no specification in regard to popular loans, because it was a contract for the purchase by the syndicate of $50,000,000 for resumption purposes, to be paid at the rate of $5,000,000 a month from the date of the contract until December, when resumption was to be perfected. They were to provide $4,000,000 of gold in exchange for $4,000,000 of 4½ per cent bonds, and there was no provision, as a matter of course, for a popular loan in that case, because it was a specific loan to be paid in gold, and to be paid into the Treasury by gradual accumulation.

That is the contract of April 11, and from that time forward, with the exception of the contract which was made for a specific purpose, the loans of the United States were sold by the Treasury Department without any syndicate and without the employment of any agent whatever. The whole sale of the vast amount of our bonds for refunding purposes was made without any syndicate at all. The Senator will not be able to show any such contract. It was made by sales all over the country. In every na-

tional bank, in every post-office, in every place the 4 per cent bonds were sold, and in that way, in the summer of 1879, a few months after resumption occurred, the whole mass of indebtedness was provided for.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator explain what is meant in the contract of April 11 that the sellers are to have a commission of one-half of 1 per cent and that the bonds are to be sold? It looks at least as though they were selling agents.

Mr. SHERMAN. They agreed by the contract to take $50,000,000 of bonds, payable as I have mentioned. Then there is this last clause, to which my honorable friend calls my attention:

The parties of the second part—

That is, these bankers, and I may say that those were the same bankers employed in the previous Administration under Mr. Morrill, the same persons engaged in the same enterprise. The contract made in 1878 provides that—

The parties of the second part shall receive in gold coin a commission of one-half of 1 per cent on all bonds taken by them under this contract, as allowed by the act of July 14, 1870, and shall assume and defray all expenses which may be incurred in sending bonds to London or elsewhere upon their request, or by transmitting bonds, coupons, or coin to the Treasury Department at Washington, including all cost of making the exchange of bonds, and shall also be charged with the cost of the preparation and issuing of the bonds.

This shows that the only commission received by these men was one-half of 1 per cent. They complained bitterly that the expenses ran so far upon this fund that they really did not make anything out of the loan, and I think it is very probable that they did not; but even then the 4 per cent bonds were offered for refunding purposes; that is, in exchange for the old bonds. They were offered for refunding purposes without cost to anyone. If any members of the syndicate entered into the operation of buying bonds for refunding purposes, they received no commission, nor did anyone else. That is the condition. After that time, in 1879, during all the period when resumption was being perfected, not one dollar was paid to anyone for commissions.

Mr. BUTLER. I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated. The Chair will state to the Senator from North Carolina that the pending question is upon the motion to refer. The amendment can be read for information, if the Senator desires.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to have my amendment read for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Amend by striking out all after the words "shall be sold," and inserting in lieu thereof "for any purpose whatever, without further authority from Congress;" so that when amended the resolution will read:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that hereafter no bonds of the United States shall be sold for any purpose whatever without further authority from Congress.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, my amendment brings up the main question—I wish to protest against considering details when the main question should be settled by Congress. The Senator from New York and the Senator from Ohio have admitted that they are together on the main question. Now, they differ about some details and are using a great deal of time discussing these details. What the Senate ought to do, what the country wants to see, is the main question voted on. Upon that main question, as brought forward in my amendment, we would get a square vote by the Senate either for or against the issue of bonds, and on that division the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New York would vote together.

Mr. HILL. I do not know about that.

Mr. BUTLER. I hope if they do vote together they will vote against these bonds; but we understand that both of them indorse the President in issuing bonds under the resumption act of 1875, which I deny he has the power to do. The Senate ought to say right now whether in its judgment bonds shall be issued or not. That is the question. That is what the people are interested in; that is the burning question of the hour.

I indorse the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], but his resolution is not as big as his remarks. I want to make his resolution cover the main question. His remarks cover the amendment that I have offered, and his remarks are pertinent to that amendment.

The Senator from New York objected to my bill referring to this question this morning because it was a bill. Now he objects to this resolution because it is a resolution. The Senator from New York is getting to be a monumental objector. I wish to ask the Senate, when it votes down the motion to refer, as I believe it will, to consider and adopt this amendment.

There are Senators on this floor besides myself who do not know how to vote on the resolution as it stands. The resolution seems to authorize the issue of bonds. Any Senator here who is opposed to bonds being issued can not conscientiously vote for the resolution, because it says "in case of any sale of bonds under existing laws," etc.; and I deny there is any existing law under which bonds can be lawfully sold. I would like to vote with the Senator from West Virginia, for I am opposed to secret sales to private parties and to syndicates. I am opposed to having midnight bargains in dark-lantern corners, and paying $13,000,000 of the people's money to private individuals as a free gift. It is an outrage upon the people of this country, and ninety-nine out of every hundred of them condemn it.

The Senate ought to speak out, Mr. President, and put a stop to this wrong. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia on that point. But if I vote with him for his resolution as it stands, I would be saying by my vote that I think the issue of bonds is allowable under the act of 1875 and that the President is justified in issuing them at this time. I say that no Senator on this floor who is opposed to bonds can vote with the Senator from West Virginia—although a majority of us, I think, are in sympathy with the resolution that he has offered—because the resolution recognizes the power of the President to issue bonds "under existing laws." I do not believe that such power exists, and I do not believe the majority of the Senate think it exists.

Mr. President, that is the vital point at issue. Therefore I am bound to offer this amendment and insist upon it. We should say here and now, in language that can not be misunderstood, that we are opposed to the further issue of bonds without the consent of Congress.

Mr. CHILTON. I prepared, a few minutes since, an amendment to the resolution offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], and I have the permission of the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] that his motion to refer shall be withdrawn long enough for the presentation of my amendment. Perhaps the proposition I desired to submit is sufficiently covered by the amendment just offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. The only difference which I discover is that this amendment is general in character, while the amendment which I have prepared refers to the question of bond issues to obtain gold for the redemption of the United States notes and Treasury notes.

I voted, sir, against the resolution offered by the Senator from West Virginia, because, in the first place, the resolution only proposes to take the sense of the Senate, and it would seem of doubtful utility to pass an empty resolution simply declaring our own views without regard to the other branch of Congress; in the second place, for the reason, which has been alluded to by others, that the wording of the resolution seems to approve in advance an issue of bonds; and, in the third place, because I am not altogether sure that a cast-iron rule requiring public advertisement in each and every case would be the best policy for the Government.

It seems to me if the exclusive method of advertising for bids was adopted it would expose the gold reserve to such a constant and extraordinary drain that one bond issue would follow another almost every month. Suppose an advertisement calling for bids should be published thirty days in advance of the date of issue. During that time intending purchasers of bonds would present greenbacks and withdraw gold from the Treasury in such sums as they desired, and, when the thirty days had expired, pay back in exchange for the bonds of the Government the same gold which the Treasury had furnished them. The Government would thus get back again, not outside gold or foreign gold, but the very gold which its own advertisement had stimulated cunning investors to withdraw. It does not seem to me, therefore, that it would be well to say that, at all hazards and in every case, a public advertisement of bond sales should be made. I can see grave objections to sales of bonds by private contract, but the difficulties are equally as formidable in the case of sales by public notice in advance. So I would go into the question deeper than any mere question of methods.

I am opposed to the issue of bonds, root and branch. I am, as has been discovered, of course, by the votes heretofore given by me in this body, a friend of silver coinage. I believe that the parity of gold and silver coins would be insured by an undiscriminating treatment of them on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury, and hence it is the purpose of the amendment which I have offered to prohibit any further issue of bonds to procure gold alone for redemption purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Texas will be read for information.

The SECRETARY. In line 1, after the word "Senate," strike out the remainder of the resolution and insert:

That no further issue of bonds of the United States to procure gold to redeem United States notes or Treasury notes shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury either by public advertisement, private sale, or otherwise.

So that when amended the resolution will read:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that no further issue of bonds of the United States to procure gold to redeem United States notes or Treasury notes shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury either by public advertisement, private sale, or otherwise.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire merely to call attention to one point which I understood the Senator from New York to make, which seems to me to embody the fallacy which underlies all the arguments in favor of a syndicate without giving any opportunity of a popular loan.

The Senator says the Government must go to the people who have the gold. Undoubtedly; but it seems to me that it is the barest assumption in the world to suppose that the gold can only be got from one small syndicate in New York. We know as a matter of fact from the reports of the Director of the Mint that the banks of the country hold a great deal of gold. Those banks are not admitted to the syndicate. We have no means of knowing from statistics how much gold is held in hoards or savings by the people, but undoubtedly a great deal is so held, and no opportunity is given for the people to offer that gold in exchange for bonds.

Here is the New York World, the principal organ of the Democratic party. It comes forward and offers to take $1,000,000 of these bonds and pay for them in gold.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I suggest that the average Democratic editor is pretty poor. I suppose that is about the only Democratic editor in the country who has got any gold.

Mr. LODGE. I will read his offer:

> The World now offers to head the list with a subscription of $1,000,000 on its own account. It will take that amount of 3 per cent bonds, or it will take $1,000,000 of 4 per cents on a 3 per cent basis, and it will promptly find and furnish the gold with which to pay for them.

That, compared to the amount which the Government seeks, is small. It is a large subscription for one person or one newspaper. But what reason is there to assume that the gold can not be procured by a popular loan? This Administration has never tried a popular loan. In the days when the other loans were made under Republican administration, as has been shown, in all the contracts but one the loans were first offered to the people. They can be offered now to the people. They ought to be offered to the people first and give them a chance to see whether they will not come forward and take the bonds of their Government and give their Government the gold that it needs. That appeal has never been made to the American people in vain.

I can not understand, Mr. President, why there should be any objection to the Senate expressing its sense that if a loan is to be made it should be offered first in the popular form, and let us see whether the people are ready to take it or any part of it. Certainly there can be no reason in paying, without any attempt at a popular loan, the gigantic percentage which was paid in the last contract.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the Senator from New York seems to think that we are endeavoring to embarrass the Administration. I judge from his argument, as well as I could hear and understand it, that he supposes if the syndicate is not allowed to take this loan it can not be made. The syndicate will have the same opportunity of bidding, when such a loan is put forth, that the individuals will have. Every national bank will be at liberty to bid; every millionaire can bid. The question is, how shall the Government of the United States get the most for the sale of its bonds, if its bonds are to be sold? The question who shall have the bonds is immaterial to the Government; but how shall we get the highest sum for them; how shall we, with the least number of bonds, get the most money? We think by allowing the people to bid on them they would outbid the syndicate's proffer made to the Administration, judging by what the syndicate proffered on a former occasion.

Mr. HOAR. The question is, whether the syndicate shall bid with or without competition.

Mr. TELLER. As the Senator from Massachusetts suggests, it is a question whether the syndicate shall bid with competition or whether it shall bid without competition. The appeal of the Senator from New York is that it shall bid without competition; and he intimates that we have got to go to New York to get the gold because it is not anywhere else. If the Treasury reports are to be relied upon, there is in the United States in the neighborhood of $600,000,000 of gold. All the national banks in the United States hold less than $200,000,000. The last time I looked they had $160,000,000. Where is the balance of it? It is among the people. Why should we say that nobody can furnish the gold except a syndicate of bankers in the city of New York?

The Senator from New York has gone into an examination of the old sales of bonds, and it seemed to me that his argument was that there had been something improperly done at that time, and therefore we ought not to say that something improper should not be done now. There was no public scandal connected with the sales of bonds prior to February, 1895. In 1893 the present Administration put $50,000,000 of bonds on the market to the public. In November following they advertised again for $50,000,000 more. That $50,000,000 was sold for something over 116 on every bond. On the 8th of February following this Administration made a contract with a private syndicate in the city of New York to sell $62,000,000 of bonds. That contract brought the Government of the United States a trifle over $65,000,000. Sixty-two million three hundred and some odd thousand dollars brought the Government $65,000,000, while in November a fifty-million-dollar loan brought the Government fifty-eight million dollars and some hundreds. When the fifty-million-dollar loan was offered in November, as I stated the other day, $178,000,000 was bid at a price that brought to the bidders less than 3 per cent interest. If the bonds in February following had been sold on a 3 per cent basis they would have been sold at 117½ at least. They were sold. That is the proper method, I understand, because, of course, when the bond is paid the premium is not paid back, and that must be accounted for.

Mr. President, the bonds were sold in February by a private contract, by such a contract, I undertake to say and do say here and now, as had never before been made; and I am credibly informed that a still worse one is about to be made. It was a contract at 104.49, when it was but a question of computation, as the other bonds were selling in the market, that they were worth at least 117½, if not more. In criticising that transaction I said in a speech I made on the floor of the Senate that they would go to 124. They have been to 123½ even in these times of depression. As I said the other day, when the panic and war scare were on in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and other places, they maintained themselves at 119. Yet we are told now that you can not sell a bond of this kind at more than you sold them for in February.

After the syndicate bought the bonds they agreed to let the public have an opportunity to buy them at 112. They kept their bank open for subscriptions less than two hours. The amount that they gave to the public was subscribed for by more than six times, and if they had kept their bank open twenty-four hours the amount would have been subscribed for forty or fifty times. We are now told by the public press that this thing is to be repeated. Whether they are to be sold at a dollar or a dollar and four cents I do not know, but they are to be sold on less favorable terms, we are told repeatedly.

There ought to be no private contracts touching the sale of bonds. If the syndicate wants them, it should be willing to stand competition with the other banks in the country, with the individuals who have money, with the men who have their money in savings banks and who would like to take it out and put it out at a small rate of interest where they know it will be absolutely safe. That is what the Senator from New York resists. He is not alarmed but what the sale can be made. The Treasury Department is not alarmed but what the sale can be made. They want to make a contract with certain parties, and I do not need to say why.

The Senator from Massachusetts read a statement from the public press of to-day that one of the great newspapers in the country, a Democratic newspaper at that, proposes to take a million dollars of these bonds at a 3 per cent rate—either to take a million dollars of 3 per cent bonds at par or a million dollars of the present 4 per cent bonds, if they should be issued, at a 3 per cent rate.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me? Does he know a single individual in the country, aside from Mr. Pulitzer, who is willing to take coin bonds at 3 per cent?

Mr. TELLER. I do.

Mr. HILL. I venture the assertion that no bank in the country has made any such suggestion. I have not seen it anywhere. I venture to say, what I did not say the other day, that even after this discussion there is not a single bank in the country that will offer the Treasury now to take any large quantity of these bonds, coin bonds, at 3 per cent.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator asks me a question and then proceeds to make a speech. I do know that these bonds can be sold at 3 per cent. I know that $1,000,000 of them can be sold here. I know that bankers have been interviewed and their statements are published in this paper that they would take them at a 3 per cent rate. I know more than that, Mr. President.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. TELLER. Not now. The last quotation is 3 per cent on bonds that were sold in February——

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will indulge me a moment, what banks are willing to take any amount?

Mr. TELLER. I did not say banks. I said bankers and prominent men.

Mr. HILL. What bankers?

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from New York says they can not be sold at 3 per cent. The Secretary of the Treasury is reported to have said that they could not be sold. How do they know? They know that when they offered the last bonds at very nearly

3 per cent they were bid at a tremendous rate. They know that when they raised the price and put them in London they were bid there in a few hours four or five times what they were allowed to take. How is this Administration to know whether there can be a popular loan until it tries it? What right has the Senator from New York or what right the Secretary of the Treasury to say it can not be done?

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. TELLER. No; not now. We have made these sales. I know that the sales can be made. The first gold that was put into the Treasury by voluntary contributions came from the State of Colorado. I will venture to say that more than two or three million dollars of the loan can be taken in the State of Colorado at 3 per cent. I know one banker telegraphed when the other syndicate was putting its loan out at 12 per cent that he wanted a million dollars of the bonds. I know other bankers from my State who telegraphed they wanted it at $1.12.

Mr. President, I do not want to say anything harsh about the Administration. I made a statement the other day, and I notice some of the papers say that perhaps I will modify it when I am cooler. I said the transaction was marked either with dishonesty or imbecility. I repeat it here to-day, that no man can come to any conclusion but that either the Administration in that affair was a dishonest one or that the Administration was an incapable one. Bonds were sold in February for $1.04½ that in ninety days were selling for $1.22. They sold for $1.04½ in February and for $1.22 three months later, with no better condition of market, with nothing to make a demand for bonds three months later that did not exist then.

Mr. President, it will not do to say that these bonds can not be sold at 3 per cent until they try it. It will not do to say that a popular loan will be a failure until they try it. If the public does not want it, let the syndicate come in then and bid with the public. If the public will not bid the syndicate will take the loan, I suppose, on as favorable terms as it can get it.

Mr. President, I am going to read a little extract from the New York World. I am not particularly in love with the New York World myself, but there is an appeal to the President in the World of to-day such as has never been made before to an Executive of ours. It is an appeal that he shall not scandalize the Administration that this paper has supported and helped bring into existence. It is an appeal that he shall not by his conduct destroy the confidence of the American people in the integrity of their officials. I suppose, as the Senator from New York says, that if we pass this resolution the President will pay no attention to us; so he will pay no attention to this great Democratic organ. But the fact remains that they have challenged the honesty and the integrity of the last transaction as they challenged the honesty and integrity of the proposed new loan. I read from the New York World of to-day:

AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT.

To you, Mr. Cleveland, the World appeals. It asks you to save the country from the mischief, the wrong, and the scandal of the pending bond deal with the Morgan syndicate.

It is not yet too late to repudiate the whole transaction, and its rejection will be the greatest act of your life. It will give you more of prestige than any other, more of honor, and more of the gratitude of your countrymen.

For this thing is a monumental wrong. If it is consummated, its memory will be a colossal scandal and you will bear the blame. You only have power even yet to veto it. That power gives you the greatest opportunity of your life and imposes upon you a corresponding duty.

The needless waste of ten or fifteen millions in this transaction is not the only or even the chief objection to it. It involves something of immeasurably greater worth than any number of millions. It involves popular confidence in the integrity of the Government, that faith of the people in their rulers which is the lifeblood of free institutions. The manner of this thing is more vitally important than its matter.

In all kindness the World asks you to look at the facts as they present themselves to the popular mind. This bargain has been made with a suspicious secrecy which has been guarded by a picket line of falsehoods put forth for the misleading of the people. It is a bargain between yourself in your official capacity and your near friends. It promises to give princely millions of the people's money to those friends, and that without any need, as we shall presently show.

You have not asked advice of the party leaders in Congress or out. The only person you are known to have counseled with is the contractor with whom you have been bargaining, and he had millions to make by inducing you to accept his advice.

His lawyer, who was formerly your law partner, has been in Washington helping the negotiation.

James T. Woodward, president of the Hanover Bank, has also been in Washington, and he is publicly known to have accumulated $4,000,000 of gold in preparation for the deal.

Mr. Stillman, of the City National Bank, who has also been at the capital, has a hoard of $8,000,000 to invest in the speculation.

You must see, Mr. Cleveland, that secrecy of negotiation under such circumstances is bound to excite suspicion. You must realize that men are already saying things which the newspapers as yet hesitate to print. You must be alive to the fact that these suspicions, directed against the conduct of the Government itself, are more threatening to the stability of our institutions than the enmity of any foreign foe could be. The most damaging thing that could happen to the Republic would be the lodgment of a conviction in the people's minds that our Government has become one of syndicates and bargains for the public moneys.

Why should you not end all this danger and scandal now? Why should you not sweep away all doubt and banish all suspicion by repudiating the whole miserable business? You have spoken eloquent words about the necessity of reposing confidence in the people. Why should you not now trust them to come to the rescue of the Treasury instead of hiring a syndicate to do so at an extortionate price?

You can get all the gold you need in Europe at 1 per cent or less premium. You can get it in our own country without paying any premium at all. An issue of fifty millions of bonds would completely meet present needs, and such an issue at 3 per cent or on a 3 per cent basis would be subscribed many times over. The very bankers who have bargained with you for a profit of ten or fifteen millions would be the eagerest subscribers the moment they found that the loan would be offered in no other way. As for the fear that they would conspire to draw the reserve out of the Treasury, there is nobody who would regard such a transaction with greater apprehension than they. The wrecking of the currency by a suspension of gold redemption would cost them many more millions than they expect to make even out of this bond deal. If such a calamity were really threatened the street would hardly hold the wagons sent by them to carry gold to the subtreasury.

If you make your appeal to the people they will quickly respond. There are $68,000,000 of gold in New York alone, to say nothing of the hoards in other cities. You will have no difficulty in securing all of it that the Treasury needs if you show "confidence in the people."

So sure are we of this that the World now offers to head the list with a subscription of $1,000,000 on its own account. It will take that amount of 3 per cent bonds, or it will take $1,000,000 of 4 per cents on a 3 per cent basis, and it will promptly find and furnish the gold with which to pay for them.

The whole country would respond with like alacrity. It would not require a week, it would not require a day, to sell $50,000,000 of bonds to the people at a fair price. Why sell them to a syndicate at an unfair price and with a secrecy which excites suspicion and distrust?

Why should you not appeal to the patriotism of the rich as in case of war a call to arms would appeal to the patriotism of poor and rich alike? Why should you invite a great national scandal where you can as easily invoke a great national demonstration of devotion to the welfare of the country?

Now is your time, Mr. Cleveland, to make war. Make war on fraud and wrong. Make war upon the usurpations of speculative wealth. In this matter lies real peril to the integrity of our institutions, and you have recently professed your readiness to go to war in their defense at all costs and all hazards. Will you rise to the occasion? Are you equal to your golden opportunity?

THE LOSS TO THE PEOPLE.

The selling of $100,000,000 of thirty-year 4 per cent bonds at 104½, when they are worth 117½, gives to the syndicate a profit of $12,750,000.

At the rate formerly stipulated by law and usual in similar transactions the payment to the brokers would be $500,000. Putting it at $1,000,000—very liberal pay, considering that the transaction involves no risk—the squeezing of the Government by the syndicate costs the people $11,750,000.

The difference between a 3 per cent rate (which the Government can command) and a 4 per cent rate (which this loan will carry if Congress shall not take prompt action) will be $1,000,000 a year, or $30,000,000 for the life of the bonds.

And the taxpayers foot the bills! It is a golden opportunity for President Cleveland to come to the defense of the people by a direct appeal to the country.

Mr. President, there were never words of truth and soberness uttered anywhere more appropriate and pertinent than those. It is not the ten or twelve million dollars that these men are allowed to make out of the Government. It is the fact that the American people facing this question must see that either one of two things exists, an incapable administration of public affairs or a dishonest one. It is frightful to contemplate that the people should come to either conclusion at this time, when it is said our credit is at stake.

Mr. President, it is time to call a halt in this matter. It is time at least that the people should have an opportunity to bid on these bonds if they desire. I have no idea that they will have that opportunity. I have no doubt that this scheme will go on, and I have no doubt that the scandal will follow. But in due time the American people will wake up to the fact that there has been a misappropriation of public funds, arising, as I said the other day, either out of dishonesty or imbecility, and it is our duty here to put in our protest unless we are to be partakers of the contumely that must follow such conduct on the part of the administration of public affairs.

For one, I do not propose by my silence to acquiesce in this kind of administration of public affairs. Heretofore at least we have been able to say to the people of the country, mistaken as the Administration may be in its policies, it is evidently working for the public good and is honest. We will not be allowed to say that much longer if these things continue. If the syndicate, whose interest lies so close to the heart of the Senator from New York, is not willing to bid with the blacksmiths, and the mechanics, and the laborers, and the other bankers, then let it keep out of the market and let the Government depend upon the honest people of the country; and they will find they will not be mistaken, for they never have when they put faith in and relied upon the great American heart, which responds in money as it responded in force when the nation's life was assailed.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, as a contribution to this debate, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Mexican loans that were made in 1846 and 1847 by Secretary Robert J. Walker, were made by the acceptance of sealed bids after public advertisements, and opened in the presence of bidders and the public in general.

I am afraid that some of the expressions by the Senator from New York will leave the impression that I had in some wise reflected upon the syndicate. I did not mention the conspicuous member in the manner the Senator from New York did. I said

expressly that I had no reflections to make; that I did not challenge their motives; that they were honorable men and able men. And it is beyond me to make any reflection whatever upon the President of the United States or challenge the motives of the Secretary of the Treasury. As I said before, I believe that they, as public servants and as public officials, are trying to do their duty as they understand it, and we are here trying to do ours. We have a right to differ with them as to the method of the transaction of the public business, and that is all that this resolution means.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it is all very well for Senators to differ with the executive authorities of the Government and to criticise them most severely by saying that they are either dishonest or incompetent, and then suggest that they have not meant anything by that criticism. I do not believe that the Secretary of the Treasury has up to this hour had any understanding, much less an agreement, with any syndicate whatever as to the issuing of any bonds. Nobody knows to the contrary. There have been some suggestions that bonds must be issued to meet the emergency; there have been suggestions of preparations upon the part of bankers to take these loans if they shall be offered, and that is all. No man is authorized to say that he has been promised a loan. No terms have been agreed upon that any Senator knows of.

Mr. President, if the friends of these gentlemen upon the other side whose pockets are lined with gold want to help the country out of its present emergency, let them come forward and make their propositions now, to-day, to-morrow, Monday. Who knows that their offer will not be accepted? Who is authorized to say? If everybody is clamoring for these bonds, as the Senator from West Virginia says—if the merchants, if the blacksmiths, if the carpenters, if the plain people, as he calls them, are so anxious for these bonds, let them come forward now, singly, by twos, by fours, by dozens, by syndicates, if they have a mind to. Where is the Senator authorized to say the proposition will not be entertained or will not be accepted?

Mr. President, no syndicates have come forward thus far; no men from the West, or from the East, or the South, or the North have come forward with any such suggestion that they were clamoring to take these bonds. The sole person in the country who has made a definite and distinct offer is the editor and proprietor of the New York World, who has suggested that he would take a million dollars' worth. So far, so good. Where are the others who are to take the $49,000,000? Where are the others to take the other $99,000,000, if there is to be $100,000,000 issued? It strikes me that there is a great deal of demagogy in this appeal to the people. From all we have heard said here in the last few weeks, the people have but little ready money; they have but little money to invest in bonds at a premium, and under existing laws only bonds at a premium can be issued, practically.

Mr. President, I have no interest nor friendship, even, with the men who compose this syndicate in the city of New York. They are not of my political household, and I care nothing about them. I am here simply to say they have a right to make their bids. Any syndicate in any other city in the United States can make their bid now. Put the Secretary of the Treasury to the test at once if you want to do so. If your men in Colorado have got their gold that they are telegraphing you about, and annoying you with telegrams, let them put their propositions in better shape. Let them say that the united wealth of Colorado is willing to help this Government to the amount of $100,000,000 at 3 per cent, and see what the Secretary of the Treasury will say.

Mr. President, there are no such propositions. When the people are drawing the money from the Treasury of the United States by at least a million dollars a day—this gold out of the Treasury—and the credit of the country is being impaired, impaired by our very inaction here to-day, impaired by the very proceedings in which we are attempting to embarrass the Treasury, do you think it is the time for this great Government to tinker around with a million here and a million there, with Tom, Dick, and Harry?

Mr. President, these men do not believe it. These men are speaking for political effect. These men are attempting simply to get up a political advantage of the party now in power. That is all there is of it. I have no reason to believe that they would proceed, if intrusted with power, any different than John G. Carlisle is proceeding to-day. Incompetent or dishonest is the suggestion made. John G. Carlisle incompetent! One of the ablest men in public life dishonest! Look at his honorable career. A poor man to-day. This man has been in public life for thirty years. He has no bonds. He has no money of any account. You know his situation. He is a poor man who lives upon his salary, and you know it. Dishonest or incompetent is the word hissed out here upon this floor. Mr. President, he is neither. I can say this, that if any man has suffered political injustice at the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury it is my colleague and myself in interparty affairs in the great State of New York; ignored by him in political appointments; ignored by him in every way, while others have been recognized in their respective States. But, sir, I think I am broad minded enough to do him justice in his official financial relations to this Government.

Sir, he is endeavoring to do the best for the country under the statutes passed before this Administration came into power—statutes which we inherited, statutes which he has suggested ought to be remedied. He has suggested amendments to get relief. You refuse to give this relief. You stand here picking flaws upon this thing and that thing that he has done to preserve the credit of the Government. You stand here not reporting your bills, holding them back, discussing these great questions when the financial credit of the country is at stake.

Mr. President, you would think that the Democratic party is in league with these men in New York. There is nothing in regard to New York business men different from other business men. Great financial transactions are had there because it is the moneyed center of the New World. That is the only reason. The great political parties have their national committees in the city of New York not because we ask to have them there, but because it is believed that is the proper place from which to make a political campaign. There is where syndicates are naturally organized. There is where great moneyed transactions take place. Where else could the Secretary of the Treasury go? Shall he go hunting around the mountains of Colorado to find a syndicate ready to furnish him gold to float the bonds of the Government? I think not. You would then, indeed, say he is incompetent, although you might not then say he is dishonest.

This is a simple question. Has anything been presented in the debate here to-day, has anything occurred since last February to justify the allegations against the competency and integrity of these officials? I think not. You have not forgotten nor has the country forgotten the message of the President of the United States, submitted to Congress last February, in which the same difficulty presented itself, the same siphoning of gold out of the Treasury to redeem these same never-ending greenbacks. He sent a respectful communication to Congress. What did he say? He said, in substance, "The best offer I have received is that I can float coin bonds at 3½ per cent and gold bonds at 3 per cent." He had no authority under existing law to make bonds absolutely payable in gold, and the Congress knew it. He therefore said, "If you make the bonds payable in gold, I can float them at 3 per cent. If you insist upon keeping them payable in coin, under the old act of 1875, I can not do better than 3½ per cent." While that was pending here where were the other syndicates who, it is said, were offering 3 per cent for coin bonds? Nowhere—Colorado, West Virginia, or anywhere. Here and there some smart petty financier might say he wanted a few bonds at a little higher rate. But large offers did not come. When the proposition to issue bonds was pending any citizen, any bankers, any syndicate could have come forward. Any bankers, any syndicate can come forward to-day, to-morrow, Monday, any time before this question must be absolutely decided.

Let Senators upon the other side telegraph to their banker friends and let them present their propositions to Mr. Carlisle. Let them say, "We will take five, ten, fifteen, or twenty million dollars of bonds at 3 per cent." If the Secretary refuses to accept the offer, then and then alone have you a right to say that he is incompetent or dishonest.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, the United States is full of capital ready to be invested wherever there is abundant security. I have not the slightest doubt that if bonds were offered at 110 or 112 they would be taken up as soon as the subscriptions could be got to the Secretary of the Treasury. There are $1,700,000,000 in the savings banks of the United States, of which a very considerable percentage is lying where the trustees are unable to lend it at any such rate as they ought to have.

It does not follow that because the times are difficult there is no capital to lend. That is just the time when capital dare not invest itself. I do not wish to discuss party questions here; it is a bad place and time to consider them; but as a business statement and proposition the tariff agitation has seriously affected the industries and business of this country, and I consider that the silver agitation is also to blame, for, whether or not the principles of our friends from Colorado are right, they are not accepted by the great financial world, and they will create distrust. Not all the people are so sanguine or are so well convinced as our friends from the Western States.

I would have no objection whatever to a provision for the future—after this loan, if you choose—like this:

Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall offer any of the bonds authorized for sale by this act or by the resumption act of 1875, he shall advertise the same and authorize subscriptions therefor to be made at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States.

That is a provision found in the bond bill which comes over here from the other House. But now suppose we interfere, just about when a great loan is to be made, by something which is intended—the resolution is not a legal enactment—to stop the loan, to show the

desire, the will of Congress that the loan should be stopped, and in the meantime Congress has not provided any other way of making a loan. During the last Congress, which was Democratic—the present Congress has scarcely had time—nothing whatever was done to provide a substitute. Now, when the Government has made the proposed loan, if we can not do it before, let us proceed immediately to provide a wise way of borrowing hereafter. Let us give our Government something like the exchequer bill law of Great Britain, providing a permanent right to loan in case of serious emergency, for whatever reason. We can trust our Government. The English have trusted theirs for generations and do not find any difficulty. They find their profit in it. To every sensible man, every plain man who can figure, and who does not know all about the inside motives, it seems a very strange thing that we are willing to sell for 104½ the identical bonds which other people within a week can sell for 115 or 117.

I think it is a monstrous mistake to suppose that the people of the United States would not take the proposed loan. I say they would take it as soon as they could telegraph to the Treasury Department. You misunderstand the means of the American people, and you misunderstand their patriotism. Because of factious counsels among ourselves and without faith in the people we are bringing our great nation into a very discreditible condition. I will vote for anything that is decent and respectable to get us out of it.

I happened to be in Paris in 1872 when France was about to pay her forfeit of a thousand million dollars to Germany. It was late on a Saturday night, and the subscriptions were to be opened the next morning in what is equivalent to a ward, in almost every ward in the city of Paris and all over the Empire. An American gentleman, long resident in that city, said to me, "I will wager you that the people are now gathering to offer their little sums of money for that loan." The subscription places were to be opened at 9 o'clock in the morning. The bonds were 5 per cent 100-franc (twenty-dollar) bonds, I think, offered at 84, which made it in the neighborhood of a 6 per cent bond, with 25 per cent down. I said, "If that is the case, I want to see it." Although I had to go away the next morning, we took carriages and drove down the Champs Élysées, and the first place we came to was the well-known Palace of Industry. At midnight there were not less than 1,200 people of the city of Paris waiting for the window to be opened at 9 o'clock the next morning. History tells us how that loan was taken many times over.

Does anybody suppose the patriotism of the American people is not equal to that? Will anybody throw doubt upon it who reads the history of the war? Let us trust our people. Offer the proposed loan at 110 or 112, if you please, and to-morrow morning by telegraph it will be taken. Trust the people of the country to take care of our honor. I shall not vote for the resolution until next week.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I merely rise to make one observation, which it is hardly necessary to make to the Senate, but the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] has reiterated again and again his suggestion why do not the people of the United States, if they are willing to bid for the loan, come in with their offers? Why do you not come here from Colorado or from West Virginia or from the banks, other than the syndicate? The one sufficient answer to that argument which the Senator spent so long in urging is that the Administration has not yet made known its purpose to issue bonds at all, or to solicit a loan.

The trouble with these loans, the last one and the one which is said to be now going on, is that no one knows how much the Government wants to borrow, or whether it wants to borrow anything, or whether it intends to issue any bonds at all until the whole transaction is over. How absurd to inquire why this workingman with $500 in a savings bank and this old woman with $500 in her teapot on the upper shelf do not come forward and make a tender of it to the Administration now. Nobody has any means of knowing what the President is going to do, either in manner or amount. The secrecy is not only as to the terms of the bargain, but also as to the purpose to make the bargain.

For one, Mr. President, I do not wish to say anything, if I could, which will affect the national credit; but I wish to repeat what I said in the last Congress, that I deny the lawful authority of the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury to contract new debts for the sake of paying the current expenses of the Government. He has undoubtedly by the resumption act the right to issue the bonds therein described and provided for the purpose of maintaining the gold reserve; but when that is not the reality of the transaction, when he first pays out the gold reserve for the current expenses of the Government, it is an idle device, a pretense, an artifice, to say that he has any lawful authority, either in substance or even technically, to issue these bonds. I have no doubt they will be paid, because their proceeds will have gone undoubtedly to the advantage of the United States; but I think it is one of the worst things ever done in our history that the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury should assume authority at will, without restraint, to increase the public debt.

Mr. President, there has been a time, and it was a time which began when this country was settled and continued until Grover Cleveland's Administration came into power, when the American people thought it was a disgrace to owe a debt which they were not endeavoring to pay, and when they considered that the first principle of honest administration and the first principle of sound finance was to relieve the country from the burden of debt. With freedom from debt all the rest of these financial problems disappear. A man who is paying his expenses from his receipts, and is increasing his property and has no debt, commands the situation anywhere; he does not need to go to philosophers or experts or financiers to inquire what is the path to prosperity. That has been the simple doctrine the American people inherited from our fathers.

I hold it to be one of the greatest of the numerous calamities this Administration has brought upon the American people that it has taken away from men from whom better things were expected the sense of national honesty in regard to the matter of paying the national debt. What has become of the old Democratic party? What has become of the old statesmanship of the South? Whatever else we may have to charge against the people of that section in times past, if we have anything, one thing until lately it always stood for, freedom from debt, economy of expenditure, and sound and honest money, gold and silver. Now, I am sorry to say, with some honorable exceptions, the statesmanship of that part of the country seems to have abandoned all three.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I deny that the Secretary of the Treasury is using the proceeds of the bonds to pay the expenses of the Government. The records do not show any such use.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to ask my friend, if he will allow me, whether the Government has not used money specifically set aside for resumption purposes, and is gradually encroaching upon it.

Mr. HILL. No, the Secretary has not. The bonds are sold for gold with which the greenbacks are redeemed. The Senator has just stated in his speech to-day that there is no law, there is no requirement, that the greenbacks in the Treasury should be set apart, but had the right to be placed in the general fund. Then the law of 1878 steps in and says they shall be put out again.

Mr. SHERMAN. The law, the act of 1882, I think, provides for $100,000,000 for the reserve fund.

Mr. HILL. The law recognizes, rather, the existence of such a fund.

Mr. SHERMAN. The real amount, as I said to-day, was $95,-500,000. When that sum had been reached, and the surplus above that sum exhausted for current expenses, it seems to me it was the duty of the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury to have avoided paying and refused to pay any of that money for any purpose except to redeem United States notes.

Mr. HILL. What law has he violated? What statute is there? Point it out if the Senator can. Not one. The Senator says it might be better. As a matter of financiering in the Treasury it might be better to keep that fund set apart. There is no statute which says it must be done. He has violated no law. Gold is converted into greenbacks by the redemption of them, and then the greenbacks are a part of the general fund of the Treasury. Then comes in the law of 1878, which says he shall pay out and shall not keep those greenbacks in the Treasury. I say here that he is violating no law; that, on the contrary, he has a perfect right to do it. You may say, as a matter of propriety, you may say, as a matter of financiering, he ought not to do it. That is one thing. That is addressed to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. But he violates no law. He is guilty of no misconduct. There is no dishonesty about it. It is his duty to keep this Government running, and he will discharge that duty in spite of the combined criticism of the gentlemen upon the other side.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from New York allow me to make a suggestion to him on that point?

Mr. HILL. Yes; suggestions are in order.

Mr. HOAR. I understand myself that wherever there is an appropriation for a public expenditure made from moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated it can not be applicable unless the reserve fund is completed, because the moneys in the Treasury are otherwise appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. Let me read what a distinguished member of this body when he was Secretary of the Treasury said. Secretary Sherman discussed this question in his annual report for 1877, before the passage of the act of May 1, 1878. Among other things he said:

> A note redeemed with coin is in the Treasury and subject to the same law as if received for taxes, or as a bank note redeemed by the corporation issuing it. The authority to reissue it does not depend upon the mode in which it is returned to the Treasury.

Therefore these greenback notes are there for any legitimate pur-

pose. They are assets of the Treasury. They can be paid out for any proper purpose, appropriations, ordinary expenses of the Government, or for any purpose.

Now, Senators, this is elementary. Senators upon the other side know it as well as I do. I do not intend to protract this discussion.

A word has been said here about the enormous profits which are being made on the sale of these bonds. The United States 4 per cent bonds of 1895, the last issue, are selling to-day, or were on December 28, for 116¼ flat, called. Those bonds only realized to the investor a little over 3 per cent. The Government actuary has figured it out. And yet Senators are expecting us to-day to float a coin bond at 3 per cent, to be readily taken. I hope it can be done. I wish the Government were in a position to try it. We can suggest its trial. We would not be responsible for the failure. No Senator here has suggested what would be the effect of a trial and failure. You would then be at the mercy entirely and completely of any syndicate that might be formed.

If a syndicate will accept these bonds at a reasonable rate, whether it is precisely at 4 per cent or a little less or a little more, and take the whole of them, I am not prepared to say that it may not be a good business transaction for the Government to close.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] speaks of individual sales of bonds; that a little lot of bonds are sold for a small amount. You might take one barrel of apples and throw it upon the market down here and it would bring perhaps a fair price; but bring 50,000,000 barrels of apples, and would not the price go down? This Government is not simply to float one bond or $1,000,000 of bonds. It has to float $50,000,000 of bonds within the very near future, within a very few days, possibly $100,000,000; and to quote what this or that or the other bond is selling for is idle and weak on the great question involved.

Irrespective of any question of that kind, the simple question is whether the Senate is prepared to slap the officers of your Treasury in the face, and pass here an expression of opinion upon this great vital question, at this critical hour, depriving the Democratic Secretary of the Treasury of the power that all former Secretaries of the Treasury have had. I will not believe it until it is done.

Mr. HAWLEY. Let us suppose that we pass a resolution here expressing by a large majority the condemnation by Congress of the Administration. Let us suppose that next Tuesday instead of passing the reasonable bond bill that comes from the other House we substitute for it a free silver coinage bill. Have we helped the financial situation? Shall we not discredit ourselves in the eyes of the world? Will the Senator from New York vote for free coinage under those circumstances and refuse a proper bond bill which will relieve the Administration of all its difficulties?

Mr. HILL. It depends upon what you mean by a proper bond bill. That term is pretty indefinite.

Mr. HAWLEY. Draw one yourself.

Mr. HILL. If I drew it myself I should be very likely to vote for it.

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not know. I think the Senator from New York is very likely to have drawn or said things he would not indorse years afterwards.

Mr. HILL. Possibly.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the bond bill from the other House is not reasonable, let us modify it and make it so, and the House will concur with us, or shall we throw it aside and vote for free coinage and discredit us, whether right or wrong, in the great markets of the world?

Mr. HILL. That is bringing up an entirely different question.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is a subject the Senator will have next Tuesday, and it directly affects the calculation of the money markets of the world upon the proposed loan.

Mr. HILL. I should very much regret if the Committee on Finance next week should, as a substitute for any bond bill to meet the present emergency, add to it as an amendment or substitute for it a free-coinage bill. Does the Senator anticipate that that will be done?

Mr. HAWLEY. I am very much afraid of it, because I have assurances from many Senators that that will be the result.

Mr. HILL. And yet we are having Senators here saying that the President of the United States is about to issue some bonds of the Government without waiting for the action of Congress. Now, the suggestion is made by an honorable Senator of influence upon the other side that he fears that no bond bill which we can vote for will be presented, but that, on the contrary, a free-coinage bill will be presented.

Mr. President, permit me to say a word on that point. I said I hoped it would not be done, because I think it would be unwise to mix the general great financial question of the policy of the free coinage of silver with a temporary remedial measure like this. I think, in all good faith, that it would be unwise upon the part of the true friends of silver to bring here such a measure. I have no objection, if they desire to do so at a proper time, to bringing in, in the near future, such a bill and let it be discussed; and if they have the votes in the Senate to pass it, let it be passed; but let it stand on its own merits.

Let not the free silver coinage question grab the Government by the throat every time it needs relief. I do not believe it is the proper policy to pursue, every time the Government gets into such an emergency as at present exists in reference to its financial affairs, to add to every bond bill a measure for the free coinage of silver. I think it is unwise. I think it will not practically solve this question. If a majority of the committee so desire, let them report their free-coinage bill in a manly fashion; let it be discussed here, and if they have a majority of the votes they are entitled to pass it. I shall not delay it. I shall submit my views upon the subject, and that is all. I do not think it would be wise—I do not know whether it will be done—to add to any bill that purports upon its face to give temporary relief to the Treasury at this crisis a free-silver measure. I do not think it ought to be done, and I trust it will not be done.

I have said frankly all that I care to say upon the subject.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, I am not aware what effect the passage of the pending resolution would have upon the action of the Secretary of the Treasury in the matter of selling bonds. I am of opinion that it would have but little effect. I am of opinion that what he thinks is his official duty under the circumstances would be executed by him notwithstanding the passage of this resolution by the Senate.

It occurs to me that the resolution is aimed more at the maintenance of the parity of gold and silver than as a reflection upon the Administration. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] called attention to the fact that when Mexican bonds were sold there was advertisement and notification to the public. Attention has been called to the fact that when the Sherman bonds were sold in 1877 there was advertisement and notice to the public. When the bonds were sold in 1893 by the present Administration there was advertisement and notification; but at that time there was a very protracted and earnest debate as to the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act. That debate had the effect of shaking confidence in the maintenance of the gold standard. I believe everyone will admit that that debate had the effect, as all the constant assaults upon that standard have had the same effect, of shaking confidence in the ability of the Government to maintain gold at a parity.

When the bonds were sold in February, 1895, the gold reserve in the Treasury had dwindled down to small proportions. There was no time to hesitate; there was no time to advertise. Consequently the Secretary of the Treasury had to act according to the exigency as it then presented itself. He made the best arrangent that he could with a syndicate. They undertook certain obligations on their part which I am told have been performed. They undertook to keep up the gold reserve, I believe, until last October. They undertook to prevent the exportation of gold. Have these obligations on their part been performed? No one has heard to the contrary. The situation is not inviting now for an advertisement.

We are told by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] that gold is hoarded. We are told that there is more gold in the United States not in circulation than is necessary to cover any advertisement of bonds offered. But in spite of the violent attempts made to bring about the unlimited coinage of silver, in spite of the open declaration made that the bonds of the United States stipulated to be paid in coin are to be paid in gold or silver indiscriminately, would holders of this gold exchange it for United States bonds threatened with that sort of payment? I do not believe they would.

Mr. President, I have no quarrel with those who entertain free-silver views. I respect their opinions. I think they are in error, and thinking they are in error I would not willingly do anything on my part which would bring about the unlimited coinage of silver. I believe that tying up the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury by requiring an advertisement of bonds, when the exigencies of the Treasury demand an immediate repletion, might precipitate a silver basis, and thinking that, I shall vote against the resolution. I believe that the Secretary of the Treasury ought to have unlimited discretion in such a case.

As to the reflections upon the honesty of the Secretary of the Treasury, I think, in all deference to the Senator from Colorado, that they had better not have been uttered. In his heart the Senator does not believe that the Administration, either individually or collectively, is dishonest.

Mr. TELLER. I have not charged that. I charged that it was incapable or dishonest.

Mr. CAFFERY. The dishonesty therefore attaches either to the Administration collectively or to the individual members of the Administration, and the Senator reiterated the charge with emphasis. I say that I do not believe he means it. I do not believe that he understood or intended the full consequences of his charge. The Administration is attempting to hold up the side of the question which tends toward a maintenance of the parity of the two

metals, and in taking that view of it, the Administration can be charged with neither inbecility nor dishonesty.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] deplores the decadence of Southern honesty and Southern statesmanship and of sound views of Southern people upon finance. There perhaps is unfortunately a very wide departure between the statesmanship of this day of the Southern Senators and members of Congress and the statesmanship of Calhoun, and Clay, and Benton. There is likewise a very large margin, perhaps, between the statesmanship of Massachusetts and the statesmanship which was ornamented and signalized by such great men as Webster. But, sir, the Southern men do not add hypocrisy to their lack of statesmanship, and while they are for the maintenance of what they call sound views on finance, they would not seek to stab those views by indirection for what I consider to be a puny party advantage.

What difference does it make in regard to the gold reserve whether we have more in the Treasury in the way of paper than the needs of the Government require? If bonds are sold and gold obtained, and the gold drawn out again by greenbacks, so that there is an apparent overflowing of the Treasury and yet a depletion of the gold reserve, how are you to maintain the thousand million dollars of paper, every dollar of which is bottomed upon the ability of the Government to redeem in gold? How would it benefit the country to pile up taxation, not a dollar of which now is paid in gold, in order to get paper notes into the Treasury which you could not hold at a parity with gold?

I admired the frankness of the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] when he said, from the standpoint of the Administration, that it was idle to talk about advertising bonds when the very people who would take the bonds with gold would get the gold by drawing it out of the Treasury with greenbacks.

Mr. ELKINS. I hope, after the full discussion which has taken place, that we may now get a vote on the motion to refer, and then reach a final vote on the resolution this evening. We have been here long enough, it seems to me.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, if we are going on I wish to say just a word or two, if the Senator from West Virginia will excuse me. I do not know whether I was misunderstood or not. I do not wish to be understood as approving of the course of the Treasury Department in making the various loans which have been so much discussed.

I did not believe that the Government had the right to borrow money under the law of 1875 and devote it, directly or indirectly, to the current necessities of the Government. I can not understand the mathematics by which the Treasury satisfies itself that the successive loans in no way went to pay current expenses. But I appreciate the necessity and the emergency, and if that method of borrowing can be palliated at all it is only by reason of the refusal of the last Congress to act upon this general subject of finance.

Mr. ELKINS. Now let us have a vote.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I wish to say a single word. I shall vote for the resolution. I am opposed to the issuance of bonds of any kind. I believe there are other means by which the wants of the Treasury may be supplied. All the arguments in opposition to the resolution are predicated upon the idea that there is no people of the United States, that a few men constitute the controlling power in finance and control the revenues and the products of the labor of this great people. Where are the gentlemen who subscribe for these bonds to get the gold? It is to come from the people, the millions of toilers in the United States. There is no system of finance that is great enough to supplant the results of the labor of the millions of the American people.

Sir, you have only to advertise, and the notes of this Government, redeemable at its option in gold or silver, and bearing 3 per cent interest, will be taken up in gold, dollar for dollar, by the people of this country without delay. It seems to me that there is no kind of question in regard to the truth of that proposition. The resources of this country are in the labor of its millions of toilers and in the brains of the poor people of the country, and not in the great princes of finance and the men who have attained, even by laudable enterprise, the position of captains of industry. There is no danger of the credit of this Government failing when it is intrusted to the people of the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, in view of the importance of this question, and the very grave questions raised by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], the certainty that other amendments will be offered to the pending resolution, and the equal certainty that the matter can not be disposed of to-night, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. ELKINS. I hope not. I call for the yeas and nays on the motion to adjourn.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER]. Otherwise I should vote "nay."

Mr. PRITCHARD (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SHOUP (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from California [Mr. WHITE]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (after having voted in the affirmative). I understood that the Senator from Idaho and myself had transferred our pairs. I voted with that understanding.

Mr. SHOUP. Very well. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DUBOIS. I announce the pair of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. BRICE. I wish to state again that the general pair which I have with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] has been transferred by agreement to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. GEAR. I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. BURROWS. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. MCMILLAN] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS]. He has not voted, and I will therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 26; as follows:

YEAS—27.

Aldrich,	Chilton,	Harris,	Murphy,
Allison,	Cullom,	Hawley,	Roach,
Bate,	George,	Hill,	Vest,
Berry,	Gibson,	Hoar,	Voorhees,
Brice,	Gorman,	Lodge,	Walthall,
Caffery,	Gray,	Martin,	Wetmore.
Call,	Hale,	Mitchell, Wis.	

NAYS—26.

Allen,	Clark,	McBride,	Pugh,
Baker,	Davis,	Mantle,	Shoup,
Burrows,	Dubois,	Nelson,	Squire,
Butler,	Elkins,	Peffer,	Teller,
Cameron,	Frye,	Perkins,	Warren.
Carter,	Jones, Nev.	Pettigrew,	
Chandler,	Kyle,	Proctor,	

NOT VOTING—32.

Bacon,	Gordon,	Morrill,	Smith,
Blackburn,	Hansbrough,	Palmer,	Stewart,
Blanchard,	Irby,	Pasco,	Thurston,
Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Platt,	Tillman,
Daniel,	McMillan,	Pritchard,	Turpie,
Faulkner,	Mills,	Quay,	Vilas,
Gallinger,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Sewell,	White,
Gear,	Morgan,	Sherman,	Wilson.

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, January 7, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 3, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday was read and approved.

CUSTOMS DISTRICT, ALASKA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a bill for the reorganization of the customs district of Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification for the year ended October 31, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The joint resolution (S. 32) authorizing and directing acceptance of the ram *Katahdin*, thereby making said ram a part of the United States Navy, having been found truly enrolled, the Speaker signed the same.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill (S. 895) granting a pension to Nancy G. Allabach; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

Also, that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 5,000 copies of the paper entitled "Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado."

The House then, on motion of Mr. HENDERSON (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), adjourned until Monday, January 6.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 3190) to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 3191) to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 3192) fixing the salary of the clerk to the disbursing officer and quartermaster at the West Point Military Academy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3193) relating to the payment of customs duties and to the finances—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 3194) in regard to that portion of the public domain situated in the State of Kansas known as "sand hills," and unappropriated public domain situated in said State composed of sand lands, and providing for the reclamation and entry thereof—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3195) to regulate the rates of pensions in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3196) granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the United States in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 3197) for the erection of a reformatory and house of detention for women and girls convicted of crimes and misdemeanors in the District of Columbia, and the safe-keeping, care, and protection of those awaiting trial, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOWE: A bill (H. R. 3198) for the adjudication of pension claims—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 3199) granting to the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak., the right to improve, beautify, lease, and use for sanitarium and public purposes American Island, heretofore granted to said city as a public park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3200) to establish a military post at or near the city of Pierre, Hughes County, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 3201) to provide for closing the artificial sloughs between Hills Ferry and Firebaugh, in the State of California, and appropriating money for that purpose—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3202) to pay for improving the streets in front of the post-office site in the city of Sacramento, State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 3203) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish as a felony the carnal and unlawful knowing of any female under the age of 16 years," approved February 9, 1889 (Twenty-fifth Statutes, page 658, chapter 120)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3204) estopping the Secretary of the Interior and those under him from denying pension claims in certain cases, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3205) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to discontinue the office of collector of customs at certain ports, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. DINGLEY: A bill (H. R. 3206) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the extermination of fur-bearing animals in Alaska," and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 3207) to increase the pay of surfmen in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3208) to amend section 3738 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, 1878—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 3209) to enable the people of Oklahoma to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 3210) to provide for the adjudication and payment of damages sustained by citizens of the United States in the border counties of York, Adams, Cumberland, Franklin, Fulton, Bedford, Somerset, and Perry, in State of Pennsylvania, from Union and Confederate troops during the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 3211) to retire United States and Treasury notes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3212) to secure a better foreign market for grain and the products of grain and other agricultural products of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that no more bonds be sold at private sale or under private contract—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Iowa: A resolution directing the Committee on Banking and Currency to report a bill to establish postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BARHAM: A resolution relating to clerks in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BOATNER: A resolution in regard to the refusal of certain officials in the Treasury Department to carry into effect certain laws enacted to pay certain bounties on sugar—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 3213) granting a pension to John L. Britton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 3214) for the relief of Philip Loney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3215) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William A. Cole—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 3216) granting an increase of pension to James P. Hurley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 3217) placing the name of John W. Brooks, of Ellsworth, Kans., on the rolls of the Army and granting him an honorable discharge with pay and allowances—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 3218) for the relief of William D. Matthews—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROMWELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 3219) for the relief of James Boland—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3220) to pension E. S. Thompson, a soldier of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3221) granting a pension to John Dalton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3222) for the relief of James H. Wimpey, of McDonald County, Mo., authorizing him or his legal representatives to select 160 acres of unoccupied and unappropriated land of the United States (not mineral) and subject to homestead entry and directing the issue of scrip therefor in legal subdivisions—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3223) for the relief of Mrs. W. C. Lucas—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 3224) for the relief of actual settlers on the Navajo Reservation addition—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 3225) for the relief of John F. Bretz, of Springfield, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3226) granting a pension to George Wolf, of North Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 3227) for the relief of Kate A. Hill—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3228) to provide for the erection of a wall around the jail of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 3229) for the relief of Hannah Newell Barrett—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 3230) granting pension to Lena D. Smith, widow of Green Clay Smith, late colonel Fourth Kentucky Cavalry and brigadier-general United States Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3231) granting a pension to John J. Benike, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3232) for the relief of Anthony McAndrew, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 3233) to authorize the Court of

Claims to hear and determine the claim of the heirs of Dudley B. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 3234) granting a pension to Williamson Durley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3235) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles R. Bortle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3236) granting a pension to Stephen Jackson, of Glassford, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 3237) to increase the pension of John Houk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3238) to increase the pension of William P. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3239) granting a pension to Annie E. Hetherington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3240) granting a pension to Hannah Osborne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3241) granting a pension to Mary E. Boyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3242) restoring Sarah J. Thompson, late Sarah J. Wilson, to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 3243) to correct the military record of Samuel Trout, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 3244) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge from the United States Army to Franz S. Zoller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3245) granting a pension to Alfred Vansickles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3246) granting a pension to Henry B. Magill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 3247) granting a pension to Charles Blitz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 3248) granting a pension to Lena Moser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3249) granting a pension to Anne Tracy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3250) granting a pension to Levi R. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3251) granting a pension to Walton Butler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3252) granting a pension to John N. Corgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3253) granting a pension to Jane Dykes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 3254) for the relief of the vestry of the Episcopal Church of Remington, Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3255) for the relief of James Y. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 3256) for the relief of Alfred T. Morey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 3257) to pension Maria L. Hughes, as widow of Isaac M. Hughes, late a private in Company H, Twenty-fifth Iowa Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 3258) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Daniel Straw, late private Company F, Twenty-fifth Massachusetts Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3259) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Monahan and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3260) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James M. Canney and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3261) correcting the muster of Second Lieut. E. D. Hadley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 3262) for the relief of Frances A. Monholland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 3263) to increase the pension of Carlos Bombard, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Vermont Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3264) to increase the pension of Mrs. Virginia E. Turtle, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Resolution of North Avenue Baptist Society of Cambridge, Mass., favoring the discontinuance of Indian contract schools; also, resolution of the Twelfth Baptist Society of Boston, Mass., favoring same legislation; also, resolution of John L. Clark and others, favoring same legislation—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HITT: Resolution unanimously adopted by the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., at a meeting held November 30, 1895, requesting Congress to grant belligerent rights to Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: Resolution of American Protective Association of Nebraska, praying that the Government recognize the belligerent rights of the Cubans—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Santee Sioux Indians praying for the passage of the bill (H. R. 280) to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Memorial from the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak., relative to authorizing said city to use American Island for certain purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of D. A. Banta and 25 others, citizens of Barton County, Kans., praying for the passage of the bill for the relief of Lena Moser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Anne Tracy, praying Congress to grant her a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Elizabeth Neal, for the passage of House bill 1856, granting her a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John F. Lewis, for the passage of House bill 1852, for his relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of C. P. Taylor Post, No. 387, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, Conway Springs, Kans., for the enactment of a service pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: Petition of Capt. William D. Richards and 45 others, owners or masters of vessels, asking that the harbor at Manitowoc, Wis., may be improved—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Resolution of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, concerning the Venezuelan dispute—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of members of Washington Camp, No. 436, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of S. G. Richards, M. E. Hotchkiss, and others, praying for an increase of the pension of Lemuel J. Essex—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Paper from ex-Governor Bulkeley, of Connecticut, in reference to transfer of cases from State to Federal courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of Lucy A. Tontain, of Banning, Cal., asking for relief—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Charles Blitz, Company C, Sixty-seventh New York Infantry, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Mary Eliz. Craig, for pension, together with affidavits—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 6, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under Rule XXIV, clause 2, the following communications, etc., were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the board of appraisers appointed to appraise the improvements of intruders in the Cherokee Nation, together with accompanying papers and letters upon the subject; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of an appropriation to carry into effect the provisions of a convention for the exchange of public documents with certain foreign Governments; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the president of the National Academy of Sciences, with papers and vouchers relating to expenditures made in accordance with the act of Congress approved July 12, 1894; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting additional estimates for the support of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of an appropriation for the purchase of a press and separating machine for the office of the Treasurer of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A bill (S. 894) granting a pension to Nancy G. Allabach; which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed at the Government Printing Office, at the earliest day practicable, 5,000 copies in separate form, with paper covers, of the paper entitled "Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado," constituting pages 1 to 209 of part 2 of the Sixteenth Annual Report of the United States Geological Survey, with the accompanying illustrations, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,500 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies for distribution by the Geological Survey.

Which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

A concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, under the direction of the Department of the Interior, 6,000 copies of a paper contained in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Director of the United States Geological Survey, entitled "The public lands and their water supply," together with the accompanying maps and illustrations, of which number 1,500 copies shall be for the use of members of the Senate, 3,000 for the use of members of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 for the use of the Geological Survey.

Which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, a joint resolution introduced by myself—joint resolution (H. Res. 61)—to provide for the payment of the force of Truck Company D in the District of Columbia was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. As it contains an appropriation it should have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I ask that the reference be corrected.

The SPEAKER. The correction will be made, and the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. The bill (H. R. 276) which I introduced, granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College and of the Kansas State Normal Institute thereon, and for a public park, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. That bill has reference to the disposition of a military reservation which has been abandoned, and is now a part of the public domain. I ask, therefore, that the reference be corrected and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUE. A bill of similar character introduced by myself—House bill 1238—took the same reference. I ask that in this case, also, the reference be changed.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1238) granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College and of the Kansas State Normal School thereon, and for a public park, was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SETTLEMENT OF THE VENEZUELA BOUNDARY, ETC.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I desire to report a resolution from the Committee on Printing and have it considered now.

The SPEAKER. Is it privileged?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. Then it requires unanimous consent. The resolution will be read, after which there will be opportunity for objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That 6,000 extra copies of Senate Document No. 226, first session Fiftieth Congress, relating to the Venezuela boundary, be printed in paper covers, of which number 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask permission to make a brief statement in connection with this resolution, after which I think there will be no objection to its immediate consideration.

This House has already passed a resolution, introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], similar to this. But that was simply a House resolution, which, inasmuch as the cost of this printing will exceed $500, can not be executed by the Public Printer. The resolution on which I now ask the House to act has already been passed by the Senate, and the action of the two Houses is necessary in order that this work may be done.

Mr. PERKINS. Is not the number here proposed—6,000—larger than is required?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think this is the same number that was proposed in the House resolution introduced by the gentleman's colleague [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. HITT. I suggest that the resolution be amended so as to include the message, with accompanying correspondence, that recently came in. This will complete the history, so far as correspondence goes, of this Venezuela question. The limited number that was printed of the message and documents makes it somewhat difficult to get them, and it is desirable that all these documents should go together.

Mr. RICHARDSON. This is a Senate concurrent resolution; it is not offered by myself.

Mr. HITT. But it might be amended.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, if the House should decide to consider the resolution it would be amendable. I think the gentleman's suggestion is eminently proper.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HITT. I move to amend the resolution by inserting after the word "boundary" the words "and the President's message of December 17, 1895, and the documents accompanying the same."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was adopted.

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

REPRESENTATIVE FROM UTAH.

Mr. BRODERICK. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Clarence E. Allen, Representative-elect from the State of Utah, be now sworn in. As gentlemen all understand, Utah is now a State, the President's proclamation to that effect having been issued on Saturday. The term of Mr. Allen, who was elected as a Representative of the State, commenced on Saturday. He has filed with the Clerk credentials signed by the governor and the secretary of state, but not as officers of the State, because they could not be sworn in until to-day. There is no contest of Mr. Allen's election; and I therefore ask unanimous consent that he be now sworn in as a member.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK] asks unanimous consent that the oath of office be administered to Clarence E. Allen as a Representative from the State of Utah.

Mr. CRISP. I will ask my friend from Kansas whether he has examined into this matter at all and has ascertained that this gentleman is entitled to be sworn in?

Mr. BRODERICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRISP. This of course is not precisely similar to the case ordinarily presented where the oath is administered to a member-elect before his credentials have been formally presented. I understand that Utah, by proclamation issued on Saturday last, has been declared a State; but has the gentleman from Kansas looked into the law sufficiently to satisfy himself that the action he now proposes is entirely proper?

Mr. BRODERICK. Yes, sir. Under the enabling act the governor and the secretary of the new State must sign the credentials of the member elected to Congress. These officials will be sworn in to-day in Utah; but they have already signed credentials to the same effect.

I confess that this proceeding is somewhat irregular; but in view of the fact that there is no contest over the election of Mr. Allen, and as the credentials, although somewhat irregular in form, are already filed with the Clerk of the House, I see no reason why the member should not be sworn in now. I know that there is no contest; I know that he was elected under a constitution adopted by the State, and I therefore make the request.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that in a matter of this sort there ought to be some reference and report from a committee of the House.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let it go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CRISP (continuing). This Territory has just been admitted as a State, and the RECORD ought to show some report either from the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Elections as to the facts involved. In other words, there ought to be some report showing that Utah is now entitled to a Representative on the floor of this House, and therefore, under the circumstances, I think I shall have to object to the unanimous consent asked by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BRODERICK. If the gentleman from Georgia will allow me to say, there are precedents for this action.

Mr. CRISP. This can be done to-morrow, and it will occasion no material delay.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made to the request of the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Maine will withhold that motion for an instant.

I would suggest that this matter of the election in Utah be referred to some committee to meet the objection of the gentleman from Georgia. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Elections or to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. McMILLIN. With the right to report at any time.

Mr. NORTHWAY. It should go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa suggests that the proposition of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK] be submitted to the Committee on Elections or the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. McMILLIN. I suggest that the committee have the right to report at any time.

The SPEAKER. With the right to report at any time.

Mr. McMILLIN. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Iowa suggested in the first instance that this should be referred to the Committee on Elections. I think it belongs properly to the Judiciary Committee, the law committee of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was not struggling to get control, but simply to get action on the matter.

Mr. McMILLIN. I wanted the gentleman to get control. I know his modesty, which prevented him from asserting himself.

Mr. HENDERSON. You know me thoroughly. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request that this matter be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary with power to report at any time?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BARTHOLDT, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky, for two weeks, on account of business.

To Mr. SORG, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. DAYTON, until Tuesday next, on account of important business.

CODIFICATION AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE PENSION LAWS.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask a change of reference of House bill No. 2782, to codify and arrange the laws relating to pensions. I ask that the Committee on the Revision of the Laws be discharged from the further consideration of this bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The SPEAKER. In this form it requires unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no motive except to attain the best results by the committee charged with the investigation and report on this matter; but it seems to me that this pertains properly to one of the law committees of the House, and I think it ought to remain with the Committee on the Revision of the Laws or else be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The revisions heretofore made have been under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, and I think it entirely proper that this should go there also.

Mr. PICKLER. If the gentleman will allow me a moment——

Mr. McMILLIN. Certainly.

Mr. PICKLER. This is a modification or arrangement of the laws relating to pensions that was made in the last Congress. The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Pearson, was a member of a committee of three appointed by the House to arrange and codify these laws. It was reported and passed by the House, but no final action was taken upon it. Now, it is entirely true that either the Committee on Invalid Pensions or the Committee on the Revision of the Laws would have jurisdiction of this matter. As I introduced this bill myself on the opening of this session, it went to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws. But I have consulted the chairman of that committee, Mr. BOWERS of California, and it is his request that it be rereferred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, as they do not care to take up the matter of pensions at this time and go through all of the various laws on the subject. It would come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Invalid Pensions anyway, and that is the desire of all whom I have consulted in the matter. It was before the last House from time to time and finally passed the House.

Mr. McMILLIN. All propositions, so far as I have known, for the revision of the pension laws have gone to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws. In addition, I happen to know that this committee has very little else to do, and as the question submitted is an exceedingly important one, it ought to go to that committee. I have the utmost confidence in the Committee on Invalid Pensions, but that committee is overwhelmed with work in the consideration of individual pension bills, which will require all of their time. They would have no opportunity to consider a matter of this importance, and therefore I object to the change of reference.

Mr. PICKLER. If the gentleman will permit me a moment——

Mr. McMILLIN. I must object to the request.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

REGENT OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Mr. DINGLEY. I withdraw my motion for adjournment for a moment to allow the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] to present a matter to the House.

Mr. HITT. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution (H. Res. 19) to fill a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than members of Congress, shall be filled by the appointment of William L. Wilson, of the State of West Virginia, in place of Henry Coppée, deceased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HITT, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

And then, on motion of Mr. DINGLEY (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 3265) donating one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to Stone River Post, No. 74, Grand Army of the Republic, Sedan, Kans.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3266) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors of the late war, and providing pensions to their widows and minor children—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 3267) to facilitate the determination of land matters in the Department of the Interior—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3268) to facilitate the procurement of evidence and to compel the attendance of witnesses in matters before the registers and receivers of the local land offices of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3269) to grant and settle with the public-land States 5 per cent of sales and warrant locations—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3270) authorizing commutation to certain inmates of the Soldiers' Home for Regular Army at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 3271) to extend the provisions of the pension laws to the Indiana State Militia, known and designated as the "Indiana Legion," and to the widows, children, and dependent relatives of deceased members of the Indiana Legion who rendered service to the United States during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 3272) to do justice to the widows of our soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 3273) for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 3274) to restore widows to the pension rolls in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 3275) to provide for the purchase or condemnation of the property of the Monongahela Navigation Company—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 3276) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the building of a railroad bridge at Little Rock, Ark.," approved March 2, 1891—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 3277) to authorize the Falls Church and Potomac Railway Company of Virginia to extend its line of road into and within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 3278) to amend section 1 of an act approved December 21, 1893, entitled "An act to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 3279) to authorize the reassessment of water-main taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3280) to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act to punish the carrying or selling of deadly or dangerous weapons within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,"

approved July 13, 1892—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3281) to authorize reassessments for improvements and general taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 3282) to repeal section 61 of an act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which became a law August 25, 1894—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 3283) to provide for a building for the use of the post-office, office of the superintendent of the Hot Springs Reservation, and other civil offices, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3284) to provide a public building for the use of the post-office and other civil offices of the city of Pine Bluff, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 3285) to confer the rank and pay of a first lieutenant of infantry upon the director of gymnastics and instructor in swordsmanship at the United States Military Academy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 3286) for the establishment of branch hydrographic offices at Duluth, Minn., Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Buffalo, N. Y.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TRACEY: Joint resolution (H. Res. 62) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISCHER: Joint resolution (H. Res. 63) directing the Secretary of War to prepare and submit plans and estimates for opening up Gravesend Bay and Coney Island Creek, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MERCER: Joint resolution (H. Res. 64) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan ordnance and ordnance stores for military instruction in high schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A resolution to have printed certain House documents—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BRODERICK: First credentials of Mr. Clarence E. Allen, Representative-elect from the State of Utah—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 582) for the relief of Dobson Johnson, of Dekalb County, Tenn.—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1118) to increase the pension of Mrs. Elizabeth V. Harman—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 685) for the relief of James M. Hankins—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 699) to pension John Morris—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 728) for the relief of Ami Simmons—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 3287) to correct the military record of William H. Signet, of McKeesport, Allegheny County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3288) granting a pension to Annie O'Neil and Mary O'Neil, of Uniontown, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3289) to correct the military record of Harvey H. Young, of Beallsville, Washington County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 3290) for the relief of Goff A. Hall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 3291) granting a pension to John L. Rumery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 3292) granting an honorable discharge to Seth Porter Church, alias Samuel Church—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 3293) to correct the military record of George C. Deininger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3294) for the relief of officers and crews of the United States gunboats *Kineo* and *Chocura*—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 3295) for the relief of John K. Dixon, of Portsmouth, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 3296) to do justice to the survivors of the shipwreck of the *Sultana*—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 3297) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John D. Brining, of Canton, Ill.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 3298) for the relief of B. F. Moses—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENDERSON: A bill (H. R. 3299) for the relief of C. S. Lobdell, of Parkersburg, Iowa—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 3300) granting a pension to William Mathers, late of the Marengo Light Guards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3301) granting a pension to James Condra, late of the Marengo Light Guards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3302) granting a pension to John Blunk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 3303) to extend the patent granted to William Farr Goodwin for an improvement in railway tracks and trucks—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3304) directing the correction of the record of John Irvin, late of Company E, Sixty-fourth Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 3305) to carry into effect the finding of the Court of Claims in favor of Admiral I. Nunn, of Arkansas—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 3306) to increase the pension of Theodore V. Purdy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 3307) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Witting—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 3308) to confirm to Allen C. Clark the title to certain real estate in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 3309) for the relief of James L. Ord, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3310) granting a pension to Patrick Bogan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 3311) for the relief of Francis M. Kirby and to amend his military record—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3312) to correct the military record of Michael Garvey, late of Company H, Twelfth Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 3313) for the relief of James Bigler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3314) for the relief of the legal representatives of David Heustis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROYSE: A bill (H. R. 3315) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of John F. Kelley—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3316) granting a pension to Cora L. Dodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3317) to remove the charge of desertion against George Stock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: A bill (H. R. 3318) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States revenue cutter *Gallatin* off the coast of Massachusetts—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STAHLE: A bill (H. R. 3319) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Witmer, late private Company E, Eighty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3320) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Herr—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3321) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah E. Mehring, Company G, Two hundred and ninth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3322) granting a pension to James K. McCullough, Company F, Seventeenth Pennsylvania Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3323) granting a pension to Mary Hatz, dependent mother of William Hatz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACY: A bill (H. R. 3324) for the relief of Charles Brewster, and to place him on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3325) to remove the charge of desertion from the service record of Alexander Warren—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3326) for the relief of certain officers of the Missouri State Militia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3327) for the relief of David C. Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3328) granting a pension to Mrs. Nancy M. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3329) for the relief of George W. Cherry, and to place him upon the pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3330) to pension Samuel Akins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3331) to pension Col. James Lindsay—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3332) granting a pension to Mrs. Fanny Warren—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3333) granting a pension to Thomas S. Daugherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3334) to grant a pension to Levi C. Faught—to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGLEY: Memorial of John Richard Dimock, praying that his naval record may be corrected—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Petition of 11 ex-soldiers of Havelock, Iowa, favoring the passage of a service pension bill on the per diem plan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL: Petition of M. H. Norton and 85 other citizens of the State of Missouri, for the improvement of the Missouri River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HARDY: Evidence to be filed in support of bill to pension James Condra—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Ministerial Association of Indianapolis, Ind., asking (1) to raise the age of consent; (2) to repeal the ninety-day divorce law of Oklahoma; (3) to enact a Sabbath law for the capital equal to the best State law; (4) to enforce compulsory education and suppress child labor in the capital; (5) to pass a law for arbitration of railway strikes, and (6) to provide for a commission to investigate the labor problem—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HITT: Memorial and resolutions of the Chicago Congregational Club, December 20, 1895, concerning outrages upon the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWE: Resolutions of the Brooklyn Veteran Association, denouncing the outrages of the Turks and Kurds upon Christian Armenians and calling upon the Government of the United States to interfere—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition for the extension of a patent granted to William Farr Goodwin for an improvement in railway tracks and trucks—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. KEM: Petition of 77 citizens of North Platte, Nebr., asking for the passage of a bill regulating immigration, introduced by Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LITTLE: Memorial of John H. Clark, the son of a Revolutionary soldier, urging currency reform—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAHON: Two petitions of members of Washington Camp, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, No. 93, of Alfrurata, Mifflin County, and No. 658, of Knobsville, Fulton County, Pa., asking for the passage of House bill No. 5446, Fifty-third Congress, known as the W. A. Stone bill, to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MERCER: Resolutions of American Protective Association of Nebraska, that the Cubans be recognized as belligerents by the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Petition of John A. Fairfax—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEILL: Petition of John S. Black, M. D. Martin, and 100 others, Indian Bay sufferers, for relief, with Exhibits A, B, C, and D—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OTEY: Resolution adopted at a meeting of citizens of South Boston, Halifax County, Va.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of Burlington Woolen Mills, Colchester Mills, and Winooski Worsted Company, for the revision of the tariff on wool and woolen goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Board of Trade of St. Johnsbury, Vt., praying for a revision of the tariff on roman and portland cements—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Paint and Oil Club of New England favoring the passage of the bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting in New Haven, Conn., concerning the Armenian outrages, calling upon Congress to act, and accompanied with letters from Rev. Newman Smyth, D. D., and others—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of J. Jones and 41 other citizens of New Hampshire, praying for the passage of a bill to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition asking for an appropriation of $1,000,000 per year for three years to continue the improvement of the Missouri River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, four petitions from Ozark, Sparta, Guinn, and Nixa, State of Missouri, asking for the passage of House bill No. 1686—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Alexander Warren—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Charles Brewster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of George W. Cherry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Mrs. Nancy M. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 7, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

NEWTON C. BLANCHARD, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM KENTUCKY.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator-elect from Kentucky, Mr. Lindsay, is present, and I ask that the oath of office be administered to him.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator-elect from Kentucky, whose credentials have heretofore been presented, will please come forward and receive the oath of office.

Mr. Lindsay was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. BERRY, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to the act of Congress of March 2, 1895, authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to consider and examine the terms of the contract between the United States and William H. B. Stout, Cyrus J. Hall, and Isaac S. Bangs, dated April 21, 1888, for furnishing stone for the Congressional Library building, which was rescinded by the act of Congress of October 2, 1888, a report as to the extent the contract was executed prior to its rescission and what payments have been made, etc.; which, with the accompanying report, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in conformity with the act of Congress of March 2, 1895, the report of the board of appraisers appointed by the President to appraise the improvements of intruders in the Cherokee Nation, together with accompanying papers and letters upon the subject; which, with the accompanying letters and papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print 6,000 extra copies of Senate Document No. 226, first session Fiftieth Congress, relating to the Venezuelan boundary line, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 19) for filling a vacancy on the Board of Regents, Smithsonian Institution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition of sundry citizens of North Platte, Nebr., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mason City, Nebr., soldiers in the late war, praying for the enactment of legislation giving the same weight and credibility to the evidence of

noncommissioned officers and private soldiers before the Pension Bureau as is given to the evidence of commissioned officers; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HILL presented a petition of members of General John Sedgwick Garrison, No. 37, Regular Army and Navy Union of the United States of America, of West Point, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend chapter 67, volume 23, of the Statutes at Large of the United States, relating to enlisted men in the service of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry ministers of the State of New York, of sundry citizens of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and of sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying that protection and security be granted to American citizens in Turkey, and that redress be obtained for injuries committed upon them; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CHANDLER. I present, by request, resolutions passed at a public meeting held in Kansas City, Mo., November 30, 1895, signed by D. S. Harriman, chairman. They are resolutions of sympathy with the Cuban revolution, and they conclude by saying, "That we believe, as Spain set the precedent during our civil war by recognizing the Southern Confederacy, we are amply justified in extending to Cuba the same aid and assistance in her struggle for liberty that France did our ancestors of the original thirteen colonies during their struggle for freedom from despotic England, and that all people seeking the blessings of a free country and self-government should receive the fullest encouragement and aid from the United States." I move the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I present a petition signed by 111 members of the University of Wisconsin and a vast number of representatives of different posts of the Grand Army of the Republic all over the country, praying for the passage of the bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH], to prevent an improper use of the American flag. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I also present a petition signed by the mayor and city council of Worcester, Mass., praying that Congress will authorize the use of a suitable vessel of the United States Navy to forward supplies to suffering Armenians. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I also present the petition of Rev. Albert Eugene George, rector of St. Matthew's Church, Boston, Mass., and others, praying that Congress will cooperate with Great Britain and other powers for the immediate relief of suffering Armenians in Turkey. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I also present a petition of sundry citizens of Malden, Mass., praying that the Government of the United States make every possible effort to relieve the suffering of Armenians in Turkey.

If I may have consent, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations whether that committee have considered a resolution in regard to supporting the President in any action he may take to relieve the Armenians. This is a matter that seems to excite the interest of the Christian churches and of citizens at large very much indeed all over the part of the country with which I am most familiar; and if I can do so I should like to be able to assure the correspondents who write to me, as they do to other Senators, that the Committee on Foreign Relations are likely to take immediate action on the matter.

Mr. SHERMAN. A great many petitions have been sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations with respect to the Armenians. I am sure I speak the sentiment of every member of that committee when I say that the committee have an earnest desire to relieve the Armenians if possible. As yet we have taken no steps in the matter. There is no doubt that due attention will be given to the subject at an early day. It is difficult to tell what is the precise point in the mind of the petitioners or the particular remedy that they seek. Some assistance ought to be given, if possible, by the American authorities in Turkey.

Mr. HOAR. If I may be permitted, I will state that it seems to me at least that the passage of a resolution assuring the President that the Senate is interested in the matter and that it is its purpose to support him in any measure that he may take, as far as it can be done, would be a very great moral support to these people.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no doubt that is true, but it must be borne in mind that the Senate did not choose to form its committees until within a few days.

Mr. HOAR. I do not say this by way of complaint, but only for information.

Mr. SHERMAN. There is no doubt that attention will be given to the subject-matter as soon as possible.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALDRICH. I present resolutions adopted at a large and important public meeting in Providence, R. I., praying Congress to recognize the belligerent rights of the Cuban revolutionists. I move that the petition be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of citizens of Claysville, Pa., favoring the intervention of civilized nations to prevent outrages upon Christians in Armenia; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of J. G. Allen and 25 other citizens of Jefferson County, Pa., and the petition of H. C. Fuller and 181 other citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Board of Trade of Port Townsend, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made to be used in constructing coast defenses, representing that the cities of the Pacific Coast, especially those on Puget Sound, are in an utterly defenseless condition, and that the increasing population and growing commercial interests of the region require that larger appropriations be made by Congress for this purpose. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE. I also present a petition on the same subject from the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Seattle, representing the defenseless condition of the seacoast in the State of Washington, embracing some 1,900 miles, and incidentally the unhappy condition of the other coast States of the American Union in this respect.

I move that the petition be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. I present the petition of D. A. Hastings and 153 other citizens of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying for the passage by Congress of an act designed to secure a better grade of immigrants, such as the bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative WILLIAM A. STONE of Pennsylvania. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHEES. I present a petition of the Indiana Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, touching the question of arbitration between nations. I ask that it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

To his excellency Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, to the Hon. Richard Olney, Secretary of State, and to the Senate and House of Representatives:

The delegated representatives of Indiana Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, embracing a membership of nearly 20,000 persons, respectfully represent that—

The Society of Friends has always been distinguished for its earnest advocacy of "peace on earth and good will to men" and for its testimony against all war. For this advocacy and this testimony many of our members in the past have suffered the loss of their property, others imprisonment and personal violence, and some have sacrificed their lives.

We have always urged upon individuals and nations the application of the benign principle of arbitration in all their disagreements, which, in the language of the joint resolution passed by Congress in Fourthmonth, 1890, "can not be adjusted by diplomatic agency."

Only a few years ago a delegation of Englishmen, representing 234 members of Parliament, proposed to the Congress of the United States that these two leading English-speaking nations should enter into an agreement to submit to arbitration all questions of difference that might arise between them; and we are surprised and grieved at the refusal of Great Britain to submit its dispute with Venezuela to arbitration, and that the reply of our Government and the President's message to Congress upon this subject should have aroused in both countries such an outburst of the war spirit.

We are, however, profoundly thankful that very soon the spirit of peace began to assert itself, first by the religious organizations and benevolent associations, then by commercial organizations, and now by the people, until the prevailing sentiment seems to be in opposition to war.

We respectfully but earnestly beseech our Government to cooperate with this sober and second thought of the people, and strive to avoid all measures calculated to provoke so unparalleled a calamity as a war with Great Britain.

And we would again urge upon our Government that the existing condition presents one of the strongest reasons for the adoption of an international agreement to refer all questions of controversy between these two nations to a court of arbitration.

By direction and on behalf of the Representative Meeting of Indiana Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends.

DANIEL LAWRENCE, *Clerk.*

RICHMOND, IND., *Firstmonth 2, 1896.*

Mr. VOORHEES. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CALL presented a memorial of the legislature of Florida, relating to the adjustment of the Perrine grant; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution relating to the adjustment of the Perrine grant.

Whereas a township of the public domain lying contiguous to Bay Biscayne, in southern Florida, in townships 55 and 56 of range 40, was set apart for the purpose of the introduction and cultivation of tropical products by act of

Congress approved July 7, 1838, and conditionally granted to one Henry Perrine and his associates; and

Whereas said Henry Perrine was killed by the Indians while living at Indian Key, and before he or his associates complied with the conditions of said grant; and

Whereas an act of Congress approved February 18, 1841, renewed the rights of said Henry Perrine to Mrs. Anna Perrine, the widow of the said Henry Perrine, and Sarah Ann Perrine, Hester M. S. Perrine, and Henry E. Perrine, his surviving children, and extended the time for a compliance with the conditions of the grant to a period of eight years after the cessation of the then existing Indian war; and

Whereas the said Mrs. Ann F. Perrine, Henry Perrine, Sarah Ann Perrine, Hester M. S. Perrine, and Henry E. Perrine have failed to comply with said conditions as expressed in said acts; and

Whereas said lands are at present occupied by a large and increasing number of industrious agricultural people, who desire to secure their said possessions as homesteads: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the legislature of the State of Florida asks our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to use every effort to restore said lands to the public domain and open the same to settlement under the homestead laws; and if the said Mrs. Ann F. Perrine, Henry Perrine, Sarah Ann Perrine, Hester M. S. Perrine, and Henry E. Perrine have any rights under said acts that the same be adjusted; and

Be it further resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Approved June 3, 1893.

STATE OF FLORIDA, *Office Secretary of State, ss:*

I, John L. Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 6, relating to the adjustment of the Perrine grant, as appears on page 403 of the session laws of Florida, 1893, and as filed and of record in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida, at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 5th day of November, A. D. 1895.

JNO. L. CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CALL. I present the petition of Walter H. Browne and other settlers within the limits of what is known as the Perrine grant, in Dade County, Fla., together with sundry affidavits, praying for the restoration of the so-called Perrine grant in Florida to the public domain. I move that the petition and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CALL. I also present sundry papers relating to the bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Hawkins, heretofore introduced by me. I move that the papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions to accompany that bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GORDON presented petitions of the Cotton Exchange, the Board of Trade, and city council of Savannah, Ga., praying for the improvement of the coast defenses of that city; which were referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Savannah, Ga., and a petition of the Cotton Exchange of Savannah, Ga., praying for the enactment of such legislation as will insure the maintenance of the present depths of the harbor at that city and the immediate construction of the extension of the oyster bed training wall at Tybee Roads; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Brunswick, Ga., and a petition of the Board of Trade of Brunswick, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect all our seacoast cities; which were referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the Cotton Exchange of Savannah, Ga., praying for the extension of the wharves and facilities of the South Atlantic quarantine station at Sapelo, near Savannah, Ga.; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

He also presented a petition of the Cotton Exchange of Savannah, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a sufficient breakwater at Savannah, Ga., in connection with the present river and harbor improvement plan now in course of construction, so as to afford a sufficient anchorage and ample protection of vessels at that port; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM. I present two petitions, to accompany pension bills heretofore introduced by me, one a petition to accompany the bill (S. 583) to grant a pension to Eli D. Walker, and the other a petition to accompany the bill (S. 1108) granting a pension to the widow of Gen. John Newton. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON presented a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the improvement of the Skagit River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Washington, would respectfully represent: That

Whereas the Skagit is the largest river emptying into Puget Sound, and drains one of the most important sections of the State of Washington; and

Whereas said river is blocked by jams of timber carried down by floods which, besides impeding navigation, causes it in times of high water to back up and overflow the surrounding country, the richest and most fertile section in the State of Washington, causing widespread desolation and ruin; and

Whereas beside said jams there are also several sand bars near the mouth of said river which are a serious hindrance to commerce and navigation, and also in time of flood tend to cause the waters to back up and overflow the adjacent land; and

Whereas the farmers of that extensive region known as the Skagit Valley have been to great expense in building dikes and levees, and have found that they can not in that manner protect their lands from overflow until said jams and bars are removed; and

Whereas the inundation of the Skagit Valley in the year 1894, which resulted in a loss of at least half a million dollars to the inhabitants thereof, was in great measure caused by said jams and sand bars; and

Whereas said jams are each year increasing in size, thereby threatening impending ruin to a large tract of country and pointing out the necessity of speedy action to avert the same; and

Whereas the removal of said jams and bars would be of great benefit to the public at large: Therefore,

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Washington, do most earnestly petition your honorable bodies to include in the next river and harbor bill an appropriation for the purpose of removing said jams and making the necessary surveys, plans, and estimates of the cost of removing said sand bars and deepening the channel where necessary.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

Passed the house January 28, 1895.

ELLIS MORRISON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed by the senate, February 6, 1895.

F. H. LUCE,
President of the Senate.

(Indorsed:) House memorial No. 6. To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Washington:*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, James H. Price, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the House memorial No. 6 with the original now on file and of record in this office, and find the same to be a true and perfect copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington.

Done at Olympia this 15th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1895.

J. H. PRICE, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. WILSON. I present a petition of sundry citizens of Skagit County, in the State of Washington, relative to the same subject. As the matter is very important, I ask that the petition be also printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

The undersigned citizens of Skagit County, State of Washington, believe that a fair consideration of the conditions surrounding the Skagit River and tributary country will induce such liberal action on the part of Congress as will meet the requirements of our present environments and prevent any disaster in the future such as we have suffered in the past.

Attached to this memorial are statistics compiled with considerable care, and which are known to be generally correct. We commend them to your careful consideration as supporting the statements in this memorial.

In order that your honorable bodies may better understand the importance of this matter, we invite your attention to the present and constantly increasing commerce, foreign and domestic, of Puget Sound; and we also invite your examination of the geography of this immediate section and the character and quantity of our products.

The surveys already made, and the map attached hereto, sustain the statement that there are tributary to Skagit River about 40 townships, or over 1,400 square miles of land. Of this large area about one-fourth is strictly agricultural, about the same quantity is coal and mineral, and the remainder is timber land. A large proportion of this country is now, and all of it when developed must be, largely dependent for its commerce on this important river. It is navigable for light-draft steamers from its mouth to Sauk City, a distance of about 70 miles, and at some seasons to Marblemount, 15 miles above Sauk City.

An examination of the map of Washington will show the rise, course, length, and disappearance of the Skagit in the broader and deeper waters of Puget Sound. The river is spanned by three large public bridges, each more than 700 feet in length, and with revolving draws more than 200 feet, for the passage of steamers engaged in commerce in the river.

A system of dikes extends on both sides of the river from its mouth to and above the village of Avon, about 15 miles; and, connecting with the main system, are other dikes running across the level country toward La Conner and other points to the north and south of the river.

This diking system has been rendered necessary by the filling in of the bed and mouths of the river from causes which will be explained, and ought to be remedied.

The system already constructed and maintained embraces 158 miles of dikes, and has cost in money and labor expended in construction the large sum of $385,000. All of this has been expended by owners of land in the Skagit Valley, including the residents of towns liable to inundation.

The maintenance of the dikes is now provided for in the laws of our State, but the tax levied under these laws is confined to the lands immediately affected, and aggregates about $12,000 annually. We are confronted by the fact that each year these dikes must be wider and higher, because the bed of the river is constantly filling in, and no matter how well our work may be done there is an absolute certainty that every large freshet in the river will, at weak points, break the dikes and overflow and for miles inundate the surrounding country.

Before the mouth of the river began to be obstructed the accumulating waters of the greatest freshets did not overflow the banks. A channel varying in depth from 12 to 20 feet was a sufficient outlet for all the water that passed in swift torrents from the mountains and highlands of the north and east. Resolute and industrious settlers reduced to cultivation the fertile lands of the Skagit Valley, and made subservient to man the thousands of acres that were a few years since inhabited by the beaver and other animals whose pelts excited the cupidity of the hunter or the Indian. We do not believe that the famous lands of the Nile or any other in the world are more fertile and productive. For years these lands, without fertilizers, have yielded an average of 100 bushels of oats to the acre, and the hay crop on the higher lands will average 4 tons. Fruits and vegetables grow in profusion, and their flavor and richness are unsurpassed. But all of this has involved a large expenditure of money and unremitting toil and patience on the part of our people.

Unless the Congress of the United States shall make an appropriation sufficient to clear out the mouth of the Skagit River, a very large proportion of this country must be abandoned.

The main channel or mouth of the river is now closed from an accumulation of logs, driftwood, and sediment. Where a few years ago steamers could safely navigate in 15 feet of water persons can now walk from one bank of the river to the other on logs or other obstructions. The only entrance from the Sound into the Skagit is by way of a small slough, narrow and unsafe, and through which steamers at high tide can find only about 6 feet of water. The north fork of the river, through which navigation was formerly maintained, is now practically closed, and no boat can traverse its waters. The south fork is only navigable from Fir, where it flows through and becomes a part of Steamboat Slough heretofore mentioned.

Various reasons may be assigned for the obstruction and closing of the two mouths of the river, but until boom companies were permitted to place obstructions in the river, and to locate their booms and appliances near the mouths, there was no trouble about overflows.

Thirty million feet of lumber in logs is a fair estimate of the quantity that for each year and for many years has been rafted or floated down the Skagit. Most of it has been caught in the pockets of the booms and appliances, and in that way an immense number of large trees, stumps, and other material drifted by the current have found lodgment along the banks, in the channel, and in the mouths of the river.

The tides ebb and flow from the Sound and ocean, and thus the obstructions have become permanent, and each year have increased in area, until the river no longer discharges its waters in quantity through its natural and original channels.

It is manifest, therefore, that when the stream is swollen and finds no outlet sufficient for the increased volume, that the waters are backed and rise rapidly and with increasing force against the dikes bordering on and raising higher the banks of the Skagit. When such condition arises it becomes only a question of a short time how long the dikes can withstand the enormous pressure, how soon the water will overflow all the surrounding country and destroy all that the labor and patience and capital of our people have accomplished.

We call your attention to the fact that since November, 1892, the floods in the Skagit have four times swept over the banks, broken the dikes, and inundated the surrounding country. The destruction of property by the overflow in November, 1892, and January, 1895, was not very great, but the overflow in May, 1894, and June of that year entailed a direct loss on the people of the Skagit Valley, as shown by estimates attached hereto, approximating one-half million of dollars.

The town of Mount Vernon was entirely flooded, small boats and rafts navigated the streets, and the people were driven from their homes for safety to the hills. The damage to public and private property was great, and the suffering from exposure and sickness was distressing. All of these overflows have been caused by the ponding of the water in the river, resulting from the obstruction and closing the channels of the North and South Forks, above mentioned. There is comparatively little danger of loss from the overflow in the winter, but in May and June, when the crops are most promising, the genial weather and hot suns melt the snow in the mountains and the creeks and small rivers and mountain streams empty their waters into the Skagit, which sweeps down with terrible fury, completing its destructive mission.

It is a well-known fact in this session, and the records of the War Department show, that some years ago, and when Washington was a Territory, a large and formidable jam of logs, trees, and other débris had collected about 10 miles from the mouth of the river, and near where Mount Vernon now stands, entirely obstructing navigation. At a great expenditure of money and labor the people resident in the Skagit Valley removed the jam, so that steamers passed up and down the river in safety. Under the license of Territorial law, and with the knowledge of the officers of this great Government, obstructions known as log booms have been placed in the river and near the mouths, since which time the difficulties and dangers that now surround us have arisen and been allowed to continue.

Under the law the General Government has ample jurisdiction in all matters affecting navigable waters, and we can only account for its failure to exercise that jurisdiction in this instance from the neglect to bring the matter to your attention and to press it with the zeal that its importance demands.

The earnest efforts of our people to protect ourselves and the temporary relief that has been afforded by the construction and maintenance of our diking system may to some extent account for the neglect that has heretofore surrounded this destructive nuisance, but the situation has now assumed such grave consequences that it can not longer be overlooked or permitted to continue.

Until the obstructions in the river and at its mouth are removed the further construction and maintenance of our diking system can not protect us; until the channel of the river shall be restored as it was before obstructions were permitted to be made and to stand, the navigation of the Skagit must at all times be uncertain and dangerous, and in a very few years must cease altogether.

We do not believe that an intelligent examination into this matter will show that its importance has been overestimated by us; nor is this the first time that we have endeavored to bring it to your attention. Memorials from our people have already been forwarded to Congress, praying some action on behalf of this section, and at the last session of our legislature a joint memorial of that body was unanimously passed for the same object.

Thoroughly impressed with the justice of this appeal, we respectfully submit it to your good judgment, and earnestly hope for an early and favorable consideration by your honorable bodies, and by such other authorities as shall have this matter in immediate charge.

Indorsement of memorial by State officials:

M. McGraw, Governor; J. H. Price, Secretary of State; R. O. Dunbar, Judge of Supreme Court; T. J. Anders, Judge of Supreme Court; Elmon Scott, Judge of Supreme Court; O. C. White, State Printer; O. A. Bowen, State Treasurer; James C. Hughes, Assistant Attorney-General; A. M. Anderson, Deputy Commissioner Statistics; John P. Hoyt, Chief Justice Supreme Court; M. J. Gordon, Judge Supreme Court; C. S. Reinhart, Clerk Supreme Court; J. E. Frost, State Auditor; Geo. D. Evans, Deputy Auditor; C. W. Bean, Superintendent Public Instruction; A. A. Lindsley, Deputy State Treasurer; W. T. Forrest, Commissioner Public Lands; M. E. Reed, Secretary Board State Land Commissioners; J. M. Hicks, Deputy Insurance Commissioner; Brad. W. Davis, Chief Clerk for Secretary of State; S. R. Nettleton, Representative, Fortieth Representative District, King County; S. J. Chadwick, State Land Commissioner; E. C. Macdonnel, Governor's Private Secretary.

Mr. WHITE presented a petition of sundry citizens of the counties of Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Riverside, San Diego, Orange, Ventura, and Santa Barbara, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to promote and foster the beet-sugar industry; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHILTON presented the petition of Nathan Mitchell, of San Antonio, Tex., a veteran of the Mexican war, praying that he be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DUBOIS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 790) to aid the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, and South Dakota to support schools of mines, reported it with amendments.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 29) to print, with certain additions, the last map of the United States published by the Interior Department, to submit an adverse report thereon, and to move its indefinite postponement.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the joint resolution may go upon the Calendar. It is a measure of considerable importance.

Mr. HALE. And let the report which accompanies the joint resolution be printed for the information of Senators.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be placed upon the Calendar, with the adverse report of the committee. The report will be printed under the rule.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 697) for the reconstruction of the United States custom-house and post-office building at St. Albans, Vt., destroyed by fire May 19, 1895, reported it without amendment.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1344) providing for the selection of the lands within Fort Pembina Military Reservation, N. Dak., by the State of North Dakota, reported it without amendment.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am directed by the Committee on Finance to report back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue, and to recommend that as amended the bill do pass.

I desire to give notice that to-morrow, immediately after the morning business is concluded, I shall ask the Senate to take the bill up for consideration, and I hope that it may be disposed of at the earliest possible day.

Mr. MORRILL. I merely desire to state that the bill just reported by the Senator from Arkansas was approved by a majority of the Committee on Finance, but not by the Republican members.

Mr. ALLEN. Let the bill be read at length as proposed to be amended.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read as requested.

The SECRETARY. The Committee on Finance report to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That from and after the passage of this act the mints of the United States shall be open to the coinage of silver, and there shall be coined dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy, of standard silver, nine-tenths fine, as provided by the act of January 18, 1837, and upon the same terms and subject to the limitations and provisions of law regulating the coinage and legal-tender quality of gold; and whenever the said coins herein provided for shall be received into the Treasury, certificates may be issued therefor in the manner now provided by law.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin into standard silver dollars, as soon as practicable, according to the provisions of section 1 of this act, from the silver bullion purchased under authority of the act of July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," that portion of said silver bullion which represents the seigniorage or profit to the Government, to wit, the difference between the cost of the silver purchased under said act and its coinage value, and said silver dollars so coined shall be used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government; and for the purpose of making the said seigniorage immediately available for use as money, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against it, as if it was already coined and in the Treasury.

SEC. 3. That no national-bank note shall be hereafter issued of a denomination less than $10, and all notes of such banks now outstanding of denominations less than that sum shall be, as rapidly as practicable, taken up, redeemed, and canceled, and notes of $10 and larger denominations shall be issued in their stead under the direction of the Comptroller of the Currency.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the United States notes, commonly called "greenbacks," and also the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins, or both, not at the option of the holder, but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department, and said notes, commonly called "greenbacks," when so redeemed, shall be reissued as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT MANKATO, MINN.

Mr. QUAY. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 60) concerning the completion of the United States court-house and post-office building at Mankato, Minn., to report it without amendment. I call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] to this report.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be now considered.

The joint resolution was read, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

SOLDIERS' HOME REPORTS.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution, submitted by Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin on the 3d instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, in addition to the number authorized by resolution adopted December 30, 1895, 600 copies of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and 600 copies of the report of the Assistant Inspector-General of State Homes for the use of Congress, 200 copies of each report to be for the use of the Senate and 400 copies of each report for the use of the House of Representatives.

REPRINT OF DOCUMENT ON THE VENEZUELAN BOUNDARY.

Mr. HALE. I ask unanimous consent to call up the resolution which has come from the other House, that I may move to concur in the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution of the Senate. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 4, after the word "boundary," insert "and the President's message of December 17, 1895, and the documents accompanying the same."

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the resolution be read as it will stand when the House amendment is agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution as amended by the House of Representatives.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That 6,000 extra copies of Senate Document No. 226, first session Fiftieth Congress, relating to the Venezuela boundary, and the President's message of December 17, 1895, and the documents accompanying the same, be printed in paper covers, of which number 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment.

The amendment was concurred in.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask that the joint resolution just received from the House of Representatives in reference to vacancies on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution be now taken up for action.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. Res. 19) for filling vacancies on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; which was read twice by its title.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROOF IN TIMBER-CULTURE ENTRIES.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 103) relating to final proof in timber-culture entries, to report it with an amendment.

Mr. KYLE. A similar bill was passed by the Senate in the last Congress. It is but seven lines long and is a very important measure indeed. It should be acted upon at once, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment of the Committee on Public Lands was, at the end of line 8, to insert "United States court commissioner or a"; so as to make the bill read:

That hereafter timber-culture claimants shall not be required, in making final proof, to appear at the land office to which proof is to be presented, or before an officer designated by the act of May 26, 1890, within the county in which the land is situated; but such claimant may have his or her personal evidence taken by a United States court commissioner or a clerk of any court of record, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 4th instant approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 32) authorizing and directing the acceptance of the ram *Katahdin*, thereby making said ram a part of the United States Navy.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1347) for the construction of a steam revenue cutter for service in the Gulf of Mexico and tributary waters; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1348) for the relief of claimants to public lands under the homestead laws; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1349) for the relief of applicants to purchase public lands under the timber and stone act; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1350) to make Commodore William P. McCann, of the Navy, a rear-admiral on the retired list; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. KYLE. At the request of various domestic science associations in the United States I introduce a bill for reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The bill (S. 1351) to create a bureau to investigate the adulteration of food products, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GEAR (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1352) for the relief of Stewart & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 1353) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the building of a railroad bridge at Little Rock, Ark.," approved March 2, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1354) for the relief of J. F. Bailey & Co. and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1355) for the relief of Andrew J. Whitaker, late special disbursing agent of the Navy Department; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1356) to increase the pension of Elizabeth L. Larrabee, widow of Col. C. H. Larrabee, late of the Twenty-fourth Regiment of Wisconsin Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1357) for the removal of charge of desertion against Lott Colbert; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1358) granting a pension to Martin Rickor; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 1359) for the construction of two steam revenue cutters for service on the Pacific Coast; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1360) granting a pension to Michael Nagle; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1361) to correct the military record of Henry F. Miller; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1362) granting an increase of pension to Patrick O'Meally; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1363) for the recognition of the military service of the officers and enlisted men of certain Pennsylvania military organizations; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1364) providing for town sites in the Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. PLATT. I desire to say that I introduce the bill by request; that while there is very great need for some legislation, I do not mean by introducing this bill to commit myself to its provisions. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1365) for the relief of the National New Haven Bank of the State of Connecticut; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1366) for the relief of Louis H. Bristol, administrator; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1367) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob R. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1368) prescribing the qualifications of soldiers and marines of the United States, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1369) directing the foreclosure of the Government lien on the Pacific railroads, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (S. 1370) for the relief of William Hunter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1371) authorizing the purchase by the United States and the making free of the toll roads passing over the Yosemite National Park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 1372) granting an increase of pension to James K. Brewer; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1373) to regulate the business of storage in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1374) to authorize the reassessment of water-main taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1375) to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act to punish the carrying or selling of deadly or dangerous weapons within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 13, 1892; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1376) to authorize reassessments for local improvements and general taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1377) for the relief of William M. Boyd; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1378) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MURPHY introduced a bill (S. 1379) for the relief of Hyland C. Kirk and others, assignees of Addison C. Fletcher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1380) for the relief of Hyland C. Kirk and others, assignees of Addison C. Fletcher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1381) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Patrick Larkin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HILL introduced a bill (S. 1382) for the relief of Lieut. Col. John L. Broome; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1383) for the relief Daniel W. Perkins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1384) for the relief of John Baker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1385) for the relief of James R. D. Morrison; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1386) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 1387) authorizing an increase of pensions in certain cases; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. TURPIE. The object of the bill is to increase the rate of pension now allowed for total deafness from $30 a month to $50 a month. The beneficiaries of the proposed enactment are not very numerous. I do not believe that the disability of total deafness has ever received the rate which it should receive as such. The condition of a person made totally deaf in both ears is one of the most unfortunate incapacities. The condition of one born deaf is much better, much to be preferred. In the case of a person born deaf the senses are reenforced by the touch, by the eye; the whole body acts as an ear to supply the defect; but in the case of a soldier who labors under such a disability incurred at a mature period of life it is too late for him to receive these betterments conferred by the kindly remedial resources of nature.

The present rate for total disability for deafness in both ears is below that of the rate for the amputation of a limb, yet we see persons with the loss of a limb pursuing ordinary vocations in every department of life. So nice are now the artificial appliances that frequently the loss of a limb is not missed even by intimate acquaintances until it is expressly stated. But the person who has become deaf, not having been born so, no matter what may be his skill, will find himself greatly embarrassed in seeking employment. Of course he can learn the sign language, but the sign language is not a vernacular. In the unspoken language very few become expert. Or he may use the tablet and pencil instead, but most employers have no patience with such a method of communication. It is extremely difficult for a person totally deaf to find employment of any sort, and when he does find it he must work for small wages on account of his disability.

There is an imaginary misery, too, connected with the condition which is hardly less than the actual or real disadvantages to which I have called the attention of the Senate. In the case of a person who is made deaf by service in the Army or Navy, although the external auditory nerves are destroyed, the internal sensations remain, and the brain is haunted by apparitions of sound, with ghosts of sound, so that the fancy becomes the receptacle for all the noises which the air carries. It is a very terrible condition, and one disturbing and embarrassing the person laboring under it to a great extent in whatever vocation he is so fortunate as to find employment.

I hope the Committee on Pensions, to whom I now move that the bill be referred, will give to it very early and favorable consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred, with the accompanying paper, to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1388) granting a pension to Joseph Vanderpool; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a letter from the Pension Office and one from the Auditor for the War Department to accompany the bill. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1389) granting a pension to Charlotte Poe, widow of Isaiah Poe, deceased; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of the beneficiary, with the marriage certificate, and a letter addressed to me, and the affidavit of John E. Liles. I move that the bill be referred, with the accompanying papers, to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1390) granting to the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak., the right to improve, beautify, lease, and use for sanitarium and public purposes American Island, heretofore granted to said city as a public park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ROACH (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1391) for the relief of Goff A. Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1392) to reimburse the State of Colorado for moneys expended in the suppression of Ute Indian depredations during the year 1887; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1393) to abolish the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the office of Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and to create in lieu thereof a board of Indian commissioners; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 1394) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. E. S. Kelly; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1395) granting a pension to A. M. Bliss; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1396) for the relief of Robert McCardell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1397) for the relief of Patrick J. Sullivan, John B. Dillon, Jeremiah McCarthy, and Bartholomew Shea, of Newport, R. I.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1398) for the relief of Maj. Samuel T. Cushing; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1399) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate condemned cannon and condemned cannon balls to certain posts of the Grand Army of the

Republic; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1400) to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to Junction City, Kans., a certain tract of land for park purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1402) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Littleton, in the State of New Hampshire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 1403) granting honorably discharged soldiers of the late civil war privileges under the land laws of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 41) to revive the grade of Lieutenant-General in the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 42) providing for the sale and disposition of United States bonds; which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

[Joint resolution (S. R. 42) providing for the sale and disposition of United States bonds.]

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That hereafter, in any sale or disposition of United States bonds, the same shall be first offered to the public for a period of not less than twenty days, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall be sold to the highest bidder, in case such bids, or any of them, are satisfactory.

Mr. ELKINS. Inasmuch as the House of Representatives has incorporated in the bill which is now pending in the Senate the method or plan of advertising bond sales, thereby virtually declaring against such sales under private contract, and inasmuch as the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury have also recently adopted the plan of advertising and selling United States bonds to the people, it seems to me that the time is at hand when we may with propriety enact such a policy into a law and make it a part of the law of the land.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 44) making an appropriation for the rebuilding of the old ship *Constitution;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. VILAS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 45) to provide for the disposition of income-tax returns, statements, and records relative thereto; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

Mr. PEFFER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue; which was ordered to be printed.

RESTORATION OF PROTECTIVE DUTIES.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I offer an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency. The amendment proposes to restore protective duties on raw materials of the South and agricultural products in accordance with the provisions of the act of 1890. I ask that the amendment be printed and that it lie on the table. To-morrow I shall ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to submit some remarks in relation to the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

THE CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY BUILDING.

Mr. VOORHEES. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk. Let it be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas, in order to complete the building for the Library of Congress within the time fixed for that event, it is now necessary that certain work yet to be done should be placed under contract without delay: Therefore

Be it resolved, That Gen. Thomas Lincoln Casey, the officer in charge of the erection of said building be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to contract for said work to be paid for from time to time as Congress shall appropriate the required amount of money: *Provided*, That the entire expenditure on said building shall not exceed the limit of cost already fixed by law for the same.

Mr. VOORHEES. Under the circumstances I will ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. I presume it needs no explanation. It explains itself. In order to complete this great work in view by the time which it is expected, it is necessary now that certain contracts be made for work in advance of the time when it is possible for appropriations to be made. To wait for the appropriations would delay the completion of the Library building for six months perhaps—I do not know how long, but it would delay it unnecessarily—and inasmuch as this work is in the hands of so safe and capable an officer, I venture to ask Congress to extend to him the authority to make contracts now and to pay for the work when the appropriations are made.

Mr. HARRIS. I should be glad to have the Senator from Indiana state about what time it is thought the building will be completed and ready for occupation.

Mr. VOORHEES. The building can be completed twelve months from this date if this authority is given. I make this statement upon the highest possible authority.

Mr. CULLOM. I inquire whether the time which was expected to be consumed in the construction of the building will not expire next spring—the six years or seven years?

Mr. VOORHEES. One may state the difference between January and March if he desires. One is winter and the other is spring. With this authority given to General Casey to make contracts now, he can have the building ready for occupancy a year from the present time. Otherwise there is no certainty as to when it will be completed.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me just one word?

Mr. VOORHEES. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. The building will be completed within the time and within the appropriation.

Mr. VOORHEES. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Maine. Of course it will be completed within the time, with quite a margin, if we give Colonel Casey authority to go on now without waiting for the delayed appropriation. It will be completed quite largely within the limits fixed by law—more so than I desired.

Mr. HALE. Is the resolution reported from the Senator's committee?

Mr. VOORHEES. It is submitted by me this morning, and not reported by the committee.

Mr. HALE. Is it not a fact that General Casey (and it is an unprecedented case) expects to complete the great building, all its ornamentation and everything, and to have a surplus of from $60,000 to $80,000?

Mr. VOORHEES. About $80,000.

Mr. HALE. A thing never known before in any building built at public expense.

Mr. HOAR. Oh, yes; it happened in regard to one of the Smithsonian buildings under Mr. Langley. It has happened in one or two cases.

Mr. HALE. I did not know of any other case.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator if there is not much work yet to be done, and is there not danger that the estimates of the engineer will be exceeded?

Mr. VOORHEES. None whatever. There is certain tiling work on the second floor yet to be done, and some other items that I could go into if I had General Casey's memorandum, which he furnished me.

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest to the Senator from Indiana that he will not accomplish his purpose by the resolution now at the desk. A concurrent resolution will not be sufficient authority for the engineer in charge to make the contracts. A joint resolution to be signed by the President is necessary.

Mr. VOORHEES. I will make it a joint resolution. I was hasty; in fact, I prepared the resolution here, though I will not hesitate to state that I prepared it after full conference with General Casey. As a matter of course, I take no such step without him, and upon the specific points given to me. But the resolution can be put in proper form, I will say to the Senator from Iowa. I will have it done.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be changed to a joint resolution.

Mr. VOORHEES. Yes.

The resolution was changed to a joint resolution (S. R. 40) providing for the completion of the Congressional Library building.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be regarded as having been read twice. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. PEFFER. I move to amend the joint resolution by adding as an additional proviso:

Provided further, That the labor required in said work shall be employed and paid for by the day at the usual wages for such work.

Mr. VOORHEES. While I might support an amendment of that sort, I hope it will not be considered in connection with this matter and that the Senate will vote it down. It is not needed now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the joint resolution:

Provided further, That the labor required in said work shall be employed and paid for by the day at the usual wages for such work.

Mr. VOORHEES. The work is being done that way anyhow. I hope the amendment will not be adopted. It will only embarrass the subject I have in view.

Mr. PEFFER. I do not in the least desire to embarrass the passage of the joint resolution, but, as is usual in all such cases where work is contracted for by one person or a firm of persons, the men who perform the labor are employed in about the same way. It leaves the average workman at a disadvantage, and the constant tendency is to depress the wages. In these hard times I think that the men who do the work ought to have the same wages, especially when the Government of the United States is one of the parties.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PORTRAIT OF ALLEN G. THURMAN.

Mr. VOORHEES. I submit a resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Library.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase the portrait of the late Allen G. Thurman painted by J. H. Witt, and now hanging in the Judiciary Committee room of the Senate, and to pay to William L. Woods, its present owner, the sum of $250 for the same, said payment to be made out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate and upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to submit a suggestion before the reference. After the word "portrait" I suggest to add "with a suitable frame." I understand that the estimate involves the probable framing of the picture.

Mr. VOORHEES. I wanted to see the Senator from Massachusetts this morning on the subject. I think the portrait is exceedingly cheap at $300 with a frame, but to avoid the frame question I put it at $250, and think it very small.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to be niggardly in dealing with artists——

Mr. VOORHEES. I am sure the Senator does not.

Mr. HOAR. But I was told by the young gentleman who brought the picture into the Judiciary Committee room that the owner desired to sell it for $200; so that $250 would provide also for a valuable frame. I presume that a suitable frame could be procured for $25. I do not think the price should be increased.

Mr. VOORHEES. If the Senator from Massachusetts stands upon it, I concede it. I want to say, however, that I knew a case where persons came here so destitute with a couple of valuable pictures that they offered them for $1,000 to the Corcoran Art Gallery, and I afterwards took great pleasure in paying those women $6,000 for the pictures, because they were worth it. I did not take advantage of their necessities. I do not know whether this is a case of that kind or not. However, I am inclined to think it is. Does the Senator from Massachusetts desire the amendment? If so, I shall put it in.

Mr. HOAR. No; I will not insist on it.

Mr. VOORHEES. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Library.

MESSENGER FOR COMMITTEE ON COAST DEFENSES.

Mr. SQUIRE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to appoint a messenger for the Committee on Coast Defenses, who shall be paid at the rate of $1,440 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, until otherwise provided for.

REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT IN ALABAMA.

Mr. ALLEN. I offer a resolution, which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That a select committee of five Senators shall be appointed to make inquiry whether there is, and for the last two years and a half has been, a republican form of government in the State of Alabama; and to inquire into the manner of the election of United States Senators and Members of Congress from said State, and whether there was any fraud, force, intimidation, or other unfairness in the elections in said State during that period, and to inquire into the election of State senators and members of the legislature, in so far as their election may have affected the election of a United States Senator, and into all other matters and things in any manner pertaining to or affecting the political autonomy of said State, and the status of its membership in the United States Senate and the Congress of the United States, and the fairness of the elections by which the selection of the United States Senators and Members of Congress was brought about. Said committee may sit as a full committee or by subcommittees, as it may elect, and in vacation or during the sessions of Congress, and at such times and places in said State or elsewhere as it may see proper, and said committee, or any subcommittee, shall have power to send for persons and papers, employ a stenographer, swear and examine witnesses, take and report testimony and evidence; and said committee shall make due report by bill or otherwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the law the resolution should first go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. I think it should first go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and be referred by them to the Committee on Contingent Expenses. However, whatever the Chair rules will be satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

JUDGMENTS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. QUAY. I offer a resolution which I send to the desk, for which I ask immediate consideration. I will say that I am not responsible for the terms of the resolution. I believe it is intended to bring to the attention of the Senate the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of mail carriers.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to transmit to the Senate, in the usual form, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, not including those for which provision was made at the last session of Congress, and which require an appropriation for their payment.

CLAIMS OF B. H. HENRY AND OTHERS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate a copy of the report and accompanying documents of a special agent of the United States heretofore sent to the Fiji Islands to investigate the claims of B. H. Henry, of Oregon, and other American citizens, for compensation for certain lands alleged to have been owned by them in said islands and claimed to have been appropriated by the British Government; which report is now on file in the Department of State.

POSTAL SAVINGS NOTES.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1401) to provide for a popular loan through postal savings notes; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to make a brief statement in reference to this bill.

Mr. President, I noticed in the morning newspapers a message to the American people, communicated through the New York World, dated London, January 6, and signed N. M. Rothschild & Sons. A paragraph of this quotation is as follows:

Until this boundary question is arranged we do not believe that either the European public or capitalists will take many American bonds for investment.

What the Messrs. Rothschild mean by a settlement of the boundary question is that America will agree to Lord Salisbury's proposition that we shall allow, without objection, Great Britain to take substantially all of Venezuela which she needs, and refer to arbitration the question whether she shall have the remainder or not. In this view of the situation, it seems to me that it is time for the American people and the American Government to see whether they can not raise among themselves the money that is necessary to carry on the Government, to see whether they can not provide from their own resources the gold that is necessary for the redemption fund in the Treasury. I am satisfied that this can be easily accomplished by a suitable appeal to the people of the United States. I fear that the hundred-million-dollar gold loan which has been recently advertised will not result in many subscriptions to the small bonds by the people. They are called upon to bid and to fix a price themselves, and then wait until they know whether the Secretary of the Treasury has or has not accepted their bids.

Mr. President, we do not want a popular loan like that. We want something that shall be immediate in its operation; we want a loan that will allow not only the rich people of this country, but the poor people of the country to come to the front and to pour their gifts into the Treasury for the national needs and the public welfare.

The first section of my bill reads:

That any person may deposit at any money-order post-office the sum of $100 and receive therefor a receipt duly dated and authenticated in the following form:

"Received of A B the sum of $100, for which there is due to him or his order a postal-savings note drawing interest from this date."

There are only 25 words in that receipt. Their issue may be authorized by telegraphic order from the Postmaster-General. The postmasters in all the money-order offices of this country can begin to receive the people's offerings to-morrow. All they have to do is to sign and issue a dated receipt:

Received of A B the sum of $100, for which there is due to him or his order a postal-savings note drawing interest from this date.

That gets the money into the Treasury and puts it on interest immediately. What is to be issued in return for this receipt?

SEC. 2. That upon the presentation of a postal-savings receipt at any designated depository of the United States within the State where the receipt was issued, there shall be issued in the place thereof a postal-savings note duly authenticated in the form following, to wit:

I ask the attention of the Senate to the extreme simplicity of the postal-savings note.

For value received the United States of America promise to pay to ——— ———, or order, the sum of $100 in lawful money in one year from ———, with $3 interest thereon; and in case of delay of presentation the interest paid shall be $6.10 after the end of the second year, $9.30 after the end of the third year, $12.60 after the end of the fourth year, and $16 after the end of the fifth year; and thereafter, in addition to the sum of $116, there shall be paid $4 for each year's further delay of presentation.

Mr. President, to carry out this law after these sums of money have been deposited in the postal money-order offices there is nothing to do but for the Secretary of the Treasury to print the postal notes and send them to the designated depositories of the United States. The note during the first year is worth $100; at the end of the first year it is worth $103; at the end of the second year it is worth $106.10; that is to say, the interest is compounded; 10 cents is paid for one year's interest on $3, and so the interest is compounded during the five years—$9.30 at the end of the third year; $12.60 at the end of the fourth year, and $16 at the end of the fifth year. If the interest had not been compounded the amount would be $115—five times three—at the end of the fifth year, but 1 per cent has been added by way of compounding the interest, and at the end of five years the note is worth $116. Thereafter it is worth $4 for every year's delay of presentation, and that $4 is 3½ per cent interest upon the $116. That runs until the holder of the note shall see fit to realize upon it.

Mr. President, I can not conceive of a security more admirable than this for the people of this country who wish to invest their savings. The difficulty I have noticed in most of the postal savings bank bills is that the system is elaborate and cumbersome. There is a proposal that men shall deposit 10 cents, 20 cents, 30 cents, 50 cents, and when the amount of $5 is reached then interest accounts are kept, postal cards and bank books are issued. The Government will have to provide in such a case a very elaborate machinery to avail itself of the savings of the people for the benefit of the Treasury; whereas here there is nothing in the world necessary except for the postmaster to issue these receipts and for the Treasury to issue through the designated depositories of the United States these postal notes, which bear interest and are payable at the end of each year at any time after the first year, which bear 3 per cent interest, compounded during five years, and which after the end of five years bear 3½ per cent interest until they come in and are canceled and other notes are issued in their stead.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. What kind of money do I understand the people are to pay for the postal notes?

Mr. CHANDLER. So far as I have read the bill already, they would pay in lawful money. The Senator will hear the whole bill in a moment, and then I shall be very happy to have him ask me any other questions.

Mr. BUTLER. Very well; I will wait until the Senator finishes.

Mr. CHANDLER. I say that is a simple system. It does not require any printing, except the printing of the receipts and the printing of the postal notes. It does not require any great expense at the money-order offices and very little expense in connection with the designated depositories of the United States.

These postal notes will soon become as popular as the compound-interest notes of the United States were, as every Senator who remembers those days will recollect. They circulated as money for a time, the interest began to accumulate upon them, and they were held for investment, until at last they were redeemed.

I continue to read the bill:

Such note may be issued with the name of the depositor inserted, or it may be issued in blank, as above described, and any holder may afterwards insert his name in the blank space.

That is to say, the system which was adopted in the case of the 7.30 bond is followed. They were issued in blank, payable in blank or on order. As long as the blank was not filled they passed from hand to hand like demand paper. Whenever the holder of the note chose to write his name in it, then it became negotiable paper and had to be indorsed before it was redeemed.

Now, I call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the next clause of the bill, which reads:

In case any deposit is made in gold coin, the note may, if the depositor so desires, be made payable in gold coin as to the dollars which may become due thereon.

This feature of the system may or may not be adopted, as Congress sees fit, but it seems to me that there is gold enough in this country to supply the needs of the Treasury if you will give every man who has $100 in gold, or who can obtain $100 in gold the privilege of putting it into the Treasury and receiving one of these notes and receiving his gold back again when the note becomes due.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether there is any legal distinction between the form of the notes for which he provides in his bill and the issuance of ordinary bonds? Is there any legal distinction in the force or effect of the two forms of obligations?

Mr. CHANDLER. It is a simplification of the Government's promise to pay; it is the postal savings note, which specifies upon its face exactly what that note is worth before the end of the first year, exactly what it is worth after the end of the next year, exactly what it is worth after the end of each year for five years, and exactly what it is worth at the end of each year thereafter.

Mr. ALLEN. Still, after all, its legal effect is the same as any other national obligation or bond?

Mr. CHANDLER. It is borrowing money.

Mr. ALLEN. Its legal effect is precisely the same as that of a Government bond?

Mr. CHANDLER. It is borrowing money on interest.

Mr. ALLEN. It is an interest-bearing obligation of the Government?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. How long, in the Senator's judgment, would it be until the banks would have those notes gathered up and out of circulation?

Mr. CHANDLER. This is a popular loan. Those notes would go out on the prairies of the Senator's State; they would take the place of the gold which is hoarded, and stay there until the end of the five years, and they would stay there a year or two longer, and then come in and be renewed, if the Government wishes to renew them.

Mr. ALLEN. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the little notes which were issued during the war to circulate as money very soon disappeared and were hoarded in the banks. Would not that be the result as to the notes under the Senator's bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. Whenever the holder of one of these $100 notes needs the money on it, he will get it, and of course he will sell it to his neighbor or the nearest bank.

Mr. ALLEN. Just one more question, and then I shall cease interrupting the Senator. Does the Senator regard the present call of the Secretary of the Treasury as in the line of a popular loan, when there are only four or five places where the bonds can be subscribed for?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not regard the notice which the Secretary of the Treasury has recently issued announcing a popular loan as in satisfactory form. I am grateful to the Secretary for heeding the voice of the people, as uttered in the Senate the other day by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], and other tribunes of the people, to the extent of offering a popular loan even in form; but I do not regard it as a wise method of testing the willingness of the people to supply money to the Treasury. I do regard the bill which I hold in my hand as the wisest and simplest possible method, and like most other Senators who draw bills, I regard it as an absolute, complete, and perfect panacea for existing conditions. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator suggest why the President and Secretary of the Treasury abandoned their purpose to make this loan through a syndicate and adopted a form of call by which bids could be made for bonds at only four or five different places in the United States?

Mr. CHANDLER. I will not undertake to criticise any further the recent announcement of the Secretary of the Treasury. It is not entirely satisfactory to me. It is, however, something of a concession. If the Senator will help get this bill through, the people can pour their money into the coffers of the Government through the post-offices of the country, and can begin to-morrow to do it.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator please, if I was in favor of the issuance of Government bonds or interest-bearing obligations I should pursue the very course the Senator is now pursuing, but I am opposed to the issuance of anything by this Government which bears interest.

Mr. CHANDLER. I presume the Senator did not think that either I or the Senate was unaware of that fact. I did not propose this as a sovereign remedy which would meet the approval of those persons who do not believe that the Government should borrow money at all or pay any interest on its loans.

I read further:

Deposits may also be made in sums of $50 and the receipts and notes shall be issued specifying one-half the sums above mentioned.

The notes issued under this act shall be redeemable at the option of the United States, in whole or in part, in the order of their issue after five years from their dates upon six months' notice given by public advertisement, at the end of which time interest thereon shall cease.

There is only one other simple section. The whole case is in two propositions: First, the deposit of sums of money in fifty-dollar and in hundred-dollar quantities in the money-order post-offices and in the issue of postal notes that state upon their face what they are worth, and then this clause:

SEC. 3. The Postmaster-General and the Secretary of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to make rules and regulations for the preparation and issue of the postal savings receipts and postal-savings notes authorized by this act, for the safe custody, disposition, and use of the proceeds thereof, and for the payment of the notes when the same may be presented. They may also limit the number of postal savings receipts which shall be issued to one individual, and may at any time suspend the issue of such receipts, according to their discretion.

This bill will make us independent of foreign countries, it will make us independent of the Messrs. Rothschild, who serve notice on us to-day, and it will enable us to pay to the people of this country the interest money on their small savings, which will aggregate hundreds of millions of dollars which we now pay to foreign bankers.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. If I understand the Senator's bill, it allows these postal notes to be paid for in "lawful money," but permits a person who may happen to have a hundred dollars in gold and sees fit to deposit it and get postal notes with special favors attached. But little gold would go into the Treasury under this bill. The difficulty with the Administration is not that they want revenue, they say, but because they need gold to redeem greenbacks and to pay the coin obligations of the Government. Will the Senator's bill remedy that? The executive department of the Government says it is absolutely necessary to pay in gold under their construction of the law.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am not sure that it will, but I say to the Senator from North Carolina and to the Senator from Nebraska that unless they propose to exclude the use of gold entirely as a part of the money of the United States there certainly can be no harm in allowing a citizen who has $100 in gold, or $50 in gold, to deposit that in the Treasury, and promise to pay him back within five or seven years gold in return for the gold which he deposited. It is not a case of long bonds—I call the Senator's attention to that fact—but a case of short-time postal savings notes, which, if the gold is deposited for them, we pay in gold when the note is redeemed.

Mr. BUTLER. I want the Senator to understand that I much prefer his plan to the Administration plan, but I should like to get the information I have asked for.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then, can I put the Senator down in favor of this bill?

Mr. BUTLER. No, and I will explain to you why not in a few words. I am opposed to increasing the interest-bearing debt of the Government. I would prefer to see expenses reduced and taxes lowered. The Senator just now said that the Administration had made a concession in response to the wish of the people for a popular loan. If it were in accordance with the people's demand there would be no bonds issued at all. But the point I wish to get at is, does the Senator approve the construction of the law made by the Secretary of the Treasury under which he redeems the greenbacks in gold and pays the coin obligations of the Government in gold; and if so, does he expect enough gold to come into the Treasury through his bill to meet the requirements of the Government?

Mr. CHANDLER. No, Mr. President, I believe if we will take gold in small sums from the people of this country and promise to pay them back in gold any time after the first, second, or third year, and so on, that this Government will get all the gold it wants, and that the necessities of the Treasury will be wholly relieved by the adoption of this bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I think the Senator is mistaken about that; but if we are going to have a loan at all it ought to be a "popular loan" in fact. But few people can raise $100, and only a very few can raise that much gold. If we are going to have a popular loan, I would like to ask the Senator whether it would not be better to make the sums smaller, like the popular loans in France, which were made small enough for every peasant to be a holder of Government securities. In my State there are a few gold pieces, but not as much as one gold piece to a family, and when they have any at all it is in the old stockings, and is saved simply as a souvenir—a kind of curiosity. I know several farmers in my State who might raise $5 in gold. If we are to issue more bonds (the necessity for which I deny), then let them be in $5 and multiples of $5, so every man who has that much gold can purchase them. And also let the price at which they will be sold be made known, so every man will know how to purchase.

I do not want to interrupt the Senator further than to say that if the construction of the law by the Secretary of the Treasury is correct, and if the Senator indorses that, then I do not think this bill will meet the needs of the Government. The first thing is to decide whether or not their construction of the law is right; that is, whether or not they are justified in redeeming greenbacks, paying coin obligations in gold only. That is the main question and it should be settled at once. I repeat that if the Secretary of the Treasury would obey the law there would be no necessity to borrow gold or money of any kind. The President and the Secretary are purposely making it necessary to pile up this debt. Congress can put a stop to this wrong and do it now. Let us promptly pass a law prohibiting the further issue of bonds without further authority of Congress.

Mr. CHANDLER. I repeat I have not introduced this bill as one likely to be satisfactory to those Senators who do not believe in borrowing money and paying interest on it; whose remedy is to first coin all the silver in the Treasury and pay our debts out of that; second, to set the printing presses going and print all the obligations of the Government that are issued without interest, and deal with the national emergency in that way. This is the simplest possible form of taking the people's money for the needs of the Government, and I commend it to the careful attention of Senators.

I ask to have the bill referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, but I give notice that I shall move it as an amendment to the financial bill which was reported this morning from the Committee on Finance.

The bill was read the second time by its title.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think that bill ought to go to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire requested its reference to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. Is there objection to that reference? The Chair hears none, and it is so referred.

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall not object to that reference now, but when the bill comes back from that committee I shall ask that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHANDLER. I beg to assure the Senator that if this bill is simply dealt with by an ordinary committee of the Senate, like the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, it would never receive a moment's consideration by the Senate unless referred to the Finance Committee, of which the Senator is an honored member.

Mr. ALDRICH. I supposed from the nature of the remarks submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire that he expected to pass the bill this afternoon.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should be very glad to have that done, but if it has to go to a committee at all it will certainly have to pass the scrutiny of the Senator's committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. I desired to do so before he took his seat, but I was not fortunate enough to be enabled to secure recognition. I wanted to ask him a question in regard to a statement he made at the opening of his speech, not in reference to the financial details of his bill. I understood the Senator to make the statement——

Mr. ALLEN. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will let us get the routine morning business transacted.

Mr. LODGE. I simply wish to proceed in order on the bill of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Massachusetts that the whole debate on the introduction of the bill was, as the Chair thinks, out of order. The bill has been referred, and is not now, in any form, before the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. That was because I was not fortunate enough to secure the President's eye. I was standing before the Senator from New Hampshire took his seat, and I appealed to the Chair for recognition on that matter, but was unable to secure it, and it was through no fault of mine that I was not recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was unfortunate in not seeing the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I am quite aware that the whole debate was proceeding by unanimous consent, as most of the Senate debates do. They are almost always out of order, except by unanimous consent. I saw no reason why I should be discriminated against after half a dozen Senators had taken part in the discussion on the bill of the Senator from New Hampshire, quite properly, as I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not sought to discriminate against the Senator. He has recognized the Senator, but the Chair has suggested that the whole debate is not in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I am quite aware of that. Few debates are.

Mr. ALLEN. I object to further debate on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska objects to further debate.

Mr. LODGE subsequently said: If there is no other morning business at this moment, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that I may now put the question to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] with reference to what he said about his bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to propound a question to the Senator from New Hampshire in reference to the discussion of a bill introduced by that Senator. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. LODGE. A loan of the United States is a measure of the United States, and into the letter the Senator from New Hampshire has read about the loan is imported a question of the boundary dispute with England in Venezuela, which is a matter of open controversy between the two Governments at this moment. We have seen other efforts to substitute private individuals for the officers of the United States charged with the care of our foreign relations by appeals to persons conspicuous in foreign governments for their opinions. We have also seen a similar movement by the New York Chamber of Commerce, a very eminent and honorable body, headed by a distinguished citizen of German birth, to take charge of the diplomatic affairs of the United States.

Mr. President, I think the Government of the United States, duly organized in all its branches, is perfectly competent to deal with affairs affecting the welfare of the country; and as the Senator from New Hampshire has read this letter from a firm of bankers and great money lenders, one of whom at least is a member of the House of Lords and therefore within the words of the statute, I desire to ask him whether he does not think that an interference with the measures of the Government, and whether all those letters were not attempts to throw doubt on the credit of the Government; whether they were not intended to bring in the influences of foreign bankers in order to discredit the Government loan and the Government bonds even before they are issued, to force us from the position which we now occupy, and to try to make the Government more than ever dependent on a syndicate of bankers? I ask the Senator whether what he read does not come within that statute?

Mr. CHANDLER. Unquestionably the Senator from Massachusetts has correctly stated the law and has properly applied it, provided the telegrams sent during the last two or three weeks by Mr. Joseph Pulitzer, the editor of the New York World, were sent to foreign governments or to any officer or agent thereof. That is undoubtedly true in reference to the telegram of Mr. Pulitzer to the Prince of Wales. He made a direct appeal by public telegram to the heir apparent to the British throne on a public question that made the relations between the two countries acute. He appealed to him in a sense which was derogatory to the sovereignty of the United States and contrary to the statute which the Senator from Massachusetts has read.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me? I listened to the language of the statute. It applies to citizens of the United States doing the things therein mentioned. I would inquire if Mr. Pulitzer is a citizen of the United States or the subject of some country of Europe?

Mr. CHANDLER. He was a Hungarian originally. I think he has been naturalized.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly he is a citizen of the United States, because he has been a member of Congress.

Mr. CHANDLER. All the telegrams sent by the editor of the World to the officers of the English Government in reference to the crisis that had arisen between the United States and Great Britain were violations of this statute, and if the President and the Attorney-General do their duty Mr. Pulitzer, if he ever sets foot upon the soil of America, as I understand he occasionally does, ought to be prosecuted according to law. [Applause in the galleries.]

The telegram to the Rothschilds, from the reply to which I read the statement that "until this boundary question is arranged we do not believe either the European public or capitalists will take many American bonds for investment," was sent to them as bankers. It was not sent, in form at least, to any official of the British Government, nor do I perceive that any other dispatches which were sent by the World for the purpose of obtaining an expression from foreign countries as to the probable success of the new United States loan were addressed to officers of foreign Governments.

Mr. LODGE. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether the governor of the Bank of England, which is a semiofficial body, having close relations with the Government, is not an officer of that Government?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Massachusetts has recently returned——

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. CHANDLER. I prefer to answer the question of the Senator from Massachusetts first. The Senator from Massachusetts has recently returned from foreign travel and has come in closer contact with the governor of the Bank of England, doubtless, than I ever did; and if the Senator says that the governor of the Bank of England is an officer of the British Government I shall not dispute it.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator be kind enough to read the section of the statute to which the Senator from Massachusetts refers, so that we may all have enlightenment as to its precise terms?

Mr. LODGE. I read the whole of it.

Mr. GRAY. A single reading of it is not enough.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], the defender of the Administration on this floor, now happily located on this side of the Chamber, is engaged with the statute, and he will favor me if he will read it to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HILL. Whatever else the Senator from New York may be, he is not at this particular time the defender of Mr. Pulitzer. I will leave that to other gentlemen. The Senator from New Hampshire is a good reader and I will allow him to read the statute for himself, but will not allow him to interpret it for the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should expect any interpretation of mine to be at once summarily overruled by the Senator from New York. But the law says:

> Every citizen of the United States, whether actually resident or abiding within the same, or in any foreign country, who, without the permission or authority of the government, directly or indirectly, commences or carries on any verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government, or any officer or agent thereof, with an intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government, or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States—

Shall be a criminal and be punished as such. That is the law.

Mr. ALDRICH. I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island will state his point of order.

Mr. ALDRICH. As these international questions seem to be settled to the satisfaction of the gentlemen who are discussing them, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The debate is proceeding upon a request for unanimous consent, which was granted, and the Chair does not think it proper——

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the unanimous consent extend for the rest of the session?

Mr. COCKRELL. It extends until 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It extends until the hour of 2 o'clock arrives, when the Chair will have to arrest all discussion and lay the unfinished business before the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Arrest the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], I suggest. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER. Am I to infer that the Chair has appointed the Senator from New York a deputy sergeant-at-arms to take part in the arrest? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not selected the Senator from New York for any such purpose.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I do not rise to consume the time of the Senate, and I shall take only a moment to express my surprise at the suggestion made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and my still greater surprise at the approbation given to that suggestion by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER]. That suggestion seems to be that in this evening of the nineteenth century we should hark back upon our track for centuries in order to stifle the expression or the effort to obtain an expression of public opinion in this country or anywhere in the civilized world.

Mr. President, if we have achieved anything in all these years of eventful history that have come and gone we have accomplished this, that among civilized countries just public opinion is the final arbiter of all public conduct and all public measures.

It is not necessary for me or for any other Senator to say that if the suggestion were seriously made, and the approbation seriously given by my usually judicial and self-poised friend from New Hampshire, it will miserably fail of accomplishment. No attempt to place this inquisitorial interpretation upon any law on the statute book of the United States by which to stifle an expression of public opinion, or to prevent the free exercise of that right in regard to all matters and affairs that concern the people of the United States, will succeed.

The Senator from Massachusetts has exercised, and I trust will continue to exercise, the extremest freedom in the expression of his own opinions, whether as a Senator on this floor or as a member of this body, when in his own home, or when receiving the hospitality of those who live under foreign skies. I do not know that that freedom has ever been abridged. When it is sought to be

abridged, or when it shall be abridged, then our institutions will have received a blow more serious than any that can be attempted by those who attempt to promote unsound finance or economic measures, for in that day the very corner stone of American liberty, the very corner stone of our world-wide civilization, of which we are the advance guard, will be sapped and undermined.

Mr. President, I am loath to believe that the Senator from Massachusetts was quite serious in the suggestion that we have a law upon the statute books of the United States so inquisitorial and so unworthy of the civilization of our day and generation.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator from Delaware a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. We were not discussing the wisdom of the law, but the question as to what is a violation of the law as it stands upon the statute books. Now, suppose that war were flagrant between the United States and Great Britain, does the Senator from Delaware think it would be a violation of the law which has been quoted for Mr. Joseph Pulitzer to telegraph the Prince of Wales asking him if this wicked war ought not to be stopped? That is the concrete form of the proposition.

Mr. GRAY. When war has been declared and is flagrant it will be time enough to answer the question. Thank God, it is neither one nor the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The SECRETARY. A resolution, submitted by Mr. ELKINS, proposing to declare that hereafter no bonds of the United States shall be sold at private sale or under private contract, etc.

Mr. VEST. I gave notice that I should address the Senate upon the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is entitled to the floor upon the pending resolution.

SALE OF BONDS.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the Democratic party does not seek to avoid any just responsibility for its ostensible control of the Government during the present Administration. I use the word "ostensible" because every fair-minded man knows that under the rules of the Senate and with the relative strength of the two great parties upon this floor it was practically impossible for us to impress upon the legislation of the country the policies and principles which are supported by a majority of the Democrats of the United States. I shall not stop now to express my oft-repeated regret that those defective rules exist, but it is matter of history that during the last Congress, with an ostensible majority of Democrats in this Chamber, we were, by reason of having practically no rules, obliged to submit to the individual opinions of a few Senators upon both sides of the Chamber.

Mr. President, the Democratic party recognizes the fact that, because apparently in control of the Government during this Administration, it must be held responsible for all the disasters which have come upon the country. It was said by a great soldier after a great defeat that success was the criterion of merit in war; and the rule equally applies in political affairs. Success is the criterion of merit; and although a hard rule, and oftentimes an unjust one, every party apparently in control of a representative Government is held responsible by the people for any disaster which may occur. I do not seek to evade even this unjust responsibility. I shall not waste time in noticing the statement that the Democratic party is dead. Sir, the political jackals that are snarling and snapping around the wounded lion will soon disappear. The Democratic party as founded by Jefferson will exist so long as this country lasts, and when it dies the last hope of popular government upon this continent will have been destroyed.

INCOME-TAX DECISION.

It is said by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] that the Democratic party exhibited its incompetence when it failed during the last Congress to enact a tariff law which would furnish sufficient revenue to defray the expenses of the Government That statement is unjust and not founded in fact. The Wilson Act, as it is called, which was enacted by both Houses of Congress and became a law without the signature of the President, would have furnished ample revenue to conduct this Government, with a small surplus besides. If that law had not, as to between $40,000,000 and $50,000,000 of taxation, been declared invalid by the Supreme Court of the United States, there would have been no deficit in the Treasury, as every intelligent man must concede.

That the Supreme Court made this decision was a matter of surprise to every intelligent lawyer in the United States, and especially to those of us engaged in the legislation of the country. I shall observe the laws of decorum and of comity between the coordinate branches of the Government, but I shall not conceal my opinion of that decision, even of the highest judicial tribunal in the land.

In my judgment no decision by the Supreme Court of the United States has done so much to weaken the influence of that tribunal and to excite the distrust of the masses of the American people, including thoughtful and intelligent lawyers, as that rendered in the income-tax cases. It had always been believed and claimed as one of the chief excellences in our Federal Constitution that whatever might be the vacillations and uncertainties of inferior tribunals the citizen could rely with absolute confidence upon the stability of the great court of last resort. Its judgments, formed after elaborate argument in the calm and passionless atmosphere of judicial equanimity, were supposed to be above the sudden and capricious changes which often represent the prejudices of individual judges. That the Supreme Court has reversed its decisions, unbroken for a hundred years, upon a question vitally important to the Administration of the Government and to all its citizens, and that this reversal has placed the legislative department in the attitude of having through ignorance or recklessness violated the Constitution, must cause the deepest concern to all who are sincerely attached to our institutions.

That the court reversed the decisions of a century is beyond reasonable question. From the Hylton case, in 1796, three years after the Federal Constitution was adopted, down to the Springer case, in 1866, an unbroken line of decisions had been rendered by the Supreme Court to the effect that incomes from real and personal property did not come within the meaning of direct taxes under the Constitution, and could be levied without apportionment among the States according to population. I repeat the assertion that for one hundred years no lawyer had doubted that this was the law judicially determined by the highest tribunal in the land. The Hylton case was decided in 1796, three years after the Federal Constitution was adopted, as I have said, by judges who had been members of the convention which made the Constitution and of the State conventions which ratified it.

Chief Justice Ellsworth, who presided over the Supreme Court when the Hylton case was decided, had been a member of the Continental Congress and of the convention which made the Constitution of 1789, and was also a leading member of the Connecticut State convention that ratified the Constitution. He was on the bench when the opinion was delivered, and although he did not participate in the judgment, by reason of his having just been sworn into office, it can not be doubted that he was consulted by the justices who joined in the opinion.

Justice Paterson had been a member of the convention, and had drawn one of the two original drafts of the Constitution which were debated.

Justice Wilson was a member of the Continental Congress, and had given especial attention to the subject of taxation. He had also been a member of the convention that framed the Constitution, and then of the Pennsylvania convention which ratified it.

Justice Chase had been a member of the Continental Congress, and had there been prominent in the discussion of taxation and apportionment. Afterwards he served in the Maryland convention which ratified the Constitution.

Justice Iredell was a leading member of the North Carolina convention that ratified the Constitution.

Those were the lawyers who made the decision in the Hylton case, which was affirmed and reaffirmed for a hundred years by the tribunal of last resort until it was discovered by a majority of the present justices that all the judges who had preceded them upon the bench had been mistaken in regard to the law, and Congress was branded with having violated the Constitution which they had judicially construed. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). There must be order in the galleries.

Mr. VEST. What did the Supreme Court of the United States decide in the Hylton case? I hold in my hand the decision of Chief Justice Chase, delivered years afterwards, in which he gave the unanimous judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States in Veazie Bank *vs.* Fenno, 3 Wallace, affirming the Hylton case and declaring that Congress had the right to tax the incomes from real and personal property without apportionment among the States according to population. I shall not read that opinion familiar to every intelligent lawyer, but will insert an extract from it in my remarks.

It may safely be assumed, therefore, as the unanimous judgment of the court [in the Hylton case] that a tax on carriages is not a direct tax. And it may further be taken as established, upon the testimony of Patterson, that the words "direct taxes," as used in the Constitution, comprehended only capitation taxes and taxes on land, and perhaps taxes on personal property, by general valuation and assessment of the various descriptions possessed within the several States. It follows necessarily that the power to tax without apportionment extends to all other objects. Taxes on other objects are included under the heads of taxes not direct, duties, imposts, and excises, and must be laid and collected by the rule of uniformity. The tax under consideration is a tax on bank circulation, and may very well be classed under the head of duties. Certainly it is not, in the sense of the Constitution, a direct tax. It may be said to come within the same category of taxation as the tax on incomes of insurance companies, which this court, at the last term, in the case of Pacific Insurance Company *vs.* Soule (7 Wall., 424) held not to be a direct tax.

Mr. Justice Brown, of the Supreme Court, with whom I differ

politically, but who is a lawyer of eminent ability and unquestioned integrity, in his dissenting opinion summarizes all the cases from the Hylton case, in 1796, to the Springer case, in 1866, showing that the Supreme Court had again and again affirmed the power of Congress to levy an income tax upon the proceeds of real and personal property without apportionment.

He says:

So, also, whenever this court had been called upon to give a construction to this clause of the Constitution, it has universally held the words "direct taxes" applied only to capitation taxes and taxes upon land. In the five cases most directly in point it was held that the following taxes were not direct, but rather in the nature of duty or excise, viz: A tax upon carriages, Hylton *vs.* United States (3 Dall., 171); a tax upon the business of insurance companies, Pacific Insurance Company *vs.* Soule (7 Wall., 433); a tax of 10 per cent upon the notes of State banks held by national banks, Veazie *vs.* Fenno (8 Wall.. 533); a tax upon the devolution of real estate, Scholey *vs.* Rew (23 Wall., 331), and, finally, a general income tax was broadly upheld in Springer *vs.* United States (102 U. S., 586). These cases, consistent and undeviating as they are, and extending over nearly a century of our national life, seem to me to establish a canon of interpretation which it is now too late to overthrow or even to question. If there be any weight at all to be given to the doctrine of stare decisis, it surely ought to apply to a theory of constitutional construction, which has received the deliberate sanction of this court in five cases, and upon the faith of which Congress has enacted two income taxes at times when, in its judgment, extraordinary sources of revenue were necessary to be made available.

The counsel who argued the case against the Government, Mr. Seward, of New York, in his printed argument, which I have before me, admitted that the Supreme Court had so decided for a century, but he said that the decision in the Springer case, rendered in 1866, was made by a loyal court to sustain the war-making power of the Government, and that therefore the Supreme Court should overrule it, together with the Hylton case and the intermediate decisions from 1796 up to 1866. The argument or suggestion then made to this great tribunal was that the Supreme Court was a part of the war-making power of this Government, or that its judges should commit perjury in order to sustain the Constitution for which battles had been fought in the preceding year. That I may do no injustice, having mentioned the name of this eminent lawyer, I ask the Secretary to read an extract from his printed argument.

The Secretary read as follows:

The Springer case adopted the reasoning of the court in the Hylton case. The statute then under consideration was passed to aid the General Government in the hour of its peril. The decision was that of a loyal court seeking to uphold the Government by sustaining a tax which had been passed as a war measure, and which was necessary to uphold and strengthen the Government against those who were seeking to destroy it. The loyalty of the decision is not questioned, and that loyalty may have had an influence even upon a judicial mind.

Mr. VEST. In the Springer case the Supreme Court of the United States, after reviewing every decision that had been made from the Hylton case down to that time, emphatically and distinctly declared that no sort of question remained as to the power of Congress to levy income taxes upon the profits from real and personal property in this country without apportionment.

After examining the cases above cited, the opinion concludes, speaking for the entire court: "All these cases are undistinguishable in principle from the case now before us, and they are decisive against the plaintiff in error. The question, what is a direct tax, is one exclusively in American jurisprudence. The text writers of the country are in entire accord upon the subject. Mr. Justice Story says that all taxes are usually divided into two classes—those which are direct and those which are indirect—and that 'under the former denomination are included taxes on land or real property, and, under the latter, taxes on consumption.' (1 Const., sec. 950.) Chancellor Kent, speaking of the case of Hylton *vs.* United States, says: 'The better opinion seems to be that the direct taxes contemplated by the Constitution were only two, viz, a capitation or poll tax and a tax on land.' (1 Com., 257. See also Cooley, Taxation, page 5, note 2; Pomery, Const. Law, 157; Sharwood's Blackstone, 308, note; Rawle, Const., 30; Sergeant, Const., 305.) We are not aware that any writer since Hylton *vs.* United States was decided has expressed a view of the subject different from that of these authors. Our conclusions are, that direct taxes, within the meaning of the Constitution, are only capitation taxes, as expressed in that instrument, and taxes on real estate, and that the tax of which the plaintiff in error complains is within the category of an excise or duty."

When judges one hundred years afterwards undertake to say what was the meaning of the framers of the Constitution, in face of the judicial declarations of the men who made the Constitution and then sat upon the Supreme Bench and construed it, no one can be surprised that Mr. Justice Harlan, in his dissenting opinion, declares that the age of miracles is not past, and that after a century these modern lawyers know better than the framers of the Constitution what they meant.

Sir, I shall not undertake to analyze the decision of the Supreme Court; I would not trust myself in the Senate Chamber to say what I should be tempted to say as to this most extraordinary proceeding. I will leave it to the members of that court to stigmatize the decision as it deserves. I send to the Secretary now, to be read, the declaration of Mr. Justice Harlan, who sat upon the bench and delivered a dissenting opinion.

The Secretary read as follows:

The practical effect of the decision to-day is to give to certain kinds of property a position of favoritism and advantage inconsistent with the fundamental principles of our social organization, and to invest them with power and influence that may be perilous to that portion of the American people upon whom rests the larger part of the burdens of the Government, and who ought not to be subjected to the dominion of aggregated wealth any more than the property of the country should be at the mercy of the lawless.

Mr. VEST. If that be not sufficient, I ask the Secretary to read from the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Brown.

The Secretary read as follows:

By resuscitating an argument that was exploded in the Hylton case, and has lain practically dormant for a hundred years, it is made to do duty in nullifying, not this law alone, but every similar law that is not based upon an impossible theory of apportionment. Even the specter of socialism is conjured up to frighten Congress from laying taxes upon the people in proportion to their ability to pay them. It is certainly a strange commentary upon the Constitution of the United States and upon a democratic Government that Congress has no power to lay a tax which is one of the main sources of revenue of nearly every civilized State. It is a confession of feebleness in which I find myself wholly unable to join.

While I have no doubt that Congress will find some means of surmounting the present crisis, my fear is that in some moment of national peril this decision will rise up to frustrate its will and paralyze its arm. I hope it may not prove the first step toward the submergence of the liberties of the people in a sordid despotism of wealth.

As I can not escape the conviction that the decision of the court in this great case is fraught with immeasurable danger to the future of the country, and that it approaches the proportions of a national calamity, I feel it a duty to enter my protest against it.

Mr. VEST. If I had made the declarations which have come from these two justices of the Supreme Court of the United States I should be charged with partisan malice and misrepresentation. Coming from distinguished lawyers, holding the highest judicial positions in the country, of life tenure, and removed from personal and political motives, I submit that those declarations from that source constitute the most fearful arraignment of this court of last resort found in the judicial annals of the country.

I have said that I do not propose to analyze this decision, nor shall I trust myself to enter into conjecture as to the reasons that caused one member of the court, after agreeing on deliberate argument as to the constitutionality of the largest portion of the law, in two weeks afterwards, upon a motion for a rehearing, to reverse his opinion and fasten upon the country "the sordid despotism of wealth." This justice unquestionably had the right to change his opinion; it is the highest prerogative of a judicial officer; but I must say most respectfully that it is a matter of regret that he did not see proper to put upon record the reasons that caused him to make the change; that he did not stand before the American people as the only member of the court really responsible for this far-reaching and terrible judicial decision. The name of that justice is known alone to himself and to his judicial associates. Not even the clerks of the court are able to say what individual justice changed the decision after the case was first argued. The reasons that controlled him are lost to the profession and to the country, and it is simply a matter of conjecture as to why, in a case the most important, possibly, that ever came before the Supreme Court of the United States, he allowed his name and his reasons to be buried in obscurity.

Sir, the Senate of the United States has been ridiculed and maligned because of executive sessions. What would be thought of a member of this body who had changed his opinion on a great question like that before the Supreme Court who did not have the manhood to stand before the American people and declare his responsibility for that result? I can imagine now the storm of opprobrium, the charges of corruption, the wrath of the independent press against a Senator who would dare to hide his name in order to escape responsibility for a public act.

I must also be permitted to express my regret that in the argument of this case eminent counsel were not only permitted but encouraged to make scurrilous innuendoes as to the motives of those of us who had placed in the income-tax law the provision exempting savings banks and mutual life insurance companies from taxation. The reasons for this exemption were given in the Senate debate, and it is not strange that they did not weigh with paid counsel who made this attack upon the majority of Congress. Those banks and companies were exempted upon the broad and humane policy which encourages the citizen in all civilized countries to make provision for those who are dependent upon him. The same eminent counsel who attacked Congress because they had made this exemption in the next breath assailed us as legislative communists who were making assaults upon the wealth of the country. This versatility would have been astounding but for the fact that the same lawyer a few weeks afterwards stood before a New York jury, Bible in hand, and read the parable of Lazarus and Dives to secure a verdict for his client against a multimillionaire who was childless, upon the ground that he ought to be made to divide his estate with the poor devil who was fortunate enough to have such an advocate. [Laughter.]

I assert that in all the debates which were had in both Houses of Congress it was not suggested that the Supreme Court had not settled forever in the Springer case our right to pass the income-tax provisions which were contained in the Wilson law. Even the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], who so vigorously opposed the income-tax provision, although his individual opinion may have been otherwise, did not pretend to controvert the fact that constitutionally we had the power to impose such a tax.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me? I know he does not want to misrepresent me.

Mr. VEST. Not at all.

Mr. HILL. I do not intend, of course, at the present time to argue the question, but I will state that I took the position all through the debate that we had no authority under the Constitution to pass any such income-tax provision as that bill contained.

Mr. VEST. I have said that was the individual opinion of the Senator from New York, but as a lawyer he never pretended to urge that the Supreme Court had not decided that we had the power and that the Springer case was conclusive upon the question.

Mr. HILL. Of course my views are published in the speeches which I made here upon that question, in which I spoke of the Springer case, and we had considerable discussion upon it. I endeavored to draw a distinction between what was decided in the Springer case and what was involved in the bill then pending.

Mr. VEST. What was decided in the Springer case speaks for itself in language so plain that there can be no mistake about it. The Springer case decided without one dissenting judge—declared emphatically and distinctly and beyond the shadow of suspicion—that Congress had the power to impose the taxes that we placed in the income-tax provision of the Wilson law. I know that counsel in the Supreme Court tried to evade that conclusion, but I have read from the printed argument of Mr. Seward to show that he admitted that the Supreme Court had so decided and only attempted to escape the legal effect by saying it was a war-time decision, made by a loyal court to sustain the Government.

Mr. President, I do not propose to speak at length in regard to the effect of this decision. My sole object is to repel and repudiate with all my power and with all the earnestness of which my nature is capable the assertion that Congress was guilty of either recklessness or ignorance in enacting that statute. I say that every intelligent lawyer concluded that the question had been judicially determined. To have doubted that the Supreme Court would have followed the decisions of one hundred years would have been a reflection upon the intelligence and consistency of that great tribunal. During the individual selfishness that always comes in times of great depression, while gloom and disaster and other great issues have been impending over the country, our people have not understood the full effect of this terrible decision. It has marked a new era in our history, and I much mistake the American people if the time will not come when neither soft words nor honeyed phrases will be sufficient apology for the doctrine announced by the Supreme Court.

Sir, the people of this country will never submit to the system of taxation which has been put upon them by the Supreme Court of the United States in opposition to its decision of an entire century. That Mr. Vanderbilt, with his hundreds of millions of dollars, should pay no more for the support of the General Government than the poorest man in the land is abhorrent to every honest mind. The Army and Navy of the United States, the military and financial resources of the Government, must be used to defend Mr. Vanderbilt's untold millions; and yet he pays simply internal-revenue taxes and tariff import duties upon what he may choose to consume, and the poor man does the same. He pays no more to support the Army and Navy than I do, or any other citizen of this country, without regard to his estate or means.

The people of the United States will never concede that either the State or national administration should be fixed upon a basis like this. This decision, I say, has not attracted the attention that hereafter must be given to it. The time will come when the prophetic language of Justice Brown will come home to every intelligent and thoughtful man throughout our wide domain, that by this adjudication the highest tribunal in the land has fixed upon the country "the sordid despotism of wealth."

DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio proceeded to draw a comparison between the administration of the Government by the Republican and the Democratic parties, and the general drift of his argument was to show incompetency upon the part of the Democracy, while great national prosperity had come from the policies and administration of the Republican party. The Senator read copious extracts from statistical reports to prove his assertion. I have with great interest and some labor followed him in his effort to convict the party to which I belong of utter incompetency and to elevate and laud the organization of which he is so prominent and distinguished a member.

What are the facts in regard to the administration of the Government?

Mr. Cleveland was elected President of the United States in 1884. The surplus revenue in 1885, the first year of his Administration, was $17,859,755; in 1886, the next year, $49,405,546; in the next year, 1887, $55,567,645. In the last year of Cleveland's Administration it was $67,608,725.

Under this incompetent and unfaithful Democratic party the surplus revenue of the Government constantly increased, and I assert here and now, differing, as is well known, from the head of my party as to great questions pending before the American people, that no administration of this Government from the beginning until now was more successful, more satisfactory, than the four years of Grover Cleveland from 1885 to 1889.

During those four years how much gold went out of the country? The gold exports during the whole four years were $79,507,504.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. VEST. Of course.

Mr. HOAR. I desire simply to ask the Senator whether during those four years there was any Democratic law in force; and if so, what?

Mr. VEST. The Senator asks me if any Democratic law was in force. I reply to him that the Democratic party was then at the head of affairs in this country, and there by a law superior to all others, the will of a majority of the people of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. It was not in control of the Senate.

Mr. VEST. Now, Mr. President, let us go to the Administration of Mr. Harrison, under Republican laws, of which I shall speak directly, and more fully answer the Senator from Massachusetts.

In 1889, the first year of Harrison's Administration, there was $48,694,000 surplus. In 1890, $45,192,000, a fall of three millions. In 1891, $17,167,000, a fall of nearly $30,000,000 in a year. In 1892, $9,914,483. There was a constant fall in the surplus under the Administration of the Republican party, with both Houses of Congress at that time under their control.

Mr. HAWLEY. I should be very glad if the Senator would state how much of the public debt was paid during that Administration.

Mr. VEST. I will do so with very great pleasure.

Mr. HAWLEY. I thought it was $259,000,000. I am not sure.

Mr. VEST. I am glad the Senator has called my attention to that point. I am very much obliged to him.

As I have stated, the surplus was a constantly declining one. The surplus, permit me to say, is shown from official reports, in 1893 and 1894, the last two years of Harrison's Administration, to have been made up by drawing money out of the Treasury, which was not a surplus upon imports and revenues of the country, internal-revenue taxes and otherwise, but, as the Treasury Department shows (and I hold the report before me), it came from money drawn out of the Treasury of the United States in order, under their system of bookkeeping, to show a surplus.

In Harrison's Administration the gold exports, instead of being $79,000,000, as under Cleveland's four years, were $213,784,757. There was incompetency for you, according to the criterion of the Senator from Ohio. The great evil of which we now hear complaint is the export of gold, but under these incompetent Democrats, for four years but $79,000,000 went out, while under the Administration of Harrison and his colleagues there was exported the enormous amount of $213,000,000. Even in the present Administration of Mr. Cleveland so far the records show that but $181,068,087 in gold has been exported from the United States.

But again, the receipts under Cleveland's Administration were $1,451,660,246. The expenditures during his whole four years were $1,063,223,202, there being the difference between $1,063,000,000 and $1,451,000,000.

The receipts under Harrison's Administration—now mark the contrast—were $1,539,723,590. The expenditures during Harrison's four years were $1,330,394,780. The excess of expenditures under Harrison over those under Cleveland amounted to $267,171,577.

But again, in answer to the Senator from Connecticut, the amount paid by Cleveland to retire the bonds and to pay the public debt, as shown by the official records, was $360,419,053. The total amount paid by Harrison to retire bonds and pay the public debt during his whole four years was $292,963,436, showing that these derided and incompetent Democrats who are now destroying this country and causing liberty to lie bleeding in the streets saved millions and millions of dollars, while the Republican party managed to deplete the Treasury and to leave us a legacy of indebtedness under which we are now struggling.

But, Mr. President, in addition to this, the continuing appropriations of the Fifty-first Congress left to the Fifty-second Congress, and of which complaint is now made, amounted to $154,000,000 in round numbers. They bequeathed to Mr. Cleveland's second Administration liabilities amounting to $96,051,325.06. I have before me (which I will not read unless Senators desire to hear it) the specific amounts, and on what account, handed down by our Republican predecessors to us, and which are now made a subject of taunt and derision, because they say the incompetent Democrats are not able to furnish sufficient revenues to pay them.

The amount above the gold reserve turned over by Mr. Cleveland's Administration to that of General Harrison was $83,627,100. The amount turned over at the end of Harrison's Administration to Mr. Cleveland (nearly all of it in subsidiary coin and unavailable for the purposes of paying indebtedness) was $24,128,687.

During Harrison's Administration the disbursing officer's balances available for current expenses were reduced from $47,905,423 to $23,515,033.

Mr. President, in addition to that, the Harrison Administration extended bonds that matured September 1, 1891, amounting to $25,364,800. We were asked here the other day, in an almost insulting manner, why the Democratic party did not pay its debts. Let me inquire why the Republican party did not pay its debts, and why it permitted these bonds maturing September 1, in the year I have named, to go by without payment by the Government, thereby impeaching the good faith of the American people. They also defaulted in 1892 and 1893 in paying $40,000,000 due to the sinking fund.

Besides all this, the party which now attacks the Democrats as being false to their obligations and to the law misappropriated the amount of $54,207,975 of trust funds in the Treasury that were placed there to redeem the national-bank notes.

This is the record from official sources of the four years of Harrison's Administration.

The Senator from Massachusetts asked me what laws were in force that were put there by the Democratic party during the successful Administration of Mr. Cleveland. What laws? The Senator impliedly exults in the legislation passed by the Republican party, the organization to which he belongs.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will pardon me. I think he misunderstood the purport of my question. He was claiming for President Cleveland the credit of the expenditures and receipts in his first Administration. During that whole first Administration the expenditures and the receipts of the Government were governed by Republican laws, which the President of the United States had no power to change; and during his whole Administration there was a Republican Senate, so that no Republican law could have been changed by the Democratic party. That was the point of my question, not whether they passed good laws.

Mr. VEST. I listen to the Senator always with great pleasure and with renewed admiration from session to session of his ingenuousness and ingenuity. Now, the Senator from Massachusetts speaks of a Republican Senate; but did they have during Cleveland's first term a Republican House of Representatives, which under the Constitution originates all appropriations? Who made the great appropriation bills? They were made by the Democratic party. Who controlled the expenses of the Government which enabled us to save the money of the people and show the surplus which I have read from the official reports?

But I could answer the Senator further and tell him of the law which bears the name of a distinguished Democrat from my own State that was then unrepealed on the statute books. I refer to what is called the Bland Act of 1878, which the Republican party declared afterwards to be hurtful to the country and placed in its stead the law which bears the name of the distinguished Senator from Ohio—the Sherman Act.

In 1890, flushed with the victory of 1888, the Republican party came back under the impression that they owned this country for an indefinite period. They placed themselves and the fate of their organization upon three bills. The first was the force law, a Massachusetts bill, controlled and managed in the House of Representatives by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and bearing his name; controlled and managed in the Senate by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. After a terrible struggle, with the assistance of patriotic Republicans, we were enabled to defeat that odious measure. Contemporaneously, by using the parliamentary power placed in the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the McKinley Act was passed, enormously increasing duties, upon the broad and undisguised assumption that revenues should be levied for protection and not to pay the expenses of the Government.

That bill came to this body, passed by the methods I have named in the House, and was here enacted into law. The Republican party put up its oriflamme before the United States and emblazoned on it "Protection for protection's sake." They went to the people upon that issue.

They passed another law to give relief, as they said, to the finances of the country. It is known as the Sherman Act, which stored in the Treasury of the United States as so much cord wood, as so much lumber, silver bullion, not to be coined, but to be made the basis of Treasury notes issued to the people.

What was the result of that legislation? The Republican party came back from their appeal to the people utterly discomfited and defeated. They gathered into this Hall a funeral procession, stamped with the disapproval of the people of this country. The McKinley law was repudiated distinctly and emphatically, and conspicuous Republicans have repeatedly said that they would never be prepared to go back to the measure of protection accorded by that law. The Sherman law was repudiated by its author and his colleagues who gave their votes for it. The Senator from Ohio stood on this floor and declared that his own offspring must be bastardized and put beyond the pale of law. It had brought disaster upon the country. It had disturbed the finances. It was unworthy the name of the great statesman, formerly Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. President, that law was passed under political coercion, so far as the Senator from Ohio was concerned, I will do him the justice to state. We are told now that the Democratic party is hopelessly divided upon the question of the free coinage of silver. In what better condition are our Republican brethren? They dare not make the issue in their own ranks in regard to the free coinage of silver, because they know it would disintegrate and divide their party hopelessly. They passed the Sherman Act to retain the votes of the silver Republican Senators from the Western States, and all the world knows it. They afterwards were compelled, under the stress of public opinion in the Northeastern and Middle States, to repeal that law. To-day they hold control of the committees in this body on account of the same potent influence inside of their own organization. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], frankly and in his own manly and emphatic way, told us the other day that if the Senate Committee on Finance had not been organized in favor of free coinage no committees would have been appointed and no chairmanships made in the Senate. No declaration could be more emphatic and distinct than that. Now the struggle of our Republican friends is to evade that issue, if possible, and not to permit the public of the United States to ascertain that they are as hopelessly divided upon it as they claim and as I concede the Democratic party to be.

Mr. President, whatever the Democratic party may have omitted to do, it has never enacted any law which it was compelled to come before the people of the United States and admit to have been vicious legislation that ought not to have been placed upon the statute books. We are honestly divided in regard to the free coinage of silver, and it is a tribute to the personal integrity of the individuals composing the Democratic party that manhood and patriotism enough still exist in public life to impel those of us who entertain an opinion different from the President of the United States, the head of our party, to come out boldly and unequivocally against his policy.

We are engaged now in an irrepressible financial conflict; a conflict as irrepressible as that which marched the armies of the North and South in the civil war. I trust that the arbitrament may not be by violence; I hope and believe that it will not be; but the conflict is just as irrepressible, and must be fought out to the last extremity between those of us who believe in retaining silver as standard money of redemption and those who believe in the single gold standard and the use of silver only as fractional coin. All attempts to evade this issue are impossible. The sooner it is settled the better for the tranquillity of the country, the better for the public and private life of the land. Those who attempt to evade it by the use of cant phrases, such as "sound money," and by the declaration that this lunacy has passed away, are guilty of absolute public crime, if intelligent men, when they assume that the vast millions who believe in the free coinage of silver will ever concede that they are either dishonest or incompetent to decide that question.

TIN PLATE.

Mr. President, pursuing further the analogy instituted by the Senator from Ohio between the policies and legislation of the two great parties of the country, let me remind our Republican friends of certain episodes in the tariff discussion when we passed the Wilson Act and of subsequent events, which I thought then "cast their shadows before." The McKinley Act put a tariff duty of $2\frac{2}{10}$ cents a pound upon tin plate, an infant industry, as it was claimed, that must be fostered and encouraged in the United States. We proposed to reduce that duty 1 cent and leave it $1\frac{2}{10}$ cents per pound. We were told by tin-plate manufacturers from Pittsburg and by the leaders of the Republican party in the debate upon the other side of the Chamber that this reduction would destroy the tin-plate industry in the United States. What is the result? I hold in my hand a report made by Mr. Ayer, whose reports have heretofore furnished the staple arguments of our Republican friends for higher protection upon tin plate. This report has just been made to the Treasury of the United States, and I will ask the Secretary to read it. It shows the result of the reduction of 1 cent a pound on tin plate in one year under the Wilson Act, made by an agent confessedly inimical to the doctrine of freer trade which I entertain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The Secretary will read as indicated unless objection be made.

The Secretary read as follows:

TIN AND TERNE PLATES.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL AGENT, TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Custom-House, New York, October 13, 1895.

SIR: I have the honor to report that during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, the production in the United States of commercial tin and terne plates was 193,801,073 pounds, against 139,223,467 pounds produced during the previous fiscal year, showing thereby an increased production of 39 per cent.

Of the production for the year, 160,576,934 pounds, or about 83 per cent, were made from sheets rolled in the United States, against about 62 per cent made

from such sheets during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1894.

The production for the year distributed according to weight and kind of plates was as follows:

	Lighter than 63 pounds per 100 square feet.	63 pounds per 100 square feet and heavier.	Total.
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Tin plates	103,256,143	17,071,806	120,327,949
Terne plates	62,934,216	10,538,908	73,473,124
Total	166,190,359	27,610,714	193,801,073

These figures show that about 86 per cent of the production belonged to the class weighing lighter than 63 pounds per 100 square feet, the proportion of the previous fiscal year having been about 95 per cent of the production for that year.

Forty-eight firms were producing during the quarter ended June 30, 1895, as against 40 during the corresponding quarter of the previous fiscal year.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is the Senator from Missouri now prepared to admit that tin plates can be successfully produced in the United States?

Mr. VEST. Under a Democratic Administration, yes [laughter]; never under a Republican.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will allow me to make a statement, the rates fixed in the iron and steel schedule in the bill for which the Senator voted were so fairly protective in every part——

Mr. VEST. I know they were.

Mr. ALDRICH. That it was, so far as that schedule was concerned, a protective measure.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Rhode Island, I must say frankly, had a good deal more to do with that schedule than I had, although I was ostensibly with the majority of the Senate. I resisted the retention of the enormous duties in the iron and steel schedule. But he can not divert me from what I state here now. The Senator himself made the issue as to tin plate, and he declared that if we took off 1 cent a pound it would destroy the industry. We did take it off, and it was one of the few things we managed to save in that bill. The result has been an increase of 39 per cent, showing, what we have always contended, that these enormous and exclusive duties do not help the producers of the United States in any regard. It is a plain, palpable evasion to talk about the whole iron and steel schedule. I take this specific article, and I show by official reports that it has thrived under a decreased duty, and I thereby establish the contention of the party to which I belong that these enormous McKinley duties are not necessary.

AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS.

The Senator from Ohio significantly alluded to the increased imports of agricultural products under the Wilson law, and it was equally significant that the distinguished Senator did not name one of the principal agricultural articles in his list of imports. He said that under the McKinley law there were $51,414,484 worth of agricultural articles named in his list imported into this country, and under the Wilson law $107,342,522. He includes in those items hides, which, he says, in 1894 were imported to the extent of $10,480,562 under the McKinley law, and $24,623,269 in 1895, under the Wilson law.

Mr. President, that is an unfortunate allusion for the distinguished Senator. We all remember that his candidate for the Presidency, the Hon. William McKinley, of Ohio, then chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, in his report on the McKinley bill made an eloquent and learned argument in favor of imposing a duty upon hides. Some mysterious influence attacked him after he prepared the report. The bill was changed, but not the report, and the astounding spectacle was presented the next morning to the House of Representatives and the country of a report from the chairman of the committee in favor of a duty on hides and in the bill hides were put on the free list.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am sure the Senator does not wish to misstate the facts.

Mr. VEST. No; I do not.

Mr. ALDRICH. The bill as reported to the House did not contain a duty on hides.

Mr. VEST. I did not say that. I said the report favored a duty. Does the Senator deny that?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

Mr. VEST. I say the argument in the report on the McKinley bill of the Committee on Ways and Means was in favor of a duty on hides.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know what the argument was, but——

Mr. VEST. The Senator ought to know before he interrupts me with such a statement as that.

Mr. ALDRICH. I know in what shape the bill was reported.

Mr. VEST. I know, and I stated distinctly, the bill was changed the night before its report, and the name of a prominent Senator of this body, then a member of the House of Representatives, was connected with that transaction. He went to Mr. McKinley in an entirely legitimate way and told him that if the duty on hides was retained he could not look for his support and that of other New England Representatives. Why, Mr. President, put a duty on hides and you would hear the New England slogan much louder and more ferocious than it has been on the Venezuelan question. You would smell powder then in this hall and hear the hurtling of bullets. Put a duty on hides, and immediately the spirit of the Pilgrim fathers would be aroused, and they would march to victory or to death. [Laughter.]

I repeat my assertion, that the report of that committee contained an argument for a duty on hides, and the bill itself did not contain any such duty.

The Senator from Ohio tells us that it is the fault of the Wilson bill that there is an increased importation of hides. Let me ask the distinguished Senator, Have not hides been free under both laws? Were they not free under the McKinley law? Are they not equally free under the Wilson law? What change in legislation causes the increased importation? What could be the cause except an increased activity in the leather business caused by the advent of the Democratic party to power? Twenty-four million dollars against ten—really, by the official report it is fifteen to twenty-six, but I care nothing about the figures. It is the fact that with free hides under both laws it is a palpable evasion of all logic to say that the Wilson law is responsible for the increased importation.

But I return to the list of agricultural products. The Senator from Ohio names hides, tobacco, rye, barley, and all the articles in which he can find an increased importation. Why did he not put in sugar? Is not sugar an agricultural product? Ask my friend from Louisiana whether it is or not. Is it not raised in the fields of the South, and the fields of Cuba, now desolated by fire and sword? Is not sugar produced even in the cold climate of Nebraska, and out upon the sunny fields of the Pacific Slope? Yet the Senator evades sugar, because he saw, or the expert who made out his list saw, that it would put the balance against him on the importation of agricultural products if he added sugar to the list he produced in the Senate.

According to official reports, the sugar imports under the last year of the McKinley law were $126,629,061; under the first year of the Wilson law $67,839,995. So, if sugar be added, as it should be, the account of the Senator from Ohio under the last year of the McKinley Act of the importation of his agricultural products would be $178,043,905, and under the Wilson law $175,182,517, making the imports larger under the McKinley law than under the Wilson Act.

WOOL.

But I come now to the most important part of this whole discussion, so far as the comparison of the two laws is concerned. The wool schedule has always been the citadel of undisguised and unlimited protection. Strike out the wool schedule and you strike out the element of vitality from the protective policy of the Republican party. In 1893, a year of immense importations and exports—and I ask the attention of the Senate to it—we imported of woolen fabrics $36,987,904. The duties under the McKinley Act were $36,457,582—a duty of 100 per cent within the shadow of a fraction. That was the ultima thule of protection; that was the Arcadia to which all protectionists go—100 per cent, making the importer pay upon the goods which he imported an equal amount with the value of the goods themselves. I said in the debate upon the tariff bill, and have repeated it a hundred times in speeches to the people, that if the Wilson law did nothing else it drew the line between protection for protection's sake and the imposition of duties for revenue. I never approved that law in all its features, as the world knows; I took it because I thought it was better than the McKinley Act, and on that ground alone, but not as a fair revenue measure or one that I would have drawn.

One thing in the speech of the Senator from Ohio I approved, and that was his frank declaration that he had never voted for a tariff bill that met his full approval. I never did, and never expect to. To make a tariff bill you must give and take. This country is now so large and its interests are so immense, and even antagonistic, that without concessions, mutually made, no legislation can be had from the National Congress. Demagogues and people almost unworthy to cast a ballot may demand of Congress unanimity. Whenever Congress becomes unanimous upon a subject like the tariff, Congress will be dishonest, and the elementary representative features of our Government will have been eliminated.

I voted for the Wilson bill because I could do no better, but I declared then, and have repeated everywhere, that if there had been nothing else in the Wilson law, I was glad it had been enacted, because it threw down the gage of battle on free wool distinctly, emphatically, and unequivocally as between protection for protection's sake and the imposition of import duties for revenue.

The contention of the Democratic party in making the wool schedule was that free wool would not only increase the price of the domestic article to the producer, but would lower the price of woolen fabrics and make them of better texture and would in-

crease the prosperity of the woolen mills. Our Republican friends accepted that gauge and they declared that free wool would lower the price of domestic wool, close the mills, and bring disaster upon the people of the United States. That was their unequivocal declaration.

Mr. President, I believed then, and can prove now, that free wool has done more for the woolgrowers of the country and for the woolen mills of the country than any legislation that the Republican party has ever enacted.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. VEST. Oh, yes, although I should prefer the Senator would answer me when I get through.

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall not interrupt the Senator again, but I should like to remind him that the industry of woolen manufacturing in the United States was never in such an unsatisfactory condition as it is at the present time.

Mr. VEST. We shall see about that. I have great respect for the Senator from Rhode Island—except in politics. [Laughter.] I must state to him frankly that I can not trust him on this question. He comes here poisoned and prejudiced with his protection ideas, and he makes a specialty of this tariff business, which he has a perfect right to do legitimately. I do not complain of that, but I do most emphatically repudiate his opinions, and I do not dispute the fact that his statements are perfectly honest, but they are not supported by official reports, and I shall undertake to prove it.

I say the price of wool in this country has increased under the Wilson law, notwithstanding the assertion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL]. I say that the woolen mills are prosperous, and that they have had a year's prosperity such as they never had before, notwithstanding the statement made the other day by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] that the mills of New England were on the verge of bankruptcy.

I have here the report of the Woolgrowers' Association, of which the shepherd king of Ohio, Mr. Lawrence, is president. He repudiates the McKinley law on wool and the Wilson law, and says they are both antagonistic to the interests of the woolgrower. He is not satisfied with 11, 22, and 33 cents upon the three grades of wool, which is given him by the McKinley law; but now comes to Congress for 12, 24, and 36. If we give him that, next year he would be here for 14, 28, and 42. He would never be satisfied with the increase. He says the McKinley law was a sad mistake and did not protect the woolgrower. He declares that the Wilson law was murderous and ruinous in its effect, and the House bill sent to us now is a mere fraud and pretense of protection and will do no good to the woolgrowers of this country. In this report, which is Senate Document 17, and forms the basis of the wool speech of the Senator from Oregon, a comparison is made between the last year under the McKinley law and the first year under the Wilson law, and the conclusion is drawn that wool has declined, as if any sane man in this country denied it. Wool has been declining since 1881. It declined all through Harrison's Administration under the McKinley law, and declined more rapidly than it did at any preceding period, as I shall show from figures prepared and brought to the Senate by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] himself.

Would any fair man who was fit to sit upon a jury or to be heard in a court of justice pretend that it was any test between the two laws, the McKinley law and the Wilson law, to take the market under the last year of the McKinley law and then the first year under the Wilson law, and say that wool had continued to decline? Would it not be the only fair test to take one year under the McKinley law and then one year under the Wilson law—a different system and different legislation—and compare the effect? What honest man would pretend to do anything else? Now let us see what has been the result of the legislation of the Republican party on wool. I said I would read from statistics furnished by the Senator from Rhode Island. Here is an extract from his speech republished with a blare of trumpets in the Wool and Cotton Reporter and sent by the thousand all over this country to the woolgrowers. The Senator furnished this table. I will ask the Secretary to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Year.	Price of fine Ohio fleece, scoured.	Year.	Price of fine Ohio fleece, scoured.
1881	$0.95½	1889	$0.73½
1882	.90½	1890	.73½
1883	.86	1891	.70½
1884	.80½	1892	.63
1885	.71½	1893	.55
1886	.74	January, 1894	.50
1887	.73½	March 1, 1894	.45½
1888	.68		

Mr. VEST. That table, taken from the speech of the Senator from Rhode Island, delivered June 15, 1894, shows a decline in wool, XX Ohio, scoured, from 1881 and during all the years when the McKinley Act was in force, and the decline, according to the president of the Woolgrowers' Association, was caused by the decline in the price of wool all over the world and, he says, also by a decline in prices produced by the single gold standard. However palatable that may be to the Senator from Ohio, that is what his constituent says in regard to the cause of the fall in the price of wool everywhere.

But I proceed now to institute a fair comparison between the operations of the two laws. In September, 1891, about one year after the McKinley Act took effect, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia XX wool was worth in the Boston market from 30 to 31 cents a pound; in October, 1892, the same grade was worth in the same market 28 to 29 cents, being a fall of 2 cents per pound under one year of the McKinley Act. Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia X wool was worth September, 1891, in the Boston market, 29 to 30 cents a pound; in October, 1892, one year afterwards, under the McKinley law, it was worth in the same market 27 to 27½ cents. In September, 1891, No. 1 was worth in the Boston market 35 to 36 cents, and a year afterwards it was worth 32½ to 33 cents. In September, 1891, fine unwashed was worth in the Boston market 21 to 22 cents; in October, 1892, a year afterwards, it was worth 19 to 20 cents, and so on. I here insert the table, which is as follows:

WOOL.

In September, 1891, about one year after the McKinley bill took effect, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia XX was worth in the Boston market 30 to 31 cents.

In October, 1892, the same grade was worth in the same market 28 to 29 cents, being a fall of 2 cents a pound.

Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia X was worth in September, 1891, in the Boston market, 29 to 30 cents.

In October, 1892, it was worth in the same market 27 to 27½.

In September, 1891, No. 1 was worth in the Boston market 35 to 36 cents, and No. 2, 33 cents.

In October, 1892, No. 1 was worth in the same market 32½ to 33 cents, and No. 2, 31½ to 32 cents.

In September, 1891, fine unwashed was worth in the Boston market 21 to 22 cents.

In October, 1892, it was worth 19 to 20 cents.

In the Boston market in September, 1891, Michigan, New York, and New England was worth 27 cents.

In October, 1892, it was worth 25 to 26 cents.

In September, 1891, Oregon (scoured) was worth in the Boston market from 56 to 58 cents.

In October, 1892 it was worth 53 to 56 cents.

In September, 1891, Texas (scoured) was worth in the Boston market 60 to 62 cents.

In October, 1892, 56 to 58 cents.

These returns are taken from the official bulletin of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers for 1891 and 1892–93. This was under the McKinley law. Now, I ask your attention to the operation of the Wilson Act. In September, 1894, immediately after the passage of the Wilson Act, XX wool, the same quality of Ohio wool, was worth in the Boston market 18 to 19 cents; December 19, 1895, it was worth in the same market 19 to 21 cents. Fine, unwashed, was worth in September, 1894, 12 to 13 cents; it was worth a year afterwards, in December, 1895, 12 to 14 cents. Fine, unmerchantable, was worth in September, 1894, 13 to 15 cents; December 19, 1895, it was worth 14 to 15 cents, showing a gradual improvement in prices during one year under the Wilson law. These figures are taken from the American Wool and Cotton Reporter for December 19, 1895, which I have and can produce if necessary.

Mr. President, we have been told here that the Wilson Act assassinated wool, and I see from the returns of protection papers, which never breathe a sentiment in favor of my opinions upon the tariff question, that the price of domestic wool has gone up in the United States; and, in addition to that, I can prove from the same sources that the woolen mills were never so prosperous as they are to-day and have been during the year 1895. The official reports show—and I have a volume of them—that we have consumed in 1895 540,000,000 pounds of wool, more than was ever consumed in the most prosperous wool year in the history of this country. What did the manufacturers do with it? Did they eat it? Did they burn it? Did they store it? They manufactured it, and the consumption of wool in the United States, foreign and domestic, has been fabulously increased.

We have heard from interested protective sources that sheep have been butchered by the thousand. It is true. Who caused it? The shepherd kings of Ohio, Mr. Lawrence and his colleagues, who, when we passed the Wilson bill, went among their people and said, "These incompetent Democrats have rendered your sheep worthless; cut their throats and pile them on the market," and some friends of mine in Missouri slaughtered their whole flocks, and sold them at 50 cents and 37½ cents a head, against my protest and that of "other deluded and incompetent Democrats." To-day they are praying for the sheep to come back from that shadowy land to which sheep and men alike hasten.

Mr. President, I have here a collection which my strength and

the patience of the Senate would not permit me to read, taken from protective papers—and I have brought nothing here from my own side of this question if I know it—showing the result of one year under the legislation of the Wilson bill. Here is an extract from the American Wool and Cotton Reporter in its annual review, which I will ask the Secretary to read, and will promise not to read much more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

BOSTON, *December 24, 1895.*

The American Wool and Cotton Reporter will say, December 26, of the wool trade:

"The year which five days hence will have rounded out its course has been, on the whole, a signally eventful one. In the volume of sales it has broken all previous records. The amount of foreign and domestic wool disposed of in the three principal markets up to December 12, 1895, amounted to 347,060,105 pounds, as compared with 261,667,229 pounds December 15, 1892. It will be also memorable for an unprecedented development of the worsted industry and for the lead which combed yarn fabrics have held in the woolen dry goods trade, notably in cloths for men's wear. And, finally, it has seen some tardy recovery in values of the staple from the depression of two years ago.

"Some idea of the recovery in values of domestic wool during the year may be obtained by a comparison of prices December 21, 1895, with rates January 1. At the earlier date, Ohio XX and above was quoted at 17 to 18 cents; at the latter, 19 to 20 cents, a XXX selling at 21 cents; Ohio and Michigan X, in January, 15 to 17 cents, in December, 16 to 18 cents; No. 1 wools, at the commencement of the year, 18 to 20 cents; at the close, 20 to 22 cents; one-half and three-eighths unwashed combing, 15 to 16 cents in January; 16 to 18 cents in December; three-eighths and one-fourth blood combing, 16 to 17 cents early in the year; 17 to 19 cents at the close. Fine medium Wyoming and Utah, in January, 10 to 12 cents; in December, 12 to 13 cents; eastern Oregon, in January, 11½ to 12 cents; in December, 12 to 13½ cents. Stocks of domestic wool December 21, 1895, in the three principal markets, amount in toto to 53,726,588 pounds.

"Stocks of foreign wool at the same points aggregate 27,241,200 pounds.

"The total supply of domestic wool in all the markets of the country, together with unreported lots, will amount to 101,726,238 pounds, which, combined with the quantity of foreign wool in the three great seaboard markets, will make the grand total (about) 123,967,438 pounds."

Mr. VEST. I hold in my hand a statement from the American Wool and Cotton Reporter as to the number of mills in the United States in 1895, which shows a vast increase in every department of the woolen industry. I will insert it in my remarks and will not weary the Senate by reading it.

The extract referred to is as follows:

MILL BUILDING—NEW ENTERPRISES LAUNCHED THE PAST SIX MONTHS AND DURING 1895—COMPILED FROM THE REPORTER'S WEEKLY BULLETIN OF NEW ENTERPRISES.

The past six months has seen the undertaking of the construction of many textile mills that will stand for years to come as monuments of what brains, energy, and money can produce in these days of active competition. While the last half of the year 1895 has not such a brilliant record as regards the construction of textile plants as the first six months can boast, still it is a record to be proud of, and can not but demonstrate the healthy, steady, and rapid growth of the textile industry of the country, thereby opening more widely a field for the investment of the savings of the people and furnishing employment, either directly or indirectly, for thousands of persons.

The last half of 1895 has seen 156 new mill enterprises set on foot, ranging in importance from small spinning mills in the South to large and imposing affairs, such as the new mill of the Berkshire Manufacturing Company, Adams, Mass., which is to be 440 by 118½ feet, five stories, the equipment consisting of 80,000 spindles and 2,100 looms, and the whole costing in the neighborhood of $1,000,000. As compared with the previous six months there have been 45 mills less put in way of construction in the half year just closed. The number of mill enterprises set on foot during the first half of 1895 was something exceptional, and the fact that the succeeding six months did not hold the pace should be no cause for alarm. The year 1895 will long be remembered as one of the most active in the annals of textile-mill construction the country has yet seen, no less than 357 new enterprises having been launched within that period, being one more than during that memorable and prosperous year, 1892. The past year shows a gain over 1894 of 94 mill plants, there having been undertaken in the latter year 263 new enterprises; in 1893, 279, and in 1892, 356. In comparison with the last half of 1894, the past six months shows a gain of 9 mills.

The cotton mills hold the palm in matter of numbers, the number of new concerns being 73, exactly the same as in the previous six months. Next come knitting mills with 42, or 15 less than in the previous six months; woolen, 23, also a loss of 15; miscellaneous, 11, a loss of 6, and silk, 7, a loss of 9.

The number of new enterprises undertaken during the past six months, as compared with the previous six months, and for the past year, as compared with the previous one, are as follows:

	Last half 1895.	First half 1895.	Year 1895.	Year 1894.
Woolen	23	38	61	45
Cotton	73	73	146	101
Knitting	42	57	99	69
Silk	7	16	23	21
Miscellaneous	11	17	28	27
Total	156	201	357	263

North Carolina once more heads the list with 32 new mills, a total for the year of 63; then comes Pennsylvania with 17, or 46 for the year; next, New York with 16, or 39 for the year; then Massachusetts, who boasts of 15, or 34 for the year; then Georgia with 14, or 28 for the year; then South Carolina with 10, the total number for the year being 32; Rhode Island has 7, with a total for the year of 12; also Alabama with 7, or 12 for the year. The remainder are scattered among 17 other States in numbers from 1 to 5.

The South is attracting large amounts of Northern capital, and deservedly so, but at the same time the textile interests of the North are not being neglected, but are steadily absorbing large sums of money that is ever looking for safe and profitable investment. One noticeable feature, which can not but show that cotton manufacturers have confidence of profits yet to accrue from the manufacture of textile goods, is the fact that several concerns already operating large mills have seen fit to erect additional mills, thereby largely increasing their capacity, in some instances to the doubling point.

Manufacturers generally are fully alive to the importance of the improved facilities for the production of their goods, and demonstrate this fact by the way they have added new machinery. Additions, both in the way of buildings and machinery, have been the order of the day, many of them being of such size as to approach the importance of new mills. Lots of worn out and antiquated machinery have given way to the newest and most improved that money can buy, with a view to producing the maximum amount of goods at a minimum cost, this being made absolutely necessary by the keenness of competition.

Mr. VEST. In 1895, under a year of the Wilson law, there have been constructed in the United States 61 woolen mills against 45 in the last year of the McKinley law. How do our friends on the other side of the Chamber explain this disparity? How do they account for the fact that this industry, which has been "murdered by the Wilson bill," is now putting up new mills, to say nothing of the vast improvements spoken of in the article I hold in my hand? I have here the annual review from the Wool and Cotton Reporter of the mill buildings in the United States, giving the number of new woolen mills and cotton mills in every State of the Union. It shows the figures which I have named in the relative proportion of 61 to 45.

The article referred to is as follows:

NEW MILLS.

New York.

Albany—Kendall Knitting Company, knit goods; capital, $50,000.
Brooklyn—Alloa knitting mills, athletic knit goods.
Brooklyn—Wingfield Manufacturing Company, woolen goods; capital, $60,000.
Elmira—Jennings Knitting Mills, rib knit goods; employ 250 hands.
Gloversville—Gloversville Knitting Company, all kinds of wearing apparel; capital, $50,000.
Hollywood Silk Manufacturing Company.
Hoosick Falls—Clark & Reif Knitting Mills Company, knit goods.
Ilion—Sterling Mills, knit goods; capital, $30,000.
New York—Gudebrod Bros. Company, spool and sewing silk; capital, $40,000.
Potsdam—Potsdam Knitting Company; capital, $50,000.
Schenectady—Herman Ury & Company, knit goods.
South Bethlehem—Silk Mill; 240 by 145 feet, with 80-foot wing.
St. Johnsville—Union Knitting Company; capital, $10,000; employ 40 hands.
Valatie Knitting Mill.
Whitehall—Keith Knitting Mill Company; capital, $12,000.
Yonkers Carpet Mill, Haleyon, Skinner & Co; 25 looms; 100 by 50 and 85 by 50 feet; dyehouse, 100 by 30 feet.

Massachusetts.

Adams—Berkshire Manufacturing Company; 440 by 118½ feet, five stories; 80,000 spindles, 2,100 looms. Estimated cost, $1,000,000.
Easthampton—Sawyer & Wolff, new two-story brick factory, 98 by 54 feet; 20 new Jacquard looms.
East Taunton—Corr Manufacturing Company; cotton mill for manufacture of fancy goods; 40,000 spindles; capital, $400,000.
Fall River—Barnard Manufacturing Company; additional mill; capacity, 30,000 spindles, doubling the company's capacity.
Holyoke—W. Skinner & Sons, silk manufacturers; weaving mill.
Hudson—$15,000 worsted plant, W. F. Brigham & Co., projectors.
Lawrence—Crescent Worsted Mills; brick mill, 59 by 89 feet, two stories.
Lowell Stocking Factory, James Gordon, proprietor.
Natick—Ladies' underwear, Rand Bros.
New Bedford—Dartmouth Mill; 821 by 100 feet, brick, with all improvements.
New Bedford Cotton Mill; capital, $350,000.
North Adams—Arnold Print Works; three stories, 200 by 75 feet.
North Chelmsford—George C. Moore; two-story wool-washing building, 100 by 50 feet; new 100-horsepower engine.
Spencer—Massasoit Knitting Company, knit goods.
West Andover—Mill for the purpose of extracting grease from wool, etc

Georgia.

Atlanta—Atlanta Hosiery Company; 25 machines to start with.
Atlanta—Exposition Cotton Mills; 20,000 spindles.
Atlanta—Piedmont Cotton Mill Company; capital, $200,000.
Athens—Cotton mill; Electric Cotton Mill Company; capital, $50,000.
Augusta—J. C. Wernig; underwear factory.
Brunswick—Knitting mill, to employ 60 hands.
Cedartown Manufacturing Company; 3,500 spindles; capital, $500,000.
Douglasville—Eden Park Cotton Mills Company; hosiery yarns; 3,500 spindles; capital stock, $30,000.
Heardmont—Pearl Cotton Mill; manufacture seine twine; 3,000 spindles.
La Grange—Dixie Cotton Mills; capacity, 15,000 spindles; mill 100 by 402 feet; two stories.
Marietta—Marietta Paper Manufacturing Company; three-story brick cotton-waste factory.
Monroe Cotton Mill; 5,000 spindles; two stories; manufacture cloth and yarn; capital stock, $100,000.
Poulan Cotton Mill; 180 looms.
Winder Cotton Mill.

Ohio.

Cleveland—Miner Worsted Company; capital, $400,000.
Cleveland—Turner Worsted Company; capital stock, $400,000.
Toledo—Knitting Factory, 50 by 100 feet, Joseph Roth & Co.
Toledo—Knitting Mill, to employ 300 to 400 hands.

New Jersey.

Elizabeth—Yates & Co.; carpets; capital, $250,000.
Paterson Wool Extract Mill, James E. Daily, proprietor.
Pompton Lakes—Silk throwing plant.
Riverside—Hosiery Mill; W. F. Tanbel; 200 by 50 feet, two stories; engine house 45 by 50 feet.

Rhode Island.

Centerville—$500,000 cotton mill.
East Pleasant View—J. J. Kenyon, cotton manufacturer; four-story factory, 300 by 50 feet; boiler and engine house.
Fiskeville—Mill for bleaching, dyeing, and finishing bookbinding and window-shade cloth; 30,000 spindles; capital, $1,000,000.
Lonsdale—Goddard Bros., for the manufacture of cotton cloth.

Scituate—Mill to manufacture ramie yarn; capital stock, $250,000.
Woonsocket—Simson & Kirkaldy, worsted; new one-story brick mill, 220 by 110 feet; 50 looms.
Woonsocket Worsted Yarn Mill, Glenark Knitting Company; two-stories, 200 by 80 feet.

Missouri.

Bowling Green—Tinker Woolen Mill Manufacturing Company; product will be wool shoddies, felt boots, etc.; capital, $25,000.

Virginia.

Chesterfield—W. D. Craig Knitting Mill.
Danville—Dan River Power and Manufacturing Company; cotton mill, 90 by 400 feet, five stories; 40,000 spindles.
Fountain Hill—E. Lipps; silk mill, 240 by 145 feet.
Winchester—Lewis Jones Knitting Company; new two-story mill, 150 by 40 feet; 250 machines; to employ 250 hands.
Riverside—Riverside Mills Company; cotton mill, 40,000 spindles, 150 looms, 90 by 400 feet, five stories.

Maine.

Canaan—$60,000 woolen mill.

Illinois.

Chicago—Great Northern Manufacturing and Woolen Company; capital stock, $2,500.
Rockford—Rockford Cotton and Warp Company; capital, $10,000.
Springfield—Columbian Knitting Company; knit goods; capital stock, $10,000.

Alabama.

Alabama City—25,000-spindle mill, Dwight Manufacturing Company.
Anniston—Afro-Alabama Cotton Mill Company; capital, $100,000.
Birmingham—5,000-spindle cotton mill; J. B. Cotton and associates.
Decatur—5,000-spindle mill.
New Orleans—New Orleans Cotton Manufacturing Company; capital stock, $100,000.
Prattville—20,000-spindle mill, Autauga Manufacturing Company.
Selma—O. A. Hobdy; cotton-rope mill.

Connecticut.

Greenwich—London Manufacturing Company; to manufacture and scour wool; capital, $100,000.
Newton—Sandy Hook Woolen Company; capital, $5,000.
Putnam—John A. Dody Corporation; silk goods; capital, $12,000.

Texas.

Austin Cotton Mill, $150,000 capital.
Marble Falls Cotton Mill.

Washington.

Spokane—Post Falls Woolen Mill Company; capital $100,000; Eugene Danzel and associates.

Mississippi.

Stonewall Cotton Mill Company, 10,000 spindles.

Tennessee.

Sweetwater—Mascot Knitting Mill.

Vermont.

Bennington—Lyons Bros.; product, yarns or threads for knit goods; employing 50 to 75 hands.
Winooski Worsted Company; brick mill, two-story and basement, 200 by 60 feet; 104 looms.

Indiana.

Michigan City—Lakeside Knitting Company; $50,000 capital; two sets of cards and mules.

Arkansas.

Morrillton Woolen Mill; yarn, flannel, jeans, and blankets.

North Carolina.

Big Island—Cotton mill to cost about $1,000,000 with equipment; Col. Frank Cope, of Asheville, prime mover.
Big Island, near Rutherfordton—Large cotton mill; R. R. Haynes is interested.
Buffalo Shoals Cotton Mill—Capital stock, $100,000.
Charlotte—Ada Cotton Mill; additional mill for weaving, costing $50,000.
Concord—$80,000 cotton mill.
Durham Shoals—Large cotton mill; cost, $200,000.
Fayetteville—$100,000 bleachery.
Fayetteville—Cotton mill; Messrs. Holt.
Franklinton—Sterling Cotton Mills.
Gastonia—G. A. Gray; 5,000-spindle cotton mill.
Goldsboro—Wayne Cotton Mills; 5,000 spindles; capital, $100,000.
Greensboro—Proximity Manufacturing Company; capital, $200,000.
Greensboro—Revolution Cotton Mill Company; capital, $200,000.
Henderson—$100,000 cotton mill; 9,050 spindles; fine yarns.
Henderson—8,000-spindle mill; Henderson Cotton Mill Company; capital stock, $125,000.
Hillsboro Cotton Mill; Webb & Co., proprietors; 5,000 spindles.
Island Ford—Riverside Cotton Mill, 75 by 165 feet; one story.
Island Ford Cotton Mill; 5,000 spindles; capital, $50,000.
Liverpool—120-loom mill.
Lockville—Lockville Cotton Mill Co.; capital, $450,000.
Lumberton—Cotton Mill; B. Goodwin and associates.
Maydon—Mayo Falls Cotton Mills; capital, $300,000.
Newton—Cotton Mill.
New Sterling—Riverside Cotton Mills; to produce yarns.
Pine Bluff—Cotton Mill; 3,000 spindles.
Raleigh—Hosiery yarn mill, 100 by 125 feet, three stories; 10,800 spindles.
Raleigh—Cotton mill on Crabtree Creek for weaving.
Salem—$100,000-cotton mill.
Salisbury—Cotton mill; capital stock, $60,000.
Spray—10,000-spindle cotton mill.
Weldon—12,000-spindle mill.
Weldon—Cotton; 254 by 100 feet, four stories; 30,000 spindles.

Pennsylvania.

Avon—Light & Deer, proprietors; knit goods.
Chester—Hosiery Mill, two stories; Thomas Clough & Sons, proprietors.
Clifton Heights—H. A. O'Neill & Co.; shoddy mill.
Moosic—Moosic Knitting Company; cotton-ribbed underwear; $25,000 capital.
Perkiomen—John Schull; hosiery mill.
Philadelphia—Caleb J. Milne; cotton mill, six stories.
Philadelphia—Cotton and woolen goods mill; four stories, 40 by 130 feet, three-story addition.
Philadelphia—Campbell Cotton and Woolen Mills; three stories, 75 by 150 feet; one-story addition, 50 by 50 and 50 by 150 feet.
Philadelphia—Five-story shoddy mill; W. & J. Ford.
Philadelphia—Frankford Manufacturing Company; cotton goods; three stories, 150 by 80 feet.
Philadelphia—Aramingo Hosiery Company; capital, $10,000; Alexander Liggett and associates.
Philadelphia—Southdown Knitting Company; for the production of underwear.
Philadelphia—Leicester Mills Company; textile fabrics; $500,000 capital; Everett Brown and associates.
Royersford Hosiery Mill, to employ 100 hands; three stories, 40 by 90 feet; C. P. Fritz and Mr. Krause.
Schuylkill Haven—E. L. Thomas, knitting mill.
Scranton Knitting Mill.
Spring City Knitting Mill; 125 by 90 feet, three stories; P. C. Fritz, proprietor.

Michigan.

Alpena—Alpena Woolen Mill; capital stock, $7,500.
Ann Harbor—Hay & Todd, knitting mill.
Michigan City Woolen Mill.

New Hampshire.

Claremont—Yarn, knit goods, etc.; Bailey Manufacturing Company; capital, $25,000.
Enfield—New yarn mill, to employ 100 hands.
Manchester—Manchester Mills; large weaving mill, costing over half a million dollars.

South Carolina.

Abbeville—Abbeville Cotton Mill; additional mill, capacity 10,000 spindles.
Aiken Knitting Mill.
Anderson—$250,000 cotton mill, R. S. Hill and associates; Anderson Cotton Mills, addition at cost of $300,000.
Cheraw Hosiery Mill, J. T. McNair and W. H. Willard, proprietors; employ 100 hands.
Factory Mills—Marlboro Manufacturing Company; cotton; capital, $40,000; A. T. Manship and associates.
Greenwood Knitting Mill.
Greers—Victor Manufacturing Company; cotton; capital stock, $50,000.
Lancaster—Cotton mill to cost $100,000.
Spartanburg—Spartan Mill, to cost $500,000.

Maryland.

Cumberland Hosiery Mill, Harry Thompson, projector.
Williamsport Hosiery Mill.

ENLARGEMENTS AND IMPROVEMENTS.

Georgia.

Augusta Factory, Augusta; improvements costing $70,000.
Crown Cotton Mills, Dalton; 10,000 additional spindles.
Eden Park Cotton Mills, Douglasville; 1,500 spindles.
Griffin Cotton Mill, Atlanta; two-story brick addition.
Hamburger Cotton Company, Columbus; to double capacity.
Harmony Grove Mills; addition and machinery, doubling capacity.
High Shoals Manufacturing Company; machinery.
Star Thread Company, Athens; 2,500 additional spindles.
Union Cotton Mills, Lafayette; 3,072 spindles, 84 looms.
Warwick Mills, Augusta; 1,700 spindles and 150 looms.

Maine.

Anderson, Lewis & Co., Skowhegan, power house, brick, 30 by 40 feet.
Androscoggin mill, Lewiston, addition, 250 hands.
Campbell & Son, D. R., Sangerville, 100-horsepower boiler.
East Pond Woolen Company, Newport, 30-inch wheel.
East Wilton Woolen Mills, enlarged.
Edwards Manufacturing Company, Augusta, $40,000 worth of machinery.
Goodall Worsted Company, Sanford, weave room, two stories, 124 by 55 feet.
Indian Springs Woolen Mill, Madison, new 100-horsepower boiler and boiler house.
Lewiston Bleachery and Dye Works, seven large boilers.
Pondicherry Mills, Bridgton, pumps, water tower, etc.
Sanford Mills Company, addition, 25 by 40 feet, two stories; center wing, 80 by 50 feet, two stories.
Sangerville Woolen Company, boiler and addition to boiler house.
Springvale Cotton Mill, 5,000 spindles, sateens and twills.
Vassalboro Woolen Mills, addition.
Worumbo Manufacturing Company, Lisbon Falls, set of cards, bolette.

New Hampshire.

Aiken Hoisery Mills, Franklin Falls; 67 new knitting machines, 75 looms, and finishing machinery.
Amory Manufacturing Company, Manchester; humidifier.
Bartlett & Sons, P.; dyehouse, 32 by 28 feet.
Belmont; mill increased capacity by adding machinery.
Cocheco Manufacturing Company, Dover; water wheel, etc.; in mill No. 1, new steam plant.
Collins, John S., Gilsum; additional story.
Elm Woolen Mills, Tilton; 12 new looms.
Great Falls Cotton Manufacturing Company, Somersworth; 50-foot addition to boiler house, and 6 new boilers.
Harrisville Woolen Mill; water wheel, granite top to dam.
Hillsboro Woolen Company, Hillsboro Bridge; 2 sets of cards.
Mascoma Flannel Company, Lebanon; 60-inch shear.
Monadnock Blanket Mill, Marlboro; additional story.
Nashua Manufacturing Company; addition to be used as a bleachery, cards, and drawing frames.
Riverside Mill, Laconia; 25-foot addition.

Massachusetts.

Adams Bros. Manufacturing Company, Adams; addition to ell.
Algonquin Printing Company, Fall River; three-story building, 90 by 60 feet; printing, bleaching, and finishing machinery.
American Print Works, Fall River; 50-foot addition.
Appleton Manufacturing Company, Lowell; addition, 100 by 120 feet; seven stories.
Arlington Mills, Lawrence; 40 combing machines, burling room 300 by 30 feet, of wood; wool-drying machinery.
Arlington Yarn Mills, Lawrence; cards and combs.
Barnard Mill, Fall River; new weave shed and 13,000 spindles.
Beaver Mills, Adams; three-story addition, 200 by 75 feet, 24,000 spindles, 600 looms; two-story addition, 150 by 75 feet, boiler, 36 cards, 21 speeders, pickers, drawing and combing machinery.
Blackinton Woolen Mill, water wheel.

Bondville Dye and Bleach Works; addition, 170 by 70 feet, three stories; will double capacity.
Boott Corporation's No. 6 Mill, Lowell; 6 drawing frames; additional story on mill facing Bridge street.
Boston Duck Company, Bondville; 2 pair water wheels, 350 horsepower each; cards, slubbers, spinning frames, electric plant.
Byfield Woolen-Blanket Mill; one-story addition and fire-hydrant service.
Carew Manufacturing Company, South Hadley Falls; addition, rotary bleach boiler, steam boiler, and engine.
Chace Mills, Fall River; weave shed, the improvement costing $300,000.
Clinton Worsted Mills; dye house 40 by 35 feet, two and a half stories; 35 looms, new boiler, and iron smokestack.
Cohannet Mills, Taunton; four-story storehouse, 40 by 80 feet.
Cole, Senior & Co., Medway; drier.
Conanicut Mills, Fall River; new looms.
Cordis Mills, Millbury; 24 looms.
Dartmouth Manufacturing Company, New Bedford; 10,000 additional spindles.
Dodgeville Mills, Dodgeville; spools.
Durfee Mills, Fall River; additional building, one story, 280 by 96 feet, of stone; 123 looms.
Dwight Cotton Manufacturing Company, Chicopee; increase of spinning capacity, additional story to slasher mill, broad looms.
Eagle Lake Woolen Mill, Jeffersonville; boiler house and boiler.
East Village Mill, Webster; sprinklers.
Eclipse Mill, North Adams; 36 cards, drawing and combing machinery, 21 speeders, 5 pickers; addition, 150 by 75 feet, 2 stories; boiler, 24,000 spindles, 600 looms.
Endrick Woolen Company, Great Barrington; mules, pickers, gig, napper, water wheel, electric lights, etc.
Everett Mills, Lawrence; cloth room.
Fall River Bleachery; 60-foot addition and additional story.
Flint Mill, Fall River, 1,250-horsepower engine, new machinery.
French & Ward, West Stoughton; knitting machines, dresser and spooler.
Grant Yarn Company, Fitchburg; three-story addition, 140 by 75 feet, 15,000 spindles.
Greylock Mills, North Adams; 5 pickers, 25 cards, spooling and warping machinery.
Globe Yarn Mills, Fall River; new machinery.
Grinnell Manufacturing Corporation, New Bedford; building for weaving, two stories.
Hampden Bleachery, Chicopee Falls; brick addition, 30 by 65 feet, two stories; cost $10,000.
Hamilton Mills, Southbridge; system of sprinklers.
Hargraves Mill No. 2, Fall River; addition to increase productive capacity 5,000 spindles.
Hayward, Harry T., Franklin; shoddy pickers.
Hebron Manufacturing Company, Dodgeville; 10 pair mules, 12 spoolers, 8 warpers, 6 spinning frames, 40 looms, 275-horsepower engine, steam pump, etc.
Hubbardston Woolen Mill; to increase capacity.
Kerr Thread Company, Fall River; humidifier.
Lawrence Dye Works; addition to plant.
Lewis, E. Frank, wool scourer; Lawrence, wool drier.
Linwood Mills Company, North Adams; two-story addition, 30 by 60 feet; skein dyeing machine.
Lowell Manufacturing Company; looms.
Lyman Cotton Mills, Holyoke; 30,000 spindles, 600 looms, boilers.
Massachusetts Mills, Lowell; brick building, 75 by 100 feet; two-story addition, 138 by 85 feet.
McWilliams Bros., Hubbardston, woolen manufacturers; enlargement.
Methuen Company's Mills; repairs and machinery.
Millbury Cotton Mill; additional two stories to brick mill; 14 spinning frames, 6 fly frames, etc.
Millbury Woolen Mill; addition.
Nonotuck Silk Company, Florence; extensive additions.
Norfolk Woolen Company, Unionville; two-story brick dry house, 20 by 40 feet.
North Adams Manufacturing Company; new looms, mules, boiler, and boiler house.
Northboro Woolen Mills, Chapinsville; 12 looms.
Otis Company, Three Rivers; addition to stock house, 80 by 60 feet, three stories.
Pemberton Mills, Lawrence; spinning frames.
Perry, L. D., Webster; addition, 20 by 36 feet, two stories; set of cards, mules, engine.
Pontoosuc Woolen Manufacturing Company, Pittsfield; boiler house and 3 boilers; two-story wool house, 100 by 60 feet; designing room, 6 sets of cards, and spinning machinery.
Ray Woolen Mill, North Bellingham; 4 rub machines.
Ray, William F., Unionville; brick addition.
Rhodes Warp Company, John, Millbury; addition, 50 by 36 feet, two stories; new dressing machine.
Sanford Spinning Company, Fall River; machinery.
Sayles & Jenks, Warren; engine.
Seaconnet Mills, Fall River; machinery.
Star Worsted Mills, Fitchburg; brick addition, two stories, 50 by 35 feet; drying machine, 6 spinning frames.
Stevens & Sons Company, M. T.; additional machinery in Haverhill and Franklin mills.
Taft, Murdock & Co., Caryville; 3 shoddy pickers.
Tecumseh Mills, Fall River; weave shed to increase capacity from 50,000 to 70,000 spindles.
Thayer Woolen Company, North Oxford; iron water tower; capacity, 7,500 gallons.
Thorndike Company; new cards in No. 2 mill and looms in No. 1.
Tremont and Suffolk Corporation, Lowell; addition to No. 6 mill, 191 by 80 feet, five stories; new storehouse.
Valley Woolen Mill, Cherry Valley; new building for dyeing, 80 by 35 feet.
Westport Manufacturing Company; new three-story storehouse, 30 by 40 feet.
Whitin Manufacturing Company, Paul, cotton, Northbridge; brick addition, 200 by 100 feet, four stories, to cost $250,000; looms, 5 boilers, etc., cotton house.
Whittenton Mill, Taunton; brick addition to cloth room; machinery; addition to storehouse; flat revolving cards, etc.
Woods Mill, Jefferson; iron smokestack.

Pennsylvania.

Allegheny Worsted Mills, Thomas Wolstenholme, Sons & Co., Philadelphia; 15 worsted combs, drawing machinery.
Baker, Seth, Philadelphia; 2 power weft looms.
Bloomsburg Carpet Works; four-story brick building for spinning, 54 by 160 feet.
Bowers's Sons, James, shoddies; wool-scouring machine.
Bromily & Burnes, dye and finishing works, Philadelphia; additional story.
Byrne & Parsons, Phœnixville; three-story building, 120 by 48 feet; machinery to double capacity.
Cardington Woolen Mills; 50-horsepower engine.
Campbell & Co., George, Thirty-first and Reed streets, Philadelphia; feeds.
Carlisle Silk Mill; added 7 new machines.
Chester Manufacturing Company; addition, 179 by 200 feet, one story.
Collingwood Mills, Philadelphia; 3 worsted combs and enlarged drawing department.
Continental Worsted Mills, Philadelphia; 5 boilers, 9 cards, spinning, combing, drawing, and twisting machinery.
Coplay Knitting Mill Company; increase capacity one-third.
Craven & Dearnley, Philadelphia, cotton and woolen goods; four-story addition, 50 by 150 feet.
Crozier, Samuel S., Upland; warpers.
Curry, Daniel, carpets, Philadelphia; four-story wing, 24 by 60 feet.
Cutter Silk Manufacturing Company, Bethlehem; 100 looms.
Dunlop's Carpet Mill, Philadelphia; storage addition.
Eddystone Print Works; addition to cost $15,000.
Emmons & Co., Royersford; hosiery, addition, four stories, 125 by 45 feet.
Ford, W. & J., Philadelphia; addition.
Gomersall, A., dye works, Germantown, Philadelphia; machine shop; 40-inch hydro extractor.
Greenwood & Bault, R., Frankford; addition.
Hallstead Textile Company; additional building for weaving and throwing.
Hamill & Co., B., Germantown, Philadelphia; new looms.
Harvey & Son, David, finishing works, Philadelphia; two stories added and three-story addition.
Hazeltine Woolen Mills, North Warren; addition.
Herbert & Jones, Philadelphia; drawing machinery; increasing capacity one-third.
Hetzel & Co., George C., Chester; woolen and worsted goods, dye tub and boiler.
Kauffman & Harley, Mifflintown; two-story addition.
Kelley & Elser, Germantown; cotton hosiery; double capacity.
Kraemer, Henry, Nazareth; seamless hosiery; machinery.
Lackawanna Knitting Mills, Scranton; office and wing, 160 by 50 feet.
Lehigh Manufacturing Company, Philadelphia; curtain machines.
Long, Bro. & Co., James, Philadelphia; 10 Eclipse harness motions.
Lorrimer's Woolen Yarn Dyeing Establishment, Philadelphia; two-story addition, 50 by 150 feet.
Marion Hosiery Mills, Philadelphia; knitting machines.
Moss Rose Manufacturing Company, Philadelphia; 20 looms.
Park Mount Mills Company, Lennie; additions to dyehouse.
Perseverance Knitting Company, Spring City; 6 new machines.
Philadelphia Novelty Company; hammocks, school bags, etc.; extensive improvements.
Pilling & Madley, Philadelphia; new building, 50 by 150 feet, three stories.
Quaker City Dye Works, Philadelphia; new one-story laboratory.
Reynoldsville Woolen Company; self-acting mule.
Sanquoit Manufacturing Company, Scranton; brick addition, five stories, 150 by 50 feet.
Scanlin & Sons, John, cotton goods, Philadelphia; addition, two stories, 45 by 55 feet.
Schadewald, Henry, Philadelphia; 100 quilt looms, engine, etc.
Scholes & Sons, William, carpet-yarn spinners, Philadelphia; four-story addition, 57 by 57 feet.
Simons, F. W., hosiery, Frankford, Philadelphia; additional machinery.
Standard Fast-Black Dye Works, Philadelphia; chroming machine.
Sternberger, S., Philadelphia, shirt manufacturer; washing machine.
Stroudsburg Woolen Mills; brick smokestack, burling machine.
Stroud, D. H., curtains, Philadelphia; additional story.
Thurman, Thomas, Germantown; brick addition, three stories, 50 by 32 feet.
Troth, jr,, Company, William P., Frankford, Philadelphia, tentering machine.
Wallworth & Sons, Upland, shoddy manufacturers; machinery.
Waterloo Manufacturing Company, Philadelphia; capacity increased.
Wilkesbarre Lace Factory; 8,000 spindles and other machinery, increasing capacity 50 per cent.
Wilson Bros., Philadelphia; additional story.
Young, William M., Philadelphia; 4 tape looms.

North Carolina.

Buffalo Manufacturing Company, Cleveland County; water wheel.
Cannon Manufacturing Company, Concord; addition, and 20 tenement houses for operatives.
Caraleigh Cotton Mills; electric-light plant, 200 lights capacity.
Charlotte Cotton Mills; 45 new looms.
Charlotte Hosiery Mills; addition.
Clermont Mills, Newbern; plant enlarged.
Columbia Manufacturing Company, Ramseur; additional machinery.
Commercial Knitting Mills, Durham; additional machinery increasing capacity 25 per cent.
Dilling Mill, Kings Mountain; addition.
Durham Cotton Manufacturing Company; extensive addition.
East Durham Cotton Mills; two-story addition, 51 by 98 feet; employ 300 hands.
Edna Cotton Mills, Reidsville; additional story; additions, one 150 by 100 feet, and another 42 by 60 feet; spinning frames, looms, engine, etc.
Elmira Cotton Mills, Burlington; addition, 100 by 170 feet, two stories, to contain 5,000 spindles.
Empire Plaid Mills, High Point; enlargement of plant.
Enterprise Manufacturing Company, Coleridge; electric lights.
Erwin Cotton Mills, Durham; addition.
Fingerville Manufacturing Company; 1,500 spindles.
Hooper Mills, Mountain Island; addition, doubling capacity picker room.
Lincoln Cotton Mills; electric lights.
Long Shoals Cotton Mills; increase their capacity 2,080 to 5,200 spindles.
Minneola Manufacturing Company, Gibsonville; new engine and boiler, 64 looms, spinning and quilling machinery, electric lights, and sprinklers.
Mooresville Manufacturing Company; 1,250 spinning and 1,050 twisting spindles.
Morganton Cotton Mills; new machinery.
Newton Cotton Mills; 10,000 spindles, engine.
Odell Manufacturing Company, J. M. Bynum; $15,000 worth additional machinery.
Pearl Cotton Mills, Durham; 25 looms.
Pilot Cotton Mills, Raleigh; brick storage warehouse, 50 by 70 feet; 4 cards, 3,000 spindles, and 60 looms.
Raleigh Hosiery Yarn Mill; three-story addition, 100 by 125 feet; 4,600 spindles.
Roberdel Manufacturing Company, Rockingham; turbine wheel, boiler, and sprinklers.
Scotland Neck Cotton Mills, Scotland Neck; dye department.

Singleton Silk Mill, Wadesboro; machinery and electric light plant.
Spencer Mountain Cotton Mill; to double capacity.
Stanley Creek Cotton Mills; capital stock increased $15,000; machinery.
Wayne Cotton Mills, Goldsboro; new machinery.
Wilmington Cotton Mills; weave room, two stories, 75 by 111 feet.

Connecticut.

American Velvet Company, Stonington; looms.
Ashland Knitting Company; additions.
Aspinock Print, Dye, and Bleach Works, Jewett City; new building, 80 by 300 feet, three stories and basement.
Attawaugan Mills, Killingly; 3 pair rope drive mules.
Briggs Manufacturing Company, Voluntown; dye house and cotton house.
Broad Brook Company, Broad Brook; new machinery.
Cheney Bros., silk manufacturers, South Manchester; brick storehouse and machine shop.
Dayville Woolen Company, Killingly; drier.
Dunham Hosiery Mills Company, Naugatuck; automatic sprinklers.
Falls Cotton Mills, Norwich; extensive improvements.
Grosvenor Dale Company, No. 3 Mill; 300 looms to replace others; 40 looms.
Hawthorne Woolen Company, Glenville; 2 sets of cards and engine.
Montville Woolen Company; boiler, pump, heater.
New England Knitting Company, Winsted; three-story addition, boiler.
Regan, James J., Rockville; 8 looms.
Rockville Felting Mill; additional room.
Springfield Manufacturing Company, Rockville; extensive improvements.
Sterling Dyeing and Finishing Company; engine and boiler house, engine.
Uncasville Manufacturing Company; reservoir, two-story dyehouse 100 by 50, engine, drawing frames.
Union Cotton Mills, Moosup; lawns, sateens, sheetings, 6 combing machines.
Warrenton Woolen Company, Torrington; 125-horsepower engine.
Williamsville Manufacturing Company; fire pump, water tank, and automatic sprinklers.
Willimantic Linen Company, Willimantic; 35 combing machines, two-story addition 40 by 50.

Rhode Island.

Ashaway Woolen Company; weave-shed.
Atlantic Mills, Providence; humidifier.
Blanding Manufacturing Company, Providence; addition to dyehouse, boiler, etc.
Bray & Sons, John P., Pawtucket; new tanks and fountain; increased drying facilities.
Briggs Manufacturing Company, Griswold; spinning frame.
Campbell Mills, Potter Hill; spinning machinery.
Careyville; 40-foot addition to the mill; new stock house, 125 by 45 feet.
Centredale Manufacturing Company; additional buildings, increasing capacity one-third.
Centreville Manufacturing Company, Manville; two large additions, two 100-horsepower boilers, engine, 50 additional operatives.
Clark Thread Mill, Westerly; 30-foot extension.
Crefeld Mills, Pawcatuck, opposite Westerly; weave shed, 269 by 89 feet.
Dempsey Bleaching and Dye Works, Pawtucket; two-story box shop, 98 by 46½ feet; one-story kier room, 49½ by 68 feet; one-story kier room, 71½ by 23 feet.
Fiske, John T., jr., Pascoag; addition.
Glenark Knitting Company, Woonsocket; one-story brick storehouse, 100 by 60 feet.
Greenville; five new looms in woolen mill.
Guerin Spinning Company, Woonsocket; to double capacity.
Hope Webbing Company, Pawtucket; addition, one-story, 80 by 270 feet, with basement, 80 by 140 feet.
Jackson Mills, Jackson; new engine house and chimney, two pair of mules.
Knight, B. B. & R., Jackson; addition to mule room, and new mules.
Leicester Knitting Company, Woonsocket; addition 60 by 50 feet.
Lymansville Company, Lymansville; new machinery.
Manville Mills; mammoth addition, 100 by 200 feet, two stories, 400 looms.
Monwassicut Manufacturing Company, Scituate; addition.
National and Providence Worsted Mills, Providence; garnet machines, looms, boilers, etc.
North Scituate; addition to mill, 100 by 75 feet.
Oak Hill Mill, North Kingston; 12 looms.
Queen Dyeing Company, Providence; additions and new boilers.
Richmond Manufacturing Company (cotton), Bristol; storage house, one-story, 190 by 40 feet.
Sayles, A. L., Pascoag; new stock house.
Silver Spring Bleaching and Dyeing Company, Providence; extensive additions, 108 by 70 feet, four stories.
Slade & Co., W. F., Bridgeton; piece dye kettle and storing washer.
Social Mill, Woonsocket; new boilers.

Virginia.

Lewis-Jones Knitting Company, Winchester; 150 new machines, doubling capacity.
Lynchburg Cotton Mills, Lynchburg; 1,500 spindles; machine shop and other improvements.
Pocahontas Manufacturing Company, Petersburg; 9 revolving flat cards and other machinery.
Portsmouth Cotton Manufacturing Company; 6 sets of cards.
Swift Creek Cotton Mill, Petersburg; improvements and new machinery.

Maryland.

Dickey & Sons, J. W., Oella; additional story.
Franklinville Mill, additional machinery, increase of 25 per cent.
Maryland Silk Mills, Hagerstown looms.
Phœnix Cotton Mill; machinery.
Savage Manufacturing Company; large reservoir and automatic sprinklers.
Vella Mills; additional building, warehouse, woolen machinery, etc.
Warren Manufacturing Company; additional machinery.

New Jersey.

Algonquin Company, Passaic; additional machinery.
Doherty & Wadsworth, Paterson; looms.
Freis, Breslin & Co., Camden; rug and carpet manufacturers; three-story brick building, 50 by 250 feet.
Gloucester City Print Works; color pans and self-mixer.
Linden Worsted Mills, Howland Croft, Sons & Co., Camden; large addition.
Somerville Woolen Mills; spinning room 54 by 120 feet, and boiler room 40 by 46 feet.

Vermont.

Anderson, C. A., Craftsbury; new set of cards, mule, fulling mill, etc.
Burlington Cotton Mills, Winooski; steam plant.
Ludlow Woolen Company; 4 new mules.
Proctorsville Woolen Company, Proctorsville; 2 sets of cards.
Queen City Cotton Manufacturing Company, Burlington; humidifiers.
Springfield Cotton Mill; machinery.
Taft, Burbank & Murdock, Proctorsville; shoddy house 100 by 40, two stories, engine house 17 by 20 feet.
Valentine Knitting Company, Bennington; boiler house, 140-horsepower boiler, and 125-horsepower engine.
Wright Health Underwear Company, Pownal; hydrants, sprinklers, etc.

New York.

Banta, J. L. & G. S., Amsterdam; new machinery.
Camden Knitting Company; boiler, dyehouse.
Conde Knitting Mill, Oswego; five-story addition.
Fiebig & Hart, Candor; boiler-house.
Gardiner & Warring, West End Knitting Mill, Amsterdam; addition 50 by 150 feet, doubling capacity.
Goodwill, Ashworth & Co., Jamestown; spinning, twisting, and roving machinery.
Hudson River Woolen Mills, Newburg; 2 sets of cards, 20 looms, fire pump, engine, etc.
Johnstown Knitting Company; new warehouse.
Kavanaugh Knitting Mill, Waterford; addition.
Mackinnon, Robert, knitting mill, Little Falls; 60-foot extension, 4 sets cards.
Norristown Hosiery Company, addition to plant.
Oneida Knitting Mills, Utica; brick storehouse, 100 by 40 feet, four stories.
Paragon Knitting Company, Mohawk; new cards, increasing capacity 25 per cent.
Rose Valley Woolen Company, Auburn; white blankets machinery.
Smith & Sons Carpet Company, Alexander, Yonkers; new dyehouse, 172 by 60 feet.
Snyder & Fisher; additional building.
Underhill Knitting Mill, Mellenville; addition.
West Bros., Newport; additional two stories, four-story tower with elevator.

South Carolina.

Cheraw Cotton Mill; electric light plant.
Darlington Manufacturing Company; 420-electric-light plant.
Fairmount Yarn Mill, Spartanburg, S. C.; 200 looms.
Lockhart Mills; mill enlarged.
Union Cotton Mills; enlargement of plant.

Wisconsin.

Beaver Dam Woolen Mills; steam plant.
Proctor, James, Genesee; woolen cards.

Michigan.

Clinton Woolen Mill; $4,000 addition.
Novelty Knitting Works, Detroit; 56 knitting machines.

Iowa.

Des Moines Knitting Company; capacity increased.

Kentucky.

Kentucky River Mills, Frankfort; 300-horsepower turbine wheel.

Illinois.

Rockford Knitting and Hosiery Company; new dyehouse.

Louisiana.

Alden Knitting Company, New Orleans; addition, 104 by 60 feet.

Ohio.

St. Marys Woolen Manufacturing Company; machinery.

Oregon.

Pendleton Wool Scouring and Packing Company; addition; to manufacture blankets, flannels, hosiery.

West Virginia.

Crawford Woolen Company, Martinsburg; two-story addition, 124 by 50 feet; 14 looms, etc.

Tennessee.

Brookside Cotton Mills, Knoxville; capacity increased 50 per cent.

Texas.

Dallas Cotton Mills; addition; increasing capacity one-third; 100 additional hands.

California.

Oakland Worsted Company; 2 new boilers.

North Dakota.

Grand Forks Woolen Mill; additional building; 3 looms, 1 set of cards; 25 additional hands.

Delaware.

Georgetown Hosiery Company, Wilmington; $3,500 worth of new machinery.
James Bancroft, Sons & Co., Wilmington; two stories to the main building.
Knowles Woolen Mills, New Castle; addition, 75 by 250 feet; 25 looms.
Triton Mills Company; New Castle; machinery.

Alabama.

Howard, B. F., Uniontown, rope factory; to double capacity.
Montgomery Cotton Mills; electric-light plant.

Mr. VEST. It is impossible for me to conceive how anything but partisan blindness can overlook the effect of free wool upon woolen manufacture and the production of wool in this country. I say nothing of the results to the consumer, which to every honest legislator should be the first and principal consideration. Woolen clothing to-day is cheaper than ever before, and the free-wool clause of the Wilson Act is a benefaction not only to the manufacturers and woolgrowers, but to the poor and humble in the harshest and coldest latiutdes of our broad land.

There never was so complete an exemplification of the unquestionable truth and correctness of the Democratic position on the tariff as the present wool schedule. I repeat that if there were nothing else in the Wilson Act I am glad we enacted it, because it has shown every impartial and honest man that protection for protection's sake, instead of being beneficial to a people, is absolutely destructive to their best interest. I have here a number of extracts, all taken from protection sources, showing the truth, elaborated, of what I have said. I have extracts from the Boston market and the New York market in the last year.

I come now to sheep, which the other side say have been butch-

ered by millions on the Western prairies. I take from the Wool and Cotton Reporter extracts from letters received from Oregon, California, Washington, and a number of other Western States, including the Dakotas, showing that the sheep flocks are increasing now under the Wilson Act, and that there are more sheep today than there were a year ago; that the insane idea of rushing their sheep into the markets for mutton has been abandoned, and that the sheep growers have now at last found that not in high duties is their safety, but in free wool, which enables the manufacturer to use the American product, mixing it with the foreign product that we can not produce in this country, thereby giving employment to his mill, and furnishing a better article of goods at a cheaper rate to the American consumer.

I have here a list of the advances in wages by woolen mills. Twice during the last year, in some instances, and three times in others the wages of employees were advanced by the woolen mills, which are running day and night. And yet we are told by the Senator from New Hampshire that the woolen mills of New England are upon the verge of bankruptcy. I have here the statement showing the fact that mills which were closed under the McKinley law have been opened under the Wilson Act. I know that statements can be brought here from manufacturers that they are in favor of a duty on wool. But why? Because it is a subject of bargain between them and the woolgrowers. The shepherd kings of Ohio stand with a million votes, they say, ready to destroy any public man who dares to vote for free wool. The same men who counseled their neighbors to destroy their sheep and make mutton of them are now telling the Republican leaders, "Unless you repudiate the duties of the McKinley law and the Wilson law and the Senate bill, and give us a duty hitherto unheard of in the annals of protection, we will hurl 1,000,000 votes against you at the polls."

Therefore the Manufacturers' Association of Philadelphia meets in solemn conclave and resolves that a duty should be put on wool. But mark the sequel in that resolution: "Put a duty on wool, and then give a compensatory duty to us." There is the honey in that hive; there is the milk in that cocoanut. "Tax wool, but give us an increased duty; put money in our pockets." Then they turn and put their fraternal arm around the woolgrower of the West and say, "Brother, I am your friend; bring your million votes and increase duties on woolen goods for me." That is the whole of this secret. Mr. Lawrence said that he applied to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, under the chairmanship of Mr. DINGLEY, to be heard upon this great interest, and they shut the door in his face. He left the Capitol swearing vengeance, with blood literally in his eye, and called his association here again, on the 20th instant, in order to inform Congress that there are a million votes in this country that demand a duty upon wool.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WARREN. For a question.

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. While the Senator from Missouri is telling us the secrets of the men who manufacture wool, and since he has proven to his satisfaction that wool is higher under the Wilson law than it was under the McKinley law, and that the manufacturers have done better in the last year than ever before, I should like to have him proceed further and tell why the manufacturers and woolgrowers are asking for a tariff.

Mr. VEST. I have been trying to explain it. My command of the English language is very poor and possibly I have not been able to convey my meaning, but I thought I had made it very plain. Mr. Lawrence wants a duty upon wool, so as to exclude foreign wools and give him the monopoly of the market, in order that he can put up the price of his domestic wool to any figure he pleases. The woolen manufacturers want an increased duty upon their goods so as to shut out the foreign manufacturer and give them the monopoly in their special interest. That is the basis of protection. That is the great, sublime, Christian doctrine of "You tickle me and I will tickle you." It permeates and pervades the whole tariff fabric, and that, to speak plainly, is the curse of the scheme. It puts up the price of everything to the American consumer in order that the profits may be divided among certain classes.

The Democratic party has always opposed it, and will continue to oppose it, because it holds, with its great founder, Mr. Jefferson, that this Government is made for the people without governmental partnership with any class, burdens and benefits to be borne alike by all, and, let me add, every man to pay taxes to the General Government in proportion to the protection that is given to his property. By that doctrine the Democratic party will live or cease to live. I have no hesitation in saying that the time will soon come when an immense majority of the American people will reach the conclusion that a return to true Jeffersonian principles is the only safety for the Republic.

GOLD EXPORTS.

But let us go further. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] told us, referring to another portion of his address, that the cause of gold exports is a deficit in the revenue, and that it is only necessary to increase the receipts of the Government in order to stop the exportation of gold. I have not time nor strength to read the tables which absolutely disprove that statement. I have carefully prepared extracts from the Government reports, showing that in the years when there was a surplus of revenue there was the largest export of gold.

The Secretary of the Treasury in his report proves beyond question, it seems to me logically, that it is not the deficiency in the revenue that causes the exportation of gold. I think the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], who spoke the other day, came nearer the truth when he said the exportation of gold came from the balance of trade being against us. This is shown by the fact that from the table which I have before me, and which I will take the liberty of printing, it is seen that in those years when the balance of trade, as it is called, was against the United States—that is, when we imported more than we exported—gold was exported to pay the balance. When the balance of trade turned in our favor the imports of gold came into the United States. But I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to one fact. This rule holds good, as shown by the Treasury reports, up to the year 1890, when the Sherman law was passed, and in the following three years there was an excess of exports over imports, and at the same time there were large exports of gold.

The table referred to is as follows:

Gold exports.

1893—	
Gold exports	$108,680,844
Notes redeemed	102,100,345
Excess of revenue over expenditures	2,341,647
Receipts $385,819,628, as against $354,937,784 for 1892 and $297,722,019 for 1894.	
1891—	
Gold exports	$86,362,652
Notes redeemed	5,986,070
Excess of revenue over expenditures	26,838,541
1894—	
Gold exports	76,978,061
Notes redeemed	84,842,150
Excess of expenditures over receipts	69,803,260
1895—	
Gold exports	43,941,589
Notes redeemed	37,768,346
Excess of expenditures over revenue	42,805,223
1889—	
Gold exports	59,952,285
Notes redeemed	730,143
Excess of receipts over expenditures	87,761,080
Surplus of revenue	48,694,907
1886—	
Gold exports	42,952,101
Notes redeemed	6,863,699
Excess of receipts over expenditures	93,956,588
Surplus revenue	49,405,545
1884—	
Gold exports	41,081,957
Notes redeemed	590,000
Excess of receipts over expenditures	104,393,625
Surplus revenue	57,603,396
1882—	
Gold exports	32,587,880
Notes redeemed	40,000
Excess of receipts over expenditures	145,543,810
Surplus revenue	85,405,955

Gold exports and imports.

Year.	Excess of exports of gold over imports.	Excess of imports of merchandise over exports.
1864	$89,484,865	$157,609,295
1865	51,882,805	72,716,277
1866	63,001,048	85,952,544
1867	22,001,761	101,254,955
1868	63,658,901	75,483,541
1869	21,870,930	131,388,682
1870	21,579,012	43,186,640
1871	59,802,647	77,403,506
1872	40,831,302	182,417,491
1873	36,174,268	119,656,288

Year.	Excess of imports of gold over exports.	Excess of exports of merchandise over imports.
1878	$4,125,760	$257,814,234
1879	1,037,334	264,661,666
1880	77,119,371	167,683,912
1881	97,466,127	259,712,718
1882	1,789,174	25,902,683
1883	6,133,261	100,658,488

Year.	Excess of exports of gold over imports.	Excess of exports of merchandise over imports.
1890	$4,331,149	$63,518,275
1891	68,130,087	39,564,614
1892	495,873	202,875,686

Mr. VEST. I am in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, but I frankly admit the contention of Mr. Carlisle that the scare upon the silver question caused the rule to be broken in the years 1890, 1891, and 1892. The Senator from Ohio says that is not true, because the Bland-Allison law, as it is called, was enacted in 1878 and was in force up to 1890, and that it could not have been the apprehension of free coinage which caused the gold exports from the United States. That is about as logical as to say that this floor would sustain the weight of 2,000 human beings, but that if the weight of 3,000 were put upon it it would not sink.

I admit the proposition that the civilized world is to-day under the control of the gold men. No man can visit Europe without knowing it. Go to Germany, and you will find all the bankers and capitalists and privileged classes in favor of the single gold standard. Go to England, and of course they are for the single gold standard; I mean the privileged classes, though there is a large bimetallic party in the British Parliament. Go to Austria, and you will find it struggling to get back to the single gold standard after having used irredeemable paper money up to 1881; and in France there is the same condition. Everywhere the people are opposed to the single gold standard and the bankers and capitalists are in favor of it. In the United States it is the same. Go to the great moneyed centers, and you will find all the capitalists denouncing the silver craze and the silver lunatics. Go out among the people at large, and Senators will be profoundly astonished in the West and South particularly to find an overwhelming majority of both parties in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

I admit that the financial influence of the world is against silver, and as a logical consequence they were able to influence this country (and if possible would intimidate it) whenever they found there was any approach to free silver coinage. They tolerated the act of 1878, but when the Senator from Ohio gave his great name, world-wide as a financier, to the Sherman Act of 1890, the capitalists of Europe said, "The United States is now going to a silver basis, and we are determined to withdraw our confidence from it." Who doubts this proposition? Look at the condition of the country now.

Mr. President, the other day the Chief Executive issued a proclamation in regard to foreign affairs, asserting the Monroe doctrine, and it was met with enthusiastic acclaim from all sections and classes of the country. What was the response from Great Britain? We heard the hostile guns in this Chamber, and the tail of the British lion was twisted until that royal animal howled like a whipped cur. But did England respond with shot and shell and saber stroke and battle ship? Oh, no. She responded with small pellets of paper called American securities, that were poured upon the New York market; a panic was created, stocks fell, and now look at the sequel. The President of the United States thought proper—rightly and patriotically, and what I complain of is that he did not come to the conclusion before—to offer to the highest bidder the bonds of the Government which he is about to sell to maintain the gold reserve. Two syndicates had been formed in New York, made up of capitalists. It is said in this morning's paper that one of those syndicates, with Mr. Morgan at its head, had hoarded $400,000,000 of gold—an enormous amount. What is the answer to the President's proclamation? Wall street is dissatisfied; Wall street will not have it; the syndicate has hoarded the gold, and we can not have a popular loan in the United States.

Mr. President, could anything be more humiliating, could anything be more in the shape of national dishonor? This great country, with 70,000,000 of the most intellectual and progressive people in the world, with a continent for an inheritance, throttled and manacled by the gold hoarders and holders! When we undertake to establish a foreign policy, when we undertake to protect our own financial system, we are met by these men with the ukase of autocrats, "We have the gold, and we intend to make you sell us your bonds at our own price." War would not be so great a calamity. I heartily indorse the sentiment in the President's message that no greater calamity can come to a people than self-humiliation. What American can go abroad without the blush of shame on his cheek when talking with an intelligent Englishman in regard to our affairs? I met an English gentleman at Cologne and traveled with him, a real gentleman, strange as that may sound to some people who do not think there can be gentlemen there. But there are; and when we were talking, in a friendly way, about the relative strength of our two countries, he said, "We do not propose to fight our American cousins with shells, bullets, and powder. We hold your securities. We have built your railroads, we own your breweries, we have your mills, and you can not afford to fall out with us."

In New York each morning where do the brokers and speculators run? They hasten to the foreign market reports, and if the English market is up, the American market corresponds; if the English market is down, the American market droops also. England is the great barometer financially for the United States, and we who should be the most independent people in the world are to-day subsidiary to these foreign influences on account of the single gold standard. We are worshiping the same fetich, we are idolators in the same temple under the present system, and if we undertake our emancipation we are immediately told "not to talk about silver, because they will pour their securities upon us and bankrupt our country."

Mr. President, what honest man could live under such a system in his individual relations with his neighbor? What would you think of yourself if a rich neighbor should come to you and say, "Pay me my money or I will turn your wife and children out before the cold and bitter wind"? Nationally we are in that condition. Why, better anything than to have ourselves manacled and gyved as we are now under the single gold standard, which we are told is a synonym with commercial and national prosperity.

I have already produced tables showing (in answer to the Senator from Ohio when he says that if we have enough revenue to pay for the expenses of the Government no gold will go abroad) that year after year, with a surplus in the Treasury, gold was exported.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S SCHEME.

Now, Mr. President, I come to the last portion of my remarks. It is one of the chief regrets of my public life that I have been forced, against my inclination, into antagonism with the head of my party. I make no apology for saying that I believe the principles of the Democratic party necessary to the welfare of this country, and that anything which looks toward its disorganization or the weakening of its great objects is detrimental to the public good. So believing, never, never in all my life have I been encountered with so much self-regret as when I was compelled to part with the head of my party upon this financial question, and not only with him, but with my personal friend, the Secretary of the Treasury, with whom my relations have always been of the most cordial description. But it was impossible for me to remain a Senator upon this floor, with my ideas of representation, and do otherwise than I have done. I have always been a bimetallist, but whatever might have been my personal opinion, an enormous majority of the people who sent me here are the friends of silver coinage. No constitutional question was involved, for I have always held that no constituency or legislature could instruct me to violate the Constitution as I understood it, but on questions of policy they have the right. If I had not been in favor of the free coinage of silver I would have given place to one who could have come here and represented the Democrats of Missouri faithfully and honestly.

Now, Mr. President, there are propositions in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury to which I can never subscribe. The theory of our friends upon the other side in regard to the financial evils that afflict the country is that if more money be furnished for the ordinary expenses of the Government there will be no export of gold and there will be no disaster. I doubt, with great respect, the sincerity of that statement in certain quarters. I make no allusion to any Senator. The House of Representatives has sent us two bills, one of them called the bond bill and the other the tariff bill. In the bond bill they provide for $50,000,000 of 3 per cent certificates to meet contingent deficits in the Treasury. Now, if they believed that this amount was sufficient and that this deficit was probable, and if they disbelieved Mr. Carlisle, who says that the deficit for this fiscal year will be $17,000,000 and there will be a surplus in 1897 for the fiscal year of $7,000,000, and who states that he wants no more money to carry on the Government—even if they disbelieved that, why did they not content themselves with 3 per cent certificates and the $50,000,000 to meet the deficit? Why do they go further and undertake to put an additional duty upon the necessaries of life? Sixty per cent of the specific duties under the McKinley bill, which now the Republican caucus is considering the propriety of increasing to 20 per cent, including sugar, over the Wilson law. Why this enormous increase in order to get more money to carry on the Government in face of the declaration of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury and the actual figures as shown by official reports?

Why, Mr. President, our friends ignore entirely the fact that $182,288,040 have been received from the sale of bonds, and that of this amount $77,000,000 in United States and Treasury notes is now in the Treasury subject to ordinary expenses, and not called for now by any demand upon the Government. There is $77,-

000,000 to meet any probable deficit in the next two years. That is entirely ignored. They send us, to speak in western vernacular, a double-barrel bill, providing for $50,000,000 of 3 per cent certificates and then an enormous increase of tariff duties on which they calculate to get $40,000,000, but which, I will undertake to prove, if they adopt these new amendments, will amount to nearly one hundred million. I doubt, therefore, the sincerity of this device on the part of our friends in the other House when they send us these two measures for our adoption.

Now, upon the other hand, what does the Secretary of the Treasury propose to us? He proposes to retire absolutely the Sherman Treasury notes and the greenbacks and rely upon the national banks for the circulation to carry on the business of this country.

Mr. President, I would be thoroughly ashamed of myself if I attacked banks because they were moneyed institutions, but upon the principles which I believe should control an American legislator I would not under any contingency give the enormous power to the national banks which is proposed by this scheme of the Secretary of the Treasury. I would give to no corporation invented by mortal man the power to control the volume of money in the United States. It is a temptation beyond description, that I would not for one instant think of hazarding.

If Mr. Carlisle's scheme of retiring greenbacks and Treasury notes absolutely and putting nothing in their place but national-bank notes be adopted, we might just as well abandon all idea of escaping the ownership by those corporations of the whole country.

I had occasion to say years ago, when I first became a member here—nearly eighteen years ago—that I would never vote for any bill that recognized the principle now in the national-banking act that enabled them to take out their bonds and retire their circulation, or put in more bonds and increase the circulation. I remember very well in 1881, when my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] was Secretary of the Treasury—about the last year of his administration—that we attempted to force these national banks to help us fund the public debt. We thought, as the Supreme Court have decided, that they were financial servants and agents and creatures of the Government. They asserted that they were not, and their officers thronged these lobbies and corridors and told us if we dared to force them to take 3 per cent bonds they would create a panic that would rock this country to its center and destroy its credit. We passed the bill through both Houses and a panic came in New York, and stocks fell from 25 to 40 points in four hours. That was the response of Wall street to the legislation of Congress, as the incipient panic now in Wall street is the response to the bond order of the President.

Mr. COCKRELL. Eighteen million dollars of national-bank notes were retired in one day.

Mr. VEST. I think nearly nineteen.

Mr. COCKRELL. Eighteen million dollars.

Mr. VEST. Over $18,000,000 of national-bank notes were retired in one day in response to that legislation by representatives of the people. If I had any doubt about this dangerous power in the hands of private corporations, called quasi-public corporations, that would have been a lesson which would have lasted me during my public life, if it had continued for half a century. Mr. President, I learned that lesson not only from events, but it was taught to me by the logic and eloquence of the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury. Now, will the Secretary read the extract from Mr. Carlisle's report that I have marked, to show his present position as to national banks?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whatever objections to a national banking system may have heretofore existed, or may still exist, among our people, upon economic or other grounds, the fact must be recognized that it has been so long established, and, notwithstanding its admitted defects, has served such a useful purpose in furnishing a convenient form of currency of uniform value throughout the country, that an attempt at this time to abolish it, or materially abridge the franchises of the institutions organized under it, would not only be unsuccessful, but would provoke injurious agitation when the precarious condition of our fiscal affairs demands repose and such a restoration of confidence as will enable the people to avail themselves of all the facilities that can be afforded for the transaction of their business. The national banking associations now in operation have been established under charters granted by the Government, and so long as they are obedient to the laws and useful to the community it would be an act of bad faith to deprive them of the privileges thus secured.

Mr. VEST. Two points will be noticed, and I bring them out in no spirit of unkindness to Mr. Carlisle, for I am not attempting to convict him of inconsistency. I am attempting to use his great ability and his unanswerable logic in defense of my own opinions, which are unchanged. There are two points in that report: first, that the charters of the national banks constitute a contract with the Government. I say the Supreme Court of the United States decided otherwise. We can take away their charters to-morrow or control them in any way we think necessary for the public good. In the second place, he says that the system is a good system, beneficial to the people of this country.

Mr. President, in 1881, when the national banks precipitated a panic upon this country because we attempted to make them help fund the public debt at 3 per cent, and when Mr. Hayes, President of the United States, vetoed that bill, and we were unable to pass it over his veto, Mr. Carlisle was a member of the House of Representatives, and I heard him deliver the best speech, the greatest speech, of his life in denunciation of the national banking system and proving that their charters constitute no contract with the Government. Will the Secretary read, and I will promise not to trespass any more, from the speech of Mr. Carlisle in 1881?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

Sir, this is not the first effort that has been made in Congress to compel these creatures and agencies of the Government to assist it in reducing the interest charge upon the people, and if it shall fail now it will not be the first demonstration of their power over the financial legislation of the country. It is a humiliating confession for the representatives of the people to make, but it is true, nevertheless, that ten years ago, when these institutions were fewer in number than they are to-day, when their organization was less perfect, and when their combined capital was not so great, they had power enough to defeat in this House a provision which was designed by the present Secretary of the Treasury to compel them to aid in funding a large part of the public debt at 4, 4½, and 5 per cent.

* * * * * * *

There are no elements of a contract in such legislation, and therefore the extent to which the Government will or ought to go in the exercise of its power of supervision and control is always a question of policy and not a question of power.

The two Houses of Congress, representing the aggregate interests of 50,000,000 people, have, after mature deliberation, passed a bill which the banks have chosen to consider obnoxious to them, and forthwith—within thirteen days—they have contracted the currency to the extent of $18,722,340, and precipitated a crisis which would have been disastrous to the country had it not been met by measures which they had no power to prevent. The prompt action of the Secretary of the Treasury in purchasing a large amount of bonds at the city of New York, and the course of the Canadian banks in throwing seven or eight millions of their loanable capital on the market alone prevented a catastrophe from the effects of which we might not have entirely recovered for many years. When Secretary McCulloch, several years since, in pursuance of his contraction policy, began to retire and cancel legal-tender notes at the rate of $4,000,000 per month, it produced such consternation in business circles that Congress was forced to intervene at once and arrest the process by the passage of a joint resolution; but now we have seen nearly $19,000,000 of circulation withdrawn in less than half a month, not by the Government, but by institutions in the management of which the Government has no voice, and still gentlemen here insist that the power under which this has been done, and under which it may at any time be repeated, shall not be taken away. Why, sir, the whole contraction of legal-tender Treasury notes under the provisions of the resumption act, from January 14, 1875, to May 31, 1878, when it was prohibited by law, was only $34,318,984, not twice as much in more than three years as the bank contraction has been in less than two weeks.

This experience warns us that we can not safely permit this great power to remain in the hands of these institutions unchecked by legal restrictions. It is an engine of destruction standing in the very narrowest part of the way to permanent industrial and commercial prosperity in this country; for there can be no such prosperity anywhere in the midst of sudden and enormous contractions of the currency; nor will prudent and experienced business men embark in large and expensive enterprises when the power to make such contractions is held by private and interested parties who acknowledge no restraints except public sentiment and their own views of the public welfare. By law the volume of legal-tender notes is limited to $346,681,016, while under the policy of the Government nearly $150,000,000 in gold and silver coin are permanently withheld from circulation and hoarded in the Treasury. Of the $454,000,000 gold coin in the country, the Government and the banks held, on the 1st day of November last, $254,000,000, and the people only $200,000,000. The circulation of State banks is taxed out of existence; the coinage of silver is limited by statute to $4,000,000 per month, and so it appears that by statute or public policy every form of currency which the people can use in the transaction of their business is restricted except national-bank notes. They alone are perfectly free from all restriction, legal or otherwise, and upon them the people are compelled to rely under existing circumstances for the additional facilities of exchange necessary to enable them to carry on their growing industries and conduct their rapidly increasing commercial enterprises.

What a fatal policy it is, in view of these considerations, to retain on the statute book as part of our currency system a law which subjects all these great interests to the arbitrary will or mistaken judgment of 2,000 corporations. The present attempt to provide against a recurrence of the danger from which the country has just made its escape, and to reestablish the original and conservative principle in the management of our currency may fail, but in the end the legislation now proposed, or something equivalent to it, will certainly be demanded by the public sentiment of the country; and in this belief I am content to abide the result of this long contest, whatever it may be.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I can add nothing to that argument made by the Secretary of the Treasury when a member of the popular branch of Congress. I have never indulged in such denunciation of national banks as is found in that address. I have never given so exaggerated a statement, if it be exaggerated—I will say a statement so highly colored, in regard to the danger from this system. Therefore I am not prepared to follow the Secretary of the Treasury, distinguished as he is, when he changes his opinion and tells us now that their charters constitute a contract with the National Government and that they are necessary to the financial prosperity of the country.

AMOUNT OF CIRCULATION.

There is one other thing in that report which I never can indorse. The Secretary of the Treasury states that the circulation outside

of the Treasury in this country amounts to $1,598,859,316. Mr. President, it is simply impossible that this could be the per capita circulation in the United States. This old fraud—for it is nothing else—has been sent down in the Treasury Department from one statistician to another until, like the common law, it has been crystallized by custom and usage and it is absolutely believed to be the truth. Mr. Carlisle makes in his report a summary of the per capita circulation, and admits that it was $24.27 per capita in 1894, and in 1895 it is $22.72 per capita. I undertake to say that it is not $10 per capita in the United States to-day.

We are told that the country has all the money necessary for the transaction of business. I deny it. The curse of our system to-day is that the money is congested in the great centers; it is not among the people at large.

The advocates of the single gold standard make no distinction between falling prices and low prices. When we have low prices in the country it may be well for the poor and humble, but falling prices constitute a curse to all classes and all sections. No man will invest in property when he thinks he can buy it more cheaply the next day, or month, or year, and the result is that now, with a single gold standard, the purchasing power of gold being increased daily and the price of everything else falling, we have falling prices and congestion in business.

Here is the solution, in my judgment, of this whole matter. If we had more money in circulation, and the capitalist was forced to let go his hoarded money and put it into investment, we then would have prosperity unexampled with the great resources at our command. The viciousness of the single gold standard is the element of contraction. No country can be prosperous with an increasing population and a decreasing volume of money, and the history of the world shows it. We tried it here in this country after the great war, and McCulloch, Secretary of the Treasury, burned up millions of dollars in greenbacks because, he said, it was immoral to have a superabundant circulation. We ought to-day be the most moral people in the world. We ought to-day to be ready for the "new Jerusalem, the temple not made with hands, eternal in the Heavens." If scarcity of money makes a people moral, out in my country they are saints divine and angels. There are counties in Missouri to-day where the people, great as that State is, rich as it is, resort to barter. Money in banks? Oh, yes; and money congested in the centers. Why, what is the matter with your single gold standard system? What is the condition to-day? With our enormous crops—why my State can feed the world, the Valley of the Nile would never compete with it—I am afraid in this cold weather to hear that they are burning their corn for fuel, as they have done in the far West. Enormous crops and falling in value, while the Eastern States declare there is plenty of money, and exclaim, "Oh, what is the matter with those haymakers out West who know nothing about finance"?

The Secretary of the Treasury calculates that there is $504,000,000 of gold in circulation. Where is it? I should like for any man to specify where that gold is. We know there is $160,000,000 in the national banks. Some Senator the other day talked about the stocking filled with gold. I should like to see one. I should like to find the old woman in this country, outside of Wall street, who has got a stocking full of gold; I could make more than my salary by exhibiting her as a financial curiosity. [Laughter.] "Money hid away behind bricks and in hollow trees!" Why, Mr. President, there is not a five-dollar gold piece to the county out West, outside of the banks. You may address an audience of 2,500 or 3,000 people and ask, Is there a man here with a gold piece? He can not be found. There is not any gold in circulation. There is not $500,000 outside of the banks and Wall street or the gold speculators.

Permit me to ask right here, in regard to this idea of a popular loan, where is the money to come from? The people have no gold. It is not among them. The syndicates have got it, and that result is the natural and legitimate offspring of the single gold standard. It is financial monopoly; it is financial autocracy; as much opposed to republican institutions as the standing armies of the monarchies and despotisms of Europe. Why does Mr. Carlisle pretend to tell us, even if he could find this gold, that the bank reserves are in circulation? What is the amount of the national-bank reserve which the banks can not touch without violating the law? Three hundred and fifty million dollars. Is that in circulation among the people? Yet he counts it. Are the reserves of the savings banks and loan associations and State banks to be included? Their reserves amount to $491,000,000. Is that in circulation? Do you tell me the national banks or these State banks violate State and national laws? I grant you they could do it. They did it in New York, when these great banks, to avert a panic, as they said, violated the law and their charters in using clearing-house certificates and refusing to depositors who came to get their own money out of the vaults that which belonged to them, and claiming as a merit that they had trampled upon the law of the land. I grant you they violated the law then, and they were lauded for it; but if an individual had done such a thing he would have been called dishonest and run the chances of indictment.

The Senator from Ohio told us the other day that out of the greenback circulation there was from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000 lost. How much of the paper money is burned in the large fires and lost by accident, to say nothing of the loss of metallic money among 70,000,000 people is unknown. Mr. Carlisle in his report estimates the loss of national-bank notes as two-fifths of 1 per cent. Yet that is mere conjecture; it is the mere supposition of a Government clerk. We know that the loss is much greater upon all paper money, but no account is taken of it. Take the reserves of the banks, State and national. They amount to more than $850,000,000, not in circulation under the law. I undertake to say there is not $250,000,000 of gold in circulation to-day. And, then, if you consider the loss upon paper money of all kinds there is in all $1,000,000,000 counted in the Treasury report not in circulation, which reduces the per capita to about $8. France has $42 per capita, and is the most prosperous country in the world. But France adopted a different system from ours after her great war with Germany. She paid Germany a billion dollars in gold. Then did she contract her paper money? No. On the contrary, she expanded the circulation, and thus opened her factories, revived agriculture, encouraged commerce, and to-day France, with $750,000,000 of silver money, is the proudest country, financially, on the face of the earth. When the Baring Bros. failed, France loaned $10,000,000 in gold to the Bank of England to prevent it from closing its doors.

No, Mr. President; there is an irrepressible conflict on this question, and men must align themselves upon one side or the other. If you propose to retain the single gold standard and the national-bank circulation, then go to the people and have it ratified and put an end to the present condition of distrust and unrest and uncertainty. But if, as I believe, the people of this country would respond to the call of those who, as Democrats and Americans, demand that one-half of the metallic money of the world shall not be destroyed; that this financial despotism shall be struck down; that we shall have gold and silver, the money of our fathers, to be the money of our children, we propose to crystallize the popular will by legislation.

Mr. STEWART obtained the floor.

Mr. QUAY. Does the Senator from Nevada desire to proceed this evening?

Mr. STEWART. I would as lief speak to-morrow morning.

Mr. QUAY. If so, I trust the Senator will give way for a brief executive session. There is some executive business to be transacted.

Mr. STEWART. I will yield for that purpose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania make a motion?

Mr. QUAY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-eight minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 8, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn January 7, 1896.

George M. De Reamer, of South Carolina, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 7, 1896.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Third Lieut. William H. O. Hay, of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Kirtland W. Perry, promoted.

Third Lieut. Henry L. Peckham, of Rhode Island, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed John B. Hull, resigned.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Elmer E. Halsey, of Marquette, Mich., to be receiver of public moneys at Marquette, Mich., vice Rush Culver, resigned.

MEMBERS OF CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION.

Col. Charles Russell Suter, vice Col. George H. Mendell, retired from active service.

Maj. Charles Edward Law Baldwin Davis, vice Lieut. Col. William H. H. Benyaurd, relieved.

Capt. Cassius Eric Gillette, vice Maj. William H. Heuer, relieved.

MEMBER OF MISSOURI RIVER COMMISSION.

Lieut. Col. William Rice King, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, July 11, 1895, vice Lieut. Col. Alexander Mackenzie, resigned.

POSTMASTERS.

Joseph F. Appling, to be postmaster at Jasper, in the county of Walker and State of Alabama, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Thomas A. Fleming, to be postmaster at Williams, in the county of Coconino and Territory of Arizona, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Thomas J. Wylie, to be postmaster at Nogales, in the county of Pima and Territory of Arizona, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Howard B. Dudley, to be postmaster at Stuttgart, in the county of Arkansas and State of Arkansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Robert M. Griffin, to be postmaster at Lonoke, in the county of Lonoke and State of Arkansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Bright B. Nunnally, to be postmaster at Marianna, in the county of Lee and State of Arkansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Dora Austin, to be postmaster at Perris, in the county of Riverside and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Virgil O. Harter, to be postmaster at South Riverside, in the county of Riverside and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Charles P. Livingston, to be postmaster at Whittier, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Orlando Streshly, to be postmaster at Azusa, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Adelbert Van Deusen, to be postmaster at Lamar, in the county of Prowers and State of Colorado, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Jacob Weil, to be postmaster at Las Animas, in the county of Bent and State of Colorado, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

George H. Ford, to be postmaster at Waterville, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

George F. Stearns, to be postmaster at Chester, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

E. Ransford Clinkscales, to be postmaster at Fort Brook, in the county of Hillsboro and State of Florida, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Gerettus Clover, to be postmaster at Gardner, in the county of Grundy and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Henry F. Day, to be postmaster at Moweaqua, in the county of Shelby and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

James Fielding, to be postmaster at Colfax, in the county of McLean and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Hattie Holliday, to be postmaster at Blandisville, in the county of McDonough and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

John M. Mills, to be postmaster at Tiskilwa, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Thomas M. Moran, to be postmaster at Coal City, in the county of Grundy and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Fred J. Nirider, to be postmaster at Kinmundy, in the county of Marion and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Lewis K. Thompson, to be postmaster at Walnut, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Charles M. Wright, to be postmaster at Gilman, in the county of Iroquois and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Ulysses M. Baughman, to be postmaster at Monon, in the county of White and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Enoch E. Black, to be postmaster at Summitville, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Joseph E. Carrier, to be postmaster at Ridgeville, in the county of Randolph and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Charles Egg, to be postmaster at Jasper, in the county of Dubois and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Henderson H. Lilly, to be postmaster at Middletown, in the county of Henry and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Thomas S. Spencer, to be postmaster at Sheridan, in the county of Hamilton and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

John E. Talbott, to be postmaster at Ladoga, in the county of Montgomery and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

William T. Wright, to be postmaster at Frankton, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 7, 1896.

POSTMASTERS.

Willis E. Dowell, to be postmaster at Missoula, in the county of Missoula and State of Montana.

Frank R. Matthews, to be postmaster at Raton, in the county of Colfax and Territory of New Mexico.

Henry B. Anderson, to be postmaster at Covington, in the county of Newton, and State of Georgia.

Julius Meredith, to be postmaster at Sparrows Point, in the county of Baltimore and State of Maryland.

Charles D. Johnson, to be postmaster at Brainerd, in the county of Crow Wing and State of Minnesota.

Sallie Spivy, to be postmaster at Henderson, in the county of Rusk and State of Texas.

James M. Portwood, to be postmaster at Amarillo, in the county of Potter and State of Texas.

Charles F. Blodgett, to be postmaster at Stoneham, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Henry G. Carter, to be postmaster at Mound City, in the county of Pulaski and State of Illinois.

Webster W. Lewis, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Summit and State of Ohio.

Jerome E. Baker, to be postmaster at Mexico, in the county of Oswego and State of New York.

John T. Amey, to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Coos and State of New Hampshire.

George W. Wales, to be postmaster at Randolph, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

George L. Brown, to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, in the county of Essex and State of New York.

Augustus Blood, to be postmaster at Brockton, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York.

John S. Brooks, to be postmaster at Tuxedo Park, in the county of Orange and State of New York.

Ernest T. Fletcher, to be postmaster at Tupper Lake, in the county of Franklin and State of New York.

Joseph H. Damon, to be postmaster at East Syracuse, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York.

Disbrow Budd, to be postmaster at Rye, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Edward Kernan, to be postmaster at Whitesboro, in the county of Oneida and State of New York.

William W. Henry, to be postmaster at Little Valley, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York.

Myron W. Gurnee, to be postmaster at Sodus, in the county of Wayne and State of New York.

Lillian I. Pearsall, to be postmaster at Sea Cliff, in the county of Queens and State of New York.

John R. Murray, to be postmaster at Oceanus, in the county of Queens and State of New York.

William E. McDonell, to be postmaster at Alexandria Bay, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

William P. Smith, to be postmaster at Castleton, in the county of Rensselaer and State of New York.

George A. Richmond, to be postmaster at Springville, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

John Reidy, to be postmaster at Morrisville, in the county of Madison and State of New York.

John Wiss, to be postmaster at Le Roy, in the county of Genesee and State of New York.

Charles S. Ware, to be postmaster at Mount Kisco, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Charles E. Vanorsdale, to be postmaster at Windsor, in the county of Broome and State of New York.

George Clark, to be postmaster at Coudersport, in the county of Potter and State of Pennsylvania.

Charles Beard, to be postmaster at Tamaqua, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania.

William S. Wright, to be postmaster at Marlboro, in the county of Ulster and State of New York.

Jane F. Hollister, to be postmaster at Mount Carmel, in the county of Northumberland and State of Pennsylvania.

Frank Feyler, to be postmaster at Rochester, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania.

Mahlon C. Detweiler, to be postmaster at Richland Center, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania.

Jennie McAllen Park, to be postmaster at Libonia, in the county of Franklin and State of Pennsylvania.

Robert S. Magee, to be postmaster at Wrightsville, in the county of York and State of Pennsylvania.

George M. Lull, to be postmaster at Sayre, in the county of Bradford and State of Pennsylvania.

William F. Rittase, to be postmaster at Littlestown, in the county of Adams and State of Pennsylvania.

Ben J. Rhoads, to be postmaster at Boyertown, in the county of Berks and State of Pennsylvania.

Norman A. Patterson, to be postmaster at Oxford, in the county of Chester and State of Pennsylvania.

J. Henry McLoud, to be postmaster at Hardwick, in the county of Caledonia and State of Vermont.

Irvin S. Weber, to be postmaster at North Wales, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

Louis J. Townsend, to be postmaster at Berwick, in the county of Columbia and State of Pennsylvania.

George H. Morgan, to be postmaster at Newton, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Henry S. Moore, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Bridget J. Copps, to be postmaster at West Rutland, in the county of Rutland and State of Vermont.

James Carnes, to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Mercer and State of Pennsylvania.

Samuel E. Walker, to be postmaster at East Northfield, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts.

Charles N. Perley, to be postmaster at Danvers, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts.

Hambleton P. Wilson, to be postmaster at Altoona, in the county of Blair and State of Pennsylvania.

Clayton E. Williamson, to be postmaster at Jersey Shore, in the county of Lycoming and State of Pennsylvania.

Frank Strang, to be postmaster at Westfield, in the county of Tioga and State of Pennsylvania.

Jerome H. Bradley, to be postmaster at Hamilton, in the county of Ravalli and State of Montana.

Allen P. Bowie, to be postmaster at Philipsburg, in the county of Granite and State of Montana.

John Knewitz, to be postmaster at Williams Bridge, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 7, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under Rule XXIV, clause 2, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting communications from the accounting officers of the Department giving lists of officers who are now delinquent in rendering their accounts or in payment of balances due from them; which was referred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an examination and review of the contract between the United States and Stout, Hall & Bangs, and also a statement of the equitable sum due said contractors; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office replying to the resolution of the House of December 12, 1895, relating to certain lands along the Union and Central Pacific railways; which was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

Letters from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the findings filed by the court in the following-named cases; which were referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed:

Wiley J. Wyatt, administrator, against The United States;
Arnold Bonnifield, administrator, against The United States; and
Robert F. Reynolds against The United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under Rule XIII, clause 2, the following reports of committees were handed in at the Clerk's desk, referred to their appropriate calendars, and otherwise disposed of as indicated below:

JAMES H. OSGOOD.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ANNIE M. GREENE.

Mr. SULLOWAY also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SIDNEY S. JORDAN AND EDWARD C. CARTER.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have a joint resolution read for information, and if there be no objection I will ask the consent of the House for its passage.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 65) to authorize Lieut. Sidney S. Jordan, Fifth United States Artillery, and Capt. Edward C. Carter, assistant surgeon, United States Army, to accept medals from the British Government.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lieut. Sidney S. Jordan, Fifth United States Artillery, and Capt. Edward C. Carter, assistant surgeon, United States Army, be, and they are hereby, authorized to accept from the Government of Great Britain the medals awarded to them, respectively, for their humane services to the shipwrecked crew of the British ship *Strathblane*.

The SPEAKER. This will be admissible only by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GROW, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MEMBER FROM THE STATE OF UTAH.

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a privileged report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the matter of seating Clarence E. Allen, member-elect from Utah.

We, your Committee on the Judiciary, have had the above matter under consideration, and while the members of the committee differ regarding the interpretation of the certificate of election presented to us, yet there can be no question of Mr. Allen's election. And your committee therefore recommend that the oath be administered to him, and that he be seated.

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report.

The motion of Mr. BRODERICK was agreed to.

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Utah, Mr. Allen, is present, and I ask that the oath be administered to him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah will step forward.

Mr. Allen of Utah came forward and took the oath of office.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 1702) providing for the erection and construction of a post-office building at South Bend, Ind., and making an additional appropriation therefor, was referred to the Committee on Post-Office and Post-Roads. I am directed by the committee to report it back and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the change will be made, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

There was no objection.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON THE POST-OFFICE AND POST-ROADS.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I also have the usual resolution providing for the printing and binding of matter for the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents, for the use of said committee, as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

EMPLOYEES IN POST-OFFICES, ETC.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a privileged report from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the following resolution—

"*Resolved*, That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the House as to the number of clerks employed in post-offices since June 30, 1895, to perform the work formerly done by canceling machines, together with the amount of salary paid such clerks; also, the number of clerks in the first twenty principal post-offices who were reduced in amount of salary received, the number who received an increase of salary, and the number of new clerks employed since January 1, 1895"—

Beg leave to report the same back with the recommendation that it be adopted, with the following amendments:

Strike out "January 1, 1895," and insert "June 30, 1894," in last two lines, and add:

"And all information and data necessary to show the reasons of the Department in making such changes, and the results regarding the efficiency and cost of the same."

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I would state to the House that this is a unanimous report of the committee, and unless some member desires to address the House I will ask for its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was then agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON PACIFIC RAILROADS.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Pacific Railroads be authorized to procure the printing and binding of such documents and papers as it deems necessary to facilitate its inquiries during the Fifty-fourth Congress, the expense of the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. POWERS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a similar resolution, from the Committee on Public Lands.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands be, and hereby is, authorized to have printed and bound such documents and papers for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by the committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. RICHARDSON. What committee was this?

The SPEAKER. The Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not object to the consideration of the resolution. I think it is in the proper form; but I do suggest to the gentleman who introduced the preceding resolution, giving the Committee on Pacific Railroads authority to have printing and binding done, that he ought not to tax it to the contingent fund of the House. It is not usual to do so. This printing is not paid for out of the contingent fund of the House, but, as the resolution under consideration provides, it is paid for out of the appropriation for printing.

Mr. LACEY. I will state to the gentleman that the resolution I have offered is the same as has been offered in previous Congresses.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is the other one to which I refer. I think the gentleman from Vermont ought to ask unanimous consent to have so much of it stricken out as provides that the payment should be made out of the contingent fund of the House.

The SPEAKER. That can be disposed of after this resolution has been considered. The question is on the resolution which has been read.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LACEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent, it is proposed that the resolution immediately preceding the one just adopted be amended by striking out the words "the expense of the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House." Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

CONDEMNED CANNON.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs to report back the bill (H. R. 1785) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to W. H. Wallace Post, No. 66, Grand Army of the Republic, of Eldorado, Kans., and for other purposes, with the recommendation that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that reference will be made.

MRS. FANNY WARREN.

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the bill (H. R. 3332) granting a pension to Mrs. Fanny Warren has been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, when, in my judgment, it should have been referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and I ask that that change of reference be made.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that it ought to be done by order of the committee.

The SPEAKER. It should be done by order of the committee. If the gentleman will examine into the matter he will see the Committee on Invalid Pensions can claim reference of it if they have jurisdiction.

BOUNDARY LINE BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent of the House that an order be made for printing the paper I hold in my hand. It has been handed me by the Secretary of State, with the request that it be printed. Congress passed a joint resolution April 19, 1890, requesting the President to enter into negotiations with Mexico in regard to affairs on the Rio Grande—the water supply, the changing channel, and uncertainty of rights. The paper in question is the report of Maj. Anson Mills, Tenth Cavalry, to the Secretary of State, December 10, 1888, concerning the fluctuations in the course of the Rio Grande River, the best method of dealing with floods, and saving the water for power and irrigation. It discusses that whole subject, and the Mexican minister and the Secretary both desire it printed in the interest of our foreign relations, and especially of the pending negotiations with Mexico under the concurrent resolution of April 29, 1890. It is only eleven pages of typewritten manuscript. I have consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Printing, and also with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], who consider it within the power of the House to have the printing done as requested, including the resolution of April 29, 1890.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be ordered printed as a House document.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ENFORCEMENT OF LAWS AGAINST TRUSTS.

Mr. HENDERSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back the resolution offered by Mr. HUBBARD, calling on the Attorney-General for certain information in respect to the enforcement of the laws against trusts, combinations, and conspiracies, with the recommendation that a substitute be adopted; which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to report to the House of Representatives what steps, if any, he has taken to enforce the law of the United States against trusts, combinations, and conspiracies, and what further legislation, if any, is needed, in his opinion, to protect the people against the same.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the original resolution introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUBBARD] and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary be read.

The original resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be, and he is hereby, directed to immediately report to this House why he has not enforced the provisions of section 73 of chapter 349, Supplement to the Revised Statutes of the United States, volume 2, relating to the suppression and prevention of trusts, combinations, conspiracies, and agreements.

Mr. HENDERSON. It will be observed, Mr. Speaker, that the original resolution assumes a certain condition of things as to the existence of which the committee have no evidence, and therefore they have unanimously recommended the adoption of the substi-

tute, which does not assume that the law has been violated or that there has been any failure to execute it, but calls upon the Attorney-General for any information that he may have in regard to the execution of the laws against trusts, and also for any suggestions as to further legislation that he may deem necessary. I move the adoption of the substitute.

The substitute was adopted.

On motion of Mr. HENDERSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the substitute was adopted was laid on the table; and the original resolution was laid on the table.

FUR SEALS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution of inquiry which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to inform the House:

1. What amount the Treasury has received from the lessees of the Alaska seal islands for the rental and tax each year since the new lease of those islands from May 1, 1890, to date, together with the number of skins annually taken under the provisions of said lease, and also the amount received from the lessees and the number of skins taken each year from 1868 to 1890.

2. What has been the cost of policing Bering Sea and the North Pacific each year since 1890; also the amount expended for the support of the natives of the seal islands by the Treasury Department each year since 1890.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is important that the Committee on Ways and Means should have the information called for, and I move the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. DINGLEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

JOHN T. WATERMAN.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Accounts, presented the following report:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred the accompanying resolution offered by Mr. CRISP, directing the Clerk of the House to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House to Annie E. Waterman, widow of John T. Waterman, deceased, late private secretary to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to his salary for six months, and the expenses of the late illness and funeral of said John T. Waterman, said expenses not to exceed the sum of $250, beg leave to report that they respectfully recommend the passage of the resolution.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move the adoption of the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the House to Annie E. Waterman, widow of J. T. Waterman, deceased, late private secretary to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to his salary for six months, and that the Clerk be further directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the House the expenses of the late illness and funeral of said J. T. Waterman, said expenses not to exceed the sum of $250.

The resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. ALDRICH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

M. F. WATKINS.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Accounts, also presented the following report:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred the accompanying resolution, offered by Mr. BROWN, to pay out of the contingent fund of the House to the widow of M. F. Watkins, deceased, late an employee of the House, a sum equal to his salary for six months and $140 for expenses of his last sickness and burial, beg to report that they respectfully recommend that the resolution do not pass, because the said M. F. Watkins was not an employee of the House at the time of his last sickness and death.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the House to the widow of M. F. Watkins, deceased, late an employee of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to his salary for six months; and that the Clerk be further directed to pay out of the contingent fund the expenses connected with the last sickness and burial of said Watkins, said expenses not to exceed the sum of $140.

Mr. ALDRICH. It will be noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the report in this case is unfavorable. The ground upon which it rests is, as stated in the report itself, that the party to whom the resolution relates was not an employee of the House of Representatives at the time of his death, but was in the employ of the General Government, and, under past decisions of the Comptroller, it has been held that this House is not authorized to provide for such expenditures. The committee have therefore unanimously reported against the adoption of the resolution. I move that the report be concurred in.

The report was adopted, and the resolution was rejected.

EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Accounts, also presented the following report:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom were referred sundry resolutions, to wit—

"1. *Resolved*, That John T. Chancey be, and he is hereby, retained on the roll of the House in his present position as special employee, at the salary now provided by law.

"That Lauritz Olsen be, and he is hereby, appointed special employee of the House, at a salary of $1,500 per annum, and that E. L. Currier and Arthur Buchanan be, and they are hereby, appointed special employees of the House, at a salary of $1,200 per annum each.

"That the salaries of said employees shall be paid monthly out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise ordered.

"2. *Resolved*, That the bookkeeper of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint George Jenison a special messenger to serve in and about the House, at a salary of $100 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until other provision is made therefor.

"3. *Resolved*, That there be appointed by the Doorkeeper an additional messenger in the reporters' gallery of the House, at $1,200, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

"4. *Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives be authorized to appoint two overseers of pages, to be paid a salary of $900 per annum each; and eight additional pages, to be paid during the sessions of Congress the compensation now prescribed by law to the pages employed under existing law. The compensation of the employees hereby provided for shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until provision shall be made therefor by law.

"5. *Resolved*, That the chairmen of the following committees, to wit, the Committee on Ways and Means, Appropriations, Judiciary, Banking and Currency, Coinage, Weights, and Measures, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Rivers and Harbors, Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, the Post-Office and Post-Roads, Public Lands, Indian Affairs, Public Buildings and Grounds, Invalid Pensions, Claims, War Claims, and District of Columbia, are hereby authorized to appoint a personal clerk, who shall receive the same compensation and for the same period, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, as is received by the clerks of other members of the House.

"6. *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Board of Capitol Police be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to appoint twelve additional policemen, at an annual salary of $1,100 each, one-half to be paid by the Secretary of the Senate and the other half by the Clerk of the House out of the appropriations for miscellaneous items of the respective Houses until otherwise provided for.

"7. *Resolved*, That Fred S. Bishop be, and he is hereby, appointed binding clerk for the House, to be borne on the Clerk's roll, at a salary of $1,600 per annum.

"8. *Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper of the House is hereby authorized and directed to employ C. W. Coombs as an additional messenger during the Fifty-fourth Congress, to be paid at the rate of $150 per month, out of the contingent fund of the House"—

Beg leave to report as follows:

The total number of extra employees provided for in these resolutions is forty-eight, divided as follows:

Six messengers to the Doorkeeper.
Eight pages.
One binding clerk.
Two overseers of pages.
Twelve Capitol policemen.
Nineteen personal clerks to chairmen of committees.

Your committee has made investigation of the circumstances calling for this addition to the working force of the House and Capitol, and are of the opinion that, with the exceptions herein noted, the needs of the service do not demand the extra help proposed under these resolutions.

In accordance with the precedent established previous to the organization of this Congress, the minority party in the House has been accorded the selection and appointment of four special employees, three of whom are paid from the contingent fund. The legislative appropriation bill provides for the appointment of two special employees, one being assigned to each side of the House.

Resolution No. 1 assigns John T. Chancey to one of the positions, and your committee concurs in and recommends that the said John T. Chancey be retained on the roll of the House in his present position as special employee.

Resolution No. 2, providing for the appointment of George Jenison to the position of special messenger, is hereby approved, with a recommendation that he be assigned to the press gallery in accordance with resolution No. 3.

Resolution No. 4, providing for the appointment of eight additional pages and two overseers of pages, is herewith returned without approval.

Your committee recommends the selection by the Doorkeeper of two pages from the present force of pages who shall have supervision and direction of the pages stationed in the two cloakrooms, and with which arrangement your committee believes the page service will be ample and satisfactory to the members of the House.

Your committee listened attentively to the arguments made by the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate and House, respectively, for an increase in the force of the Capitol police, but are not satisfied that the same are needed at this time, and disapprove the resolution (No. 6) calling for same.

The proposition embodied in the resolution No. 5, providing for nineteen personal clerks to members who are chairmen of certain committees, has, in the opinion of your committee, more or less force to it; but we do not feel justified in approving same at this time, partly because of the low condition of the contingent fund, and partly because we believe this to be a subject which should receive the consideration of the Committee on Appropriations and be incorporated, if at all, in the legislative bill which emanates from that committee.

Resolution No. 7, providing for the appointment of Fred S. Bishop to the position of binding clerk of the House, at a salary of $1,600 per annum, is herewith returned without approval.

Resolution No. 8, which provides that the Doorkeeper of the House be authorized and directed to employ C. W. Coombs as an additional messenger during the Fifty-fourth Congress, to be paid at the rate of $150 per month out of the contingent fund of the House, is hereby approved.

In conclusion, your committee beg leave to recommend the adoption of the accompanying resolution as a substitute for those referred to in this report:

Resolved, That John T. Chancey be, and he is hereby, retained on the roll of the House in his present position as special employee, at the salary now provided by law.

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint George Jenison an additional messenger in the press gallery of the House, at a salary of $1,200 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for.

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to select two pages from the present force of pages of the House, who shall act and be known as assistant chiefs of pages, and who shall be placed in charge and have the direction of the pages in the two cloakrooms.

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper is hereby authorized and directed to place on his roll the name of C. W. Coombs as special messenger of the House during the Fifty-fourth Congress, at a compensation of $1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise appropriated for, said Coombs to be in addition to the present force of the Doorkeeper and have desk room in the folding room.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether it is necessary to make any extended remarks on this report, or, indeed, any explanation further than that which the report itself embodies. I simply wish to say on behalf of the committee that they have made a careful and exhaustive examination of the existing condition in regard to the necessity for these extra employees, and of the forty-eight places which these various resolutions proposed to provide the committee have reported favorably upon only three.

Mr. HOPKINS. I wish to ask my colleague [Mr. ALDRICH] a question. The Mr. Coombs whom it is proposed to put upon the rolls at $1,800 a year is one of the old employees of the House, is he not?

Mr. ALDRICH. He is. He has been in the employ of the House for twenty years.

Mr. HOPKINS. When was he discharged from the public service, if at all?

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no information on that score. I simply know that the resolution has been before the committee, and it is the understanding of the committee that this gentleman's place has been filled by another appointment.

Mr. HOPKINS. Do you know who has taken his place?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not, further than that I understand his name is Vail and that he is a resident of the State of New York.

Mr. HOPKINS. Is this person who has taken the place incompetent to discharge the duties to which he has been assigned?

Mr. ALDRICH. My understanding is that he is a thoroughly competent man, having had an experience of several years' duration.

Mr. HOPKINS. If it be true that Mr. Coombs has been discharged, that another man has taken his place, and that this man is competent to fill the position which Mr. Coombs once filled, I should like to know from my colleague why it is that the committee proposes to have Mr. Coombs put upon the rolls at $1,800 a year.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will state for the benefit of my colleague that the Committee on Accounts has no jurisdiction in the appointment of individuals to places provided for under the legislative appropriation bill. It has no jurisdiction of the appointments made by any of the officers of this House. That is a question of which we can not take notice. The facts were presented to us as contained in the resolution providing for the appointment of Major Coombs; that is all we could consider. We believed that a man who has been for twenty years in the service of the House of Representatives and who, as appeared by the testimony especially of the older members, has proved himself of incalculable value, should be retained in some position where his efficient services could be continued.

Mr. HOPKINS. I will inquire whether my colleague conferred with the appointing power as to whether it was important or necessary for the service of the House to continue Major Coombs in his present place—whether provision could not be made for him without creating a new office at a salary of $1,800 a year?

Mr. ALDRICH. Speaking for myself, I will say I have not conferred with the Doorkeeper or any other officer of the House with respect to the necessity of retaining any individual in any particular place. I repeat that the services of Major Coombs have commended themselves to the older members of the House in such a way that it did not seem possible for us to ignore the petitions which came to us from several sources. The interests of the service, the proper conduct of the individual work assigned to members of this House, and which must be discharged in such a way as to do justice to their constituents, and the peculiar relationship which this employee has borne to members, seemed to us sufficient to justify the favorable report we have made on the resolution.

Mr. HOPKINS. If I understand my colleague, the place which Major Coombs has filled is now filled by another man who, the gentleman states, is entirely competent to discharge the duties.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no doubt that is true.

Mr. HOPKINS. If that be true, why is it necessary to create an additional office?

Mr. ALDRICH. I want to say to my colleague that these various resolutions called for the creation of forty-eight extra offices. The committee believe that they have been wise in limiting their favorable recommendation to three of these offices, and wise in recommending that these three places be filled in the manner proposed in the report.

Mr. HOPKINS. I agree with the gentleman that the committee should be commended for the discrimination they have shown, but the fact that they have rejected some forty-odd propositions does not dispense with the necessity of some good and valid reason in favor of this particular proposition before it can commend itself to members of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. If the gentleman from Illinois will make careful inquiry, I venture the assertion that he will find out that a thoroughly competent and reliable man, necessary to the members of this House in the carrying out of their public business, has been discharged to satisfy the exorbitant and greedy demands of a "combine," which has filled his place with an incompetent man [applause]; that this is simply another evidence of the infamous character of the proceeding whereby competent employees necessary to the members in the discharge of their duties have had their places taken from them in order to satisfy the greed of some gentlemen who must have places for their constituents. [Renewed applause.]

Mr. ALDRICH. I regret that my friend from Indiana has seen fit to revive unpleasant recollections connected with the early days of the organization of this House. I presume that naturally I might sympathize with him in the remarks he has made. But the committee, in an unbiassed way, without regard, I think, to past events on the lines suggested by my friend from Indiana, have sought to make a report here which will benefit the service. Our committee is prepared to stand by that report. We believe it to be a very modest recommendation, and I think there will be no serious objection to it.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I wish to ask the gentleman whether the object of this report recommending these men to places in the public service is not to repair the injury done the public service by the "combine." [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, who desires to ask a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether or not the Committee on Accounts has investigated to see if some method can not be adopted by which Mr. Coombs can be restored to his place, in order that the members of this House who desire to avail themselves of his services may have an opportunity to do so? I wish to ask also if he has investigated, when that is done, whether it will not be wholly unnecessary to make the additional appointment recommended in this report of the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that I doubt whether it is within the province of the Committee on Accounts to investigate as to the personnel of the appointees of this House further than as these questions may come before them in new resolutions or new business providing for the appointment of additional employees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. If the gentleman will pardon me, the committee has made a favorable recommendation in reference to a certain appointment. Now, it strikes me that, if the facts show that a capable employee has been turned out, it would be entirely germane for the committee to inquire whether his restoration would not make a new appointment wholly unnecessary.

Mr. ALDRICH. Well, I am willing to submit to the judgment of the House whether or not it is necessary.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him this question: Supposing the resolution proposed by the Committee on Accounts should be adopted, what will be the increase in the number of employees of the House, and further, what will be the increase in the monthly expenditures by reason of the change?

Mr. ALDRICH. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the number of employees recommended by the resolution of the Committee on Accounts is but three. One of these has been an appointee of the House for a number of years——

Mr. SAYERS. Is it not more than three?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; only three.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in the process of answering a question now. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. In response to the gentleman from Texas, I find on reexamination that so far as the number of employees is concerned, there is an increase of only two, Mr. Chancey having been in his present position for a great many years, and having been already provided for in the general appropriation bill. This resolution, therefore, provides for but two additional appointees, with a compensation of $250 a month.

Mr. McMILLIN. What is the object of giving that increase?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not understand that there is any increase, further than is carried by the increase in force.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I find that my claim has been preempted. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. I will hear the question of the gentleman.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I wish to ask how many employees were provided in the original resolutions referred to the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. ALDRICH. Forty-eight.

Mr. CUMMINGS. And that number has been reduced to two?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] has, in my opinion, spoken entirely without authority when he challenges the competency of the man appointed to take the place of Mr. Coombs as an em-

ployee of this House. I know the new officer and know him to be competent. I think I am able to say that I was as little connected with the "combine" he speaks of as he was himself; and yet I know that the gentleman from New York, Mr. Vail, appointed to this position is not only competent, but willing and ready at all times to discharge all of the duties of the office to which he was appointed. He is also a good Republican. If it is necessary, out of courtesy, to yield to the minority of this House the retention of Mr. Coombs, I am perfectly willing to vote for the adoption of the resolution. But I must confess I do not see the propriety of making places for two employees when there is only room for one.

I only desire to say, however, that Mr. Vail, the new appointee, is a gentleman of capacity, not only competent and willing to discharge all of the duties of the office, but ready at all times to do so; and it is unfair to attack him on the floor of the House on the ground of incompetency. If we need two men for this work, put it on that ground.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS. Do I understand the gentleman from Iowa to say that it is entirely unnecessary to adopt this resolution appointing Mr. Coombs an additional employee under the doorkeeper?

Mr. HULL. I undertake to say that the new appointee, Mr. Vail, is just as competent as Mr. Coombs, or any other man, for the discharge of the duties of that position. The fact is that one of these gentlemen stepped out of employment because he was a Democrat, although competent for the place, which was filled by a Republican who is equally competent, and who was appointed because we are entitled to it. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, just a further question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] has the floor.

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOPKINS. Then this resolution, instead of being for the benefit of the House, is simply for the purpose of furnishing employment at a good handsome salary to a Democratic ex-employee?

Mr. HULL. I yield that question to the chairman of the Committee on Accounts. I hardly think it is a fair statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] yield for a minute?

Mr. HULL. I will. But I am occupying the floor by courtesy of the chairman of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Does the gentleman mean to say to this House that the gentleman who has been appointed to the position held by Major Coombs is capable of discharging the duties of that place as efficiently as Major Coombs without his having had a considerable period of preparation?

Mr. HULL. He has had considerable experience in public affairs. He is a man who has filled more important public places than this, and I will say further, that if the gentlemen representing my side in the organization of this House had succeeded—those of us who went down to defeat with the gentleman from Illinois—I should have insisted on Major Coombs being discharged from his place and a Republican taking it, because I do not believe it has come to pass that there is only one man in the United States capable of filling this place, and he a Democrat. If it has, let that argument be used on the floor—that there is but one man, and he a Democrat, capable of serving this House in that position, and then we will pass a law forever continuing him in that place regardless of the change of party.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. HULL. I have answered it. I say I believe he can fill the place just as well as Major Coombs, and will soon become as efficient.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Without considerable time for preparation?

Mr. HULL. He has had considerable experience in public affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. May I ask the gentleman what experience——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] yield to the gentleman again?

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. May I ask the gentleman what experience the gentleman sought to be appointed in place of Major Coombs——

Mr. HULL. Sought to be appointed? He is already appointed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Well, already appointed. What experience has he had with respect to the performance of these particular duties?

Mr. HULL. He has been connected with the House and with the Departments; and I want to say as to that, that there would not have been a man changed in this House if that argument is to apply; all officers superseded were experienced men, and I suppose we members would like to have it apply, because it would keep us continually here, on the ground that we have had experience and the other fellow has not.

Mr. GIBSON. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Speaker, do I not occupy the floor?

Mr. GIBSON. Did not Major Coombs take the place of a Republican when he was appointed?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; the place was created for Major Coombs originally twenty years ago.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. If I can have the attention of the House, I want to say a word. I have listened to this report. Naturally, when the Republican party obtained a majority in this House it did what the Democratic majority accomplished in the Fifty-second Congress. It changed the employees from Democrats to Republicans. In the very nature of things, new employees, the first week or the first month, can not do as good service as those who have had two years' experience. But I think, without having any special personal interest in any of these employees, that they are demonstrating that they are fairly competent, for new fellows, and I do not know but they are beginning to act like old employees. So much for that.

Some twelve or fourteen years ago Major Coombs was made Department messenger. I think he is from Missouri, and I have always understood he is a Democrat. In the years that have passed by he became a very valuable employee, because he knew where to obtain just such documents as members desired, and we were all in the habit of unloading on him. I am of the opinion that it will take a little time for any employee of equal ability to get the same kind of knowledge that he has, and as he has run errands for so many of us for so many years, I can understand how this resolution would be reported.

Now, in conclusion, I want to compliment the Committee on Accounts that in the great desire we have to see the business of the House properly performed, and to find places for our constituents, which desire led to the introduction of resolutions calling for forty-eight new places, that the Committee on Accounts, after careful investigation, have reported in favor of but two.

I am inclined to vote for the report. Let me say one thing further. I think I am without prejudice or bias in this matter. I hail from the State of Illinois, with 21 Republicans in this House. There are 22 members altogether. We have one contestant, who hopes he will make it 22; whether he ought to or not will appear a little later. [Laughter.] I think I can speak without prejudice, because, so far as I know or believe, that delegation of 21 have not had the honor to have had even a page appointed upon the recommendation that any one of them has made. [Laughter.] I do not know whether that is the fault of the powers that be; but so far as I am concerned, I have not recommended anybody. Still I am sure that the employees who have been appointed by the powers that be in this House are competent, and very competent. [Applause.] Because if they were not, they would not have been selected entirely to the exclusion of people who might have desired to be appointed from Illinois. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. I yield two minutes to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. NORTHWAY. If Colonel Coombs is appointed, what will his duties be?

Mr. ALDRICH. His duties will be the same, as I understand it, as they have been in the past.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Can not Mr. Vail perform all those duties?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is an open question. I am not sure whether he can or not. This is a larger House than it was twenty years ago, and the business of this House is constantly increasing, and the constituents are also increasing.

Mr. NORTHWAY. What will become of Mr. Vail if this report is agreed to?

Mr. ALDRICH. This does not affect Mr. Vail in any way, because Mr. Vail was appointed by the Doorkeeper.

Mr. NORTHWAY. He will draw the salary, but who will perform his duties?

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no doubt that the work will be divided, and I also have no doubt that there is enough work for both of them.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Is it a matter of necessity? Is there more than one can do?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think there is enough to keep both busy.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Well, Mr. Vail says that he does not need assistance.

Mr. ALDRICH. We do not know Mr. Vail in this matter. He has not appeared before the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania. Has Mr. Vail been consulted as to this matter, and does he ask any aid?

Mr. ALDRICH. Not so far as the Committee on Accounts is concerned.

Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that Mr. Vail says he does not need any assistance?

Mr. ALDRICH. I have not spoken to him on the subject.

Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have. He told me this morning that he did not need any assistance.

Mr. DOVENER. And he also said the same to me.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am so much of a partisan that I dislike to put myself seemingly in antagonism to the position taken by my colleague [Mr. HULL]. And yet I have such a strong feeling in regard to this matter that I must speak just as I feel about it. Colonel Coombs I know well. I believe he is a Democrat. He is also an honest man. [Laughter and applause.] I throw that in to give the boys a chance. [Renewed laughter.] He is one of the most courteous and efficient officers that I have known in connection with the duties of this House. He has been retained in two Republican Congresses.

In the Fifty-first Congress there was a united voice for his retention. Why? To answer that question let me go into detail. There are certain public documents put to the credit of members for distribution among their constituents; but those of us who have served in this body know that there are a large number of calls for documents constantly coming to us that are never placed to our credit; and, for one, I was baffled in meeting these requests from my district until I learned there was such an office as that of "Department messenger" filled by Colonel Coombs. Since then, when I get a request for documents outside of those put to my credit in the folding room, I refer it indorsed "Respectfully referred to C. W. Coombs, Department messenger." He will find that document if it is in this Capitol. [Applause.]

A MEMBER. Would not the other man do so, too?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, sir; I do not care what member of Congress was appointed to take that place it would take him years to learn to perform the duties. He goes into the archives of this Government. He knows every nook and corner where these documents are concealed and hidden, and I never felt a keener regret than when I learned he had been removed.

I do not care what his politics are. That man can do the best service for my people of any man that I know, and now that I have been made a full-fledged chairman of a committee and have not a private secretary I feel all the more the need of his efficient services. I do not want to discuss "combines." I fought for the views that I entertain in regard to the organization of this House and was licked out of my boots. [Laughter.] I took my medicine like a man, and I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, that the victorious troops have put competent men in office, nor do I challenge the competency of Mr. Vail. I have met him three times and he impresses me as a gentleman in every sense of the word, and I have no doubt that, with years of training, he can do good work for this House in that line; but I applaud the Committee on Accounts for striking down the army of extra employees and giving us the two men recommended—one an old soldier and the other a man equipped by years of training—twenty years, I am told—for serving this House in this respect as no other man, in my judgment, can do. Therefore, be he Democrat or Republican, I am going to vote for this report and with hearty good will, because it is in the interest of the public service and of my people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I did not know the politics of Mr. Coombs until I heard the statements that have been made in this discussion to-day. I met him when I first came to Congress and understood that he had been connected with the House for many years. I found him to be a very honest and intelligent gentleman and one who thoroughly understood his duties. In the hurry of public life I have very frequently found that my duties would not permit me to go around and hunt up documents desired by my constituents. I was anxious to please them, and at the same time desirous of saving all the time I could, in order that I might study public questions and fit myself to discharge my duties in committee and on the floor of the House. I always found Mr. Coombs thoroughly efficient in attending to these matters for me, and while there may be many positions within the gift of this House which can be readily filled from the start, on the going out of the old employee, by some person of good general qualifications, yet I undertake to say that this is one of those peculiar positions that can not be properly filled by Mr. Vail or by anybody else without long experience, such as Mr. Coombs has had.

I am heartily in favor of the resolution reported by the Committee on Accounts; but the trouble in this case is that the cart has been placed in front of the horse. The proper course would have been to retain Mr. Coombs and then to bring in a resolution authorizing the appointment of Mr. Vail or someone else to assist him, if, in fact, any assistance whatever was necessary to Colonel Coombs.

I want to take issue, too, with a proposition that has been laid down here by my friend from Iowa [Mr. HULL]. I do not think that a man occupying a mere clerical position in the service of this House should be put out of office solely on account of his politics. Neither do I think that any man should be put into such an office merely on account of his politics. I think that Congress and the public have some interest in such a matter which is not to be needlessly sacrificed. I think that putting Mr. Coombs out of his position was a mistake on the part of those having the appointing power, and I think it was also, though perhaps unwittingly, an abuse of the appointing power. I am therefore glad that he is to be restored, and I hope it will be understood that the duties he is to perform in the future shall be those that he has so ably discharged in the past.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW].

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, by the remarks which have been made here in reference to political "combines" I am reminded of the witty clergyman who said that his "doxy" was orthodoxy, and that all other "doxies" were heterodoxy. We all believe in the combine that we ourselves belong to, and the bad fellows are always in the other combine. [Laughter.] Now, the success of a political "combine" means simply that somebody has had a majority. Two votes were taken here upon the question of the employees of this House, and every man who voted on the one side voted for one set of men, and every man who voted on the other side voted for another set of men. Of course, in all such contests one side or the other must necessarily prevail. For my part, I see no reason why the employees of this branch of Congress should not be increased as the body increases in numbers. You can not carry on the Government of the United States to-day with the appropriations that sufficed in John Adams's time, and neither can you carry on the business of this large legislative body with the small number of employees that were sufficient when it was smaller. Therefore, what sense is there in spending our time here over the question of securing an additional competent employee for this House, though he be a Democrat? I think the report of the committee is all right.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I dissent in toto from the low-down, disreputable spoils system that is defended here. [Laughter.] I have no doubt that it is for the interest of this House and that it is necessary to change about half the employees whenever the politics of the House changes, in order that the body may be properly served. But I want to say that while all this talk here is entirely honorable for the men who make it, in the light of the views they take, I should think it disgraceful in me from my standpoint. [Laughter and applause.] I think this resolution is one which we ought to vote for in order to repair, so far as we may, the injury that has been done by the "bosses" of the "combine" that have used their power relentlessly and to the damage of the public service.

Furthermore, I should like to ask gentlemen whether we are to have a reader here whom we can not understand on each side of the House at all—whose voice is loud enough, but of such a quality as to mingle with the sounds in the House so that on either wing we do not know anything that is being read from the desk. I should like to know whether or not that is to be continued through this Congress by the "bosses" of the "combine"—not by the officers of this House, not by the Speaker, not by the House, but by the two gentlemen who farm out the offices of this House. Noble business! [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question.

The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof the resolution was agreed to, there being—ayes 154, noes 10.

On motion of Mr. ALDRICH, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CLERKS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Accounts, submitted a report; which was read, as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred the resolution of the House authorizing and directing said committee to designate the committees of the House to which the clerks provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, should be allowed and assigned for the present Congress, and to report by resolution to the House for its action thereon, respectfully report that they have examined into and considered said matter, and report to the House and recommend the passage of the following resolution, namely:

Resolved, That the nineteen clerks to committees of the House during the session, provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, be, and they are hereby, allowed and assigned for the present Congress to the following committees, namely:

To the Committee on Banking and Currency, a clerk.
To the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, a clerk.
To the Committee on Education, a clerk.
To the Committee on Enrolled Bills, a clerk.
To the Committee on Invalid Pensions, an assistant clerk.
To the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, a clerk.
To the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, a clerk.
To the Committee on Labor, a clerk.
To the Committee on the Library, a clerk.
To the Committee on the Militia, a clerk.
To the Committee on Mines and Mining, a clerk.
To the Committee on Pacific Railroads, a clerk.
To the Committee on Patents, a clerk.

To the Committee on Pensions, a clerk.
To the Committee on Private Land Claims, a clerk.
To the Committee on Printing, a clerk.
To the Committee on Railways and Canals, a clerk.
To the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, a clerk.
To the Committee on the Territories, a clerk.

And resolved, That the pay of the clerks to committees of the House of Representatives which have been or may be hereafter authorized by the House, who are paid during the session only, shall begin from the time such clerks entered upon the discharge of their duties, which shall be ascertained and evidenced by the certificate of the chairmen of the several committees employing clerks for the session only.

The resolutions reported by the committee were adopted.

On motion of Mr. ALDRICH, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ASSISTANT CLERKS TO CERTAIN COMMITTEES.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Accounts, submitted a report; which was read, as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred the resolution of the House authorizing the chairmen of the Committees on Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce to each appoint an assistant clerk for their respective committees, to be paid a compensation of $6 per day each during the sessions of this Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, beg to report and recommend the passage of the same.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the chairmen of Committees on Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce be, and they are hereby, authorized to each appoint an assistant clerk for their respective committees.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to offer an amendment to this report, which I will read:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint Lauritz Olson a messenger to the House gallery at a salary of $1,200 per annum.

Mr. ALDRICH. I question whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] is germane.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois make a point of order?

Mr. ALDRICH. I desire very much that the gentleman should have the opportunity to offer that proposition at the right time; but I question whether it is germane to this resolution.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to state if the gentleman will permit——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois make a point of order?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not wish to be heard on the question of order. I desire to make a statement in regard to the amendment I have offered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the amendment is not in order.

The question being taken on the resolution reported by Mr. ALDRICH, it was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ALDRICH, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules hope to be able to report to-morrow their amendments, and they would like to have a meeting to-day immediately after the adjournment of the House. I move, therefore, that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported the following bills; which were referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

The bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood. (Report No. 15.)

The bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene. (Report No. 16.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SETTLE: A bill (H. R. 3335) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Durham, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3336) to establish a military post at or near the city of Raleigh, N. C.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3337) amending the act of June 8, 1880, entitled "An act to authorize the President to appoint an officer of the Navy or the Marine Corps to perform the duties of Solicitor and Judge-Advocate-General, etc., and to fix the rank and pay of such officer," and for other purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD (by request): A bill (H. R. 3338) to protect and support commercial credit; to equalize rates of interest; to provide for the incorporation of clearing houses; to regulate and define their operations; to provide a clearing-house currency secured by pledge of commercial assets and the responsibility of the associated banks, and to provide for the circulation and redemption thereof—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 3339) to create a special commission on highways, and to make appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KEM: A bill (H. R. 3340) to provide for the transfer of the Fort Sidney Military Post Reserve to the city of Sidney, Nebr., for educational purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 3341) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds to maintain a sufficient gold reserve, and to redeem and retire United States notes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PENDLETON: A bill (H. R. 3342) to grant to railroad companies in Indian Territory additional powers to secure right of way, depot grounds, etc.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 3343) providing for the compensation of fourth-class postmasters for issuing money orders—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 3344) relating to the sale of gas in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 3345) to require the street railroads in the District of Columbia to issue and receive transfers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 3346) to raise additional revenue for the support of the Government—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Florida: A bill (H. R. 3347) to restore to the public domain certain lands in the southern extremity of Florida, known as the "Perrine grant," and to enable settlers within the limits of said grant to homestead the tracts actually occupied by them—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 3348) to prescribe the pleading, practice, and proof in prosecuting pension claims—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: A bill (H. R. 3349) to reduce the denominations of United States notes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 3350) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 3351) relating to compensation of fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3352) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate 1 condemned cannon and 15 cannon balls to C. A. Craig Post, No. 75, Grand Army of the Republic, of Parkers Landing, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also a bill (H. R. 3353) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate 1 condemned cannon and 15 balls to John F. Crall Post, No. —, Grand Army of the Republic, of Kittanning, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3354) to further regulate immigration, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 3355) to amend section 2324, Revised Statutes, relating to mining claims—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. HOWE: A bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for the dredging and widening of the channel of Newtown Creek, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BENNETT: A bill (H. R. 3357) to provide for the dredging and widening of the channel of Newtown Creek, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3358) for the recognition of the military service of the officers and enlisted men of certain Pennsylvania military organizations—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 3359) to impose a discriminating duty on tea imported from this side of the Cape of Good Hope, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3360) to amend section 19 of the administrative customs law of 1890—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 3361) to promote the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 3362) increasing the rate of pensions for certain disabilities—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 3363) exempting American coastwise sailing vessels piloted by their licensed masters or by a

United States pilot from the obligation to pay State pilots for services not rendered—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STAHLE: A bill (H. R. 3364) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for the Worth Infantry and York Rifles, of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: Joint resolution (H. Res. 66) to supply the Department of State with documents—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Joint resolution (H. Res. 67) recognizing the belligerency of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRODERICK: Joint resolution (H. Res. 68) requiring attorneys and claim agents having offices in the District of Columbia, and who have undertaken or shall undertake to prosecute claims for pensions, to advise each of the claimants once every three months as to the condition of his or her claim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: Joint resolution (H. Res. 69) to secure the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds as required by law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOODMAN: Resolution requesting the Committee on Foreign Affairs to make an early report on the resolution, heretofore referred to said committee, touching the affairs of the Cuban republic and its proposed or existing rights as a civilized nation—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: Resolution calling on the Secretary of the Treasury for information concerning the proceeds of certain bond sales—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. AITKEN: A bill (H. R. 3365) to correct the military record of Timothy Way—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3366) to correct the military record of Wesley B. Coon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3367) for the relief of Joseph Eager, Charles Gallagher, and A. A. McGaffey, to repay them moneys unlawfully collected from them by the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOATNER: A bill (H. R. 3368) for the relief of the heirs of Myra Clark Gaines—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 3369) for the relief of Richmond L. Steers, of Kenton County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 3370) for the relief of James R. D. Morrison—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 3371) for the relief of Stalnaker Marteney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 3372) for the relief of certain carriers in the post-office at Cleveland, Ohio—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3373) to increase the pension of Susannah E Todd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 3374) to remove the charge of desertion against Henry W. Curtis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 3375) for the relief of W. A. Walker, of Albuquerque, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Florida: A bill (H. R. 3376) to correct the military record of Edwin Higgins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 3377) for relief of George C. Ellison—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3378) for the relief of the heirs of the late Alexander Kirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3379) granting an increase of pension to Joseph O. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3380) granting an increase of pension to John R. Row, of Toronto, Kans.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3381) for the relief of William Stockebrand, of Woodson County, State of Kansas—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3382) granting an increase of pension to William H. McHenry, of Marion, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3383) for the relief of Sarah Oddy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3384) granting a pension to Mrs. Ann Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3385) granting a pension to Ellen Justice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3386) to remove the charge of desertion against Samuel W. Smith, alias Samuel Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3387) authorizing the Secretary of War to accept the resignation of Maj. D. H. David, of the Fourteenth Regiment Kansas Cavalry Volunteers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 3388) to increase the pension of Mary Doubleday, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Abner Doubleday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWNING: A bill (H. R. 3389) increasing pension of Albert Buck from $12 to $30 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 3390) to carry into effect a finding of the Court of Claims in favor of David Maberry, jr., of Washington County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3391) to carry into effect a finding of the Court of Claims in favor of Charles Cowell, late of Benton County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 3392) for the relief of Charles T. Trowbridge, George D. Walker, and John A. Trowbridge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 3393) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to issue an honorable discharge to Francis M. Bacon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 3394) granting a pension to Nancy Caroline Pickard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3395) granting a pension to Carrie H. Greene—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 3396) to increase the pension of Mrs. Helen G. Heiner, widow of the late Capt. R. G. Heiner, Company A, First United States Infantry, of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 3397) for the relief of Isaac N. Jennings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3398) for relief of Augusta Tuller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 3399) to correct the military record of Charles G. Augeroth, jr.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3400) appropriating $4,323.15 in payment of the claim of A. Bruner, of Indianapolis, Ind., for constructing a sewer adjacent to the United States arsenal in said city—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3401) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob Shreckengost—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULING: A bill (H. R. 3402) granting a pension to William Sheppard, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 3403) for the relief of Dr. William A. Johnson, late a contract surgeon in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3404) for the relief of Mary A. Phillips, widow of Capt. Edwin R. Phillips, late of Company L, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 3405) for the relief of Benjamin R. Waller—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 3406) granting an increase of pension to William Boyer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3407) granting a pension to Margaret J. Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3408) to correct the military record of Conrad Hyne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3409) granting a pension and for the relief of Dr. Harrison Wagner—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 3410) for the relief of George W. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3411) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Lucy A. Johns, of Laynesville, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3412) to correct the military record of H. C. Jett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3413) removing charge of desertion from the record of William Justice—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3414) removing charge of desertion from the record of Gilmore Justice—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 3415) granting a pension to Jesse Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3416) granting an honorable discharge to John Sumners—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3417) granting a pension to Milton P. Julian—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3418) granting a pension to William M. Kelley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOW (by request): A bill (H. R. 3419) for the relief of Edwin Gomez—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 3420) for the relief of C. C. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3421) to grant a pension to Elizabeth Sadler—ot the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3422) for the relief of Mary P. Mullin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 3423) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Simon Trostler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3424) to correct the military record of William Marshall, of Sturgeon Bay, Wis., and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 3425) to remove the charge of desertion against Charles H. Leland and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMICK: A bill (H. R. 3426) granting an increase of pension to Eugenia R. Sweeney, widow of Brig. Gen. Thomas W. Sweeney, deceased—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 3427) for the relief of William Crow—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3428) to carry into effect the finding of the Court of Claims in favor of Jacob Lavender, late of Nevada County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 3429) granting a pension to Irena Redman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 3430) for the relief of Charles W. Cronk—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3431) granting a pension to Eliza Sandford, daughter of the late William Sandford, a soldier in the Revolutionary war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 3432) for the relief of John E. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 3433) for the relief of William H. Schriver, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-sixth Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 3434) granting a pension to William F. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3435) for the relief of Herbert O. Dunn—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 3436) for the relief of Archibald J. Sampson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 3437) to pension Ellen Carey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3438) to pension Mary Elizabeth Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SETTLE: A bill (H. R. 3439) for the relief of John S. Leary and Mathew N. Leary, jr., executors of Mathew N. Leary, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3440) for the relief of the estate of Franklin A. Davis, late of Orange County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3441) for relief of Anna S. Rawls, of Durham, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 3442) to restore the pension of Alexander A. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3443) to revoke the order dismissing Lieut. Lanson Zane, Tenth Independent Battery, Ohio Light Artillery, from the service and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 3444) to grant John T. Nagle the privilege of applying for a medal of honor for conspicuous bravery in action while serving as an acting assistant surgeon of the United States Army with troops in the field during the late civil war under the orders of commanding officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A bill (H. R. 3445) to amend the military record of Reuben Levy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3446) to amend the military record of Louis Pereles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of 129 citizens of Brownsville and vicinity, for free navigation of the Monongahela River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BRODERICK: Petition for increase of pension, by Elizabeth Stewart, of Sabetha, Kans., widow of Thomas L. Stewart, late first lieutenant, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, war of rebellion, 1861–1865—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Oliver J. Lyon, private Company G, Forty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, war of 1861–1865—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of George C. Ellison, late chief engineer House of Representatives, that he may be reimbursed for expenses incurred, etc.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARDY: Evidence in support of House bill No. 2386, to correct the military record of John W. Canary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the widow of John Lessle, late private Company G, Eighty-second Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILBORN: Memorial of the One Hundred Thousand Club, of Fresno, Cal., urging that immediate action be taken on the part of our Government for the speedy completion of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Letter of the Ætna Life Insurance Company, of Hartford, Conn., regarding proposed legislation on the jurisdiction of Federal courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Memorial of Indiana Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEM: Papers to accompany a bill to provide for the transfer of the Fort Sidney Military Post Reserve to the city of Sidney, Nebr., for educational purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition of Charles N. Maryman and 111 other citizens of Lafayette County, Ark., asking for the improvement of Red River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PITNEY: Memorial of the united congregations of the Reformed, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches of Boonton, N. J., concerning the Armenian atrocities—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUSK: Four petitions of Thornton Rollins and others, together with Frank Mitchell and others, Michael Shea and others, and Rudolf Rasmerssen and others—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Herbert O. Dunn—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of John T. Ross, assistant postmaster House of Representatives, in reference to difference in salary—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPERRY: Action and resolutions adopted by the Davenport Congregational Church, of New Haven, Conn., in relation to Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAHLE: Resolutions of the Knights of Malta, of York, Pa., in regard to Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Worth Infantry and York Rifles, of York County, Pa., praying that they may be recognized as among the first defenders of the capital of the nation in the late civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRACEY: Paper to accompany House bill No. 3330—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 3332—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3333—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 3334—to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 8, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM COLORADO.

Mr. TELLER. My colleague, Mr. Wolcott, is present, and I ask that the oath of office be administered to him.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator-elect from the State of Colorado, whose credentials have heretofore been presented, will please come forward and receive the oath of office.

Mr. Wolcott was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. TELLER, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

BATTLE SHIPS FOR THE NAVY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to the resolution of December 27, 1895, information as to whether it would be advantageous to the naval service to now contract for six battle ships instead of for the two at present authorized, on the basis of the bids now before the Navy Department, modified as might be, in the opinion of the Department, to the public interest; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 65) to authorize Lieut. Sidney S. Jordan, Fifth United States Artillery, and Capt. Edward C. Carter, assistant surgeon, United States Army, to accept medals from the

British Government; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of the First Baptist Church of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the passage of a Sunday-rest law for the national capital; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Akron, Ohio, praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CLARK presented the petition of D. A. Hastings and 152 other citizens of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation designed to secure a better grade of immigrants; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. GEAR presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by Ed. Hamlin Post, No. 112, Department of Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, of Wellman, Iowa, praying for the enactment of a service pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pueblo County, Colo., praying that a pension be granted to the widow and children of John R. Webster, deceased, late private in Company A, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment National Guard of Ohio; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Washington, praying that an appropriation be made to pay the moneys due to the veterans who fought in the Indian wars in Oregon and Washington in 1855–56; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorial in relation to the survivors of the Indian war of 1855 and 1856 in the Territory (now State) of Washington.

To the Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Washington, would respectfully represent that many of the early settlers of the Territory of Washington, during the years 1855 and 1856, in the protection of the lives of themselves and families, and their property, having to contend against the hostile Indians occupying the country at that time, upon the call of the governor of the Territory, freely volunteered to suppress the hostility of such Indians; that while fighting these Indians many valuable lives were lost and much property destroyed; that of those volunteers and early settlers but few now survive; that while the services of the soldiers of the Regular Army during that war were promptly provided for by the Government without diminution of any kind, and received full recognition at the hands of the General Government for their services, the brave men who volunteered and defended the Northwest Territory from the hostile Indians in the war of 1855 and 1856, responsive to the call of the governors of the Territories of Washington and Oregon, have failed to receive that recognition and consideration at the hands of the Government of the United States to which they are entitled.

That by the eleventh section of the act of August 18, 1856, the Secretary of War was directed "to examine into the amount of the expenses necessarily incurred in the suppression of Indian hostilities in the late Indian war in Oregon and Washington by the Territorial governors of said Territories for the maintenance of the volunteer forces engaged in said war, including the pay of the volunteers"; and he was authorized, if in his judgment necessary, to appoint a commission of three persons to ascertain and report such expenses; that by an order issued from the War Department, September 4, 1856, Capt. A. J. Smith, United States Army, Rufus Ingalls, United States Army, late Quartermaster-General, and Lafayette Grover, afterwards governor of the State of Oregon and United States Senator from said State, were appointed a commission to ascertain and report upon the expenses incurred by the Territories aforesaid.

The commission met at Portland, Oreg., October 20, 1856, organized a board, proceeded to the discharge of the duty assigned them, and, after full investigation and consideration, found, among other things, that the aggregate number of troops engaged in this war from the Territory of Washington was 1,896; that the approximate number of troops engaged at any one period was 1,000; and, in taking action upon the pay of the volunteers from Washington Territory, the commission—in the absence of any law of the Territory upon the subject—deemed it proper and just to recommend the same rates of pay and allowance as were reported in the case of the volunteer troops of Oregon.

The Oregon statute provided as follows: "Whenever such volunteers are called and received into the service of the Territory * * * each noncommissioned officer and private shall be entitled to receive $2 per day and rations, and $2 per day for the risk of his horse, except for horses actually killed in action, unavoidably lost or reported unfit for service; in which cases the owner shall receive the appraised value thereof. All commissioned officers shall receive the same pay as officers of the same rank in the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That commissioned officers shall receive the same pay for the use and risk of horses as noncommissioned officers."

The Commission upon that basis found that there is due for troops in the service of the Territory of Washington a total of $519,593.06; and it was further found in examining into the amount of expenses necessarily incurred for the maintenance of these volunteers that the total amount due for expenses was $961,882.39.

That said Commission visited extensively both Territories with the view of being informed fully as to the nature and extent of the Indian hostilities, means employed for their suppression, the rates of labor, the prices current for the property furnished for the service, and the facilities and expenses of transportation.

They examined into each distinct department of the service, and filed an exhibit of the total expense necessarily incurred in the suppression of the Indian hostilities in the late Indian war by the Territorial governors of said Territories, and further found that the expenses for the maintenance of the volunteer forces engaged in said war from the Territory of Washington, including pay, was $1,481,475.45, and for the State of Oregon the sum of $4,499,949.33; and the total amount reported by the commissioners as due the Territories of Oregon and Washington was $6,011,457.36.

That on the 7th day of February, 1860, the Third Auditor of the Treasury reported to the House of Representatives upon these claims and allowed, under said report, only $2,714,808.55, thus leaving a balance justly due these early pioneers of $3,296,648.81.

Your memorialists respectfully refer you to the report of the Commission above named, and the adjustment by the then Third Auditor of the Treasury, and respectfully ask that an appropriation may be made sufficient to cover the claims above set forth as due the volunteers from the State of Washington and State of Oregon during the Indian war of 1855 and 1856; and to that end your memorialists will ever pray.

Mr. BRICE presented the memorial of B. W. Campbell, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and the memorial of J. H. McBride, of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill No. 291, to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to vessels propelled by steam, gas, fluid, naphtha, or motor; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of the legislature of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant to Michael Sheehy, late of Company E, First Regiment Michigan Cavalry, a muster as captain; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Michael Sheehy, late of Company E, First Regiment Michigan Cavalry Volunteers, now a resident of Yale, Mich., served as captain of cavalry from the 13th day of June, 1864, until the 29th of August, 1864, and was in command of a skirmish line and was wounded on that date and claims pay up to the 25th day of March, 1866, and through an oversight never received any commission as such officer, after having been duly appointed as such and recommended to such position and for such commission, and by reason of his not having secured such commission has been unable to draw any pay from the Government for serving in such capacity; and

Whereas House bill 5305, looking to his relief, was introduced in National House of Representatives at the second session of the Fifty-third Congress, and is now before the Committee on Claims of that body, a copy of which bill is as follows:

"A bill granting muster and pay allowance of captain of cavalry to Michael Sheehy from June 13, 1864, to March 25, 1866.

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Michael Sheehy, late of Company E, First Regiment Michigan Cavalry Volunteers, the muster and pay and allowance of a captain of cavalry from the 13th day of June, 1864, to the 25th day of March, 1866, after deducting therefrom the pay and allowances he received as sergeant of cavalry during the same period": Therefore

Resolved (the senate concurring), That the Senators and Representatives from Michigan in the next Congress be, and are hereby, requested to use every honorably means to secure the passage of the said bill, and thus aid in doing justice to one of Michigan's bravest soldiers, who promptly answered his country's call in time of danger and need; and

Be it further resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives of this legislature be instructed to forward a copy of these resolutions to each Senator and Representative-elect from Michigan to the next Congress.

JOSEPH R. McLAUGHLIN,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
WILLIAM D. GORDON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

STATE OF MICHIGAN, *Department of State, ss:*

I, Joseph W. Selden, deputy secretary of state of the State of Michigan, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of a concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Michigan, passed on the 14th day of May, A. D. 1895, with the official daily journals of both the State senate and house of representatives of said date, and that it is a true and correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of such concurrent resolution.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Michigan on this 28th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1895.

JOS. W. SELDEN,
Deputy Secretary of State.

EXPLORATION OF THE OLYMPIC MOUNTAINS.

Mr. SQUIRE. I have a letter addressed to me from the War Department, transmitting a copy of the report of Lieut. Joseph P. O'Neil, Fourteenth Infantry, of his exploration of the Olympic Mountains, from June to October, 1890. It is a very interesting and important report. I move that the letter be referred to the Select Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, and that it be printed as a document.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom the subject was referred, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 1404) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to enlist additional men for service in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the bill be printed with the accompanying report and go to the Calendar, simply stating that it is a very important measure, covering the enlistment of men needed in the Navy, and also in an emergency authorizing the recruiting from the Naval Militia and from forces outside. I shall call it up at a later day with the leave of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar. The printing requested will be done under the rule.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1271) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore English, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 649) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore English, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 249) granting a pension to Charles E. Jones, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom were referred the following report, memorials, and resolu-

tion, asked to be discharged from their further consideration, and that they be referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was agreed to:

Annual report of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua, for the year 1895;

Memorials of California fruit growers, favoring the building of the Nicaragua Canal;

Memorial of citizens of Monterey, Cal., urging the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; and

Resolution of the Board of Trade of Ocala, Fla., favoring the construction of the Nicaragua Canal by the United States Government.

ISSUE AND RECORDING OF COMMISSIONS.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 732) to regulate the issue and recording of the commissions of officers in several of the Departments, to report it without amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered. It is reported unanimously by the committee, and a short letter of the Secretary of State will show the importance of passing it now.

The bill was read.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President——

Mr. SHERMAN. There is a short letter from the Secretary of State. Let it be read.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why not include the Secretary of the Interior in the bill?

Mr. FRYE. The law already provides for the Interior Department.

Mr. SHERMAN. The object of the bill is to allow each Department to make out and record and have in its own records the appointment of its own officers. That is all there is of it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HOAR. Let the bill be read once more.

The Secretary again read the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the letter be read, which I think will explain the matter sufficiently. It is a brief letter.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is a short letter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, December 4, 1895.*

SIR: I have the honor to inform you that it is deemed desirable that this Department be relieved of the duty of issuing and recording the commissions of civil officers who are under the direction and control of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Agriculture, and it is believed the service will be improved by legislation which shall provide for the transfer of this duty to the Departments under which the officers respectively serve, as was done in the case of postmasters by act of March 18, 1874 (Statutes at Large, volume 18, page 23); officers of the Interior Department by act of March 3, 1875 (Statutes at Large, volume 18, page 420); and judicial officers, including marshals and United States attorneys, by act of August 8, 1888 (Statutes at Large, volume 25, page 387).

I therefore request that there be introduced to that end a bill of which a draft is inclosed herewith.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

RICHARD OLNEY.

Hon. JOHN T. MORGAN,
Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING FOR FINANCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. MORRILL. I am directed by the Committee on Finance to report a resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

Mr. MORRILL. This is the usual resolution that is passed in behalf of the committee.

Mr. GORMAN. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the recent act, passed during the last Congress, regulating the public printing, which provides that no greater amount of printing for the Senate or House of Representatives, or a committee of either House, or a Department, shall be made by an order of one House than will fall below the limit of $500 in cost. I suggest to the Senator from Vermont that in view of that law he would not be able, in all probability, to have the amount of printing done that is necessary for the Committee on Finance, and that the resolution had better be referred to the Committee on Printing, so that a joint resolution may be brought in and passed.

Mr. MORRILL. I have no objection to the reference of the resolution, but the amount of printing required by the committee now or at any time will be exceedingly small. It may not cost $5.

Mr. GORMAN. I merely called attention to the law for the information of the Senator. I myself have no objection to the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ST. ALBANS, VT.

Mr. MORRILL. I wish to call up for present consideration the bill (S. 697) for the reconstruction of the United States customhouse and post-office building at St. Albans, Vt., destroyed by fire May 19, 1895. The bill was reported yesterday from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The débris of the burned buildings and parts of the walls are something of a nuisance in the principal streets of St. Albans, and in order to preserve a considerable amount of valuable materials for rebuilding it will be necessary to have the appropriation made at once.

Mr. HALE. What is the order of business?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there are no further reports of committees the introduction of bills is next in order.

Mr. MORRILL. There will be no debate; it is a short bill.

Mr. HALE. I hope the Senator will wait until we get through with the routine business.

Mr. MORRILL. Very well.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1405) authorizing the purchase of law books for the use of the United States circuit and district courts; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1406) regulating the salaries of watchmen in the Departments of the Government; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 1407) granting a pension to William Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KYLE. Before introducing the bill I hold in my hand I should like to say a few words.

Despite the efforts of this branch of Congress and also the other, and despite the promises of the Washington Gas Light Company, the citizens of Washington and the District of Columbia are still paying $1.50 per thousand for gas. Notwithstanding the fact that some other large cities of the United States have gas furnished at $1 per thousand——

Mr. CULLOM. And less.

Mr. KYLE. And notwithstanding the fact that certain cities in New England have gas furnished as low as 75 and 60 cents per thousand, and certain companies are agreeing to furnish gas at 50 cents per thousand, and are making the statement that gas can be manufactured at 30 cents per thousand—notwithstanding these facts, I say, we are still paying in the District of Columbia $1.50 per thousand for gas.

I this morning introduce a bill which I introduced last year, proposing an incorporation supported by some of the strongest financial men this city and the United States afford. They are willing to give a guaranty that they will furnish gas for the District of Columbia, including Washington City, for 60 cents per thousand for the public buildings in this city and the District, and at 75 cents per thousand for the inhabitants of this city and the District. This you will see is almost cutting the present rate in two in the middle.

Some people may think that a company can not furnish gas at this rate. I beg to assure the Senate and the Committee upon the District of Columbia that this company is manufacturing a gas by one of the best processes at present in use in the United States. It is in use at various points in the West and the East. I beg to assure the Senate also that the company is going to furnish a gas of 22 candlepower, according to its guaranty. The present Washington Gas Light Company agrees to furnish a gas of 18 candlepower, but it has never gone beyond 16 candlepower. This company guarantees 22-candlepower gas, and at the rate of 60 cents for the city and 75 cents for the inhabitants. As a guaranty of their good faith for the construction of this plant, they are willing to put up a bond of $200,000, and if that is not satisfactory to the Committee on the District of Columbia and the United States Congress, they are willing to make their bond $500,000 or any amount that may be deemed necessary by the Congress of the United States.

In introducing this bill for the consideration of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I beg their most earnest and careful consideration that, if possible, they may bring in a bill, either this one by amendment or some other bill, that will deliver us from the thralldom, I might say, of the Washington Gas Light Company. I introduce the bill for reference to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (S. 1408) to incorporate the National Capital Gaslight, Heat, and Power Company of the District of Columbia was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to inquire what is the function of the Select Committee on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia. This is a bill (and I have one or two bills which I propose to introduce) for the incorporation of some persons here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Chair would state to the Senator from Massachusetts that the Senator introducing the bill asked that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. The question the Senator propounds the Chair will not undertake to decide, as to what the functions of the Select Committee on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia may be.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to urge one policy or another in regard to the selection of a committee to which to refer such bills, but I should like to have some uniform policy pursued by the Senate. I supposed that the select committee was raised to deal with all such subjects.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I will state to the Senator from Massachusetts that my impression is that the select committee was intended to examine into the affairs of the corporations here, the details of the operations and the reports made by the corporations, and not a matter of this kind, which I think should go to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1409) providing for the construction and equipment of two steam revenue cutters for service on the Great Lakes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1410) providing for the construction and equipment of two steam revenue-cutters for service on the Pacific Coast; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM. I introduced the last bill after consulting with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], not desiring to take any jurisdiction whatever of the business of the Pacific Coast. I desire to have read, so that it may go into the RECORD, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in reference to the two bills I have introduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter will be read.

Mr. CULLOM. It is a personal letter to me, but I think it is important.

The Secretary read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *January 7, 1896.*

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 6th instant, I beg to say:

First. "The number and character of Government boats on the Great Lakes."

Answer. There are two revenue cutters at present on the Great Lakes—the steamer *Johnson*, stationed at Milwaukee, Wis.; the steamer *Fessenden*, at Detroit, Mich., and the tug *Calumet*, at Chicago. The *Johnson* is a very old wooden vessel, built in 1865; cost originally $92,000, and has cost since for repairs to keep her in commission upward of $87,000. This vessel is not now worth further repairs.

The *Fessenden* is a side-wheel vessel, iron hull, is a good vessel of her class, but of obsolete type.

The *Calumet* is a small iron steamer of 123 tons, new, and designed for harbor duty and anchorage work at the port of Chicago, where she is now stationed.

Second. "Whether the revenue cutter *Perry* is now on duty on the Lakes, or whether it has been taken away for service on the Pacific Coast?"

Answer. The *Perry* was ordered from Lake service to the Pacific last year, to reenforce the fleet of cutters there for the patrol of the North Pacific and Bering Sea. The *Perry* was of the Bering Sea fleet the past season, and is now temporarily at San Francisco.

Third. "I will be glad if you will inform me whether or not, in the judgment of the Treasury Department, there ought not to be an additional number of revenue cutters constructed for service upon the Lakes; and if so, what number?"

Answer. It is the opinion of the Department that at least two revenue cutters, additional to the one now being constructed at Cleveland, Ohio, should be provided for service on the Great Lakes. In view of the large advance in the price of material entering into the construction of iron and steel vessels, the sum named by you will not be too great for the class of vessels required for service on the Great Lakes. Your suggestion that several good vessels should be provided for Lake service is in perfect accord with the views of this Department.

I beg to say further, in reply to the closing inquiry of your letter, that an additional number of revenue cutters should be constructed for service on the Pacific Coast. The vessels now there are all very old and of obsolete type of construction—some wooden, some iron, all of them too small and too slow and of too small power to properly meet the service required of them. Vessels required for service on the Pacific Coast should be of size, general dimensions, and capacity to enable them to take and keep the sea under all conditions, with a cruising radius of not less than 2,500 miles.

Respectfully, yours,

C. S. HAMLIN, *Assistant Secretary.*

Hon. S. M. CULLOM, U. S. S.,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1411) for the relief of Joseph W. Parish; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CAFFERY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1412) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Shannon, widow of Joseph R. Shannon, deceased, and administratrix of his estate, and to provide for the payment of the value of the steamboat *A. W. Quarrier;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1413) to relieve Benjamin F. Church from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1414) granting a pension to Emma Brough Gerard; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1415) relating to the liability of employers in the District of Columbia to make compensation for personal injuries suffered by employees in their service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1416) providing for the preferment of wages of employees in cases of assignment, execution, in payment by receivers, etc.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1417) to regulate the employment of labor on public buildings and public grounds belonging to the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1418) for the relief of Charles Speare; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1419) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 1420) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Sutherland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 1421) for the relief of Henry R. Walton, administrator of John Walton, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1422) fixing the times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1423) to protect the wages of seamen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1424) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 4178, Revised Statutes, in relation to the marking of vessels' names at bow and stern, and also to provide for marking the draft," approved February 21, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1425) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Private Land Claims to try and determine a title; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Mr. GORDON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1426) for the relief of Rosella Rachel Wyatt, of Bryan County, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1427) to provide for promoting Capt. William N. Tisdall, United States Army, now on the retired list, to the rank of major; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BRICE introduced a bill (S. 1428) granting to the Washington Cooling Company the right to lay pipes for the distribution of materials for refrigerating purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 65) to authorize Lieut. Sidney S. Jordan, Fifth United States Artillery, and Capt. Edward C. Carter, assistant surgeon, United States Army, to accept medals from the British Government, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to offer and have read at the desk several amendments to House bill 2904 which I intend to propose. Let them be read for information and printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments are printed under the rule. The amendments will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed to House bill No. 2904 by Mr. BUTLER:

Amend section 2 by striking out in line 11, after the word "be," the words "used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government," and insert in lieu thereof the words "covered into the Treasury."

Amend by striking out section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following sections, to be known as sections 4 and 5:

"SEC. 4. That the issuance of interest-bearing bonds of the United States for any purpose whatever, without further authority of Congress, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury, when redeeming United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, and Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, and when liquidating either the interest or principal of any of the Government's coin obligations, is hereby directed to make such payment in gold coin whenever the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold is less than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, and to continue to pay in such gold coin until the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be equal to the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver; but when the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be greater than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, he shall pay

said coin obligations as they mature in silver coin, and continue to pay the same in silver coin until the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver shall be equal to the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold; and said notes, commonly called greenbacks, when so redeemed, shall be reissued, as provided by the act of May 31, 1878."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will lie on the table and be printed.

MESSENGER FOR COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to appoint a messenger for the Committee on Indian Affairs, who shall be paid at the rate of $1,440 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate until otherwise provided for.

INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I submit a resolution and ask for its reference to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be instructed, as now constituted, either by full committee or such subcommittee or committees as may be appointed by the chairman thereof, with the full power of such committee to continue during the coming recess of Congress the investigations authorized by the resolutions of May 13, 1890, and February 27, 1891, with the authority and in the manner and to the extent provided in said resolutions, and in the pursuance of such investigations to visit the several Indian reservations, Indian schools supported in whole or in part by the Government, and the Five Nations in the Indian Territory, or any reservation where, in the opinion of said committee, it may be necessary to extend their investigations.

Second. That said committee or subcommittee shall have power to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to examine witnesses under oath touching the matters which they are hereby empowered to investigate, and may hold their sessions during the recess of the Senate at such place or places as they may determine; and the necessary and proper expense incurred in the execution of this order shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs. It will have to be referred afterwards to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the Chair would suggest to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I so understand it.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask now to call up the bill for the reconstruction of the United States custom-house and post-office building at St. Albans, Vt., destroyed by fire May 19, 1895.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Vermont in a few moments. Are there further concurrent or other resolutions?

MESSENGER FOR COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint a messenger for the Committee on Privileges and Elections, who shall be paid at the rate of $1,440 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, until otherwise provided for.

TARIFF ACTS.

Mr. MILLS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the Committee on Printing be instructed to have all the acts heretofore passed by Congress imposing duties on imports printed and bound in one volume; 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CALL. There is a resolution lying on the table subject to be called up at any time, asking for certain information from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, presented by request of the labor associations. If there be no objection on the part of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, at whose instance the resolution was laid over, I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further concurrent or other resolutions?

Mr. SHERMAN. In order to expedite business I will move that the Senate do now adjourn. Senators are probably conscious of what I have in view when I state that I believe it would expedite business if an early adjournment could be had to-day. I think it would probably facilitate business. I do not wish to displace any gentlemen who have the floor for to-day; let them take it to-morrow. I submit a motion to adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable except by unanimous consent.

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent that the motion be postponed for an hour, so as to allow me to deliver the speech I intended to make to-day.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask unanimous consent to express the hope that the Senator from Nevada will not insist upon occupying an hour of the time of the Senate this morning. The motion of the Senator from Ohio to adjourn is a proper recognition of the great historic event which this the 8th day of January commemorates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair could not hear the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHERMAN. I could not hear the suggestions made.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Ohio withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. WHITE. Some time ago I gave notice that I would address the Senate with reference to certain suggested changes in the rules of this body. I have not had occasion to do so heretofore, and give notice that I will to-morrow morning make such observations as seem apposite.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 9, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 7, 1896.

POSTMASTER.

David A. Adams, to be postmaster at Georgetown, in the county of Scott and State of Kentucky.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 8, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be authorized to have printed and bound whatever documents and papers may be necessary for the use of said committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HOPKINS. Is the amount limited?

Mr. BOUTELLE. It is unlimited. This is the usual resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to.

BUSINESS BEFORE NAVAL COMMITTEE.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I also ask, Mr. Speaker, for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or such of the subcommittees as they may designate, shall have leave to sit during the sessions of the House during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, joint resolutions of the following titles:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 60) concerning the completion of the United States court-house and post-office building at Mankato, Minn.; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 19) for filling vacancy on Board of Regents of Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 103) relating to final proof in timber-culture entries;

A bill (S. 1340) to repeal in part and to limit section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 40) providing for the completion of the Congressional Library building.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, in addition to the number authorized by resolution adopted December 30, 1895, 600 copies of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and 600 copies of the report of the Assistant Inspector-General of State Homes, for the use of Congress, 200 copies of each report to be for the use of the Senate and 400 copies of each report for the use of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent

resolution to print 6,000 extra copies of Senate Document No. 226, first session Fiftieth Congress, relating to the Venezuela boundary, etc.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SKINNER, until Monday next, on account of important business.

To Mr. MCKENNEY, for one week, on account of sickness.

To Mr. SOUTHWICK, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. LEFEVER, for ten days, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. RANEY, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. TUCKER, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. EVANS, for two weeks, on account of important business.

ADMISSION OF HAWAII AS A STATE.

Mr. SPALDING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit at this time a joint resolution for reference to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ask unanimous consent to have it read.

The SPEAKER. It can be filed with the Clerk.

Mr. SPALDING. I would like to have it read simply for the information of the House. I ask unanimous consent that it may be read prior to its reference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the reading of a resolution and its reference to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was read at length, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how this matter comes before the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan rose and asked unanimous consent to have the resolution read for information and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. To that request there was no objection.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. It is not now before the House for consideration?

The SPEAKER. Not for consideration.

PRINTING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture be authorized to have printed and bound whatever documents and papers may be necessary for the use of said committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rivers and Harbors be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents, for the use of said committee, as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HEPBURN. Before consent is given, I wish to make an inquiry in regard to this matter. I wish to ask, Mr. Speaker, what kind of printing and binding is contemplated by the resolution which is now before the House.

It looks to me as if this resolution and resolutions of a similar character that we have been passing confer an authority on the committees of the House which may become a very dangerous one. As I understand the law, printing to the amount of $500 with reference to a particular subject may be indulged in under a resolution of the House.

Under such a resolution as this, as I understand it, the gentleman may on each day have $500 worth of printing done, to be determined by him or by his committee. It looks to me as if that were an unwise authority to confer, and yet we have been doing it from time to time. I have been hoping that some gentleman would explain the matter, so that the House could understand whether this view of it is erroneous or not.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, so far as the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is concerned, there will be no disposition or desire on the part of that committee to indulge in any such amount of printing as suggested by the gentleman. I understand this is the usual resolution that has been offered and agreed to for each of the committees. All that it is desired to have printed and bound for the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is simply the reports of the engineer, which are necessary for the work of the committee in considering the different projects throughout the country. They are to be printed and bound, one set for each member; and, in addition to that, a small memorandum book. It is my understanding that that is all the printing and binding that are necessary for that committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee——

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me a word?

Mr. HOOKER. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the law——

Mr. PERKINS. I was going to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOOKER] that my understanding of the law is that under a resolution of this kind the committee would not be authorized to have printing done to exceed $500.

Mr. HOOKER. For the entire session.

Mr. PERKINS. For the whole Congress.

The SPEAKER. Debate on this side of the House must be with the consent of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON]. [Laughter.]

Mr. PERKINS. My understanding is that the printing for the committee for the entire Congress can not exceed $500 under this resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, if I yield the floor, I must insist upon hearing what gentlemen are saying.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman from Tennessee will excuse me, I was undertaking to give some information to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOOKER].

Mr. RICHARDSON. "The gentleman from Tennessee" will yield for that purpose.

Mr. PERKINS. "The gentleman from Iowa" will soon yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Now, in the view which I have stated, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the House can not be extravagant, and that the committee can not order printing to exceed the amount of $500 during the entire session, under this resolution.

Mr. HOOKER. That is all.

Mr. PERKINS. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON]. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman from Iowa has said, and probably said better than I could, about what I desired to say, that this leave to a committee to print, as I understand it, only gives permission to print within the limit of $500.

Mr. PERKINS. That was the statement I was making, in my feeble way and with my feeble voice.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As I understand it, neither House, without the action of the other, can order printing beyond $500, and therefore it could not authorize a committee to go beyond $500.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, if my friend will permit me for one moment, he is clearly in error upon this subject. There is not in the statute any limitation upon a committee to the session. The limitation of $500 is with reference to the particular act of printing, and not a limitation extending over months of time. The gentleman might as well say that the House can only authorize $500 worth of printing during the entire session as to say that the statute imposes any such limitation upon a committee. The limitation is as to a single order for printing.

Mr. PERKINS. Under a single resolution. Under one resolution, not to exceed $500.

Mr. HEPBURN. But this is a continuing resolution. A part of the authority may be exercised to-day, part of it to-morrow, and part of it next week. There is no question about it, Mr. Speaker, but that under this resolution any one of the committees of this House having this authority may, under the law, daily authorize an expenditure of $500 for printing. I do not intend to intimate that any extravagance of that kind would be indulged in, but it is not the proper kind of legislation, after we have taken the trouble, by law, to hedge the actions of the House. When we control ourselves in this way, making a bill necessary in order that more than $500 worth of printing may be done, it is improper that we should give to committees the right to exceed that, or to equal that sum, every day during the session.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the criticism of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] seems to be well founded, but he will find, and other gentlemen will find, that if any committee undertakes to exceed $500 under such a resolution as this it will be stopped at the Government Printing Office. The Public Printer construes a resolution of this sort to mean that it gives the committee authority to print within $500. These resolutions have been so construed heretofore. I have not interposed objections to any of these resolutions. They have been usual; but it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, while I have not examined the RECORD, that we are extending this privilege this session to committees that have not had the privilege heretofore.

Now, it is right and proper, eminently so, I think, for committees that have charge of appropriation bills, committees that have to make up appropriations upon estimates furnished by the Departments and otherwise, to have this right and discretion to print within a reasonable limit; but I do not think it ought to be extended beyond where it has heretofore been used. I do not object to this, and shall not object; but I do not think it ought to be extended too far. I think the gentleman from Iowa will find that

there will be no exercise of the right to print beyond the limit of $500 at the Government Printing Office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to ask unanimous consent that that committee may have leave to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors may have leave to sit during the sessions of the House. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chairs hears none.

VENEZUELAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I present a memorial adopted by the Welsh people in their National Eisteddfod, held in the city of Utica, N. Y., on the 1st of January, 1896, favoring the settlement of the Venezuelan question by diplomacy or arbitration, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I object to printing the memorial in the RECORD. I do not know what it is, but it is contrary to the rules.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

SECTION 3980 OF THE REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report back the bill (H. R. 272) to amend section 3980 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and move its reference to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

PAYMENTS OUT OF THE CONTINGENT FUND OF THE HOUSE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication of the Clerk:

The Clerk read as follows:

CLERK'S OFFICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1896.

SIR: The late disbursing clerk of the House of Representatives has called my attention to four resolutions which were passed by the House of Representatives, directing the payment of certain amounts out of the contingent fund of the House, and also to certain accounts against the House remaining unpaid for the reason that there were not sufficient funds remaining unexpended out of which to pay and satisfy the same, which letter I submit herewith for such action as the House may deem proper.

Respectfully submitted.

A. MCDOWELL,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Hon. THOMAS B. REED,
Speaker House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the letter of the Clerk, with the accompanying letter, will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules, not having finished the work on the rules, will not be able to report to-day, but hope to do so to-morrow; and as the work is now unfinished, I move that the House adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. HENDERSON. I withdraw the motion for a moment.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama, Mr. HARRISON, desires to be relieved from service on the Election Committee No. 2, because his own seat is contested. Without objection, he will be relieved, and the Chair will appoint the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BAILEY, in his place.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of State requesting an immediate appropriation for the purchase of the premises occupied by the United States legation at Tokyo, Japan—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an abstract of the official emoluments of officers of the customs service received by them during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. Res. 25) to extend the time for making an assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 19); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOOD (by request): A bill (H. R. 3447) for the better protection of post-offices in all places, towns, and cities having a population of less than 20,000 inhabitants—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 3448) authorizing the county of Navajo, Territory of Arizona, to issue bonds for the construction of a court-house and jail at the county seat thereof—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 3449) to facilitate the construction and maintenance of telegraph cables in the Pacific Ocean for the use of the Government in its foreign intercourse—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 3450) providing a service pension to all honorably discharged officers and enlisted men of the military and naval services of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 3451) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the building of a railroad bridge at Little Rock, Ark.," approved March 2, 1891—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 3452) prohibiting the dropping, suspending, or reducing of pensions, and providing for the restoration of pensions already dropped, suspended, or reduced in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 3453) to improve Jefferson Barracks, and making an appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 3454) to regulate promotions and dismissals in the Executive Departments at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 3455) to establish a classification division in the United States Patent Office—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 3456) to provide for special terms at the city of Buffalo of the United States district court for the northern district of New York—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3457) to change the time and places for the district and circuit courts of the northern district of Texas—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 3458) to purchase a portrait of Daniel D. Tompkins, late Vice-President of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 3459) to amend an act entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes," approved July 1, 1862; also to amend an act approved July 2, 1864, and also an act approved May 7, 1878, both in amendment of said first-mentioned act; and to provide for a settlement of claims growing out of the issue of bonds to aid in the construction of certain of the railroads, and to secure to the United States payment of all indebtedness of certain of the companies therein mentioned—to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 3460) for the relief of applicants for pensions under the act of June 27, 1890, and granting pensions in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 3461) to constitute the Department of Labor an Executive Department of the United States Government—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3462) to regulate the business of storage in District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TYLER (by request): A bill (H. R. 3463) providing for the retirement of wagonmasters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3464) to amend

sections 2 and 3 of an act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors, approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the following changes of reference were made:

The bill (H. R. 1271) to compensate Elihu Root for legal services rendered by direction of the Attorney-General—Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill (H. R. 1371) to apply the unexpended balance of the amount heretofore appropriated for the relief of the captain, owners, officers, and crew of the late United States private armed brig *General Armstrong*, their heirs, executors, administrators, agents, or assigns—Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 2220) granting a pension to Kate C. McDougal—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2260) granting a pension to Christiana C. Queen, widow of Walter W. Queen, Admiral United States Navy—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2971) directing the Quartermaster-General to settle with the McMinnville and Manchester Railroad Company, and for other purposes—Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 272) to amend section 3980 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

The bill (H. R. 694) for the relief of A. H. Keller—Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 1023) for the relief of A. S. Hardin, administrator of Thomas Warfield, deceased, late of Hardin County, Tenn.—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 1024) for relief of Dr. J. D. Geiser, of Savannah, Hardin County, Tenn.—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 2021) for the relief of Eugene Callaher—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 2222) granting an honorable discharge to John Tredenick—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 1067) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Ellis J. Payne—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 1111) for the relief of William E. Keene—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 2411) to pension Amanda F. Walter—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3465) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Coffman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 3466) granting a pension to Mary E. Slater, guardian of the minors of Nathaniel W. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3467) granting a pension to Mary E. Slater—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 3468) for the relief of Alvin Adam Young—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3469) for relief of Robert McKown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri (by request): A bill (H. R. 3470) for the relief of Arra M. Farnsworth—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 3471) for the relief of Winyaw Lodge, No. 40, Ancient Free Masons, of South Carolina—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 3472) to correct the military record of Thomas Walker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3473) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Battelle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 3474) for the relief of Joseph W. Parish—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 3475) to amend the record of Company C, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia, by including the name of Alfred H. Tipton therein, with the date of his enlistment and date of his discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULING: A bill (H. R. 3476) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Henry T. Woody—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 3477) for the relief of Hibbard Williamson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3478) for the relief of Mrs. Kate C. Welsh, of Mount Sterling, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3479) for the relief of the legal representative of John Waldron, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3480) for the relief of Emily A. Mann—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3481) granting a pension to James L. Wing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3482) granting a pension to Maggie Donovan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3483) granting a pension to Sarah Gregory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3484) granting a pension to Russell N. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 3485) granting an honorable discharge to James Campbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 3486) granting a pension to Benjamin Contal, of Blair, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 3487) for the relief of J. V. Davis—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3488) for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Alexander Payne, widow of Capt. J. Scott Payne, Fifth United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3489) for the relief of the estate of Tapley Beckwith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3490) for the relief of J. W. and J. P. Hall—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3491) to correct the record of William Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: A bill (H. R. 3492) for the relief of Matthew McGuirk, of Los Angeles, Cal.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 3493) for the relief of Robert Burton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 3494) granting a pension to Frances M. Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHANNON (by request): A bill (H. R. 3495) granting a pension to Isabella Clary—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNOVER: A bill (H. R. 3496) for relief of Oliver Dodge and to place him upon the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 3497) to restore the pension of Harry Epright, United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 3498) for the relief of Capt. William N. Tisdall, United States Army, retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 3499) granting a pension to Eliza A. Foss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLER: A bill (H. R. 3500) to authorize the adjustment and settlement of accounts of John Y. Williams—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 3501) granting a pension to James F. Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3502) granting a pension to Mrs. Francis A. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3503) to correct the military record of Elisha B. Bassett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3504) granting a pension to Cleona E. Gaines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3505) granting a pension to Franklin W. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3506) granting a pension to Hannah Seward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3507) granting a pension to Frank Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3508) granting a pension to Isaiah H. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3509) granting a pension to Joseph H. Failes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3510) granting a pension to Alexander Purdy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3511) granting a pension to John Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3512) for the relief of James K. Bowman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3513) granting a pension to Mrs. Martha Henderson and children—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 3514) granting an honorable discharge to John J. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: A bill (H. R. 3515) for the relief of James Gilmore—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3516) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Paynter, widow of Christian Paynter, deceased, late second lieutenant Company D, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteers, war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3517) for the relief of George Heishman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3518) for the relief of David Melton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3519) for the relief of John R. Watson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3520) for the relief of Allen W. Philips—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3521) granting a pension to Mrs. Ellen Quinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3522) granting a pension to Handy Deputy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3523) granting a pension to Sarah L. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3524) for the relief of James McGowan from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3525) granting a pension to Mrs. Nancy Thurman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3526) granting a pension to Mary J. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3527) granting increase of pension to Lieut. Col. James B. Meriweather—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3528) granting a pension to David B. Salts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3529) granting a pension to Thomas Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3530) granting a pension to Peter Wendell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3531) granting a pension to Dennis Sheedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3532) granting a pension to Lucy Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3533) granting a pension to Catharine Pee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3534) to remove the charge of desertion from John Dickson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3535) to reimburse the city of New Albany, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 3536) for the relief of Frederick Gramm, of Ironton, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Four petitions, severally, of 103 citizens of West Elizabeth, 98 citizens of Washington County, 80 citizens of Black Diamond, Allegheny County, and 100 citizens of Boston, Allegheny County, Pa., in favor of free navigation of the Monongahela River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolutions of George G. Meade Post, No. 1, Department of Pennsylvania, in favor of reviving the rank of Lieutenant-General in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: Petition of Andrew Harris and others, of Barry County, Mo., praying for an amendment to the pension law of June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Petition for the relief of Winyah Lodge, No. 40, A. F. M., of South Carolina—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, four resolutions, severally, of the Chamber of Commerce, the Cotton Exchange, Young Men's Business League, and the city council of Charleston, S. C., favoring the passage of the bill to provide fortifications and other seacoast defenses, introduced by Senator SQUIRE—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: Petition and affidavits of Marion Martin et al. for pension, to accompany House bill No. 2686—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition and evidence in support of House bill No. 1307, to correct the military record of Monroe Blackburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, evidence in support of House bill No. 1306, to increase the pension of Benjamin F. Douglas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Letter of the Ætna Life Insurance Company of Hartford, Conn., in reference to proposed legislation on the jurisdiction of United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: Petition of William Fearnot and 135 others, inmates of the Soldiers' Home at Marion, Ind., asking for an additional pension of $10 per month to such inmates of the Home as desire to and will live outside of the Home—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL (by request): Paper from citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Connecticut, proposing an amendment to section 1491 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LESTER: Memorial of the Savannah Cotton Exchange, in reference to the national quarantine station at Sapelo, Ga.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Savannah Cotton Exchange, in reference to the anchorage in the harbor at Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McLAURIN: Resolutions passed by the city council of the city of Charleston, S. C., asking that Congress support the bill introduced by Senator SQUIRE December 4, 1895, to provide fortifications and other seacoast defenses—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Petition of William H. Robinson, of Fauquier County, Va., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 561, relating to the claim of Jane Taylor, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: Three petitions, respectively, from the First Baptist Church of Rockland, the First Baptist Church of West Newton, and the Ruggles Street Baptist Church of Roxbury, Boston, Mass., against the appropriation of public money for the support of sectarian Indian schools—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NOONAN: Three petitions, respectively, of citizens of San Marcos, San Antonio, and Houston, Tex., asking Congress to accord belligerent rights to the people of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHANNON (by request): Petition of Isabella Clary for the passage of a special act to grant her a pension, as the widow of James Clary, late private Company K, Seventy-second Regiment New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: Petitions of residents of Harwich, Chatham, Orleans, and others for the clearing of the channel connecting Salt Pond, in the town of Harwich, with Vineyard Sound, to prevent its closing, at present used as anchorage of light-house tenders and fishing boats—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STAHLE: Petition of Kennedy Post, No. 490, Department of Pennsylvania, in relation to dependent pension claim of Mary Katz, of Mount Holly, Pa. (H. R. 3323)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: Two petitions of E. J. Ruland, A. N. Jordan, and other citizens of West Liberty, Ohio, praying for the passage of House bill No. 58, providing for the inspection of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TRACEY: Papers to accompany a bill granting an honorable discharge to John J. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Petition of the estate of Isaac M. Hicks, of Bibb County, Ala., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 9, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MONEY ISSUES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, acknowledging the receipt of a resolution of the 31st ultimo calling for a statement containing a copy of each obligation issued by the Government since March 4, 1789, with a reference by title and date to the laws, respectively, authorizing such issues, and showing the amount of each issue, etc., and respectfully informing the Senate that the information called for is being prepared and will be transmitted as soon as possible; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McMILLAN. I present a petition of the National Federation of Colored Men, of Detroit, Mich., praying that they be granted the right of citizenship due them as native-born citizens

of the United States. I move that the petition be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented the petition of Athen Green, of Bakersville, N. C., a volunteer in Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Cavalry, praying that he be allowed arrears of pension at the rate of $10 per month; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TILLMAN presented a petition of the executive board of the Young Men's Business League of Charleston, S. C., and a petition of the city council of Charleston, S. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide fortifications and other seacoast defenses; which were referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Thirty-second Ward Republican Club of Chicago, Ill., praying that the Government of the United States use its best efforts to prevent further outrages on the Armenians; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM. I also present a memorial of sundry citizens of Beardstown, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill No. 291 to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to vessels propelled by steam, gas, fluid, naphtha, or motor. I call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce to this memorial. There seem to be a great many protests against the passage of that bill.

Mr. FRYE. A perfect shower.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the bill will be so amended as not to interfere with the ordinary little pleasure naphtha launches that are in use about the cities.

Mr. FRYE. It may perhaps be as well to state that I have no idea that there will be the least purpose on the part of the Committee on Commerce to report a bill which shall affect the little naphtha pleasure launches and yachts. The committee may report a bill which shall affect vessels carrying freight and passengers for hire, running now from 25 tons up to 150 tons, utterly regardless of all the rules which provide for and control other vessels of the same kind.

Mr. CULLOM. I was aware that the chairman of the committee desired to report such a bill as he has indicated, and I thought perhaps if he would make the statement to the Senate he has made it might satisfy those who are uneasy lest an improper bill may be passed.

Mr. GALLINGER. On this point I desire simply to say that I am gratified to hear the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce. I have had a flood of letters on this subject from parties in New England owning little launches, and it will be a great gratification to them to know that they are not to be put to annoyance and expense.

Mr. HAWLEY. I wish to ask a question. I am very glad, likewise, to hear the statement, because I have had letters also. What is the necessity for a law? Does the existing statute apply to steam and sail only?

Mr. FRYE. To steam and sail only.

Mr. HAWLEY. So that the proposed legislation is necessary?

Mr. FRYE. Therefore these launches are not subject to the ordinary laws of the road, to the requirements for carrying life-preservers, boats, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. HAWLEY. And the inspection of boilers?

Mr. FRYE. And the inspection of boilers. They are relieved from all of those requirements. It is all well enough when they are simply little pleasure launches where the owners themselves run them and where they do not carry passengers or freight, but especially on the California coast they are building to-day such launches of 100 and 150 tons.

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; I know.

Mr. FRYE. And they are carrying freight and carrying passengers. Vessels of that kind must be subject to the ordinary rules which provide for safety at sea.

Mr. PASCO. I wish to state that I have received a great many communications from owners of small pleasure yachts on the coast of Florida, and I am glad to hear the remarks of the Senator from Maine, because I do not think that any legislation ought to be enacted which would be disadvantageous to the owners of yachts which are not used in the ordinary business of commerce.

Mr. CALL. I desire to add a single observation to what has been said. The people upon the Atlantic coast of Florida and the Gulf coast are very largely interested in the proposed law. I have also received a great many requests (and have stated the matter to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce and to the committee) that they should be exempted, as it has been declared they will be, from the operation of such a law.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. VEST presented the petition of G. A. Plens and sundry other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DANIEL presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of citizens of Falls Church, Va., and resolutions adopted at a meeting of citizens of South Boston, Va., favoring energetic measures for the prevention of outrages on the Armenians; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry members of the bar of Roanoke, Va., praying Congress to secure one term annually of the United States district court at that city; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DANIEL. I present a petition in the form of resolutions adopted by the Business Men's Association of Newport News, Va., praying for the passage of the bill introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE] providing for fortifications and other seacoast defenses.

Mr. President, I hope I may be indulged, by unanimous consent, to say just a word respecting these resolutions. The number of petitions which have been sent to the Senate in favor of a liberal provision by Congress for fortifications and seacoast defenses attests the general interest which our people feel in this subject. From Norfolk, Va., San Diego, Cal., Seattle, Charleston, Savannah, New York, and almost all of our seaboard cities the number of resolutions that have flowed in upon us shows that our people feel some sense of alarm in view of the rumors of war which have reached their ears. While I think the apprehensions are perhaps overstrained, and that it is quite likely none of those cities will ever be bombarded, the petitions show that the American people realize that this nation ought to be fully equipped and prepared for its own defense.

A bill, I understand, making ample provision for that purpose has been introduced, and I seize this occasion in presenting these resolutions to express the hope that the present Congress will see to it, as I have no doubt it will, that this country prepares itself for whatever emergency may happen.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BACON presented a petition of the Cotton Exchange of Savannah, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation maintaining the present depth of water in the channel of the Savannah River and to create a port of safety for the merchant marine; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Brunswick, Ga., and a petition of the Board of Trade of Brunswick, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation providing additional defenses for the harbor at that city; which were referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the Cotton Exchange of Savannah, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation furnishing adequate accommodations for vessels which, under quarantine regulations, are required to be sent to the quarantine station for the South Atlantic, at Sapelo; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GORMAN presented the petition of Mrs. A. M. Hollingsworth, of Allegany County, Md., praying that she be reimbursed for stores and supplies taken by the military forces of the United States from the farm of Harriet B. Hollingsworth, in Frederick County, Va.; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. Louise Stewart, widow of George B. Stewart, deceased, of Anne Arundel County, Md., praying that she be reimbursed for supplies and stores taken in that county by the military forces of the United States for their use during the war for the suppression of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 54) for the relief of Ezra S. Havens;
A bill (S. 56) for the relief of John M. Davis;
A bill (S. 57) for the relief of Napoleon B. Giddings;
A bill (S. 58) for the relief of John S. Neet, jr.;
A bill (S. 59) for the relief of Joseph W. Carmack;
A bill (S. 60) for the relief of George A. Orr; and
A bill (S. 61) for the relief of Frederick Gramm.

Mr. BLANCHARD, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 360) for the relief of Northrup & Chick; and
A bill (S. 361) for the relief of Silas P. Keller.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 565) providing for the establishment and enforcement of rules and regulations for the use and navigation of United

States canals and similar works of navigation, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 564) providing for the collection of fees for furnishing certificates of title to vessels.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 661) to amend section 2880 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, fixing time for vessels to unlade, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MURPHY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 628) to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami*, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TURPIE. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 153) authorizing the persons herein named to accept of certain decorations and testimonials from the late Hawaiian Government, to report it without amendment, with a recommendation for its passage. A similar bill was passed by the Senate in the last Congress.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 69) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle the claims of the legal representatives of S. W. Marston, late United States Indian agent at Union Agency, Ind. T., for services and expenses, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by himself on the 8th instant, authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs to continue investigation during recess of Congress and visit the several Indian reservations, etc., reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; which was agreed to.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (S. 130) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H., reported it with amendments.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF RAILROADS.

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE], with an accompanying report. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. BRICE December 9, 1895, was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, of the annual report of the Commissioner of Railroads for the year 1895, 1,500 extra copies, in paper covers, with appendices, for the use of the Commissioner of Railroads.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. COCKRELL. One moment, please. Have any copies been printed for the use of the Senate and the House?

Mr. HALE. Yes. If the Secretary will read the report that will tell the whole story. It is short.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us hear the report.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution, introduced by Mr. BRICE, authorizing the printing of 1,500 extra copies of the annual report of the Commissioner of Railroads for the year 1895, with appendixes, for the use of the Commissioner of Railroads.

The Commissioner of Railroads, under date of November 25, 1895, in a letter addressed to Senator CALVIN BRICE, and referred by him to this committee, says: "The number of copies printed heretofore for public official use has been 2,500. Under the law enacted by the Fifty-third Congress relative to the printing of public documents, which provides that no more than 1,000 copies of a bureau report should be printed without the authority of Congress, requisition was duly made through the Department for the printing of that number. * * * The number of copies of the report authorized to be printed under the new law will be wholly insufficient to supply the demand."

In a later communication from the Commissioner's office it is stated that it "has not been possible to supply the press of the country with copies of the report, as heretofore, and private as well as official requests therefore await compliance." Speaking of the value of the report, the Commissioner says: "As the subject-matter of the report is of considerable importance, pending a settlement of the debts of the Pacific railroad companies to the United States, and as the information contained therein is thought to be valuable and exhaustive, the necessity for printing the extra copies will be obvious."

The committee, to whom the resolution was referred, after carefully considering the same and fully weighing the recommendations of the Commissioner, report the resolution back with the recommendation that it do pass.

The cost of the printing, as per the estimate of the Public Printer, will be $135.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. COCKRELL. I am not offering any objection, but simply call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Printing to the fact that this is a step in setting aside the printing law, which was so carefully prepared and so ably urged by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Manderson, who retired at the close of the last Congress.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE BUILDING.

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Printing I present the report of operations during the month of December, 1895, upon repairs and enlargement of the Government Printing Office and the erection of a fireproof building upon the site of the Government Printing Office stables, under the Chief of Engineers, and ask that it be printed as a document. It is a report made each month.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be printed.

FOUNDRY AT WASHINGTON NAVY-YARD.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am instructed by the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 23) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to use a portion of the appropriation for new iron roof for foundry at navy-yard, Washington, D. C., in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," for repairs to the walls of said foundry, to report it favorably and submit a report thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. BAKER. I ask that the bill (S. 808) for the relief of Simeon Motz, Nathaniel Robbins, and William J. Sloan; and the bill (S. 1326) for the relief of Eli Fox, George C. Fox, and Thomas Levick, which were referred to the Committee on Claims, be now referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. It seems to me that the Committee on Military Affairs is the proper committee for those bills, and that they should have been so referred in the first place. Similar bills were introduced in the previous Congress and referred to the Committee on Claims, and the Committee on Claims was discharged from their further consideration and had them referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. After the lapse of some time these bills would probably take the same course, and I ask that the change of reference be now made.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Committee on Claims will be discharged from the further consideration of the bills, and they will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 1429) for the relief of Augustus G. Kellogg; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1430) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Benjamin Walker, of Ottawa, Kans.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1431) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James A. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1432) for the relief of Carl F. Kolbe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 1433) to amend the charter of the Metropolitan Railroad Company of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1434) for the relief of the legal representatives of John W. Branham, late an assistant surgeon in the United States Marine-Hospital Service; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 1435) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Kimball; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1436) providing for the retirement of employees in the Executive Departments of Government of the classified service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1437) to refer the claim of the loyal Creek Indians to the Court of Claims of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1438) for the relief of the estates of Daniel Woodson and of Ely Moore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1439) for the relief of Levi Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1440) for the relief of John S. Leary and Mathew N. Leary, jr., executors of Mathew N. Leary, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1441) to protect the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest and worship in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1442) to increase the pension of William D. Mack; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1443) to increase the pension of Patrick O'Meally; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 1444) granting an increase of pension to John Nicodemus; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1445) to authorize the St. Louis and Oklahoma City Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 1446) to provide for the adjudication of the claim of the Fond du Lac band of Chippewa Indians, arising upon the failure of certain treaty stipulations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 1447) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. G. M. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. VILAS introduced a bill (S. 1448) to withdraw from the Supreme Court jurisdiction of criminal cases not capital, and confer the same on the circuit courts of appeals; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CALL. I introduce a bill by request of a considerable number of citizens of the District of Columbia and some nonresidents of the District who frequently come to this city. It is a subject which they regard as of great importance, and I think it will commend itself to the consideration of the Senate. I hope the Committee on the District of Columbia will consider the bill and act upon it at an early day.

The bill (S. 1449) to provide a home and employment for reputable girls and young women of the District of Columbia who are without means of support and are unable to obtain work was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1450) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1451) for the relief of the legal representatives of David Heustis, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 1452) to authorize the Falls Church and Potomac Railway Company of Virginia to extend its line of road into and within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 1453) for the relief of Daniel Drawbaugh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1454) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 1455) to validate deeds in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1456) granting an increase of pension to Dwight A. Aiken; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1457) to pay the administrator of the estate of Bluford West, deceased, for the Bluford West Saline, in Cherokee Nation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HALE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 47) relating to the Federal census; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Census.

Mr. CARTER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 48) authorizing the publication of an edition of A Digest of International Law; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

SWAMP AND OVERFLOWED LANDS.

Mr. CALL. I introduce a joint resolution, and if there be no objection I ask that it may have present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 46) prohibiting the Secretary of the Interior from patenting any lands under the swamp and overflowed land-grant act by the exterior or meander lines of surveys was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby prohibited from patenting any lands under the swamp and overflowed land-grant act by the exterior or meander lines of surveys, and he is required to conform strictly to the requirements of the acts of Congress in approving lists of lands under the said act or issuing patents thereto.

Mr. CALL. That the Senate may understand the necessity, and the urgent necessity, of the joint resolution, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Interior and also one from a citizen of Florida in relation to this subject, from which it will appear that the Secretary of the Interior has decided to approve and patent a large portion of the State of Florida, not by the report from the field notes of the surveyors of the United States, as required by law, but by the exterior lines of the surveys, without reference to the question whether the land within the interior of the meander lines is or is not within the terms of the grant and subject to homestead entry by the people.

I will state that the letters which I send to the desk from a citizen of the State of Florida exhibit the fact that land which is properly subject to homestead settlement is being taken away from the people who have a right to it, and not only under the old obsolete and void railroad grant, but also under the swamp and overflowed land-grant acts.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. PLATT. I do not think anyone in the Senate knows what the joint resolution is which we have been asked to consider and pass this morning.

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senator will allow the correspondence which I have sent to the desk to be read, and he will then see what the joint resolution is.

Mr. PLATT. I merely rose for the purpose of suggesting that joint resolutions ought to be referred to a committee. They are introduced here in the morning when the Senate is paying no attention to business, and if the rule is to be adopted that joint resolutions affecting large interests are to be passed in this way we shall get into infinite trouble. It seems to me the rules of the Senate ought to be observed and that the joint resolution ought to be referred to the Committee on Public Lands. I make that motion.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator to withdraw the motion until the correspondence is read, so that he may be advised as to whether there is necessity for the motion, and if he then thinks it should be referred I shall make no objection to it.

Mr. PLATT. I have no objection to the correspondence being read.

Mr. PASCO. This is a matter that relates to my own State. I have not been consulted about it, and know nothing in reference to it. I have no objection to the correspondence being read, but it seems to me the joint resolution ought then to be referred to the Committee on Public Lands. The chairman of that committee is not present. Certainly it would be unwise to pass the joint resolution without giving even the chairman of the committee or myself an opportunity to know what the proposed legislation refers to and what is the full meaning and purport of the joint resolution.

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent to say a word.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will first state the question, and then the Senator will be recognized. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HOAR. Is not that motion debatable?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion is debatable.

Mr. HOAR. Then the Senator from Florida has a right to be heard upon the motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has not ruled the Senator from Florida out; but he desires to state the question, upon which the Senator from Florida will be entitled to proceed.

Mr. CALL. I trust the Senator from Connecticut will not make the motion until the correspondence has been read.

Mr. PLATT. The Senator from Florida can read it as part of his remarks, or have it read at the desk as part of his remarks.

Mr. CALL. All right. Then after I have made a single observation I shall ask the Secretary to read the correspondence, in order that the Senate may understand it. If there is any interest on the part of any Senator to have a committee report whether or not the patenting of a large area of a State by the meander lines of a survey under an act of Congress which requires that each 40 acres shall be reported by a surveyor of the United States from the field notes as unfit for settlement, and when citizens of the United States who are within that area send in a petition here in the form of a letter to the Interior Department that their homes may be exempted from this unlawful act of the Interior Depart-

ment, I have no objection to a committee investigating and reporting upon the subject.

If my colleague does not know that the area of the Everglades proposed to be confirmed by the meander line does contain within it not only land not subject to this law, but thousands of acres which are properly the homes of the people of the country, and under the law they have a right to it—if anyone needs information upon that subject, as to whether the Secretary of the Interior shall patent absolutely tracts of land, which are the homes of the poor people of this country, under a law which requires that each 40 acres shall, by the field notes of the surveyor of the United States, be proved to be within the class of lands subject to the swamp and overflowed land-grant act, then let it go to a committee.

I ask that the correspondence be read—first the letter of Mr. Lorbeer and then the letters from the Interior Department.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The correspondence referred to will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

YALLAHA, FLA., *December 27, 1895.*

HONORABLE SIR: The letter inclosed explains my object in writing to you at this time. What perplexes me at present is that they offer me "thirty days in which to file a motion for review." I supposed the honorable Secretary had reviewed the case and his action was now final. I do not know if it is worth my while to follow it up further. Will you oblige and give your opinion on my filing said motion for review?

I should like my home. Experience here has proven that those having their places given to them by the Government were able to live on them after the freeze last winter. I have done the same; but if I must pay the railroad company $10 per acre—it amounts to that, interest and all—I am forced off and my grove and place become a cattle range again, as thousands of others are, on account of extortion by railroad and land grabbers combined. It must be remembered I settled in "good faith" under the promise of $1.25 per acre for the land and put thirteen years' labor on a 7-acre grove, for which I can not get money enough to pay car fare away.

Please advise me.

Very truly, yours, EDW. A. LORBEER.

Hon. WILKINSON CALL,
United States Senator for Florida.

—

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1895.

SIR: Responsive to your letter of November 12, 1895, I have to advise you that on October 11, 1895, the honorable Secretary of the Interior rendered a decision in your case against the Florida Railway and Navigation Company, involving the SW. ¼ of NW. ¼, NW. ¼ of SW. ¼, NW. ¼ of NW. ¼, and SE. ¼ of NW. ¼, sec. 9, T. 21 S., R. 25 E., Gainesville land district, Florida, in which he affirmed the decision of this office of January 13, 1894, holding for rejection your application to make homestead entry for the above-described tracts of land.

On November 9, 1895, said departmental decision was promulgated through the local officer at Gainesville, and they were directed to advise you thereof, allowing you the usual time, thirty days after notice, within which to file a motion for review, and at the proper time make due report to this office as to action taken by you in the premises.

Very respectfully,

S. W. LAMOREUX, *Commissioner.*

MR. EDWARD A. LORBEER,
Yallaha, Lake County, Fla.

—

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1896.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 3, 1896, inclosing "correspondence" of Mr. Edward A. Lorbeer (notably letter F, December 21, 1895, addressed to him at Yallaha, Lake County, Fla.), and you request "that the time of thirty days in which to file a motion for review be extended to a longer limit."

In reply, I would state a compliance with your request is contrary to the Rules of Practice, rule 114, amended. (See copy office circular A, May 4, 1894, inclosed herewith; 18 L. D., 472.)

I would add that this office is awaiting report from local officers at Gainesville, Fla., and action by this office will be governed thereby, as the matter relates to motion for review of the honorable Secretary's decision.

Mr. Lorbeer's "correspondence" (two papers) is returned herewith.

Respectfully,

S. W. LAMOREUX, *Commissioner.*

Hon. WILKINSON CALL,
United States Senate.

—

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1896.

SIR: I have received your letter dated January 3, 1896, inclosing a letter from Mr. O. Hardgrave, of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., asking "what right anyone has to make a settlement and home on unsurveyed lands in the Everglades;" also, "If I make a home there, will I have the first chance of entry or purchase when surveyed?"

In reply, you are advised that the whole body of unsurveyed lands known as the Everglades has been applied for as swamp land under the act of September 28, 1850, by the State of Florida, being described by the exterior meander lines thereof, and is now in process of being patented to the State of Florida. The disposal of tracts therein is therefore no longer in the hands of the Government. Mr. Hardgrave is referred to the State land agent at Tallahassee for further information.

In regard to Mr. Hardgrave's request for copies of maps this office has received the same request from him by another letter, and a copy of the answer thereto is herewith inclosed for your further information.

Should you still desire copies of these plats for your own use, they will be made and furnished to you upon receiving your request therefor, without charge.

Your correspondent's letter is herewith returned.

Very respectfully,

S. W. LAMOREUX, *Commissioner.*

Hon. W. CALL, *United States Senate.*

Mr. CALL. I have no objection to the course desired by the Senator from Connecticut—that the joint resolution and correspondence shall be referred to the Committee on Public Lands, but I wish to state that a vast portion of the area of the State of Florida has been unlawfully—and I might say more than that—taken away from the people who have a right under the law to settle upon and occupy it, and if the people have any rights which Congress should protect it demands the action of this body, and early action on its part, not only to prevent the remainder from being taken, but also to restore to the people the homesteads unlawfully taken from them.

I insert in my remarks the laws making a grant of the swamp and overflowed lands to the States, from which it clearly appears that this action of the Secretary is entirely without authority of law.

SEC. 354. To enable the several States (but not including the States of Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, and Colorado) to construct the necessary levees and drains, to reclaim the swamp and overflowed lands therein—the whole of the swamp and overflowed lands, made unfit thereby for cultivation, and remaining unsold on or after the 28th day of September, A. D. 1850, are granted and belong to the several States, respectively, in which said lands are situated: *Provided, however*, That said grant of swamp and overflowed lands, as to the States of California, Minnesota, and Oregon, is subject to the limitations, restrictions, and conditions hereinafter named and specified, as applicable to said three last-named States, respectively.

SEC. 355. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to make accurate lists and plats of all such lands and transmit the same to the governors of the several States in which such lands may lie, and at the request of the governor of any State in which said swamp and overflowed lands may be to cause patents to be issued to said State therefor, conveying to said State the fee-simple of said land.

The proceeds of said lands, whether from sale or by direct appropriation in kind, shall be applied exclusively, as far as necessary, to the reclaiming said lands, by means of levees and drains.

SEC. 356. In making out lists and plats of the lands aforesaid all legal subdivisions, the greater part whereof is wet and unfit for cultivation, shall be included in said lists and plats, but when the greater part of a subdivision is not of that character, the whole of it shall be excluded thereform.

* * * * * * * *

SEC. 359. All lands selected and reported to the General Land Office as swamp and overflowed land by the several States entitled to the provisions of said act of September 28, 1850, prior to March 3, A. D. 1857, are confirmed to said States, respectively, so far as the same remained vacant and unappropriated and not interfered with by an actual settlement under any law of the United States.

SEC. 360. The provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to enable the State of Arkansas and other States to redeem" the swamp lands within their limits, approved September 28, A. D. 1850, extend to the States of Minnesota and Oregon: *Provided*, That the grant shall not include any lands which the Government of the United States may have sold or disposed of under any law enacted prior to March 12, 1860, prior to the confirmation of title to be made under the authority of said act—and the selections to be made from lands already surveyed in each of the States last named, under the authority of the act aforesaid, shall have been made within two years from the adjournment of the legislature of each State, at its next session after the 12th day of March, A. D. 1860—and as to all lands surveyed or to be surveyed, thereafter, within two years from such adjournment, at the next session after notice by the Secretary of the Interior to the governor of the State that the surveys have been completed and confirmed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I introduce a joint resolution, which I send to the desk and ask that it be read.

The joint resolution (S. R. 50) authorizing the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for the public building at Chicago, Ill., was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, in addition to the amount authorized to be expended for the temporary employment of draftsmen and skilled service in the preparation of plans and specifications for the public building at Chicago, Ill., as provided in the sundry civil appropriation act approved March 3, 1895, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, out of the appropriation heretofore made, a sum not exceeding $25,000 for the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for said building.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. Do I understand the proposition is to give one architect $25,000 for assisting?

Mr. CULLOM. The proposition is to enable the Supervising Architect to do that which he can not do under the existing law making the appropriation for that building—to have such an architect as is desired by him to prepare the plans. The bureau has not the force, and under the particular technical construction of the statute making the original appropriation the Supervising Architect has no power to employ assistance. After two or three consultations by my colleague and myself with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Supervising Architect says that it is impossible for him to proceed and do anything preparatory to the construction of the building without the passage of a resolution of this kind.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us hear that clause of the resolution read relative to proposing to appropriate $25,000 for the employment of one architect.

Mr. CULLOM. The resolution says "a skilled architect." I do not know whether it means one or more.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be again read.

The Secretary again read the joint resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. I shall certainly have to object to the joint resolution, and I shall ask that it go to a committee unless it is provided that the $25,000 be for the employment of architects to assist, and not $25,000 for one architect.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection to making it "architects" instead of "architect."

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it read "architects to assist."

Mr. CULLOM. What is desired by the Secretary of the Treasury, as well as those of us who are interested in getting the plans of that building, is to push the work. The Secretary insists that with his present force it is impossible for him, unless allowed by law to employ an architect, to get the building started, under the pressure of hundreds of other buildings now being constructed.

I have no objection to the word being in the plural number instead of providing for one architect.

Mr. COCKRELL. As the joint resolution now stands it proposes to appropriate $25,000 for one year's service of an architect.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not want anybody paid any more than he is entitled to. Let the word "architects" be inserted instead of "architect."

Mr. BERRY. Is the joint resolution reported from any committee?

Mr. CULLOM. It is not.

Mr. BERRY. Then I object to it.

Mr. CULLOM. Let me say that the joint resolution simply proposes to take the money out of the appropriation already made for the Chicago building, because we are not able to start the work as the law now stands.

Mr. BERRY. I think the sum of $25,000 to pay an assistant architect is unreasonable and ought not to be permitted by a resolution of Congress. The amount is out of all proportion, it seems to me, for a year's service of an assistant architect, and I am unwilling to allow a resolution to pass which makes provision to pay such a sum to an assistant architect or architects, whether there be one or more than one. I think the amount proposed is entirely too large, and for that reason I think the resolution had better go to a committee, and let the committee report on it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I do not rise to object to the resolution offered by the Senator from Illinois, but only to say that in case his resolution shall be considered I shall desire to offer an amendment to it. I am fully aware of the fact that there is a lack of enough competent help in the Supervising Architect's Office to conduct that bureau in anything like the manner in which it should be conducted to have it managed in a businesslike way. Buildings in New Jersey are lagging behind on account of the want of additional force in the Supervising Architect's Office. He claims that he is a year behind in his plans with most buildings. If there is any special effort made for any particular post-office, I shall propose to amend the joint resolution so that the Supervising Architect shall be authorized and money enough furnished him to employ sufficient help for all offices which are in the same condition as the Chicago office now is, so that the work may be completed in some reasonable time.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President, over a month ago, on the 5th of December, I introduced a resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for information as to the cause of the delay in the preparation of plans for the construction of a public building at Portland, Oreg., for which the first appropriation was made several years ago. That resolution was adopted by the Senate on that day, and I have been waiting very anxiously for a response from the Secretary of the Treasury, which up to the present time has not materialized. I hope it may be forthcoming before the resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] comes up for consideration to-morrow, and I shall then be in better condition to know how to vote. Possibly I shall desire to join my friend from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in amending the resolution, and possibly not, depending somewhat on the nature of the information we get from the Secretary of the Treasury or the Supervising Architect.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, this joint resolution relates to a special single public building. It has been prepared with reference to that building alone. It proposes to take from an appropriation already made $25,000 to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to perform one part of his duty—an essential part of his duty. I regret exceedingly that any obstruction should be attempted to be thrown in the way of this particular resolution. After the most careful consideration by the Secretary of the Treasury, and the amplest conference among those who are interested, I think this special resolution ought to be passed.

In the face of the objection of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] I suppose the resolution must go over under the rules, but it is due to the particular interest represented that this shall be considered separately. I regret very much that it should be mixed up with other matters, because it has reference alone to a particular building which involves an expenditure of $4,000,000.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from Illinois will be able to so amend the resolution which he has introduced as to include other cases of a similar character. It seems to me that that can be done. I have in my mind the case of San Francisco, which is suffering in a degree but little inferior to that of Chicago. The Chicago case is the most pronounced in the United States, and next, certainly, comes the city of San Francisco. The Government has invested a very large sum of money in a lot in that city, and it has been supposed, because the appropriation had been heretofore made by Congress, that the work would be commenced upon the Government building there. The condition of affairs in that city is a disgrace to the Government, and has been so for years in this regard, and it is all because the Congress of the United States has failed to provide adequately for the office under consideration. If practicable, I hope the Senator from Illinois will be able to so frame the resolution he offers as to provide the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department with the necessary means for carrying out the work enjoined upon that Department by Congress in reference to public buildings of the United States. The exigent cases are numerous and should be attended to, and from Congress must come the authority to do so.

Mr. CULLOM. I think it unfair, after the Illinois delegation has frequently conferred with the Secretary of the Treasury with reference to the beginning of the work upon the building at Chicago, and after we have come to the conclusion that this ought to be done, when it is not proposed to take money out of appropriations for public buildings elsewhere, but merely to use a portion of the appropriation which has been made for the building at Chicago, that other Senators should insist upon tacking amendments on the resolution with reference to public buildings in their States.

This is, as my colleague says, a direct resolution, pertaining exclusively to the condition of affairs at Chicago, and I think in all fairness, as the subject has been thoroughly considered by the Illinois delegation and by the Secretary of the Treasury, and what ought to be done has been determined upon, that the resolution should be passed. Then the Senate can adopt such general legislation amending the law relative to the Supervising Architect's Office as may become necessary in order to meet the demands of other sections of the country.

I am willing to amend the resolution so as to make it apply to architects for that building, and change it so as to read:

That $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be applied to the employment of architects for the construction, etc.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I wish to state to the Senate that there is no public building in my State situated similar to the one in Chicago, and I do not desire to have the Senator's resolution amended. The objection I have to the resolution is that it says the Secretary of the Treasury may employ an assistant architect at a salary not to exceed $25,000.

Mr. CULLOM. It does not say anything about salary.

Mr. BERRY. It proposes to appropriate a sum not to exceed that amount. The Senator from Illinois says it is to be taken out of the appropriation already made for the public building at Chicago. There is no one who knows better than he that the time will come when it will be claimed that the appropriation originally made was insufficient to finish the building, and that other appropriations will be required. If it is intended to pay an assistant architect $25,000 a year for his services, and if the money is to be expended on the extensive scale proposed by the resolution, I think that is conclusive evidence that a very large additional appropriation will be required before that building will be completed. I think, therefore, that the resolution had better go to a committee, and let it be amended, guarded, and changed in such a way that it will not show that the Senate is willing to pay to an assistant architect the enormous sum of $25,000 a year.

Mr. CULLOM. I merely desire to say one word, and then the Senate can do what it wishes with the joint resolution. The Senate remembers very well that it has now been a year or more since the original appropriation was made for the beginning of the work upon a new public building in Chicago, and yet the Secretary of the Treasury has not been able to do the first thing with reference to it. Is it to be the fact that the city of Chicago, which is paying into the Treasury on account of the postal service millions upon millions more than is expended in the conduct of the post-office in that city shall go without proper accommodations for the transaction of its postal business? What we desire and what we are entitled to is to get the work started. We can not do it under the present condition of affairs unless Congress gives the Secretary of the Treasury an opportunity to employ assistants to help in the preparation of the plans.

The joint resolution relates exclusively to the post-office at Chicago, and it seems to me that the Senate ought to allow it to pass in order that there may be no further delay with reference to the work.

Mr. WHITE. I trust the Senator from Illinois will not suppose that I am insisting upon any objection to the consideration of the joint resolution. I merely called his attention to a condition of things which I thought he might conceive would warrant a change in the phraseology of the joint resolution. I have visited the Chicago post-office, and after I saw its condition I remained there for as brief a time as possible, considering it a measure of prudence to get out. I would not do anything in the world to impede the completion of the building.

But if it be the opinion of the parties most interested and the opinion of the Senators from Illinois that the joint resolution should be unamended I shall not interpose an objection. I have called attention to what I conceive to be a grave defect in the laws and in the administration of the laws regarding the construction of public edifices.

Mr. PALMER. In reply to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE] I will state that if at any time an appropriation shall be made for public works in the States they represent, and they simply ask that a part of the appropriation already made shall be devoted to a particular purpose, I shall certainly assist them to the best of my ability in passing any resolution for which they may ask.

Here is a case where an appropriation has been made. The necessity of the work has already been determined by the Senate, and those who are familiar with the facts know that the need of a building is pressing. The present building is unfitted for public purposes. It has become dangerous. The Senate has considered all the questions involved in order to construct the building, and has joined in making an appropriation. As nothing is proposed here beyond a provision authorizing the use of a certain portion of the money for a specific purpose, which, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, is necessary and without which he can not proceed further, it seems to me this case ought to stand upon its own ground. It ought not to be mixed up either with the propositions or the complaints of other Senators. That is all there is of it. It is not proposed that a salary shall be paid to any particular person, but that the Secretary of the Treasury may obtain, by means of the appropriation already made, such additional architectural assistance as the particular case requires. That the Secretary of the Treasury himself insists is necessary. Without it nothing further can be done.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] intimates that a further appropriation may be asked hereafter. I will not say that that may not be true; but if such an event should happen, if the time should ever come when more money is asked, I suppose the Senate will then be prepared to act upon the necessity of that requirement. This particular sum of money is needed as a preliminary to the work. Without it nothing more can be done. The matter stands as it is to the detriment of the public interest, not the interest of Chicago alone, but the interest of the whole country, so far as it depends upon the conduct not only of the postal service, but of all branches of the public business, while the Government is paying large sums in rent because the building heretofore used is unfit for occupancy.

I trust, therefore, that we may be allowed to obtain the attention of the Senate to this particular joint resolution and secure its passage.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope my friend from Arkansas will not object.

Mr. BERRY. I object to the consideration of the joint resolution to-day. I am compelled to object to its passage to-day unless it is referred to a committee.

Mr. CULLOM. Then let the joint resolution go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being interposed to the present consideration of the joint resolution, it goes over.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask may be read at length, and if there is no serious objection I should like to submit a few observations in reference to it before it is referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution (S. R. 49) to enforce the Monroe doctrine was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the United States of America will regard it as an unfriendly act for any foreign power, without our consent, by war, treaty, purchase, or otherwise, to extend its territorial limits in the Western Hemisphere on either of the American continents, or to or over any of the islands adjacent thereto which this country deems necessary or proper for its self-preservation. And the United States of America reserves the right to be the sole judge of the necessity.

That the principle herein enunciated is founded upon the law of self-preservation, which from necessity adheres in and belongs to every civilized nation as a sovereign and inalienable right, and this principle is attested by Washington's Farewell Address and by President Monroe's ever-memorable message of December 2, 1823.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I venture on this occasion, and because of the importance of the subject-matter contained in the joint resolution just read, to offer a few remarks.

The Monroe doctrine, as understood by the American people, is a doctrine of peace, not war; of preservation, not destruction. Washington, in his Farewell Address, enunciated a rule of conduct for the government of this country in foreign affairs which has been as fully observed, acted upon, and respected as though it had received all the formalities and power conferred by an act of Congress. The people for many decades have acknowledged the correctness of his views upon national affairs, and have applauded and approved the principle that we should avoid all entangling political alliances with foreign powers. From this prescribed rule of conduct, which is but the assertion of the doctrine of self-preservation, of national supremacy, another important principle has been evolved or legitimately drawn—that while we should avoid entangling political alliances with the powers of the Old World, we should see to it at the same time that those powers enter into no entangling political alliances with nor interfere in the affairs of the Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

The principle announced by Washington in his Farewell Address was the beginning of the American doctrine of noninterference and of nonintervention by and with foreign powers in the political and domestic affairs of the American Republics. This principle has been fought for, and any violation of it will be contested again.

Great Britain, strong, aggressive, and imperious, impressed American citizens and seamen in her wars and exercised the right of search on American vessels sailing in American waters, under the American flag, upon the tyrannical theory that "once a subject, always a subject." The assertion of this kingly and autocratic principle of interference in our political and domestic affairs was settled in that tribunal from which there is no appeal, in the contest of 1812, waged not for conquest, not for glory, but for the rights, dignity, and honor of American citizenship and of America. The powers of Europe at this time were contesting for supremacy. France, under the leadership of Napoleon, had undertaken to make all the nations of Europe subservient to her power. Russia, Prussia, and Austria, having felt the iron hand of the man of destiny, entered into a protective alliance to control the civil and religious destinies of the world.

The victorious eagles of Austerlitz went down in disastrous defeat at Waterloo. St. Helena obtained another resident, and France became a member of the Holy Alliance. The colonies of Spain in America were generally in revolt. They were contesting for independence and nationality by wager of battle.

At this time all Europe was practically arrayed against England. The sympathy of America went out to the Spanish-American colonies in their contest for liberty and nationality. America feared intervention of the Holy Alliance in the affairs of the Spanish Republics, whose independence had been recognized, and England feared the powers composing the Holy Alliance. Then it was, and under such peculiar circumstances, that England advised, consented to, and acquiesced in the doctrine pronounced by President Monroe in his ever-memorable message of December 2, 1823.

President Monroe, in discussing the question of nonintervention in his message, uses the following language:

The occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle, in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

It will be observed that he asserts the time had come in our national affairs when a principle or rule of conduct should be announced with reference to the future colonization of both of the American continents by European powers. He was discussing a condition, not a theory. He was formulating a rule of conduct not only for the present, but for the future. Again he declares:

It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness. * * * We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

The principle of noninterference by this nation in foreign matters was as strongly indicated in this message, as a rule of conduct, as by Washington in his Farewell Address, and the importance of nonintervention by foreign powers in the affairs of the Republics on either of the continents in the Western Hemisphere was particularly and forcibly elaborated. It was the precise question at issue.

Such interference was declared to be dangerous to our "peace and safety," to our "peace and happiness," and could not be viewed "in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." "The position taken by President Monroe in his message," says Mr. Adams, "was received by England not only with satisfaction, but with enthusiasm. Therefore England, by reason of her conduct at the time,

as well as by every principle of law, moral or legal, is bound by the Monroe doctrine of nonintervention."

The people of this country, with all the warmth and zeal of patriotism, hailed it with delight as another declaration of American independence, and with singular unanimity have maintained and upheld it ever since, although the doctrine announced in this message has never been approved by joint resolution or act of Congress. However firmly the people may have adhered to the doctrine as a principle and rule of conduct for the present and future, the same unvarying loyalty to it can not be truly ascribed to all of our statesmen and politicians.

When the Holy Alliance had been dissolved, when its menace to the civil and religious liberty of the world was a thing of the past, then England, true to her traditions and history, ignored the principle and claimed that it never had any application, except to a particular case. Some American statesmen, inoculated with English principles, have sought to overthrow the doctrine of nonintervention by adopting the English idea. It has been denied as a correct principle when applied to the South American continent. Its applicability has been denied as to the islands adjacent to the American continents in the Western Hemisphere. Its applicability has been denied even as to the North American continent. Its applicability to the present existing conditions in Venezuela has been denied. So, Mr. President, there is not that entire and absolute unanimity there should be as to the principle which should control this country in the future with reference to intervention of foreign powers on this side of the ocean with the political and domestic affairs of the American continents and of the islands adjacent thereto. Therefore, it would seem to be an imperative duty devolved upon this Congress to declare in no uncertain language just what is meant and understood by the American principle of nonintervention.

The statesmen of America, at the time the principle was announced, understood it the same as the people do generally to-day. Thomas Jefferson, writing upon the subject of nonintervention, uses the following language:

> I could honestly therefore join in the declaration proposed, that we aim not at the acquisition of any of their possessions, but that we will oppose with all our means the forcible interposition of any other power as auxiliary, stipendary, or under any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way.

Here, Mr. President, we find, as I believe, a correct statement of the Monroe doctrine. It is made applicable alike to the acquisition of territory by war, by cession, by treaty, by purchase, or otherwise, in any manner whatsoever. The danger apprehended was the acquisition of territory here in any manner by foreign powers, and the setting up of their forms of government or establishments adjacent to ours. The danger thus apprehended by American statesmen was imminent, and was the reason for the rule or principle announced. And the danger apprehended is just as great and imminent to-day, even more apparent.

Mr. President, I do not intend at this time to enter into a discussion of the questions at issue between Great Britain and Venezuela. The commission appointed by the President will discuss and decide those questions impartially. I may properly state, however, in passing, that the history of Great Britain for more than two centuries has been one of war and aggression against weaker peoples and nations. Her policy has been one of relentless conquest. Her possessions are so vast and extensive that the sun, in all its course, never ceases to shine thereon, and in her greed and rapacity the sullen roar of the British lion is heard round the world. In her tireless career of conquest she seized Gibraltar, Mauritius, Aden, and Malta, Trinidad, Soudan, Cape Colony, and Zululand, the islands of Jamaica, Ceylon, and Ascension, British Burmah, Borneo, Hongkong, and St. Helena. I have not mentioned her large possessions in India and South America, nor all in Africa. I have not mentioned almost innumerable stations, lesser islands, and ports seized for commercial advantage. I have not mentioned her many cruel and bloody wars. Her history, her rapacious greed, raises a very strong impression that she is out land grabbing in Venezuela.

On the 17th day of December, 1895, President Cleveland in his message to Congress attempted to state the American doctrine of nonintervention. Did he state it fully? From the general approval of the message by the press of the country one would be so inclined to believe. But upon a careful perusal of the message I am of the opinion that he did not state the American principle fully, and while announcing the principle generally he nullified it in one of its most important features. If we give to words their plain and ordinary meaning, then we are forced to the conclusion that he attempted to apply the doctrine to the American Republics only in case of a foreign power, by war or force, attempting to extend its territorial limits. In his message he expressly declares that Venezuela may adjust this matter with England. He says:

> Great Britain's present proposition has never thus far been regarded as admissible by Venezuela, though any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage and may enter into of her own free will can not, of course, be objected to by the United States.

We are here informed that if Venezuela should see fit to recognize the English claim and thereby concede 30,000 square miles or more of territory to England it could not be objected to by the United States. If territory can be thus obtained by peaceful means, by consent, by agreement, by concession, by treaty, why may not the entire territory of Venezuela, or of any other consenting nation, be transferred fully to some foreign power? Again he says:

> If a European power, by any extension of its boundaries, takes possession of the territory of one of our neighboring Republics against its will and in derogation of its rights, it is difficult to see why to that extent such European power does not thereby attempt to extend its system of government to that portion of this continent which is thus taken.

It will be observed that the President says that the acquisition of territory against its will would be in derogation of its rights. Therefore, if acquired with its will, its consent, it would not be in derogation thereof. If the Monroe doctrine is only to be invoked or applied when territory is sought to be obtained by war, or a condition equivalent thereto, the doctrine ought to be immediately amended so as to make it applicable to territory obtained by cession, treaty, purchase, or otherwise.

If not, then foreign powers may, by cession, treaty, or purchase, obtain large tracts of land on either of the American continents or on the islands adjacent thereto. Under such construction Spain can cede Cuba to England, and America would have no cause to complain. Surely the American people will never willingly adopt such construction. The American people to-day, with almost perfect unanimity, believe that Cuba should, as a matter of self-preservation, belong to us. In any event, that if it ever passes from the control of Spain, it must either become an independent power or else become subject to or a part of this nation; and this upon the principle of self-preservation or self-defense, a principle as old as men and nations; a principle just and right and of most generous application. The Gulf of Mexico, the mouth of the great Mississippi River, the Republics of Yucatan and Nicaragua, naturally fall under the protecting ægis of this island. Hence the great importance of it to America. And, more than all, when we shall have made the two great oceans one by constructing the Nicaraguan Canal, when the greater commerce of the world, on American bottoms, manned by American seamen, under the American flag, shall pass through this great thoroughfare, we shall want Cuba. That it will ultimately become a part of this great nation seems to me manifest destiny.

Mr. President, I am one of those who believe the American principle of nonintervention is not founded wholly upon the Monroe doctrine or upon any technical construction of international law, but rather upon a principle as old as civilization itself. It is founded, in my humble opinion, upon the natural law of self-preservation. And, Mr. President, in the assertion and maintenance of this principle each and every nation has the inherent and exclusive right to judge for itself what is best suited to its own condition and most likely to promote its happiness and welfare in its own way.

Mr. President, let us have peace, therefore, at this time, while we are attempting to settle the disputed facts as to whether Great Britain, by wrongful aggression, has, or is about to acquire, a large extent of territory in Venezuela, let us make known to the nations of the world in language so plain that "he who runs may read" our position and understanding of the American doctrine of nonintervention and at the same time let the nations of the world know that as a last resort we will maintain the principle by war, if necessary, in order that peace may come.

The principle announced in this resolution is not one of war, but of peace; not one of conquest, but of national honor and glory.

As the great powers of Europe are extending and rearranging their territorial lines in the Eastern Hemisphere for the final great contest of national supremacy, it is but just and proper that we should declare our position with reference to the American continents and the islands adjacent thereto in the Western Hemisphere, so that there may be no mistake or misunderstanding. No one deplores war more than I do. I do not believe in war except in case of necessity. My views upon this subject are fully expressed in the language of one of our greatest and most humane generals:

> Far be the day when we shall enter into war unless we are fully justified by our own inner consciousness that it is right, for "thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just." And men should not engage in war unless they are fully conscious that the cause is just for so doing. War means desolation, destruction, sacrifice, and suffering, as well as heroism and glory.

Mr. President, national dishonor, national decadence, and decay are more deplorable than war. By announcing the principle contained in the resolution we shall not invite or provoke war. The justness of our cause will challenge and command the admiration of the civilized world. Opposition thereto will disappear like summer clouds before the morning sun. War may come in upholding this principle, but I do not believe it. But if it does come we shall triumph in a cause which Heaven will bless and crown with glorious success. And when the shock of fierce contending armies shall be heard no more, when the smoke of battle shall have been gathered in the hand of peace, then we shall behold greater

America united, prosperous, and free, still the wonder and marvel of the world—matchless, incomparable.

Mr. President, let us have peace; and, in order that we may have honorable, lasting, and glorious peace, let us announce to the nations of the world the principle contained in the resolution as a rule of conduct for all time.

Mr. CALL. I desire to ask whether the joint resolution is before the Senate for consideration at this time.

Mr. BAKER. I understand that it is not. I desired to make a few remarks when introducing the joint resolution.

Mr. CALL. I merely wish to state, with the unanimous consent of the Senate, so far as is pertinent to the joint resolution, that I hope the Committee on Foreign Relations will at an early day and without delay bring into the Senate for consideration a measure according belligerent rights to the people of Cuba.

The application of the Monroe doctrine, whatever may be proper in regard to its extension as contained in the joint resolution of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], now before the Senate, is certainly applicable to the present condition of affairs in Cuba. It is unquestionably true that the Government of the United States should not permit the terrible atrocities which are now being perpetrated upon the people of that island. There is no greater instance of heroism in the history of the world than that of a comparatively small population upon a little island successfully maintaining a war against one of the great powers of Europe. Without arms, without munitions of war, relying entirely upon the unanimous sentiment of the people, they have endured cruelties which outrage human nature and which find constant publication in the press.

Mr. President, I hope no delay will occur in the expression on the part of Congress of the right of those people to recognition as a belligerent power.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASCO in the chair). The Chair understands that that is the pending motion. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

IMMIGRATION FROM PENAL COLONIES.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration be directed to inquire whether or not any legislation is necessary to prevent the introduction into the United States of aliens imprisoned in penal colonies of European nations established in their American possessions.

PAYMENT OF COIN OBLIGATIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. BUTLER relative to the purpose of Congress to keep gold and silver at a parity by investing the Secretary of the Treasury with the discretion of paying the coin obligations of the country as they mature in either metal.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

Mr. BUTLER. Do I understand that the Senator from Nevada proposes to address the Senate on the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has risen, and the Chair presumes that he desires to address the Senate on the resolution.

Mr. STEWART. I rose to request that the resolution of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] be temporarily laid aside without losing its place, and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business a few minutes before the time when it will be laid before the Senate—I presume there is not time enough for anything of importance to intervene—in order to enable me to address the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BUTLER. I am willing that the resolution shall be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I gave notice two days ago that at the expiration of the morning business to-day I would move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2904, being the bond bill. If the morning business has been concluded I will make that motion.

Mr. STEWART. I have the floor on the unfinished business, and should like to make some remarks upon the resolution of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. It will not enlarge the time if I should do so now, as I can make them on one measure as well as the other.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let me get this bill up.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to make my remarks on the unfinished business, because I think that is the matter immediately under consideration, and it is the subject on which I want to talk.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada how long he thinks it will take him to submit the remarks he proposes to make?

Mr. STEWART. About an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first question before the Senate is as to the disposition of the resolution heretofore submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. Unanimous consent is asked that it be allowed to lie on the table without prejudice. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SALE OF BONDS.

Mr. STEWART. Now I ask that the unfinished business be taken up in order that I may submit some remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent to address the Senate upon the unfinished business. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Is it the proposition of the Senator from Nevada to discuss the unfinished business or some matter coming over in the morning hour?

Mr. STEWART. The unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposition is to discuss the unfinished business, which will not come up in regular order until 2 o'clock. It can come up before that time by unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. At the expiration of the morning hour.

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent that it be taken up now.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not want to be discourteous to the Senator from Nevada. At the same time, as I gave notice two days ago that I would make this motion, I do not think the Senator from Nevada ought to insist on taking the time of the Senate just now.

Mr. STEWART. I am entitled to the floor at 2 o'clock. I do not suppose it will take me until 3. I shall insist upon my right to speak at 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator from Arkansas will permit a suggestion, I think a solution of the difficulty can be reached in harmony with the ideas of the Senator from Nevada as well as those of the Senator from Arkansas. If the motion proposed to be made by the Senator from Arkansas be submitted at this time and be adopted by the Senate, the Senator from Nevada can make his speech upon that measure, as I understand the rules, with as much propriety as if the other matter were pending.

Mr. STEWART. I have taken the floor to speak on the resolution with regard to the issue of bonds, and I wish to speak upon that resolution. I do not want to speak on the bond bill to-day.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Nevada has had the floor twice to make a speech, and I think it is hardly fair that he should not have an opportunity to make it now, when he has secured the floor for the third time.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have no idea of being discourteous to the Senator from Nevada. I only hope there is some way to avoid postponing the measure any longer. I know he feels as much interest as I do in taking up the bill which I have in charge; but, of course, I can not object to the Senator taking the time he desires. However, at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Nevada I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be now taken up. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. ELKINS relative to the sale of bonds by the United States.

Mr. STEWART. Let the Secretary read the resolution and the proposed amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution and the amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. The resolution submitted by Mr. ELKINS December 31 is as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that hereafter no bonds of the United States shall be sold at private sale or under private contract, and in case of any sale of bonds under existing laws the same shall be made only after due advertisement of such sale and proposals invited, and then only to the highest bidder.

It is proposed by Mr. BUTLER to amend the resolution by striking out all after the word "sold" and inserting the words "for any purpose whatever, without further authority from Congress;" so that the resolution when amended will read:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that hereafter no bonds of the United States shall be sold for any purpose whatever without further authority from Congress.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the reasons why the resolution of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], as proposed to be amended by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER], should pass seem to me to be overwhelming. In the first place, I shall show why reasons against the issuance of bonds have accumulated since the resolution was last under discussion, and in-

stead of complying with the spirit of the original resolution offered by the Senator from West Virginia, the Administration has taken a departure which is much worse than the original private sales.

REASONS FOR THE RESOLUTION.

Before I proceed to show that there is no authority and no law for the sale, which I shall do, I propose to call attention to the very remarkable call issued by the Executive for the sale of $100,000,000 of United States bonds, bearing 4 per cent interest, and running twenty-nine years, the coupons from last February being cut off. In the first place, the bids are to be for $50 and any multiple of that sum. In the next place the bidders must estimate what premiums they will pay, which involves a very difficult calculation. I do not suppose one in a thousand of the people of the United States, perhaps not one in ten thousand, can make a calculation to show what interest their bid would bear, if they named a certain premium. That takes it out of the reach of ordinary bidders. Then $50 is entirely too much. It, too, takes the bonds out of the reach of the ordinary bidder. Then there is contained in the offer a declaration like this:

The right to reject any and all bids is reserved.

That is not all. It is further provided in this offer that the purchasers will be required to pay United States gold coin. Yet this is called a popular loan. Can it be so called in any just acceptation? We never have had a popular loan in this country, but they have had such loans in other countries. After the Franco-Prussian war, France was compelled to pay a ransom of $1,000,000,000 to make peace with Germany, and she raised that sum by a popular loan.

WHAT A POPULAR LOAN IS.

I think the best way to describe a popular loan is to state how France did it. The minimum size of the bonds she offered was 10 francs, a little less than $2 of our money. They were offered to be paid for in French money, and no bid was to be rejected, but the bidders were to receive the bonds pro rata. There was no obstruction in the way, no fooling about it, no underhand scheme about it, no syndicates behind it. What was the result? Every servant who could raise 10 francs bought a bond. They were bought with French money, and the result was that the $1,000,000,000 was subscribed two or three times over by the French people. What effect did it have upon France? The $1,000,000,000 of these bonds of small denominations operated like so much currency. It changed from hand to hand. The people had that much money really, and the $1,000,000,000 which France paid did more good to France than the $1,000,000,000 which Germany received did for Germany, for within two years from that time France was the most prosperous country in Europe.

How did that happen? Having an abundance of money, all the people went to work. The wealth of a country depends upon its labor and its resources. The French prospered as no other people did. What has been the result since? With the impetus that France got by the $1,000,000,000, there was plenty of money and all hands went to work. She has since accumulated $900,000,000 of gold and $700,000,000 of silver, and has put out about seven or eight hundred million dollars of paper money, with less than 40,000,000 people. France has kept her people at work and has prevented falling prices, and thus secured the balance of trade in her favor.

How has the United States done? What kind of a policy has the United States pursued? The United States during the war put out various kinds of bonds, which were used as money. In fact, the whole national debt was practically money. The holders of the bonds used them as a basis of credit in the place of money.

Some of the bonds passed from hand to hand as money. When the war closed what happened? Europeans invested in them because there was no question of their payment. They became the best of security. The Europeans bought them and took them away from the people and contracted the circulation enormously. What happened then? The debt was refunded and taken by syndicates and kept from the people. I think the people of Washington will remember very well that when an opportunity was given to invest in a popular loan of $10,000,000, there was a string of people a mile or two long to get the $10,000,000 of bonds. The next day the syndicate had taken up all the bonds and none could be bought.

THE PRESENT LOAN A MOCKERY.

This advertisement, coming at the present time, it seems to me, is a cruel mockery. In the first place, the amount of the bonds is too large. They ought not to be more than $5 each, if you are going to have the people take them. It is all nonsense to talk about a popular loan in $50 bonds. France never made an experiment of that kind. If she had she would have failed. If that had been tried in France it would have been a failure.

Mr. HAWLEY. I had a chance to hear a good deal about the French loan, and it is my recollection that France issued bonds as low as 100 francs, $20.

Mr. STEWART. As low as 10 francs.

Mr. HAWLEY. I thought the Senator from Nevada said nothing as low as $50.

Mr. STEWART. I said, referring to the offer of the President, that $50 was too much. Bonds of that denomination can not be taken by the people at large, but they could take bonds of $2 or $3 and they would all take some if they had an opportunity. When they needed money they would bring the bonds out.

I received a letter from my wife in Paris when the French loan was being taken. She said that every servant about the hotels and all the waiters were gathering up money to get 10 francs to buy a bond. They all took an interest in it. We have no such opportunity here in the United States. Here comes the fifty-dollar bond; then comes the assertion that they must be sealed bids, and that they may be rejected, to discourage the people. That is a matter of uncertainty about it. Then the ordinary person can not fix the price to determine any given per cent. If this had been intended as a popular loan the denomination of the bonds would have been not to exceed $5. It would have been arranged that they should be paid for in American money, and the Government would have fixed a price which would have made it a 3 per cent bond. The Government officers could have figured it out so that everybody would have understood it, and the people, no doubt, would have taken about all the bonds the Government wants to issue. The Government should have figured it out, whether it was 116, 117, 118, or 119, so as to make it a 3 per cent bond, and stated that price. Then the people could have taken the bonds; they would have been within the reach of the people. But the proposed issue is placed out of their reach by a dozen different arrangements in this proposition.

Then comes another obstruction. The bonds must be paid for in gold. That is required by an Administration which has been declaring all along that it was going to maintain the parity between gold and silver; that there should be no discrimination; that there should be no degradation of the money of the country; "that one dollar should be as good as another." That phrase has been used in all our elections since Harrison invented it. It has been taken up and echoed and reechoed—that one dollar should be as good as every other dollar. Yet here the Executive requires a particular kind of dollar to maintain the parity! That is a great way to maintain the parity, to say that other kinds of dollars are not good enough with which to buy those bonds.

UNITED STATES TREASURY NOTES.

Mr. President, from the foundation of this Government until 1861 there was never a period of five years when there was not circulating paper which would pay all Government dues and which was at par and never went below par. From time to time, until 1816, they issued Treasury notes and received them for Government dues. Then the circulation of the United States Bank was received for Government dues from about 1816 until 1835, and it never was at a discount. Then Treasury notes were issued again under Van Buren's Administration. Those Treasury notes were received for public dues, and they never fell below par. Then, in 1861, we had Treasury notes put out. Those Treasury notes were as good as gold, and after greenbacks were dishonored by the refusal to receive them for customs dues, then the $62,000,000 of Treasury notes—I think that was the amount—remained as good as gold to the end of the war. In those days notes were issued upon which there was no limitation of legal-tender power, and so long as they paid Government dues they remained at par.

THE EXECUTIVE DEGRADES THE NATION'S MONEY.

Here the Executive says that no kind of money but gold shall be received on the bids. It disparages the greenbacks and the silver certificates and all other money about in the same manner that it would to refuse to receive them for custom dues. "Resume specie payments; make one dollar as good as another; no discrimination between dollars." Here we have this document put out, saying, "we require gold and we will repudiate all the other circulation."

Now, it has been suggested, and circumstances appear to point in that direction, that this offer was put out under a stress of circumstances, on account of the clamor against the sale of bonds to the syndicate, in order to excuse the Administration for dealing with a syndicate. If that is the object, they offer it in the right shape to be used for that purpose, for it can be used for no other purpose. The money of this country is in a condition where the people can not get gold. The syndicate has it hoarded.

I have here an article from the Washington Post entitled "A grip on gold," which contains a statement made by the Treasury Department, being a summary of the condition of our currency, which I will ask the Secretary to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The paper will be read, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is recalled that private subscriptions to the first loan of $50,000,000 amounted to only about $745,000, and to the last loan but little more. The last issue resulted in the payment into the Treasury of $65,116,244 in gold, for which the Government issued 4 per cent thirty-year bonds to the amount of $62,315,400. The premium realized by the Government, therefore, was $2,800,844, or 4.494 per cent, the investor realizing a rate of interest of about 3.75 per cent. The market price of the bonds is now about 114. The Treasury now holds legal

tenders to the amount of $147,495,510, of which $115,825,143 are in United States notes, $2,845,000 in currency certificates, and $22,044,511 in Treasury notes of 1890. The amount of legal tenders now in circulation is $378,187,642, as follows: Treasury notes of 1890, $115,726,769; United States notes, $230,855,873, and currency certificates, $206,653,836. Of the amount of legal tenders in circulation, the 3,712 national banks on September 28 last, the date of the last report, held $143,866,685, the remainder being held by State banks, trust companies, savings banks, and private banks, aggregating in number 10,038, and by private individuals.

NO GREENBACKS OR GOLD FOR THE PEOPLE.

Mr. STEWART. It will be observed that there are nearly $150,000,000 of legal tenders in the Treasury, and that outside of the Treasury there are three hundred and seventy-eight millinos and some thousands; that of the $378,000,000 of legal tenders over $143,000,000 are in the national banks, and the balance, as stated in this article, in about 10,000 other private banks, trust companies, etc. The probabilities are that there are not $50,000,000 of legal-tender notes circulating among the people. So that the bankers have the means of calling on the Treasury for gold, and nobody else has the means of doing it, and no way of getting the gold.

As to the question of the amount of gold in the country, nobody knows that any worth naming exists outside of the banks and the Treasury, except on the Pacific Coast, where there may be twenty or thirty million dollars in actual circulation. But there is no gold whatever in circulation east of the Rocky Mountains; whatever there is is in the banks, and undoubtedly the pool understands that.

THE WAYS OF THE ROTHSCHILD SYNDICATE.

When this call was issued, what did the syndicate do? It will be remembered that there was a syndicate formed to take this entire loan, and that was composed of Europeans. Did they encourage a popular loan in the United States? I have in my hand telegrams from Europe showing how they boomed our popular loan. They were cooperating to destroy it, with the intention of having a pretended coercion upon the President, a sham coercion to make him give them the bonds. I think it might be well to insert in the RECORD the kindly way the Europeans who belonged to this syndicate, of which Morgan was the head, undertook to aid the popular loan in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

EUROPEAN BANKERS' VIEWS—THEY WILL ACCEPT NOTHING BUT A BOND PAYABLE IN GOLD.

NEW YORK, *January 6.*

The World to-morrow will publish the following cablegrams:

"LONDON, *January 6.*

"In answer to your telegram of the 4th, we beg to say that under ordinary circumstances we would never venture to offer an opinion on any financial question which is under discussion by a foreign government and its legislature, but we are always ready to give our advice on any practical issue when called upon to do so by those who have power to act.

"Last year, during the financial crisis in the United States, we made an offer for a 3 per cent gold loan, and failing Congress giving necessary powers to enable such an issue to be made, we undertook, with others, to place a certain amount of 4 per cent coin bonds.

"As you now have done us the honor of asking our opinion, we must tell you very frankly that in our judgment the severe financial situation at present is chiefly caused by the political crisis, and as soon as the American and English Governments have satisfactorily settled the questions at issue the financial strain will be considerably relaxed, if it does not altogether disappear.

"Until this boundary question is arranged we do not believe that either the European public or capitalists will take many American bonds for investment, if any, and we believe that although a certain number of people on this side of the Atlantic have signified their intention of taking a share in a syndicate to be formed in New York, they have only done so in the belief that at the present moment they could at once resell the bonds in America.

"When the political horizon is quite clear and it is finally established in the minds of all men that the good feeling and understanding which exists in the hearts of the people in England and America is beyond doubt and is acknowledged and ratified by the two Governments, then will be time and opportunity for America to apply to the British capitalists.

"We offer no suggestions how this is to be accomplished. It is for the Governments to decide this.

"All we can say is that good feeling exists among our people on this side, and you, sir, have proved by your patriotic efforts that it exists on the other side of the Atlantic.

"N. M. ROTHSCHILD & SONS."

Mr. STEWART. There were a number of other telegrams by other bankers, indorsing the Rothschilds. Of course they had to indorse the Rothschilds and sustain their position. Now, mark this significant telegram. A few days previous to this offer to the public, the agent of the Rothschilds who formed the other syndicate, Pierpont Morgan, was in this city, as all the papers announced, with Mr. Stetson, the same attorney who helped manage the other pool. The Messrs. Rothschild & Sons tell us they were part of the other pool. It was announced in the press that a new pool had been formed to take this loan, but it was the old pool, the old syndicate somewhat enlarged, a few more American bankers being taken in, and here were Messrs. Rothschild & Sons, with a pool already formed, and with the gold all cornered.

When this offer was published—which, if I might express my opinion without being impolite, I would call a "sham offer"—in order to defeat it, the members of this syndicate telegraphed from London that the bonds could not be sold, that they would not take them under existing circumstances, when their agent had been in this city and had made arrangements to take them and expected to get them, and still expects to get them, and get them cheap, when the force of a popular loan has failed.

They wanted to discourage the American people. It seems to me that such a message coming from a syndicate which was proposing to buy bonds for less than their value shows a conspiracy against the finances and honor of this country that should make us pause; and it is time to stop selling bonds until there is some mode provided for their issuance by law and some regulation, so that a syndicate can not fool with the Government in this way.

The Rothschilds are in a syndicate to buy the bonds, and when the offer is put out, in order to discourage the American people and to damage the finances and credit of this country, then come telegrams from members of the syndicate, disparaging American credit; and our papers have been teeming with laudation of the patriotism of the syndicate—the syndicate saved the country!—and the commercial press throughout the land has been commending the syndicate for the last year. Now come these same individuals applying for $100,000,000 of bonds, after they have collected the gold which nobody else can get. This proposal, pretending to be a popular loan, is trammeled by the necessity of bidders having gold. Then come telegrams from the same banking syndicate disparaging the credit of the United States. If there is anything more important for consideration than this, if there is anything which more appeals to American pride and American honor than this, I should like to have the subject suggested. I will insert in my remarks the full dispatches.

The papers referred to are as follows:

BERLIN, *January 6.*

Not having taken part in the negotiations for a new loan, we think it inopportune to give an opinion on the subject.

S. BLEICHROEDER & CO., *Bankers.*

LONDON, *January 6.*

In my official capacity I can not express any opinion.

GOVERNOR BANK OF ENGLAND.

—

LONDON, *January 6.*

Can not express opinion as to continental investors. Doubt if sufficiently attractive here in form suggested.

COUTTS, *Bankers.*

—

LONDON, *January 6.*

In our opinion the success, or otherwise, of an issue of American bonds in England would depend on the feeling existing between the two countries at the time of issue.

CHILDS & CO.

—

PARIS, *January 6.*

Believe European investors would readily take United States threes, principal and interest payable in gold, but coin or currency bonds, even 4 percents, would find quite limited market.

MUNROE & CO., *Bankers.*

—

LONDON, *January 6.*

If your inquiry refers to United States bonds expressed in coin, an expression regarded here and on the Continent as equivocal and dubious, we don't believe any such 3 per cent bonds would be taken abroad. In ordinary times a 3 per cent United States loan, expressed in gold, would no doubt go well here and on the Continent, but these are exceptional times, and at present even that may be uncertain. In our opinion, also, the absence of small hoarded savings in the hands of the people of the United States, such as among the French form the support of popular loans, makes a popular issue in the United States unpromising.

BROWN, SHIPLEY & CO., *Bankers.*

—

PARIS, *January 6.*

French capital would largely participate in United States loans provided principal and interest be paid in gold. Terms would depend on circumstances.

THE CREDIT LYONAISE.

THE POPULAR LOAN EXPECTED TO FAIL.

Mr. STEWART. But other things have appeared. It now appears to be generally conceded by the syndicate that the popular loan will fail. The first intimation that we had came from the little evening paper here which always feels for the Administration—the little Star that twinkles dimly but actively. It gives us the first inkling of what is anticipated. I ask the Secretary to read what the Star says, and then I will make some comments on it. The extract I desire to have read is from the Star of yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE RAID ON GOLD—WHAT THE PRESIDENT MAY DO UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.

The withdrawals of gold from the Treasury thus far this week are looked upon as ominous by Treasury officials, but this result is not altogether unexpected by the Administration. They would not be surprised if a serious raid should be made, taking practically all of the gold out of the Treasury, and if this should occur they will be disposed to say, "I told you so." It is what the President and his Secretary expected to result from an attempt at a popular loan.

It is said that in anticipation of a raid on the gold a course has already been decided on, to be followed as soon as the reserve is run below a certain point. As soon as it becomes apparent (if it does) that the gold in the Treasury is being drawn on for the purchase of the proposed bonds the President will, it is said, withdraw the advertisement for bonds and at once make a contract with the syndicate for gold. It is believed that he will not wait for the re-

serve to sink much lower before doing this, provided it is evident that the gold is being withdrawn in consequence of the offer of bonds.

THE STORY OF JOE SANDS.

Mr. STEWART. Though not in the habit of telling stories, this article reminds me of one. We had a bad man in California whose name was Joe Sands. He was very bad. He played three-card monte in Stockton, and had to run away from that place because he cheated everybody. Then he went up to Sonora and played a swindling game, and was run out. He went around playing tricks of that kind, and as soon as he was discovered in one place he had to leave for another. He was always prepared to leave on short notice, and had his horse saddled. He worked his games along up to Placerville, and then to Mormon Island, and then to Nevada. Each time he had his horse saddled and had to go. He marked cards, loaded dice, and did all that kind of thing. He finally got over into Plumas County on Jim Crow Bar. The water was so high there that the people could not get into the stream. They were all very poor, and nobody had any money.

Joe Sands discovered a large, good-looking, but very lank dog. There was only one very small meat market in the place, where Joe Sands actually bought a good-sized piece of beef; he did not steal that time, he made an exception. Then he held the meat before the dog and made the dog stand on his hind legs and roll over. He teased the dog in that way for a long time, but finally took a piece of paper, rolled the beef up in it, put it in his pocket, and said he would have to go, that the meat was for another dog. The trick Joe played on the dog ended his career. The miners voted unanimously that he was too mean to live. They did not give him time to escape, but dealt with him in a way that put a stop to his wicked works.

The President is now offering these bonds. The people are hungry for them, but they can not reach them. The President will withdraw them and give them to his pet syndicate. The evidence is accumulating that the people are not going to get any of them.

GIVING THE LOAN "A BLACK EYE."

In the New York Sun of this morning we find an interview with a Cabinet officer. The Sun is pretty careful about misrepresenting high officers of the Government in its interviews. In discussing the question of the probable failure of this popular loan the reporter says, among other things, what I now read:

Discussing the question with the Sun correspondent to-night this Cabinet officer——

Mr. GEORGE. Who was it?

Mr. STEWART. He does not give the name. He says the Cabinet officer requested that his name be not given.

Mr. GEORGE. You can take any one you please, then?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; you can take any one you please.

The interview continues—

gave the reason why the Administration is absolutely confident of the success of the new loan. This reason is that the loan is practically underwritten now by bankers, and that an arrangement has been made with banks to produce the gold necessary to prevent a financial crash whenever it is threatened, between now and February 5, the date when the bids are to be opened and passed upon.

Nobody doubts that the country is perfectly secure, now that it is underwritten by Morgan! The failure of the offer would be an excuse for selling bonds at a remarkably low figure. Then we shall hear Rothschild lauded as the only patriotic American anywhere. We have to go to the other side of the water to get patriotism. The same syndicate which has underwritten the bonds already tells you, "You put them out and we will give the loan a black eye, and then the honesty and the patriotism of the country will justify you in selling to us very cheap; the ten or fifteen millions we made in the other deal is not satisfactory; we want to make more; we want to destroy the credit of the country, so that we can make more money under this loan than we did under the former one."

There is another thing in this interview which is very significant, but which we all knew:

This same Cabinet officer says that there are plenty of statistics at hand, in addition to the piles of telegrams that have arrived from financial centers during the last few days, to demonstrate that the people of the country have not hoarded away the vast sums of gold they are credited with.

We have heard about the vast amount of gold in possession of the people, when everybody knew the people did not have any gold, and the bonds can not be purchased with anything else. Is it not tantalizing the people to offer them these bonds when the gold is all pooled and everybody knows it, to offer them under conditions when they can not buy them?

THE BONDS UNNECESSARY AND ILLEGAL.

I say now there is no necessity, there is no law for this proceeding. The President tells us there is necessity for it. What does he say in his annual message? I will have the passage I send up read, and I hope the Senate will pay attention to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE, FIRST SESSION FIFTY-FOURTH CONGRESS.

It is possible that the suggestion of increased revenue as a remedy for the difficulties we are considering may have originated in an intimation or distinct allegation that the bonds which have been issued ostensibly to replenish our gold reserve were really issued to supply insufficient revenue. Nothing can be further from the truth. Bonds were issued to obtain gold for the maintenance of our national credit. As has been shown, the gold thus obtained has been drawn again from the Treasury upon United States notes and Treasury notes. This operation would have been promptly prevented if possible; but these notes having thus been passed to the Treasury, they became the money of the Government, like any other ordinary Government funds, and there was nothing to do but to use them in paying Government expenses when needed.

Mr. ALLEN. With the permission of the Senator from Nevada, I wish to call his attention to a rumor which was in circulation in February, 1894, when the first loan was effected, and which attached to every loan which has been made by this Administration. It was charged that of the fifty or sixty million issue of bonds only about thirteen millions of the sum were received in actual gold—that is, in actual gold money or bullion—or gold certificates. The same charge has been made with reference to subsequent loans, that not to exceed 25 per cent of those loans have been received in gold, or gold certificates.

Mr. STEWART. I do not know how that may be, but I know that the people have to pay gold to get the bonds, and I know they have not the gold and can not get the bonds, and that has been known from the beginning. But to the point.

There is now $178,000,000 cash balance in the Treasury, nearly $150,000,000 of which is legal-tender notes. If we put out another $100,000,000, the syndicate can buy up all those notes and make more contraction. It is undoubtedly the object to continue to buy them up and pile them in the Treasury for the purpose of depriving the people of what little money is in circulation. The President says he does not need any more revenue, but he needs this money to sustain the honor of the Government. He has got to deal with this Rothschild syndicate, which is disparaging our credit and is speculating off the Government, getting bonds 10 or 15 per cent less than their actual value, piling up debt on us, and we must do this to sustain the honor of the Government! How long will this Government have honor or credit if these outrageous speculations and peculations are allowed to proceed? We can not imitate the press, which says it is patriotism for Rothschild to disparage our credit and buy bonds for less than their value. We should not be intimidated by the Executive power, which offers these bonds in such a way that the people can not get them. We should stop these wicked transactions, and stop them now.

The resolution as proposed to be amended by the Senator from North Carolina ought to pass this body to-day. But this is not all. There is an ample surplus in the Treasury. The President says he makes this loan to maintain the gold reserve. I deny that he has any right to maintain the gold reserve, whatever may be said about the coin reserve. I shall not discuss that, but I believe there is no law for that either. As to the gold reserve, however, it is a thing unknown to the law. It is only by the combination of the Executive with gold gamblers that a gold reserve ever has been made in this Republic.

THE STANLEY MATTHEWS RESOLUTION.

A clamor for gold arose in 1878, and Stanley Matthews, one of the brightest lawyers who ever sat in the Senate or who ever adorned the bench, drew a resolution which was passed by more than a two-thirds vote in each House of Congress after mature debate. That disposes of the idea of a gold reserve up to that date.

Mr. GEORGE. What is the date of that?

Mr. STEWART. January, 1878. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas by the act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," approved March 18, 1869, it was provided and declared that the faith of the United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment, in coin or its equivalent, of all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had expressly provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver; and

Whereas all the bonds of the United States authorized to be issued by the act entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, by the terms of said act were declared to be redeemable in coin of the then present standard value, bearing interest payable semi-annually in such coin; and

Whereas all bonds of the United States authorized to be issued under the act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved July 14, 1875, are required to be of the description of bonds of the United States described in the said act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt;" and

Whereas at the date of the passage of said act of Congress last aforesaid, to wit, the 14th day of July, 1870, the coin of the United States of standard value of that date included silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains each, declared by the act approved January 18, 1837, entitled "An act supplementary to the act entitled 'An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,'" to be a legal tender of payment according to their nominal value for any sums whatever: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That all the bonds issued by the United States, issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited, are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States, containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in viola-

tion of the public faith nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor.—*Congressional Record*, volume 7, part 1, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 564.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Carlisle, voted for this resolution, and the law was then supposed to be settled that there was no distinction between the coins of this country.

Mr. GEORGE. Was that a concurrent resolution, or a Senate resolution?

Mr. STEWART. It was a concurrent resolution. We had in the White House at that time Mr. Hayes, who would have vetoed it, of course. He was there for that purpose, as all his successors have been.

THE AUTHORITY FOR LOOTING THE TREASURY.

The act of 1875 which was recited in this resolution, the resumption act, contains the clause which I am about to read, and this is the only authority in the books by which bonds are sold. There is nothing else to be found. There have been some other laws enacted, but they have all been repealed. There is only this one authority. Now, let us examine this authority for looting the Treasury, to satisfy these benevolent and patriotic citizens on the other side of the Atlantic.

This is the resumption act of 1875. I read the clause wherein the authority to sell bonds is obtained, so far as any authority is supposed to exist:

And on and after the 1st day of January, A. D. 1879, the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem, in coin, the United States legal-tender notes then outstanding on their presentation for redemption at the office of the assistant treasurer of the United States in the city of New York in sums of not less than $50, and to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and provide for the redemption in this act authorized or required he is authorized to use any surplus revenues from time to time in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and to issue, sell, and dispose of at not less than par in coin either of the descriptions of bonds of the United States described in the act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," with like qualities, privileges, and exemptions, to the extent necessary to carry this act into full effect.

THE FRAUDULENT "PARITY."

The Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to redeem the greenbacks then outstanding. He was given a right under that law to sell bonds for coin to redeem the greenbacks then outstanding—for coin, not for gold coin. But a more recent, a more fallacious, absurd, and insulting pretext has been found than was ever invented before. It was invented at the tail end of Harrison's Administration, and it has been iterated and reiterated constantly. It is to the effect that the act of 1890 required the redemption of everything in gold coin. I have the clauses of that act here, and I propose to call attention to them, because I think the construction placed upon the act is the greatest outrage upon common sense and law that ever emanated from the executive department; and that is the climax of all that can be said upon that subject. This is the act of 1890 for the redemption of the Sherman notes:

That upon demand of the holder of any of the Treasury notes herein provided for the Secretary of the Treasury shall, under such regulations as he may prescribe, redeem such notes in gold or silver coin at his discretion, it being the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law.

Now, it is said that because it was declared in that act as a policy—that simply because a recital declaring a policy is found in the act—the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to pay in gold or silver coin is taken away, and that he is bound to pay in gold coin to maintain the parity. This, too, is claimed in face of the fact that both political parties in the campaign of 1892 declared in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money.

Mr. GEORGE. Standard money.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; standard money, both coins. This, too, is claimed in face of the further fact that from Harrison down to the present they have been iterating and reiterating that every dollar should be as good as every other dollar; that they would not disparage one coin in favor of the other. Now they propose to maintain the parity between gold and silver by rejecting silver, by cutting off its market, by not using it, and throwing the whole demand upon gold alone. Everybody knows that the disparity has been created by the demonetization of silver. That is not disputed by any intelligent man. The Royal Commission found that that is what created the disparity. It was done by cutting off the market for silver. It was done by the suspension of the coinage of silver. Here to create a parity, they not only refused to coin silver, but they refused to use it, and what has been the result? Silver has gone down, down under the blows of this Administration and its predecessor in refusing to use it. How logical, how honest the pretext! That is the way they created the disparity, under the pretense of creating a parity. That is the pretense of this Administration, and never was excuse more false than this. They presume that the American people are idiots, and do not know that cutting off the demand for one article and placing all of the demand on the other will increase the disparity. That is what they intended to do.

THE EXECUTIVE TRAMPLES ON THE LAW.

But that is not all. Every lawyer knows that the entire context of a law must be taken into consideration in interpreting it, and the last clause always has more weight than the first as the final conclusion of the lawmaking power. Now, what follows your parity provision? Here is a positive mandate; yet the Executive tramples upon it as chaff. Section 3, following the section which contains the parity clause, provides—

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall each month coin 2,000,000 ounces of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act into standard silver dollars until the 1st day of July, 1891, and after that time he shall coin of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes herein provided for.

Mr. GEORGE. He says it is not necessary.

Mr. STEWART. Ah, it is not necessary if you use only gold, but he has no means of getting gold. When he has silver there in the Treasury it is his duty to coin it. But he says that he can not get redemption money without involving this country in untold obligations—without ruining the country, without letting in syndicates, Morgan, Stetson, and the Rothschilds. He must do it to save the honor of the country, when the statute had pointed out a plain way. The wayfaring man, though a fool, could not err on that statute if he had an honest purpose. In order to relieve him from his pretended embarrassment the last Congress passed a bill through both Houses requiring the coinage of the bullion in the Treasury, the whole of it, and allowing him to use the seigniorage, $50,000,000, immediately. He vetoed the bill. Why? Because it was for silver, and to use silver and give it any value whatever would destroy the parity. He could not do it because it would destroy the parity, and he vetoed that bill, refusing to carry out the wishes of the legislative department as expressed in it, and preferring to manufacture a law of his own.

I have given the Matthews resolution, which recited the laws up to that date. There is nothing else to justify the course pursued by the Administration except the act of 1890, and that provides a mode of redemption, giving a discretion to the Secretary of the Treasury. It was supposed the Secretary would exercise that discretion in an honorable way. In the debate here the idea that the enactment would not be carried out was repudiated. We had that point discussed in the debate here. It was said to be a reflection upon the Executive to suggest that he would not coin and pay out the silver.

A SYNDICATE RUNS THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. President, with $178,000,000 of money in the Treasury, with authority to coin silver bullion, with an abundance of it in the Treasury, but with not only the authority but the duty of the Executive to coin it to provide for the redemption of these notes, with the means of getting any amount of silver to coin, we are in a crisis. What has produced the crisis? Have twenty-five years of peace and abundant harvest made times harder than they had been since the landing at Jamestown? Is that the cause? If not, what? Congress meets and suggests no remedy. The banks and the syndicate run the Government, and the people suffer. Two bills are sent to us from the other House. What are they? We stayed here during the holiday recess to consider these matters. What came here? First a bond bill, which nobody wanted, which they knew would not become a law, to which the Rothschilds were as much opposed as anybody; but to show simply that a certain political party was in favor of low-rate bonds.

Has a resolution been put through in either branch like the one now pending, declaring it the sense of Congress or of either branch of Congress that these proceedings should not go on? No; there is no remedy proposed. The bond bill came here. It is reported back from the Senate Committee on Finance with a free-coinage amendment. Upon that bill every free-coinage man can record his vote, and thus become a free-coinage man, I suppose. Everybody knows it is harmless to vote for the bill; it will go to the other House and die there; it will do no harm. Even the Rothschilds would be willing to have us vote for that measure for the purpose of quieting apprehension. It is a dress-parade measure, and all on dress parade will vote for it. I will vote for it on dress parade or on any other occasion. That is what will be done.

Then comes another bill, a tariff bill for the purpose of reviving the tariff agitation. What is the use of agitating the tariff when all the silver countries already have a tariff against us of 100 per cent in the difference of exchange? What is the use of talking about a tariff on manufactures that will offset the tariff that the Asiatics hold against us in the difference of exchange? Of course, silver is their money, and it will buy as much in their country as it ever did. They produce a yard of cloth worth in their country 20 cents. They can sell it for gold at 10 cents and get their price. Young manufactories are springing up in the Orient, and the manufacturers of this country are going to feel it severely.

ASIA IS UNDOING US.

Already the French and English consuls have reported to their Governments that if nothing can be done to equalize exchange the manufacturing of the Western World will be transferred to the Orient. This is the unanimous testimony of learned men who have investigated this subject. Our consuls of course dare not say that much, but they report facts upon which you can predicate

your conclusions. The cotton planters have not understood what ailed them. Cotton is coming here from India, and it will soon be coming from China. China is able to produce good cotton. China and Japan can manufacture cotton enough to supply the world. Cotton has been developed in India, so that instead of being out of the market India is shipping now about $60,000,000 worth of raw cotton. Cotton industries are growing up all over the world. The South thought they had a monopoly of cotton; that is not true at all. The Asiatics can produce cotton at prices that will starve the people of this country to death. We have come in competition with the Asiatics in the production of cotton and the price has gone down.

So it is with wheat. A bushel of wheat is produced in India for two rupees, a dollar in their money. It is sold in Liverpool for an ounce of silver, which has been the price of wheat for a hundred years there. That ounce of silver taken back to that country is worth over $1.30, and it has the effect of $1.30 in their products. When an American sells a bushel of wheat in Liverpool for an ounce of silver he takes it back to this country and gets 67 cents.

LOOK AT RUSSIA.

Look at Russia and see what a spectacle she presents. If they have a despotic government, the people who govern Russia love Russia. That is evinced more in the way they have treated this question than any other. They have their silver ruble behind. They do not coin any silver, but they put out paper in sufficient quantities to keep it on a par with the silver ruble, and that is their circulation. The gold they get they hoard or loan. They will let us have some gold if we want it. They keep it for military purposes. There is a large quantity of it deposited in the banks of Western Europe, to be drawn out of those countries if war is threatened. They hold it as a check. They would let us have some of it, for there seems to have been a proposal of that kind.

How did Russia accumulate this gold? She has five or six hundred million dollars of gold; nobody knows how much. How did she get it? Twenty years ago she had poor credit. Our credit stood high above that of Russia; 15 or 20 per cent above on the same kind of bonds. How is it now? She would come to our relief in a crisis. How does it happen that she can do it? Stable money has kept stability of prices in Russia. When wheat was sold at the rate of an ounce of silver per bushel and the money for it was brought back to Russia it was there worth over $1.30. The ounce of silver is brought to this country, and it is now worth only 67 cents. The practical result has been that Russia has accumulated an enormous reserve, and is strong and powerful because the balance of trade has been with her. She has kept her people at work by giving them abundant circulation. We, on the contrary, have robbed our people of a circulating medium, and on falling prices we could not compete with her. Twenty years ago we had almost a monopoly of all Europe for our wheat and our cotton, but when we had these disadvantages forced upon us by the gold standard and falling prices Russia came forward and enjoyed the benefit that is now being enjoyed by all Asia.

THE TARIFF CRY A TRICK.

Do Senators talk about rescuing our country with a tariff? You must have a specific duty which will be prohibitory, if you intend that anything shall be manufactured in this country when manufactories are fully established in the Orient. The farmers, planters, and woolgrowers felt it first. Now, wool has gone down constantly under all tariffs. This was shown by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] the other day. He gave us a table showing that wool has been continually declining. Why is that the case? Our competitors are in Mexico, South America, China, and India. Our competitors produce wool on a silver basis. For instance, a pound of wool that costs in Mexico and China 20 cents in their money can be sold here for 10 cents in our money.

While they were destroying the farming interests of this country, when the South and West were groaning under the heavy strokes of Asiatic competition, the manufacturers of the East seemed satisfied. It gave them cheap supplies and they did not complain. Their withers were unwrung. It took some time to inaugurate a manufacturing system. It is much easier to start with farm products. They could start with farm products at once, and it took no time for preparation. But time is making all things even. I received a letter a few days ago from a gentleman in Philadelphia which I ought to have brought with me. It inclosed a toothbrush that his neighbor was selling. It was made in Japan, and his neighbor was selling it for 5 cents. It was a pretty good toothbrush. He stated that the bristles in it were worth 3½ cents in this country. He ascertained from his neighbor that the price of those toothbrushes was 2 cents apiece in Japan. You can not compete with that at all. So it is with a great many articles. They have just started on this line of manufacturing.

Japan has opened the ports of China by the recent treaty. The Japanese and the Chinese are now united, and Europe is having a boom in supplying them with manufacturing machinery. The native population have only to see a thing done and they can do it.

Here you are talking about a paltry tariff, an emergency tariff measure, that is soon coming up here. Who ever heard of an emergency tariff—a tariff proposed to last for two years only? What good will that do anybody? We have heard much talk about disturbing business, and here you propose to keep business disturbed all the time. What is the object, what is the plain, palpable object, of the whole of this tariff bill? It is not expected if it passes this body that it will become a law. The President says we do not need the revenue, and he is not going to sign any tariff bills, but there will be a tariff bill pending. For what purpose? To attract the attention of the people from their real distress. That is what it is.

Of course the Democrats will fight a tariff bill, and if it should pass and become a law it is only for two years, and it is open for contest in the next Presidential election. It is to bring the tariff to the front, as we have had the tariff to the front for a hundred years. I know it is a great rallying cry. The great mass of the people of the South are free traders; those of the North are protectionists, and you can array the North and West against the East and have a tremendous conflict upon which politicians will ride into office. The tariff plan is the club which is to beat down the financial question. It has been the cuttlefish which has darkened the waters and prevented the country from seeing what the real difficulty was. You have had tariff legislation. It made times no better. We had the McKinley Act, and times were worse. You have your Wilson Act, and they still grow worse, and you may have your Dingley Act, and they will be worse still.

THE ONLY REMEDY.

Times will continue to grow worse, and there can be no protection that will do this country any good until silver is recognized as a standard money of the country and has free access to the mints on the same terms and conditions which apply to gold. There is no other remedy. Shall we live in a crisis in which syndicates are going to rob us and destroy the credit of this country eternally? I say, no. What would be thought of a merchant doing business who made contracts to deliver what his rival has? Do you not think he would break pretty soon if he confined himself to selling what his rival neighbor had and what he could not get anywhere else? That is just what the United States is doing. We are contracting to deliver gold which a British syndicate has pooled, and if we obtain and deliver it we have to obtain it on their terms, and their terms mean lower prices, harder times, less industries, more dependence, more degradation. That is what they mean.

I never saw a class of men who could endure the miseries of mankind with equanimity equal to that of the gold ring. They care not what happens to others so that it does not happen to them. We are at the tender mercies of the Rothschild syndicate, which committed the robbery before and now has this robbery planned, ready to carry it out. It consented, perhaps, to this sham offer, and then came thundering across the ocean to the disparagement of the credit of this great Republic. They sneer at us now. We did not need their help or support in the struggle of the rebellion. Neither side had it. No; not then; but now we have property for them to take; we have services which they desire to command. We are making them rich, and they have a tender regard for us—the same regard that the hawk has for the chicken, and no other.

OUR DEBTS, MONEY, AND PRICES.

Look at the condition of the civilized world. The debts of the civilized world, according to the estimates of the best statisticians, exceed the assessed value of the property of the world for taxation. That is certainly true of the United States. In the United States it is estimated that the debts, public and private, aggregate between twenty-five and thirty billion dollars, and the assessed value of the taxable property a little over $20,000,000,000. Is it a very small thing to double that debt by cutting the volume of money in two? The value of money is like the value of everything else. It depends upon the law of supply and demand. The property for sale on the one side, and all the money in circulation on the other hand, are reciprocally the supply and demand of each other, and all political economists agree that if you diminish the volume of money general prices must fall; if you increase the volume of money general prices must rise. We have been decreasing the volume of money. We have cut off the metallic supply more than one-half by adopting the gold standard, and still we have not reached the bottom; still we go on with falling prices.

What has been the result? Falling prices the last five years have produced a greater loss than the amount expended by both sides in the civil war. The whole wealth of the country is reproduced in three or four years by its labor. But all the labor has been paralyzed, and millions of men have been out of employment for the last five years. The daily loss now is greater than the expenses of the war in the most flagrant times.

Is there no way to avoid it? Ah, but they say you can not create values. Governments can create money, however. From Aristotle down to the present time every writer whose opinion is worth

anything, every sensible man who has expressed an honest opinion, has agreed with Aristotle that money is the creature of law. Suppose that brown paper of a particular kind were the only material upon which money could be stamped. Would not that be the best money in this country? All that is necessary to make good money is to clothe any material with the exclusive monopoly of paying debts and taxes. That makes money. Anything clothed with the exclusive monopoly of paying debts and taxes is money. Then the value of each dollar will depend upon the number of units. If all the gold and all the silver were banished and we made our own money, properly limiting quantity, we would be the richest nation on earth, if we would make enough to keep up the stability of prices. Prices depend upon quantity. You want enough money, so that prices will not fall, and statisticians can tell you what the general prices are, whether they are rising or falling. It is as sure a test as the gauge that determines the amount of steam in a steam boiler.

Our dear President talks about the money of the world. There never was any such money. He ought to know it. Of course he does not know it or he never would tell us that he wants the world to know that we will pay our debts in the money of the world. The world has no money. Every kind of money is national, not international. It is made money by law, and whatever the law makes money is money.

HOW NATIONS RISE AND FALL.

Here is the greatest nation in the world, with more resources than any other, with 70,000,000 people, and it can make the best money, for nobody will believe that the United States will break up. The difficulty with the money of the South was that the people were afraid the Confederacy was going to break up. The quality of money depends upon the strength and the stability of the Government. Rome for two hundred years had fiat money, and she had no other money. The Romans had simply a metal piece with the value fixed by the Government, and the quantity was controlled by law, and Rome grew from nothing to the greatest republic the world has ever seen. She used nothing else in her better days. It was not until she made conquests and robbed other nations of gold and silver that she used the precious metals. Gold and silver then came into her treasury until she got nearly two thousand millions of gold and silver in circulation, according to Jacob and Gibbon. Eighteen hundred millions is about the estimate as the best they can get from the Roman writers.

Then the mines failed; they were worked out. The Romans had falling prices. The money lenders demanded more and more collateral until they got all the property of the people, and the grand old Romans, who bore the eagle from the tropics to the frozen zone, became feudal slaves and were sold with the land. Take our money away from us and we will share the same fate. It is not a question of manhood or bravery. Every man will make sacrifices to get bread for his children, and the terms grow harder and harder on each generation, until the people become accustomed to slavery.

Thus are civilizations blotted out. The dark ages came. There was only one star that appeared during the fourteen hundred years of gloom, and that was the star of Venice. There the Romans had to flee, on account of the ferocity of the savages. They took their ships and their gold and their silver and settled upon the marshy islands on the northeast of Italy. They were without money to accomplish any purpose. They formed a republic, and they took what money they had and put it in a government trust. They allowed interest at 4 per cent upon it for a time, and they made it legal tender for all debts, public and private. They exempted it from mortgage or execution, so that it could be transferred only on the books of the government. They took in gold and silver and sold them. They did not keep any of them. This went on for six hundred years, until all the world believed that it was the best money in the world; and it was so long as the Republic of Venice lasted. But Napoleon with a rude hand overran Venice and captured the bank, expecting to get great treasures; and all he got was the books. That was fiat money, with the power of Venice behind it; and so long as that government lasted the money was good.

Take the experience of Great Britain. When Napoleon was overriding the world and all was gloom, she declared the paper of the Bank of England legal tender and suspended specie payments for twenty-two years. During that time her commerce extended all over the world, and she was able to loan money on the Continent, to conquer Napoleon, and to take the first place among the nations of the world. She did it by the fiat power of the Government. But when that was done there was a vast sum owing by England and the English people. Then the Rothschild syndicate was formed, and it secured the passage of a law that all those obligations should be paid in gold alone. The misery that was entailed upon the people blotted from the face of the earth the middle class that had given the constitution to England. The yeomanry was no more. The aristocracy that were in the deal were saved. All the rest were lost. A moneyed aristocracy was created as heartless as sin, as grasping as the devil, and it has been preying upon mankind ever since. That aristocracy has reached out its octopus tentacles and grasped the United States. Great Britain can not meet us in arms. We have had two wars with her, and each was a blessing to mankind.

An English syndicate now dictates terms to us, and it is said that the credit of America must be protected by a set of English gold gamblers. Have we come to that? Is there no other relief? If our civilization is to be destroyed thus, let it be known. Is it not lamentable that Congress should meet and see the country languishing, see it suffer more than at any time during the war, while we are offering inconsequential bills, playing for position, trying to fool the people again, trying to make an issue of the tariff without grappling with the tariff question, trying to make an issue of money without grappling with the money question, discussing how we can get the money from Europe. If we continue to agree to pay the money of Europe, which we have done, Europe will continue to make us slaves.

LET US HAVE FINANCIAL INDEPENDENCE.

Let us have an independent policy as Venice did. Let us have an independent policy as England did during her struggle. Let us have an independent policy for the United States. When the war broke out the legal tenders, the Treasury notes, which were receivable for all dues, were at par, and remained at par all during the war. But when the fatal stab was made at the greenbacks, then the gold board was established. That gold board is working upon us now. It was more dangerous than the foe in the field. The same gold board which found a foothold by destroying the greenback in 1862, denying to it the power to pay customs dues and interest upon Government obligations, cost thousands of millions. Poor old Thaddeus Stevens, when he was beaten on the conference committee, according to Judge Kelley, came from the room shedding tears. He said it would cost the Government a thousand million dollars. But he had to do that or let the Government starve. He had to submit, and we have constantly been submitting to such outrages.

We have had large gold deals before. We remember very well Black Friday, when Gould and one or two others borrowed four or five million dollars in legal tenders and locked them up for the purpose of breaking stocks. That was a small operation compared with the syndicate which is said to have control now of over $400,000,000 of gold. That includes all the gold in this country, and they must have secured some gold from Europe in order to make that sum. It is said the syndicate has control of that sum, and yet the President of the United States tells the people to get gold from Rothschild and they can have bonds. Oh, that will not do! We must have a government of the people and for the people. Compare our financial operations with those of France and the business conditions here and there, France a limited country, with no resources to be compared with ours, yet France could get rich by borrowing from her own people a thousand millions and we are getting poorer and poorer every day. Look at our condition. How are we to get gold? Must we always borrow? According to the lowest estimate our annual gold obligations to Europe certainly equal $350,000,000. That is the lowest estimate which has been made.

Mr. BUTLER. May I interrupt the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. STEWART. Let me get through with this sentence.

Mr. BUTLER. Say coin obligations instead of gold obligations?

Mr. STEWART. The creditors make them gold obligations.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; but that is not correct.

Mr. STEWART. They are gold obligations because we will not pay in anything else. Of course that is not the law; I understand that. I thank the Senator. But I am repeating other people's lies; I do not lie myself.

That is the way they put it out—$350,000,000 annually. That was in 1894. In that year our exports exceeded our imports by about $100,000,000, so that we got in debt in that year only about $250,000,000. But in 1895 the balance of trade has been against us, and we have increased our debt to Europe to the extent of about $500,000,000 in the last twelve months.

Now, the only way to get gold besides what little we produce, which is a mere bagatelle, is to sell our products, cotton and wheat mostly, in the foreign markets in competition with Russia and Asia. We can not sell enough to pay them for what we have to buy. Consequently we must give our notes, and let them accumulate. We have a foreign debt accumulating at the rate of from four to five hundred million dollars a year, and no way to pay it. Yet we are told that it is necessary to go on and increase the debt, and that we must borrow gold, when there is no obligation on the statute books for any such purpose and the law allows us to use our own money. I am sorry it does not, just now, allow us to coin our own money; but we are allowed by law to use it. But the Executive will not obey the law and use it. Here is the Treasury with $1,100,000,000 of paper and silver money—a thousand millions anyhow—and $61,000,000 of gold, on which it all rests, because the Executive informs us that the silver, and the silver certificates, and the greenbacks, and the bank notes, all depend upon gold for redemption. Sixty-one millions behind it, with no

way to get gold but to borrow, and you have to borrow every year. You can not run the Government in that way. The policy you allow to stand here means an eternal increase of the national debt and a decrease of the power of the people to pay it. Increasing the debt and impoverishing the people is the policy of the present Administration and was the policy of the preceding Administration.

Here we are talking about having a tariff discussion to attract the attention of the people. If we are going to protect the people of the United States and make them again prosperous, we will give them money and stop the crisis. We must equalize exchange, and then we can discuss the collateral matter of the tariff. There is no tariff that will now do us any good; and I wish to say to my Eastern manufacturing friends that when they ask to be protected from Asiatic competition, from cooly labor, in their manufacturing establishments, they ought to remember that the West and the South have been already destroyed by that competition, and when they ask us to increase tariff taxation and to make them an exception, they ought to remember our situation, and be willing to place us, who produce wheat, cotton, and wool, at least on an equality with the Asiatics and other silver-standard countries producing the same articles. We are at a disadvantage of 100 per cent; our civilization will be destroyed if this inequality continues. Besides, what good would a tariff do you if you had it high enough to shut out Asiatic products, if the people of the South and West had no money to buy your manufactured articles? We must be one country.

I am in favor of protecting the American people and all of the American people. I am in favor of an independent financial policy for the United States. I am in favor of this great Republic taking the stand to which it is entitled as the greatest and most intelligent people on earth, with resources to which there is no parallel. I am in favor of cutting loose from all entangling alliances with Europe; I am in favor of laws which will protect the farmer, the mechanic, and the manufacturer, and all alike. I am in favor of laws which will give to the laboring people of this country a chance to live. I am opposed to laws that involve this country in debt through syndicate transactions. I am opposed to eulogizing as patriots men who take the country by the throat and extort money from it in times of distress—men who have produced the distress by their infernal policy. I am opposed to eulogizing the Rothschilds when they have robbed us once, and when their syndicate here and on the other side of the Atlantic are disparaging our credit.

CONGRESS CAN RELIEVE THE COUNTRY.

Oh, it is shameful for us to sit here idly by and see this country more miserable than it ever was before in its history when there is no reason for it but our shortcomings. This Congress can raise the country out of its depths of despair; it can give hope, prosperity, and good times to all. Every willing hand could find work if Congress would but say the word. We do not want charity; we want a chance to work. That is the spirit of every true American; that is the spirit of this people. They are crying for work and not for charity. Give them money and start the wheels of industry, and they will accumulate wealth beyond a parallel.

Our resources are greater than those of all Europe. Why should we bow our knees to Europe? When we talked about vindicating the Monroe doctrine, how did England reply? She replied by saying, "We will bankrupt you; you can not defend yourselves." "The idea of the American people asserting American rights" was treated with contempt by our tormentors. If we can get no money except what we get from England, England can do what she pleases with us.

I tell you the people have about come to the conclusion that anything would be a relief from this intolerable peace. War, with all its horrors, would not decimate the population as fast as the English gold standard. The population to-day would be at least ten millions more than it is if all the people had work; but starvation and want are more decimating, and destroy population faster than the plague or any other calamity. Starvation and want are the destruction of population. That has been the history of every country. They are more potent than artillery for the destruction of human life. Not 10 per cent as many can be killed by England's guns and ships as she is constantly killing by her infernal gold policy, which brings want to every household.

Let us have our own policy, and when we say the word that will be the end of it. We are not in such a desperate condition as some imagine. Suppose we were threatened by a foreign foe, could we not raise money without asking the aid of this foe, which is gnawing at the vitals of the Republic and which is worse than any foreign foe? Let us whip this foe; let us whip the monster of contraction, and expand the currency and extend the blessings of an ample circulating medium to all the people of this broad land; let all come and enjoy it; but do not let Congress fritter away its power and insult the people by maneuvering for party position. Let party go.

DOWN WITH PARTY; SAVE THE COUNTRY.

What has been done in the name of party? In the name of party there has been more misery brought upon the country in the last twenty years than all it had seen in its previous history. The members of each party think they must stay with their party and stay with the gold power, because in that way they get money for elections. Let Wall street keep her money; let the Democracy declare for themselves. Freemen do not want money to vote. They can vote without it. The Republican party try to please Wall street so as to receive their share of contributions. If Manhattan Island could be isolated during the elections and all communication cut off with it, right might prevail, but so long as both parties regard party machinery as essential in order to get money for elections they have to do the bidding of the Rothschilds for that purpose.

I have heard a man say: "I am for silver, but I can not give up the principles of the Democratic party." In God's name what principles have the Democratic party left when they give up free coinage, when they give up the money of the Constitution? You say you are opposed to consolidation; you are for State rights. What State rights have you left when the Executive is the sole power and wields the patronage and runs the whole Government? That is State rights! I was a Democrat for many years, but during the war I became a Republican, because I was in favor of the Union. When I found the Republican party belonged to an alien organization, I quit that party. I am not dependent upon party. I am opposed to any party that is opposed to the country.

If any Democrat can get up here and state what great principle of the Democratic party is left after he has surrendered State rights, surrendered the money of the Constitution, and consolidated the Government, I should like to hear him. I should also like to know what the Republicans have. They started out as the friends of the people with the sublimest creed that man ever uttered. They were for the freedom and equality of man. That appealed to the sentiment of the whole world, and that party had the sympathies of the world against the South on account of that magnificent, that sublime sentiment that inspired the human heart. The result of their grand career was the liberation of 4,000,000 slaves and the preservation of the Union, a record of which they are justly proud. What have they done since? They have turned the Government of this country over to the hands of an alien gold syndicate, and they look with complacency upon the sufferings of the people. No sentiment of humanity can be addressed to them. They are willing that all else shall be sacrificed, provided the gold king shall be forever worshiped. That is the Republican party.

I believe individually the Republicans and Democrats alike in the Senate would be glad to see the country prosper and would do all they could to promote it if they were not trammeled by party. With a proper financial policy there is no doubt that we should be relieved and have the greatest country in the world; we should be the clearing house of the world; and so far from getting into controversy with other nations the word of the great American Republic would settle disputes everywhere. We have the resources, the men, the intelligence. All we want is patriotism to inspire us with American sentiments and raise the flag of America financially, politically, and commercially. Let us do this and prosperity will come, and come to stay.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I inquire what becomes of the resolution? Can it not be, by unanimous consent, referred to the Committee on Finance? There is no use of letting it remain on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Finance.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2904, being Order of Business No. 15.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MORRILL. Will the Senator from Arkansas allow me to call up a small bill, which it will not take two minutes to pass?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If the Senator will allow the vote to be taken on taking up the bill I have indicated, I shall then yield to whatever motion he wishes to make.

Several SENATORS. That is right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas to take up the bill referred to by him, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ST. ALBANS, VT.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 697) for the reconstruction of the United States custom-house and post-office building at St. Albans, Vt., destroyed by fire May 19, 1895.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue is now before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Arkansas does not desire to speak upon the bill this afternoon, I suggest that he yield to a motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. At this late hour I believe I prefer not to go on, but of course the bill will be taken up to-morrow at 2 o'clock as the regular order, at which time I shall ask the attention of the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand the bill will be the unfinished business.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It will be.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that we have an agreement that the bill referred to by him be taken up to-morrow at the expiration of the morning business.

Mr. WHITE. I shall object to that, as I have given notice of my intention to submit some remarks on another matter.

Mr. COCKRELL. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The morning hour has been taken up for several days past with morning business, and probably the morning business will not be completed to-morrow before 2 o'clock; but if it is disposed of before that time, we can then act upon the proposition of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirty-two minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 10, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 9, 1896.

POSTMASTERS.

Samuel E. Phelps, to be postmaster at Windsor, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut, in the place of Ida Willis, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

John W. Brown, to be postmaster at Nappanee, in the county of Elkhart and State of Indiana, in the place of William F. Peddycord, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Frank W. Barnes, to be postmaster at Wagoner, in the Creek Nation, Indian Territory, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

John B. Conrardy, to be postmaster at Exira, in the county of Audubon and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

William R. Flemming, to be postmaster at Armstrong, in the county of Emmet and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Edward M. Harrington, to be postmaster at Story City, in the county of Story and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

William U. Sulser, to be postmaster at Ireton, in the county of Sioux and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

John Selby, to be postmaster at Prairie City, in the county of Jasper and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Enoch B. Dolly, to be postmaster at Troy, in the county of Doniphan and State of Kansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

William A. Wagoner, to be postmaster at Sabetha, in the county of Nemaha and State of Kansas, in the place of William Moyer, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

James A. Snow, to be postmaster at Medway, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

John M. Winslow, to be postmaster at Nantucket, in the county of Nantucket and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Josiah Freeman, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

James Norton, to be postmaster at Ewen, in the county of Ontonagon and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Hugh H. Gilday, to be postmaster at Janesville, in the county of Waseca and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Orvin J. Rea, to be postmaster at Tracy, in the county of Lyon and State of Minnesota, in the place of Myron D. Gibbs, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

Robert J. Collins, to be postmaster at Hattiesburg, in the county of Perry and State of Mississippi, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Edward M. Scott, to be postmaster at Rosedale, in the county of Bolivar and State of Mississippi, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Jacob Burns, to be postmaster at Humansville, in the county of Polk and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Weston Dawson, to be postmaster at New Madrid, in the county of New Madrid and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

James H. Fleming, to be postmaster at Dexter, in the county of Stoddard and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Charles T. Hamilton, to be postmaster at Montgomery City, in the county of Montgomery and State of Missouri, in the place of Stephen D. Ham, whose commission expired December 23, 1895.

Timothy Barrett, to be postmaster at South Orange, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in the place of Arthur F. Elmendorf, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

John Neafie Johnson, to be postmaster at Freehold, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey, in the place of J. T. Roselle, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

John Kimmel, to be postmaster at Wayland, in the county of Steuben and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Hiram Steele, to be postmaster at Arcade, in the county of Wyoming and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

A. Winthrop Williams, to be postmaster at Highland, in the county of Ulster and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Julius A. Little, to be postmaster at Wadesboro, in the county of Anson and State of North Carolina, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

R. A. Freeman, to be postmaster at Burlington, in the county of Alamance and State of North Carolina, in the place of Joseph Fix, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Richard H. Smith, jr., to be postmaster at Scotland, in the county of Halifax and State of North Carolina, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Charles E. Boehme, to be postmaster at Germantown, in the county of Montgomery and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Andrew J. Ewing, to be postmaster at McComb, in the county of Hancock and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

John Nesbitt, to be postmaster at Chicago, in the county of Huron and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

James Ramage, to be postmaster at Gibsonburg, in the county of Sandusky and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

John Riley, jr., to be postmaster at North Amherst, in the

county of Lorain and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

George T. Roof, to be postmaster at Corning, in the county of Perry and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Collins Dean, to be postmaster at Annville, in the county of Lebanon and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

William H. Dengler, to be postmaster at Quakertown, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Robert W. Hutchins, to be postmaster at Wyoming, in the county of Luzerne and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Hugh H. McClellan, to be postmaster at Marionville, in the county of Forest and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Dora M. McElhany, to be postmaster at Brockwayville, in the county of Jefferson and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Edward A. Mellon, to be postmaster at Patton, in the county of Cambria and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Augustus N. Cunningham, to be postmaster at East Providence, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island, in the place of Francis B. Butts, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Joseph F. Gregory, to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Lancaster and State of South Carolina, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

John P. Little, to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Laurens and State of South Carolina, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

E. E. Poag, to be postmaster at Rockhill, in the county of York and State of South Carolina, in the place of Cadwallader J. Pride, whose commission will expire January 28, 1896.

Henry A. Pike, to be postmaster at Tyndall, in the county of Bonhomme and State of South Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Mary M. Connell, to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Robertson and State of Tennessee, in the place of John E. Patton, whose commission will expire January 11, 1896.

Andy J. Chessher, to be postmaster at Jacksonville, in the county of Cherokee and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Lucas Rowntree, to be postmaster at Bartlett, in the county of Williamson and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Louis T. Walker, to be postmaster at Commerce, in the County of Hunt and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Edward G. Winston, to be postmaster at Smithville, in the county of Bastrop and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Willis E. Fuller, to be postmaster at Enosburg Falls, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Patrick H. McCarthy, to be postmaster at North Bennington, in the county of Bennington and State of Vermont, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Thomas C. Tracy, to be postmaster at Island Pond, in the county of Essex and State of Vermont, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Watkins L. Moorman, to be postmaster at Lynchburg, in the county of Campbell and State of Virginia, in the place of Joseph M. McLaughlin, whose commission will expire January 26, 1896.

George W. Bishop, to be postmaster at Wonewoc, in the county of Juneau and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 9, 1896.

MEMBER OF BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATION.

Joseph H. Outhwaite, of Ohio, to be a member of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

Emory F. Best, of Macon, Ga., to be Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

Patrick H. Kirwan, of Olivia, Minn., to be surveyor-general of Minnesota.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Samuel L. Rogers, of North Carolina, to be collector of internal revenue for the fifth district of North Carolina.

CONSULS.

Owen McGarr, of Tennessee, to be consul of the United States at Cienfuegos, Cuba.

Carl Bailey Hurst, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Prague, Bohemia.

Horatio R. Bigelow, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Rouen, France.

Julius G. Tucker, of Texas, to be consul of the United States at Martinique, West Indies.

James F. Connelly, of New Jersey, to be consul of the United States at Osaka and Hiogo, Japan.

Otto Munchmeyer, of West Virginia, to be consul of the United States at San Salvador, Salvador.

R. Dorsey Mohun, of the District of Columbia, formerly commercial agent at Boma, to be consul of the United States at Zanzibar.

Frank D. Hill, of Minnesota, to be consul of the United States at La Guayra, Venezuela.

Andrew F. Fay, of Illinois, to be consul of the United States at Denia, Spain.

William E. Mantius, of New York, formerly commercial agent at Turin, Italy, to be consul of the United States at that place.

James B. Coffin, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at St. Helena.

Richard M. Bartleman, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Antigua, West Indies.

Charles Jonas, of Wisconsin, to be consul of the United States at Crefeld, Germany.

SPECIAL EXAMINER OF DRUGS, ETC.

J. Thomas Leary, of Massachusetts, to be special examiner of drugs, medicines, and chemicals in the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Albert D. Chamberlin, of Inez, Wyo., to be register of the land office at Douglas, Wyo.

George W. Myers, of Miles City, Mont., to be register of the land office at Miles City, Mont.

ASSISTANT APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

Henry P. Kitfield, of Massachusetts, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts.

Joseph J. Morrison, of New York, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Albert B. Reeves, of Johnson City, Kans., to be receiver of public moneys at Dodge City, Kans.

Jared S. Dixon, of Natchitoches, La., to be receiver of public moneys at Natchitoches, La.

Elias E. Dorsey, of Del Norte, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Del Norte, Colo.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

James H. Collins, of Tennessee, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Nashville, in the State of Tennessee.

George S. Cleaves, of New York, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Greenport, in the State of New York.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

David G. Browne, of Montana, to be collector of customs for the district of Montana and Idaho, in the States of Montana and Idaho.

George W. Drisko, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Machias, in the State of Maine.

John Desmond, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Fall River, in the State of Massachusetts.

Philip R. Bradley, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Dunkirk, in the State of New York.

Sidney R. Riggin, of Maryland, to be collector of customs for the eastern district in the State of Maryland.

Dorsey Clagett, of the District of Columbia, to be collector of customs for the district of Georgetown, in the District of Columbia.

PROMOTION IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. John M. Eager, of Pennsylvania, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Herman Kotzschmar, jr., of Maine, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Charles W. Zastrow, of Vermont, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Alfred L. Broadbent, of Ohio, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Harry U. Butler, of Maryland, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Harry L. Boyd, of Maryland, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Samuel P. Edmonds, of Missouri, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Nathaniel E. Cutchin, of Virginia, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Claude S. Cochran, of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Howard M. Broadbent, of Pennsylvania, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Fred. R. Falkenstein, of Maryland, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer J. Edward Dorry, of Maryland, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Charles F. Coffin, of Maryland, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. William E. W. Hall, of Maryland, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Aaron L. Gamble, of Indiana, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Daniel P. Foley, of the District of Columbia, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. William F. Kilgore, of the District of Columbia, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. David H. Jarvis, of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Edwin V. D. Johnson, of Indiana, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. John C. Moore, of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer David McC. French, of Virginia, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Levin T. Jones, of Maryland, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Johnstone H. Quinan, of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Wesley J. Phillips, of Maryland, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Charles F. Nash, of the District of Columbia, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Worth G. Ross, of Pennsylvania, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. William E. Reynolds, of the District of Columbia, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Byron L. Reed, of the District of Columbia, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Horace B. West, of Pennsylvania, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Percy W. Thompson, of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Edward G. Schwartz, of the District of Columbia, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. James H. Scott, of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer George B. Maher, of the District of Columbia, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer William E. Maccoun, of Maryland, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Urban Harvey, of Virginia, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Horace D. Glover, of the District of Columbia, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Horace C. Whitworth, of Maryland, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Taylor W. Ross, of Indiana, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Theodore G. Lewton, of Virginia, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Albert C. Norman, of Kentucky, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Robert E. Wright, of Virginia, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Milton W. Thompson, of Pennsylvania, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Henry F. Schoenborn, jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Denis F. Bowen, of New York, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer William F. Blakemore, of New York, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Henry C. Barrows, of New York, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. William J. Herring, of New York, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Carl M. Green, of New York, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. D. F. A. De Otte, of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Kirtland W. Perry, of New York, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. William H. Hand, of New York, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Frederick J. Haake, of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Samuel H. Magee, of New York, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Charles A. McAllister, of New York, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Francis A. Levis, of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. James L. Sill, of New York, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

John P. J. Ryan, of New York, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Frederick E. Owen, of New York, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Francis S. Van Boskerck, jr., of New Jersey, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Henry O. Slayton, of New York, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. Charles F. Shoemaker, of New York, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Francis M. Dunwoody, of Iowa, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

John Q. Walton, of New Jersey, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. Thomas D. Walker, of New York, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Samuel B. Winram, jr., of Michigan, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue Cutter-Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Eugene Vallat, jr., of Michigan, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the the United States.

First Lieut. Oscar C. Hamlet, of Michigan, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Colin S. Craig, of Maine, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. John G. Berry, of Maine, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Henry K. Spencer, of Wisconsin, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. John Dennett, of Maine, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. George M. Daniels, of Rhode Island, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer John B. Coyle, of Maine, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Alexander R. Hasson, of Connecticut, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Charles C. Fengar, of Connecticut, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Howard Emery, of Massachusetts, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Orin D. Myrick, of Massachusetts, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Charles W. Munroe, of Massachusetts, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. David A. Hall, of Rhode Island, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. William H. Roberts, of Massachusetts, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Frank B. Randall, of New Hampshire, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Edward J. Noonan, of Massachusetts, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Chester M. White, of Massachusetts, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. Francis Tuttle, of Maine, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Herbert W. Spear, of Massachusetts, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

POSTMASTERS.

D. F. Ayer, to be postmaster at Dover, in the county of Piscataquis and State of Maine.

David J. Brothers, to be postmaster at Kaukauna, in the county of Outagamie and State of Wisconsin.

Henry P. White, to be postmaster at West Plains, in the county of Howell and State of Missouri.

Winfield S. Reed, to be postmaster at Orono, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.

William M. Pennell, to be postmaster at Brunswick, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine.

Alfred R. Huston, to be postmaster at Woodfords, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine.

John M. Woodburn, to be postmaster at Newville, in the county of Cumberland and State of Pennsylvania.

William L. Diehl, to be postmaster at Lansdale, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

Charles F. Reed, to be postmaster at Whitman, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.

George H. Walling, jr., to be postmaster at Machias, in the county of Washington and State of Maine.

Lou S. Flournoy, to be postmaster at Ruston, in the county of Lincoln and State of Louisiana.

Edward M. Scott, to be postmaster at Seaford, in the county of Sussex and State of Delaware.

Sarah Hodgdon, to be postmaster at Deming, in the county of Grant and Territory of New Mexico.

Edmund P. Looker, to be postmaster at Boonton, in the county of Morris and State of New Jersey.

Alfred L. Brock, to be postmaster at Moorestown, in the county of Burlington and State of New Jersey.

Waldo H. Jones, to be postmaster at Lakeport, in the county of Belknap and State of New Hampshire.

Ellsworth M. Daron, to be postmaster at Steelton, in the county of Dauphin and State of Pennsylvania.

Alexander M. Cornmesser, to be postmaster at Bellwood, in the county of Blair and State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 9, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SENATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 40) providing for the completion of the Congressional Library building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1340) to repeal in part and to limit section 4480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 103) relating to final proof in timber-culture entries—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, in addition to the number authorized by resolution adopted December 30, 1895, 600 copies of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and 600 copies of the report of the Assistant Inspector-General of State Homes, for the use of Congress, 200 copies of each report to be for the use of the Senate and 400 copies of each report for the use of the House of Representatives.

Which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

ALLEGED RECENT ENCROACHMENTS IN VENEZUELA.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk. After the resolution is read I shall ask the privilege of briefly explaining it.

The resolution was read.

Mr. BOUTELLE (at the conclusion of the reading). I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment to explain the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I ask the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] to withdraw his objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report.

PHILADELPHIA MINT BUILDING.

Mr. BINGHAM, from the Committee on Appropriations, presented the following report:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *December 12, 1895.*

Mr. BINGHAM submitted the following, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby requested to inform the House what progress has been made under the act approved March 3, 1891, in the erection of a building at Philadelphia, Pa., for the use and accommodation of the United States Mint, and the reason for the delay in the prosecution and completion of said building.

"The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the accompanying resolution, requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to inform the House what progress has been made under the act of March 3, 1891, in the erection of a building at Philadelphia for the use of the United States mint, and the reasons for the delay in the prosecution of said building, having considered the same, report it back herewith and recommend its adoption."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under the direction of the committee I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. BINGHAM, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

PRINTING FOR MILITARY COMMITTEE.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and hereby is, authorized to have printed and bound such documents and papers for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered, by the committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The resolution was adopted.

AMENDMENTS TO RULES.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say to the House that the Committee on Rules have agreed upon their report, which will be submitted to-morrow morning. In the meantime the proposed amendments have been printed and members who desire to examine them in advance can find copies in the document room.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman does not propose to present the report now?

Mr. HENDERSON. No; not until to-morrow morning; but so far as giving the House knowledge of the nature of the proposed amendments, it is the same as if the report were submitted now, because any member who desires can obtain a printed copy of them. The report will be submitted in the morning and will probably be called up for action during the day unless some appropriation bill should be deemed more urgent.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRUMM. In the Philadelphia Press of December 29, in a statement and analysis of the vote here on what is commonly known as the bond bill, I find the following:

Mr. BRUMM of Pennsylvania was not present and is classed as a dodger.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that on the Thursday night preceding the vote on that bill I received a telegram stating that my

son, who was lying ill in the Presbyterian Hospital at Philadelphia, had had a relapse, that it was serious, and that I ought to come on immediately. I had but a quarter of an hour to make the train. I got my grip and did make the train at 10 o'clock that night, but, before leaving, I requested my friend from West Virginia, Mr. DOVENER, to have me paired, and I am informed that he did so.

I am not surprised at all at the correspondent thinking that I should be classed as a "dodger" upon this theory. He knows very well that I know that in a great, rich country like ours, united and at peace, there is no necessity for creating a bonded or any other form of interest-bearing debt. Upon that theory the correspondent doubtless supposed that I desired to oppose the bill, and that, not wishing to go on record as voting against my party, I had abstained from voting, and was therefore to be classed as a "dodger." But in taking that view of the matter the correspondent seems to have forgotten that it is "a condition and not a theory that confronts us," and he probably did not know that under the condition which does confront us I would most cheerfully have voted in favor of that bill, and would be glad to have been recorded as so voting. [Applause.]

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BLUE, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Points of order are reserved.

Mr. CANNON. I ask the attention of my colleague of the committee [Mr. BLUE] for a moment. I understand the Committee on Rules will make their report in the morning; and if it meets the views of my colleague, who has just reported the pension appropriation bill, I suggest he give notice that as soon as the consideration of the report of the Committee on Rules is concluded he will call up this bill for consideration.

Mr. BLUE. That is what I was about to do. I was about to suggest that this bill would probably be taken up to-morrow or next day.

Mr. HENDERSON. In view of that statement, I give notice that we expect to take up the report of the Committee on Rules in the morning.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the House do now adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Pending the motion to adjourn, by unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HUFF, for two days, on account of business.

To Mr. HARRIS, for ten days, on account of important business.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. CANNON that the House adjourn, it was agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table, and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter of the Chief of Engineers of the Army, showing the name of each civilian engineer employed from July 1, 1894, to June 30, 1895, in the work of improving rivers and harbors—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statements showing the condition of the public business in the several Executive Departments and other Government establishments in the city of Washington on December 1, 1895—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of an appropriation for the establishment of an office of land-grant colleges in the Bureau of Education—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of deficiencies in appropriations required to meet urgent demands upon the Government—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the House Calendar, as follows:

By Mr. LOUD, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads: Resolution requesting the Postmaster-General to furnish certain information to the House in regard to work done by clerks in post-offices which was formerly done by canceling machines, with an amendment. (Report No. 23.)

in post-offices which was formerly done by canceling machines, with an amendment. (Report No. 23.)

By Mr. HULICK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia: A bill (S. 30) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," approved March 2, 1893. (Report No. 22.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: A bill (H. R. 3538) to amend section 2880 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, fixing time for vessels to unlade—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3539) placing West Virginia State Militia who were in actual service under command of United States officers during the late war of the rebellion on the same standing as United States soldiers in the matter of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 3540) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of St. Cloud, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 3541) to provide for the relinquishment by the Turtle Mountain band of the Pembina Chippewa Indians of their unceded lands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 3542) to prevent discontinuance of pensions, to restore pensions discontinued, to establish uniform rates of pension, to facilitate the allowance of pensions in matters of proof, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3543) to amend law relating to final proof in timber-culture entries—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 3544) empowering and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish not more than four pieces of condemned cannon to the village of New Rochelle, N. Y.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COWEN: A bill (H. R. 3545) to amend the charter of the Metropolitan Railroad Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 3546) to reimburse the State of Colorado for moneys expended in the suppression of Ute Indian depredations during the year 1887—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3547) directing the Secretary of War to furnish a certain number of unused rifles to Harper Post, Grand Army of the Republic, at Keosauqua, Iowa—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 3548) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, entitled "An act for improving Aransas Pass;" also to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act of Congress approved May 22, 1890, granting the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass," approved January 22, 1894—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3549) authorizing the Aransas Harbor Terminal Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Corpus Christi Channel, known as the Morris and Cummings Ship Channel, in Aransas County, Tex.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERMAN (by request): A bill (H. R. 3550) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3551) to increase the limit of cost for the erection of a public building at Paterson, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 3552) providing for sundry lights, etc., in Lakes Huron and Superior—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDERSON: A bill (H. R. 3553) to incorporate the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MEREDITH (by request): A bill (H. R. 3554) making an appropriation for the Anacostia statue of George Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 3555) to provide for the construction on a bridge across Niagara River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 3556) to extend the advantages

of the copyright law to James Owens with respect to a certain history of England—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 3557) for the transmission of the Michigan State Horticultural Society reports and bulletins through the mails free of postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 3558) to aid the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, and South Dakota to support schools of mines—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 3559) to extend Fourteenth street to Spring road—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: A bill (H. R. 3560) directing and requiring the return of all lists or returns of income and the destruction of copies thereof made according to the provisions of the act of Congress of August 28, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT: A bill (H. R. 3561) providing for the construction of a steam revenue cutter for service on the Atlantic Coast of the United States, with headquarters at the port of New York—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: Joint resolution (H. Res. 71) authorizing the preparation of a subject catalogue of the books in the law library—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FISCHER: Joint resolution (H. Res. 72) to provide for the purchase of the painting by J. Walker representing the capture of the City of Mexico, September 13, 1847—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: Joint resolution (H. Res. 73) authorizing the publication of an edition of A Digest of International Law—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Concurrent resolution relating to the Venezuela boundary—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Resolution relating to the Rules of the House—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARHAM: Resolution asking for report on Napa River, California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WALKER of Virginia: Resolution allowing further time within which to take depositions in the contested-election case of J. Hampton Hoge *vs.* P. J. Otey—to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: Memorial of the Eighteenth legislature of Arizona, praying for the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael McKenna—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNE: Memorial from the legislature of the State of Minnesota, requesting the enactment of an arbitration law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS: Memorial of the legislature of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant to Michael Sheehy, late of Company E, First Regiment Michigan Cavalry, a muster as captain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the following changes of reference were made:

The bill (H. R. 1305) for relief of Byron Stickney—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 368) granting a pension to Nathan Hite—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1249) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of Amos D. Le Fevre, surviving partner—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 587) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Luke McGrath, alias Lewis Ainsworth, Company B, First Massachusetts Cavalry—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 2003) for the relief of Mrs. A. C. Wagner—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 2136) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Freeman, widow of D. W. D. Freeman, late captain Company C, One hundred and first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2231) for the relief of Bluford Reeder—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Memorial of the San Jose Grange, No. 10, Patrons of Husbandry, of San Jose, Cal., in favor of the Government constructing and controlling the Nicaragua Canal and the indorsement of the California State Grange thereof—Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Memorial of the fruit growers of California to Congress, in favor of the Nicaragua Canal, and asking that it be made, owned, and controlled by the United States in the interest of commerce—Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 3562) for the relief of the persons who sustained damage by the explosion of an ammunition chest of Battery F, Second United States Artillery, July 16, 1894—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3563) for the relief of J. H. Sparks—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 3564) to correct the military record of James C. Stanley, alias David Summers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3565) to grant an honorable discharge to Ezra Abbott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 3566) for the benefit of Ira E. Neville, of Dayton, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3567) for the benefit of Mary Bramble, widow of William Bramble, etc., Kenton County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3568) for the benefit of Thomas F. Beach, a soldier of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3569) for the relief of William Bramble, etc., of Kenton County, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 3570) granting a pension to Michael O'Neil, Company B, Third Regiment Rhode Island Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 3571) for the relief of George W. Graham—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 3572) for the relief of Gen. Francis L. Hagadorn—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 3573) for the relief of William H. Bentley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3574) granting arrears of pension to Hermann F. A. Roedell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3575) for the relief of William O. Eagle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3576) appropriating $6,332.30 in payment of the claim of C. M. Kirkpatrick for paving the street adjacent to the United States arsenal at Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL (by request): A bill (H. R. 3577) for the relief of Lydia T. Hadlock, administratrix of E. C. Hadlock, deceased, of Vermont—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 3578) granting a pension to Elmira E. Dustin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 3579) granting a pension to E. C. Curtis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3580) correcting the military records of the United States as to the First Ohio Light Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3581) granting an increase of pension to James H. Blakeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 3582) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Henry H. Bailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEIGHTY: A bill (H. R. 3583) to pension W. F. Bryson, of Fort Wayne, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 3584) for the relief of Elfird & Bros., of Winston, N. C.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 3585) granting a pension to George W. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3586) granting a pension to Sarah R. Burrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLURE: A bill (H. R. 3587) to remove the charge of desertion against Samuel Jobes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3588) to remove the charge of desertion against Peter C. Lawyer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3589) to muster Henry Knisely as a member of Company L, Eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteers, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3590) to remove the charge of desertion against Edward Hines—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3591) for the relief of Isaac De Witt—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3592) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Zell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3593) to muster James W. Miller as chaplain of the Eighth Tennessee Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3594) to increase the pension of D. B. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3595) granting a pension to Charles H. Dollman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 3596) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael McKenna—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 3597) granting a pension to Frederick Upperman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3598) granting a pension to Gretchen Stommel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 3599) granting a pension to H. S. McGown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 3600) for the relief of Andrew J. Whitaker, late special disbursing agent of the Navy Department—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROYSE (by request): A bill (H. R. 3601) to pay to Charles H. McCord the sum of $5,000 for his claim against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3602) for the relief of William T. Kimsey, late private of Company K, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3603) for the relief of William Shulmire, late private Company E, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3604) to grant a pension to Jonathan Goble at the rate of $75 per month—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 3605) granting a pension to Grotius N. Udell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 3606) granting a pension to French W. Thornhill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 3607) to increase the pension of Mrs. Kate Grant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 3608) granting a pension to Philip Newdecker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3609) for the relief of Thomas J. Scruggs—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of 20 citizens of Fayette County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 57 citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., praying for the passage of a bill to amend the postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Memorial of a meeting of Presbyterian ministers of Pittsburg and Allegheny, Pa., in regard to the sufferers of Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Grocers and Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., in regard to a ship canal to connect the Delaware River with New York Harbor—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, memorial of the Society of the United States Military Telegraph Corps, to accompany House bill asking for proper recognition for efficient and important services during the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: Four petitions, respectively, of William Bollman, Joseph Mills, Andrew Deihl, and many other citizens of Foreman, Bedford County; R. B. Long and 15 other citizens of Blue Knob, Blair County; Levi S. Biddle, J. L. Shaffer, D. B. Rice, and 40 other citizens of Blair County; George W. Ruggles, George W. Burns, Henry A. Conrad, and many other citizens of Blair and Bedford counties, Pa., asking for an amendment to the postal laws so as to permit office rent to be paid fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HULING: Petition asking Congress to pass an act regulating immigration in the United States, signed by a number of citizens of Webster County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KULP: Resolution of Lincoln Post, No. 140, of Shamokin, Pa., upholding President Cleveland's message in regard to the Venezuela question and maintenance of the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINNEY: Petition of James A. Gray and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Resolutions of the Sherburne (Minn.) Congregational Church, favoring more liberal pensions for the soldiers of the late war and their widows and orphans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Resolutions of Welsh citizens of Utica and vicinity, with reference to the Venezuelan matter—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAHLE: Petition of Viola Council, No. 845, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Fairfield, Pa., asking for the passage of House bill No. 5446, Fifty-third Congress, known as the W. A. Stone bill, to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Adams County, Pa., in favor of the passage of the W. A. Stone bill on immigration and naturalization—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEELE: Paper to accompany House bill No. 3498—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of the heirs of Samuel C. Pointer, deceased, late of Lawrence County, Ala., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *January 10, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

IMPRISONMENT OF VICTOR H. M'CORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. CAMERON, ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, in response to the Senate resolution of December 18, 1895, addressed to the Secretary of State, a report of that officer, with the accompanying correspondence, in relation to the arrest and imprisonment of Victor Hugo McCord, at Arequipa, Peru, requested by said resolution.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 10, 1896.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BLANCHARD presented a petition of the Board of Trade, Limited, of New Orleans, La., praying for a reduction of letter postage; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. KYLE. I present a series of resolutions prepared by a delegation of 500 settlers upon the Sisseton and Wahpeton reservations, in South Dakota, praying to be relieved from the payment of $2.50 per acre, required by the Government from all homestead settlers who settled upon this land, believing it to be good agricultural land; but it is in the drought-stricken portion of the State of South Dakota, and the land is really not fit for anything except pastoral purposes. The petitioners therefore wish that these resolutions may be taken in hand by the Committee on Public Lands, and that a bill be considered at an early date for their relief. When that order of business is reached I shall introduce the bill. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the Rhode Island ex-Prisoners of War Association, praying for the enactment of legislation giving pay and pension to those soldiers and sailors who were confined in Confederate prisons during the civil war; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Merchants' Exchange and Board of Trade of Portland, Me., praying that the Congress of the United States provide adequate protection for our seacoast cities; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

Mr. HILL presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of the American Federation of Labor at a recent convention held in New York City, December 9 to 17, 1895, praying for the enactment of legislation to cancel all contracts for carrying mails on street cars, and for the establishment of savings institutions in connection with the Post-Office Department, and remonstrating against the passage of the so-called arbitration bill, which would in any way by contract or otherwise make it an offense under the law to quit employment, and also against the adoption of a proposed amendment to the act of February 18, 1895, relative to a shipping commission; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 941) granting to the Atchison and Nebraska Railroad Company and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, its lessee in perpetuity, the right of way over a part of the Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian Reservation in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 880) to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891, asked that the committee be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations; which was agreed to.

POST-GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 650) to incorporate the Post-Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia, to report it back favorably, without amendment, and as the bill is a brief one and its prompt passage is very much desired, I ask for its immediate consideration.

The bill was read, and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PORTRAIT OF ALLEN G. THURMAN.

Mr. VOORHEES, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the following resolution submitted by him on the 7th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase the portrait of the late Allen G. Thurman, painted by J. H. Witt, and now hanging in the Judiciary Committee room of the Senate, and to pay to William L. Woods, its present owner, the sum of $250 for the same, said payment to be made out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate and upon voucher to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. KYLE. In accordance with the petition I presented a few minutes ago, I reintroduce the bill which I introduced last year touching the Sisseton and Wahpeton lands.

The bill (S. 1458) to classify and fix the price of Government lands within the bounds of the Sisseton and Wahpeton reservations was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1459) to require persons who make their residence on boats on the Mississippi or Ohio rivers to obtain license, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 1460) for the construction of a steam revenue cutter for service in the Gulf of Mexico and tributary waters; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1461) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1462) to provide for a public building at New Orleans, La.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1463) for the relief of Mrs. Laura J. Bemiss; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1464) for the relief of the estate of Michael Knight; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1465) granting an increase of pension to Elijah A. Gilbert; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1466) to purchase, inclose, and improve the sites, or portions thereof, of certain forts, battlefields, and graves of American soldiers, sailors, and marines in the Maumee Valley, and to erect thereon appropriate monuments and commemorative tablets; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1467) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Loomis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1468) extending the time allowed the Blue Mountain Irrigation and Improvement Company for the construction of its reservoirs and canal in and through the Umatilla Indian Reservation in the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1469) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 1470) to develop 14 water transportation routes to the seaboard, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1471) to establish the customs collection district of Santa Barbara and to make the city of Santa Barbara a port of entry and delivery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 1472) to reorganize the line of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1473) to grant a part of Fort Lyon abandoned military reservation to the State of Colorado for a soldiers' home, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1474) granting a pension to Elliott H. Benton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1475) granting a pension to Maria L. Meserve; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 1476) to amend Title LXII of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to national banks, and the several acts amendatory and supplemental thereto; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1477) to carry out section 61 of the act of Congress of August 28, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HILL (for Mr. MURPHY) introduced a bill (S. 1478) providing for the construction and equipment of a steam revenue cutter for service on the Atlantic Coast of the United States, with headquarters at the port of New York; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1479) granting arrearages of pay to Edmund C. Bailey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VILAS introduced a bill (S. 1480) to amend an act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters," approved March 3, 1883; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

TEST OF THE LAKE PAVEMENT.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be instructed to make a careful inquiry into the advisability of having a block of pavement, known as the "Lake pavement," on which letters patent have been granted, laid on some street or avenue in the city of Washington, with a view of determining its value as compared with the pavement or pavements now in use in said city, the result of said inquiry to be reported to the Senate.

REPUBLIC OF TRANSVAAL.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the people of the United States of America, through their representatives in Congress assembled, convey to the President and the people of the Republic of Transvaal their earnest congratulations upon their success in establishing free representative government, republican in form, and in their opposition to any foreign power that denies to them the full enjoyment of these rightful liberties.

The people of America, having realized, through the favor of the God of Nations, the blessings of government based upon the consent of the governed, entertain with confidence the pleasing hope and belief that the principles of self-government will be securely established through the influence of the Republic of France, in her colonies, and of the Republics of Liberia and the Transvaal, founded by the people in Africa, and that those Republics will foster and give firm support to the peaceful progress of Christian civilization in the new and vast field now being opened to the commerce and institutions of all the nations of the earth throughout that great continent.

Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested to communicate this action of Congress to the President of the Republic of Transvaal.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PAYMENT OF COIN OBLIGATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] coming over from a previous day. The resolution will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. BUTLER relative to the purpose of Congress to keep gold and silver at a parity by investing the Secretary of the Treasury with the discretion of paying the coin obligations of the Government as they mature in either metal.

Mr. PRITCHARD. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] is out of the Chamber at present, and I ask that the resolution be passed over until a subsequent day.

Mr. PEFFER. Without prejudice.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it will be so ordered.

RESTORATION OF PROTECTIVE DUTIES.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I desire to call up from the table the amendment proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 2749) to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency, that I may submit some remarks in relation thereto.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I submit my amendment for publication as part of my remarks.

The amendment proposed by Mr. PRITCHARD is to add to the bill the following proviso:

Provided, That on and after the date of the passage of this act there shall be levied and collected on the following-named articles imported into the United States the several rates of duties hereinafter designated:

Clays or earths—

Clays or earths, unwrought or unmanufactured, not specially provided for in this act, $1.50 per ton; wrought or manufactured, not specially provided for in this act, $3 per ton; china, clay, or kaolin, $3 per ton.

Lime, 6 cents per 100 pounds, including weight of barrel or package.

Marble and stone, and manufactures of—

Marble of all kinds in block, rough or squared, 65 cents per cubic foot.

Veined marble, sawed, dressed, or otherwise, including marble slabs and marble paving tiles, $1.10 per cubic foot (but in measurement no slab shall be computed at less than 1 inch in thickness).

Freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone, and other building or monumental stone, except marble, unmanufactured or undressed, not specially provided for in this act, 11 cents per cubic foot.

Freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone, and other building or monumental stone, except marble, not specially provided for in this act, hewn, dressed, or polished, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Chromate of iron, or chromic ore, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, also the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites, 75 cents per ton. Sulphur ore, as pyrites, or sulphuret of iron in its natural state, containing not more than 3½ per cent copper, 75 cents per ton: *Provided*, That ore containing more than 2 per cent of copper shall pay, in addition thereto, one-half of 1 cent per pound for the copper contained therein: *Provided also*, That sulphur ore as pyrites or sulphuret of iron in its natural state, containing in excess of 25 per cent of sulphur, shall be free of duty, except on the copper contained therein, as above provided: *And provided further*, That in levying and collecting the duty on iron ore no deduction shall be made from the weight of the ore on account of moisture which may be chemically or physically combined therewith.

Metallic mineral substances in a crude state, and metals unwrought, not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent ad valorem; mica, 50 cents per pound.

Timber, squared or sided, not specially provided for in this act, one-half of 1 cent per cubic foot.

Sawed boards, plank, deals, and other lumber of hemlock, white wood, sycamore, white pine, and basswood, $1.50 per 1,000 feet, board measure; sawed lumber, not specially provided for in this act, $2 per 1,000 feet, board measure; but when lumber of any sort is planed or finished, in addition to the rates herein provided, there shall be levied and paid for each side so planed or finished 50 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure; and if planed on one side and tongued and grooved, $1 per 1,000 feet, board measure; and if planed on two sides, and tongued and grooved, $2 per 1,000 feet, board measure; and in estimating board measure under this schedule no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tongueing, and grooving: *Provided*, That in case any foreign country shall impose an export duty upon pine, spruce, elm, or other logs, or upon stave bolts, shingle wood, or heading blocks exported to the United States from such country, then the duty upon the sawed lumber herein provided for, when imported from such country, shall remain the same as fixed by the law in force prior to the passage of this act.

Cedar paving posts, railroad ties, and telephone and telegraph poles of cedar shall be dutiable at 20 per cent ad valorem.

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all forms of sawed cedar, lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods not further manufactured than sawed, 15 per cent ad valorem; veneers of wood, and wood, unmanufactured, not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Pine clapboards, $2 per 1,000.

Spruce clapboards, $1.50 per 1,000.

Hubs for wheels, posts, last blocks, wagon blocks, oar blocks, gun blocks, heading blocks, and all like blocks or sticks, rough hewn or sawed only, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Laths, 15 cents per 1,000 pieces.

Pickets and palings, 10 per cent ad valorem.

White-pine shingles, 20 cents per 1,000; all other, 30 cents per 1,000.

Staves of wood of all kinds, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Leaf tobacco suitable for cigar wrappers, if not stemmed, $2 per pound; if stemmed, $2.75 per pound: *Provided*, That if any portion of any tobacco imported in any bale, box, or package, or in bulk, shall be suitable for cigar wrappers, the entire quantity of tobacco contained in such bale, box, or package, or bulk shall be dutiable; if not stemmed, at $2 per pound; if stemmed, at $2.75 per pound.

All other tobacco in leaf, unmanufactured and not stemmed, 35 cents per pound; if stemmed, 50 cents per pound.

Animals, live—

Horses and mules, $30 per head: *Provided*, That horses valued at $150 and over shall pay a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

Cattle, more than 1 year old, $10 per head; 1 year old or less, $2 per head.

Hogs, $1.50 per head.

Sheep, 1 year old or more, $1.50 per head; less than 1 year old, 75 cents per head.

All other live animals, not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Buckwheat, 15 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.

Corn or maize, 15 cents per bushel of 56 pounds.

Corn meal, 20 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.

Oats, 15 cents per bushel.

Oatmeal, 1 cent per pound.

Rye, 10 cents per bushel.

Rye flour, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

Wheat, 25 cents per bushel.

Wheat flour, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Cider, 5 cents per gallon.

Hay, $4 per ton.

Rice, cleaned, 2 cents per pound; uncleaned rice, 1¼ cents per pound; paddy, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound; rice flour, rice meal, and rice, broken, which will pass through a sieve known commercially as No. 12 wire sieve, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

Honey, 20 cents per gallon.

Eggs, 5 cents per dozen.

Onions, 40 cents per bushel.

Pease, green, in bulk or in barrel, sacks, or similar packages, 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; pease, dried, 20 cents per bushel; split pease, 50 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; pease in cartons, papers, or other small packages, 1 cent per pound.

Butter, and substitutes therefor, 6 cents per pound.

Beans, 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.

Milk, fresh, 5 cents per gallon.

Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.

Cheese, 6 cents per pound.

Flaxseed or linseed, poppy seed and other oil seeds, not specially provided for in this act, 30 cents per bushel of 56 pounds; but no drawback shall be allowed on oil cake made from imported seed.

Garden seeds, agricultural seeds, and other seeds not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Vegetables in their natural state, not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Fish, pickled, in barrels or half barrels, and mackerel or salmon, pickled or salted, 1 cent per pound.

Fish, smoked, dried, salted, pickled, frozen, packed in ice, or otherwise prepared for preservation, and fresh fish, not specially provided for in this act, 1 cent per pound.

Herrings, pickled or salted, one-half of 1 cent per pound; herrings, fresh, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

Apples, green or ripe, 25 cents per bushel.

Apples, dried, desiccated, evaporated, or prepared in any manner, and not otherwise provided for in this act, 2 cents per pound.

Grapes, 60 cents per barrel of 3 cubic feet capacity or fractional part thereof; plums, and prunes, 2 cents per pound.

Oranges, lemons, and limes, in packages of capacity of 1½ cubic feet or less, (1) 13 cents per package; in packages of capacity exceeding 1½ cubic feet and not exceeding 2½ cubic feet, (2) 25 cents per package; in packages of capacity exceeding 2½ cubic feet and not exceeding 5 cubic feet, 50 cents per package; in packages of capacity exceeding 5 cubic feet, for every additional cubic foot or fractional part thereof, (3) 10 cents; in bulk, (4) $1.50 per 1,000; and in addition thereto a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem upon the boxes or barrels containing such oranges, lemons, or limes.

Filberts and walnuts of all kinds, not shelled, 3 cents per pound; shelled, 6 cents per pound.

Peanuts or ground beans, unshelled, 1 cent per pound; shelled, 1½ cents per pound.

Bacon and hams, 5 cents per pound.

Beef, mutton, and pork, 2 cents per pound.

Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Lard, 2 cents per pound.

Poultry, live, 3 cents per pound; dressed, 5 cents per pound.

Tallow, 1 cent per pound; wool grease, including that known commercially as degras or brown wool grease, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

Hemp, $25 per ton; hemp, hackled, known as line of hemp, $50 per ton.

All wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals shall be divided for the purpose of fixing the duties to be charged thereon into the three following classes:

Class 1, that is to say, merino, mestiza, metz, or metis wools, or other wools of Merino blood, immediate or remote, Down clothing wools, and wools of like character with any of the preceding, including such as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Buenos Ayres, New Zealand, Australia, Cape of Good Hope, Russia, Great Britain, Canada, and elsewhere, and also including all wools not hereinafter described or designated in classes 2 and 3.

Class 2, that is to say, Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Down combing wools, Canada long wools, or other like combing wools of English blood, and usually known by the terms herein used, and also hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals.

Class 3, that is to say, Donskoi, native South American, Cordova, Valparaiso, native Smyrna, Russian camel's hair, and including all such wools of like character as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Turkey, Greece, Egypt, Syria, and elsewhere, excepting improved wools hereinafter provided for.

The standard samples of all wools which are now or may be hereafter deposited in the principal custom-houses of the United States under the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury shall be the standards for the classification of wools under this act, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall have the authority to renew these standards and to make such additions to them from time to time as may be required, and he shall cause to be deposited like standards in other custom-houses of the United States when they may be needed.

Whenever wools of class 3 shall have been improved by the admixture of Merino or English blood from their present character, as represented by the standard samples now or hereafter to be deposited in the principal custom-houses of the United States, such improved wools shall be classified for duty either as class 1 or as class 2, as the case may be.

The duty on wools of the first class which shall be imported washed shall be twice the amount of the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed, and the duty on wools of the first and second classes which shall be imported scoured shall be three times the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed.

Unwashed wools shall be considered such as shall have been shorn from the sheep without any cleansing; that is, in their natural condition. Washed wools shall be considered such as have been washed with water on the sheep's back. Wool washed in any other manner than on the sheep's back shall be considered as scoured wool.

The duty upon wool of the sheep or hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals which shall be imported in any other than ordinary condition, or which shall be changed in its character or condition for the purpose of evading the duty, or which shall be reduced in value by the admixture of dirt or any other foreign substance, or which has been sorted or increased in value by the rejection of any part of the original fleece, shall be twice the duty to which it would be otherwise subject: *Provided*, That skirted wools as now imported are hereby excepted. Wools on which a duty is assessed amounting to three times or more than that which would be assessed if said wool was imported unwashed, such duty shall not be doubled on account of its being sorted. If any bale or package of wool or hair specified in this act imported as of any specified class, or claimed by the importer to be dutiable as of any specified class shall contain any wool or hair subject to a higher rate of duty than the class so specified, the whole bale or package shall be subject to the highest rate of duty chargeable on wool of the class subject to such higher rate of duty, and if any bale or package be claimed by the importer to be shoddy, mungo, flocks, wool, hair, or other material of any class specified in this act, and such bale contain any admixture of any one or more of said materials, or of any other material, the whole bale or package shall be subject to duty at the highest rate imposed upon any article in said bale or package.

The duty upon all wools and hair of the first class shall be 11 cents per pound, and upon all wools or hair of the second class 12 cents per pound.

On wools of the third class and on camel's hair of the third class, the value whereof shall be 13 cents or less per pound, including charges, the duty shall be 32 per cent ad valorem.

On wools of the third class, and on camel's hair of the third class, the value whereof shall exceed 13 cents per pound, including charges, the duty shall be 50 per cent ad valorem.

Wools on the skin shall pay the same rate as other wools, the quantity and value to be ascertained under such rules as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

Coal, bituminous, and shale, 75 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel; coal slack or culm, such as will pass through a half-inch screen, 30 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel.

Coke, 20 per cent ad valorem.

All laws and clauses of laws inconsistent with this amendment are hereby repealed.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. President, the amendment I have proposed pertains essentially to the material welfare of my State and section. I do not offer it for the purpose of crippling the revenue bill which is now under consideration by the Finance Committee, but it is submitted as a basis of some remarks and with a view to its adoption as an amendment to the revenue bill when reported. My chief object in urging the adoption of the amendment is to secure to the Southern section of the country its proportionate and equitable share in the administration of our beneficent Republican protective tariff system. However, I do not wish to be understood as giving my sanction to the revenue policy embraced in the bill, as now constituted. Its function is to meet an emergency, produced by the operation of a makeshift Democratic tariff law, which the President denounced as an "act of party perfidy and dishonor." It is practically "war legislation," and is justified only by the grave crisis that confronts the country as the result of a Democratic Administration. Dire as the alternative may seem, I am not fully persuaded that we should resort to temporary expedients, but that we should enact legislation along distinctively Republican lines, and let the responsibility of Executive disapproval rest where it belongs.

It can not be successfully denied that our present financial trouble grows out of the fact that under the present Democratic tariff law it is impossible to raise a sufficient amount of money to pay the ordinary expenses of the Government. It is due to this calamitous condition of affairs, caused by unwise Democratic legislation, that the Republican party, in a spirit of patriotism, has decided to adopt this measure as a temporary expedient only; for no tariff law can bear the badge of genuine Republicanism which does not provide ample protection for every home industry. It is claimed by our Democratic friends that the gold reserve fund can not be maintained and that it is being absorbed by the redemption of Treasury notes and silver certificates. They insist that with the retirement of these notes they would have no trouble in keeping a sufficient amount of gold in the Treasury to guarantee the obligations of the Government. To this proposition the Republican party will never consent, for Republican management in the past has floated these notes among the people as the most convenient currency, without the slightest impairment of our national credit. When we come into power (as we certainly will at the next election), we shall maintain these notes as a part of our circulating medium. No sane business man questions or doubts it. Republicanism is synonymous with national integrity and sound finance.

The reports show that there is not now a sufficient amount of money in circulation to meet the business demands of the people. When we are confronted with such a state of affairs it is folly to expect the Republican party to enact legislation which will further contract the circulating medium. I call the attention of Democratic Senators to the fact that in 1893 we were assured by them that the only menace to our financial and industrial prosperity was the Sherman silver law, and that its repeal would insure speedy and permanent relief. The law was repealed, and times have been growing worse and worse ever since. Disasters have accumulated, and we see nothing ahead but a bankrupt Treasury and general impoverishment. They then called upon us to repeal a law which had for its object the increase of our circulating medium to the amount of about forty-eight millions annually. They now ask us to go a step further and withdraw from the channels of business the sum of $346,000,000. That means the complete and final triumph of the money power and the enslavement of the people. It means "the despotism of wealth," so eloquently depicted by the distinguished Senator from Missouri a few days ago. As an excuse for this outrageous proposition more gold is demanded, with which, as alleged, to maintain the credit of the Government. That we should keep our gold reserve fund sacred and unimpaired no one will dispute, but I remind Democratic Senators that there is but one certain way to keep gold in this country without a further issuance of bonds and a consequent increase of our public debt.

We can do it by reenacting the McKinley law, which will transfer the balance of trade to our credit. It is easy to understand the fact that a law which increases importations from a gold-standard country in excess of its exports makes it only a question of time when the gold supply will be exhausted. Then the reenactment of McKinley duties, the adoption of a law forbidding, under any circumstances, the private sale of bonds, an imperative inhibition to issue bonds without the consent of Congress, the free coinage of silver, the redemption of outstanding silver certificates and Treasury notes with the silver now hoarded in the Treasury, the return of the Republican party to full power next November, and the country will realize a wholesome, speedy, and permanent reaction. The "irrepressible conflict" so woefully depicted by the Senator from Missouri will have ended.

The truth is, this country is suffering from an overdose of free-trade, bond-issuing, debt-contracting, disintegrating, distracting Democracy. As an evidence of this fact I desire to call attention to the following editorial, which appeared in the London Standard of the 27th of last December:

When the barriers of McKinleyism were partially demolished goods rushed in from abroad to fill up the empty spaces in the home markets of the Republic. Our woolen manufacturers in particular benefited by this change, as the trade and navigation returns of the United Kingdom very clearly exhibit. For the eleven months of 1895 for which we have the figures, the United States have taken nearly six millions sterling worth of woolen and worsted tissues from us, as compared with less than a million and a half's worth last year, and not much more than two and a quarter millions' worth the year before. A gap produced by the long suspense of the tariff question had to be filled up, and the enlarged market opened by the reduced tariff further increased the buying. To a less extent the same phenomena were discernible elsewhere, and the broad general result was that at the very time when the States were finding the markets for their own productions restricted or unprofitable abroad, they saw foreign goods pouring in upon them in an augmenting volume. They therefore had more to pay and less to receive, and as they also owed a great deal of money abroad their foreign exchange market became permanently adverse. Shipments of gold to Europe were soon the order of the day, to such an extent that the Government of Mr. Cleveland has had to intervene three times within two years by selling interest-bearing bonds in order to replenish the stock of gold in the public Treasury.

Under the McKinley law there was sufficient revenue to meet every public demand, and during its existence about $48,000,000 were added annually to the circulating medium. Under Republican financial management silver certificates and Treasury notes were kept in circulation among the common people of this country in order to meet the demands occasioned by the establishment of new industries, and labor and capital everywhere found profitable investment and employment.

In this connection we have a striking illustration of the fact that the one certain way to keep money in circulation among the people is by legislation that offers inducement to investors in manufacturing enterprises, which necessarily involves the expenditure and distribution of money in purchasing the raw material of the people and farm products at living prices, and giving employment to labor at remunerative wages. Now, as to the application of this theory to North Carolina and other Southern States. Had our Democratic friends of the South observed their pledges to the Southern people since the war, I would not be compelled to stand here to-day and demand in their behalf that protection be extended to the articles covered by my amendment. Democratic recreancy does not justify Republican remissness, and I shall insist, by way of perfecting the House bill, that the products of the farm and the raw material of the Southern people shall be fully protected in the impending revenue legislation. The Democratic party has maintained its supremacy in the South since the war by election frauds and false pretense. In every campaign Democratic leaders have promised the people that once the party succeeded in getting in power they would remove from the statute books of this country every vestige of legislation which afforded protection to the manufacturers of the New England States. By such appeals to the prejudices and passions of the people, supplemented by "Democratic election methods," they had no trouble in keeping the South solid until the enactment of the Wilson bill. Now, what has hap-

pened under the Wilson bill? How fares the New England manufacturer by comparison with the farmer and producer of raw material in other sections?

The New York Herald, an ultra free-trade journal, in a recent issue, among other things, says:

All who scan the returns of the National Bureau of Statistics can not fail to make the exceedingly pleasing discovery that beyond all doubt the manufacturing industries of the United States generally entered in 1895 upon an era of unprecedented promise.

I have not had the opportunity, Mr. President, to verify the Herald's statement, but I admit for argument's sake that it is approximately correct. And this is "tariff reform" from the Southern Democratic standpoint. Unexampled prosperity to the manufacturer, and bankruptcy to the farmer and the producer of raw material. Who is responsible?

Mr. GALLINGER. If it will not disturb the Senator, I would like to make a suggestion.

Mr. PRITCHARD. It will not interrupt me.

Mr. GALLINGER. The New York Herald is a newspaper which sees prosperity not only in low tariff, but in absolute free trade. It does not speak for the Republican party or the people of New England. It never represents fairly the condition of manufacturing enterprises in the Northern States.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. President——

Mr. PEFFER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. PRITCHARD. In one moment. In reply to what the Senator from New Hampshire has said, I understand the case as he does; but I am giving the statements of the other side for argument's sake, to show the manner in which the Southern people have been treated by the very men who have assured the Southern people that they were their friends and only wanted an opportunity to show their friendship. My desire is to show that when they got an opportunity, they turned their backs upon the Southern people and joined hands with the very men they had theretofore been denouncing. That is the object I had in making the statement.

Mr. PEFFER. I simply want to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether it is not a fact that the Democrats and Republicans of New England are very fast coming together upon the subject of protection.

Mr. GALLINGER. My reply to that is that the Republican party of New England will be glad to welcome Democrats to their ranks whenever they are ready to advocate and believe in the doctrine of protection to American industries and American labor. I think Democrats are coming to us very rapidly, as was evidenced in New Hampshire in the last election; for, while heretofore we have frequently not had a majority of the votes, we had at that election 12,000 plurality.

Mr. FRYE. But they are not coming as Democrats.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly not.

Mr. FRYE. But coming as Republicans.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes, as Republicans.

Mr. HILL. I understood the Senator from North Carolina to complain because, as he alleged, the Democrats had gone out of their way to protect the manufacturers of New England in the Wilson bill. Am I correct?

Mr. PRITCHARD. The Senator is correct in part and in part he is not.

Mr. HILL. I will complete my idea. I call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that it was only the other day that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] who just now interrupted him made the announcement here that under that very Wilson bill the manufacturers in New England were upon the verge of bankruptcy.

Mr. GALLINGER. The manufacturers of woolens.

Mr. HILL. You can not pull the wool over our eyes in that. [Laughter.]

Mr. PRITCHARD. I know of no better way to answer the Senator from New York than to quote from a speech delivered by the Hon. W. H. Bower, of the Eighth Congressional district of North Carolina, when the Wilson bill was under consideration. Before reading his statement I desire to say that Mr. Bower was one of the ablest Democrats in the last Congress. He had this to say in regard to that bill:

Almost every raw material, certainly every important one except leaf tobacco, instead of being taxed 10 per cent ad valorem, is put upon the free list, while the duties on the manufactured articles into which they enter, instead of being limited to 20 per cent, range from 20 to 50 per cent, the average being over 30 per cent.

This is evidence from a Democratic Representative which confirms me in the statement when I say that the Democratic party, after promising the people of the South to stand by them, deliberately abandoned their interests and joined their Democratic brethren of the North in protecting the manufacturers of the New England States.

I want to say further, before proceeding with what I had intended to say, that it is the policy of the Republican party to not only extend ample protection to the manufacturers of the New England States, but it is the policy of the Republican party, as evinced by all the legislation they have enacted in the past, to likewise extend protection to every article in which the Southern people are interested.

The record shows when the Wilson tariff law passed the last Congress, Democratic Representatives and Senators from the South constituted a majority of that body. Though treated by the President as nullius filius, it is an easy matter to establish its paternity. It is the product of Southern Democracy. It is a palpable repudiation of Democratic free-trade theories and a demonstration of Democratic recreancy at the enormous cost of Southern progress and the prosperity of the people who are not engaged in some line of manufacturing. The Wilson bill—conceived, concocted, and consummated by Southern Democratic Congressmen in the interest of the manufacturer—was the "culminating atrocity" of either Democratic ignorance or Democratic malevolence. Whatever the influence, the result has caused alarm and indignation in the South, and unless I am entirely mistaken in all the signs, the Southern people will resent it at the next election. In the last and in many preceding campaigns Southern Democratic leaders, and among them the late senior Senator, Mr. Ransom, from North Carolina, who I regret is not exercising the privilege of the floor to-day to hear what I say, denounced protection to the manufacturers of the country as "robbery," but for some strange and incomprehensible reason we find them all, representing what might be termed "the best thought" of the Democratic party, engaged in a war of extermination against Southern raw material, the great basic element of Southern development and Southern prosperity.

The South believed in Democratic promises to establish a revenue tariff, but the Wilson law has undeceived the people. It is established by Democratic confession that it does not yield enough revenue for the ordinary expenses of the Government by monthly deficits of several million dollars. And unless the official figures of the Bureau of Statistics do not speak the truth, it is abundantly established that the Eastern manufacturer is the chief if not the sole beneficiary of the law of "perfidy and dishonor."

The authors of this destructive legislation "dare not face the farmers with this record." If there is one lingering doubt in the minds of Southern Democratic Senators as to public feeling on this question, the letters on my desk, which I shall ask to have read and incorporated in my remarks, remove it. They come from Virginia and North Carolina, and reflect the sentiment of leading business men without regard to party. A large majority of them are Democrats, and they implore me to insist upon and demand the legislation contemplated in the amendment offered by me.

I ask that the letters may be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

BESSEMER CITY, N. C., *January 4, 1896.*

DEAR SIR: I learn from the press reports that the tariff bill is now in the Senate, and I trust you will make a determined effort to have the duty on iron ore raised to $1 per ton, or at any rate have it restored to 75 cents. It is, as you know, now 40 cents per ton of 2,240 pounds, which is practically free ore. Dr. J. M. Worth and associates have bought the Greensboro Iron Furnace, and I learn will start it up, and the manager told me in person their plan was to get Cuban ores by rail from Wilmington. Owing to the cheap labor with which the Cuban ore is mined and cheap transportation, they can get the Cuban ore at a cheaper rate than we can afford to mine it. I have seen with my own eyes several hundred thousand tons of the Cuban ore in bulk at Sparrows Point. The only remedy is a protective duty on foreign ore, or our mines will remain undeveloped for years to come, and thousands of our laboring men will remain out of employment. The Wilson bill is full of discrimination against the interests of the South. Pig iron, the lowest form of manufactured iron, bears a high rate of duty, as well as steel rails; in fact, a duty which is practically prohibitive. Now, why not protect the poor miner who works in mud and water ten hours a day as well as the laborer in a warm machine shop or furnace yard? All we ask is that just such treatment be meted out to us as is given to the manufacturers.

Sincerely, yours,

J. A. SMITH,
Vice-President of Southern Manganese Company.

Hon. J. C. PRITCHARD,
Washington, D. C.

NEWBERN, N. C., *December 26, 1895.*

DEAR SIR: We note that Congress intends revising the tariff. We earnestly and respectfully request that you will use your influence in having lumber, both rough and dressed, put back on the dutiable list.

Our State, as you are aware, is largely interested in lumber, and as a very large number of our people get their support from that source, it has been up-hill work ever since it was placed on the free list, and we desire its restoration.

Whatever assistance you give in the matter will be highly appreciated by us, and we feel quite sure that it will be indorsed by the entire State.

Respectfully,

Hackburn & Willitt, merchants; J. R. Parker, jr., merchant; Robt. S. Primrose, M. D.; James A. Bryan; Joel Kinsly, farmer; M. Hahn, ex-sheriff; J. A. Jones, sales stable; O. Marks & Son, wholesale dry goods; J. J. Woguder, real estate; Charles Hunter; T. A. Green, president City Bank; Ferdinand Ulrich, merchant; Thomas Daniels; Watson & Daniels; Enoch Wadsworth, farmer; S. E. Sullivan Lumber Company; The Blades Lumber Company; K. R. Jones, merchant; Trent Lumber Mills; Roberts & Bro., merchants; J. J. Baxter; D. F. Jarvis, merchant; J. M. Howard, merchant; Pine Lumber Company; Sam. B. Waters, merchant; Howard & Hughes, insurance; James Redmond; L. H. Cutler, president; John Dunn, merchant; A. E. Wadsworth, farmer; A. E. Hibbril, jeweler.

Hon. JETER C. PRITCHARD.

LENOIR, N. C., *January 6, 1896.*

DEAR SIR: I note with much satisfaction that you are advocating the restoration of duty on lumber, iron, and kaolin. The lumber industry in this section of the State, Caldwell County, has been seriously interfered with by the removal of the duty, and a number of enterprises have been seriously crippled and all have lost money. If the duty is restored it will help to revive the industry. No kaolin whatever has been taken out in this section, though it exists here in large quantities. It is of vital importance to help the kaolin industry that pottery should be protected, as that is the principal thing for which kaolin is used. I trust your distinguished influence may prevail on behalf of these interests.

Yours respectfully,

CALDWELL LAND AND LUMBER CO.
WM. S. HARVEY, *President.*

Hon. J. C. PRITCHARD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

NORFOLK, VA., *December 30, 1895.*

DEAR SIR: We take the liberty of addressing you at this time in regard to a subject which is of such vital importance to us as, in our judgment, fully justifies us in thus infringing upon your valuable time.

We allude to the revenue tariff bill, and particularly to that portion of it bearing upon the lumber trade. We are free to say that at this time we have no knowledge of your views on the subject, yet we feel, beyond question, that on this, as well as on all other matters coming before the Senate of the United States, your voice will always be lifted and your vote cast in behalf of the interest and welfare of your constituents.

You are doubtless aware that the lumber business of North Carolina and Virginia is one of the greatest manufacturing industries which exist in those States to-day. Its development has been rapid, and when one considers the vast timber resources which are yet undeveloped, it is easy for the mind to grasp the priceless heritage which the Creator has so bountifully bestowed upon these two grand old Commonwealths, and we therefore believe that you will agree with us that the subject is one of more vital interest to the welfare and prosperity of the people of Virginia and North Carolina than any other piece of legislation with which they are now confronted. As you perhaps know, the product of the mills manufacturing North Carolina pine finds its market almost entirely in the Eastern and New England States. We would also call your attention to the fact that the largest and chief Canadian manufacturing center is located in what is known as the Ottawa district, from which point the Canadian product has the advantage of a very direct and cheap outlet to the United States by way of Lake Champlain and the Hudson River. From Burlington, Vt., Albany, N. Y., and New York City this product is distributed through the same territory our North Carolina pine depends upon for its market, and it therefore becomes our greatest competitor. It is needless for us to say to you that no other manufacturing section of this country is brought into such close competition, or is so vitally affected by the Canadian product as our North Carolina pine mills.

That the Canadian manufacturer has some decided advantage over us, we think, can not be questioned. In starting his manufacturing operations he has only had to go to the Government land department and state that he wishes from ten to fifty thousand acres of timber lands entered up in his name, and upon payment of a small entry fee these lands are secured to him, and he has been required to make no further payments for this timber until such time as, in the course of his operations, he finds it necessary or advisable for him to cut the timber and manufacture it. With us all timber purchases have to be made outright, and very few careful and conservative mill operators in this country would deem it safe to spend from fifty to one hundred thousand dollars in building a mill plant unless they had first secured enough timber to run them for a period of, say, ten years. They are therefore required to make a larger investment in timber than in their mill plant, and the interest for a long term of years on the capital which is tied up in these timber lands cuts no small figure in the expenses of our operations.

The Canadian operator has no difficulty in getting plenty of common labor at an average of $15 per month, while our mills here are paying their common labor from 75 cents to a dollar per day.

When the Wilson tariff bill went into effect the manufacturers in this section had, through the competition of the Canadian manufacturers, been forced down to a point where any reasonable margin of profit on their investments could not possibly be obtained. To-day this little margin of profit ha. been entirely wiped away, and in addition to it the price on standing timber in North Carolina and Virginia has been lowered at least from 20 to 25 per cent and labor from 10 to 20 per cent. To bring this matter down in more comprehensive form to you, we beg to submit you the following figures in regard to the cost of production with us, together with the selling prices of our product:

	Per M.
Average cost of stumpage	$1.00
Average cost of logging	3.50
Average cost of railroad freights and other expenses in getting logs to the mills	3.50
Average cost of manufacturing and kiln drying	2.50
Average cost of selling, shipping, office expense, insurance, taxes, etc	1.50
	12.00
Average price, net, by Norfolk mills during year 1895	12.00

These figures are based upon operations at this point. At points farther south the cost of manufacturing, etc., will be lighter and the freights to the market higher, so that we are safe in saying to you that the operations of the Norfolk mills are on about the same basis as those at manufacturing points in North Carolina or south of Norfolk, and we assure you that the mill manufacturer in this section who has been able to do anything better during the past year than the figures above quoted would be difficult to find, while in the majority of cases the operators have run their business during the past year at an actual loss. When you take into consideration that there is invested in this business from ten to twelve million dollars of capital, employing from fifteen to twenty thousand men, which means the support of at least 50,000 people, you will readily see that the hardship which the present situation lays upon us is shared in by a vast number of people outside of the manufacturers.

None of the lumber-producing sections of the United States is within such easy reach of the great metropolitan cities of the East as we are. We maintain that the farmer of Virginia or North Carolina who owns a hundred or two hundred acres of timber land should realize more for his timber than he has ever been able to do in the past, but this condition of affairs will never be brought about so long as Canadian lumber is placed on the free list. The manufacturers and the labor employed by our mills will not be the only sufferers, but every owner of timber lands in North Carolina or Virginia, both large and small (and they number thousands), must continue to feel the effect of the blight which has been placed upon this trade.

We maintain that the interests of Virginia and North Carolina, as well as of all the timber sections of the South to-day, imperatively require that not only should the small duty proposed under the revenue tariff bill be placed upon lumber, but that it should be put back to $2 per thousand. It is our candid opinion that had the duty remained at $2 per thousand every timber owner in these States would to-day be able to realize at least 50 per cent more for his timber holdings, while every laborer engaged in this trade would be commanding 50 per cent more for his services than he is now able to do.

We have trespassed upon your time and good nature to quite a lengthy extent and we trust that you will pardon us for so doing; yet, as before stated, the question is one of grave importance to us, and we feel that in writing you we might be able to give you some points or ideas in regard to the matter which heretofore have not been brought to your observation. We know that when one undertakes to consider a question pertaining to a great industry like ours, spreading over such a wide field and affecting such a multitude of other interests and thousands upon thousands of people who at the first glance would not appear to be interested at all, it is no easy matter for the mind to reach out, grasp, and fully realize the benefits which must necessarily follow if the present bill should become law and a slight duty be placed on Canadian lumber, which the bill contemplates.

We therefore trust that we are not asking too much in requesting that you give this matter your earnest and thoughtful consideration, feeling that after doing so it will be a pleasure to you and an undoubted service to your constituents should you see fit to give the bill your support and your vote.

With much respect, we remain, yours, very truly,

THE NORTH CAROLINA PINE LUMBER CO.,
W. W. MINS, *President.*
JOHN L. ROPER LUMBER CO.,
By JOHN L. ROPER, *President.*
HAMPTON LUMBER CO.,
E. B. FREEMAN, *President.*
THE COURTLAND LUMBER CO.,
E. B. FREEMAN, *Vice-President.*
THE CUMMER CO.,
E. C. FASBURGH, *Secretary and Manager.*
ROANOKE RAILROAD AND LUMBER CO.,
R. S. COHN, *Secretary and Treasurer.*
THE TUNIS LUMBER CO.,
W. W. MINS, *Manager.*

Hon. JETER C. PRITCHARD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. PRITCHARD. These letters give but a faint idea of the blighting effect of Democratic "tariff reform" upon the industries of the Southern people. The lumber interest has been a source of much revenue, especially to the people of North Carolina and Virginia. Alabama, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia abound in vast, undeveloped mineral wealth. Immediately after the passage of the McKinley law a rapid development of the resources of these several States at once began, and our people were just beginning to taste the fruits of industrial progress and development when, for some inscrutable reason, the people voted the Democratic party back into power. Scandal, humiliation, and disaster have swiftly followed. But the end is at hand. We are told by this Democratic Administration that we are in the midst of a crisis, but what is the nature of the emergency? Too many Treasury notes in circulation! Another explanation is that, as a result of Republican legislation in the interest of silver in the past, the country is threatened with a silver basis. From the inception of the Cleveland Administration this has been the common excuse for bond issues. That is what a Democratic "crisis" means. The cause is apparent. Democratic mismanagement, Democratic misconstruction of the laws, Democratic defiance of the people's weal, and the subordination of the common welfare to party expediency.

When I realize the deplorable condition of affairs in the South, I am impelled by a sense of duty to my constituency to urge the adoption of this amendment. I appeal to my Northern friends in this body to come to our relief. I appeal to you to accept this amendment and save Southern industries from inevitable destruction. I appeal confidently to you whose section has so long been the beneficiary of protection and whose great wealth and splendid civilization is the direct result of Republican tariff legislation, to come to the South's rescue in its heroic struggle for industrial emancipation. I realize the fact that the Republican party has not a majority in this body, and of itself is unable to enact any legislation; but I earnestly appeal to our Populist friends to stand by the people in this life and death contest.

The amendment I offer gives the owner of the raw material and the farmer an equal show in the race of life. In the light of recent history the South expects little at the hands of Southern Democratic Senators in this matter, but I am almost persuaded that the operation of the Wilson law has convinced them of its iniquity from the Southern standpoint. It is not too late to undo the wrong and wreck of Democratic mistakes in this particular. The votes of Southern Democratic Senators can pass this amendment. This one solitary act of common business sense would cover years and years of folly, of false pretense, and of broken promises. You have permitted your Northern Democratic associates to stab to the death every struggling Southern enterprise, and at the same time you have aided them in protecting the Northern manufacturers whom you and they, in common, have repeatedly denounced as "robber barons." Is it too late to appeal to your manhood and beg you to vote for this amendment as the only remaining alternative of Southern self-preservation? While the lamp holds out to burn the most extreme Democratic tariff reformer may repent. This is the day of atonement.

This appeal may not be heeded now, but take my word for it, Mr. President, the time is at hand when the great iron, coal, and cotton producing States, imperial in vast but undeveloped wealth,

will speak with one voice in this Chamber on this momentous subject. Where now this great interest is represented by a single Republican Senator on this floor, a little while hence and there will be other choice vacant seats on the other side of this Chamber. The day of tradition and sentimentalism in the South has passed. With honest elections has begun a business era which is the hope of our people, and the solid South is a thing of the past.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not intend at this particular time to open up a tariff discussion, but I simply call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the peculiar situation in which Congress is placed. It strikes me it is somewhat difficult for Congress to gratify the people of North Carolina, for the reason that that State recently sent to the Senate two distinguished gentlemen, who are its Senators, elected substantially at the same time, by the same body, and by the same combination. One of them the other day in his speech arraigned the Democratic party because it had been false to tariff reform, and he gravely told us that the people of North Carolina earnestly desired extreme tariff reform. The Wilson Act, he thought, did not embody it sufficiently, and that is the reason he left the Democratic party and joined the Populists. Now comes the other end of the combination, and he says the people of North Carolina want the reenactment of the McKinley Act and extreme high-tariff duties. I do not know how we are going to gratify both of those Senators at the same time.

I shall not speak of the other subject. It is a matter about which both parties seem somewhat divided. But I was rather amused to hear the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD] say that the Democratic party is responsible substantially for the repeal of the Sherman silver law, when we all recollect that a majority of his own party upon the other side of the Chamber cast their votes for the repeal of that act. The Democratic party is entirely willing to be responsible for all that it has actually done either upon the tariff question or on the silver question, but we certainly are not able to gratify the inconsistent claims which are made here in behalf of the great State of North Carolina.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. PRITCHARD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The Senator from California [Mr. WHITE].

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE OF THE SENATE.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire at this time to offer a few remarks in enforcement of the position of those Senators who have heretofore insisted that there should be changes in the rules of the Senate looking to the more logical transaction of public business. I ask in this connection that Senate resolutions 14, 15, and 16, submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], and Senate resolution 18, submitted by me, be read from the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HILL to the rules of the Senate, submitted December 11, 1895:

"*Resolved*, That subdivision 2 of Rule V of the standing rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"If at any time during the daily sessions of the Senate a question shall be raised by any Senator as to the presence of a quorum, the Presiding Officer shall forthwith direct the Secretary to call the roll, and shall announce the result, and these proceedings shall be without debate; but no Senator, while speaking, shall be interrupted by any other Senator raising the question of the lack of a quorum, and the question as to the presence of a quorum shall not be raised oftener than once in every hour, but this provision shall not apply where the absence of a quorum is disclosed upon any roll call of the yeas and nays."

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HILL to the rules of the Senate, submitted December 11, 1895:

"*Resolved*, That Rule IX be amended by adding thereto the following section:

"'SEC. 2. Whenever any bill or resolution is pending before the Senate as unfinished business, and the same shall have been debated on divers days, amounting in all to thirty days, it shall be in order for any Senator at any time to move to fix a time for the taking of a vote upon such bill or resolution, and such motion shall not be amendable or debatable, and shall be immediately put, and if passed by a majority of all the members of the Senate the vote upon such bill or resolution, with all the amendments thereto which may be pending at the time of such motion, shall be had at the date fixed in such original motion without further debate or amendment, except by unanimous consent; and during the pendency of such motion to fix a date and also at the time fixed by the Senate for voting upon bill or resolution no other motion of any kind or character shall be entertained until such motion or such bill or resolution shall have been finally voted upon.'"

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HILL to the rules of the Sen ate, submitted December 11, 1895:

"*Resolved*, That Rule XII be amended by inserting an additional clause, as follows:

"'When upon a vote by yeas and nays it shall appear to the Presiding Officer, upon recapitulation and before the announcement of the result, that a quorum has not voted, he shall call upon Senators present who have not voted by name to vote; and shall direct the Secretary to add to the list of the Senators voting the names of the Senators present not voting, including those announcing pairs, or who may or may not be excused from voting, and to enter the same in the Journal; and if the whole number constitute a quorum, and it shall appear that a majority of a quorum (or two-thirds of a quorum where the Constitution prescribes a majority of two-thirds) has voted on either side, the question shall be deemed to have been determined and the result shall be announced the same as if a quorum had voted.'"

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. WHITE to the rules of the Senate, submitted December 12, 1895:

"*Resolved*, That Rule XIX be amended by inserting at the end of paragraph 1 thereof the following: 'All debate shall be relevant and confined to the subject directly before the Senate.'"

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, during the last Congress many resolutions suggesting alterations in the procedure of the Senate were introduced. Several were to the purport that Senators in addressing the Senate should be confined to the subject under inquiry; others that debates should be restricted; others that for the purpose of making a quorum every Senator actually present, or at least signifying such presence by announcing a pair or otherwise, should be counted.

So many propositions emanating from so many able sources ought to be enough, without further argument, to convince us that material departures from our present procedure must be desirable. Error long practiced is difficult of eradication. Habits grow upon us. The ability and public services of many of our members have compelled their return here time and time again. Pride, indisposition to retract opinions once expressed, unwillingness to accord to later generations the credit of improvement, have made it hard to effect reforms. More than this, the more venerable Senators have viewed as semisacrilegious the efforts of comparative novices to vary our fossilized processes. Perhaps it is hopeless to attempt the task now. However, I am somewhat encouraged, because not only is the twentieth century approaching, but I note that some of those who have heretofore opposed more businesslike methods have changed their views and are now anxious for revision.

The Constitution of the United States contains, inter alia, the following:

Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, etc. (Article I, section 5, subdivision 2, Constitution.)

The rules now in existence, as far as mooted points are concerned, were formulated at a very early date, and I concede that the onus of showing a reason for alteration is upon those who seek to bring it about. This presumption might, indeed, be met and perhaps overcome by the admitted general demand, but as I will later on discuss the effect which the opinion of the public, and especially of our constituents, should have upon our acts, I will not now avail myself of this counter presumption. I shall endeavor to state generally the ground upon which I stand, and shall refer to analogous cases and to the variable and peculiar conditions which have brought about prevailing embarrassments. While there are cogent considerations justifying many modifications, the principal defect, as I presume to term it, which should be remedied is the entire omission in our so-called rules to provide for the bringing of a subject to a vote otherwise than by unanimous consent; because as long as a Senator can stand up and talk, and read or have read, matters relevant and irrelevant, the question can not be put.

Next in grade descending is the recognition by the Senate of the ancient but not honorable fiction that a majority of the Senate may be in the Senate and yet no quorum be present, and that although a Senator may answer a roll call by stating that he is paired with another Senator, and although he may help to make the one-fifth of those present who demand a roll call, still, in conflict with his assertion of presence, we, with eccentric and patient indifference to the truth, rule that he is not here.

Then the Senate permits unlimited talk—discussion it is called—upon subjects absolutely and completely, entirely and obviously, foreign to the bill or question appearing by the record to be pending. It is interesting to know that at an early date the difficulties which now confront us were to some extent felt. We are informed by Mr. Schouler (History United States, volume 3, page 369) that Mr. Randolph during the last years of his public service was prone to wander from the actual question to which his remarks should have been addressed. In speaking of the Senate this author says:

The decorum of this quiet Chamber was outraged as never before, and Virginia was mortified at the unseemly exhibition. As a thorn in the flesh of an unpopular Administration Randolph was not to be despised, and on this account perhaps Calhoun bore gently with him, watching from his chair the flow of poesy and vituperation which the rules of the Senate, so he alleged, forbade him to interrupt.

I find by referring to 30 Niles's Register, pages 146–147, that the Senate rescinded the then existing rule which vested in the President the appointment of the Senate committees and the supervising of the Journal, and Mr. Calhoun made an elaborate statement in connection with this action, and also concerning his jurisdiction to confine Senators to the subject of debate. His argument in part is thus expressed by the reporter:

From the direction which the debate, in some degree, took, as well as from what has been said without these walls, it becomes, on this occasion, proper that I should state, for the information of this body, the construction that the Chair has put on the sixth and seventh rules of the Senate. They are in the following words:

"When a member shall be called to order he shall sit down until the President shall have determined whether he is in order or not; and every question of order shall be decided by the President without debate; but if there be a doubt in his mind he may call for the sense of the Senate.

"If the member be called to order for words spoken, the exceptionable words

shall immediately be taken down in writing, that the President may be better enabled to judge of the matter."

The Chair, said the Vice-President, has bestowed its most deliberate and anxious attention by night and by day on the question of the extent of its powers under a correct construction of these rules, and is settled in the conviction that the right to call to order on questions touching the latitude or freedom of debate belongs exclusively to the members of this body and not to the Chair. The power of the presiding officer on these great points is an appellate power only, and consequently the duties of the Chair commence when a Senator is called to order by a Senator. Whenever such a call shall be made, the Chair will not be found unprepared to discharge its only functions in such a case—that of deciding on the point of order submitted. And the opinion of the presiding officer in relation to the freedom of debate in this body it will be time to declare when a question may be presented; but such as it is, it will be firmly and, I trust I may add, fearlessly maintained.

Mr. Schouler also writes that in the course of the next Congress, in 1828, the Senate gave to the Vice-President concurrent power in calling members to order, subject to appeal from his decision.

We all know that this prerogative is never exercised by either the Senate or the Vice-President in so far as it refers to the obligation to keep within the limits of the question under discussion. Matters which are germane and matters which are not germane seem to be alike in order here. I believe that even under our rules, properly construed, Senators should be required to adhere to the question; but the contrary practice prevails, and will only be corrected by positive prohibition.

THE ANTIQUITY OF OUR RULES DOES NOT INHIBIT THEIR AMENDMENT.

In examining this question it is fair to admit that rules which have been in operation during such an extended period, and have been found frequently competent to discharge the functions for which they were designed, should not lightly be set aside. That a plan of action has been, for a period, found advantageous suffices, perhaps, to make out a prima facie case in its favor. This, however, is all that can be claimed. This is as much as the doctrine of presumption warrants. It must likewise be granted that no regulations sufficiently comprehensive to include the advanced requirements of an alert nation can be devised for all time. We can not photograph the future, or even comprehend it. However wise we may be, or however closely we may have studied that which has gone, we are not permitted to penetrate the mystery of that which is to come. The unexpected developments of an active world we can but partially forestall. The phonograph does not store the pronunciation of the sages, the heroes, the philosophers of antiquity. Ages unborn will hear the voices of Gladstone and Bismarck, but the tones of their predecessors in greatness must be ever absent.

To suppose that rules adopted in the days of the nation's infancy by her Senate will be sufficient for all exigencies in maturer hours is to expect that there is never to be any actual development; that our country must be monotonous and nonprogressive. It needs no discussion to show that we are a go-ahead people; that we are fully alive to inspiring demands.

According to the census of 1800 the United States then contained 5,308,483 persons, and of these nearly one-fifth were slaves. It now contains a population but little less than 70,000,000. At that time Cincinnati contained, perhaps, 15,000 people. Buffalo was not laid out. There were a few cabins upon the site of Cleveland. Pittsburg amounted to little. Rochester did not exist. Boston contained a population of about 25,000; New York about 60,000, and Philadelphia, which then headed the list, some 75,000. Chicago was unknown. The great West was undeveloped. The vast resources of the Pacific Coast had been untouched.

The Western frontier was located within the Empire State. The entire banking means of the United States in 1800 would not, as a contemporaneous historian has remarked, "have answered the stock-jobbing purposes of one great operator of Wall street in 1875." The same author tells us that in 1800 "the normal capital of all the banks, including the Bank of the United States, fell short of twenty-nine millions. The limit of credit was quickly reached, for only the richest could borrow more than fifteen or twenty thousand dollars at a time, and the United States Government itself was greatly embarrassed whenever obliged to raise money. In 1798 the Secretary of the Treasury could obtain $5,000,000 only by paying 8 per cent interest for a term of years, and in 1814 the Government was forced to stop payments for the want of twenty millions."

It is perhaps accurate to say that the gross exports and imports of the United States at the dawn of this century did not more than balance at about $75,000,000. The States were few in number. This body was exceedingly small. When the Senate contained three or four dozen members, there was but little necessity for the enactment of stringent rules. There was no opportunity to filibuster. No chance was afforded to obstructionists for the retardation of public affairs.

Although it is true that civilization, with its varied social requirements, molded somewhat by climatic conditions, and influenced, too, by many other causes, has developed characteristics in one locality and among a certain set of men at a particular date, nevertheless, human nature is very much the same the world over and through the generations. The people of the United States had been governed under the English system. They had imbibed much of the hard sense and practical ideas which begot the common law. Moreover, the severe experiences of border life, the trials of war, and the demands of a new and unprecedented situation evoked love of country and smothered tendencies to indiscretion. Thus it came about that a country not then remarkably important commercially, offering but limited opportunity for the accumulation of lucre, sustained the most generally patriotic people who ever lived. This spirit has not become inactive, but many contentions which were entirely foreign to those who sat in this Chamber when the rules which I am attempting to consider were adopted are now urged upon us. It passes without saying that the development of the United States has induced many innovations and made imperative the enactment of numerous laws. The wisdom of our earlier Congresses, however marked, was not equal to the task of modeling statutes wide enough to cover the demands of 1895–96. Laws have multiplied until they have become so numerous that no one pretends to have more than a passing knowledge of the public and private bills which have become absolute rules of conduct. Our Constitution, the best result of the greatest wisdom of our predecessors, did not satisfy all necessities. Men who now sit here took part in changing that instrument and vitally adding to its prohibitions. These circumstances amply answer the claim that no revision should be made in the mere rules of a body which is itself constantly revising the statute law and sometimes aiding in the alteration of the organic instrument.

I assume that the causes which have made it necessary to add to or take from our Constitution, our statutes, our Federal and State systems must have made amendments to the Senate's procedure advisable. Apart from the concrete consideration of this topic, an intelligent stranger to the present discussion would doubtless say that if our rules are perfect, fit for unvaried endurance, the Senate must have been divinely organized and at all times acting in accordance with a plan born in omnipotent wisdom, or else that such rules must be behind the age, partaking somewhat of those proofs of the existence of ancient marvels which are furnished by prehistoric formations, petrified forests, the remains of various monsters, etc. These physical reminiscences are important because they are extremely old and not available for present use. They form examples of that which has been, and are valuable for the scientific lessons which are taught from them. Our rules are too modern for display and too ancient to suit our purposes.

I do not wish it to be understood that our rules ever will become or have become so obsolete as to suggest their exhibition with Cleopatra's Needle. I merely advert to the possibility of their improvement. They are still capable of being read by the public, but can not, it seems, be understood in all regards, even here. During my limited incumbency I have noticed grave differences among our parliamentary Nestors as to their proper interpretation, and when such controversies have been submitted to the Senate, the solution has been accomplished along party lines, presumably because the safest course to pursue was that dictated by faith in tried and trusted leaders. But mutations which ought to affect about everything depending upon human intelligence have not interfered with these creations of the remote past to which the future is to be sentenced, because, Mr. President, I contend that in this regard we are behind the times; that it is our duty to be up and doing; that we can not hold the world back; that however great we may assume and presume ourselves to be we are atoms to be crushed if we seek to stay the march of intelligence; that we must either keep abreast of the chariot or be dragged at its wheels. These are propositions not susceptible of refutation. I would not change a rule merely for the sake of change; I would not alter one without a reason; but I would not retain a rule merely because I or my predecessor had made it.

We can not, I know, vary our conduct as the dictators of the fashionable world do their raiment, but when the test of thought confronts us, ought we not seriously ask whether we, even we, may not be in error? The boys in the gallery many times suggest to the accomplished theatrical manager some defect in the acting or staging of his piece which the boxes have not detected. May it not be that those who have sent us here are right in their present criticism? "We owe it to ourselves," says one, "not to yield to public clamor. Let us take our time about it." This advice seems to be heeded. We are taking our time about it. Senators declare that we can always pass a bill if the majority wishes it to be passed. This may be true, but such passage is brought about only when the opposition is practically taken out on a stretcher. Such proceeding is not intellectual. While not novel here, it excites universal surprise everywhere else.

THE MAJORITY IS AT THE MERCY OF THE MINORITY.

Under our programme a single voice neutralizes, nay, vanquishes 87. Sir Boyle Roche would have said that one Senator outnumbers 87. True, a single Senator may be subdued, but no thanks to our rules for this boon. Give the credit to that nature which

can not be conquered. Thus is afforded the relief which our rules attempt to negative. We can not overcome a single and determined opposing Senator until, his physical powers having weakened, we march to the roll call over his prostrate and panting form. Such procedure is not dignified surely, and if there is reason behind it no one has disclosed the same. If a sufficient number of obstructionists to order a roll call be present and a proper supply of positive Senators be here to watch and pray with their fellows—which must nearly always be the case in the great controversies now pending or plainly in sight or hereafter to occur—no vote can be reached until the minority so wills it. The more numerous Senators, the more need for firmness and positive regulation. We have now the largest Senate that ever convened in the United States, and the end is not yet. Let us look at this matter in the light of the present and consider the experience of the past. The tariff discussion in the last Congress furnished competent lessons. We sat here day after day and were treated to essays of enormous length, compilations, treatises, etc. Many of these were not listened to throughout by a single Senator beyond the member who had the floor, and except perhaps the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], who listens patiently to everything. I am told that he has felt it to be his duty to harken with the hope of hearing that which might instruct, and I am also informed that he feels that his self-sacrifice has been but partially rewarded, and that after all his trouble he is ready to confirm the generally accepted theory that everything said is not relevant or manifestly instructive.

Mr. President, I witnessed during the last tariff discussion a Senator of great ability and long experience speaking in this Chamber when there were but four of his associates present. One was in the chair, and one was attentive. I marveled why it was necessary to talk under such circumstances. The fourth Senator was writing a letter. After a while an absentee strolled into the Chamber, and, with a desire to emancipate us, moved an adjournment, and the Senate adjourned, leaving the Chamber but slightly less agitated than it had been. Was this deliberation? Did the Senators who left the Chamber pending the argument, speech, or recitation leave to deliberate? Perhaps so—perhaps so. After certain religious instructions the auditors are remanded to solitude for reflection. Maybe those who leave while the lone member deliberates aloud do so to deliberate in silence.

In a note to the second edition of Brice's American Commonwealth (volume 1, page 116), it is said:

> One is told in Washington that it is at present thought "bad form" for a Senator to listen to a set speech; it implies that he is a freshman.

I had not heard of this, but our custom gives color to the theory that such is our faith.

The numerous calls of the Senate, the appearances and disappearances, the exits and entrances of Senators, summoned from the cloakroom and immediately thereafter returning thereto, indicate that lack of interest and want of proper regard for public business which are the legitimate result of the procedure I condemn. It must be conceded that it would have been cruel to force anyone to hearken to the many repetitions dealt out here during the tariff debate. Those addresses were not made to be listened to. No Senator was offended because his colleagues absented themselves. Why should he feel offended? He exercised a similar right himself, and he did unto others as he desired others to do unto him. I know that many able speeches were delivered upon the tariff; that our opponents, especially in the running debate, made trenchant criticisms, and, from their standpoint, appropriate remarks; but I do not hesitate to affirm that folios after folios of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are filled with statistical and other compilations, originating on the Republican side which, while wholly cumulative compelled modifications in our bill, yielded under compulsion as the only means of shortening that which threatened to last world without end. Much of this profuseness will not be studied or read until the hieroglyphics of ancient Egypt have all been deciphered; until the partially eradicated stories which linger in the ruins of Asia Minor or arrest the archæologist's attention in the land of the Aztecs have been fully interpreted and understood.

During the discussion to which I have referred a diminutive minority (diminutive as to numbers) upon the other side of this Chamber declared themselves ready to talk until March 4 to beat the bill. And if there had been a slight addition to their strength the threat would have been executed.

Another and very striking illustration of the consequences of our rules was furnished on February 9 and 11 by a distinguished Senator. The bill making appropriations for the maintenance of the Post-Office Department of the Government was under consideration. A certain amendment thereto was proposed by the committee, and a point of order was made to the effect that the amendment was such general legislation as to conflict with the first subdivision of Rule XVI. The Senator referred to thereupon took the floor and proceeded to discuss the Alabama election controversy, devoting hours to its consideration, presenting numerous affidavits, statements, etc., bearing upon the transactions incident to recent proceedings at the polls in that State. That Senator, whom we all know to be able and intelligent, did not pretend that he was addressing himself to the subject then before the Senate. On the contrary, he had sought to be heard upon the election matter during the earlier part of the day, and being cut off by the parliamentary situation, did not hesitate to say that he would take the floor and make his speech in any event. He is not to be greatly blamed for this. He was merely exercising a privilege allowed him by the absurd procedure which the Senate tolerates, in defiance alike of sentiment and sense.

The following is one of many samples of the working of the present rule. Omitting names, I will read the report of an occurrence of the last session, which was published in a journal of this city. The report was substantially correct:

AIMS A BIG GUN.

Mr. A did not attempt to further prolong the delay in passing the bill, although for a few moments it looked as if the Senate was on the verge of a speech three months long. Mr. B's amendment providing for legal proceedings to test the constitutionality and validity of the tax before the taxpayer had paid it had been ruled out of order, and the decision of the Chair had been sustained by an overwhelming vote. Thereupon Mr. A, in order to get a vote upon the question directly, offered another amendment to the same effect; but Mr. D, declining to let the proposition be voted upon on its merits, raised the point of order. It was immediately sustained by the Chair, Mr. E being the presiding officer. Never a word said Mr. A, but, reaching beneath his desk, produced a pile of manuscript that was a foot and a half high and must have contained at least a thousand pages. It was a speech.

Mr. C laughed out loud. Mr. A smiled quietly and Mr. G nearly fell out of his chair. Mr. A, with a face as solemn as any clergyman's, unbuckled the great leather strap with which the immense mass was fastened, took up the topmost pages and began to look through them. Half a dozen Senators at once gathered around him.

"Are you going to make some remarks?" one of them asked him.

"I am going to make these remarks," was the Senator's reply, pointing to the mountain of manuscript, and the very ludicrousness of the situation brought a smile to his face.

Mr. H went over to plead with him. Mr. I also approached to view the threatened danger, and then Mr. G walked across the Senate to interview Mr. A. The result of the conference was seen a moment later, when Mr. A again introduced his amendment. This time no point of order was made against it. It was voted upon, and, as Mr. A had doubtless anticipated, was defeated by a vote of 19 yeas to 32 nays. But he had gained his point, and sinking back in his chair with an expression of beatific satisfaction he watched his clerk once more buckle up the thousand pages and stow them away under the desk, where they still remain to be again forthcoming when Mr. A has anything to gain by their appearance.

I know that some will probably say that there has not been any filibustering here. I am not particular about words or names. I am referring to transactions as they occur. During the last session, and after the tariff bill finally passed, it was pretty well known that there were in that bill defects—certain errors—which the alleged dominant party wished to correct. The adoption of all the Senate amendments by the House rendered the usual committee revision impossible. It was suggested here that one or two of the inaccuracies should be cured; but no; the minority informed the majority that this could not be done, and the few had power to control the many. We threw up our hands and submitted without more than a murmur. Hence but little effort was made in the line of even clerical improvement. The press correctly informed us that the leaders of the other side concluded that there should be no more tariff legislation. The minority thus dictated to the majority, and the majority acquiesced. Others again affirmed that there must be no financial legislation. It may be that the majority here believe, as I do, that it is practically impossible to enact a complete financial scheme at this session; but it is wholly immaterial whether the majority or the minority favors legislation. The majority can do nothing unless the minority consents.

True, the minority can not enact a bill disagreeable to the majority, but practically the Senate is governed by a minority. It is common experience for a majority leader to say to his restive subordinates: "Wait a while; have patience; I have been in consultation with Senator Blank, the leader of the minority, and he agrees that if we will make the following concessions he will see that the majority is allowed to proceed." The followers sometimes are irritated, use nonparliamentary language in the cloakroom, refuse for a day or two to bow down, but they always come to time. They have to come to time under the rules—the constitutional rules of the Senate. Even our leaders do not relish having to do this. No one pretends that it is just right. The most plausible excuse that can be given is that nothing is perfect, even in the Senate, and that these difficulties are of less moment than those that might, could, or would be produced by more positive and less curious regulations.

I will show that there is nothing in these excuses or arguments. Just now there are various important bills before us. Perhaps we may be allowed to vote upon them. Many of them present no party issue. But one opposing Senator may baffle us. If we assume that there is a majority of 10 or 20 only, either for or against one of these bills, and if the measure reaches a roll call or a determination, it will be because the minority have so willed. In other words, the passage of a bill is effected when the opponents thereof agree thereto. This is certainly a harmonious anticipa-

tion involving peace and good will. We vote because of the magnanimity of those whom we outnumber.

I know that some who differ from me declare that bills are always passed on. This is not true. But if it were better founded it would be a remarkably weak response. Are those rules the perfection of human wisdom whose only value is that notwithstanding their existence legislation may be had? Rules framed for a legislative body defended because in spite of them work may be done! Rules are everywhere supposed to be designed to promote work. If the argument is worth anything, it is for the reason that it means that the essence of Senatorial statesmanship is the impeding of legislation. A body formed to legislate is, according to this view, performing its obligations when it does its best to negative the object of its creation, Organized for action, it luxuriates in inaction and deliberates and deliberates and deliberates, while one part of the country is swearing and the other is yawning.

ILL-ADVISED LEGISLATION IS NOT AVOIDED BY A SYSTEM WHICH CONSUMES TIME AND ENLIGHTENS NO ONE.—THE DISCUSSION WHICH RESULTS IN BENEFIT IS PERTINENT, DIRECT, AND PITHY DEBATE.

The person who tells me that addresses which are listened to only by the suffering Presiding Officer and by the party who is talking enlighten anybody does not appeal very strongly to me. When a minority resolves upon the death of a bill the speeches, while fatal to the measure, are also dull to the Senate and void of intelligent consequences. If mistakes have been made in bills which have passed here after lengthy debate, it does not prove that we did not spend enough of time upon such measures, but does establish that our hours were not as well employed as would have been the case had there been a brisk and apposite discussion upon which was centered the undivided attention of the whole body. The present plan inhibits such educating consideration. Reasonable rules will produce the improved condition. I frankly admit that I do not like to be driven, and I also know that self-respect requires us to maintain our integrity against demagogic onslaught. If you do not respect yourself, how can you expect others to respect you, is a pointed inquiry upon a proper occasion. It is an inquiry which I would address to those who inflict kill-bill compilations upon their brethren, which compilations are never read again nor intended to be read by men or angels—certainly not by angels who are not paying the fearful penalty of transgression. It is because I revere this place, long and now tenanted by many great and good men; it is because I trust that our posterity may see in this Chamber nothing to offend and but little to improve, and it is because I feel that unless we remodel our practice we will be righteously condemned that I make this appeal, especially to those Senators whose extended and valuable services to their country leads me to hope that they will finally decide aright.

THE DIGNITY OF THE SENATE IS NOT MAINTAINED BY ADHERING TO PARLIAMENTARY ANOMALIES.

Much has been said with reference to the dignity of the Senate, and it appears to be intimated that it would not be dignified to have a previous question here; that other bodies may condescend to such restrictions, but that it would be indecorous for us to do so. But the Senate was created for the purpose of, to some extent, legislating for the country. Such, certainly, is one of its most important duties. It was designed to act with the House of Representatives, and both together to form the National Legislature. It was not organized merely that its members might be impressive. But dignity (dignus) is the equivalent of true worth, of excellence. It does not depend solely or chiefly upon external manifestations nor lofty bearing. Senatorial dignity should result from the full discharge of the obligations of a Senator. It is not begotten of rules; it exists only in just appreciation of high responsibility, and is the companion of onerous, patriotic labor, carefully, ably, and conscientiously done. Due comprehension of the importance of his trust should influence the manner and conduct of a Senator. He should ever remember that his fealty to the great power which he represents inhibits improper and unseemly action. But the people of the United States did not make this body for any other purpose than to conserve, develop, and perpetuate the principles of liberty, which they hoped would enable them to pursue, without fear or favor, their legitimate affairs. The Government, after all, is an agency of a strictly business character. The unessential embellishments of power, the pomp and circumstance of authority, are daily becoming less and less tolerable. The diffusion of education, the fact that the printing press is so generally in use and literature so available tends toward the equalization of mentality as far as such equalization is natural, and renders too much display and obtrusive consciousness of the possession of authority repulsive to the average American. Recognition of the courtesies of enlightened life must undoubtedly prevail; the enforcement of regulations dictated by regard for order and adequate veneration of our country's institutions is also vital, but here the patience of our constituents is disposed to cease.

THE SENATE SHOULD NOT BE AN EXCEPTION TO ALL LEGISLATIVE BODIES.

Every effective assemblage in the civilized world is controlled by rules which make the transaction of business by the majority always attainable within a reasonable period. This is true of short-lived bodies, such as conventions, of more permanent organizations, such as parliaments, diets, chambers of deputies, etc. Even the Senate claims to have rules, and I think I have heard it admitted that these are valuable as aids to affirmative action. How absurd to fix hours for morning business or to designate a time when the Calendar may be considered or anything else taken up, when we contumaciously and with premeditation so manage our affairs that one-fourth of the body can readily defeat a roll call on the merits. That a quorum may be present and actually debating, and yet by declining to vote members present may make the record show no quorum, is a condition perfectly familiar and indefensible. If we are to have rules at all, let them reach the vital part. If we are here for work, let the work be done. If it be better for the country that no legislation should be had—and I have heard a distinguished man defend our rules on this ground—then let us meet only to adjourn. If a bill is good, ought it not to pass? If it is bad, should it not be disposed of according to law? Talking a bill to death, while in harmony with Senatorial usage, is unreasonable. Rational consideration, full consideration, every measure indeed should have, even at the risk of weariness, but a minority should not be allowed to effectively say, "We will not permit clerical errors or other obvious defects in a tariff or other bill to be changed. Our policy is to compel the country to act under the measure as it is. We claimed that the bill was defective, nevertheless it was made a law. We will now decline to permit mistakes to be rectified, even though the same may have been exposed by us. It is against our policy to permit the majority to act."

Is it wonderful that the people of the United States censure the Senate? Is it remarkable that this is not a popular body? Is it singular that every one asks us why the Senate is so slow? And is it not peculiar that our excuse must be that our rules will not permit us to do anything—that we are disciplined to inaction? Is it true of other advanced peoples that their highest legislative chambers are compelled to admit that their rules, their own instruments, created to facilitate business, are efficacious only to prevent the determination of important issues? It was never designed by the framers of the Constitution that this body should be an insuperable obstacle to reform, or that it should place about its limbs shackles of its own fashioning and justify its torpor by referring to impediments of its own proper design.

THE FORCE BILL.

I am aware that several Senators whose abilities and statesmanship long ago justly won for them high national reputation object to anything approaching a cloture, because they say we ever stand under the menace of the force bill, that the effort to enact that bill is a warning of the presence of kindred perils. Stated in a different form, this means that there is always danger that the majority may become tyrannical or may scheme for continuous dominancy, or may plot against the country's interests. The force bill seems to be used by each and all of those upon the Democratic side who rest upon this so-called argument. The pertinency of the illustration is hardly admitted by our Republican friends who defend the rules. I shall consider the subject first as it regards the obnoxious bill so fortunately buried. Then I shall attempt to maintain that the good or evil of any special measure can never warrant a general and century-extending policy which can not be justified except as a preventive to such ill-advised legislation.

Is it true that the country or the Democratic party would have been ruined had the force bill become a law? I do not think so. I have the highest respect for Senators who regarded that concoction as an edict of proscription and death. I fully agree that it contemplated an unrepublican system. I concur that the time of its introduction—a generation after the close of our lamentable civil strife—was most unhappily selected. Nevertheless, had that bill been enacted there would have been no temporary or other Democratic falling off, either North or South. The common danger would have solidified expression in the ballot box, and an attempt to repeat the criminality of carpetbagism or the errors of electoral commissions would have stirred the Union to such an extent that election cyclones would not have been causes of discomfort to this side of the Chamber. If I am not right about this, and if still I be correct in my disapproval of the force bill, it follows that our Government is a total failure. For if an odious, unpatriotic, enslaving, power-perpetuating enactment, unjust in its conception and cruel in its workings, be not doomed to swift destruction by the honesty of the land, it can only be because it reflects public immorality and general wanton disregard of sacred privileges. Nor is it any response that the nature of that bill was such as to place the machinery for counting in and counting out in the hands of politicians, who would have exercised such authority selfishly and to the fullest extent.

This condition would no doubt require more decided public expression, greater majorities than are ordinarily determinative of party struggles, but the difficulty is purely theoretic. The Ameri-

can people occasionally "go out gunning" with weapons thoroughly charged. During these uprisings schemers, gerrymanders, force-bill men, id genus omne have only one recourse, viz, to take to the woods. Sometimes even the innocent go down with the guilty. If, which I do not deem likely, the Republican party shall come into complete power once more, having under its control the executive and legislative departments, its astute leaders will not attempt to enact a force bill any more than they will seek to reenact the McKinley bill. They have tasted both to their hearts' discontent, and will be found somewhat homeopathic even as to protection. While the people will often go too far—while, as in the late elections, they may perhaps visit the sins of one party upon the other—yet in the end the matter will be honestly adjusted—the fair thing will be done. To hold differently is to write oneself a pessimist, an unbeliever in republicanism, or, at best, a political agnostic.

I can well appreciate that Senators who lived under the impositions of carpetbag control, who watched the looting of their treasuries and of their people by imported conscienceless and merciless speculators upon patriotism, who saw not only their personal belongings taken away, their families humiliated and terrorized, their rights as citizens ignored and repudiated, but who also suffered from enormous State and municipal debts and the infliction of numerous other evils, should shudder at the remembrance of such a condition, and should protest against any concession rendering the recurrence of such enormities possible. But this very experience, the presence of hearts and frames yet bearing the scars of outrage and sorrow, is apt to exaggerate the peril. We are not upon the heels of an awful war; our people are commercially and otherwise one; and no such sad state as that to which I have alluded can be born of force bills or miscalled legal writs. The American people are too well educated in liberty and law to allow long life to any cruel or clearly unjust measure. So much for this feature of the case.

I affirm that we must not spend our time in rendering legislation difficult because we fear that the majority may pass an iniquitous bill. When I say the majority, I mean as far as this body is concerned—the Senate.

There are instances—as in the case of the expulsion of a member or upon impeachment trials or the ratification of a treaty—where more than a majority is required; but I allude now to those cases where those who sum up more than half a quorum are given by the Constitution the right to express the will of the Chamber. The Senate mentioned in enacting clauses and which Senate concurs with the House, is not practically and necessarily composed of more than a majority of a quorum. Of course nothing less than a quorum constitutes the Senate. The contesting minority either does not participate in the enacting of a law, or if it participates, it is by way of protestation. It does not enact. It seeks to prevent enactment. That this minority has a right to require deliberation I grant. That it may dictate the extent of the deliberation and define what constitutes deliberation I positively deny. To admit such a proposition would be to permit the minority to deliberate to the death. Consideration there should be; patient, painstaking, earnest reflection; but as either the minority or the majority must determine when deliberation ceases and the wasting of time begins, I at once select the majority as the repository of the power.

Majorities are not infallible. The majority and minority both come from a body speaking a common language, living under a common Constitution, governed by a common Federal system, and having a common aspiration. They are all samples of one stock. Hence it is obviously demonstrable that the majority will be oftener correct than the minority. I prefer to live under a plan which sometimes leads to wrong rather than under one which generally leads to wrong. Usually the majority is in sympathy with the latest expressed will of the people. Hence it is not easy to avoid the conclusion that the majority will commonly enact the popular will, and no one is bold enough to claim that we should not, as a rule, defer to the public will by which we have been inducted into our places. There may be an extreme case, but I am not discussing such. My argument is a protest against the adoption of a policy based upon exceptions. I repudiate the view which forces me to follow a line of conduct usually which is only tolerable in isolated instances. I ask for a rule that now and then may work an inconvenience, but which, in the vast mass of cases, must be beneficial. My adversaries invoke a plan which, as I have said, ignores the rule and recognizes the exception, adopts the special and rejects the general. I am afraid of majorities, says one. Very true. But I am afraid of minorities. If we can not trust the majority, a fortiori minorities must be avoided. The basis of our Government is the recognition of the majority. Many of those who have endeavored to enforce minority control are in jail. Some of them have been disposed of according to law and with the judicial prayer, "May God have mercy on your soul." Outside of the faith of this Chamber, the American people do not believe in minority control. Mr. Webster well said "Liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraint." Without some curtailment of the obstructive power of the minority liberty is in peril. When the majority representing the people can not prevail within a reasonable time the condition is menacing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] as being entitled to the floor on the unfinished business.

Mr. WHITE. I inquire if the Senator from Arkansas prefers to proceed immediately? It will not take me very long to conclude.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. How long will it take the Senator from California to conclude?

Mr. WHITE. About fifteen minutes.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should be very glad indeed to proceed, but I do not like to interfere with the Senator's speech. I yield to him if he desires.

Mr. WHITE. I am much obliged to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside without losing its place. The Senator from California will proceed.

Mr. WHITE. The Committee on Rules is and has been composed of some of the ablest Senators; men of great experience, who have given much consideration to parliamentary problems as well as to general legislation; yet that committee, as heretofore organized, and I do not confine myself to any one committee or to any particular membership, suggests an admirable illustration of the evil against which many are now protesting. That committee creates not, neither does it destroy. It lulls into somnolence all tendered changes. The most energetic rule, the most stirring proposition, is afflicted with incurable lassitude when it comes within the anæsthetic atmosphere of this remarkable organization. Occasionally a member of the Committee on Rules notes the propriety of reporting back a proposed resolution. The vitalized committee member is informed that he can not even enjoy the privilege of filing a minority report, because a minority report presupposes the existence of a declaration from the majority, and the majority reports not, neither does it cease to be. So the progressive member may fuss, he may protest, he may storm, but the Committee on Rules, smiling upon him, benignly prescribes calmness. There are many centuries to come. Why should the minority of the Committee on Rules become agitated while the majority are so completely satisfied? You believe in majorities, they sarcastically say; hence demur not. This condition is the more remarkable when we reflect that the Senators who are and have been on that committee are and have been men of integrity, determination, ready judgment, and admitted fearlessness. But I am not addressing myself to any particular committee or to any special person. I spend not a moment from a mere disposition to censure an individual. To do so would be unjust. My aim is directed against a system which drags down not only the Committee on Rules, but the Senate. The Senate is responsible for the committee and its customs and usages. It has been unjustly said that the Committee on Rules is the graveyard of Senatorial advancement. There is nothing left of a rule when it reaches that committee. There is nothing to inter. The suggestion not only sleeps, not only dies, but it is forgotten. No coffin conceals its wasting form, no urn contains its ashes, no parting words are uttered, no eulogy pronounced. The Committee on Rules is not obtrusive. Its power of annihilation is effectively manifested in silence, serenity, and solemnity. The numerous amendments which have been submitted to this committee at different times have not affected any controlling opinion within its circle. That body has had nothing to say as to the impropriety of the many propositions which the irate and nervous, the dignified and sedate have pressed for consideration.

The committee has not even officially informed us whether its members think that the rules can be improved. We have not been told whether it is desirable to enact a rule to establish that we are present when we are not absent, or whether it is not possibly well that we should repeal a canon of practice which records us absent when we are demonstratively, though it seems unparliamentarily, here. We have not been informed whether it is right to place upon the Journal the presence of a Senator who declares in stentorian tones that he can not be counted because he is paired; who announces that because some one is really abroad he is constructively away. If a Senator should engage another Senator in desperate physical encounter—a supposition purely illustrative—and should in the midst of the mêlée declare himself paired or refuse to answer, he would not be counted, would be considered absent, although he might be expelled because of misconduct in the presence of the Senate while in session. Senators who do not know this body have, when in workful mood and as the result of rosy anticipations of duty performed, transmitted to the Commit-

tee on Rules declarations of principles of action which have been recognized as effective and necessary throughout civilization, vainly trusting that the hour for improvement had been reached. Visionary, indeed, are such aspirations; unfruitful such efforts; abortive such exertions. Time disciplines these enthusiastic tyros in Senatorial ways. They finally lapse into a semiacquiescent state. When these rules are changed—and they will be changed—Senators, now young, who tendered these amendments, will stay their tottering steps as they proceed down the pleasant walks of their later lives, and will say, in the uncertainty of the utterances of old age, "Yes, yes; those amendments were proposed long ago, forty or fifty years ago. I made a few remarks concerning them; am glad to see that my sentiments have at last obtained. Singular that it should have taken half a century to induce the Senate to agree with unanimous expression. It has been a little slow—yes, quite slow; quite slow."

IT IS UNNECESSARY TO SEEK PRECEDENTS ABROAD CONCERNING THE DESIRABILITY OF A MORE PRACTICAL SET OF RULES.

We have a home example; a case not only in point, but a teaching, inspiring, chiding, and dominating case—that furnished by the House of Representatives. At the outset of the debate which there led to the final rules of the Fifty-third Congress, precedents were cited to show that there was no necessity for more restrictive forms. Attention was called there, as it is called here, to the truth that our country has managed to get along for a century under old conditions. Undoubtedly the founders of this Government did not consider the obstructionist of to-day. It is unnecessary to ask for the reason. It is sufficient to say that without the change business could not be transacted at all; and hence the good sense of our Representatives brought about the alteration. Although the majority of the party to which I belong denounced Mr. REED for his work with reference to parliamentary matters, it is safe to say that neither party will ever go back to the rules and regulations which have been abandoned. Our Republican friends deserve the credit of the first effective action in the House, though in inaugurating the work they but followed the precedent made by the Senator from New York while he was the presiding officer of the senate of the Empire State. But that party, after loudly proclaiming in justification of its course that it is traitorous to oppose the popularly selected majority, had no sooner been condemned to second place than it immediately adopted dilatory tactics, and with pleasing abandon maintained that until the Democratic majority forced the Republican minority to do its duty the latter was authorized to pursue its natural bent. The best advertised honesty in the Republican Congressional delegation advocated and directed this course. The Republican press applauded it. Republican bosses said: "Go on; your course is bold, but your immorality will demonstrate the need of coercive measures. We will sustain our virtue by insisting upon vice." This programme, faithfully carried out, resulted in the rules which finally prevailed at the other end of the Capitol during the last part of the Fifty-third Congress, and which gave the majority that control which the Constitution contemplates and the public rightfully demands.

It must be understood that I do not favor the House rules. The numerical parliamentary features existing there are not so marked here, and for that reason greater latitude can be allowed. My insistence is that some method shall be devised which will enable the majority, after a rational period, after liberal debate, allowing time which can not without unanimous consent be reduced, to put the previous question, and also to compel the record to speak the truth as to the presence of Senators. I know that no one will insist upon a vote even under these conditions at such an hour or day as will prevent a Senator from fully and fairly expressing himself, and I trust that I am not hoping against hope when I assume that the Senate will some time exercise the power to determine that the reading of Paradise Lost, Webster's Dictionary, Mr. Gladstone's translation of Horace, etc., are not always in order, regardless of the subject under discussion. If such authority exists to-day, either in the Senate or its Presiding Officer, it is not exercised, and yet clearly irrelevant matter has been often projected upon us. The Senator who fathers an address so long that he can not afford to listen to it himself, which, perhaps, he may not have even read or heard read, should not be permitted to procure an enthusiastic colleague to publish it for him while he retires to be refreshed, that he may be able to come again upon the stage and challenge the physical endurance of those whose judgment he does not either hope or seek to affect.

Technical debate is not actual debate in this Chamber. Some one delivers a formal address to-day and it is answered by an equally formal preparation two months hence. The enormous accumulations contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would, I believe, be greatly reduced, to the benefit of all, if we proceeded upon business principles. Senators have stated here frequently that the number of bills passed by this body shows that the rules are good enough. It must not be forgotten that most of these measures have excited no great interest or active discussion. In such cases no trouble is experienced in obtaining speedy action; but when the great issues—the material matters pertaining to legislation—are before us, the obstructionist becomes omnipotent, and days and days and weeks are wasted. Senators may say that such discussion is not wasted. But no one listens to it. Occasionally some episode induces the public to fill the galleries and Senators to seek the floor; but for the most part the deliberative eloquence mentioned is spoken ineffectively, except in so far as it stops needed legislation.

The House of Representatives more than once has passed a resolution favoring the submission to the several States of a constitutional amendment authorizing the election of Senators by direct vote. For months at a time that resolution has been here. It has been tied up, buried, ignored, sat upon by our preponderating ponderousness. Great interest is taken all over the country in this proposition. Representatives direct from the people have asked that the States be permitted to act upon the matter; but the Senate not only fails to permit such action, but declines to expressly say whether it will or will not submit it. For myself, I am emphatically in favor of the adoption of that constitutional amendment. The issue was submitted to the voters of California in 1892, and the vote stood: For the amendment, 187,958; against, 13,342. It must be understood that I am not blaming anyone in particular. The pernicious results to which I refer are the legitimate offspring of a system that is operative only for harm and that should have been remodeled long, long ago.

I think that we owe something to the public. This body, while not chosen by the popular vote, is, nevertheless, elected by agencies of popular creation. While we are not bound by an initiative or referendum, still we should pay some attention to the desires of those who sent us here. As our Government is based upon the popular idea, we must not deny the long-continued demands of those from whom we have obtained our authority. I do not refer to the expressions of self-constituted newspaper critics, whose views of public conditions are sometimes most selfish and unreliable, but I speak of the actual beliefs of our constituents. I have been in many States of the Union—in large cities and small towns, and in rural districts—during the last two years. I have not discovered one man, woman, or child who favors our prevailing doctrine of legislative paralysis, and the subject has been and is one of constant consideration. In every instance the Senate has been censured and referred to as antique and as constituting more a relic than a life—a thing that has been, rather than a present existence. This situation is not pleasant; it is unfortunate; it is exaggerated and grossly unjust; but the provoking cause is plainly discernible.

The ill which we permit, and against which my words are leveled, is the parent of many of the unfounded attacks from which we suffer. It must not be thought that I believe that any Senator should sacrifice his views of the Constitution, his convictions of duty, to a mere external demand, whether from meetings hastily gathered together, or from more regularly convened bodies, or from newspapers, or from the press generally. These expressions should be duly weighed and should not be thoughtlessly ignored; nevertheless, I will not abandon or advise another to abandon conscience or independence. I am certain that the States here represented want firm as well as true counselors, men of integrity who will not be swerved by threats or flattery or by "the conscious simper and the jealous leer." I do not forget, either, that it often happens that those who criticise possess "a brain of feathers and a heart of lead." Still, while thus holding firmly to our rights and guarding according to our judgment public interests, we must not, as I have stated, fail to respect or consider opinions of those whose servants we are. I think that every cautious person will appreciate that the Constitution contemplates care in the passage of bills, and that that instrument made it practically impossible to enact a law without considerable deliberation. The passage through the House of Representatives of any bill is attended with much discussion.

The Senate was organized upon the long-term idea that it might enjoy greater independence and be subjected less to exciting influences and political flurry. It was thought that when the more popular branch and the Senate united the country would not often have inflicted upon it an unwise law, and that when that occurred an Executive veto would arrest the threatened wrong, and that more than one-third of either body would, when occasion warranted, hasten to the support of the President. These and other safeguards, such as that requiring a roll call when demanded by one-fifth of the members present, were thought ample, and are, in my judgment, entirely adequate. There may be possible exceptions, but rules well conceived are not predicated upon exceptions. No one concerned in the making of the Constitution apprehended that a second veto power, or, rather, the authority to extinguish by protracted torture, resided in the minority of the Senate. No such bill destroyer was called to the attention of the fathers. They no more anticipated that a Senator would filibuster against a vote than we look for a filibuster by a minority of the Supreme Court against a judgment of that

court when attempted to be announced through the majority. But opinions of official responsibility have changed since then. In this epoch the Senatorial parliamentarian invokes as many quibbles as the most erudite professor of any class.

We should not forget the usually correct proposition expressed by Gibbon:

All that is human must retrograde if it do not advance.

I understand the solicitude of those of my associates who fear that a change of rules just now will emphasize Republican influence in this body; but my remarks have been of no avail if I have not shown that the objections to the procedure of the Senate which I have urged are not conceived in partisanship, but arise from a deliberately formed judgment that the public welfare is involved and that it is imperative that attention should be paid to the well-grounded and universal demand for the adoption of an improved plan. The party advocate may and should be patriotic, but he does not rise above the level of selfishness if he insists upon saddling a parliamentary incubus upon an already heavily burdened body solely because he thinks that the majority, whose power is born of the people, may under prevailing conditions be unable to exercise the authority thus solemnly intrusted to their keeping without the intervention of technical obstruction.

Our rules should be reasonable, in harmony with the period for which we legislate and the civilization of which we partake. Let us have ample argument, but not argument lasting long after all have ceased to listen. Let us protect the minority, but permit the majority to assert their manifest privilege. Let no Senator openly avow his presence and place the same upon the record and then aver that he may not be counted as part of a quorum. Give to all wide latitude in debate, but do not refuse to call a Senator to order who willfully deserts his subject and consumes the time allotted thereto in the consideration of matter wholly foreign and palpably irrelevant. The star of progress glows with increased brightness. He who stands with sleepy visage, uncertain of his duty, is mischosen to place. Reverence for the great and gone should ever be cherished, but the examples of these have been given without profit if we do not move with rapid as with thoughtful step in the performance of the duties of an evolutionary age.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That from and after the passage of this act the mints of the United States shall be open to the coinage of silver, and there shall be coined dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy, of standard silver, nine-tenths fine, as provided by the act of January 18, 1837, and upon the same terms and subject to the limitations and provisions of law regulating the coinage and legal-tender quality of gold; and whenever the said coins herein provided for shall be received into the Treasury, certificates may be issued therefor in the manner now provided by law.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin into standard silver dollars, as soon as practicable, according to the provisions of section 1 of this act, from the silver bullion purchased under authority of the act of July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," that portion of said silver bullion which represents the seigniorage or profit to the Government, to wit, the difference between the cost of the silver purchased under said act and its coinage value, and said silver dollars so coined shall be used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government; and for the purpose of making the said seigniorage immediately available for use as money, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against it, as if it was already coined and in the Treasury.

SEC. 3. That no national-bank note shall be hereafter issued of a denomination less than $10, and all notes of such banks now outstanding of denominations less than that sum shall be, as rapidly as practicable, taken up, redeemed, and canceled, and notes of $10 and larger denominations shall be issued in their stead under the direction of the Comptroller of the Currency,

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the United States notes, commonly called "greenbacks," and also the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins, or both, not at the option of the holder, but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department, and said notes, commonly called "greenbacks," when so redeemed, shall be reissued as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, the bill under consideration, as it came from the House of Representatives, provided for the issue of bonds for the redemption of the United States notes commonly called greenbacks, and for the issue of certificates of indebtedness of the United States to provide for any deficiency now existing or that may hereafter exist in the Treasury.

It is claimed, I believe, that this bill was framed and passed through the House in response to the wishes of the President of the United States. It is also said that the bill is entirely unsatisfactory to the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, from the fact that the bonds provided for are not specifically payable in gold. It seems that the President considers the Treasury in an unsatisfactory, if not in a critical, condition. The majority of the Finance Committee of this body believe that the financial condition of the people generally is anything but what it should be, and we regard it as the first duty binding on the consciences of members of Congress to undertake to provide a remedy for the widespread distress now existing through the country, especially if it is in any sense the result of Congressional action. If a condition of reasonable prosperity can be restored among the masses of the people there will be no difficulty whatever about the condition of the Treasury. The present deficiency results, in our opinion, from the much greater evil of the unsatisfactory condition of the people. The bill amended as proposed by us will, we firmly believe, bring this relief, and for that reason we urgently urge its passage by the Senate.

The amendment proposed to the bill is in the following words:

To strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That from and after the passage of this act the mints of the United States shall be open to the coinage of silver, and there shall be coined dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy, of standard silver, nine-tenths fine, as provided by the act of January 18, 1837, and upon the same terms and subject to the limitations and provisions of law regulating the coinage and legal-tender quality of gold; and whenever the said coins herein provided for shall be received into the Treasury, certificates may be issued therefor in the manner now provided by law.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin into standard silver dollars, as soon as practicable, according to the provisions of section 1 of this act, from the silver bullion purchased under authority of the act of July 14, 1890, entitled 'An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes,' that portion of said silver bullion which represents the seigniorage or profit to the Government, to wit, the difference between the cost of the silver purchased under said act and its coinage value, and said silver dollars so coined shall be used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government; and for the purpose of making the said seigniorage immediately available for use as money, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against it, as if it was already coined and in the Treasury.

"SEC. 3. That no national-bank note shall be hereafter issued of a denomination less than $10, and all notes of such banks now outstanding of denominations less than that sum shall be, as rapidly as practicable, taken up, redeemed, and canceled, and notes of $10 and larger denominations shall be issued in their stead under the direction of the Comptroller of the Currency.

"SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the United States notes, commonly called 'greenbacks,' and also the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins, or both, not at the option of the holder, but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department, and said notes, commonly called 'greenbacks,' when so redeemed, shall be reissued as provided by the act of May 31, 1878."

It would seem that the advocates of a single gold standard regard the issue of bonds as a panacea for every ill, that with them it is a remedy ready in every emergency. No matter what financial difficulty is to be met, an issue of bonds is at once and promptly proposed. Those who think as I do, on the contrary, look upon them as an unmitigated evil, especially as they have been and are now about to be issued. An issue of bonds is doubtless a boon to that small class of persons who have large incomes, which they have not the knowledge, industry, or courage to use profitably, who long for investments upon which they may draw interest without any greater labor than clipping coupons; but to no other class is an issue of bonds desirable.

It is true that the Government is not collecting as much revenue just at this time as is needed, and some steps should be taken to provide for the deficiency. The Secretary of the Treasury, however, in his official report, shows that this deficiency will be temporary and not continue beyond a few months.

The amendment proposed by the committee, if enacted into law, will amply provide for this, for the issue of about fifty millions of silver certificates against the seigniorage now held in bars in the Treasury is one of its features, while the deficiency estimated by Mr. Carlisle is far below that sum. A sale of bonds, as proposed by the House, could accomplish no good result, and, in my opinion, would be productive of much evil.

The issue of bonds can not alter existing conditions, and the causes which have brought about the present situation will speedily bring about like results and another sale of bonds will soon be just as necessary as this, and this "endless chain" of bond sales might continue until a thousand millions had been sold, and yet we would be no nearer a solution of the difficulties which encompass us than we are now. In fact, the President in his last annual message to Congress says, after issuing a hundred and sixty millions of bonds, that, at that time (the beginning of this session), to use his language, "we are nearly where we started;" and we will continue indefinitely to be "nearly where we started" under the system proposed by the House of Representatives or the President.

There was a time when, with a much smaller population and much less wealth than we now have, we had no difficulties in the Treasury—no deficiency of revenue, and what was of much more consequence, no distress among the people. If the causes which produce the present difficulties with the people can be removed we certainly will return to the old condition of prosperity and happiness. It would seem that there should be no difficulty in finding out what changes have occurred and in ascertaining beyond question the cause of our present troubles. There must be something radically wrong somewhere if the richest and freest nation on the globe is in such a condition of absolute helplessness and dependence as the President of the United States seems to consider us now.

In this country the people are the source not only of all power,

but also of all wealth and prosperity. When they are prosperous, business will flourish, all branches of commerce will be active, and no financial difficulties will come to the Treasury except as the result of insufficient revenue laws; but no revenue system, no matter how wisely or judiciously framed, can provide revenue unless there is commerce and active business. A time of industrial depression and commercial stagnation must be and ought to be a time of embarrassment for the Government.

The laws we now have on the statute books will, with the revival of business, provide ample revenue. The change needed is not in the revenue laws, but in the financial condition of the people at large. Whatever embarrassments the Government may now have to encounter are the result of the depressed condition of all branches of business and the unsatisfactory condition of the people generally. If we can devise a means of relieving these, there will be no difficulty about the condition of the Government or of the revenues. The conditions of distress not only in this country, but in England, Germany, and France, the great nations of the world, will not be denied by anyone. There were more business failures in numbers and amount during the year 1895 in the United States than there were in the panic year of 1893; there were a million acres less of corn planted in Great Britain in 1895 than in 1894, thus throwing out of employment, it is said, 30,000 laborers.

The following is from the Daily Telegraph of a recent date:

On Tuesday, November 26 last, an estate known as Scotland farm, situate about 11 miles from Salisbury, and containing 501 acres of light but healthy sheep and corn land, with good farmhouse and substantial buildings, was sold at auction by Messrs. Waters & Rawlings, of Salisbury, for the sum of £1,640. In 1879 the same estate was bought for £7,000, and at that time it was considered very cheap. Since then a considerable sum has been expended on improvements.

How does it happen that in a time of profound peace all over the world, with abundant harvests, with no pestilence or other such calamity, such a condition of things can exist? No local cause can account for it, for it embraces all the greatest nations in the world. There must be some cause operating in all these countries to cause such widespread distress, uniform in character. That cause seems clearly to be the falling prices which has cursed and blasted this country for twenty years. The evil effects of such a condition need no proof. It is clear to the mind of any man that such a condition is burdensome to any business, and has been so recognized by writers on political economy from the beginning.

David Hume long since wrote that—

If prices rise, everything takes a new face; labor and industry gain life; the merchant becomes more enterprising, the manufacturer more diligent and skillful, and even the farmer follows his plow with greater alacrity and attention. If prices fall, the poverty, beggary, and sloth that must ensue are easily foreseen.

It is a principle well recognized that falling prices operate as a redistribution of wealth in favor of the rich and that rising prices operate as a redistribution of wealth in favor of the poor.

J. R. MacCulloch said that "while cases of individual hardship may arise, a progressive depreciation of money is like a fall of rain after a long drought, beneficial to incomparably the larger part of society, and it is of great public and national advantage," and I believe that the advantage which has come to the masses of men from a steadily and gradually increasing volume of money, decreasing its value and enhancing prices, has done more to advance civilization, to build up mankind, to implant a love of liberty and independence in them, than any other one existing human agency; that it has been of more material and substantial benefit to mankind than all the wars and revolutions which have occurred in the name of liberty.

Of course every fall of prices is not an evil. A fall which results from improved methods of production, or from improved and cheapened transportation, is a blessing and brings prosperity to producers, while it showers its blessings upon consumers. Improvements in the methods of producing cotton and woolen goods have clothed the world in comfort and elegance. While the manufacturers have grown in wealth, power, and influence, the industry has attained a magnitude which would have been impossible under the old clumsy and costly methods.

E. Benjamin Andrews, president of Brown University, speaking of this distinction, uses this language:

Falling costs imply prosperity, high interest and dividends, good wages and profits, few strikes and lockouts, rapidly multiplying industrial undertakings, and rapidly increasing wealth, none of which features characterize the world's economic life since 1873.

And again he says:

It is my belief that if general costs had fallen since 1873 as gold prices have fallen, these twenty years, which have been so lean, would not only have matched the fat decades preceding, but would have formed industrially, economically, and in respect to every interest of civilization the most splendid era in human history.

The world is at last learning that the highest and best means of production, whether of men or machines, is the cheapest and most economical. Prices cheapened by these improved methods is an advance in civilization, adds to and stimulates business, brings men to a higher level, awakens new ideas, and stimulates new ambitions. But such agencies radically affect only the particular branch of manufacture directly interested, and a few others which are incidentally related to it; they can not have an effect on general prices; improved methods of cotton manufacture will not affect the prices of locomotives; cheap shoes will not make cheap books.

There is, however, one commodity which, when affected in its value, necessarily affects all other things in the world, in all countries, and among all civilized people, to wit, money. Suppose money to be doubled in value suddenly, it would take then just one-half as much of it to buy any given article as it would have taken before the rise in its value; what would before have cost $1 would then cost 50 cents, because the 50 cents is worth as much as the dollar was before. This rise in the value of money then would find its expression, its visible manifestation, in a fall of general prices to 50 per cent of their former scale, while money would remain nominally just as it was before; and the superficial observer might think, and a modern gold bug would be sure to think, that this change in prices had resulted from overproduction and improvements in methods of production and transportation, and not in the change in the value of money.

It is often the case that there are two causes operating at the same time and in opposite directions, and that these counteract each other to some extent. For instance, suppose the value of money doubled as already suggested; this would tend to divide the price of cotton, for instance; but suppose at the same time, as was the fact last year, that there should be produced one-half of an ordinary crop of cotton. Under normal conditions this falling off in the crop would tend to double the price, while the increased value of money would tend to reduce it 50 per cent. These two causes operating in different directions against each other would have a tendency to keep cotton at its old value. It would not fall by reason of the scarcity of money; it would not advance by reason of the shortness of crop, but remain at the old price. But the two causes operating in directly opposite directions with exactly equal force would paralyze each other, leaving the price of cotton where it had been before. The two evils of an increase in the value of money and a short crop would both be borne by the community, though the effects of both might be hidden. This was practically the condition during the fall of 1895.

It seems to me to be as clear as a demonstration that the legislation of 1873 has had the effect to double the value of money, and that it has steadily grown in value since the passage of that act and will continue to do so until it is repealed. Supply and demand regulate values, and this rule applies just as certainly to money as it does to any other commodity.

I take the following apt illustration of this from page 24 of The Distribution of Wealth by Money, by John W. Miller, of England:

Wheat and rye are both used on the Continent of Europe as food, and though we ourselves use only one of these, viz, wheat, it can not be said that the value of wheat is totally independent of the use of rye. Suppose, for example, that a law was passed compelling the people of Europe to dispense with rye and compelling them to use wheat. Would not that affect the value of wheat? Would it not change the condition of wheat relative to demand? The position of the money metals, silver and gold, was precisely similar. We used gold as our money, and the people of Europe used both silver and gold, which were exchangeable in France through the medium of the French mint at the fixed coinage ratio of 15½ to 1. The closing of the French mint in 1873 dispensed with the use of silver and compelled the use of gold throughout. As in the case of the example, if the supply of rye was short the demand would fall upon wheat, or a full supply of rye would lessen the demand for wheat; so if there was a full supply of silver gold would be released and participate in the less demand, while if there was a short supply of silver gold would likewise be affected, and vice versa.

It is a matter of universal observation that when money is plenty business is active and prices are high, and when money is scarce business is stagnant and prices are low. Of course, high prices is the same thing as cheap money and low prices is only another form of expression for saying that money is high.

John Locke said long ago:

For the value of money in general is the quantity of all the money in the world in proportion to all the trade.

And John Stuart Mill much more recently said:

That an increase in the quantity of money raises prices and a diminution lowers them is the most elementary proposition in the theory of coinage, and without it we should have no key to any of the others.

This is but the scientific recognition of a truth which is self-evident.

That the adoption of either gold or silver alone as the standard of value, when the entire sum of both gold and silver had always theretofore been such standard, would by its lessened volume have the effect to increase its value and inevitably to produce a disastrous fall in prices was known and fully understood long before the action of 1873.

Hon. R. M. T. Hunter, of Virginia, at that time chairman of the Committee on Finance, in a report made to the Senate on March 8, 1852, used the following language:

But the mischief would be great indeed if all the world were to adopt but one of the precious metals as the standard of value. To adopt gold alone

would diminish the specie currency more than one-half, and the reduction the other way, should silver be taken as the only standard, would be large enough to prove highly disastrous to the human race. Indeed, a reference to the history of the precious metals and the general course of human production can scarcely fail to convince us that there has been a constant tendency to appréciate their value, as compared with the residue of the property of the world, and that every extraordinary increase of the supply of the precious metals of which we have any account has exercised a highly beneficial effect upon human affairs. When contracts are made by a standard which is constantly contracting, the advantages are on the side of capital as against labor, and productive energy is cramped by receiving less than a fair share of the profits of the enterprise. Before the invention of substitutes for payment in coin, and before the increased supply of specie from the discovery of America, human history is full of the strifes between debtor and creditor, and human legislation is rife with experiments to limit the encroaching and engrossing power of capital. The most ancient legislation of which we have authentic account extinguished all debts every seventh year. Interest was often prohibited and generally regarded with abhorrence, for although the reason was not perceived, yet the fact was felt that capital received profit enough for its use in the appreciation of the value of the standard.

On page 9 of the same report he uses this language:

We require, then, for this reason the double standard of gold and silver, but above all do we require both to counteract the tendency of the specie standard to contract under the vast increase of the value of property of the world. And what harm can arise from any probable increase in the precious metals if both are allowed to swell the volume of currency? On the contrary, a more beneficial event for the trade, the industry, the moral and political condition of the world could scarcely be imagined. Of all the great effects produced upon human society by the discovery of America there were probably none so marked as those brought about by the great influx of the precious metals from the New World to the Old. European industry had been declining under the decreasing stock of precious metals and an appreciating standard of value. Human ingenuity grew dull under the paralyzing influences of declining profits, and capital absorbed nearly all that should have been divided between it and labor. But an increase of the precious metal in such quantities as to check this tendency operated as a new motive power to the machinery of commerce.

Production was stimulated by finding the advantages of a change in the standard upon its side. Instead of being repressed by having to pay more than it had stipulated for the the use of capital, it was stimulated by paying less. Capital, too, was benefited, for new demands were created for it by the new uses which a general movement in industrial pursuits had developed; so that if it lost a little by a change in the standard it gained much more in the greater demand for its use which added to its capacity for reproduction and to its real value. Property which had been acquired by the strong arm and accumulated in violation of the great laws of equity and trade, by an almost insensible transition, was distributed more equally in society. Nature, under the operation of this its great bankrupt law as if by an invisible hand loosened the bonds of the debtor, which heretofore time had continually tightened, and distributed to labor for purposes of reproduction and upon equitable terms capital which distrust and apathy had either locked up or administered with a too sparing hand. New influences arose in society and a new impulse was given to its movements.

In the present stage of the world we may, perhaps, no more expect any event to produce such rapid transformations in society. But we might reasonably look for something like the same consequences from a similar event. Any system, either of violence or law, which distributes property improperly and unjustly and which gives a false direction to the great stream of productive industry will in the end produce throes and convulsions in the bosom of society. Unless human skill such as is rarely if ever known intervenes to give the true direction to affairs, or unless nature interferes through the silent operation of her laws to remove inequalities and repair injustice, violence is almost sure to be used to make a change if it can not apply a remedy. The recent discovery of vast auriferous deposits on the globe would seem to mark the approach of one of those great eras in human affairs when the hand of nature is more obvious than that of man in producing changes.

Thus we see that it was clearly stated by the Finance Committee of this body twenty years before the act of 1873 that to adopt either one of the metals as the standard of value to the exclusion of the other would, by reducing the volume of money, enormously decrease prices, bring great hardship and distress on the world, and prevent the beneficial effects which ought to follow from a natural increase in the production of the precious metals.

A fall in the bullion price of silver absolutely necessitates one of two things, either silver prices must advance in silver countries or gold prices are bound to decline in gold countries. This can not be avoided. It is as absolute as the law of the Medes and Persians, and it is no more absolute to-day than it was in 1873 and has been each year from then until now, and will continue to be for all time to come. To illustrate, suppose 412½ grains of silver to be worth a dollar all over the world, as it was in 1873 and had been practically always, and that wheat in Minnesota and India is worth a dollar a bushel. Suppose, then, a sudden decline in the value of silver of 50 per cent. This would of course necessitate either a doubling in the value of wheat in India and making a bushel cost 825 grains of silver, or else wheat in Minnesota would be reduced to 50 cents a bushel. Fifty cents in gold would buy 412½ grains of silver, which would be the amount with which a bushel of wheat could be bought in India. If there was no advance in the price there, this fact would fix absolutely the price of Minnesota wheat.

Of course the price in Minnesota must come down to the level of the gold value of the silver necessary to buy in India. It is a principle recognized in political economy everywhere that it is easier to bring prices down than it is to carry them up. This being the case, it was perfectly natural that when the legislation of 1873 was adopted which necessitated a reduction in the value of silver bullion, that this entailed beyond question the fall of prices which has occurred between then and now; and yet we find advocates of the gold standard blindly shutting their eyes to the fact that the reduction in the price of silver bullion is the cause of the decline of gold prices, and many of them still deny it. This can not remain so. The inseparable connection between the two is too strong and too manifest to remain long out of the sight of any thinking man.

Taking two tables which were published in the proceedings of the Royal Statistical Society of London during the last summer, one by Mr. Barr Robinson and the other by Mr. Probyn, it may be roughly stated that of the fifteen hundred million people in the world, 375,000,000 are gold-using people and eleven hundred and twenty-five millions silver-using people. These figures will show how utterly impossible it is for any decline in silver bullion to occur anywhere which does not effect either an advance of prices among all the eleven hundred and twenty-five million people who use silver, or a decline of prices in the less than 400,000,000 who use gold, and when we consider the sharp competition and the tendency to "bear" prices, it is not surprising that the reduction of gold prices and not the advance of silver prices has been the result. It is a fact notorious that there has been no advance in silver prices in silver-using countries, and as there must be the one or the other, the decline in gold prices was absolutely inevitable and unavoidable. Everyone admits that it is extremely desirable to maintain a practically uniform level of general prices.

To maintain such a level of prices it would be absolutely necessary that as the volume of commerce increased as the demand for and uses of money increased the volume of money should increase in exactly the same proportion. Now, everyone knows how marvelously rapid has been the development of all commerce during the last century, and it is perfectly clear that there never was a time when there was a demand for so large an increase in the volume of money as during the last twenty years. It seems that it would be physically impossible to have an increase in the volume of metallic money to at all correspond with the wonderful development of commerce which has occurred under the use of steam and the general appliances of modern civilization.

The ingenuity of men has compensated in some degree for this inability of nature to keep up with the increase of commerce in the production of metallic money by providing means of facilitating the use of money by bank checks, bills of exchange, etc., which, of course, supplement the volume, tending to maintain a just parity between the volume of money and the demand for it. When the volume of business and the use and demand for money increase more rapidly in proportion than the volume of money—the supply of money—the value of money must necessarily increase relatively. A smaller amount of it than before will perform the same office, although there may be at the same time an actual increase in the volume of money. The marvelous development of commerce and business all over the world since the close of the Napoleonic wars has been wonderful, and this taking place so much more rapidly than the increase in the volume of money necessarily increased the value of both gold and silver. This increase was estimated by Jevons to be 145 per cent between 1809 and 1846. Thousands of men are now living who remember the distressing times existing just before the discovery of gold in California.

Sir James Graham, of Netherby, writing of that time, said:

The bitter fruit of the system was tasted by all classes. I am in error when I say all, for amid the ruin of the farmer, the manufacturer, the distress of landlords in the insurrection of a populace without bread and without employment, one class flourished and was triumphant—the annuitant, the tax eater, rejoiced in the increased value of money and in the sacrifice of productive industry to unproductive wealth, in the victory of the drones over the bees.

That condition, like this, was not confined to any one country. Great Britain's statesmen stood appalled in the presence of that overwhelming trouble, and no solution seemed to present itself to their minds except emigration. The decreased volume of money in proportion to the volume of business was so great and so sharp as to bring about exactly the condition of things that exists now, and the similarity between the two periods is recognized again and again, and has often been commented upon by a leading advocate of the gold standard. How any man can shut his eyes to the fact that exactly the same cause, to wit, a reduction in the volume of money in proportion to trade, has brought about these results is beyond my comprehension. As soon as gold was discovered in California and Australia and it began to find its way into the channels of trade and commerce the distress passed away, and the most marvelous prosperity succeeded it. Business sprung up and developed as it had never done before in the history of the world, and amid the universal shouts of a happy and prosperous people were drowned the complaints of the only class who suffered by this great change.

Those who had reaped the benefits of the steady increase in the value of money from 1809 to 1846 from its failure to increase as rapidly in volume as commerce had increased fully saw and understood the advantages which had come to them from this lessening supply of money in proportion to trade, and the fact was never lost sight of by them. They fully understood that the beneficence of Almighty God and the industry of man had given to the world a sufficient supply of gold and silver to defeat the usurers in their

game of consuming the wealth and labor of the world by the unearned increase in the value of their money. It was clear that there was no way to reduce the supply of metal which Providence had placed in the mountains, and there was no way to prevent the strong arms of the miners from bringing it up. The only chance left to them then was to create an artificial scarcity of money if they were ever to bring back the old conditions of robbery by law—the old conditions of hard times and distress which was their harvest. When nature and industry had provided abundance, scarcity could only be produced by legislation to strike down one metal and limit the money function as far as possible to the other.

This crime was consummated in 1873. From the day that that law unfortunately became operative it has carried into execution the purposes which these conspirators had in view. The volume of money, lessening not absolutely, but in proportion to the volume of trade, has of necessity continually increased the value of money, and by this hidden, unseen, and covert means confiscation of the property of the masses for the benefit of these individuals has been and is being accomplished, and this condition of things must and will continue so long as the laws remain as they are now. The causes which have operated to produce the present results will continue their operation in the same line. Prices which have been in the last twenty years reduced, say, 50 per cent will in the next twenty years be reduced 50 per cent more.

Before 1873 the coin and bullion value of both gold and silver were practically the same. Since that time the bullion value as well as the coinage value of gold has enormously increased, while silver practically remained steady, at least up to 1893, although excluded from the mints and denied its money function. Up to 1893, when the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act was forced through Congress and when England arbitrarily closed the mints of India to the coinage of silver, there was no decline in the real value of that metal; it was worth as much, would buy as much, of any one of the thousands of articles of commerce all over the world, even in the United States and in Great Britain, as it would in 1873 and before. It was only since these two blows, delivered by the two great Anglo-Saxon peoples of the world, that silver has actually declined in value. I insert here a table, taken from the Bimetallist, an English publication, which illustrates this point:

The exchangeable value of commodities in gold and silver.

TABLE I.

	1867-1877.	1893.
10 ounces of silver at the average prices would exchange for—	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
English wheat	429	541
Town-made flour	299	319
German beet sugar	229	222
Sugar, average import price	34	36
Common bar iron	667	665
Middling upland cotton	65.5	77
English lead	269	341
English wool	30	35
Leather	37	24

TABLE II.

123.27 grains of standard gold at the average prices would exchange for—	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
English wheat	171	349
Flour	122	215
Sugar	93	149
Iron	272	448
Cotton	26.6	52
Lead	109.3	229.7
Wool	12.15	23.4
Leather	15	18.6

Webster defines a standard to be "that which is established by a sovereign power as a rule or measure by which others are to be adjusted." Accuracy and inflexibility in a standard is demanded by common honesty. It has been demanded from the earliest times by all human laws. Holy Writ is full of injunctions that measures shall be just. The great importance attached to exactness in measures is illustrated by the history of the yard measure in Great Britain. In 1760 a standard yard was constructed under the direction of a committee of the House of Commons, consisting of a solid brass bar about an inch square. At about 1½ inches from each end a gold pin or stud was inserted, in which pins at the distance of 36 inches are two points intended to designate the length of the yard. The language of the law adopting this standard is as follows:

The straight line or distance between the centers of the two points in the gold studs in the brass rods now in the custody of the clerk of the House of Commons, whereon the words and figures "standard yard, 1760," are engraved, shall be, and the same is hereby, declared to be the original and genuine standard of that measure of length or lineal extension called a yard; and that the same straight line or distance between the centers of the said two points in the said gold stud in the said brass rod, the brass being at a temperature of 62° Fahrenheit thermometer, shall be, and is hereby, denominated the imperial standard yard, and shall be, and is hereby, declared to be the unit or only standard measure of extension.

This standard came up for examination and consideration later, and it was reported that the mean diameter of each of the holes was nearly one-hundredth of an inch, and they by no means presented anything like a circular shape; that in fact not only did different persons differ in their estimates of the centers, but the same persons also differed at different times according to the degree and direction of the light that impinged on the sides of the holes, and the report of Mr. Bailey adds:

How the legislature of the present day, when the art of making mathematical instruments has arrived at such a state of perfection, could have sanctioned the adoption of such an imperfect and undefinable measure as this for a standard must always be a matter of astonishment.

This variation in the length of a yard, we notice, in the opinion of Mr. Bailey, might possibly have resulted in so great a variation as the one-hundredth part of 1 inch. Thus we see that in Mr. Bailey's opinion it is possible there might have been a variation in the length of a yard measure amounting to one thirty-six hundredth part of its length, and he expresses profound astonishment that such an "imperfect and undefinable" and uncertain measure should have been adopted.

We have a measure of value which is certainly open to Mr. Bailey's criticism of being "uncertain and undefinable." While he was astonished at a possible variation of a one thirty-six hundredth of a unit of length, we maintain a measure of value which has doubled in twenty years, and instead of this being a matter of "astonishment" to our wise men, it is freely intimated that a man who thinks that this is not right is a lunatic, if not a thief. An uncertain measure of length, all will admit, is wrong, with even so small a variation as this, but a measure of value which fluctuates thirty-six hundred times as much is considered "sound." Why this should be so I can not imagine, unless it be because it only robs the "bees" to benefit the "drones." For such a "sound" measure I have only contempt.

Our fluctuation in this most important of standards is already thirty-six hundred times as great as the largest possible fluctuation which could have occurred in the measure of length, and which produced such "astonishment" in the mind and conscience of Mr. Bailey, and yet we have intelligent men insisting that our honor as a nation is pledged to maintain this marvelous and constantly increasing discrepancy in our most important of all standards, the standard of value.

Brande says:

No precise notion can be formed of the magnitude of a line in any other way than by comparing it with another line of a known length.

When we undertake to measure a standard of value we find great difficulty, owing to the fact that there is no one thing by which we can measure it, as in the case of measure of length or weight. In an effort to devise a steady measure of values many suggestions have been made and many theories advanced. The same high authority, Brande, speaking of this subject, says:

The value of money or its power of exchange for buying other things should be as invariable as possible or should change only by slow degree * * * and the money of any country may be said to be good or bad according to the degree in which it possesses or wants these qualities.

Mr. Gladstone himself says that—

The standard of value, which is the great unit of exchange, is itself a commodity, and, being such, is itself subject to fluctuation. Such fluctuation is economically an evil, and any wisely governed state should seek to have for its standard of value the commodity which is least subject to fluctuation. That commodity, as I conceive it, is gold.

Without having stability of value itself, money as a measure of value is a cheat and a fraud. Exactness, inflexibility in standards of weight, quantity, and length are insisted on to a nicety, and, of course, the reasons are much stronger why a standard of value should be even more so.

Tried by these scientific tests, which must commend themselves to the judgment and consciences of honest men everywhere, was there ever a money, a standard of value so bad as gold, and does it approach silver in point of goodness, in point of honesty, in point of integrity, and steadiness? It certainly does not. How far, then, does this single standard fall below the double standard of both gold and silver? Even so pronounced and eminent a monometallist as Mr. Leslie C. Probyn, only a few months ago, in a prize essay in favor of monometallism, which was passed upon and approved by Lord Farrar, had the frankness to say explicitly:

It must be admitted that so far silver has proved a more stable measure of value than gold, but too much importance should not be attached to this point.

How could too much importance be attached to the point of stability of value in a "measure of value" in the mind of any just and honest man? In this same prize essay, speaking of what might have been the effect if England had become a member of the Latin Union, Mr. Probyn uses the following remarkable language, to which I beg leave to call the special attention of the Senate:

Greater stability of value between the British standard and commodities generally might have been secured, the fall in British prices might to a great

extent have been prevented, uniformity between the monetary standards of England and her dependencies and the principal countries of the world might have been secured. But it is believed that these results would have been obtained by the sacrifice of a tried standard of value, which, though it does not happen to have been so stable, is for many reasons better than the silver standard, and by a breach of faith being sanctioned which would have benefited debtors at the expense of their creditors; that there would have been no sufficient security for the permanence of the new arrangement; that the fall in prices which has occurred is not really injurious to the nation; and that uniformity between the monetary standards of England and her dependencies (though it has not) might have been, and might now be, secured without a departure from the gold standard.

Steadiness of value in the measure of value seems to be but a secondary consideration with this champion of monometallism. What quality it is which would, in his opinion, be more desirable than steadiness of value is not stated, but I think it will appear later on.

Twenty years of actual test has demonstrated the correctness of the position occupied by Hunter and demonstrates that the unavoidable effect of the suspension of the coinage of silver was and must continue to be a persistent fall in general prices. The question presented for our consideration is, will we continue a system which has resulted so disastrously to every interest of ours, or will we correct the mistake of 1873, reenact the coinage law of 1837, under which the country was prosperous, restore justice and equity among the people, and make the country once more prosperous? The monometallists themselves will not have the hardihood to assert that there is anything so sacred about 25.8 grains of standard gold as to make it always the measure of value without regard to its own value. Its inherent weakness as a measure of value is so palpable that even the strongest advocates of monometallism can not defend it.

Mr. Horr, who was selected, I believe, by the bankers and the capitalists of New York to be sent to Chicago to engage in debate with Mr. Harvey during last summer, said, on page 222 of the authorized report of that debate:

The real measure of value is human toil.

Mr. Loughlin, who is authority with monometallists, is quoted as saying in a recent work on political economy that—

A long contract, like a government or railroad bond, ought not to be settled by paying back the amount of gold or silver borrowed, but by giving the lender that sum which would, at the time of payment, purchase the amount of commodities for which the money loaned could have been exchanged at the time it passed from the lender to the borrower.

In other words, "human toil."

Is this true? If so, gold can not be a just measure. Accept this as true, and there can be no stronger condemnation of the existing condition of things than inevitably results from the application of this suggested standard of value. Let us examine this one moment. It required the same labor to produce a bale of cotton in 1895 that it required to produce it in 1865; the same amount of "human toil" is represented by a bale of cotton now that it represented then.

On page 8 of An Honest Dollar, by E. Benjamin Andrews, president of Brown University, I find the statement made that the national debt on September 1, 1865, amounted to about two and three-quarters billions of dollars, and that at that time it would have taken 18,000,000 bales of cotton (the human toil represented in 18,000,000 bales of cotton) to have paid the whole debt, and that after this debt had been reduced to a billion and a quarter—in other words, after there had been a payment of 55 per cent of the entire debt and all the interest due—it would have required 30,000,000 bales of cotton (the human toil represented in 30,000,000 bales of cotton) to have paid the balance, or 45 per cent of the original debt. If Messrs. Horr and Loughlin, both monometallists, are correct, if "human toil" is the measure of value, how can any honest man insist that there is any semblance of justice in compelling the payment of twice as much of "human toil" in the shape of cotton on a bond now as it would have taken to pay it when it was issued.

In an address made by President Andrews before the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, which was published on the motion of Senator COCKRELL as a document by this body, this statement is made: Between 1870 and 1884 the public debt decreased not far from three-quarters of a billion of dollars, say seven hundred and fifty millions. Yet if we take wheat, corn, beef, oats, coal, cotton, and bar iron together as a standard—and they make not a bad standard—the debt did not decrease, but increased not less than 50 per cent. Mr. Horr's standard, then, of human toil "shows distinctly that the burdens of the people have been enormously increased by the silent and unseen operation of unjust laws which do not deserve longer to disgrace the statute books of this great Republic." The era of a lessening volume of money from the coming of Christ to Columbus was one of growing ignorance, tyranny, degradation; it was a period of retrogression, notwithstanding the power of the Christian religion which had just been revealed to man. When an increasing money supply created commerce, aroused mankind, stimulated ambition, created civilization, which in time widened into a system of education and enlightenment, it showed itself to be the most powerful aid to the great cause of Christianity, and more good, more advancement, was accomplished in the four centuries succeeding the discovery of the gold and silver mines in America by the Spaniards than was accomplished in all of the fifteen centuries preceding it. The constantly decreasing value of money proved a great blessing to mankind, perhaps more than compensating for the injuries which had been entailed by the opposite condition of a constantly decreasing volume of money during the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era.

The evils which have been the direct result of taking away the money function from silver in 1873 it seems but natural to suppose would be immediately removed by a restoration of those functions and that this would bring about the condition of prosperity that existed prior to that time. A natural and simple remedy for whatever bad results have come from the legislation of 1873 would seem to be the repeal of that legislation. It was an experiment. Nothing like it had ever been tried before. Its results have been disastrous in the extreme. They have been beneficial in no single respect, and it seems that by common consent we should as promptly as possible undo the entire work.

We are so conservative as a people that it is impossible to get prompt action on any strongly contested political question. The long struggle over the tariff is an illustration of this. Ever since I have been in public life we have been persistently making efforts to repeal the act of 1873, and although we have more than once passed free-silver bills here they have been defeated elsewhere; but I hope and believe that success is not to be much longer delayed.

Both of the great political parties have again and again declared themselves in favor of bimetallism. No national convention of any party has ever declared itself in favor of a single standard, either of gold or silver, and no convention, in my opinion, ever will. The great body of those who declare themselves sound-money men say that they are in favor of international bimetallism. Almost everybody in this country admits that if the United States, England, Germany, and France should agree to open their mints to the unlimited coinage of silver at 15½ to 1 or 16 to 1 that silver would at once resume its old value, and that the conditions of general prosperity existing prior to 1873 would be at once and permanently restored. Nobody would suffer wrong—even the bondholders would get their own, with interest. True, they would fail to get double what they are entitled to by the terms of the contract, as they now think, perhaps, that they are sure to do, and as they will do without some change in the present laws, but surely this fact is not an objection. The world would once more be prosperous, and civilization and the arts of peace would develop as they never have developed before; mankind would enter upon a period of advancement and progress the like of which has never been seen.

This, I believe, is the almost universal conviction. But we are assured that Great Britain will not consent to this, and for the selfish reasons of a small class of bankers who disregard other interest, even in England. The position of Mr. Gladstone, and his reason for it, is well known. Mr. Giffen long since declared that—

A creditor nation is able to draw more from its tributaries who have to pay it in the appreciating money than it would otherwise be able to draw. To pay the same debt they must send to their creditors 30, 50, perhaps 100 per cent more of produce than they would otherwise have to send. There is no doubt that in this sense the weight of the gold debt of a debtor country like India or the United States has enormously increased of late years.

The utter selfishness and absolute heartlessness of the dominant class in Great Britain, and their total disregard of the agricultural class of their own people, were strongly illustrated when Mr. Bertram Currie, of London, a banker and, I believe, the president of the Gold Defense Association, stated before a Government commission some years ago, as follows:

Q. But I think you said that a demand for gold increased its value. If there were a fresh demand by America gold must pro tanto have increased in value?

A. But what evil is done thereby if it had?

Q. Do you think that a fall of prices due to an appreciation of the standard is no evil?

A. I think a fall of prices is no evil.

Q. A fall of prices due to cheaper production of commodities would be a gain?

A. I ask no questions as a consumer. A fall in prices benefits me.

Q. Is it not a fact that, owing to the low prices, large tracts of country that were formerly profitably cultivated in England have gone out of cultivation and are now producing nothing?

A. If this is so it is because they are unsuited for the production of these commodities.

Q. But I am speaking of land which produced these commodities at great profit not long ago.

A. That is the general state of mankind. Somebody else has found that he can produce them cheaper and better. I know the feeling of the class to which I belong, and I know that any change is diametrically opposed to our feeling, and that whatever change is made, to whatever extent we can we will be clear of it. If we lend a man a thousand pounds we will say to him: "Understand, we are not to be paid back in this new stuff; we must have gold."

Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, member of Parliament, on the 16th of July last, at Stratford-on-Avon, said in the course of a speech that when it was shown in the House of Commons that agricultural depression was caused by low prices of all the things which

agriculture produced, Sir William Harcourt declared that he did not want to find the remedy, and did not want to raise prices, because he believed that low prices were a great advantage to the great mass of the people.

And the London Times says:

It seems impossible to get bimetallists to understand that there is quite a large number of us for whom a general rise of prices has no charms whatever. We like them low, and the lower the better. If they all went down to half their present figures we should rejoice, because we have nothing to sell and a great many things to buy. For those who have things to sell we do not feel any great concern.

Let me call attention also to a speech by Sir William H. Houldsworth, member of Parliament, delivered before the Bradford Chamber of Commerce on November 19, 1894, in which he quotes and comments upon certain declarations made by Mr. Shaw-Le Fevre, a member of the House of Commons, and who had previously delivered an address before the same body. I quote from Mr. Houldsworth:

Here I come upon a most extraordinary argument used by Mr. Shaw-Le Fevre in his address. It is to be found in that division of the report of his speech which appears in the Bradford Observer, headed, "England, the creditor of the whole world." The argument is this: "England, as a whole, is a creditor of all the world to the extent probably of over fifteen hundred millions sterling, payable in gold." If gold prices fall "the interest on the debt (and he might have added the principal) will have to be paid in a greater quantity of produce of all kinds."

Then follows a remarkable statement: "But, while we gain, other countries, as a whole, do not necessarily lose." There is a conjuring trick for you, and, as in the case of other conjuring tricks, no doubt you would like to know "how it is done." I will show you. He assumes, as usual, that the fall of prices is due to increased production in other countries or to diminished cost. I will take his argument on his own ground presently, but first I want to show you that though he asserts he does not believe in the appreciation of gold, he does believe in it after all, and more than this, thinks it a very good thing.

He says: "If gold prices fall the debtors in other countries will have to pay their creditors here 'a greater quantity of produce of all kinds' in order to pay the interest accruing on their debt and, of course, also to pay the principal when that becomes due. By this England 'gains.'" Now, if England "gains" because the debts due to her are gold debts does not this prove that her gold debt has become more valuable? What is this but an appreciation of gold in its clearest possible form?

But it is useless to multiply evidences of the selfishness which animates the governing class of the English nation in the course it pursues in this question. The motive which moves her in refusing to join the other nations of the world in this great movement is perfectly clear.

We are brought sharply face to face with the question whether we will follow England humbly in a course which has compelled our people to sell their produce, to use Mr. Giffen's own language, for the last twenty years, "30, 50, or perhaps 100 per cent cheaper than we would have had to," or have we manhood enough to say that we will no more submit to England's injustice in this than we will her aggressions in Venezuela? There is not a shadow of doubt in my mind as to what the people of this country will do. In this connection I beg to call the attention of the Senate to an editorial which appeared in the London Times of September 2 last.

Speaking of Mr. Balfour's statement that personally he was strongly in favor of an international agreement, but that he had no right to pledge his colleagues on the subject, and that he had no reason to think that an international bimetallic agreement would at that moment be the result of an international conference—in speaking of the United States and Germany, that paper uses this language:

Their natural hope was that, in view of the prominent place which Mr. Balfour holds in the present Government, some steps would be taken to bring about the meeting they wished for. It has been a cruel disappointment to them to learn that nothing of the kind is to be done and that they have no choice but to acquiesce in the indefinite postponement of their favorite project. Germany, it appears, is the more submissive of the two countries. Its bimetallists recognize that without help from England no effective international agreement can be arrived at, and they feel compelled accordingly to fold their hands and to wait for more propitious times. In the United States bimetallists are made of sterner stuff. With or without England they will keep on agitating and will not be frightened from their course if they are forced to act alone; but it is less probable than ever that they will be able to carry their countrymen with them.

This editorial is remarkable in several ways. The insolence of its tone is the most offensive feature of it. There is nothing remarkable in its not understanding that the bimetallists in this country are the people, for the reason that it gets its information from the Eastern American press, and the intensity of the feeling of the people at large upon this question is as utterly unknown in New York as it is in London or Cape Town.

There is, however, one grain of truth in all this chaff. The bimetallists of this country are made of "sterner stuff" than to sit down and wait "submissively" until England graciously grants them permission to act.

When it is clear that England will not consent to an international agreement, and that France and Germany will not move except in company with England, then the question comes home to us, what will the people of the United States do? When they see that our people are suffering these great wrongs and that they will certainly become more and more aggravated as the years go by, what will we do? With no chance in sight for international bimetallism, can the United States, acting alone, undertake this great work with a reasonable hope of success? A tremendous responsibility in this emergency, in my opinion, rests upon us as a nation. We are the only people holding the good of the masses generally to be above all other considerations. We are the only nation who believe that the object of organizing governments is to advance the interests and welfare of the masses. That the complete reestablishment of bimetallism would greatly benefit and advance the masses, would tend to check and to strangle the startling aggregations of wealth into a few hands which are now taking place, there can be no doubt. If other nations will not join us in this great movement in the interest of humanity, it is our duty to undertake it alone. Where the right is clear, obstacles should not be allowed to deter us from doing our duty. We have encountered and overcome greater difficulties in the past, and I believe that the high destiny that was marked out for us by Providence requires us to act now with decision, and to assume fully the great responsibility of leadership among the nations of the earth. It is impossible for me to undertake at this time a full discussion of the question of our ability to accomplish this alone, but a few of the points which seem to me to be conclusive that we can do so may be briefly stated.

From 1803 to 1873 France, practically alone, maintained bimetallism. How she, in maintaining bimetallism for herself maintained it for the whole world, in spite of England's adverse action, is strongly stated by Hon. Daniel Manning, in his report for 1886, as follows:

What Great Britain did by the act of 1816 was to close, then and thereafter, her mints to the free coinage of silver into full legal-tender money, leaving them open for the free coinage of gold alone into full legal-tender money.

In fact, Great Britain's monetary standard, then as before and thereafter, which measured and scored all commodity prices for herself and the trading nations of both hemispheres, consisted of all the gold and silver of the world. Its prevalence was in this wise: one nation or more gave free coinage to silver alone into full legal-tender money, another nation or more gave free coinage to gold alone into full legal-tender money, another coined both metals into full legal-tender money, and fixing the different weights of the two metals which should have the same debt-paying and purchasing power, kept in use so large coined stocks of both as to make her ratio prevalent.

Gold, therefore, had in its proportion as much paying power wherever silver alone had free coinage as where both were coined. Silver, therefore, had in its proportion as much purchasing power where gold alone had free coinage as where both were coined. The two metals were thus joined practically in a universal money, and the general range of prices which it measured was identical, other things being equal, in Great Britain and elsewhere. In other words, the silver coinage which England shirked in 1816 was elsewhere done; the free coinage at a fixed ratio into full legal-tender money, which she had previously proffered, both to all the gold and all the silver anywhere mined or melted, was elsewhere actively maintained for sixty years. She neither had a different standard nor a single gold standard; she was merely a factor in the general equilibrium of monometallic coinage, which France, by a bimetallic coinage, had power to keep stable. The dependence of Great Britain was absolute at the time her independence was most vaunted.

On another page of the same report Manning gives what he calls the essential monetary conditions which existed at that time:

The essential conditions of that old monetary order in their last analysis seem to be these:

"1. Mints open to the public for the free coinage of gold.
"2. Mints open to the public for the free coinage of silver.
"3. Coined gold a full legal tender.
"4. Coined silver a full legal tender.
"5. Mints open to the public for the free coinage of silver and of gold.
"6 Rated equivalence of both metals in such coinage, fixed by States powerful enough to make and keep it prevalent."

Every one of these six conditions will be complete upon the passage of this bill except the one question as to whether we are powerful enough to make the "rated equivalence" we might adopt "prevalent." France did this before. Can we do it now?

In the June number of the North American Review the great English statistician, Mulhall, said:

If we take a survey of mankind in ancient or modern times as regards the physical, mechanical, and intellectual force of nations, we find nothing to compare with the United States in this present year of 1895. At the same time we see that the wealth of the American people surpasses that of any other nation, past or present.

He states the energy or our working power to compare with that of France as 129,306 to 34,580, our producing capacity as 475 to 115, and he says that the "merchandise transported by rail in the United States is shown by official returns to be double the amount of the land carriage (at least by rail) of all the other nations of the earth collectively." We are known to be the largest consumers of the necessaries as well as the luxuries of life on the earth, and of course our internal commerce as well as our external commerce must be enormously large. We have 41,000,000 of instructed citizens, and spend a hundred and fifty-six millions on schools, against thirty-one millions in France. As France successfully maintained a "rated equivalence" at 15½ to 1 for seventy years, may we not reasonably anticipate that if we should declare in favor of bimetallism that we could easily accomplish our purpose; that we are powerful enough to keep the ratio of 16 to 1 prevalent—a lower rate than that of France?

The advantages to be derived by us from bimetallism are well stated by Wharton Barker, of Philadelphia, in the American of November 9 last, as follows:

By restoring bimetallism, expanding the basis of our currency instead of contracting the superstructure of credit money to the narrow gold basis, we can keep gold and silver in circulation side by side. The gold monometallist believes, or at least feigns to believe, this to be impossible. He says we must

turn the balance of trade much in our favor; that only thus can we keep our gold. We answer, certainly. He says it is only possible to turn the balance of trade sufficiently in our favor by contracting our currency, and thus causing such a fall in prices as to induce foreign buying. We answer, this is not only ruinous but needless. The English trader does not seek our products, because he can buy cheaper in India, Argentina, or Mexico. Raise the price to the Englishman of wheat or cotton bought in India and Mexico, and he will buy from us at prices much higher than those now ruling.

That it is preferable to make a market for our surplus products at higher prices, rather than beg for a market at lower, any gold monometallist, whose feelings are not deadened to the sufferings of our people, must admit. But is this possible? Assuredly it is. The Englishman now buys in India, in Mexico, and other silver-using nations, paying with silver or silver exchange—silver that has remained of stable purchasing power in those countries even since the Western world struck it down. We have simply to raise the price of silver by opening our mints, and the Englishman, no longer finding it possible to buy silver with which to pay for purchases made in silver-using countries at 67 cents an ounce, but forced to pay our mint price, to wit, $1.29, would at once find the cost of buying in silver-using countries doubled, and he would eagerly turn to our markets to buy cotton and wheat, so long as the price was not doubled here.

The advocates of the single gold standard, however, scout every suggestion of this kind, and every proposition to do anything except sell bonds brings from them dire predictions of evil, and we are always assured that if we undertake the coinage of silver that we will inevitably go on a silver basis.

Let us, for the sake of the argument, consider what this amounts to. What does this terrible calamity of a silver basis mean? Let us suppose that it is realized; that the country has actually gone on a silver basis. What then will be the condition, and what may we anticipate in the future? To go on a silver basis seems to mean simply that gold will go to a premium; that thereafter it will be bought and sold as a commodity; that it will not be used as a medium of exchange or as the single standard of value. It means that silver, on the contrary, will be our money, the basis of our currency, and that thereafter only when gold and silver become equal in value shall we have them both as currency. If this should be realized there can be no question that we would then have a money steadier in value than we have now, a money which would be nearer a just standard, a money which would come nearer fulfilling all the conditions of a scientific and an honest standard than the one we now have.

These statements can hardly be denied in view of arguments which have already been presented. Suppose we should open the mints to the unlimited coinage of silver to-day. There certainly would be no premium on gold until it should become more valuable abroad than it is in this country. There would be no premium on gold, and no tendency to ship gold abroad, until it became more valuable abroad than here. That would not be the case until there had been either a fall in prices abroad or an advance in prices here.

If falling prices have caused the present condition it would seem that an advance in prices here would at least have a tendency to relieve the people and the country of a part of the burden which has been entailed upon them by the decline in prices. That a rise in prices would benefit the people there can be no denying, and if gold goes abroad simply because of the improved condition of the people, the sooner it goes the better, and I imagine that nobody would object to its going upon that condition. The owners of gold have not brought it to this country from motives of benevolence, nor will they send it away as a matter of disgust or spite. It goes now, and it will go then, wherever it will pay the holder the largest profit. I would be glad to see our own people protected from the iniquitous exactions which it has levied on mankind for the last twenty years, and if we can free them from it, I hope to see it done. If it can find more profitable investments abroad, where it can unjustly and without right absorb the wealth of other people, let it do so. Our people will at least be freed from its extortionate greed.

The difficulty of exchange between gold-using and silver-using countries is so great that commerce between England and such countries has been denounced as gambling, and not commerce. This has caused the most intense feeling among certain classes in England, and commissions have been appointed to investigate it. The effect upon commerce in a silver-using country trading with a gold-using country may be illustrated by the following extract from the North American Review, by Mr. Romero, the Mexican minister at this capital, as follows:

The advantages to Mexico of the silver basis are the following:

"The silver standard and currency encourages very materially, while other leading commercial nations have the single gold standard, the increase of exports of domestic products, because the expenses of producing them, wages, rents, taxes, etc., are paid for in silver and therefore their cost as compared with their market value is considerably less than that of similar articles produced or raised in single gold standard countries. When sold in gold markets, therefore, they bring very lucrative prices, as they are converted into silver at a high rate of exchange. These conditions have caused a great development in the exportation of some of our agricultural products, because they yield a very large profit. For instance, coffee, which costs to produce, all expenses included, on an average of not over 10 cents a pound, is sold at about 20 cents in gold in foreign markets.

"The exportation of other agricultural products which did not pay when gold and silver were at par—that is, at the ratio of 1 to 16—is now remunerative, because there is a return to us in exchange more than we lose in the gold price of the article. Such is the case, for instance, with beans, which at 8 cents would not pay when silver and gold were at par, but now 8 cents in gold makes nearly 16 cents in silver, and that is a lucrative price. Our exports for several years up to 1869 were about $20,000,000 a year. In the year 1872–73 they amounted to $31,594,005.14; in 1888–89 they were swelled to $60,158,423.02; in 1891–92 to $75,467,114.95; and in 1892–93 to $87,509,207. The silver standard is a great stimulus in developing home manufactures, because foreign commodities have to be paid in gold, and, owing to the high rate of exchange, their price becomes so high that it pays well to manufacture some of them at home, our low wages also helping to bring about these results."

Ate no to the same paper, on page 707, is as follows:

The following remarks, contained in a paper read at a recent session of the Royal Colonial Institute at London by the Hon. T. H. Whitehead, of Hongkong, China, which deals with the effects of the depreciation in the value of silver on the trade of Great Britain with the Orient, confirms my statement about the great stimulus that the low price of silver is to manufacturing in silver-using countries:

"In oriental countries we are witnessing remarkable industrial progress and unequaled prosperity among their people, when simultaneously serious losses are attending similar industries in England; while under the present system it is highly probable that there will be a further fall in the present very low level of gold prices, which will still more prejudice the position of the British manufactures. What is also of unquestionable great concern in the Empire is that it may lead to the transference of a large part of our principal industries to silver-using countries. So long as the gold value of silver continues to be, as it is now, liable to violent fluctuations, the more perilous must become the conditions of the principal British industries and the more possible must it be to prevent disaster from overtaking them. British labor and gold capital can no longer compete on equal terms with Asiatic labor and silver capital, and the position of British industries is growing more critical every day."

Summing up, on page 710 Mr. Romero says:

In consequence of all these causes we have fewer business failures than other countries; our internal traffic has greatly increased, with much benefit to our railroads, which, with only one exception, have not gone into the hands of receivers.

We do not suffer in Mexico from one of the principal causes of the present financial distress in other countries, the low price of agricultural products. In fact, in some cases the price of domestic commodities has gone up considerably, when it is fixed by the value of the commodity in gold markets. This is the case with coffee, for instance. As the largest portion of our crop is exported and commands cash, its price is fixed by its value in gold markets, and in consequence of this its price in Mexico has been almost doubled, with great advantage to the producers.

We have more stability of prices, wages, rents, etc. Although our wages are low, there has been in recent years a marked tendency to their increase. Our factories are not only in operation but they are being greatly extended, and new plants and industries are being established. Instead of dismissing our laborers we find occupation for them all, and we need to import them for the work to be done in some localities, and as our laborers find occupation and increased wages we have no strikes. Our silver mines have not stopped work, and we find them yet quite profitable. We have more ready money with which to transact our increased business. We offer greater inducements to foreign investors than formerly, and the country is undoubtedly more prosperous than it has ever been, although the silver standard is not the only cause of our prosperity. One of its principal causes is, undoubtedly, the building of railroads, but they could not have been so remunerative without the production and coinage of silver.

The great development in India of cotton manufacturing while silver had unlimited coinage, and the severe check it received when her mints were closed by Great Britain, is well understood. The tremendous impetus given to all industrial development in Japan as a result in a great measure of the closing of the Indian mints is familiar to us all, and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] only a few days ago called attention to the apprehension felt by our manufacturers lest a competition ruinous to them should be set up by Japan.

England's great wealth is the result of her commerce, and perhaps her most profitable customers are the silver-using countries. How her trade with these nations is handicapped we see forcibly set out by Mr. Romero in what has just been quoted. These drawbacks greatly embarrass British merchants in their dealings, and they would gladly rid themselves of them; but other interests in great Britain, the bankers, for instance, in London, intent upon their own gains, by reason of the increase in the value of gold, are unwilling to heed the complaints of the merchants about the difficulties they are compelled to endure. It would seem to be clear, then, that the hope of both bankers and merchants is that all of their formidable rivals may be so blind to their own financial interests as to follow the lead of England in her policy of ruin to the bees to benefit the drones. As long as we continue to do this the London bankers can continue to harvest their unearned profits, gained from the increased value of gold, and the merchants can be quieted with the assurance that we have nc advantage of them in dealing with other nations, but are embarrassed by the same difficulties in our dealings with those people which embarrass them. The producers of the United States, especially our manufacturers, must begin to widen their foreign markets. It is natural that our neighbors should trade with us, but commerce can not be diverted from old channels easily. An inducement must always be offered to accomplish such a result.

The manufactories of Great Britain have been long established, are thoroughly equipped with expert labor long trained to its avocation. To compete successfully with these for a trade already their own is not an easy matter. If we were free of the embarrassments of exchange, it seems clear that we would have a great advantage of any country hampered by them, and that this would easily give us the trade of such nations.

In a pamphlet by Mr. C. J. Hillyer, The Silver Basis, I find the following quotation, taken from the London Financial News,

which would seem to indicate that some of the English appreciate the situation to some extent:

There can be no doubt about it, that if the United States were to adopt a silver basis to-morrow British trade would be ruined before the year was out. Every American industry would be protected, not only at home, but in every other market. Of course the States would suffer to a certain extent through having to pay their obligations abroad in gold, but the loss on exchange under this head would be a mere drop in the bucket compared with the profits to be reaped from the markets of South America and Asia, to say nothing of Europe. The marvel is that the United States has not long ago seized the opportunity, and but for the belief that the way of England is necessarily the way to commercial success and prosperity, undoubtedly it would have been done long ago.

It has been a little more than twelve months since the President, having already issued a hundred millions of bonds, declared in his message that he would continue to issue bonds "whenever and as often as it became necessary to maintain a sufficient gold reserve." I had at the time no sort of doubt that the President would continue to issue bonds, and this has proved correct. Those bonds bore 5 per cent interest. Some time after the message, knowing that there was no other hope of getting free coinage of silver during this Administration, while I was opposed to the issue of bonds, and so stated at the time, I offered a bill which proposed not to enlarge the power which the President already asserted and was exercising of issuing bonds, but to authorize the issue of bonds at a lower rate of interest, from 5 to 3 per cent, and at the same time to provide for the unlimited coinage of silver; for a substitution of silver certificates, payable expressly in silver alone, for greenbacks which the Government has for twenty years persisted in paying in gold alone, guarding at the same time carefully against any reduction in the volume of currency while the substitution was taking place, and also providing for the retirement of national-bank notes under $10, thus giving the whole field of paper money under $10 to silver certificates.

I believed then, as I believe now, that the unlimited coinage of silver would by reviving commerce, increase our revenues, and do away absolutely with any pretense of a necessity to issue bonds, and that under that bill such a revival in business would take place that no issue of bonds could be claimed to be necessary. And any man who believes that under that bill, if it had been enacted into law, any considerable amount of bonds could have been issued has much less faith in the efficacy of unlimited coinage than I have. I stated when I offered the bill to the Senate that I was opposed to the issue of bonds. The President had insisted that the issue of bonds was our only hope. I believed that the unlimited coinage of silver was the only hope. The President was at that time exercising, and has continued to do so, the right to issue bonds anyway, and the bill introduced by me would have put the test whether absolute relief would not come from the coinage of silver. I have no doubt now that if that bill had passed there would have been no more bonds, and we certainly would have had the unlimited coinage of silver. This was a fair offer to test our different theories, and the advocates of gold dared not accept it. This seems conclusive to my mind that they agreed with me that that bill would, by demonstrating the soundness of our position, have absolutely destroyed theirs. They rejected the bill, and what is the result? Bond sales continue, and we are no nearer a solution of the question and no nearer silver coinage now than before.

This leaves nothing for us to do but to present the system we believe in, without reference to theirs, to discuss it, and appeal at last to that great tribunal which must decide it. I am ready for the question.

The overwhelming majority of the people are animated by sentiments of lofty and unselfish patriotism. I have an abiding confidence that the great question which this proposed amendment presents for solution will be wisely and justly determined by the great tribunal by which it must be finally determined.

It is to my mind an evidence almost conclusive of the weakness of any cause for its friends to be unwilling to have it passed on by the people. To say that they are incapable of deciding any question they are interested in, as is sometimes done as to this question, is to declare them incapable of self-government. A man who believes this has no place in this country and ought to find more congenial associations in the realms of those who believe in absolutism. The friends of bimetallism are ready and anxious to have the people settle this question. They hope and believe it will be speedily done, and well done.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to inquire of the Senator who has the pending bill in charge as to what degree of speed he proposes to make, and about what time will be afforded for the discussion of the question? I know several Senators who desire to speak upon the bill, who are perhaps not ready to do so now, who would like to be informed on the points I have suggested.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. So far as I am personally concerned, I propose to defer to the wishes of the friends of the bill in a great measure. While I shall be glad to have the bill pressed as rapidly as possible and passed at the earliest day that will suit the convenience of the Senate, at the same time I have no desire to cut off any Senator on either side of the Chamber who wishes to discuss the bill. I suppose I may say, in view of the fact that I have been assured by a number of Senators that they wish to speak upon the bill and are not ready now to do so, that I shall not for several days yet, at least, ask for a vote upon the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. If there is no Senator who expects to speak on Monday upon the opposite side of this question, I will take the floor now on this bill, with the expectation, of course, that the Senate is ready to adjourn at this time.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 13, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 10, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PRINTING AND BINDING FOR COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS.

Mr. PICKLER. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Invalid Pensions be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with the subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. DOCKERY. I simply wish to inquire whether this is the usual resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is in the usual form.

Mr. PICKLER. It is an entirely usual resolution.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the resolution; and it was adopted.

ORDER FOR EVENING SESSION VACATED.

Mr. PICKLER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for this evening's session be vacated.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

PRINTING AND BINDING FOR THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and hereby is, authorized to have printed and bound such documents and papers for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish to inquire whether this privilege has been extended in former Congresses to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. HENDERSON. I believe it has uniformly been done; and I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] that the bankruptcy bills and other important matters coming before the committee make it necessary to have this printing and binding done.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If it has been done heretofore, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and adopted.

ADMINISTRATION OF MEDICAL DIVISION, PENSION BUREAU.

Mr. TAWNEY asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution of inquiry, which was read, directing the Secretary of the Interior to furnish information in reference to the allegation that the medical division of the Bureau of Pensions fails to properly regard the reports and findings made by the boards of pension examining surgeons.

Mr. CRISP and Mr. MCCLELLAN objected.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Mr. WILLIS. I ask unanimous consent to have read, printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs the resolution which I send to the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Delaware asks unanimous consent for the reading and printing in the RECORD of a resolution, which he also desires to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Is there objection?

Mr. DOCKERY. I suggest that when these requests are made to print in the RECORD the resolution should first be read, in or-

der that an intelligent judgment may be reached as to the propriety of printing.

Mr. WILLIS. This resolution is very short.

The SPEAKER. The question is on printing the resolution in the RECORD and referring it to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, instead of referring it under the rules of the House. The request requires unanimous consent.

Mr. CRISP. I object.

Mr. WILLIS. I ask to have the resolution read and referred.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

BONDS AS NATIONAL-BANK RESERVE.

Mr. ODELL. I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ODELL] desires to present a resolution. The Chair will state that all such resolutions can be referred under the rules. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that it be read out of order. Is there objection to the reading?

Mr. CRISP. We do not know what the resolution is.

Mr. McMILLIN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I believe that under the ruling heretofore made by the Chair, the reading of a resolution for information does not entitle it to be placed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. It does not.

Mr. CRISP. Then I do not object.

The resolution of Mr. ODELL, directing the Committee on Banking and Currency to report legislation empowering national banking associations to invest not exceeding 50 per cent of their lawful reserve in bonds of the United States to be hereafter issued under the acts of June 14, 1875, and May 31, 1878, was read.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I object.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On December 21, 1895:

An act (H. R. 2173) making an appropriation for the expenses of a commission to investigate and report on the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana.

On December 27, 1895:

An act (H. R. 803) to amend section 2601 of the Revised Statutes, relative to ports of entry; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 27) ratifying the use of the appropriation for materials and miscellaneous expenses for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the fiscal year 1896 for the purchase of articles provided for in the appropriation for the miscellaneous expenses of the Treasury Department, and authorizing the continued use of the same for the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1896.

On January 4, 1896:

An act (H. R. 2264) fixing the times for holding the circuit and district courts of the northern district of Iowa and of the southern district of Iowa; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 56) to transfer certain offices of the United States in the Territory of Utah to the officers of the State of Utah.

On January 6, 1896:

An act (H. R. 2720) to make Palm Beach, Fla., a subport of entry.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 732) to regulate the issue and recording of the commissions of officers in several of the Departments;

A bill (S. 697) for the reconstruction of the United States custom-house and post-office building at St. Albans, Vt., destroyed by fire May 19, 1895; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 23) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to use a portion of the appropriation for new iron roof for foundry at navy-yard, Washington, D. C., in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," for repairs to the walls of said foundry.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed of the annual report of the Commissioner of Railroads for the year 1895, 1,500 extra copies, in paper covers, with appendixes, for the use of the Commissioner of Railroads.

THE RULES.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a report from the Committee on Rules, which I send to the desk.

In this connection I would like to say, for the information of the House, that the committee wishes, if agreeable to the House, to take up and dispose of the amendments recommended by the Committee on Rules first, and we ask for unanimous consent that the understanding be had that the Speaker shall call all of the rules in their order afterwards so that any member may have an opportunity to offer amendments and have them considered. That, I think, will be agreeable to both sides.

Mr. CRISP. The proposition is, as I understand, to dispose of the amendments of the committee first?

Mr. HENDERSON. That is the request.

Mr. CRISP. And after that the rules are to be considered as read through, and amendments may be offered to any of them?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that it would be better, perhaps, for the Speaker to call for amendments to each section of the rules, and if any gentleman desires to offer an amendment, that particular section will be read; if not, the Chair will proceed to call the next section, and so on.

Mr. CRISP. That will answer my purpose; and I have no objection to the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. McMILLIN. I would ask the gentleman from Iowa whether, under the arrangement he proposes, we would be required to complete the sections that are amended in the report of the Committee on Rules before proceeding to the body of the rules, or whether we would have authority to recur to these sections afterwards, for the purpose of offering amendments, under the plan suggested by himself?

Mr. HENDERSON. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that my proposition was first that the amendments should be considered on the report of the Committee on Rules, and disposed of, as well as the rules touched by them, after which the Speaker, under the agreement, would ask if there was any amendment to be offered to the other rules, as they are reached in their order. That will give full opportunity to the House to touch every one of the rules, and determine what amendments may be necessary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the proposed arrangement?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the first amendment proposed by the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives be amended as follows:

Add to section 3 of Rule III the following:

"He shall pay to the officers and employees of the House of Representatives, the last day of each month, the amount of their salaries that shall be due them; and when the last day of the month falls on Sunday, he shall pay them on the day next preceding."

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to say a word in explanation. Under the rules of the Fifty-second Congress, as well as in the Fifty-third Congress, express direction was given to the Clerk of the House to pay the salaries of the officers and employees of the House, and we have only in this report adopted the same rule. Under the rules of the Fifty-first Congress there was no provision directing the Clerk of the House to pay the officers and employees their salaries, although, as I say, it was embodied in the rules of the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the committee. I propose to insert in the third line of the amendment, after the words "due them," the words "excepting the month of December, when they shall be paid on the 20th day of the month." It will be remembered that during each Congress the time of the House is occupied with a lengthy discussion as to the propriety of paying the employees of the House their salaries on the 20th day of the month, before the usual Christmas holidays.

Mr. MILES. Let me ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. Suppose the day you propose in your amendment falls on Sunday, what provision do you make then for the execution of the order?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I think the law already provides for that, but I propose, in the event of the adoption of this amendment, to offer another one, that is, in the fourth line to strike out and insert, so it will read "and when the pay day falls on Sunday, he shall pay them on the day next preceding." In order to save the time of the House, I offer that amendment now.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman allow one suggestion in opposition to the amendment before he proceeds?

Mr. HENDERSON. I would ask to have the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts read from the desk.

The SPEAKER. The first amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the words "due them" the words "excepting the month of December, when they shall be paid on the 20th day of that month."

Mr. CRISP. Before my friend from Massachusetts proceeds, will he allow me to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question, and

that is, where the Clerk of the House gets authority, or how the rules of the House can give him authority, to pay any salaries whatever?

Mr. HENDERSON. There is no power that I know of, excepting that in the appropriation bills.

Mr. CRISP. But this is a rule of the House. It says that he shall pay the officers and employees of the House of Representatives on the last day of each month the amount of salaries that shall be due them. Now, how can the House, by a rule, determine what the law fixes? I ask the gentleman if he is satisfied that we have the authority to adopt such a provision at all?

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the money is appropriated for this purpose in the legislative bill. A part of the duty of the Clerk of the House is to see that these salaries are paid. By time-honored usage the Clerk has always paid them, and the rules of the Fifty-second Congress, as well as the Fifty-third, reported by the gentleman from Georgia himself, from the Committee on Rules, when he was Speaker of the House, contained the exact language the committee has adopted in this rule.

Mr. CRISP. Does this refer to the clerks of members? I only ask the gentleman for information, because I do not know.

Mr. HENDERSON. It refers to the officers and employees of the House, directing him to pay to the officers and employees of the House their salaries, as he has done time out of mind, and as was required by the rules of the last two Congresses.

Mr. CRISP. If the gentleman is satisfied, I have no objection to it. I only desired to ask for the authority for it. That is all.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is merely to carry out the provisions of the law in detail.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will include in the amendment——

Mr. HENDERSON. Now, I shall be glad to hear the reasons which the gentleman from Massachusetts gives for his amendment, if he will state them again.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. The reason for my amendment is that in each Congress, just before the holidays, the House is detained quite a little time in order to have an explanation of the reasons for and to pass a resolution providing for payment of the employees before the holidays. If this amendment is put in, the Clerk will pay them on the 20th of each December, and just before the holidays. My amendment would include striking out, in the third line, the word "last," and putting in the word "pay," and also striking out the words "of the month," in the fourth line. Then it will read:

And when the pay day falls on Sunday he shall pay them on the day next preceding.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] that the amendment he offers is in harmony with the custom which has prevailed; but whenever there is a change in the political complexion of this body, a change of control, the amendment operates to some extent to duplicate compensation. The resolution agreed to by the House providing for the payment of employees on the 20th of December last operated to compensate two sets of employees for the same service. The outgoing employees were all paid for the entire month on the 20th of December. A great many of the annual clerks were sworn into office immediately after that date. Under the law, or at least in equity, they may be entitled to compensation for the remaining days of December. It will probably be found also that a number of employees were dismissed immediately after the 20th, and their successors will be entitled to compensation for the additional days in that month. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] will concede that when the organization of the House changes his amendment will operate as it did in December last—to give double compensation for the same service.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the only answer to that is that my motion is in harmony with the action of this House for years, and will not change the custom one iota, excepting that it will save the time of this House two or three hours every December.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman is entirely accurate in his statement; but I desire to say that I am already advised that a deficiency appropriation will be asked to compensate the annual clerks and other employees who were sworn into office immediately after the 20th of December last. What amount will be carried by that deficiency I do not know; but the incoming clerks seemingly have an equitable claim upon Congress for compensation for services rendered prior to the 1st of January.

Mr. LOUD. Is it not a fact that we have more time than anything else at the beginning of the session?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Let me say that it is undoubtedly true that the rule is to get all you can, and keep all you get; but the reason for my amendment is not affected one iota by what the gentleman has said.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it is safer to leave the rule as we have quoted it. We may sometimes want to continue in session throughout the entire month of December. In addition to the suggestions of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] this adopts a uniform rule, while, if any special occasion comes up, the House can probably meet it by a resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment of Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment proposed by the committee was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there any other amendment to be proposed to this rule?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, are we proceeding in that way, that as soon as the amendment of the committee is disposed of, to a particular rule, the Speaker will then make the inquiry which he has just made?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will make inquiry with regard to the rules which are amended by the committee. The Chair understood the arrangement to be that those rules were to be finally disposed of.

Mr. CRISP. That is entirely satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. If there is no other amendment to be proposed to this rule, the Chair will cause the next amendment of the committee to be read.

The next amendment reported from the committee was as follows:

In Rule IV, strike out section 3:

"3. He shall give bond to the United States, with sureties to be approved by the Speaker, in the sum of $50,000, for the faithful disbursement of all moneys intrusted to him by virtue of his office and the proper discharge of the duties thereof, and no member of Congress shall be approved as such surety."

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment is to strike that provision out, because we have a law which requires the Sergeant-at-Arms to give bond to the United States. It is otherwise provided for, in the provision made by reason of the Silcott defalcation; and, therefore, it is not needed; and in this we follow the last two Congresses.

Mr. MILES. May I ask the gentleman whether that bond to the United States protects members of this House?

Mr. HENDERSON. Absolutely. It was the purpose of the law. That is why he was made an officer of the United States instead of the agent of the House.

The amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there any other amendment to that rule?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding the following:

"It shall be the further duty of the Sergeant-at-Arms to deduct from the salary of Members of the House and Delegates for absence from the House during its sessions, except when caused by illness, as required by the provisions of section 40 of the Revised Statutes of the United States."

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to detain the House upon this proposition, but merely submit it to the judgment of the House. As those who were members of the last House, when we, now a minority, were the majority, know, we compelled the making of such deductions from the salaries of members on account of absence not occasioned by the sickness of the member or sickness in his family. This was thought to be and is in accordance with the provisions of existing statute law. The result was twofold. In one respect the tendency——

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, we can not hear a single word.

The SPEAKER. The House must be in order. It is impossible to hear. Conversation must cease, and gentlemen must take their seats.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the result from this provision of the law, in its application in the last House, was twofold, and it would be so here again. First, better and more prompt attendance of members would be secured, tending to lessen the length of the session. Next, in deducting for absence not occasioned by the sickness of the member himself or of some member of his family, there would be a considerable saving to the Treasury, in that a member would not be paid as if he did attend to his duties here, when, in fact, he was attending to his private business elsewhere, or amusing himself somewhere outside of the precincts of this House. I do not care, as I said before, to detain the House. I propose simply to submit the matter in order that this House may determine whether it will, in this particular, do what the last House did, thereby insuring to the House a better attendance of its members, and saving to the Treasury thousands of dollars, by refusing to pay members for what they choose not to do—for neglect of duty as well as for performance of duty.

I have nothing further to say, beyond asking that the law upon the subject be read.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I wish to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he means to state that the enforcement of this rule in the last Congress did result in securing better attendance, and does he think it was enforced?

Mr. DE ARMOND. That is my judgment and was my observation.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I wish to ask the gentleman if he has consulted the RECORD to see the number of people who were absent, sick, necessarily absent, during the enforcement of that rule? [Laughter.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. I have not done that.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I think if the gentleman will do so, he would reach the conclusion that all that the enforcement of that rule ever did was simply to add to the sick list of this House. [Laughter.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. I understand, then, Mr. Speaker, that the only objection suggested by my friend from Pennsylvania is that the health of the members of this House would perhaps be better when they are paid for being healthy than when they are not. I simply submit the proposition to the House.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The gentleman certainly does not claim that the enforcement of this rule in the last Congress has resulted in securing a larger attendance in this Congress on his side of the House. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, one moment. I desire, as before stated, to have read the section of the law, section 40, which I ask to have incorporated in the rule and enforced in this Republican House as we enforced it in the last Democratic House.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 40. The Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House, respectively, shall deduct from the monthly payment of each Member or Delegate the amount of his salary for each day that he has been absent from the Senate or House, respectively, unless said Member or Delegate assigns as a reason for such absence the sickness of himself or some member of his family

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to say that the law already covers this matter in full.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I would like to have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

The question was taken on ordering the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Thirty-nine gentlemen have risen in support of the demand and 182 in the negative—not a sufficient number.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I would like to have tellers on ordering the yeas and nays.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is too late, after the demand for the yeas and nays, to demand tellers.

Mr. BAILEY. I would suggest——

The SPEAKER. It is in order. The Chair understands the gentleman to demand the yeas and nays on ordering tellers. [After counting.] Thirty-five gentlemen have risen—not a sufficient number; tellers are refused; the yeas and nays are refused, and the amendment is rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to section 57, Rule XI, the following:

"It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules, and, pending the consideration thereof, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of."

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment and of the one in the next paragraph will be, first, to enable the Committee on Rules to sit during the sessions of the House and to report at any time; and second, to cut off dilatory motions with the exception of one, and bring the House to a vote after one dilatory motion. For the further information of the House, I will state that this is in accordance with the rules of the last two Congresses.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest an amendment to this amendment, which is to insert, after the word "other," in the fifth line of the proposed amendment, the words "motion to adjourn or any"; so that the clause will read: "But after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other motion to adjourn or any dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of." What I object to in the amendment as proposed is that it characterizes every motion to adjourn as a dilatory motion. Now, a motion to adjourn is not necessarily a dilatory motion. It may be, or it may not be. If made for the purpose of delaying proceedings, it is a dilatory motion, but if made in good faith and for proper purposes it is not a dilatory motion according to the dictionary definition of the word. The amendment which I propose does not change the meaning or purport of the rule as reported from the committee, but simply gets rid of the idea that every motion to adjourn is necessarily a dilatory motion.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am not authorized to accept amendments, but I see no objection to the one proposed by the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], which will be read.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 5 of proposed amendment to section 57 of Rule XI, after the word "other," insert the following: "Motion to adjourn or any"; so that the clause will read: "But after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other motion to adjourn or any dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of."

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, as I understood the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], and as I see from a comparison of the amendment proposed by the committee with a copy of the Rules of the Fifty-third Congress, this provision is taken from the Rules of the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses.

Now, if I recollect aright, gentlemen on that side of the House exercised themselves very violently when this rule was proposed. It was said to be the method by which the Democratic majority proposed to "gag the minority," and gentlemen on that side were very urgent and earnest in their opposition to this Democratic method of "gagging the minority." I am in favor of this rule. I was then, and I am now; and I want to congratulate the Speaker and that side of the House on the fact that they have at last risen to the position where they can accept the Democratic rules as the proper rules for the government of this House. [Laughter.] I want to extend my congratulations to them all. You have wandered about a long time, gentlemen, in your endeavor to get sensible rules that would facilitate the proper conduct of business in the House, and at last you have wisely decided to adopt this Democratic rule which worked well for two Congresses, and which, if administered in a spirit of justice and fairness, will still work well, and, I repeat, I want to extend to you my congratulations. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The congratulatory feeling would naturally be mutual. [Laughter.] The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] to the fact that the language which the gentleman from New York is now proposing to correct has been in the rules for a great many years. This particular language is not new at all; it was not new when adopted in the Fifty-second Congress. If he will look at the rules of the Fifty-first Congress, under "Motion to suspend the rules," he will find the same language.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia will find it in the eighth section of Rule XVI.

Mr. CRISP. Yes, I have found it. Now, I wish to call attention to the fact that this language was adopted in the Forty-seventh Congress as a part of the rule which reads:

Pending a motion to suspend the rules the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn, but after the result thereof is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the vote is taken on the suspension.

This particular expression was copied from that old rule into the rules of the Fifty-first, Fifty-second, and Fifty-third Congresses, because it was deemed prudent to retain language which had been in the rules prior to that time and had been repeatedly construed by the presiding officers.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. RAY, it was rejected.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I see that Rule XI, as proposed in this report, names ten committees to which it proposes to give the right to report at any time. I observe that for some reason the Committee on Banking and Currency has been taken out of the list of committees thus entitled, although it was embraced in the list in the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses. As the Committee on Rules has reported in favor of giving the right to report at any time to the Committee on Public Lands, the Committee on Territories, the Committee on Invalid Pensions, etc.—ten committees in all—I should like to know whether the committee has any decided objection to treating the Committee on Banking and Currency with the same liberality which has been extended to it heretofore, and whether the Committee on Rules would not be pleased to include our committee in the number of those that may report at any time. I should like to ask the reason for excluding the Committee on Banking and Currency when it was included in this privilege in the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses. I suppose it was omitted by mistake.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, is any amendment offered?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I move to amend by inserting after the words "Rivers and Harbors," the words "the Committee on Banking and Currency, bills relating to banking and currency." These are the same words which were embraced in the rules of the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this is no change by our com-

mittee. The rule as we report it is just as it was in this particular in the Fifty-first Congress. It seems to me that in the rule as we report it we have given to enough committees this power of reporting at any time, unless we are going to open the door and let in many other committees. When it is borne in mind that the Committee on Rules will in this Congress, as in the last two Congresses, have the right to shape the order of business so that if there is before any committee any important measure which the House may want to consider, a special rule for its consideration can undoubtedly be obtained, it seems to me that we should open the door far wider than we ought if we should allow any additional committees to report at any time, because the House must remember that the right to report at any time carries with it the right to have the measure considered at any time.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I am inclined to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] whether what he has said is not equally true of more than half of the ten committees named in this report. The Committee on Banking and Currency having been included in this privilege for several Congresses, there must be some special reason why it is proposed to exclude that committee from it in this Congress. In asking that the Committee on Banking and Currency be included, I am not making any new proposition. I am simply asking that the rule of past Congresses be continued. The Committee on Rules, in proposing to take our committee out of this list, must have some reason for it; and I hope the gentleman from Iowa will either withdraw his opposition to my amendment or state to the House frankly that reason.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] by adding the words, "the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, bills relating to coinage." The effect of this amendment is to give the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures a right to report at any time. I desire to say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] that I concur in what has been said by the gentleman from Massachusetts as to the importance of these two committees. I take it that the gentleman from Iowa himself will not deny the statement that there are not two committees of this House more important than the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures; and their importance is especially emphasized at this time in view of the necessity of some legislation on these subjects. If there be a committee of the House that ought to be privileged to report at any time, the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures should have that right.

I desire the new members of the House to understand that without an amendment of this kind it will be utterly impossible for this House to consider either a banking measure or a measure affecting our coinage system without the special favor of the Committee on Rules. Inasmuch as both these committees enjoyed this privilege in the Fifty-third Congress, it seems to me nothing but right that it should be accorded to them in this Congress.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] to the origin of this rule. If those gentlemen will investigate they will find that in the beginning there were only two classes of committees that were privileged to report at any time. One class was constituted of committees that had to deal with the business of the Government—the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations. The other class was constituted of those committees that had to deal with the business of the House, and whose right to report at any time was an absolute necessity to the orderly methods of business in the House—the Committee on Accounts and the Committee on Enrolled Bills. Still another committee privileged necessarily on account of its constitutional character was the Committee on Elections.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that instead of going in advance of the stage already reached we ought to go in the other direction. There is absolutely no necessity for extending the list of privileged committees, in view of the fact that the business of this House as administered under existing methods admits of any important legislation being brought before the House at any time by a report of the Committee on Rules. If the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures are to be added to this list, there is no reason why the Committee on the Judiciary should not be added; there is no reason why the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should not be added; and so we might go on and open the door, adding to the number of privileged committees, until the time of the House might be exhausted in the consideration of business not of absolutely essential importance. I trust the House will see the propriety of abiding by the ancient landmarks as they have been established.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, "going back to ancient landmarks" is good as coming from the Committee on Rules, with a report favoring ten committees and giving them this important right and throwing out two. They have simply taken this Committee on Banking and Currency to the door and kicked it out. That is all. [Laughter.]

Now, I wish the gentleman from Iowa would oblige this House by giving his reasons why this committee should be excepted from the privilege accorded to the other committees. They have put into the rules "the Committee on Territories," and I would like to ask him why that committee should have an advantage over the Committee on Banking and Currency. Why should the Committee on the Public Lands have this privilege rather than the Banking and Currency Committee? Why should the Committee on Invalid Pensions have the privilege? Do you gentlemen assume that these committees are of more importance, that the business they have intrusted to them is of more consequence to the people of this country than the right settlement of great questions which are necessarily under the rules considered in the Committee on Banking and Currency? And before the gentleman from Iowa answers my question I want to ask him if there is a single committee in the House to which the country is looking for wise action with more interest than to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and, further, I hope the gentleman will tell us if, in his judgment, there is a committee in this House from which matters can possibly come under existing circumstances or which can report to this House measures of more importance to the people of the United States than the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Further, I hope the gentleman from Iowa will tell us if there is any possible relief for the present financial situation in this country except from legislation that may be matured by that committee—legislation that will relieve the Treasury of the United States from the constant drain by redemption in gold of every dollar of paper money in this country, and at the same time let him tell us if, in his judgment, such relief can possibly come from before any other committee than that on Banking and Currency. I ask the gentleman again why the Committee on Rules has seen proper to take this important committee from the list, while at the same time it includes in its amendment committees having matters of relatively little importance to the people of this country. That is all I desire to say at present.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to indorse what my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] has said, and also what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] has stated in reference to the importance of the business intrusted to the Committee on Banking and Currency and on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. The fact is that both of these important committees, which have jurisdiction of the currency and the coinage questions, should have the right to report at any time and to have the reports considered when made, if the majority intend to legislate upon these questions.

It will be utterly impossible without this amendment to obtain the consideration of any such bills, no matter how important, reported by these committees without a special order from the Committee on Rules. To illustrate: A bill to repeal the banking law, increase the currency, or to provide additional coinage of gold or silver, or both, is introduced and referred to one or the other of these two committees, is considered by the committee, and a favorable report made to the House.

Under the rule proposed here by the Committee on Rules that bill, when the report is made, will be referred to the Calendar of the House, and unless it could be reached in the regular manner, which is not at all probable, it can never be considered unless the Committee on Rules see fit to take it from the Calendar by special order and give it precedence over other matters. So, it is evident, if left to the majority of the Committee on Rules, it can, if it so desires, suppress and prevent the House from considering any of these questions upon which we ought to legislate. In view of the condition of the country, in view of the urgent necessity for a change of our banking system and coinage laws, it is, I think, of the utmost importance to give these committees the privilege asked for. The people of the country have demanded repeatedly a change in the present laws, and we should now embody in our rules a provision by which it can be done.

Let no gentleman deceive himself, Mr. Speaker, who votes on this question. If he is for silver, or desires any legislation upon these questions, or wants even consideration, as my friend from Tennessee suggests, he had better vote to amend the rules and secure that right here and now. If by the rejection of this amendment he ties his hands he can not go back to his constituents and tell them that he did not consent to be so tied. If you want the right to vote upon these questions, vote for the amendments. If you want no legislation, then vote against it and for the committee report.

Mr. KYLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have something to say on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER].

The proposition presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts brings up a subject in which our country is almost universally interested at the present time, and that is the subject of some

reform in our monetary system. I take it that the reason why the other committees mentioned in the rules are given the right of way is because of the importance of the legislation passing through their hands, and that in view of that importance they are given the right to report at any time. That right is extended to the Committee on Ways and Means, under the rules, because it is the great committee through whose hands must pass all measures for the support of the Government. The same is true of the Committee on Appropriations, and without going on to enumerate other committees, the same reason—the importance of the subject—obtains in reference to all. Then, if, as I take it to be, that is the reason why this right of way is given—if it is the importance of the subject-matters intrusted to the committees—I ask any gentleman here in all candor and fairness and earnestness and sincerity why is it that that great committee which is in charge of the most important matter now agitating the minds of the people of this country is left out and excluded from the privilege of calling up its bills the same as other committees that have the right of way? Why not omit some of the others of less importance?

Why, Mr. Speaker, the Administration and the Treasury are engaged in selling bonds to get money to keep up the gold reserve, and thereby maintain the credit of our Government. The question of the revision of our financial system must come before the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Committee on Banking and Currency has to deal with this subject, to a certain extent, and bring in measures regulating our banking system. If the vexed questions now before the country relating to our currency matters are settled by the present Congress, the bill must come through this committee. So that, in view of the importance of the question, this great committee, instead of being "kicked out of the House," as the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, ought to be permitted to retain the place that it has occupied heretofore in reference to business before this body. Mr. Speaker, the money question should be met in an open and manly way, and not dodged in the manner indicated by the amendment proposed by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. PAYNE. If this amendment is adopted, it simply makes all the business of the House special business, to come in at any time. The House goes far enough when it provides that appropriation bills and bills from the Ways and Means Committee to raise revenue and questions of the right of members to their seats shall have special right of way. The rule as it is reported by the committee goes further than it ought to go. It gives too much business a special right of way. Now, if we add these two committees, there is no reason why we should not add half a dozen others, and so we take away all the special privileges.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I asked the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] the question, and I now will ask the gentleman from New York, and will see if he has the courage to answer me: Why should the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the Committee on Public Lands, the Committee on Territories, and the Committee on Pensions have this right, while the Committee on Banking and Currency is shut out?

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] will yield to me for a moment, I will answer my friend from Massachusetts as to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PAYNE. Very well.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the gentleman will read the rules of the Fifty-first Congress he will find that we have not disturbed this rule in this particular at all. We had it in the Fifty-first Congress. He will see that the powers of the Committee on Public Lands are limited. That committee can not report generally on anything it pleases at different times, but the Public Lands Committee can report on what?

Bills for the forfeiture of land grants to railroads and other corporations—

Is not the gentleman willing to give them that right, in the interest of the people?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Certainly I am.

Mr. HENDERSON (reading)—

bills preventing speculation in the public lands, and bills for the preservation of the public lands for the benefit of actual and bona fide settlers.

It was seriously considered by the committee to take away this privilege from the Committee on Public Lands, because we have been going so far; but when we analyzed this and found that the committee had limited powers, for a great and sacred purpose of the people, the power being in this House to bring about the forfeiture of public lands and to protect bona fide settlers on the public lands, we left this power undisturbed. I have answered the question of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], and I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE.]

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I only want to say another word. I agree with the gentleman who has just spoken, that it would have been fully as well if the Committee on Rules had taken away this privilege from the Committee on Public Lands. As I understand it, all of the railroad land grants have been forfeited that anybody desires to forfeit at this time; but if you extend these privileges to cover so much more business of the House, and ultimately to cover all the business of the House, then you simply go into the question of consideration on every report and every bill that comes before the House, and we fritter away hours and days in going through roll calls to determine whether some measure from the gentleman's Committee on Banking and Currency, or some measure from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, or some measure from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or a dozen or fifteen other committees, shall have precedence in the House. It is a great deal better to leave these things just as they are, and let these few committees have the precedence. There is fighting and squabbling enough, then, to take precedence, by raising the question of consideration, and time enough frittered away, without extending this privilege.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, just a moment, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], and in reply to the other suggestions that we are endeavoring to unduly extend this privilege. If the gentleman will examine the rule of the Fifty-third Congress he will find that the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], and the amendment which I submit to his amendment, if agreed to, would make the rule precisely what it was in the Fifty-third Congress. So far from trying to extend the privilege, we are simply protesting against that privilege being narrowed, and we ask the Fifty-fourth Congress to accord no further or other privileges than were accorded by the Fifty-third Congress. The gentleman confuses the issue when he asks the House to believe that we are trying to enlarge the list so as to include all of the important business. We simply ask to make it as large in this Congress as it was in the Fifty-third Congress.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] has several times repeated the question, what is the reason for taking away from the Committee on Banking and Currency the privilege enjoyed by it in previous Congresses of making its reports and having its proposed legislation considered at any time?

That question is fair and simple. It deserves a frank and fair answer. Surely the gentlemen of the committee by whose votes the change was made can, if they will, give to the House the reasons which influenced them to make the change.

We have all been looking anxiously but vainly to those gentlemen who ought to be in a position to answer—to explain their departure in displacing this committee and the related Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. We have not received a satisfactory answer, and I think it may fairly be said that the answer made by gentlemen representing that committee have not evidenced the frankness that we ought to expect from them and from their dignified and responsible committee. Indeed, I think their answers may be fairly said to be evasive. One gentleman answers, "We are trying to preserve ancient landmarks." That clearly was not the reason influencing the Committee on Rules to make this change, because, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] has shown, they are cutting away an ancient landmark instead of preserving one. Another gentleman makes a special plea by selecting the case of the Committee on Public Lands and showing that, although given privilege, that committee in its right to make privileged reports is limited to special and highly important purposes; but he failed to show that the legislation which should come to the House from the Committee on Banking and Currency is less important or is less deserving of special attention. He has failed to show why the privilege was taken away from the Committee on Banking and Currency and left generally and without limitation to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions as to general bills, to the Committee on Territories, and to other committees included in the list. Surely, if the reasons given by gentlemen of the committee for its action in this behalf be the true reasons which influenced them, those reasons would have appealed to them with greater force to take away the privilege of these less important committees.

Now, sir, I think it may as well be stated openly by the Committee on Rules that, looking to what they believe to be the best interests of the Republican party in the next campaign, and for the moment closing their eyes to the best interests of the country, they desire to prevent the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Coinage from forcing any kind of financial legislation upon the attention of this House during the present session of Congress. They are trying to save the Republican party from the dangerous duty of even considering the financial legislation which the country now requires. They are trying to save

their party from the danger of making a record on that question until after the next election. That is the purpose of the Committee on Rules, and it might as well be frankly stated.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], and also the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER]. Certainly of all the subjects to be considered by this House those in charge of those two committees are of vital importance to this country. Those committees were dignified in the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses by being made privileged committees; and it seems to me that the Fifty-fourth Congress can not afford to take a step backward in that line. The statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that the time would be necessary for the Ways and Means Committee, and those others, is not a well-stated proposition, because we are already informed that the Ways and Means Committee have already dumped their grist in the hopper and it has been ground out in the shape of the horizontal tariff bill passed a few days ago. Now, it seems to me that, having done that, and followed it by their bond bill, they have completed their work, and therefore there ought not to be any conflict between the Ways and Means Committee and these two committees. Certainly the question of coinage and the question of the currency of this country ought to be of some importance, and sufficient importance to make them privileged. I hope both amendments will prevail.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent a few minutes ago and do not know exactly what has been said about the proposed amendment.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. We can not hear a word of what is being said.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will try to make the gentleman hear. I am not in harmony with the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I think I have a good reason for objecting to it. The rules provide how business shall be transacted in the House. We have calendars. As the membership of the House increases it is extremely difficult to go to the Calendar and take up and consider the business of the fifty-odd committees of this House. It is desirable that this should be done; that all the time of the House that is not necessarily given to the business that must be done or the Government stop should be, in an orderly way, devoted to the transaction of business under the general rules. Now, then, it is perfectly proper that certain committees should have the right to report at any time, which right carries with it the right of consideration.

The Ways and Means Committee is one, because it is necessary that the revenues should be raised to carry on the Government. The Appropriations Committee is another. These include the Appropriations Committee proper and the various committees that make up appropriation bills when reports are made as to those bills. The Committee on Printing is another, because that goes to the daily transaction of the business of the House. The Committee on Accounts is another. Now, when you have mentioned these committees, I do not now think of any other committee that ought to have the right of way over and above all the other committees, because gentlemen will notice that as you give this special privilege to committees it decreases the power of all the other committees to have their business considered under the general rules of the House.

In addition to the general rules of the House, we conduct much business from time to time under special orders reported from the Committee on Rules. I think it is unfortunate to be compelled to do so, and the only excuse for it is that in a House of the size of this from time to time, surrounded by the exigencies that may at that time exist, the majority of the House sees proper to adopt a special order; and this power is ever present in the House. Now, with this privilege of specified committees to report at any time, with the power to adopt a special order at any time, it seems to me that we ought to allow the general rules to operate. I believe under the rules that we now have, as it is proposed to amend them, if we are industrious, having gotten rid of mere waste of time by dilatory opposition, having at last the power universally conceded (and I am glad that it is universally conceded) to utilize the majority of this House that is present for a quorum either by vote or not—I say that with such amendments to the rules I hope and believe it will be possible to get to the Calendar and give the other fifty committees some chance for a hearing. And, further, I will say again that every privilege you give to special committees decreases the standing and influence of the other committees.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, those members of the House who have become familiar by experience with the method of transacting business here recognize that this is a very important question. In the first place, the House should understand that where a committee is given the right to report at any time that committee has the right to call its measures up for consideration at any time. Now, probably more than 10,000 bills will be introduced into this House; our calendars will be crowded, as they are in every Congress, and the great question to be determined here will be, as it always is, what business shall be considered? If it were possible to consider every bill upon the Calendar, then this would be a wholly unimportant question. If it were possible to consider even the great mass of the bills upon the Calendar, this would not be a question of much moment. But, for the reason that there must necessarily be a very large amount of business undisposed of at the end of each session of Congress, there has grown up the practice of incorporating in the rules a right to certain committees to have business reported by them considered beyond or outside of the general rule regulating the order of business. The Committee on Ways and Means, for example, is allowed to report at any time, which, as I have already said, means that that committee can report a bill and call it up for consideration at any time.

Measures reported from the Committee on Ways and Means are not required to take their turn upon the Calendar. That committee is not required to invoke a special rule from the Committee on Rules, but can itself report such business as it deems proper, and have it considered by the House. Why is that right given to the Ways and Means Committee? It is given to that committee because, in the judgment of the House, revenue bills are matters of very grave importance, and it is proper that the committee having charge of that business should have the right, of its own motion, without conference or consultation with the Committee on Rules, to call up such business whenever, in the judgment of the committee, it is ripe for consideration. The Committee on Appropriations has the same right. Why? Because the business with which it deals is recognized as of great importance, and the House has regarded it as proper that that committee should be taken out of the operation of the general rule and be given a right to present business for the consideration of the House whenever it thinks proper.

Now, the same right has been given to the Committee on Public Lands, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to the Committee on Accounts, and to the Committee on Printing. All those committees have been given this right to report measures and call them up for consideration at any time. During the last Congress so important were questions of banking and currency and coinage considered that leave was given to the respective committees having charge of those great subjects to report at any time, which, I repeat, carried with it the right to call up their business for consideration at any time. That action of the House simply meant that in the opinion of the majority of the members of the last Congress the questions of which those committees had jurisdiction were so important that it was not wise to require the committees to appeal to the Committee on Rules for a special rule whenever they had business to report, but that they should be given the right to report and call up such business whenever, in their judgment, it was ripe for consideration.

The proposition reported now from the Committee on Rules is to degrade these two committees from the high position they occupied in the last Congress—to take from them the right to have considered by the House measures reported by them relating to currency and coinage. Do not deceive yourselves, gentlemen. As you proceed further in the business of this Congress you will ascertain that there is no better graveyard for a proposition reported from a committee not having the right to report at any time than the Calendar of this House. [Laughter.] Your committees may be in constant session and activity. The committee presided over by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] may sit day and night and prepare a bill or bills, and may report those bills to the House and have them put upon the Calendar, but right there progress will stop. Right there those measures will linger and die unless the Committee on Rules can be induced to assign a special time for the consideration of them.

Now, if you adopt the amendment presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], the House itself will have the right to decide whether or no it will proceed with the consideration of business reported from that committee. Gentlemen should understand that no matter how anxious the House may be to consider a subject, no matter though three-fourths of the members may be anxious to consider it, the first step to authorize such consideration is a report from the Committee on Rules. It is not in the power of the House to change the rules or fix the order of business unless the Committee on Rules take the preliminary step to that end. Now, if you adopt this rule reported from the committee, without the amendments presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], you leave it in the power of the Committee on Rules to determine for you whether or no you shall consider the great questions of coinage and currency. On the other hand, if you adopt the amendments proposed, you retain in your own hands the right to determine whether or no you will consider those questions.

If you want to avoid a vote, if you want to dodge these questions, possibly you had better vote to retain the rule as reported from the Committee on Rules; but if you want to have a fair and full discussion of these great questions in the House, if you want

them brought before the House so that each member can express his views and cast his vote upon them, then you ought to vote for the pending amendments. Those amendments deprive you of no right, but simply retain in your hands rights which you ought to have, and which you should not surrender to the Committee on Rules. Many gentlemen who have not had experience in the House do not fully realize the effect of the rule as reported, but I am now giving warning, and I say to them, if you fail to put these amendments in the rule and Congress adjourns without action on currency and coinage and you go home to your constituents and are asked, "What did you do with the currency and coinage questions?" and you reply, "We had no chance to vote upon either," say at the same time that by your own vote on this occasion, in making rules for the government of the House, you, with full knowledge, surrendered all power to the Committee on Rules, and thus deprived yourselves of the right to take any action upon either of those great questions. [Applause.]

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield now to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is simply a question of proper procedure in the transaction of the business of the House, and I regret to see that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], who has just sat down, has descended from the high judicial position which he occupied in the chair in the last Congress, and in descending has appealed to this House as though he were speaking from the stump.

What is the method of procedure in all parliamentary bodies? What are the committees that are entitled in all such bodies to report at any time and thus to have their reports considered immediately by the House to which the report is made? In every parliamentary body in the United States of America, the only committees entitled to report at any time and to have their reports considered immediately when called up are those whose measures relate to raising revenue for the support of the government and appropriations therefor, those having jurisdiction of the rules, those dealing with the right of a member to his seat, and those having jurisdiction of the ordinary and necessary machinery for the transaction of daily business.

There is no State legislature in this country that gives to any committees the right to report at any time except committees that have to do with business that it is vital should be transacted in order that the government may be carried on. We have extended this principle in past years, improperly, as it seems to me, in the House of Representatives. We have extended it to the Committee on Public Lands in certain cases. We have extended it to the Committee on Pensions, purely from sentimental ideas; and we have extended it to one or two other committees. In the last Congress, under precisely such appeals as the gentleman from Georgia has made to us this morning, the House decided to set aside all the ordinary principles of procedure in parliamentary bodies and to extend to the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures the right to report at any time, and to have their business considered.

Now, I appeal to gentlemen of this House, especially to gentlemen on this side of the House, not to be misled by the kind of appeals which have been made here to-day, evidently not regardful of the proprieties of parliamentary procedure, but looking to certain partisan ends. Let us not be misled by such appeals. [Applause on the Republican side.] And let this side of the House understand just what the meaning of these appeals is.

Now, I desire to pass from all those considerations and simply to say to all members of this House that the principles of parliamentary procedure demand that we should not enlarge the list of committees authorized to report at any time beyond the number so authorized in the Fifty-first Congress; and it would be well, if we could, to cut out three committees that were so authorized in the Fifty-first Congress—committees whose business is not necessary to the carrying on of the Government. But the rule, as reported by the Committee on Rules, does not propose to go back and do that. We take this rule just as the Fifty-first Congress left it. And I again appeal to gentlemen, especially on this side of the House, not to be misled by any such appeals as we have had this morning into violating those principles of parliamentary procedure which are necessary for the successful transaction of business in the House of Representatives. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MCMILLIN obtained the floor.

Mr. LOUD rose.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I will yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], who, I understand, wants to put a question to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. LOUD. I wish to ask the gentleman from Maine one question. As I understand, the right, as covered by the rule, to have a bill considered can never bring a bill to a conclusion on the floor of this House unless the Committee on Rules should bring in a rule forcing the measure to a vote.

Mr. DINGLEY. Do you mean to say there may be filibustering to prevent the passage of a bill?

Mr. LOUD. Is it not the fact that a bill may be debated forever, unless the Committee on Rules bring in a rule to force the House to vote?

Mr. DINGLEY. The moving of the previous question cuts off debate, at least until it is voted down.

Mr. LOUD. But is it not a fact that during the last Congress a bill for the free coinage of silver was considered in the House, but never brought to a vote because the Committee on Rules did not bring in a rule to require a vote? The idea I desire to present is this: A measure can not be brought to a vote in this House simply because of a rule giving the committee having it in charge the privilege of reporting it and having it considered.

Mr. DINGLEY. Of course there may be filibustering to prevent a vote on any bill, even if it comes from a privileged committee.

Mr. LOUD. But can you bring a bill to a vote without a special rule?

Mr. DINGLEY. Generally we have no difficulty. Occasionally there is some difficulty when the measure is very strongly opposed.

Mr. LOUD. But can you bring a measure to a vote without a special rule? Without such a rule may it not be debated forever?

Mr. DINGLEY. All ordinary business can be brought to a vote. There may be an occasional instance where it can not be done.

Mr. LOUD. I think the gentleman is evading the question.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] has just admitted that among the committees embraced in the list that it is here proposed to make privileged are some which ought not to be made so. He says that one of those committees was given the privilege on the ground of "pure sentiment." Now, if he can afford, on "pure sentiment," to give one committee this privilege of reporting its measures and having them considered at any time, it seems to me that he might at least have warmed himself up to the point of giving the right to report and consider to the committees whose measures are of the utmost importance to the business of this country.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman allow me one question?

Mr. MCMILLIN. With pleasure.

Mr. CRAIN. Is it not a fact that the question of the coinage ratio was voted upon in the last Congress before any committee was appointed?

Mr. MCMILLIN. Yes, sir; I believe so. There was a vote on one of the silver bills before the committee had organized, I believe. And the votes embraced propositions to coin silver at the present ratio of 16 to 1, and to coin at the ratio of 17 to 1 and 18 to 1. All this was done before the committees were appointed.

Mr. Speaker, there are three classes of business which may be justly said to be of the utmost importance to the American people. First, the question how and how much the people shall be taxed is important. Such questions go to the Ways and Means Committee, and that committee has the right to report at any time. Secondly, what shall be done with the money that is raised by taxation is important. That is referred to the several Committees on Appropriations, and they have leave to report at any time.

Now, if they are important, how transcendently important is that question, Mr. Speaker, which involves the subject of how much money shall exist in this country to pay both taxes and appropriations, and what kind it shall be? I will touch on the merits of the questions to be considered, as the gentleman from Maine has spoken on the question of the importance of the subject. I do not believe that there is a member in this House who is satisfied, in toto, with the currency system of the people of the United States as it exists at this time. If there is any one thing that our recent disturbances have proven beyond all question, it is the fact that our banking system is not sufficient to adjust itself to a sudden panicky emergency which may arise at any time. Shall we have more or less bank circulation? Shall we repeal the 10 per cent tax on State banks?

These great questions are necessarily, under the rules, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and questions affecting our coinage, the weights of our coins, whether we shall coin silver, and kindred questions, are referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. I beg gentlemen to remember a fact which none will deny, that this question of currency and our banking laws has assumed an importance during the last third of a century that it never attained in Congress before in the entire history of this Government, and because of the fact that we have changed, in toto, our banking system. Originally the States dealt with the questions—the States through their legislatures—determined the nature, within certain limits, of the currency which circulated among their people. They chartered banks. These banks issued circulating notes. But this Congress, exercising its authority, not for raising revenue, not for collecting taxes, but as a war measure, to make a place for greenbacks and national-bank notes, imposed a 10 per cent tax on State-bank circulation, and has virtually crushed out all of the rights of the State legis-

latures to deal with the subject or provide currency for their people.

Every power that the Constitution originally attached to a State and the State legislature on this subject has been thus taken from them and transferred here. It was wrong, but it has been done. I know of no question more vital to our people than that which determines what their banking system shall be, what their currency shall consist of, and what character of coin shall circulate among them. This is very vital, Mr. Speaker, when we consider that half a billion in Federal taxes is annually gathered from all parts of this land.

It is well to remember also that we have in actual circulation, outside of our reserves, only between $1,500,000,000 and $1,600,000,000. One-third of that amount is handled by the Federal taxgatherers every year; a half a billion of it goes through the hands of the State, county, and municipal taxgatherers, leaving but about half a billion dollars untouched by our taxgatherers to meet the wants, the commerce, and the activity of our people. And will gentlemen here now deliberately say that a question so great as that, a question so vital and far-reaching in all its ramifications and results, a question that rises in importance second only to that of taxation itself, shall not be considered at the same time and with equal privileges that it permits to the consideration of an appropriation bill of $20,000,000 of money for the improvement of rivers or harbors or $140,000,000 for pensions?

I do not propose to discuss this question from a partisan standpoint. It is a question of such importance to the American people that it should not be dealt with in any such spirit, and so I appeal to you, representatives of the people from all parts of this land, to give some chance to these committees that deal with the currency of the country to enable them to get a hearing on this floor. Give a chance to have the 10 per cent tax on State banks repealed. Give an opportunity to have our silver coined. Enable us to give some relief to a suffering people. For I say to you now that if this permission is not embodied in the rules, if this privilege is not granted to these committees at this time, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures had just as well attempt to swim up the rapids of Niagara as to get their bills considered on this floor after they are reported from the committee. And the same thing is true with reference to measures reported from some other committees. So, gentlemen, you who represent regions of country which are interested in coinage, take note of that fact. You who want to relieve present stringency had better support these amendments.

Sir, it does not follow by any means that the granting of this privilege to these committees will deprive other committees of their privileges. Not at all. That is not a suggestion to be considered now. But you propose to give these other committees a fighting chance on their measures, and yet at the same time you deprive this great Committee on Banking and Currency, and the one on Coinage, of a like privilege. The question then is, will this House give to these committees a reasonable opportunity to deal with the important questions presented to them? For myself, I am now, as I have ever been, for the greatest liberty in dealing with these important public matters, having perfect confidence in the good sense of the American people and their representatives. If freedom of speech, freedom of amendments, freedom of action, and calm deliberation shall be given on this floor, their patriotism may be relied upon to take care of the American Union and of its vast and vital interests.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out of Rule XI, reported from the Committee on Rules, the words "Committee on Rivers and Harbors, bills relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, my substitute is in line with some arguments presented on this floor in regard to the privileged committees. It has been claimed here that only those committees should be privileged under our rules whose bills have reference to the general business interests of the people or to the business of this House. We find among the privileged committees, however, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, whose bills, although privileged, may have reference to some small or unimportant improvement in the remote parts of the country and not of interest at all to the people at large. I believe that the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures and the Committee on Banking and Currency should have this privilege over other committees, such as I have named, in view of the fact that they are dealing with the business interests of the country; they are charged with matters which relate to every individual citizen of these United States; and if they are not entitled to the privilege of reporting at any time, a committee that is in charge of measures that may be entirely unimportant ought not to be accorded that privilege.

Mr. BOATNER. If the gentleman will allow me, I merely want to suggest to him that this amendment about rivers and harbors is entirely unnecessary. That bill generally goes through of its own weight.

Mr. MONDELL. I did not understand the remark of the gentleman.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the substitute proposed by the gentleman who has just spoken, and will support the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER]. In addition to what I have already said, I desire to send to the Clerk's desk some remarks that were delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] when this same proposition was made to amend the rules of the last House. If gentlemen of the majority will hear the reasons given by him at that time they will get an answer to what he has said to-day, and I submit that his words should now be applied to his side of the House as he sought to apply them to this side then. I ask the Clerk to read the paragraph which I have marked.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in sympathy with the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. Springer]. I am in sympathy with it for the reason that now our friends on the other side of the House are not only in power here and in the Senate, but they also have the Presidency, and the responsibility for legislation rests upon them. The time has come when they can no longer fold their hands and say, "No, no." And this is especially true in this matter of the currency.

If justice is to be done to the business interests of the country, to the industrial interests, in fact, to all the interests of the country, the time has come when you gentlemen must either take the financial system that you find and adopt it without amendment, or must take it and amend and improve it; or, if that is not agreeable to your policy, must wipe it out and put some better or worse system upon the statute book. The country demands a policy in this matter of the currency. Therefore, I repeat, I am in harmony with my colleague's amendment. The committee of which he has the honor to be chairman should be given the power to report at any time, that power carrying with it the right to insist upon consideration of the measures reported. I shall vote for the amendment.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. McRAE. In the mutations of politics the majority has become the minority, and the advice that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] gave to us two years ago I now commend to him. I will say, however, in justice to my friend, that notwithstanding he made the speech which has been accredited to him he is recorded as having voted against the amendment, and if he will vote against his own reasoning now as he did then I will not complain. The suggestion that he made as to the importance of the subjects then was so well received as to influence, or at least to aid in influencing, a very large majority of that Congress to adopt the amendment. The country does want the currency and coinage laws of this country reformed. The people have demanded it. They demanded it of the Democrats. We failed and we have received our rebuke. If you fail you will receive yours. Those of you who want coinage and currency legislation should remember that now is your time to protect your right to consideration.

Suppose an amendment to the bond bill passes the Senate and comes back to this House providing for free coinage, and that amendment is smothered in the committee, as the gentleman from Georgia has told you it can be, then do not say that you did not have fair warning. The proposition is a plain and fair one. Let us then come up boldly and squarely and meet this issue courageously. If the House wants to consider these questions, give the committee the right to report what they may mature for consideration.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. COOPER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I submit that what is called the substitute is not in order. It is an entirely independent proposition, relating to a different part of the rule. It does not substitute or dispose of the proposition in the amendment, or the amendment to the amendment. We have two amendments pending, and this is a proposition which, although it is called a substitute, really seeks to strike out an entirely different committee, having no connection with the same subject. I submit that it is out of order.

Mr. BAILEY. The point of order comes too late.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is right, but no point of order was made.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] would more frequently take up some of my old speeches and read them, possibly they might shed more light than his speech made at the present time. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILES. Will my friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON. No, not just now. I am speaking about the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE]. I have examined the extract from the RECORD which the gentleman from Arkansas had read. It seems that during the last Congress, when the President of the United States was Democratic, when this House was Democratic, and the Senate was Democratic, when for twenty years, almost, they had been agonizing before the country for power, promising all things to all men touching the currency and touching the revenues, at last, when they came into full power, my then colleague [Mr. Springer], who always shone in this House

like a beacon in the storm, was at the head of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and desired to have his committee, under those conditions, given leave to report at any time. They were differently situated from what the Republicans are now, and therefore were anxious to try to keep their promises, and appealed for this special power. Out of good feeling to Brother Springer and wanting to see you Democrats in the last Congress run and glorify, I suppose I must have made those remarks. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. But the gentleman did not assign the reason he has just given.

Mr. DINGLEY. And the gentleman voted right.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says I voted right. I shall always be glad if I vote right. I have noticed in my experience at the bar and in legislative bodies that the action is many times better than the talking. I am now of the opinion, with only partial power in Congress, that a Republican House will get better results and do more good legislation by readopting the rule of the Fifty-first Congress touching the orderly consideration of business.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BAILEY. Division. I demand the yeas and nays; it will save the time in taking a division.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 114, nays 181, not voting 61; as follows:

YEAS—114.

Abbott,	Denny,	Maddox,	Sayers,
Aitken,	Dinsmore,	Maguire,	Shafroth,
Allen, Utah	Dockery,	McClellan,	Shaw,
Anderson,	Doolittle,	McClure,	Shuford,
Andrews,	Downing,	McCulloch,	Sparkman,
Bailey,	Ellett, Va.	McDearmon,	Spencer,
Baker, Kans.	Erdman,	McEwan,	Strait,
Baker, N. H.	Fairchild,	McLachlan,	Strode, Nebr.
Bartlett, Ga.	Hainer, Nebr.	McLaurin,	Strowd, N. C.
Bartlett, N. Y.	Hall,	McMillin,	Swanson,
Bell, Colo.	Harrison,	McRae,	Talbert,
Black, Ga.	Hart,	Meredith,	Tarsney,
Boatner,	Hartman,	Meyer,	Tate,
Bowers,	Hendrick,	Miles,	Terry,
Broderick,	Hermann,	Milnes,	Tracewell,
Catchings,	Howard,	Miner, N. Y.	Turner, Ga.
Clardy,	Hutcheson,	Mondell,	Turner, Va.
Clarke, Ala.	Johnson, Cal.	Neill,	Tyler,
Cobb, Ala.	Jones,	Ogden,	Underwood,
Cobb, Mo.	Kem,	Otey,	Walker, Mass.
Cockrell,	Kendall,	Owens,	Walsh,
Connolly,	Kyle,	Patterson,	Washington,
Cooper, Fla.	Latimer,	Pearson,	Williams,
Cowen,	Lawson,	Pendleton,	Wilson, Idaho
Cox,	Lester,	Price,	Wilson, S. C.
Crisp,	Linney,	Richardson,	Woodard,
Crowley,	Little,	Robbins,	Yoakum.
Cummings,	Livingston,	Robertson, La.	
De Armond,	Lockhart,	Russell, Ga.	

NAYS—181.

Adams,	Dingley,	Jenkins,	Ray,
Aldrich,	Dolliver,	Johnson, Ind.	Reeves,
Apsley,	Dovener,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Robinson, Pa.
Arnold, Pa.	Draper,	Joy,	Royse,
Arnold, R. I.	Eddy,	Kerr,	Sauerhering,
Atwood,	Elliott, S. C.	Kiefer,	Shannon,
Avery,	Ellis,	Kirkpatrick,	Sherman,
Babcock,	Faris,	Knox,	Simpkins,
Baker, Md.	Fenton,	Kulp,	Snover,
Barham,	Fischer,	Lacey,	Southard,
Barney,	Fletcher,	Leighty,	Spalding,
Barrett,	Foote,	Leisenring,	Sperry,
Bennett,	Fowler,	Leonard,	Stahle,
Bingham,	Gamble,	Linton,	Steele,
Bishop,	Gardner,	Long,	Stephenson,
Black, N. Y.	Gibson,	Lorimer,	Stewart, N. J.
Blue,	Gillet, N. Y.	Loud,	Stewart, Wis.
Boutelle,	Graff,	Loudenslager,	Stone, C. W.
Brewster,	Griffin,	Mahany,	Stone, W. A.
Bromwell,	Griswold,	McCall, Mass.	Strong,
Brosius,	Grosvenor,	McCall, Tenn.	Sulloway,
Brown,	Grout,	McCleary, Minn.	Taft,
Brumm,	Grow,	Meiklejohn,	Tawney,
Bull,	Hager,	Mercer,	Tayler,
Burrell,	Halterman,	Miller, Kans.	Thomas,
Burton, Mo.	Hanly,	Miller, W. Va.	Towne,
Burton, Ohio	Hardy,	Minor, Wis.	Tracey,
Calderhead,	Harmer,	Moody,	Treloar,
Cannon,	Hatch,	Morse,	Updegraff,
Chickering,	Heatwole,	Mozley,	Van Voorhis,
Clark, Iowa	Hemenway,	Murphy,	Wadsworth,
Clark, Mo.	Henderson,	Noonan,	Walker, Va.
Codding,	Henry, Conn.	Northway,	Wanger,
Coffin,	Henry, Ind.	Odell,	Warner,
Cooke, Ill.	Hepburn,	Otjen,	Watson, Ind.
Cooper, Wis.	Hill,	Overstreet,	Watson, Ohio
Corliss,	Hitt,	Parker,	Wellington,
Cousins,	Hooker,	Payne,	Wilber,
Crain,	Hopkins,	Perkins,	Willis,
Crowther,	Howe,	Phillips,	Wilson, N. Y.
Curtis, Iowa	Howell,	Pickler,	Wilson, Ohio
Curtis, Kans.	Hubbard,	Pitney,	Wood,
Curtis, N. Y.	Hulick,	Poole,	Wright.
Dalzell,	Huling,	Powers,	
Daniels,	Hull,	Prince,	
Dayton,	Hurley,	Pugh,	

NOT VOTING—61.

Acheson,	Evans,	Mahon,	Skinner,
Allen, Miss.	Fitzgerald,	Marsh,	Smith, Ill.
Bankhead,	Foss,	McCormick,	Smith, Mich.
Bartholdt,	Gillett, Mass.	McCreary, Ky.	Sorg,
Beach,	Hadley,	McKenney,	Southwick,
Belknap,	Harris,	Milliken,	Stallings,
Bell, Tex.	Heiner, Pa.	Money,	Stokes,
Berry,	Hicks,	Moses,	Sulzer,
Buck,	Hilborn,	Newlands,	Tucker,
Colson,	Huff,	Quigg,	Wheeler,
Cook, Wis.	Hunter,	Raney,	White,
Cooper, Tex.	Hyde,	Reyburn,	Woodman,
Crump,	Layton,	Rusk,	Woomer.
Culberson,	Lefever,	Russell, Conn.	
Danford,	Lewis,	Scranton,	
De Witt,	Low,	Settle,	

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. HUFF with Mr. MOSES.

Mr. BEACH with Mr. SORG.

Mr. SCRANTON with Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky.

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi.

Mr. SETTLE with Mr. LAYTON.

Mr. LEFEVER with Mr. MCKENNEY.

Mr. WOOMER with Mr. TUCKER.

Mr. HARRIS with Mr. MONEY.

Mr. HICKS with Mr. RUSK.

Mr. FOSS with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. RANEY with Mr. STALLINGS.

On this vote:

Mr. WHITE with Mr. BELL of Texas.

For this day:

Mr. CRUMP with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. REYBURN with Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague [Mr. HYDE] be excused from voting. He has been sick for a week and confined to his room.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that this House has the right to be dealt with with entire frankness by the Committee on Rules, and by the chairmen of the various committees who are included in this right to "report at any time." I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, as I have no right to doubt, their entire frankness of purpose in the remarks they made to this House; but I think, furthermore, that I have the right to say that they have failed to make the impression on this House that they should have made in the remarks they have addressed to it. We are told that this is a matter of procedure. Certainly it is a matter of procedure; but it is a matter of a very peculiar procedure. We are told that only business of vital importance ought to have the right of presentation to this House at any time through the committees charged with such business. Furthermore, we are told that some of the committees included in the list were so included because of sentiment.

Now, I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, and through you ask this House, what there is in the matter of legislation of great and vital importance that needs sudden consideration with reference to matters with which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors are charged, and what sentiment induced the committee to include with the other committees the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in granting it this privilege to report at any time? Will the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], with his peculiar frankness, tell us what feeling of sentiment and what matter of hurry and of vital importance induced him to justify the report of the committee including Rivers and Harbors in this rule and excluding the Committee on Banking and Currency? However constituted, whoever may be members of it, what they have done themselves, and in what they have done heretofore in this House to commend them to this House, it is a striking commentary upon the Speaker of the House in constituting that committee that the Committee on Rules excluded it from its former place.

Again, why do they exclude the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, just constituted by the Speaker, having, it is said, 10 members upon it who agree with the views of the Speaker. Again, as we have given the Committee on Rules absolute power to take any question out of this House before it has had any discussion at all, or at any point in its discussion, what harm can there be in including a committee—or two committees, I may say—that the country is now looking to for most important action and legislation on the subjects now before it. Then, again, I would like to ask of this committee what there is about the business of the Committee on Public Lands that is of such sudden and vital importance that it should have this right, to the exclusion of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and what sentimental consideration induced the Committee on Rules to include the Committee on Public Lands in this rule to the exclusion of the two committees they have taken out of it?

Again, take the Committee on Territories. What, I ask, is the sudden exigency of the business referred to the Committee on Territories, or what sentimental considerations are there which should induce the Committee on Rules to include that committee in its report? Next comes the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Yes; the Committee on Invalid Pensions ought to have precedence, and I am willing that it shall have preference if it is necessary; but, as everyone knows, this House never has hesitated to grant to the Committee on Invalid Pensions a hearing, in season or out of season, and if there is any committee in this House that really does not need the protection of a rule such as this, it is the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, this question: Upon the idea that the committee is not to have the privilege of reporting its measures at any time, what does your committee amount to? [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that I think this House will decide that question, and I am now trying to convince the members of the House that they should decide it properly, and in favor of the motion to include the Banking and Currency Committee to report at any time.

Mr. COX. One word more, Mr. Speaker. I will say to the gentleman that he will never convince this House the way he is going on, and, further, I tell him that his Committee on Banking and Currency is a cipher in this House. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, let me say, in reply to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], that the rules provide what the procedure of this House shall be. Certainly they do, and either all these committees, with the exception of three or four, should be taken out of this rule, or else the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Coinage should be included in it. After the vote is taken upon this amendment I shall therefore move that all these other committees be taken out of this rule except the Committee on Rules, the Committee on Elections, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Enrolled Bills, and the Committee on Printing. If the Committee on Banking and Currency is not to have the same privileges in this House as other committees included in this rule, many of them far inferior to it in importance, then I claim that those committees ought not to be included, for certainly there is no gentleman here who will say that the business with which they have to deal is of more importance than that which is dealt with by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to take more than a moment of the time of the House. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to say that if this rule which is reported from the Committee on Rules should be adopted there can be no question as to one result. That result will be that whatever time the members of the committee may devote to the consideration of measures of legislation will be wasted and their labor will amount to nothing. If this amendment which is offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], our chairman, is adopted we may probably work out some good results, but if the committee is to be set back as indicated by the report of the Committee on Rules, I do not think it is worth the cost or trouble of printing its name in the RECORD. [Laughter.]

The substitute was read, as follows:

Strike out of Rule XI the following words: "The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors."

The substitute was rejected.

The question recurring on the amendment of Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts, it was again read, as follows:

Insert, after the words "rivers and harbors," the words "Committee on Banking and Currency, bills relating to banking and currency."

The question being taken on the amendment, the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 115, nays 159, not voting 82; as follows:

YEAS—115.

Abbott,	Clardy,	Doolittle,	Johnson, Cal.
Allen, Utah	Clarke, Ala.	Downing,	Jones,
Andrews,	Cobb, Ala.	Ellett, Va.	Kem,
Bailey,	Cobb, Mo.	Elliott, S. C.	Kyle,
Baker, Kans.	Cockrell,	Ellis,	Latimer,
Baker, N. H.	Cooper, Fla.	Fairchild,	Lawson,
Bartlett, Ga.	Cooper, Wis.	Erdman,	Lester,
Bartlett, N. Y.	Cowen,	Hainer, Nebr.	Linney,
Bell, Colo.	Cox,	Hall,	Little,
Bell, Tex.	Crain,	Harrison,	Livingston,
Berry,	Crisp,	Hart,	Maddox,
Black, Ga.	Crowley,	Hartman,	Maguire,
Boatner,	De Armond,	Hendrick,	Mahon,
Bowers,	Denny,	Hill,	McClellan,
Brosius,	Dinsmore,	Howard,	McCormick,
Catchings,	Dockery,	Hutcheson,	McCulloch,
McDearmon,	Otey,	Shuford,	Turner, Va.
McEwan,	Owens,	Simpkins,	Tyler,
McLachlan,	Patterson,	Sparkman,	Underwood,
McLaurin,	Pearson,	Spencer,	Van Voorhis,
McMillin,	Pendleton,	Strait,	Walker, Mass.
McRae,	Price,	Strode, Nebr.	Walsh,
Meredith,	Richardson,	Strowd, N. C.	Washington,
Meyer,	Robbins,	Swanson,	Williams,
Miles,	Robertson, La.	Talbert,	Wilson, S. C.
Miner, N. Y.	Russell, Ga.	Tate,	Woodard,
Moody,	Sayers,	Terry,	Wright,
Neill,	Shannon,	Tracewell,	Yoakum.
Ogden,	Shaw,	Turner, Ga.	

NAYS—159.

Adams,	Dolliver,	Joy,	Robinson, Pa.
Aitken,	Draper,	Kerr,	Royse,
Apsley,	Eddy,	Kiefer,	Russell, Conn.
Arnold, Pa.	Faris,	Kirkpatrick,	Sauerhering,
Arnold, R. I.	Fenton,	Knox,	Sherman,
Avery,	Fischer,	Kulp,	Smith, Ill.
Babcock,	Foote,	Lacey,	Smith, Mich.
Baker, Md.	Fowler,	Leighty,	Snover,
Barney,	Gamble,	Leisenring,	Southard,
Barrett,	Gibson,	Leonard,	Spalding,
Bennett,	Gillet, N. Y.	Linton,	Sperry,
Bingham,	Graff,	Long,	Stahle,
Bishop,	Griffin,	Lorimer,	Steele,
Blue,	Griswold,	Loud,	Stephenson,
Brewster,	Grosvenor,	Loudenslager,	Stewart, N. J.
Broderick,	Grow,	Mahany,	Stewart, Wis.
Bromwell,	Hager,	McCall, Tenn.	Stone, C. W.
Brown,	Halterman,	McClure,	Stone, W. A.
Burrell,	Hanly,	Meiklejohn,	Strong,
Burton, Mo.	Hardy,	Mercer,	Sulloway,
Burton, Ohio	Harmer,	Miller, Kans.	Taft,
Calderhead,	Hatch,	Miller, W. Va.	Tawney,
Cannon,	Hemenway,	Minor, Wis.	Tayler,
Chickering,	Henderson,	Morse,	Towne,
Clark, Iowa	Henry, Conn.	Mozley,	Tracey,
Clark, Mo.	Henry, Ind.	Murphy,	Treloar,
Codding,	Hepburn,	Noonan,	Updegraff,
Coffin,	Hitt,	Odell,	Wadsworth,
Cooke, Ill.	Hooker,	Otjen,	Walker, Va.
Corliss,	Hopkins,	Overstreet,	Wanger,
Cousins,	Howe,	Parker,	Warner,
Crowther,	Howell,	Perkins,	Watson, Ind.
Curtis, Iowa	Hubbard,	Pickler,	Watson, Ohio
Curtis, Kans.	Hulick,	Pitney,	Wellington,
Curtis, N. Y.	Huling,	Poole,	Wilber,
Dalzell,	Hull,	Powers,	Willis,
Daniels,	Hurley,	Prince,	Wilson, Ohio
Dayton,	Jenkins,	Pugh,	Wood,
De Witt,	Johnson, Ind.	Ray,	Woodman.
Dingley,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Reeves,	

NOT VOTING—82.

Acheson,	Cummings,	Layton,	Reyburn,
Aldrich,	Danford,	Lefever,	Rusk,
Allen, Miss.	Dovener,	Lewis,	Scranton,
Anderson,	Evans,	Lockhart,	Settle,
Atwood,	Fitzgerald,	Low,	Shafroth,
Bankhead,	Fletcher,	Marsh,	Skinner,
Barham,	Foss,	McCall, Mass.	Sorg,
Bartholdt,	Gardner,	McCleary, Minn.	Southwick,
Beach,	Gillett, Mass.	McCreary, Ky.	Stallings,
Belknap,	Grout,	McKenney,	Stokes,
Black, N. Y.	Hadley,	Milliken,	Sulzer,
Boutelle,	Harris,	Milnes,	Tarsney,
Brumm,	Heatwole,	Mondell,	Thomas,
Buck,	Heiner, Pa.	Money,	Tucker,
Bull,	Hermann,	Moses,	Wheeler,
Colson,	Hicks,	Newlands,	White,
Connolly,	Hilborn,	Northway,	Wilson, Idaho
Cook, Wis.	Huff,	Payne,	Wilson, N. Y.
Cooper, Tex.	Hunter,	Phillips,	Woomer.
Crump,	Hyde,	Quigg,	
Culberson,	Kendall,	Raney,	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PAYNE and Mr. TARSNEY were announced as paired on this vote.

Mr. BARHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during the roll call, but I desire to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House the gentleman can not vote.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. If there is no other amendment to be offered to Rule XI, the Clerk will read the next amendment reported from the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 58 of Rule XI (old section 52) by inserting, after the word "committee," the words "except the Committee on Rules"; so that the section will read as follows:

"58. No committee, except the Committee on Rules, shall sit during the sitting of the House without special leave."

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

In Rule XII, after "Mines and Mining," insert "and two on Territories"; so that the rule shall read:

"RULE XII.

"DELEGATES.

"The Speaker shall appoint from among the Delegates one additional member on each of the following committees, viz: Coinage, Weights, and Measures; Agriculture; Military Affairs; Post-Office and Post-Roads; Public Lands; Indian Affairs; Private Land Claims, and Mines and Mining; and two on Territories; and they shall possess in their respective committees the same powers and privileges as in the House, and may make any motion except to reconsider."

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the effect of that is solely to put two Delegates on the Committee on Territories where under the present rule there is but one.

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of Rule XIV the following: "Neither shall any person be allowed to smoke upon the floor of the House at any time."

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Iowa will explain the full extent to which he intends that amendment to go. I believe I understand it myself, but I think it would be well that he should explain it so that the officers of the House and members may understand just what is contemplated by this amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not hear the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. CATCHINGS. This is an amendment of very great importance and one which I very heartily indorse; but I suggest to my friend from Iowa that he explain to the House the full significance of the amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. I suppose from the manifestation of applause on the part of the House that this provision is thoroughly appreciated. I will state, however, in compliance with my friend's request, the effect of the provision. Under the present rule smoking is prohibited only during the sessions of the House and on the floor of the House—within this Hall. Under the amendment reported from the committee smoking is never to be allowed before or after the sessions in this Hall. It is absolutely prohibited here.

Many MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. HENDERSON. The cloakroom is not a part of the House, as I understand.

The theory of the committee in making this recommendation was briefly this: It is well known that many ladies are compelled to leave the galleries of this House because of the impure air resulting from the practice of smoking. This evil is not averted by discontinuing smoking during the sessions of the House if it goes on upon this floor one, two, or three hours before the gavel falls for the commencement of business. The committee believe that at all times the air of this Legislative Hall should be exempt from the polluting influence of tobacco in this form, so that the American citizen desiring to look down upon Congress from our galleries may do so without suffering the contaminating effects of tobacco smoke. [Applause.]

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that since I have had a seat in this body members have been killed not alone because of the polluting effects of tobacco, but generally because of the impure air in this Hall. I think this provision will be a great step toward the preservation of the health of members of this body. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The question being taken, the amendment proposed by the committee was agreed to. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HEPBURN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Was it the agreement that after the amendments of the committee had been disposed of the other sections of the same rule should be subject to amendment? I have an amendment I desire to offer to clause 1, Rule XIV.

Mr. HENDERSON. As I understand the order of proceeding, we are first to dispose of the committee amendments, after which any amendments may be offered by any member to the pending rule or any section of it.

Mr. HEPBURN. As I understand, there was one amendment of the committee to Rule XIV (in clause 3) which has been agreed to. Now, I desire to offer an amendment to clause 1 of the same rule.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is right.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I will state my amendment. It is to insert after the word "Speaker" the words "and shall be recognized," striking out the words "on being"; so that the clause will read:

When any member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House he shall rise and respectfully address himself to "Mr. Speaker," and shall be recognized, and may address the House from any place on the floor or from the Clerk's desk, and shall confine himself to the question under debate, avoiding personalities.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, Rule XIV, clause 1, is the most important upon which this House will act. I believe the rule as it stands to be wrong; to be grossly violative of the Constitution of the United States; to be a perversion of the power that is vested in the membership of this House by the surrender of it to the Speaker of the House. If there is any one proposition of the Constitution that is well established it is the absolute equality of constituencies and of the representatives of constituencies on this floor. Here each member is the equal of every other member in the contemplation of the Constitution. Here every member has the right of every other member; here every constituency has the same right to be heard at all times and upon all questions through its selected representative. This rule of ours surrenders that right and puts into the hands of the Speaker the power arbitrarily to silence a constituency during the existence of an entire Congress. In other words, my constituents can be heard only when it meets the pleasure of the Speaker that they should be.

In the remarks I now make I am not saying aught to impugn the fairness, or the kindliness, or the sense of justice of the honored gentleman who presides over this House. As the rule is now we throw upon him the great burden and responsibility of recognition. We compel him to choose what members shall speak and what constituencies shall not be heard. I propose by the change I have suggested to relieve him of that responsibility, and to make it his duty to recognize a member who, in respectful attitude, addresses him. Mr. Speaker, the authority does not belong to us as members to surrender this right. Our constituents are clothed by the Constitution with power—the power to be heard, the power to deliver or have delivered their messages to this House, and we as their representatives have no right, in my humble judgment, to deprive them of this power by its surrender.

It has been suggested to me by gentlemen with whom I have discussed this matter that the Speaker can not do the business of the House unless he is intrusted with this power. Why, Mr. Speaker, we are a reasonable people, and, I take it, we will ask no more of the Speaker than we make it possible for him to perform. Besides, allow me to suggest that that expression embodies an idea entirely at war with the true one. This is a deliberative body. Business here is to be done by the people's representatives, and not by the Speaker. I heard it suggested once as coming from the Speaker that there would be no debate upon a certain question, because this was "not a debating school." Ah, Mr. Speaker, there is getting abroad too much of the idea of the schoolmaster in the Speaker's chair. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I believe it is time to call a halt on that, and to relieve the Speaker of this grave responsibility—to make this House again a deliberative body.

Gentlemen suggest that if this change is made in the rules there will be great confusion, as well as great delay. I doubt it. If the right to be heard should be abused, with the ample power already vested in the Committee on Rules how easy it would be to check the abuse. We need not fear that.

I remember trying to call the attention of this House to the matter some time ago—two years ago. Then the suggestion did not meet a response from many men who later on said to me, after they had witnessed the practical workings of the rule—after they had seen a kind and amiable and courteous Speaker, when men were clamoring for recognition, coolly ask, "for what purpose does the gentleman rise," on other occasions refusing to recognize a member until a message could be sent by a page to some derelict member and a suggestion made to such a one that if he sought the floor he would be recognized to the exclusion of those already on the floor and with equal rights to him demanding to be heard; after gentlemen had witnessed spectacles of this kind, after they had seen how little worth were the rights of membership, they said to me that they would have been glad to have an opportunity to adopt such a rule as would relieve the Speaker of this difficulty and put upon him an obligation to recognize that person upon whom his eye first rested.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an innovation. The innovation is on the other side. Up to the Forty-sixth Congress the Speaker of the House of Representatives was required to recognize the member upon whom his eye first rested. Then the rule was changed and the language of the present rule adopted. The words "and on being recognized," have been construed as giving the Speaker the power to refuse recognition on this floor and to thwart the purposes of the Constitution, to defeat the equality of members, and the rights of constituencies, and whatever abuses have sprung from that condition of affairs have grown out of this construction of this rule.

I hold in my hand an admirable authority on parliamentary procedure.

Several MEMBERS. Who is the author?

Mr. HEPBURN. It is by the Hon. THOMAS B. REED. [Applause.] It bears date 1894, a date intermediate between the ending of the Fifty-first Congress and the beginning of the Fifty-fourth, when there was nothing but a record of the scenes in this branch of the lawmaking power to influence in any way the opinions of its writer. He says, on page 157:

In the United States House of Representatives the recognition by the Speaker is never questioned. This is right, for any other course would inevitably lead to confusion. But if a member rises he will, of course, be recognized.

I undertake to say, Mr. Speaker, that the last sentence is a part of the parliamentary law universal everywhere save in this Chamber—everywhere. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, certain gentlemen have suggested opposition to the proposed amendment because of the confusion that would arise if the determination of the Speaker were not final with reference to the question of recognition. But gentlemen must bear in mind that the rule I have suggested does not affect this question at all. I am content that the determination of the Speaker shall be final in that regard. I am not asking that an appeal should be had, although it is true that in that deliberative body from which we have borrowed largely our form of procedure an appeal is per-

mitted from the decision of the speaker with reference to recognitions. I do not ask for that. I think the Speaker should have the power finally to determine, but I think it wise for us to say how he should determine it, or what our prerogatives are on this floor. As the matter now stands, we throw the responsibility solely on him, which in effect enables him to settle this matter as he chooses; that A, B, C, or D shall have a right to the floor; that others shall not have.

Now, the rule, as I would have it, simply requires that when a member of this House, invested with the same rights as every other member, sent here to aid in deliberation, from a constituency that has the same rights as any other constituency, who in a respectful manner rises and addresses himself, "Mr. Speaker," when no one else seeks the floor, and when he is the first to thus address the Speaker, my rule requires that under such circumstances the Speaker shall recognize him. I believe it is right that it ought to be done. [Applause.]

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this is an astounding proposition, and merits the careful consideration of this body. I concede that the power lodged with the presiding officer of this legislative body is a very great power, but I fail to see wherein my colleague points out a remedy. His amendment certainly does not.

Now, let us see what is the underlying principle of this whole question. Carried to its ultimate conclusion, the amendment of my colleague will give the right to each one of the 356 members of this House to be recognized and to be heard on any question.

In the very nature of things every member of this House could not be heard upon every question. Does any member of this House, including my colleague, deny that proposition? If it is not possible for the 356 members to be heard on every question, then on his reasoning we defy the constitutional right of each member. If that curtails our rights and privileges as Representatives, then every rule that takes the right from the individual Representative to be recognized, have a bill read, have it considered, debated, and acted upon at the time, is a violation of his constitutional rights. The creation of committees which meet around these halls and corridors, where bills must first be matured, considered, and reported, is an interference with the member's constitutional rights.

Now, let us look at it from another standpoint. The Speaker, in the exercise of his sound judgment, by an unwritten law of this House, recognizes the members of the committees reporting bills before other members are recognized for debate. A committee brings in a bill of great importance that they have considered in committee for a month, upon which they have heard the arguments of experts, where heads of Departments and bureaus have been before them to give them light and information, and yet agility and a tremendous voice may defeat a single member of that committee from ever being heard upon the bill which they have reported. Does my colleague seriously commend that to the House of Representatives?

Under the unwritten law, pursued by every Speaker, the members of the committee first come here to be heard. They come charged with knowledge that the rest of us have not. It would be a pretty state of parliamentary proceeding if the first fellow who could get his voice and figure before the Speaker could take an hour, and then another take an hour, and this House never have the benefit of the instruction and information which the members of the committee have possessed themselves of by diligence and by days and months of study.

Now, we are told that this was an innovation in the Forty-sixth Congress. This matter is sprung upon me. I have not had the time to give it the investigation which my colleague has given it; but I notice, turning to our rules, on page 501, first session Fifty-third Congress, a report made by Mr. Garfield in the Forty-sixth Congress, in which it is said:

> With the exception of the last clause of Rule CXIII, which was adopted in 1805, these rules have remained unchanged for twenty years.

This is where they brought in the rule on this very subject:

> When any member is about to speak in debate, or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise from his seat and respectfully address himself to "Mr. Speaker."

Mr. Garfield goes on in his report——

Mr. HEPBURN. Have you read all of that rule?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am reading it now. Mr. Garfield goes on in his report:

> In the nature of the case discretion must be lodged with the presiding officer.

Mr. HEPBURN. If my colleage will permit me, did he read the rule?

Mr. HENDERSON. I have read that part of the rule which calls forth the report, and which is given here on this page.

Mr. HEPBURN. And that rule Mr. Garfield approves of, and in that rule we do not find the language which I condemn.

Mr. HENDERSON. He does not quote the whole of it, but he is introducing that subject, as the report will show. This discussion which he gives here will show exactly what his interpretation was of the question. He says:

> In the nature of the case discretion must be lodged with the presiding officer, and no fixed and arbitrary order of recognition can be wisely provided for in advance; and the committee are of the opinion that these rules should not be changed.
>
> The practice of making the list of those who desire to speak on measures before the House or Committee of the Whole is a proper one, to enable the presiding officer to know and remember the wishes of members. As to the order of recognition, he should not be bound to follow the list, but should be free to exercise a wise and just discretion in the interest of full and fair debate.

Where else can you lodge it than in our creature and our head who presides over us?

Then here is what is stated in the rules as the result of the examination:

> In general terms it may be said that, except in cases where the rules expressly fix the rank and order of motions, thus requiring the Chair to entertain a superior in preference to an inferior motion, the uniform practice of the House has been to lodge with the Speaker exclusively the question of recognition, from which there is no appeal.

Now, my colleague says that this was not known until the Forty-sixth Congress. At the second session of the Thirty-second Congress, page 405 of the proceedings of that session, on March 3, 1853—

> Mr. Schermerhorn having been recognized by the Chair, Mr. Henn made the point of order that he was not entitled to the floor, not having risen from his seat at the time he addressed the Chair.

He was not even up.

> The Speaker (Mr. Stuart in the chair) overruled the point of order, on the ground that the rules confer authority upon the Speaker to name the member who is entitled to the floor.

Now, let me suggest some of the difficulties that occur to my mind. A bill is up for consideration, something that interests the entire legislative body. Every man is instantly upon his feet, for, under the amendment of my colleague, it is vigor, supple joints, and loud voice that will have the advantage. We are now invited to adopt a system of confusion and not an orderly system. We are all upon our feet saying "Mr. Speaker." Suppose, as a matter of fact, and it is quite a supposable fact, that a hundred men spring to their feet and say that at once. How is the Speaker to determine? Suppose he does determine in favor of Mr. A, and Mr. B, Mr. C, and Mr. D, and so on down through the alphabet, four times repeated, each contends that he was the first to address the Chair. Are we going to stop in this body and hold a trial as to the matter of precedence and determine who is entitled to recognition? Gentlemen, if you want pandemonium let loose, adopt the amendment. If you want to drive order from this floor, adopt the amendment. I know that sometimes it seems hard that gentlemen can not be recognized. I have suffered from it many a time when I was loaded with information that I thought this House ought to have. [Laughter.] And yet by long experience I have learned that the system of recognizing those specially equipped by committee work was the proper thing. There is not a member here but is a member of some committee. He may at his opening session, as I had at mine, have the misfortune to be on a committee to investigate some Department or other before which nothing ever comes.

I was on the Committee on Banking and Currency. We had nothing special to do at the time. I do not believe I ever got the floor except when through kindness some brother thought he would like to see me try my stepping qualities at the beginning, but as time has rolled by and experience has come, I have seen the wisdom of having those recognized who ought to be heard. But, Mr. Speaker, I will not extend my remarks further on this question, it seems so clear. The experience of every legislative body in the world recognizes this right of the Speaker. The contention is made that the Senate of the United States is an exception. God save this House from that exception! For the right of recognition would tie up the business of this Republic, and it could not be done. But, as I understand it, in nearly every legislative body in the civilized world that power is lodged in the presiding officer.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not done in town meetings. In town meetings, where there are but few and little gatherings, for public purposes, where they are voluntarily thrown together, the other rule ought to be adhered to.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HENDERSON. I will hear my friend from Georgia directly. I never turned him down.

In great conventions of all political parties a wise discretion is exercised by the presiding officer as to who will be recognized.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to ask the gentleman whether he believes it to be proper treatment of a Representative on this floor, who has a constituency of his own, when he rises to address the Chair, when there is no confusion by reason of numbers who rise, that he should be asked, "For what purpose does the gentleman rise"?

Mr. HENDERSON. I certainly do. I think it is the best thing to do; because the party may rise for a purpose that will block and delay the business of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. One more question. Does not his responsibility first rest with his constituency, and should not he be governed by his responsibility to them rather than it should be left to the arbitrary power of the Speaker?

Mr. HENDERSON. But my friend from Georgia must remember that each Representative here has a proud constituency behind him, and what I am contending is that the man with the nimble legs must not be able to get away with the right of the member who is best equipped in the matter under discussion. I am looking out for the chaps who are not fully furnished with legs. But I will not extend my remarks any further.

Mr. BELL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] has brought up this subject. In my opinion is the first thing during this session that indicates a reformation of matters. I belong to a party that casts 1,600,000 votes, and there are seven of us in this Hall. There are three or four more who are entitled to places in this Hall, knocking at the doors of the Election Committees. We have stood here during the last four weeks and pleaded with the Speaker and with the members leading this House for the majority, and not one member of the Populist party has been permitted by them during this session the privilege of addressing the House in his own time. The few moments I obtained heretofore were from Judge CRISP and taken out of his time. As I have before said, we represent a constituency that casts 1,600,000 votes. We had a joint conference with the Populist members of the Senate a few days ago, and it was unanimously agreed that a resolution should be presented to this House and to the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures shall inquire what effect, if any, the divergence between gold and silver has upon commerce in this country.

We came to this House, and I was designated by the joint conference of the Populists in the Senate and House of Representatives to ask the Speaker to request the unanimous consent of the House to allow us to consider this question while we were in absolute idleness.

We had not done a day's work, although we had been drawing our pay for four weeks. We had been meeting and adjourning at the twinkling of the eye of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY]. [Laughter.] I went to the Speaker and said that I would like recognition to ask this House if it would give consent to discuss the important question: What effect, if any, does the divergence between gold and silver have upon commerce? He looked at my resolution and kindly but firmly said: "I should not like to recognize you for this resolution." Now, I want to say for the State of Colorado, represented here by Mr. SHAFROTH as a Republican and by myself as a Populist, that the other day when you brought in your bond bill there were no two Representatives in this House who were more interested in that question, or who represented constituencies more interested in it than our constituencies are, yet I could not get an opportunity to even breathe aloud upon that subject. [Laughter.] It is true that my colleague, by joining a rebellion, did get in for three minutes just before the hammer fell for adjournment; but when he was recognized he was in the attitude of going out of the back door, not expecting it or asking it at that time. [Laughter.]

So far as the committees are concerned, the Populist members of this body have not a single important position on a committee in this House. Their committee assignments signify nothing. We thought that the predecessor of the present Speaker was a little hard on Populists; we thought that, from the fact that the invincible Thomas Watson lived in his State, he did not appreciate Populists; but when we came to compare our committee assignments in the Fifty-third Congress with the treatment that we have had at this session, we are forced to the conclusion that they do not care much about Populists even down in the old State of Maine where they have none but Republicans. [Laughter.]

These rules give control of the House to less than a half dozen men—the five forming a Committee on Rules—the dictates of whom a majority will obediently obey. The rules of this House give the power of the American Congress to a half dozen States. Take the State of Maine, with 600,000 inhabitants, and it has the greatest power of any State in the Union here. I know one county in Colorado that contains more innate wealth than can be found in all of the State of Maine, and this whole State is without recognition in any committee concerning her chief resources under these sacred rules. Maine, with four Representatives, occupies four of the best positions in this House and directs and controls more legislation than all the members of the Western States from Colorado to California, inclusive, and we are told this is in accordance with these sacred rules. Take the State of Iowa—God bless her—she is out West somewhat, but I think she is off the track—take the State of Iowa, with her eleven Representatives, she has, I believe, seven good chairmanships of committees said to be under these just rules, and I suppose just because she is off the track. I do not wonder, therefore, that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] says, "Leave it to the Speaker and to these old-time rules." He is chairman of one of the best committees, he is second on the Committee on Rules, and he can have the floor in season and out of season, while constituencies that have not been recognized upon committees and can not get the Speaker's eye have no recognition in this House.

Now, I repeat what I have already said, that it is time this House was taking another course. I was surprised at the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] resenting comparison with the Senate of the United States. It acknowledges the equality of the States as well as individual rights of members. The day has been when the House of Representatives was the great deliberative body of the American people. The day has been when this was a great deliberative body, but it has degenerated until it has become the body of bosses, the body of tyranny, the body where individualism is swallowed up by a few old war horses who come down here every year to run the American Congress. [Laughter and applause.]

I want to say further, that Colorado did not send me and I do not think sent my colleague [Mr. SHAFROTH]—though I do not pretend to speak for him—here to have her interests represented by Massachusetts, Maine, or by Iowa, although, if all the Representatives from those States had the same qualities as evidenced by the gentleman [Mr. HEPBURN] who addressed the House a short while ago, I would almost be willing to be ruled in that way, because I know he would always love justice and do it wherever it could be done. [Laughter.] The things desired by these leaders are the very things that we do not want. And now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to this House that it has not done, in my opinion, up to this day one creditable thing for the good of the people. [Laughter.] It started in with a sensation sprung by the gentleman from the grand old State of Massachusetts [Mr. BARRETT], who, as his own party papers say, brought a question before this House indirectly which he knew would not be permitted under the rules he helped to fasten on us. He said in substance: "We will do indirectly in this body a thing that the rules will not permit us to do directly."

That gentleman presented an impeachment resolution, which was admitted by his own newspapers and friends to be an odious violation of the spirit of the rules. It was known that it was not an impeachable, though a reprehensible, offense. Then came the war cry that was precipitated upon us by the President's message. Immediately the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], after the war message of the President had been read, attempted to introduce a bill to carry out the suggestions of a Democratic President. He rose and cried out, "Mr. Speaker," but in that case the Speaker was both blind and deaf. [Laughter.] Next morning, however, to our great surprise, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] came in with a bill which he said complied with the request of the President, and then he looked over at this side of the House (referring to Democrats) and said, "Now, gentlemen, I beg of you to let us pass this bill and help the President out"; the fact being that they had adjourned on the day before simply for the purpose of giving Mr. HITT, a Republican, an opportunity of introducing the bill, so as to keep the Democratic side from having the supposed credit of it. [Laughter.] That was all there was in it. It was merely an attempt to go to the country upon that as a piece of petty politics; and while a great majority of the Republican party and a portion of the Democratic party in this House were masquerading under the guise of patriotism, every thinking member knows it was a piece of the cheapest kind of party politics. [Laughter.]

Then another question came up quickly, and in that case I admit that you gentlemen did what the President wanted you to do [referring to Republicans]. After you had joined the President in the war scare, and he had sent in his message for you to further destroy the industries of this country by building up the bonded debt and a gold standard for the money centers of the East and of other countries, you certainly did just what he wanted and asked you to do. You varied it a little in form, but you did in substance just what he asked you to do. You gave him bonds which you said were payable in "coin," but the construction of the Republican party has been the construction of the Speaker of this House and of its other leaders in the last Congress—that "coin" means gold.

Those who supported that measure understood what its effect would be. They intended to retire every greenback and every Treasury note. Although they did not say so, that was the manifest object. There was in the Treasury, as they knew at that time, money enough to pay the expenses of the Government; that from former sales of bonds the Treasury had $170,000,000 in available cash. You well knew that if you got into the Treasury two or three hundred million dollars more the Treasury notes would be laid aside, because not needed, and would be taken out of circulation as they were received and would not be reissued or paid out. If this House wants to maintain its old record—if this House wants again to become a deliberative body, it must go back to first principles, to statesmanship and patriotism.

We, as Populists, as also the new Republican members, have appealed time and again in this House for recognition. The few Populists who are here have permitted you to come in on the Republican and on the Democratic side and pass your bills by unanimous consent. But under your present rules, here are seven members, representing a constituency of over a million and a quarter of voters and over 6,000,000 people, who have had no recognition in this House, who are not even regarded as a part of the minority. To the representatives of this vast constituency are given little positions upon committees that do not deserve to be dignified by the name of committees. They are not given a single position on a good committee anywhere. I speak of this in answer to the argument of the gentleman from Iowa who last spoke. He suggested that we have the right of debate on measures coming from our committees. I want to say to him that the members of the Populist party are on no committees, and the same may be said of new members of the Republican party from the West. Therefore I gladly second the generous effort of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] who first spoke in favor of amending these autocratic and despotic rules.

Mr. HEPBURN. I desire to withdraw the amendment. [Loud laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read the next amendment proposed by the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to Rule XVII the following new section:

"4. Whenever a quorum fails to vote on any question, and a quorum is not present, and objection is made for that cause, there shall be a call of the House, and the Sergeant-at-Arms shall forthwith proceed to bring in absent members, and the yeas and nays on the pending question shall at the same time be considered as ordered. The Clerk shall call the roll, and each member as he answers to his name may vote on the pending question, and, after the roll call is completed, each member arrested shall be brought by the Sergeant-at-Arms before the House, whereupon he shall be noted as present, discharged from arrest, and given an opportunity to vote, and his vote shall be recorded. If those voting on the question and those who are present and decline to vote shall together make a majority of the House, the Speaker shall declare that a quorum is constituted, and the pending question shall be decided as the majority of those voting shall appear. And thereupon further proceedings under the call shall be considered as dispensed with."

Mr. HENDERSON and Mr. WHEELER addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized. The gentleman from Alabama will be heard at the proper time.

Mr. BAILEY. I desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question. In the third line from the last, where this section reads "and the pending question shall be decided as the majority of those voting shall appear," did the committee intend to use the word "voting" or the word "present"?

Mr. HENDERSON. "Voting" was the word intended.

Mr. BAILEY. I very much doubt whether the House has the power to adopt the rule in that form. I think the Supreme Court has decided that to determine a question the vote of a majority of those present is required.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the gentleman will take the whole sentence together, he will find it all right.

Mr. BAILEY. We can decide that in a moment. I will refer to the case.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this section is what is known as "the Tucker rule." The object is to secure a quorum. Many times when a vote is being taken in the House members will get up and leave, so that they neither vote nor can they be noted by any officer of the House as present. This section provides that a member may be brought in by the Sergeant-at-Arms, noted as present, discharged from arrest, and have the privilege of voting, if he should wish to vote, and if not shall be counted as present to constitute a quorum. This provision is in the line of the reform which has been progressing for the conduct of business in this body. When first proposed in the Forty-sixth Congress by Mr. Tucker, of Virginia, the father of the present honored member of that name, this provision was voted down. The present occupant of the Speaker's chair tendered it again, by motion, in the Fifty-third Congress.

With our large majority on this side we do not need a provision of this kind; but that makes it all the more desirable to take it up and incorporate it in the rules of the House at a time when the contention can not be sustained that we do it for any partisan purpose.

Mr. PICKLER. I wish to ask the gentleman a question as to the practical working of this provision. It is here provided that—

The Clerk shall call the roll, and each member as he answers to his name may vote on the pending question, and, after the roll call is completed, each member arrested shall be brought by the Sergeant-at-Arms before the House, whereupon he shall be noted as present, discharged from arrest, and given an opportunity to vote, and his vote shall be recorded. If those voting on the question and those who are present and decline to vote shall together make a majority of the House, the Speaker shall declare that a quorum is constituted, and the pending question shall be decided as the majority of those voting shall appear.

Now, suppose on some occasion when the roll is called there is no quorum present, and the Sergeant-at-Arms, being sent out to arrest members, does not find enough to make a quorum. If we adopt this rule, will it not be impossible under such circumstances for the House to adjourn or to dispense with further proceedings under the call until a quorum has been found?

Mr. HENDERSON. The House could adjourn, or dispense with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. PICKLER. No; it can not, because you are engaged in calling the roll. Now, you know that under the rules you can not interrupt the roll call for any purpose, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. HENDERSON. Under the rule the roll, as the gentleman is aware, is called twice on any proposition. The second roll call is completed, and when it is then developed that there is no quorum present these proceedings are in order; but nothing in this rule prevents an adjournment.

Mr. PICKLER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I do not care to differ with him, of course, but I think he is entirely wrong. This clause provides the time when further proceedings under the call may be dispensed with, that is, after the Sergeant-at-Arms shall have produced a majority of the members upon the floor. The House is kept here until the Sergeant-at-Arms succeeds in getting a majority of the members present, which may take any length of time, from one day to five days. Then, at that time, after he has secured the quorum, the last clause becomes operative, "and thereupon further proceedings under the call shall be considered as dispensed with." Until you reach that point you can not suspend proceedings under the call and can not move to adjourn because you are in the process of a roll call, and as I understand the rule a roll call can not be interrupted to move an adjournment.

It seems to me that the practical effect of this amendment might be to put ourselves at times into a very serious difficulty. We will find ourselves here sometimes, when the matter pending is of no general importance and members will be out, thus running up against a snag when no quorum is present, and the Sergeant-at-Arms will be compelled to go around and try to bring in sufficient members to make a quorum to enable the House to adjourn. Under such circumstances we would be kept here an indefinite time.

Mr. HENDERSON. My friend must not get this provision confused with the other provision for getting a quorum by a call of the House. That is still preserved in the rules. This is only to provide a method of getting a quorum when we come to a vote on a question, and is a convenient way of accomplishing that result. After we have called the roll twice, and we fail to get a quorum, we send the Sergeant-at-Arms or his officers to bring in the absent members. But nothing in the rule prevents an adjournment if it be deemed just; and the only object of this rule is to get a quorum when a vote is being taken on any particular proposition, whatever it may be.

Mr. PICKLER. I think the gentleman is entirely mistaken; but let me go further. Of course, if you could get back to paragraph 2 of this rule, under the circumstances the gentleman suggests, then you could move that all further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. But there is no such provision under this new clause 4 which we propose to adopt. Of course, in construing these rules you could not refer to a general clause, like clause 2, when you have a specific clause, 4, bearing on this particular question. The only way under paragraph 4 to dispense with proceedings under the call is to wait until members come in and get a quorum, and then dispose of the matter at hand and adjourn.

Mr. HENDERSON. If my friend will allow me, this provision, which he says provides for dispensing with further proceedings under the call in this particular proceeding to obtain a quorum, does not interfere with any privilege of moving to adjourn when a quorum is not present.

Mr. PICKLER. I do not agree with the gentleman in his construction of the language.

Mr. WANGER. Will the gentleman from Iowa allow me to ask him a question in this connection? What would be the effect of this provision if the pending question were a motion to suspend the rules? It says the question, whatever it may be, "shall be decided as the majority of those voting shall appear." What effect will this have on the motion to suspend the rules, which require a two-thirds vote under the provisions of another rule?

Mr. HENDERSON. That comes under an entirely different rule. That condition is governed by the general rule affecting motions to suspend the rules.

Mr. PICKLER. There is another question I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Iowa. How will this affect the matter when the Committee of the Whole rises for the want of a quorum?

Mr. DINGLEY. This does not apply to proceedings in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PICKLER. But the Committee of the Whole often has to rise for the want of a quorum. What would be the effect under this rule?

Mr. HENDERSON. But this is a proceeding in the House, not in committee.

Mr. PICKLER. But the rule provides that when a quorum fails to vote "on any question."

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, but that is in the House.

Mr. PICKLER. It does not say so.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. But that is what it means.

Mr. PICKLER. It does not confine it to the House at all.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays could not be ordered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PICKLER. But this provides arbitrarily that the call of the roll shall be had and the yeas and nays entered upon the Journal.

Mr. DINGLEY. But not in Committee of the Whole. That is in the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. Certainly; this is entirely a House proceeding.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, another question. I am not satisfied with the gentleman's answer as to the practical working. There is another question I should like to ask: You have a special order. For instance, an Election Committee is to have four hours' debate, and then a vote. At the end of two hours' debate it is found that the House is without a quorum. The question before the House is whether a certain member shall be seated. You have a special order for four hours' debate. At the end of two hours a quorum is found not to be present, and you go through this process. You bring that question on to a vote in two hours, necessarily, under this rule.

Mr. DALZELL. It does not apply except when a vote is being taken on a question. This does not apply at all to the case where the question of a quorum is raised in any other way than by a vote.

Mr. PICKLER. That does not say so. It may be the construction, but it is a long way from saying anything of that kind.

Mr. DALZELL. The first section says, "Whenever a quorum fails to vote" on any special question. It is made for that special purpose and applies in no other case.

Mr. HENDERSON. The gentleman is confusing it with the other part of this rule.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman, I hope, does not think that there should be a preamble to each rule that "this is a rule to apply to the House, and not to the Committee of the Whole."

Mr. PICKLER. But we have another provision that says that as far as practicable the rules of the House shall apply to proceedings in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DALZELL. This is not practicable, because we have no yeas and nays in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, upon an examination of the case—and it is the celebrated one which adjudged the constitutionality of the rule adopted to ascertain the presence of a quorum—I find the decision to be as I supposed. The court says:

> As appears from the Journal at the time this bill passed the House, there was a majority present, a quorum, and the House was authorized to transact any and all business. It was in a condition to act on the bill if it desired. The other branch of the question is whether, a quorum being present, the bill received a sufficient number of votes. And here the general rule of all parliamentary bodies is that when a quorum is present, the act of a majority of the quorum is the act of the body itself. This has been the rule for all time, except so far as in any given case the terms of the organic act under which the body is assembled have prescribed specific limitations; as, for instance, in those States where the constitution provides that a majority of all the members elected to either house shall be necessary for the passage of any bill. No such limitation is found in the Federal Constitution, and therefore the general law of such bodies obtains.

The court here says, as plainly as words would enable it, that it requires a majority of a quorum to pass a bill. I think it intended to go further even than this. I think it intended to make a distinction between "a quorum," which is a bare majority of this body, and "the quorum," which is any number in attendance greater than a majority. In other words, since the admission of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ALLEN], the membership of this House is 357, and 179 constitute "a quorum," but "the quorum" here on this occasion is not less than 250. Notwithstanding the presence of 250 members, "a quorum" is still 179, but "the quorum" is something like 250.

If the theory of the gentleman from Iowa is correct, 76 members may enact a bill into a law. For instance, if 180 members were to appear, but 30 of them, not being informed upon the question, or for any other reason, should decline to vote, and the vote should be taken as between the other 150, 76 might vote affirmatively and 74 might vote in the negative; and yet, under the proposed rule, the bill would pass, though it received neither a majority of those present nor a majority of a quorum. Or, to put a more extreme case, if 179 members were present and 164 should decline to vote, 8 were to vote aye and 7 nay, 8 votes would pass a bill upon a recorded vote. It seems to me perfectly clear that this conflicts with the doctrine of the Supreme Court in the case of The United States *vs.* Bullin.

Mr. Speaker, I do not exactly recall the facts of that case, but I think I am not mistaken when I say that the Journal of the House shows that upon the passage of the act, the constitutionality of which was questioned, not only did a quorum appear, but that a majority of all those present voted affirmatively. Perhaps there were only 15 or 20 members who were noted as present and not voting.

The court sums up its decision on this branch of the case in these words:

> Summing up this matter, this law is found in the Secretary of State's Office properly authenticated. If we appeal to the Journal of the House we find that a majority of its members were present when the bill passed, a majority creating, by the Constitution, a quorum, with authority to act upon any measure; that the presence of that quorum was determined in accordance with a valid rule theretofore adopted by the House; and that of that quorum a majority voted in favor of the bill. It therefore legally passed the House, and the law as found in the office of the Secretary of State is beyond challenge.

But "that quorum" was formed, as appears from the records of the House, by the gentlemen who voted for the passage of the bill, together with the gentlemen who sat in their seats and refused to vote.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think you will find out that the rule proposed here does not require a quorum.

Mr. BAILEY. It requires only a majority of those voting.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does that decision raise the point?

Mr. BAILEY. It does not. It could not have been raised, because of the state of facts.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then it has no bearing on this question.

Mr. BAILEY. I think it has. It analogizes with this case, and must have a bearing upon it. The court declares positively, in discussing the manner of the passage of the bill the validity of which had been called in question, that a majority of "the quorum" was necessary to pass it, and the majority of "the quorum" means the majority of those who were present, whether their presence was ascertained by their responses on a roll call or by their presence being noted under the direction of the Speaker. That the Supreme Court had the distinction in their minds between "a quorum" and "the quorum" I think the decision itself leaves no room to doubt.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas hold that it is necessary that 89 persons at least should vote for every proposition that passes the House?

Mr. BAILEY. If it is a recorded vote, I do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit to the gentleman from Texas whether there was a recorded vote or not makes no difference, because the Constitution attaches as much importance to the passage of a bill where there is no recorded vote as it does where there is a record.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand that. But where there is no record to show the contrary, the court conclusively presumes that the action of Congress was regular and legal.

The SPEAKER. Then there ought not to be any record of any bill passed without 89 votes.

Mr. BAILEY. If there is, it would not be a valid law.

The SPEAKER. Yet for twenty years, under all administrations, we have seen thousands of them.

Mr. BAILEY. I have seen it frequently during my brief service here, but that does not make it right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair begs the pardon of the gentleman from Texas for interrupting him to make the suggestion that, having examined the matter somewhat carefully at various times, he finds that the court in making that decision perhaps decided that it was within the most extreme contention of the opponents, some people having contended that it is necessary to have a majority of a quorum voting. The court pointed it out in this case; but it was not necessary to discuss that question. They might have decided, had they come to the plain question of the body being constituted of the persons who participated in the presence of the rest of the body they were controlled by their votes, because the rest of the body being present, could have intervened and overruled them if they had so chosen; but, not having chosen to do so, it allowed 88 or any less number to pass a measure practically by their assent, because declining to participate was consent.

Mr. BAILEY. In reply to that I would say that the only purpose in ascertaining the presence of men who did not participate in the proceedings is to constitute a quorum which will enable the House to proceed with its business; but the capacity of the House to proceed with its business is one thing, and the result which it may reach is quite another. The presence of men who do not vote may enable the House to vote on a bill, but it still requires a majority of those present to pass a bill.

The SPEAKER. If that were the rule the Chair would be obliged to declare not passed every bill that had not received 89 votes.

Mr. BAILEY. I have seen bills passed when nobody had voted either way, but there being no record of a vote, those bills could not be successfully assailed.

I desire to call the attention of the Speaker and of the gentleman from Iowa to the fact that throughout the entire discussion of the question the court everywhere says that a "majority of the

quorum" is required. It first asserts that the House may constitute a quorum by ascertaining the presence of gentlemen who do not participate in its vote; that after their presence has been ascertained under the rule established by the House, then, the House being competent to transact its business, the next question arising is: Did the House lawfully transact its business? Did the bill pass? Now, whether it passed or not depended in the case at bar upon the question whether it had received the votes of a majority. A majority of whom? A majority of those voting or a majority of those present? The Supreme Court distinctly answers, "A majority of the quorum," and I am confident that "the quorum" is the membership of the House then attending its session. I can not believe that the Supreme Court use "the quorum" instead of "a quorum" without a purpose, because that tribunal usually chooses its language with reference to the subject under consideration and with great care.

But, Mr. Speaker, even if I am mistaken in supposing that the court intended to distinguish between "a quorum" and "the quorum," and even if it did not intend to declare that "a majority of those present" must vote in favor of a bill before it can pass, the proposed rule would still be obnoxious; because it is certain that the court has declared that "a majority of a quorum" is required to pass a bill, and this rule permits a majority of those voting to decide the question whether that majority constitutes a majority of a quorum or not. On this point the court's language is neither obscure nor doubtful. It plainly asserts that a majority of the quorum must vote affirmatively before a bill can pass, and it cites with approval no less than four decisions to the same effect. To my mind it is clear that the court would hold a law invalid which did not receive a majority of the votes present; and I do not see how, in the face of the opinion in The United States *vs.* Bullin, any man can doubt that the court would hold a law invalid that did not receive at least a majority of a quorum.

I am willing to venture whatever reputation I may have as a lawyer upon the statement that the Supreme Court will hold any law void which the Journals of this House show was passed by the votes of less than a majority of those present; and I will surrender my law license if that court ever sustains a law which the Journals of this House show did not receive a majority of a quorum.

I submit to the gentleman from Iowa that, at best, the rule is one of doubtful power, and why encounter that doubt when it can be obviated by eliminating the three words "of those voting," or by substituting the word "present" for the word "voting"?

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, by the Constitution a quorum of this body to do business consists of a majority of the members chosen. I have been here when the whole House consisted of 179 members, and the records showed that that was the total number chosen to the House of Representatives, and the acts of that Congress were as constitutional as those of any Congress that ever assembled. The same old question comes up here: How do you ascertain when a quorum is present? In the Fifty-first Congress our Democratic friends insisted that there was no way to ascertain that fact but by a viva voce vote of the members themselves, and the question arose whether the sense of sight was not as good evidence of the presence of visible objects as the sense of hearing. The House held that it was, and the present Speaker of this House (who was also Speaker of that House) occupies the proud position of being the only Speaker of the American Congress whose official acts were ever passed upon judicially by the Supreme Court of the United States.

That august tribunal, in a unanimous opinion that the McKinley Act, so called, was constitutional (the only disagreement being as to the reciprocity treaties attached to the bill), decided incidentally that the evidence derived from sight as to visible objects is as good if not better than that from the sense of hearing. But, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic party stood upon the doctrine that you must depend altogether upon the sense of hearing in such cases, and they vociferated loudly about it upon this floor and throughout the country. Now, it is not strange that the Democratic party should be partial to the sense of hearing, because for more than half a century that party has lived on hearsay. [Laughter.] They are unable to refer to anything in the history of our country, any action of the Democratic party that is worthy of commendation, except what took place under Jefferson and Jackson, both of whom have been dead for more than half a century. [Laughter.] The proposition presented to the American people by the Democratic party in Congress in 1861 was that the Congress was paralyzed and powerless to do business unless a majority of all the members who might have been legally elected to that Congress chose to attend and to answer to their names on the roll call. In the Fifty-first Congress they took substantially the same ground—that a member who was actually present could not be counted as part of a quorum to do business unless he chose to answer when called.

The Speaker decided that a member who, sitting on this floor, closes his lips when the rule of the House requires him to open them can be counted as a part of the quorum provided for by the Constitution, which is a majority of the members chosen to the Congress, whether they vote or not. If there were only 5 men voting and 200 men in their seats, a law passed by those 5 votes would be constitutional. Upon that issue a record was made up; it went to the Supreme Court, the record showing that those who were present constituted a quorum. The court decided that in such a case the action of a majority of those present can make a law valid, no matter what the number may be. A minority can not stop the wheels of Government. That has been tried here, and has failed. A minority can not stop the onward march of the legislation of the American people in these their council chambers. It has been settled, and settled forever, that the fact as to whether there are present in their seats a majority of the members chosen is to be ascertained by the sight of the Speaker, and by the Clerk on the call of the roll; and that, the presence of a quorum having been so ascertained, the men who vote in the affirmative, if they are more numerous than those who vote in the negative, carry the measure and enact a valid law. To allow a constitutional quibble to be set up to defeat the will of the American people, and to invalidate the action of their representatives, would be a strange commentary indeed upon republican government.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me advert for a moment to the confusion in which some of our friends seem to have involved themselves in regard to an adjournment in certain cases. Why, sir, the first great principle of parliamentary law—one that lies at the foundation of the whole system—is that a motion to adjourn is in order at any time. And when you adopt such a motion you necessarily leave the business unfinished. That is the case always. You may leave a call of the House unfinished. You may adjourn while your Sergeant-at-Arms is out looking through the country for absentees. What an idea, that five men may be compelled to sit here for two weeks until the Sergeant-at-Arms shall bring in absent members, on the ground that after a call of the House has been ordered, there can be no adjournment until it is finished! A motion to adjourn is always in order. That principle is necessary in a parliamentary body as a principle of self-preservation. It is a law that overrides all other principles of parliamentary law. It can not be destroyed by any arrangement of rules that you may choose to adopt. If it could be, you might tie yourselves up to starvation in these seats until a sufficient number of absent members had been brought in to make a majority of those chosen to seats in this body.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the proposed rule is, in my judgment, subject to but one criticism, and that is that it would make it possible for a measure to be passed by a vote which would not equal a majority of a quorum of the House. The Supreme Court in the case which has been cited decided that as a matter of fact there had been in the case presented a quorum of the House present and that a majority of that quorum had voted affirmatively upon the measure under consideration. No other facts were passed upon by the court. As a legal proposition the court held that that was all that was required for the validity of the law. But the court did not decide, and I do not believe it would ever decide, that any measure can become a law unless it receives the affirmative vote of a majority of a quorum. In the opinion of the court in that case there is nothing to intimate that the court entertained any different view from that which I now express.

I do not agree that the Supreme Court intended to hold that a majority of those who are present must vote for the bill. Although the gentleman from Texas contends that such was the meaning of that decision, I do not think the court intended to go further than to say that if a quorum of the House were present (and by that the court meant a majority), and if more than one-half of that quorum should vote in favor of the bill, that fact would suffice under the Constitution to enact it into law.

But it will be possible under this rule as it is drawn for a measure to become a law by receiving a much smaller vote than that of one-half of a quorum. I do not believe that such a rule is justified by the decision of the Supreme Court or by any fair and just construction of the Constitution. What the court meant to hold, in my opinion, was that when more than one-half of the members of this House are present it is organized for the transaction of business. That (having in mind the facts of the case before the court) this quorum being present for the transaction of business, a bill which receives a majority of the votes of that quorum is properly passed. The court, as I have said, did not go further than that, and I do not believe it ever will. The rule here proposed is subject, therefore, to the objection I have stated. But I do not think it is subject to any other.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, there are more serious objections than one to the amendment which has been proposed by the majority of the Committee on Rules. I realize the importance of this question, because under the rules which we now adopt the

business we may be called upon to do is to be transacted. Hence the importance of the rule is second only to the importance of the questions to be decided under it. I realize, therefore, that to the utmost of our ability we should strive to adopt that code of rules which will most certainly conduce to the full reflection here of the sentiments of those we represent and most efficiently subserve the public good. In doing this we have a chart that has heretofore generally been sufficient to guide the American Congress in its deliberations—the Constitution.

There is one provision of the proposed rule that it strikes me does not observe sufficiently that chart; and then in another clause there is a question of expediency involved, sufficient, I think, to justify us in rejecting the amendment. This is not a new amendment. Substantially the same amendment was proposed in this body some seventeen years ago. The committee constituted to report to the House the new rules, after deliberating on the question during the recess, was composed of the late President of the United States, Mr. Garfield, the late Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, and Mr. BLACKBURN of Kentucky. There might have been other members on the committee, but these I happen to remember, and when they brought in their deliberations this proposition was offered as an amendment. The present Speaker of this House made a speech against it so clear, so pointed, and so conclusive that I think it had not a little to do with the determination of the House not to accept this proposition. I thought then that his argument was conclusive. I believe yet that it was and is. I do not think that this proposition ought to be adopted, and if the House will bear with me I will briefly give my reasons for that conviction.

The Constitution of the United States declares how the yeas and nays of this body shall be ordered. For more than one hundred years there has not been a rule adopted that attempted to abridge or in any manner to enlarge that provision of the Constitution. This rule, in its practical operation, will, in my judgment, necessarily make possible not only a different standard by which to gauge the rights of members of the House to have the yeas and nays recorded, but it changes the constitutional method. The Constitution is so familiar to every member here that it is hardly necessary for me to quote it, but inasmuch as the provision in question is a brief one, I will do so. It provides:

> And the yeas and nays of the members of either House, on any question, shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered upon the Journal.

"One-fifth of those present." This is not simply a proposition to defend a majority against the captious, petulant, or unreasonable demands for record votes, but it is the provision to defend the minority also, and give them the right to have the yeas and nays recorded in order that there may be a record to enable the people to judge of their faithfulness and action.

But let us see whether there is not an entirely different method provided in this rule from that which I have quoted. I read from the proposed rule itself. Bear in mind the provision of the Constitution.

> 4. Whenever a quorum fails to vote on any question, and a quorum is not present, and objection is made for that cause, there shall be a call of the House, and the Sergeant-at-Arms shall forthwith proceed to bring in absent members, and the yeas and nays on the pending question shall at the same time be considered as ordered.

"The yeas and nays shall at the same time be considered as ordered." How? By the rising of one-fifth of the members present and demanding it, as the Constitution requires? No, not at all. All that is necessary in order that the yeas and nays shall be ordered and taken under this rule is that there shall not be a quorum present, that the point of the absence of a quorum shall be suggested, and then by operation of the rule, not of the Constitution, without anyone rising except the man who makes the point of order, the yeas and nays shall be taken. Even the one man making the point of "no quorum" may neither have "desired" nor demanded the yeas and nays; still they are taken—taken when nobody demanded it. It will be seen that this is an entirely different rule and a distinct method of making a record from that provided by the Constitution. So much for the constitutional infraction.

Now, as to the question of the expediency of the rule. Let us see for a moment as to that. Let the House remember in the first place that this is not a proposition to do away with the stringent and harsh provisions of the rules of the Fifty-first Congress. I believed then that these rules were entirely unnecessary, and I still believe so. As vivid as is my memory of that Congress, I may candidly say that I have not seen a Congress assembled that could be more safely trusted with the interests of the people if left unhampered. I realize, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we must have rules. But I also realize that they must be founded, first, on the Constitution, second, on common sense, and third, that members of the House are able to be intrusted with the management of affairs, and keep out of the fire if left alone. [Laughter.]

Further, under all the systems of rules heretofore adopted, when there is the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, a member can only be arrested by a motion for that purpose being put to the House and carried. But under this proposed rule a member is dealt with as though he were a recusant witness or a criminal or a convict. Under this rule—and I challenge contradiction of the assertion—it is not only possible, but it is the duty of the Sergeant-at-Arms, without waiting for an order, without members voting that it shall be done, when the absence of a quorum is ascertained—it is his duty to go out and, without further orders, to arrest and bring in the members. For my own part, while I am not often absent from the House, or try not to be, I do not want any officer of this Government, without any authority from somebody or some authority besides a rule of this House, to order my arrest, to take me into custody, and bring me before the bar of the House as a criminal.

I am loath to believe that when the House considers the seriousness of this question it will thus bind and tie itself. I am slow to believe that the members of this House are willing to admit that day by day they ought to be arrested and brought here without an order from the House made at the time and for the purpose. I do not say without authority, but I do say without considerate authority, and without sufficient authority. The rules control the officers of the House; and when the members read this rule carefully—I will not take the time to reread it—they will see that when a quorum fails to appear and there is a call of the House, not as the old rule provided, but under a new system, it is made the duty of the Sergeant-at-Arms to go out and arrest a member and bring him in.

The present rule, or the rule of the Fifty-first Congress, provided that the member should be "retained" when brought here; and there was an effort made to enforce that. But a little episode at that far door, set in motion by the not very small foot of a considerable-sized man, Mr. Kilgore, of Texas, broke down that rule, and there never was any attempt to enforce it any more. But you are to have the Sergeant-at-Arms diurnally and nightly on your track. If it happens that at a Friday night session, when there is not a quorum—and we all know that at those sessions there is seldom a quorum—any one man makes the point of "no quorum" and there is a call of the House, then, without an order made for that purpose any further than the rule, the officer is put upon your track and you are brought back here under arrest. Now, I do not believe that the House ought to adopt such a rule. I myself am sincere in the conviction that it is such a degradation of this House itself as the members ought not to inflict upon this body. Why, listen to the provision of the old rule. After describing the manner of the call, it adds:

> The doors shall then be closed, and those for whom no sufficient excuse is made may, by order of a majority of those present, be sent for and arrested.

That is sensible and practical. This is harsh and impractical. But it had to be a direct order; while here, in the day of grace January 10, 1896, we propose to adopt a rule that shall make subject to arrest every member of this body from now until the 4th of March, 1897, when his term of office shall expire.

I for one have witnessed with regret that very perceptible decadence of the individual power of the members of the House of Representatives in the last ten or fifteen years and the accumulation of power into fewer hands. It is claimed by many that that is necessary from the increased number and the multiplicity of business. I know that it is very important to expedite business here. But we have only to look back and see the history of different things upon which this House has legislated under harsh rules to see the effect that it has had upon the legislation. By that means the McKinley bill was passed without due consideration. Under that method what was known as the "force bill" was passed, and many other obnoxious measures during the Fifty-first Congress. And even since this Congress assembled two important measures—one providing for the issuance of bonds and another for the imposition of forty-odd millions of dollars of taxes per annum—were put through this House under rules that were so framed and so adopted that it was impossible for any member to offer an amendment. The only remedy is to vote down the rule when it is presented, and then, in some instances, you do not know what the measure is. It has not been fully considered. The importance of voting it down is not known.

Members are slow, when they have the responsibility of the government of the House on their hands, to antagonize what seems to be the most expeditious method of disposing of business. They will not, therefore, vote down a special rule even if it is objectionable. I have felt called upon to say this much concerning the impropriety of the adoption of this rule. With calm, deliberate action on public measures the American people have nothing to fear. But when haste supplants care, and debate and amendment are not allowed, they may be justly apprehensive.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HENDERSON. I move that the House do now adjourn.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

The SPEAKER. Pending that motion, the Chair would like to entertain a request for the reprint of a bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MAHANY] has requested that the bill which he sends to the Clerk's desk (H. R. 2751) to provide for the construction of a bridge or tunnel across Niagara River be reprinted for the correction of errors simply. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 19) for filling vacancy on Board of Regents, Smithsonian Institution; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 60) concerning the completion of the United States court-house and post-office building at Mankato, Minn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WILBER, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. ANDERSON, for to-day and to-morrow, on account of important business.

To Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. FOSS, for ten days, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. HENDERSON (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, submitting a detailed statement of the expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, under the appropriations for "International exchanges," "the National Museum," etc.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. BOWERS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3018) to amend the act approved March 3, 1891, granting the right of way upon the public lands for reservoir and canal purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 26); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RICHARDSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 3610) for the relief of holders of certain District of Columbia tax-sale certificates, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 3611) in relation to retirements in the Regular Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 3612) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment who were the first fully equipped soldiers to arrive on April 19, 1861, for the defense of the city of Washington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 3613) amending section 2 of an act approved March 3, 1879—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 3614) to provide for the complete execution of the ninth article of the treaty of 1819 between the United States and Spain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3615) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Huntington, in the State of West Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 3616) to limit the time within which prosecutions may be instituted against persons charged with carrying on the business of a retail liquor dealer without having paid the special tax as required by law, or with being a manufacturer of tobacco without having given bond as required by law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3617) to authorize United States circuit and district courts to disallow costs and fees in certain cases, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 3618) to organize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy; to increase the usefulness and numbers of the Corps of Naval Engineers; to induce the scientific institutions to provide a naval engineering reserve for time of war; to establish a naval engineering experimental station, and to encourage the study of the mechanic arts and sciences, and particularly that of naval engineering, in the technological colleges of the country—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3619) to enlarge the powers and duties of the department of commerce and to create an Executive Department to be known as the department of commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3620) for the erection of a public building at Janesville, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCORMICK: A bill (H. R. 3621) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 3622) for the construction of a steam revenue cutter for service in the Gulf of Mexico and tributary waters—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 3623) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act to define the jurisdiction of the police court of the District of Columbia"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3624) to amend section 969 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3625) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Littleton, in the State of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 3626) to repeal certain laws relating to permanent and indefinite appropriations—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 3627) directing town-site boards in Oklahoma to close up their trust in thirty days, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A bill (H. R. 3628) to incorporate the Columbia Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 3629) to authorize the extension of the Columbia Railway eastward from its present terminus—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): A bill (H. R. 3630) to amend the charter of the Belt Railway Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 3631) to prevent the issue of interest-bearing obligations of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 3632) fixing the times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States, relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3633) granting 5 per cent of the land sales on military land warrants to the public-land States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3634) to amend an act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters," approved March 3, 1883—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 3635) to encourage the settlement and reclamation of the arid lands of the West—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3636) to amend section 3 of the act of June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 3637) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Oregon and Washington Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Columbia River between the State of Oregon and the State of Washington, and to establish it as a post road"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3638) to provide for the examination and survey of Santiam River from the town of Jefferson to the Willamette River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3639) providing for the examination and survey with a view to the improvement of the Long Tom River from its mouth to Monroe, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3640) providing for an examination and survey of the Siletz River, in the State of Oregon, with a view to the improvement of navigation from the mouth of said river to the head of the tide-water navigation—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3641) to provide for the examination and survey of the Yaquina River, from the town of Yaquina to Pioneer,

in Oregon, including Big Elk River to Sunset Quarry—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COWEN: A bill (H. R. 3642) to aid in the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. William Smallwood and the soldiers of the Maryland Line in the war for American independence—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 3643) to prevent the reduction or discontinuance of pensions without first giving notice to the pensioner of such intended reduction or discontinuance, and allowing testimony to be submitted in defense thereof, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 3644) to extend the limits of the port of entry of New Orleans—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 3645) to extend to the port of Eagle Pass and other ports in Texas the privileges of immediate transportation of dutiable goods—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 3646) to amend section 1225 of the Revised Statutes so as to provide for the detail of officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military instruction in the public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado (by request): A bill (H. R. 3647) to authorize the exploration and purchase of mines within the boundaries of private land claims—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 3648) granting to pensioners of the United States the privilege of returning their pension vouchers free of postage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 3649) making an appropriation to continue the improvement of the mouth and passes of the Calcasieu River, Louisiana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3650) making an appropriation for continuing the improvement of the Mermentau River and its tributaries, Louisiana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3651) making an appropriation to continue the improvement of the channel, bay, and passes of Bayou Vermilion, Louisiana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3652) making an appropriation to continue the project of connecting Bayou Teche with Grand Lake, Louisiana, at Charenton, La.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3653) making an appropriation to continue the improvement of Bayou Teche, Louisiana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3654) making an appropriation to continue the improvement of Bayou Lafourche, Louisiana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3655) making an appropriation to continue the improvement of Bayou Plaquemine, Louisiana, and directing the Secretary of War to have made a preliminary survey of Bayou Grosse Tete, Louisiana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 3656) providing for free homesteads on the public lands in Oklahoma Territory for actual and bona fide settlers, and reserving the public lands for that purpose—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 3727) to grant a service pension to officers and enlisted men who served in the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: A joint resolution (H. Res. 74) to amend the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of suffrage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON: A joint resolution (H. Res. 75) to provide for the printing of a digest of the laws and decisions of the courts relating to war claims—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A joint resolution (H. Res. 76) to print in pamphlet form 10,000 copies of a complete list of the names and addresses of all pensioners whose pensions have been stopped, suspended, or reduced since March 1, 1893, with reasons therefor—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WILLIS: A concurrent resolution (House Con. Res. No. 11) requesting the President to take such steps as will result in the speedy recognition of the belligerency of the Cuban insurgents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ODELL: A resolution (House Res. No. 96) to authorize amendment to the general banking laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHANY: A resolution (House Res. No. 97) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to inform the House whether the provisions for the safety of the public in ocean travel are being strictly enforced—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A resolution (House Res. No. 98) providing for a clerk to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A resolution (House Res. No. 99) calling upon the Secretary of the Interior for certain information relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the following changes of reference were made:

The bill (H. R. 352) for the relief of Thomas O. Corbin—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 2896) for the relief of Jane Elizabeth Owen, legal representative of John Young, sr., late of Elizabeth City County, Va., deceased—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 1291) granting a pension to Martha R. Hitchcock—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2833) for the relief of Col. Jesse H. Strickland, Eighth Tennessee Cavalry, United States Volunteers—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 1776) granting a pension to Anthony Christy, of Osage City, Kans.—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1544) to correct the military record of William H. Feaster—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 1529) for the relief of William Gregory—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 1403) for relief of Noah R. Yeargin—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 2977) for the relief of the estate of Vasti Smith, deceased, of Wake County, N. C.—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 353) for the relief of Maj. Samuel T. Cushing—Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3657) for the relief of W. D. Gold & Co.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 3658) granting an increase of pension to Woodbury Day, alias John White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 3659) for the relief of John E. Wilbur—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 3660) granting an increase of pension to John C. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 3661) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Sutherland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3662) for the benefit of J. D. Thompson, of Trimble County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 3663) for the relief of James Nipper, of Cleveland, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3664) for relief of Mary Ann Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 3665) granting an honorable discharge to Rollan Prentice—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3666) to provide for the reinstatement in the Railway Mail Service of C. W. Merrick, of Pueblo, Colo.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3667) granting an honorable discharge to Harrison S. Crites—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3668) for the relief of Willbert Bowen, of Cripple Creek, Colo.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3669) for the relief of Joseph Clucas—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3670) for the relief of Drury Shrewsbury—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 3671) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Anthony O'Grady, alias John Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 3672) for the relief of Richard P. Blackistone—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3673) for the relief of Calvin Gunn—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULBERSON: A bill (H. R. 3674) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compen-

sation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COWEN: A bill (H. R. 3675) for the relief of representatives of John W. Branham—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 3676) to remove charge of desertion from John Lyons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3677) granting a pension to George W. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3678) granting pension to Martin Hope—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3679) for the relief of Nancy A. E. Hoffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 3680) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph B. Seabrook, deceased, late of Charleston, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3681) for the relief of Michael B. Ryan, son and administrator de bonis non of John S. Ryan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 3682) granting a pension to Catharine Carroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3683) to reimburse George W. McKinsey, postmaster at Kokomo, Ind., for money paid out by him as said postmaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 3684) for the relief of William H. Cleaden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 3685) for the relief of the estate of Enos Lassiter, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3686) for the relief of John M. Higgins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3687) for the relief of P. F. Warterfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 3688) to pension James L. McKinney for services in Oregon Indian wars—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3689) increasing the pension of Jefferson Fuesston, of Company M, Tenth Ohio Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH: A bill (H. R. 3690) restoring a pension to Henry Mackvill, alias Henry Mackey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 3691) granting a pension to Catharine Kelley, widow of John Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 3692) granting a pension to Mrs. Annie M. Clemens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 3693) to remove charge of desertion against James Stone—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3694) for relief of J. T. Patrick, of Salyersville, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KYLE: A bill (H. R. 3695) for the relief of Enoch P. Ward, of Holly Springs, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 3696) for the relief of the estate of Frank H. Nichols—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 3697) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILES: A bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane Dulany—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILNES: A bill (H. R. 3699) for the relief Mrs. Belinda Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3700) for the relief of John P. Webber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 3701) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Charles Amos—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: A bill (H. R. 3702) for the relief of Carl F. Kolbe—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 3703) for the relief of Nancy Rose, light-house keeper—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWENS: A bill (H. R. 3704) to increase the pension of Dwight A. Aiken, of Lexington, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 3705) for the relief of F. F. White—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3706) granting a pension to Elizabeth Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PITNEY: A bill (H. R. 3707) for the relief of Amos S. Carkhuff—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 3708) for the relief of Fanny B. Randolph and Dora L. Stark—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 3709) for the relief of the estate of the late Revere W. Gurley—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 3710) for the relief of Lorenzo Thomas, jr., and Henry C. Thomas, both of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3711) for the relief of Lorenzo Thomas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3712) for the relief of Henry C. Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 3713) granting a pension to Peter Travis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A bill (H. R. 3714) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of James Charles Cramer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3715) for the relief of Capt. W. J. Kountz—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3716) removing charge of desertion from military record of Martin Mehaffey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3717) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Peter Guia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3718) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Alexander Wheeler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3719) to provide for appointment by brevet of active or retired officers of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 3720) to increase the pension of Thomas Reed, late a private in Company I, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 3721) for the relief of Sarah J. Warren—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 3722) for the relief of Hix Patterson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 3723) for the relief of John D. Hicks—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 3724) for the relief of George M. Henry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 3725) for the relief of Columbus F. Hayward and the executor of Charlotte G. Hayward—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 3726) to restore to the pension roll Lycurgus Q. Parkhurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia: Petition of Sarah C. Gray, of Fayette County, Ga., praying reference of her war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOUTELLE: Petition of F. W. Sawyer and others, of Millbridge, Me., for the repeal of the law of February 18, 1895, in relation to shipping commissioners—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Memorials from citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, advocating reduction in postage on first-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of the Cincinnati Bicycle Club, concerning good roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BULL: Resolution of the Rhode Island ex-Prisoners of War Association, praying for the passage of the bill giving pay and pension to those soldiers and sailors who were confined in Confederate prisons during the war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution adopted at a public meeting at Providence, R. I., December 20, 1895, asking Congress to recognize the belligerent rights of the Cuban revolutionists—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: Remonstrance of M. A. Ballinger, president of Columbia Heights Citizens' Association, and others, against the location of contagious hospital in Pleasant Plains—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of T. J. Buntain and others, favoring reclassification of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CLARDY: Petition from 96 citizens of Spottsville, Ky., on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition to Congress relative to the Paris Exposition of 1900—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition for the payment of bounties to regulars who served in the war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa (by request): Petition of 187 citizens of Muscatine County, Iowa, praying for the noninterference of the Pope's representatives in United States affairs—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Allegheny

County, in favor of the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAYTON: Eight petitions, severally, from A. S. Wells and others, W. H. Neville and others, M. R. Neville and others, W. H. Marple and others, J. M. Downs and others, W. H. Brand and others, Abe Moon and others, and George C. Clem and others, all of West Virginia, praying the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. H. Coombs and others, of Monongalia County, W. Va., praying that navigation of the Monongahela River be made free—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the heirs of Allevia A. Hamill, of Jefferson County, W. Va., praying reference of her war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of citizens of Peoria, Ill., to Congress to take action toward the recognition of Cuban insurgents as belligerents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Canton, Ill., for relief as to the keeping of a deputy revenue stamp office at Canton, Ill.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of citizens of Maple Mills, Ill., for the recognition of Cuban insurgents as belligerents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAGER: Petition of William F. Stipe and 100 others, of Stanton, Iowa, praying for the recognition as belligerents of Cuban patriots—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Four petitions, severally, of 28 citizens of Westmoreland County, 14 citizens of Blairsville, citizens of Cokesville, and others of Westmoreland County, praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Paper from Hon. J. E. Blythe, of Mason City, Iowa, urging the establishment of a national military park at Vicksburg, Miss.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: Resolutions of the governing committee of the Indianapolis Board of Trade, expressing sympathy with the people of Cuba in their efforts to attain independence—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petition for transfer of remains of Joel Barlow from Poland to America—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOOKER: Papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Catharine Kelley, widow of John Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: Resolutions on the Armenian question—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Harrison, of Clark County, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: Two petitions of citizens of Satillo, Huntingdon County, Pa., asking for the passage of House bill No. 5246, Fifty-third Congress, known as the William A. Stone bill, to restrict immigration—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Petitions of numerous colored citizens of South Carolina, asking for speedy settlement of contested-election cases—to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

Also, resolutions of the Perkins Street Baptist Society of Somerville, Mass., favoring the discontinuance of Indian contract schools—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NOONAN: Petition of H. D. Bonnet, for correction of antemuster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: Petition of 119 citizens of Summit County, Ohio, in behalf of an act to secure a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Resolutions of a mass meeting held at Plain Grove, Pa., December 20, 1895, in favor of the Armenian people—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 116 citizens of Rochester, Beaver County, Pa., in favor of a free Monongahela River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of 87 citizens of Butler County, Pa., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Petition of Alexander Wheeler, to remove charge of desertion, and for an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the citizens of Ashland, Wis., relative to the Armenian atrocities—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Milwaukee Medical Society, to provide for a department and secretary of public health in the Cabinet of the President—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Resolutions of the Pennsylvania State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, in favor of equitable protection—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Petition of Catharine C. Smith, praying for an appropriation of $1,200 on account of the services of her brother in the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of Lycurgus Q. Parkhurst, son of Elisha W. Parkhurst, Company F, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteers, for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *January 11, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read, corrected, and approved.

SENATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A bill (S. 697) for the reconstruction of the United States custom-house and post-office building at St. Albans, Vt., destroyed by fire May 19, 1895—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Joint resolution (S. R. 23) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to use a portion of the appropriation for new iron roof for foundry at navy-yard, Washington, D. C., in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," for repairs to the walls of said foundry—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 732) to regulate the issue and recording of the commissions of officers in several of the Departments—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed of the annual report of the Commissioner of Railroads for the year 1895 1,500 extra copies in paper covers, with appendixes, for the use of the Commissioner of Railroads.

To the Committee on Printing.

THE RULES.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the unfinished business; and desire to say that, as to Rule XV, we will lay that aside for the present and call it up hereafter, going on with the rest of the work, because some members seem to be in trouble about the rule as it may apply to Friday night sessions, and possibly to business brought up by unanimous consent, and we desire to see if we can meet their suggestions.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the House will proceed to the consideration of the next amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to ask the gentleman if that disposes of the third paragraph of Rule XV.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to amend another portion of the same rule?

Mr. WHEELER. I simply desire to strike out the third paragraph of Rule XV.

The SPEAKER. That motion will be in order. The Chair supposes the gentleman from Iowa does not desire to postpone anything but the fourth paragraph.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the gentleman has any other amendment to offer he may do so now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves to strike out the third paragraph of Rule XV.

Mr. MILES. Mr. Speaker, will it be in order to——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized, unless the gentleman rises to make a point of order.

Mr. MILES. I simply desire to ask for information in reference to an amendment to be offered hereafter. Will it be in order to offer an amendment to section 4 of Rule XV?

The SPEAKER. That will be taken up later.

Mr. MILES. When taken up later will it be in order to offer amendments to it?

The SPEAKER. Certainly. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out clause 3 of Rule XV, as follows:

"3. On the demand of any member, or at the suggestion of the Speaker, the names of members sufficient to make a quorum in the Hall of the House who do not vote shall be noted by the Clerk and recorded in the Journal, and reported to the Speaker with the names of the members voting, and be counted and announced in determining the presence of a quorum to do business."

[Mr. WHEELER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], which is to strike out clause 3 of Rule XV.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WHEELER demanded the yeas and nays, but subsequently withdrew the demand.

Accordingly the amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend Rule XV by striking from the first paragraph thereof the following: "And after the roll has been once called the Clerk shall call in their alphabetical order the names of those not voting," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "And after the roll has been once called the Speaker shall, of

his own motion or at the request of any member or members, cause the Clerk to call again the names of those present and not voting."

Mr. DALZELL. To what section is this amendment proposed?

The SPEAKER. The first clause of Rule XV.

Mr. DE ARMOND. The first clause of Rule XV; and the object of it is merely to dispense with the necessity of calling twice the names of those who are absent and who of course can not respond. Any member can determine readily, when he sees the amendment in print, whether he is in favor of or opposed to the proposed change. I therefore ask that it merely be passed over with the rule for consideration at a later time.

Mr. HENDERSON. To be brought up hereafter, when we call up the rule. The gentleman merely asks, as I understand, that the matter remain pending.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes. It is the amendment to which I called the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] asks that this amendment may remain pending when the fourth clause is called up. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. If nothing further is offered on Rule XV, the Clerk will report the next amendment.

Mr. MILES. I was informed that hereafter I might offer an amendment to section 4, Rule XV. Am I right?

The SPEAKER. That goes over to be called up, and when it comes up the gentleman will have the right to offer whatever amendments are in order. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The next committee amendment was read, as follows:

In Rule XVII, section 1, second line, substitute the word "voting" for the word "present," and after the word "quorum" add the words "be present"; so that as amended the section shall read as follows:

"RULE XVII.

"PREVIOUS QUESTION.

"1. There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of members voting, if a quorum be present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked and ordered. The previous question may be asked and ordered upon a single motion, a series of motions allowable under the rules, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all authorized motions or amendments, and include the bill to its passage or rejection. It shall be in order, pending the motion for, or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain and submit a motion to commit, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there any other amendment to Rule XVII? [After a pause.] The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend Rule XIX by adding the following provision:

"Amendments to the title of a bill or resolution shall not be in order until after its passage, and shall be decided without debate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. If no other amendment is offered to Rule XIX the Clerk will proceed to the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In Rule XXI strike out of section 3 the words "to the Committee on Indian Depredation Claims," and insert after the words "Land Claims" the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Unless there are other amendments offered to this rule, the Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In Rule XXII, section 3, insert after the words "correction in case of error of reference may be made by the House" the words "without debate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there any other amendment to this rule? [After a pause.] The Clerk will proceed.

The Clerk read as follows:

In Rule XXIII, section 3, insert after the words "to the United States for money or property" the words "or referring any claim to the Court of Claims," so that the section will read as follows:

"RULE XXIII.

"3. All motions or propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people; all proceedings touching appropriations of money, or bills making appropriations of money or property, or requiring such appropriations to be made, or authorizing payments out of appropriations already made, or releasing any liability to the United States for money or property, *or referring any claim to the Court of Claims*, shall be first considered in a Committee of the Whole, and a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced."

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard on that proposition for a moment. The proposition is to amend Rule XXIII by adding the words "or referring any claim to the Court of Claims." That means that all claims, before they can be referred to the Court of Claims, must first be considered in Committee of the Whole here. Now, Mr. Speaker, the act of Congress passed on the 3d of March, 1883, expressly provides—and I ask the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to it, because I do not think he will object to this amendment if he hears me a moment——

Mr. HENDERSON. I am listening to the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The act of Congress passed on the 3d of March, 1883, known as the Bowman Act, expressly provides that the committees of either the Senate or House, in order to expedite the business of Congress, may send, upon their own motion, claims to the Court of Claims. That is a provision of the act known as the Bowman Act, and I will ask the Clerk to read the first section of that act. This rule will be directly in the teeth of that act of Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

That whenever a claim or matter is pending before any committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or before either House of Congress, which involves the investigation and determination of facts, the committee or House may cause the same, with the vouchers, papers, proof, and documents pertaining thereto, to be transmitted to the Court of Claims of the United States, and the same shall there be proceeded with under such rules as the court may adopt.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is sufficient.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that language is as explicit as it can be that the Committee on War Claims of the House has the right to send certain claims to the Court of Claims, and it certainly violates that act of Congress to come and provide that the House must take action before the Committee on War Claims can take its action, when the law expressly provides that it may do it.

Mr. DALZELL. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not perfectly competent for the House to make a rule as to its action which is in confirmation of the Bowman Act?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Not at all; because the law expressly states that the committee may take this action. This rule would provide that the House must first take action.

Mr. DALZELL. Not at all. The Bowman Act provides a rule which applies in certain cases to committees and which applies in certain cases to the House of Representatives. Now, when the House of Representatives comes to exercise its powers under the Bowman Act we provide in this rule that it shall be done through the intervention of the Committee of the Whole. The gentleman has overlooked the fact that either the committee or the House may cause the claim to be sent to the Court of Claims. There are cases where it becomes the business of the House of Representatives to pass upon these claims, and they may see fit to send them, under this act, to the Court of Claims at once, or, if this is provided in the rules, they will then send them to the Committee of the Whole, which it seems to me, considering the amount of money possibly involved in these claims, is not only a proper thing, but a duty on the part of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But the rule provides that before any money can be appropriated the Committee of the Whole must consider the claim.

Mr. DALZELL. But one of the difficulties is——

Mr. RICHARDSON. That has to be done before we make an appropriation. This reference to the Court of Claims is not for an appropriation; it is not for a judgment; it is simply to find the facts. Now, before an appropriation can be made the bill must receive its consideration in Committee of the Whole. I would not object to that, because that is all right.

Mr. DALZELL. I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that it was the express intention of the Committee on Rules to have all these references when only the House was involved, whether they involved judgments or merely findings of fact, go to the Committee of the Whole, because we all know that findings of fact by the Court of Claims involve in nine cases out of ten a subsequent appropriation of money. For that reason, I repeat, it was the intention of the Committee on Rules to require all these cases where the House is acting independently of a committee, whether intended to be followed by a judgment immediately or contemplating a mere finding of fact, to go to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DOCKERY. I congratulate the Committee on Rules.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee that it amounts to this, that whereas the law provides two authorities, the Committee on Rules in their report reduce the number to one.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is it.

Mr. CANNON. Let me see if I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania. As I understand him, he claims that the Committee on War Claims being a creature of the House, it is quite competent for the House to say on what terms and conditions its creature shall act; in other words, that the House can revise the action of the Committee on War Claims either in Committee of the Whole or in the House itself. If that is the gentleman's ground, it seems to me quite correct.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think it is quite incorrect if I can construe the language of the statute of March 3, 1883. The statute provides that—

Whenever a claim or matter is pending before any committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or before either House of Congress, which involves the investigation and determination of facts, the committee or House may cause the same, with the vouchers, etc., to be transmitted to the Court of Claims of the United States, etc.

The committee "may cause the same" to be transmitted to the court. The bill may not be pending before the House; it may be pending only before the committee. Now, you provide in this

rule that the claim can not get to the Court of Claims until it has been considered in Committee of the Whole. That seems to me to be as plain and palpable a contradiction of the statute as can be made. The statute gives the committee the right to refer every war claim of this character to the Court of Claims. Suppose that the Committee of the Whole, considering such a claim, should say, "We will not refer it." Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania mean to say that that would operate as a limitation on the action of the Committee on War Claims?

Mr. DALZELL. This rule simply provides that the bill shall be considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But suppose the Committee of the Whole considers it adversely, does the gentleman maintain that in that case the Committee on War Claims can not refer that bill to the Court of Claims?

Mr. DALZELL. The Committee on War Claims can not have jurisdiction of the claim unless it gets it from the House. No claims can go to that committee save those which go to it from the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I beg the gentleman's pardon. When the bill is introduced it is referred to the Committee on War Claims, and the committee then has absolute jurisdiction and can refer the claim to the Court of Claims under this law.

Mr. DALZELL. But does the gentleman claim that the House can not change its rules?

Mr. RICHARDSON. This amendment does not do that, and I do not think the House could violate the law in that way.

Mr. DALZELL. This amendment does not violate the law. The law gives the House jurisdiction of all these claims, and it has the right to say whether they shall go to the Court of Claims or how they shall be disposed of. Now, this rule simply provides that when that question is presented the House, before determining to exercise its power to send those claims to the Committee on War Claims, shall consider the matter in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the whole object of the Bowman Act was to expedite the hearing of these cases and to afford relief to Congress and the Executive Departments. That appears from the title of the act. The idea was that the House of Representatives and the Senate should be relieved from considering the question of referring these claims to the Court of Claims, and that the calendars of the two Houses should be thereby relieved by giving the Committee on War Claims the right to refer these claims to the Court of Claims.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman from Tennessee does not assume, I suppose, that the Bowman Act includes all cases known as war claims? It does not go beyond cases relating to claims for supplies and subsistence furnished to our forces during the war.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is all. It does not go beyond that. Claims under the Bowman Act are limited to claims for supplies and subsistence.

Mr. LOUD. That act applies only to claims for subsistence furnished to our forces during the war, and does not include the thousands of other cases known as "war claims."

Mr. RICHARDSON. Certainly not. The language of the Bowman Act is wholly different from the language of the Tucker Act, which also relates to war claims other than those for supplies.

Mr. DALZELL. I would ask the gentleman from Tennessee if there are not two classes of cases, one under the jurisdiction of the committee, and the other cases in possession of the House and capable of being referred to the Court of Claims——

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. DALZELL. Are there not two classes of cases which, under the Bowman Act, may in proper circumstances be referred to the Court of Claims, to wit, cases over which a committee has jurisdiction and cases over which the House has jurisdiction?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I so understand.

Mr. DALZELL. Now, with reference to the latter class, does the gentleman contend that this rule interferes at all with the law which makes it entirely discretionary with the House as to whether or not it shall send claims over which it has jurisdiction to the Court of Claims or dispose of them otherwise?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think where the House has jurisdiction of the claim and there is no provision in any law as to how it shall be disposed of, then we may adopt such a rule as I understand this to be; but if the language of an existing law covers the case, then I do not think it is possible for this House to make a rule contravening that law.

Now, the language of this proposed rule is explicit. It says, "or referring any claim to the Court of Claims." Now, the Bowman Act provides that the Committee on War Claims may refer to the Court of Claims any claims for supplies furnished by loyal people to the armies of the Union during the war. If it be admitted that the language of this proposed rule does not undertake to limit the Committee on War Claims in its action, that without regard to this rule the committee can under the law refer claims to the Court of Claims without having those claims go to the Committee of the Whole, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. DALZELL. My contention is that it is within the power of the House of Representatives——

Mr. RICHARDSON. To violate the law?

Mr. DALZELL. To say whether it will refer a war claim to the Court of Claims or dispose of it in some other way, the House having jurisdiction of the claim, and it not having gone to a committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, I desire to ask the gentleman (because I know he is an able lawyer) this question: If the House in considering a war claim in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union or considering it during the disposition of the Private Calendar should decide adversely to the motion to refer, what are you going to do with this provision of the Bowman Act, which says that the Committee on War Claims may refer such a bill without action of the House to the Court of Claims?

Mr. DALZELL. The committee can not refer it until it has jurisdiction, and it can have no jurisdiction except from the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The Committee on War Claims has jurisdiction of the claim, in the case supposed, by the reference of the claim to that committee.

Mr. DALZELL. The committee has not jurisdiction of those claims which the House disposes of in Committee of the Whole. The House has power to control its agent, a committee, and to say whether a claim shall go to a committee or not. The power of the House to do this under the rule and its power to decide adversely constitute a contingency in which the jurisdiction of the committee under the Bowman Act to make the reference might not arise. A committee can not rise above the power that appoints it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. According to the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, this rule, if adopted, would operate as an absolute repeal of so much of the Bowman Act as provides that the Committee on War Claims may refer these bills to the Court of Claims.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will.

Mr. LACEY. Under the rules of the House, a war claim is at once referred by the Speaker to the Committee on War Claims; and under the Bowman Act that committee can do one of two things—it can send the bill directly to the Court of Claims, or it can report the bill back to the House. If the bill comes back to the House, then, under this proposed rule, it can be considered in Committee of the Whole and then referred to the court.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is all right. If that is the construction of this proposed rule, I have nothing to say. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not, I think, state that such is his understanding.

Mr. DALZELL. "The gentleman from Pennsylvania" says that his contention is that these claims, which it is within the jurisdiction of the House to refer, may be disposed of in Committee of the Whole and an adverse report had thereon, notwithstanding the provisions of the Bowman Act.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then, I ask the gentleman whether he means to say that by a rule of this House the act of Congress passed on the 3d of March, 1883, can be expressly repealed, for that act says that the Committee on War Claims may make this reference? The gentleman from Pennsylvania, on the contrary, insists, as I understand, that the House of Representatives must first act upon the question and may take away from the War Claims Committee the right given it under the Bowman Act to make the reference of the bill to the Court of Claims.

Mr. DALZELL. On the gentleman's first proposition he needs no answer. Of course I make no such contention.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman understands, if I may be permitted to say so, that the construction which he gives to the Bowman Act would enable the House of Representatives, by itself, without the concurrent action of the Senate, and without any change of the existing law, to practically abrogate that law as it stands on the statute book. Now, I insist the House can not do that and the Senate can not do it. It must be done, if at all, by the concurrent action of the House and Senate, taking the form of a new law.

Mr. DOCKERY. As I understand, there is nothing in the Bowman Act requiring the House to send these war claims to the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Not in the act itself; but the rule of the House requires that.

Mr. DOCKERY. As I understand, the Bowman Act provides only that in the event of the committee getting jurisdiction of any one of these claims it may send the claim to the Court of Claims or may return it to the House for consideration. There is nothing, however, in the Bowman Act, as I understand, requiring the Speaker to refer a war claim to the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. WHEELER. The rules of the House require it.

Mr. DALZELL. If the gentleman from Tennessee will allow me, I wish to make perfectly clear the position that I take in refer-

ence to this matter. My contention is that all these claims that are within the jurisdiction of the House in the first instance, not sent to a committee, may be disposed of in Committee of the Whole; may be sent to or may be withheld from the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman Act. I concede that it is within the power of the Committee on War Claims, when it has obtained jurisdiction of a war claim, to determine whether it shall go to the Court of Claims or not, when it has jurisdiction of the matter.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit me to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Certainly.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania this question: Does he propose by this rule to take away the right of a member introducing a bill of having it referred to the Committee on War Claims?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not understand that to be the purpose of the rule.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Then, if a bill goes to the War Claims Committee that committee, under the provisions of the Bowman Act, would have the right to refer it to the Court of Claims.

Mr. DALZELL. I have already said so, where the committee has jurisdiction. They may send it to the Court of Claims under such circumstances.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow me to make this suggestion? If the rule proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is adopted it would have the result of requiring the consideration of these claims twice in the Committee of the Whole. They are submitted to the Committee of the Whole in the first instance, to determine whether or not they shall go to the Court of Claims, and then, when they come back from the court, if they require an appropriation of money from the Treasury, they would have to be considered again in Committee of the Whole, which does not occur with reference to any other class of bills, so far as I know.

Mr. DALZELL. If that be true, I think that is a very strong argument in favor of the amendment.

Mr. McMILLIN. Well, it seems to me to be a very strong argument against it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not understand why the gentleman from Pennsylvania should make that remark. The only object of the Bowman Act was to provide loyal citizens of the disloyal States of the Union who had furnished supplies to the Union Army during the war a tribunal in which they might have their claims examined and passed upon.

Now, the gentleman says there is reason why they should not be so considered. I can not see why the gentleman should desire to place the loyal people in the disloyal States in that position. That may be the policy of the gentleman, but it has not been the policy of Congress since the passage of the act providing for the 4th of July claims, or what is known as the 4th of July bill, passed in 1864. On the contrary, they have permitted these claims to be paid for twenty years, and they were paid without going to either branch of Congress, having been adjudicated and paid in the Departments.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not care to enter into the question of the policy of the law——

Mr. RICHARDSON. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the provision of the Bowman Act prescribes that—

> Whenever a claim or matter is pending before the committees of the Senate or House of Representatives, or before either House of Congress, which involves the investigation and determination of facts, the committee or the House may cause the same, with vouchers, papers, etc., to be transmitted to the Court of Claims, etc.

This gives jurisdiction to the committee or to the House. The House lays down the rule that before a committee may do so and so—the House committee—that the Committee of the Whole shall consider it. Inasmuch as the law gives the House jurisdiction, it has merely the right to say through what channel the claim shall go before it goes to the Court of Claims. It seems to me that the proposition is so clear that it needs no discussion, and how there can be confusion in the minds of gentlemen with reference to it I do not understand.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Has not the committee, under the Bowman Act, irrespective of the action of the House, the right to send the claim to the Court of Claims?

Mr. HENDERSON. The rule of the House requires that the House shall first submit it to a Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Then, can a rule of the House violate a statute of the United States?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, sir; it does not and can not, because the House in dealing with these claims has a perfect right to give jurisdiction to the Committee on War Claims or to withhold it. We prescribe under the law the means by which these claims shall reach the Court of Claims. The law gives the House jurisdiction to that extent, and in my judgment there is no clearer proposition than the right of the House, under the law, to do exactly what is contemplated by the amendment of the rules.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Then, as I understand your contention, by denying jurisdiction to the Committee on War Claims you defeat the intention of the law?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, sir; the gentleman misunderstands me. This simply gives concurrent jurisdiction, and the House exercises it under the law, and makes the channel through which these claims shall reach the Court of Claims. It is simply a proposition to submit these claims to the consideration of the Committee of the Whole under the five-minute rule to determine whether the claim shall go to the Court of Claims or not. It does not deny jurisdiction and does not affect the statute in any way. It is simply a protection in the interests of the public Treasury and in favor of a general consideration of all proper claims.

Mr. RAY. Let me make this suggestion. When a claim comes into the House in the first instance, the House has exclusive jurisdiction; and these bills do not go to the Committee on War Claims except by the consent of the House.

Therefore, this House can prescribe the condition under which it shall go to the committee, and when it goes to the Committee on War Claims we have only surrendered a part of our jurisdiction over it, and the jurisdiction obtained by the Committee on War Claims is limited by the rule which this House sees fit to adopt and prescribe. Therefore, we can adopt this rule without any violation of the Bowman Act whatever.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says we do not propose to take away——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of very great importance to my people, and I want the ear of the members on this side of the House. The Congressional district that I have the honor to represent has more pensioners in it than any other in the United States of America. In proportion to our population we put more men into the Union Army than any other Congressional district in the United States. We furnished the Union armies that came down to East Tennessee under Burnside and under the other Federal generals millions of dollars' worth of commissary and quartermaster stores. We supplied Burnside's army for many months out of our smokehouses and our corncribs, our stables and our fields, and for a very large part of the supplies that we thus furnished to Burnside, which saved his army from being starved to death or captured by Longstreet—for a very large part of the supplies thus furnished the loyal men of that country to this good day have never been paid a solitary cent. When this Bowman Act was passed the object of it was to give the loyal men of East Tennessee and other loyal sections of the country an opportunity to prove their claims before a court of competent jurisdiction. Now, in the name of God, in the name of justice, in the name of patriotism, will this House strike down that law under the name of adopting a rule of procedure? Can it be done in that way? Can this House, by the adoption of a rule, repeal a solemn statute passed by the two Houses of Congress and signed by the President? This amendment undertakes to do that. I hold in my hand the Bowman Act. How does it read?

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever—

Whenever—

> a claim or matter is pending before any committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or before either House of Congress, which involves the investigation and determination of facts, the committee or House may cause the same, with the vouchers, papers, proofs, and documents pertaining thereto, to be transmitted to the Court of Claims of the United States, and the same shall be proceeded in under such rules as the court may adopt.

Under the first section of this act, just read by me, when a bill to pay any of these claims of my constituents was referred to any committee of this House, that committee could, on its own motion and without the previous consent of the House, refer the claim to the Court of Claims, which was empowered to find the real facts and report them to Congress for its action thereon. Then the claim had to go before a committee again, and then before the Committee of the Whole, and then had to pass the House, and then go to the Senate, where nearly all of these same steps had to be taken again, and then to be signed by the President or passed over his veto. All of these various courses of procedure had to be observed before the bill could become a law and my constituent paid the money so long due him by this great Government which he had befriended thirty years ago in her hour of need. Surely these are ordeals enough, and many too many. But now the Committee on Rules proposes to add yet another ordeal, and that is to compel every claim to pass through the Committee of the Whole before it can even have a chance to go to the Court of Claims, although the Bowman Act expressly provides that "any committee of the Senate or House" may send any claim it chooses to the Court of Claims without asking anybody's consent.

I do not see, Mr. Speaker, how any impartial man can think that

this proposed amendment to our rules does not conflict with the Bowman Act. This act authorizes "any committee" to refer a claim, and the amendment proposed forbids a reference by any committee until the Committee of the Whole first authorizes such a reference. In other words, the proposed amendment forbids any committee to exercise the power conferred on it by the Bowman Act unless the House in Committee of the Whole allows it so to do.

The Bowman Act expressly authorizes either a committee or the House to refer a claim, thus showing that they are to act independently of each other—concurrently, as the lawyers say; and this House has no more right to forbid a committee to refer a claim than a committee has to forbid this House, and to undertake to do so is a violation of a solemn law passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President.

Now, can this House, by adopting a rule, say these claims shall not be sent to the Court of Claims until they have first been passed upon by the Committee of the Whole? It can not be done. A statute of the United States can not be repealed in that way; and if it could be, I appeal to the men on this side of the House to do justice to the loyal men of the section that I represent. Can you not trust a solemn court of the United States to pass on these questions and say whether this great Government of ours owes the humble men of East Tennessee and other sections of the South, loyal men who stripped themselves naked and actually starved their families in order to uphold the flag of their country and maintain the cause of the Union? Are you willing to say that the Bowman Act, passed for the benefit of these men, shall be repealed by a simple rule adopted by this House, solitary and alone? In the name of patriotism, may God forbid that the people of the loyal sections of the South be thus treated in the house of their friends.

The Union men and women of East Tennessee furnished millions of dollars' worth of supplies of all kinds—provisions, horses, mules, cattle, hogs, sheep, wheat, corn, oats, hay, beef, pork, bacon, lard, meal, flour, and everything needed by the Federal armies operating in East Tennessee—during the war of the rebellion, these armies being often entirely dependent on the loyal men of that loyal region for their means of subsistence, their base of supplies being hundreds of miles away, and communication difficult at best, and often impossible. And for a very large part of the supplies thus furnished our half-starved armies—often furnished, too, at great personal sacrifice and when actually needed for the support of their families—for a very large part of these supplies my people have not yet been paid, although more than thirty years have elapsed since the property was used and the promise of payment by the officers of the Government made.

I call upon the men upon this side of the House, especially those who served in the Union Army, to stand by their compatriots in brave, gallant, patriotic, loyal East Tennessee who stood by you when you came down, and welcomed you with patriotic hands and with all the supplies that we had in our country to keep you alive and prevent you from starving when you were cut off by Longstreet's army from every means of reaching your supplies on the Ohio River. Gentlemen on this side of the House, let the Bowman Act stand. Strike out these italics proposed by the committee and let justice be done to the loyal men of the South who contributed their thousands and tens of thousands of dollars for the relief of the Union Army.

Now, let me say another thing. The supplies that were furnished the Union troops in Pennsylvania during Lee's invasion, prior and subsequent to the battle of Gettysburg, were all paid for without question. The supplies furnished the Union troops in the State of Ohio, while they were pursuing Morgan in his raid, were all paid for without question. But the supplies furnished the Union Army in East Tennessee have to pass every imaginable scrutiny before they are paid for; and now, though thirty years and more have gone by since these supplies were furnished, yet the great Government of the United States, with its 70,000,000 people, believing in the God of justice, praying for the perpetuity of our country, down to this good day has failed to pay the honest claims of my patriotic constituents and other like patriotic men all over the South. In all the record of patriotic valor there can not be found a brighter page than the one that tells of the heroic sacrifices made not only by the men but also by the women and children of East Tennessee in showing their devotion to the cause of the Union during the war of the rebellion, they being willing at all times during that terrible and tremendous conflict to fight. to starve, to suffer imprisonment. and even to die, rather than falter in their loyalty to the Union and the Constitution of their country. On every side of them the Confederate flag floated; but, intrenched in their mountains, as in the great fortress of freedom, they defied every attempt to subjugate them, and from their loftiest crags the flag of the Union never ceased to fly.

Oh, it was an easy thing in those days to have been a Union man in the loyal North and in the loyal West, but to be a Union man in the South, and especially in East Tennessee, was to be a marked man, the aim of slander, the aim of scrutiny, the aim of the guerrilla and the bushwhacker, the aim of the Confederate government, all using every instrumentality to pull down and destroy, with nobody to lend a helping hand or give an encouraging word. Do not go back on that class of loyal people by adopting this amendment, which strikes them down in the house of their friends.

Mr. POWERS. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the scope of this proposed amendment is very much misunderstood by gentlemen who seem to oppose it either by gentle words or by extravagant ones. My friend from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON] had very much to say about the loyal men of east Tennessee, and his encomium upon them will not only read well in his own district, but sounds well here. [Laughter.] Nobody questions the loyalty of those gallant men.

Mr. BOATNER. Except when they have a claim.

Mr. POWERS. I submit to him that when he proposes to restrict this House, as a House sitting in Committee of the Whole, from an opportunity to listen to such impassioned appeals as he has just made, he is weakening the prospects of those claimants to recover their just claims. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GIBSON. So much the worse for the Government when it undertakes to do it.

Mr. POWERS. This Government does not propose to do anything of the kind; but we are simply asking that the Committee of the Whole House shall have an opportunity to listen to the gentleman when he appears in behalf of these claimants, and not send the hearing of such important questions to the small number of ten or fifteen who may for the time constitute the Committee on Claims. So that the very ground on which he has based his argument redounds against him.

Mr. GIBSON. We want the Bowman law.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman should not only be heard by the whole House, but it would be eminently proper that he should have the attention of 70,000,000 people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the real gist of this proposed amendment? It is simply that when a bill is introduced in the House to make compensation to a loyal claimant his bill shall come to us as every other bill comes. There is no Committee on Claims except as the House itself sees fit to appoint one. The Bowman Act makes no reference to any committee of the House by name. It simply says these bills "referred to a committee." What committee? Not the Committee on War Claims necessarily. It is entirely competent for the House to abolish that committee and substitute in its place the Committee of the Whole House. It simply provides that a claim pending before a committee—and this House may as well say that that claim shall be pending before the Committee of the Whole as to say that it shall be pending before a committee of fifteen. So there is nothing in the proposed amendment that trenches at all upon the sanctity of the Bowman Act. It simply provides that another committee shall pass upon the question; and if it be conceded that there is a Committee on War Claims, then it does provide that these claims shall be considered by the Committee of the Whole before they are referred to the Court of Claims. It seems that there is not the slightest embarrassment in this proposed amendment so far as the Bowman Act is concerned.

Mr. CATCHINGS. The Constitution, Mr. Speaker, confers upon this House the right to make its own rules of procedure, and the power thus conferred upon this House by the Constitution, beyond any question to my mind, would make this a lawful exercise of authority. It will be entirely competent for this House, if it chose so to do, to declare in so many words that the Committee on War Claims should make no reference whatever of any claims referred to it to the Court of Claims. I go to the full extent in the opinion that it is not within the power of Congress to curtail even to the slightest degree its constitutional power, which is always vested in the House of Representatives, to pass rules to regulate its own procedure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Bowman Act was never intended to constitute a rule of procedure for this House. Its purpose simply was to create a jurisdiction in one of its own courts to receive, hear, and dispose of such claims as this House might in its discretion choose to refer to it. Gentlemen confound the Bowman Act with a rule of this House. As I have said, it was never the design to create a rule which should govern the procedure of this House. Its sole purpose was reference to the Court of Claims, one of its own tribunals, with the right and authority to hear such claims as this House, in the exercise of its own discretion, may choose to refer to it. I have no contention to make against this as an unlawful exercise of power in this House. I have no criticism to make upon the idea that has been suggested that it violates an act of Congress, but it is well that the House should understand just what would be the effect of this rule if adopted.

It is an effort on the part of this House to nullify, for all practical purposes, the exercise by the Court of Claims of the jurisdiction which the Bowman Act conferred upon it, and the effort will fail of its purpose, because this rule, binding as it will be upon

this House, will have no effect upon the Senate, and the result will be that all of these claims will be introduced in the Senate, will go to the proper committee there, and by that committee will be referred to the Court of Claims. So that we are attempting here to adopt a rule whose purpose is to take away the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims by providing no means by which that jurisdiction can be exercised, and yet, as I have said, it will fail of its purpose. Of course, our rules can have no operation in the other branch of Congress, and the result will be that we shall take from our own committee a right which will remain with the Senate committee.

Now, the question is, whether this House desires to so degrade its own committee that it shall not have the power to exercise an authority which the corresponding committee of a coordinate branch of Congress will have power to exercise. If it be a fact that the Treasury is endangered by claims of this kind, the true remedy is to repeal the law; but so long as the Senate of the United States has the right through its committees to exercise this power it seems to me that the House should have the right to exercise an equal power and authority. By adopting this rule we do not prevent the reference of these cases to the Court of Claims. We merely limit the power of our own committee. These claims will still go to the Court of Claims just as abundantly as ever. If any gentleman here thinks that a claim, if it once gets upon the Calendar, will ever be referred to the court through the agency of the Committee of the Whole they will be undeceived when they have served a little while in this Congress. When these claims come back from the Committee on War Claims and take their position on the Calendar that is the end. They will never be heard from again. The effect of this rule, therefore, is intended to be to prevent the reference, under any and all circumstances, either by this House or by one of its committees, of these claims to the Court of Claims. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that while I do not dispute the entire validity of this rule, because the adoption of it is simply an exercise of the constitutional power of this House, the rule will fail of its purpose, and its only effect will be to degrade this body in authority, leaving the evil, if it be one, to still exist in full force.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there is a great misapprehension in the minds of some gentlemen, and especially in the mind of my friend from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] who has just sat down, with reference to what this rule is and what this amendment proposes. What is Rule XXIII, which it is here proposed to amend? It is simply a rule controlling proceedings in Committee of the Whole House or in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. What kind of business alone can be taken up in Committee of the Whole? It must be business that has been reported by some committee of this House and that is upon one of two Calendars, viz, the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole or the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. No business can be taken up in Committee of the Whole except that which has been reported by some committee of the House and is upon one of those two Calendars. Hence this rule does not refer at all to the primary reference of bills.

Bills are referred to the appropriate committees under another rule. But if the appropriate committee, let it be the Committee on Claims or the Committee on War Claims, shall report to this House a resolution or bill providing for the reference of a particular claim to the Court of Claims—and they never do that unless they desire to put in some limitation or some condition which shall broaden the reference and make it different from what it would be under the Bowman Act, because in any other case they can refer the claim themselves without taking the trouble to report it to the House.

Now, the whole object of the proposed amendment to Rule XXIII is to provide that when a bill or resolution by which it is proposed to send a claim to the Court of Claims, and which has been reported by a committee and is upon one of the two Calendars I have named, that bill or resolution, whichever it may be, because the probability is very strong that it will ultimately make a charge on the Treasury, shall be first considered in Committee of the Whole. That is all this amendment to the rule provides. It does not refer to bills in any other condition, because Rule XXIII deals only with the consideration of bills already upon the Calendar which have been reported by some committee of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Do I understand the gentleman to insist that after the House in Committee of the Whole has considered a bill and referred it to the Court of Claims——

Mr. DINGLEY. In the cases covered by this rule and amendment the House has not considered it a bill. The bill has been referred to the committee in the ordinary way and gone to the Committee on War Claims or to the Committee on Claims, and that committee report a bill authorizing the Court of Claims to enter judgment in the case or modifying in some way the terms of the Bowman Act so as to give the court larger authority. Now, I say that because that bill in all probability will involve a charge upon the Treasury, it ought to be considered in Committee of the Whole, as other measures involving a charge upon the Treasury are considered.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then, after the Court of Claims have made a finding upon the case, the bill comes back to the House and it must be considered again in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DINGLEY. Not necessarily if the court was authorized to enter judgment. In that case an appropriation would be placed in the deficiency appropriation bill to pay the judgment. But if the court has only made findings of fact, then, of course, the claim must come before Congress to be acted upon in view of the findings.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman wants to have bills providing for the payment of claims in the South twice considered in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, whereas no such rule applies to other bills involving a charge upon the Treasury.

Mr. DINGLEY. I want to ask my friend, for he is very familiar with these war-claims matters, whether it is not true that nearly every bill that comes into this House to refer a claim to the Court of Claims and goes upon the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House, is not a bill intended to broaden the authority of the Court of Claims, or to authorize the court to enter a judgment in the case?

I have hardly ever known a bill to be reported to the House that was not of this character, for a reference to the court for finding of facts alone can be made by the Committee on War Claims without coming here.

Now, I take it for granted that if my friend from Tennessee has in his charge a bill involving a claim against the Government—one of the so-called "war claims"—and it must be borne in mind that every one of these so-called war claims has had its day in court and has been rejected by an appropriate tribunal——

Mr. RICHARDSON. Some have not.

Mr. DINGLEY. His object in bringing the bill here is to start the claim afresh and get rid of the statute of limitations. When such a bill comes here the gentleman having charge of it has the right, under the Bowman Act, to place the bill in the box or in the hands of the Clerk, and have it referred to the Committee on War Claims; and that committee may send the bill immediately to the Court of Claims for a simple finding of facts. That is what has been done in thousands of cases.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does the gentleman mean that that could be done under this new rule?

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes; if this new rule should be adopted it will not vary that practice at all—not in the least. This proposed rule has relation only to proceedings in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman from Maine will pardon me—I do not wish to interrupt him—the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] expressly stated that such would not be the effect of this proposed rule.

Mr. DINGLEY. I understood that in the final explanation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania he expressly stated the reverse of that.

Mr. WASHINGTON. We did not so understand him over here.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will state that such is the effect of this proposed rule we have nothing further to say.

Mr. DINGLEY. This rule—Rule XXIII—refers only to proceedings in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then, what is the objection to saying that the provisions of this rule shall not apply to War Claims presented under the Bowman Act?

Mr. DINGLEY. No difficulty can arise on that score. Rule XXIII applies exclusively to proceedings in Committee of the Whole; and the Committee of the Whole, as my friend knows, can not take up a bill at all until it is on one of two Calendars; and it must have been reported from some committee; it can not get before the Committee of the Whole in any other way.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But the gentleman, it seems to me, overlooks the important language of this proposed rule, which says that no claim shall be referred to the Court of Claims until it has been considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DINGLEY. The rule, if amended as proposed, provides that a bill or resolution referring a claim to the Court of Claims—that is, a bill reported from a committee—shall first be considered in Committee of the Whole. The provision applies also to "propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people." But the gentleman would not say that we can not refer a bill involving a tax or charge upon the people to a committee before it is considered in Committee of the Whole. Why, then, should the gentleman make such an inference in the present case? The language here proposed does not deal with bills when they are referred to a committee, but after they have been reported and are upon one of two Calendars. The whole reference is to proceedings in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman from Maine is correct—if that is the only proper construction of this proposed new rule—there will be no trouble on this side of the House, or anywhere else, I imagine.

Mr. DINGLEY. I have been surprised at the opposition raised to this rule, because obviously when a bill is on the Calendar—a bill reported from a committee and one which may involve a charge on the Treasury—it should be considered in Committee of the Whole.

I take it for granted that one reason for bringing in this provision was the fact that we have had heretofore a ruling to the effect that a bill simply referring a claim to the Court of Claims, no matter what the conditions might be, did not require consideration in Committee of the Whole. I say that as such a bill will possibly, if not probably, involve a charge upon the Treasury, it should, like all other bills that may draw money from the Treasury, be considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WHEELER. If the gentleman will read the Bowman Act he will see that it simply allows to the War Claims Committee the aid of the Court of Claims——

Mr. DINGLEY. Or to any committee——

Mr. WHEELER. To ascertain the facts, so that an intelligent report may be made to the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. But we are not touching the Bowman Act at all. That still stands. This has nothing at all to do with that. I may say, however, with reference to that act (although it is not up now) that I do hope there will be some amendment made to it which will remove from the scope of that act thousands of cases that have once been adjudicated.

Mr. DOCKERY. A good amendment would be to repeal the act.

Mr. DINGLEY. The docket of that court should not be filled up with such claims, as it has been. But we are not dealing at all with that question. I simply say that all that this amendment to the rule provides is, that when any committee reports a bill to this House for a reference of any claim against the Government to the Court of Claims, that bill shall be first considered in Committee of the Whole, for it may involve a charge against the Government, and that is the proper place to consider it. That is all that this rule does.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to be heard for a moment.

Mr. DINGLEY. I would yield to the gentleman for a few moments.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to occupy five minutes.

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, the class of persons who are benefited by this Bowman Act——

Mr. DINGLEY. I do not want to yield for a speech. If the gentleman wants to make an inquiry or suggestion——

Mr. WHEELER. I simply ask five minutes to make a statement.

Mr. DINGLEY. All right.

Mr. WHEELER. The class of persons who are benefited by the Bowman Act are a class of very poor people, loyal people, and, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON] who has just spoken will tell you, ninety-nine out of a hundred of them stanch Republicans, and they furnished supplies to the Federal Army when it was sorely in need of them. It seems to me that the Bowman Act has not been fully understood. It does not authorize the Court of Claims to render any judgment upon a claim referred to it, but, quite to the contrary, it specially prohibits the Court of Claims from entering any judgment. It simply authorizes the Committee on War Claims to invoke the aid of the Court of Claims in ascertaining the facts in any claim which becomes a pending claim before the committee. The language of section 1 of the act is—

That whenever a claim or matter is pending before any committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or before either House of Congress, which involves the investigation and determination of facts, the committee or House may cause the same, with the vouchers, papers, proofs, and documents pertaining thereto, to be transmitted to the Court of Claims of the United States, and the same shall there be proceeded in under such rules as the court may adopt.

The law then specially provides that the court shall not enter judgment, the language being as follows:

When the facts shall have been found, the court shall not enter judgment thereon, but shall report the same to the committee or to the House by which the case was transmitted for its consideration.

But the law specially provides that the court shall have no jurisdiction, except in cases where the person who furnished the supplies was loyal to the Union throughout the war.

The person who furnished such supplies or stores, or from whom the same were taken as aforesaid, was loyal to the Government of the United States throughout said war.

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, so far from its amounting to a large sum we have the records showing exactly the character and amount of all of these claims. The reports from the Southern Claims Commission have been printed, and they include every claim that can possibly be adjudicated under this section of the Bowman Act.

Most of them have very small claims, some of them as low as $50 or $100, and very few of them exceeding $1,000.

Now, I do not intend to criticise our friends from the North, but it is nevertheless a fact that the loyal men of the South have been great sufferers under the various laws enacted since the close of the war which affect the South and Southern people.

Any law that has operated detrimentally upon the Southern people has, of course, affected all alike. In very few of the laws has there been any distinction, nor was it possible in many cases for any distinction to be made, between men who adhered to the Union and those who fought in the Confederate army. It is true that in this clause there is a provision that a man who can prove absolute loyalty shall have the right to have his claim passed upon by the Court of Claims, while a man who can not prove that he was loyal throughout the war is debarred from any benefit under this act; but if the rule under consideration is adopted it will practically nullify the provision of the Bowman Act, which was passed for the benefit of loyal men.

The gentleman from Maine was here in the Forty-seventh Congress and recollects the discussion in relation to the Bowman Act. That act was a compromise. Every one of the questions which have been brought up to-day was considered and fully discussed in the House. The gentleman discussed it himself and voted for it, and I believe that every Republican in the House did so. It was, in fact, almost a unanimous vote.

It was not a hastily prepared bill, but was before the House during nearly all of the Forty-seventh Congress, and only became the law on March 3, 1883, the day that Congress ceased to exist. It was amended over and over again, and the section providing that the War Claims Committee should have authority to refer cases to the Court of Claims was incorporated in order that the facts might be fairly and honestly adjudicated, and this was regarded as the most important feature in the law. It was regarded as more important to the Government than to the individual, as it saved the Government from being imposed upon by the committee being compelled to act upon ex parte affidavits.

The gentleman, I know, recalls the spirited debate on this point between Mr. Bowman, of Massachusetts, and General Bragg, of Wisconsin.

The mode of procedure under the Bowman Act has been as follows: When a petition is presented to the House for the payment of money for supplies, it shall be referred to the Committee on War Claims. That committee, before reporting it back to the House, shall have authority to invoke the aid of the Court of Claims, which shall report its findings back to Congress, but no judgment is rendered; they simply report the findings of fact as obtained by the court under the rules of evidence, and return it to the committee, and the committee then consider the matter and make their report to the House.

I want to repeat that in substance the clause of the Bowman Act which is sought to be nullified is nothing more than authority to the War Claims Committee to invoke the aid of the Court of Claims to enable the committee to give fair and just consideration to a claim; and I also ask the gentleman to remember that the Court of Claims is inhibited from considering these claims unless the loyalty of the claimant is first established.

Let me ask if there can be any objection or if any harm can come to the Government by the Committee on War Claims invoking the aid of the Court of Claims before reporting the bill back to the House?

Mr. DINGLEY. Well, I think I have been as patient as the gentleman could wish. Has he now concluded his inquiry?

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman allow me a moment more? I asked leave to use five minutes of the time, and I shall occupy but a moment longer. I desire simply to recur to a fact with reference to a citizen in the district represented by the gentleman from Tennessee, in order to illustrate the operation of laws upon Southern men who served in the Federal Army. A Federal soldier of some distinction, Captain Mosier, of Tennessee, said to me shortly after the war that when Mr. Lincoln issued his proclamation saying that it was not his desire or intention to interfere with the institutions of the South he felt certain he could save his property by enlisting under the banner of the Union. He was one of the first to espouse the Union cause. He rose to the rank of captain, and campaigned from Louisville with Buell down to Savannah under Sherman, and he exclaimed, "Would you believe it, after the war was over, after fighting through it all, when they emancipated the negroes they emancipated my negroes, too?" [Laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman permit me to offer an amendment at this time?

Mr. DALZELL. Just a word. I want no misunderstanding as to my position. I concede that this relates simply tc claims

over which the House itself has jurisdiction, and has nothing to do with claims in reference to which it has parted with jurisdiction. In other words, that it does not refer to Rule XI at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask to offer my amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I must ask for the previous question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not offer the amendment when I had the floor because I understood I should have permission to offer the amendment later. I thought I should have permission to offer an amendment to the amendment. I do not think the gentleman will object to it under the statement which was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. I hope the gentleman will hear it.

Mr. HENDERSON. The gentleman understands from what has been said that the committee is not deprived of its power to refer.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not think my friend will object to the amendment, if he will hear it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Let us hear it read, then. I am too good-natured; that is my weakness.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think it is right.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "claim" add "by the House of Representatives."

Mr. RICHARDSON. That will make it conform to the effect of it, as stated by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. DINGLEY. What is the proposition?

Mr. RICHARDSON. My proposition is, after the word "claim," in the proposed amendment, to add the words "by the House of Representatives." The effect of it will be that where any claim is referred by the House of Representatives to the Court of Claims, it will first go to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DINGLEY. I do not understand the gentleman. What does he mean by that?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Why, the gentleman's argument is based on the idea that it is where the House itself makes the reference that it must first be considered in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Tennessee will for a moment consider the natural course of a bill under the rules he will see that it must be so, because the bills are presented to the Speaker and are referred, and they can not go to the Committee of the Whole until they come back from the committee to which they are referred.

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly; it is perfectly clear.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then, Mr. Speaker, while that is so, after the Chair, acting for the House, has referred a bill—we will say it is a war-claim bill—to the Committee on War Claims, is it understood that that committee will then refer that bill to the Court of Claims without it coming back to the House?

The SPEAKER. That is a question of law on which the gentleman's judgment is as good as that of anybody else.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think we may settle that as we go along here now.

Mr. DINGLEY. If my friend will pardon me, this is a rule referring to proceedings in Committee of the Whole House. Does not my friend know that nothing can be considered in Committee of the Whole House until it has been reported back by a committee and is on the Calendar?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; I know that.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then what is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. RICHARDSON. But does not this rule attempt to provide that no committee of this House shall refer a claim to the Court of Claims until it has been considered in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. DINGLEY. It does not say that. There is nothing here that reads that way.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If that is true, that is all I desire to accomplish by my amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is no doubt about that. I ask for the previous question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman will not permit my amendment to be offered, then? I take it the amendment is not necessary, anyway, under the construction given the proposed amendment, which may be considered as the construction of the House, then, I suppose.

Mr. HENDERSON. I must ask for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In Rule XXIV, section 2, in the next to the last line, after the words "Committee of the Whole," strike out the words "may also."

Mr. CRISP. What is the amendment? There is nothing in the print which I have before me to indicate it.

Mr. HENDERSON. This amendment is simply to correct a repetition. It is a matter of mere formality, a verbal amendment to Rule XXIV.

Mr. CRISP. It is not italicized, as the other amendments are, and I do not see it.

The SPEAKER. It is merely the correction of a verbal error which was in the original rule.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is to strike out the words "may also" in the next to the last line.

The SPEAKER. There is a repetition of the words "may also."

Mr. HENDERSON. It is merely a question of grammar.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I suggest that there is nothing to vote upon. There is no motion pending, and it requires a motion to strike out these two words.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand the point made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. It seems to me that in order to make this vote effective, a motion should be made to strike out the words "may also."

The SPEAKER. That is the proposition which is presented to the House.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I did not understand that. I thought it was claimed that the amendment was printed in the copy of the rules which we have before us.

The SPEAKER. That is the motion. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the amendment? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Is there any other amendment to be made to this section?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend Rule XXIV by adding as clause 7 the following:
"Whenever a member of either House of Congress dies during the term for which he was elected it shall be in order, in place of special memorial services, for a member to announce the same and to send a resolution to the desk briefly stating the worth and services of the deceased; which, if adopted by the House, shall be printed in the RECORD."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the word "briefly" as it occurs. If we are to abandon these ceremonies it is not necessary to use the word "briefly" in the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I accept that amendment.

Mr. McMILLIN. Does the gentleman in charge of the report think it proper to abandon them?

Mr. HENDERSON. I have not consented to it, but I want the amendment in proper shape.

Mr. McMILLIN. It would appear to me that if this House can not take cognizance of the life and character of a gentleman who has died in the public service we are a very busy body.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I think it would be a good deal better to spend our time in the performance of the duties for which we were elected and let the dead bury the dead. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BOATNER. Which amendment?

The SPEAKER. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa has been accepted by the gentleman from New York, and the question is on the amendment as proposed by him. The Clerk will read it as modified.

Mr. DALZELL. I want to suggest as an amendment that there should be leave to print for ten days.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. As that seems to be the wish of the House, I accept that also.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that if this practice is to be abandoned at all, if there is any public exigency that requires that there shall not be a memorial recognition of a man who has spent his life in the public service and who dies in it, I think it would only be an insult to his memory to go through the useless form of printing some things that were never said concerning him. I am not going to object. If the gentleman thinks it proper to take that course, and wants to do it, I will not stand in the way; but it looks to me very much like, if the custom is abandoned, and if we are to pay no regard to the memory of those men who die in the public service, it would also be decent not to inaugurate any mockery in connection with it.

Mr. BOATNER. I want to ask the gentleman if he has not had his sensibilities seriously affected by seeing a mockery of memorial services over a member of the House when not half a dozen members of the House were in attendance, and I will ask him whether he does not really think it is a mockery that ought to be abolished? I think if I were going to die in the service of the country, and knew it, I should make a dying request that these ceremonies should be omitted with reference to me.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from New York, I suppose, will

not say that there should not be so much respect shown as makes provision for carrying him to the depot when he is to be sent home, if he were to die here. I will say in response to my friend from Louisiana, Mr. Speaker, that I do not want to treat his interrogatory otherwise than most respectfully, for I have the most profound respect for his judgment and know that habitually he takes the serious and the patriotic side of all questions here. In reply to his inquiry I do not hesitate to say that I have never seen any services in this House in memory of a deceased member that were not beneficial in their character to mankind; and I have seen this House spend its time in a thousand times worse way than in commemorating faithful public service. The trouble with this amendment is that it does not go to the root of the evil. The exercises here are costless and decorous. Let him seek to correct the evil or reduce unnecessary expenses and I will join him cheerfully in it. I have no anxiety in the matter, however, as I do not intend to die here.

Mr. BOATNER. It seems to be an ungracious thing to support the proposition of the gentleman from New York, but I have so often seen memorial services degenerate to mockery that I feel compelled to vote for it. It has come to be the custom to set aside a part of an evening for these services by special order, and when the time is reached for the special order, all except those who expect to deliver memorial addresses take their hats and go away. It is a useless charge upon the public; it is a useless consumption of public time, and it is a mockery except in cases where the distinction of the member who died is such as to command audiences on those occasions. For one I think it is a movement in the right direction, and think that a resolution spread upon the record attesting the estimation in which the deceased member is held by the House of Representatives is a sufficient recognition of his merit and would be all that proper respect could require.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the amendment will not prevail. I think that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] has given most excellent reasons why it should not be adopted. If I understand the effect of the amendment it would be to prevent the delivery of eulogies here upon our deceased members. Now, it seems to me that it is only a decent and proper thing for this House to suspend its ordinary business for a few hours to do honor to the memory of men who have rendered long and distinguished public services upon this floor. I am sure that such an amendment as this would not meet the approval of the country. These memorial services usually take place on a Saturday afternoon after the business of the House has been concluded, and therefore do not really occupy time which otherwise would be employed in legislation. The old Romans had a maxim, memento mori, and it was a sound maxim. It is good for us to pause occasionally in our public duties and ponder upon the solemn fact that we, too, are mortal and that we have here no continuing city. It is a decent and proper proceeding, and I certainly hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. Speaker, these eulogies upon our deceased members are an inspiration to the young men of our country. They not infrequently develop the fact, as in the case of Judge Houk, of Tennessee, that men have risen to the high position of member of Congress in spite of untoward circumstances, in spite of misfortune of birth, in spite of poverty. And in this way I say they are an inspiration to the young men of the country who are surrounded by unfortunate circumstances to rise above the circumstances of their birth. In the eulogies to which I have referred the fact was developed that Congressman Houk, of Tennessee, got his education by the light of a pine torch; that he struggled with poverty and untold obstacles, in spite of which he rose to be a judge of his native State and finally to be a member of Congress, and for many years to represent that State on the floor of this House with dignity and signal ability. They inspire patriotism and love of country, and I believe are worth all they cost.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to this House that after the most eloquent eulogy which was published in the RECORD in commemoration of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Charles O'Neill, by our friend from Massachusetts, Mr. MORSE, I think it would be a great deprivation to this House not to have this practice of pronouncing eulogies continued as each member of the House goes to his long home. But, on the other hand, I think we ought to pay some regard to the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER] on this subject, for it was but very recently that we all burned midnight oil in writing eulogies in anticipation of a prospective event which was liable to occur to that gentleman. [Great laughter.] No wonder what might be the result added new terrors to the meeting. So far as these eulogies generally are concerned, I think that the empty benches of this House have been called upon to weep and mourn often enough, and as that has been the only effect, it seems to me that it would be well to suspend these commemorative eulogies here and let them be addressed to living men at the homes of members rather than to empty benches here. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say only a word. I am in sympathy with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I remember that at one time during my experience here the cost of printing the eulogies delivered in a single Congress exceeded $100,000. That is one reason for dropping the practice, but it is not the controlling one. It is a question in my mind whether this amendment to our rules, if it be adopted, ought to take effect during the present Congress, for this reason: The Senate will probably go on, under its rules, continuing to have eulogies delivered and printed—if there should be any occasion for eulogies there. [Laughter.] We have no knowledge that the Senate will consent to this change, and if they do not the effect will be that they will continue to deliver and print their eulogies, while this body will be deprived of that privilege. [Laughter.] It occurs to me, therefore, that the gentleman from New York ought to limit his amendment by providing that it shall not be operative until after the adjournment of this session of Congress, so that the Senate may have an opportunity to adopt a similar rule if it is so disposed.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I think some gentlemen here misapprehend the effect of these memorial addresses upon the public mind. The other day I received a letter from a constituent of my colleague, Mr. HENDERSON, saying that he had written to his Representative for some documents, but had not got them, and asking me to send him an agricultural report, and also some memorial addresses, because, as he said, there was nothing he read with so much pleasure as the obituaries of Congressmen. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. The whole country is in about the same state of mind.

Mr. LACEY. Well, I think we ought not to deprive our constituents of such valuable literature. [Laughter.]

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], which I am not willing to accept, because I think that we ought to establish our own rules without reference to the action of any other body—if the Senators see fit to continue the practice which has prevailed in the past, it is for them to do so, and if we may not give them advice, certainly we are not required to withhold action which we may deem proper for this body until the Senate shall have made a similar reform.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is always desirous of putting before the people on every suitable occasion the words of truth and wisdom with which he is overflowing, and when his great generosity comes to be understood by gentlemen who have not had the opportunity of witnessing its manifestations in the past they will better appreciate the remarks he has just made.

My distinguished friend in the last Congress, in a memorial address, transformed a venerable bachelor of mature years into a married man with wife and many children. [Laughter.] I need hardly say that this account of the deceased member somewhat disturbed his friends at home, who had always supposed that their distinguished representative at Washington had pursued an entirely different course of life. [Great laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, that mistake was all owing to the extreme generosity of our friend from Massachusetts. His warm heart and kindly feelings undoubtedly led him to believe that every good man should enter into marital relations, and therefore he assumed that so good a man as the one he was commemorating must necessarily have been a man of family. This case illustrates another fact, namely, that the gentlemen who address the House on such occasions generally know so little about the details of the lives of those they eulogize that their addresses would be equally applicable to Peter Jones or John Smith. [Laughter.]

As has been said by the gentleman from Louisiana, on the days appointed for these eulogies, as soon as the order is reached, every man, excepting those detailed to make the speeches, takes his hat and leaves the Hall. There could be nothing more disrespectful toward the friends of a deceased member than such action in this House, and could any of them see it they would wish that no member of their family who might be a member of Congress and die during his term should be the subject of such a proceeding.

Mr. McMILLIN. Does the gentleman's amendment propose to do away with that portion of the obsequies which is really the expensive portion—the funeral procession and the "wake"—or does the gentleman propose to let that go on?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I am not interfering with that——

Mr. McMILLIN. Then you are willing for that to go on?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. My friend from Tennessee should understand that the provision now under consideration relates to proceedings in this House. The matter to which the gentleman refers comes under another head. I shall be glad to join with him in reducing the funeral expenses of deceased members so that the family might regard them as suitable to his condition in life. But that is not the question now before the House.

Why need more be done for any man who may die while a member of the House, whatever may have been his services to the coun-

try, than to have this body stop in its proceedings, take notice of the fact of his death, and by resolution set forth the character of the man and his services, and such a resolution, if adopted by the House, printed in the records, to be preserved in the archives of the Government. No man who may occupy a seat on this floor should desire more to be done in respect to his memory than that. It should be sufficient on the death of anyone now living or of anyone who may already have died, to have the House adopt the simple, dignified method of announcing the fact and expressing the sense of the House as to the character of the man and his services. I hope the amendment will be adopted. It will save expense to the Government and promote the dignity and character of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I can not agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS]. It may be that there is necessity for some reform in these memorial services; but I do not believe we should adopt a proposition to dispense with these services entirely. To simply print a resolution in the RECORD, as here proposed, would be almost equivalent to ignoring the death of a man altogether when he dies a member of this House. His relatives would scarcely be able to find the resolution. It seems to me that when a man has served his constituents in this House a long term of years, or even for a short term, the House can well afford to spend enough time to give suitable recognition of his life and services if death comes to him here while at his post of duty.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] has said jocularly that a constituent wrote to him saying that he was delighted to read the eulogies on deceased members of Congress. It seems to me the gentleman from Iowa can not have been quite accurate in that statement. The meaning intended was probably this: A great many young and earnest men have applied to me for these eulogies upon the ground that in them they read the history of struggling young Americans who have made their lives successful. Those who thus apply to me say: "We want to know the history of such men; we want to know something of their struggles." A lesson for the young men of the country, and for the older men of the country, can be learned from reading of the struggles and trials of many of these men in reaching the United States Senate or the House of Representatives. In this way, according to my view, these memorial addresses are often beneficial. In these memorials the poorest boy in this country may stimulate his courage and learn that these men, many of them with surroundings in no way superior to his own, rose to high and honored places in the nation.

I am surprised that a resolution of this kind should come from the gentleman from New York. In the great army of which he was so conspicuous a member, when the most inconspicuous private went down to death, if the army was not in dire conflict—if there was any possibility of taking time to do it—that inconspicuous private was accompanied to his grave by a detail of his comrades with muffled drums and reversed arms, and over his grave a salute was fired in commemoration of his services. It seems to me that this House could scarcely do less in respect to a deceased colleague than observe some ceremony appropriate with reference to one of their associates. If there be a demand for some reform in this line, it is evident to me that the suggestion now made in that direction has not been properly considered. The question ought to be acted on in connection with the Senate. We should not have the Senate pursuing one line in these matters while we pursue another. We should not, in other words, pay less attention to the deceased members of this body than is paid at the other end of the Capitol to deceased Senators. Any reform which may be attempted ought certainly to be well considered. The proposition that we merely pass resolutions does not seem to me adequate.

Some gentlemen make objection to these memorial services because all the members of the House do not stay and hear the eulogies. I concede that this is sometimes the fact. These services are like the funerals which we have at home. If a man is widely known and people feel greatly interested in regard to him there is a larger attendance at his funeral than at that of a less distinguished man. But I have never seen on these memorial occasions in this House anything else than the most orderly conduct, and I think all must be impressed with the solemnity of the occasion during these memorial exercises. Time and again I have remained here when I knew little or nothing of the deceased member, except the history then given of him, and have been interested in hearing that history rehearsed by his friends. Certainly it is not expected that members who are not especially interested should all stay here on such occasions, but there will always be found a goodly number to remain.

It does seem to me that there is not so great a rush of business—there is not such a demand for giving up every moment of our time to legislation—that we may not, as suggested by my friend from Massachusetts, devote so much as may be necessary of Saturday afternoons, or possibly Friday afternoons, to these memorial services. I am not in favor of adopting such a proposition as this now, especially when it would have the effect of cutting out the eulogies of such men as General Cogswell, that distinguished soldier and statesman, our colleague in this House, so much admired and loved by his colleagues in previous Houses. I think the pending proposition has not been well considered, and should not be adopted. I think if there has been a demand, or any necessity of the adoption of such a measure, it ought to be in connection with the action of the Senate, that it ought to be done in an orderly and regular manner, and not adopted in the shape proposed here as an amendment to the rules of the House.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman——

Mr. HENDERSON. I must demand the previous question on the amendment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I hope the gentleman will yield to me for a moment to offer an amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Before that, I would like to inquire if the gentleman from South Dakota, when he speaks of the "services of the men on this floor," does not recall the proceedings in the last Congress, where men elected to Congress who never were here at all had as much attention paid to them, and when members on this floor delivered orations on them, as in the case of the most distinguished men in the Republic?

Mr. PICKLER. Well, I am not undertaking to classify the members; but I would not deny any member elected to the House such a distinction.

Mr. HENDERSON. I withdraw the demand for the previous question for the purpose of allowing the gentleman from Ohio to offer an amendment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not wish any debate upon it, but simply to add to the amendment pending the words:

Provided, That nothing in this rule shall prevent eulogies on members of this House who have died prior to this date.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I accept that.

Mr. QUIGG. Is there an amendment pending providing for leave to print?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. It has been already offered.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HENDERSON. Now, I demand the previous question.

Mr. WILLIS. I hope the previous question will not be ordered. It is not right.

Mr. HENDERSON. We have shown every indulgence to the members in considering these rules. It is getting along late in the afternoon of Saturday, but I withdraw the request in order that the gentleman from Delaware may be heard, after which I shall insist upon it.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman withdraws the demand, the Chair will first recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG].

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those "young, struggling Americans"—to whom the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] so touchingly referred, and for the suitable publication of whose virtues after death he is so solicitous—and I am frank to say that there is nothing that would add a more acute pang to my feelings in apprehension of that event than to think that things were going to happen about me in this House when I had died which I have observed in the cases of other "young, struggling Americans" who came to Congress, but who had led otherwise blameless lives.

I understand that this business of eulogies consumes from fifteen to twenty days of the sessions of the House. Half a month is spent in listening to obituaries, or, if not in listening to them (because few members do that), in having them read on the floor of the House. There could be no waste of time more objectionable to the members who have died, I am quite sure. And the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] says that it costs a hundred thousand dollars of the public money to pay for the mere printing of these obituaries.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; I said that was the case in former Congresses. It does not reach that sum now, because under the general law the printing is limited—a smaller amount being allowed.

Mr. QUIGG. But what sum or sums will be required if the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Iowa prevails, of giving leave to print on these occasions? That is a very bad suggestion. There is no practice of the House, as it seems to me, more entirely unwarrantable than this habit of sticking into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD things that were never said on the floor of the House. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ought to be what it was intended to be, a record of just exactly what is said—verbatim et literatim—and of nothing else, and there ought not to be a line in it, or one dollar of expense incurred on the part of the people of the country with respect to it, of things that are not said, and that we know there is no time to say. This practice is a fraud on our constituents in two ways: First, by the pretense that we do things that we do not do, and then by making them pay for the pretense. It is to my mind a very petty sort of vanity that prompts this practice. I hope it will not be continued in any such increasing or objectionable form as is proposed by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not propose the amendment myself, but said I approved of it.

Mr. QUIGG. I hope we will do away with all this nonsense, and if the House wishes to pay its respect to a deceased member it can do so sufficiently under the amendment to the rules proposed by my colleague from New York, which I sincerely hope will be adopted.

We can record upon the House Journal the fact of our respect for him. We can send a copy of the RECORD to his family, and that is all that ought to be done unless the character of the man is such as calls for a public tribute. Then the rule could be suspended for the occasion, as, of course, it would be.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I hope this amendment will not prevail. I have one reason for it that nobody has referred to, and that is, that we consume so much time saying unpleasant things of one another that it constitutes a very profitable exercise to meet on such occasions and say something that is good about one another. [Applause.] If there is no other reason for this than the wholesome exercise of the human mind which is involved in that idea I believe that neither time nor money is wasted. [Applause.] Because, while we remember that we are Congressmen and representatives of the people in this country's legislative body, it is not well for us to forget that we are men—a few feet of organized dirt, endowed with certain strange and often conflicting qualities; acting many times upon motives that are not too high, and making it too frequently a practice to find out all the faults of our neighbors and none of the virtues.

Now, these memorial occasions bring to the surface and to the tongues of men utterances concerning what is good of one another, after they have been spending too much time in spreading before the world what they think is not good of one another. Looking at this thing as a matter of common observation and human philosophy, these memorial services have accomplished some good in this direction; and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] has well said, it is a profitable time for pause, for reflection; and even though the audience that may be present may not be a large one, influences arise in our minds which better qualify us to legislate for the people, to entertain sentiments of well-ordered patriotism, and to do the duties devolving upon us as representatives of our constituencies better than we should otherwise perform them.

We are not ready for such a radical change, and I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. HENDERSON. I merely want to say to the House that there is no rule on this subject. The Committee on Rules have not proposed any amendment, and this proposition is brought forward by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS], with an amendment by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I will detain the House only for a moment on this question, for I do not wish, in anything that pertains to the rules or the conduct of our business, to appear in any light except as one seeking to promote good government. I realize that there might be some reform inaugurated along the lines proposed here. That there has been some complaint at the method of conducting the funerals of deceased members is unquestionable. How far that has been well founded, or how far it has been ill founded, I will not undertake to say. There has also been some complaint at the amount expended in conducting these funerals. How just that is I will not undertake to discuss, but I want to say that whatever evil there may be connected with this, the rule that is proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS] does not reach any evil. The most expensive part of it he leaves untouched and does not propose to remedy. His amendment does not even pretend to reach that. If we are going to do anything at all, let us do that which is substantial. Let him propose to conduct funerals more decorously or cut off any unnecessary expense and I join him. But these he does not seek to do.

What we should do in this matter depends entirely upon how far we remedy any ill. If this amendment went to the remedy of any great evil, we might afford to adopt it, but it seems to me it does not remedy any ill complained of. It does not do away with the long journey and expensive funeral, but only with the costless part of the proceeding.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. It is a step in the right direction.

Mr. HENDERSON. I ask the previous question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to move an amendment. I move to strike out the words which were inserted by request, giving leave to print. My reason is a very simple one, and I can give it in one word.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have refused to yield to several gentlemen around me, because I think we must finish this up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I simply desire to make this motion and to state the reason for it in a word.

Mr. HENDERSON. The gentleman from Massachusetts and several other gentlemen have requested to be recognized, and I have refused.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I submit my amendment to the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The first question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That nothing in this rule shall prevent eulogies on men who have died previous to this date.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the original amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 31, noes 130.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. If there is no other amendment to be offered to this rule, the Clerk will read the next.

The Clerk read as follows:

In Rule XXVII, section 1, strike out "No standing rule or order of the House shall be rescinded or changed without one day's notice of the motion therefor"; and also strike out the words "except to fix a day for the consideration of a bill or resolution already favorably reported by a committee on motion directed to be made by such committee, which will require only a majority vote of the House," and insert, after the word "members," the words "voting, a quorum being."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Unless there is further amendment proposed, the Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In Rule XXXVI, amend section 2 by striking out, after the words "may assign," the words "two seats," and insert the words "one seat"; after the words "press reporters" insert "and"; after the words "United Press" insert the word "reporters," and strike out the words immediately following, "and one to the Press News Association Reporter"; and after the words "occupation of the same" insert "and the Speaker may admit to the floor, under such regulations as he may prescribe, one additional representative of each press association."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to this rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend Rule XXXVI as reported by inserting, after the word "chair," in line 4, the words "and to the Hall in the rear thereof."

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, the object of this amendment is to introduce the same provision that we had in the latter part of the last Congress, in order that, under such regulations as may be established by the Speaker, it may be the privilege of members to meet the representatives of the different newspapers in the room back of the Speaker's chair. It seems to me that that was a very great accommodation to us all as well as to the members of the newspaper fraternity. It is certainly a most unpleasant thing to be called upon to go into the corridors to confer with the representatives of the press; and there can be no question that our own convenience was greatly promoted by the provision of the last Congress which I propose in this amendment to secure to ourselves.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want the House to understand the effect of this proposition. It is to allow the newspaper correspondents to enter the doors on the two sides and occupy the lobby of the hall and the parlors. That is the way I understand the amendment. Am I right?

Mr. WANGER. I was not aware that I was off the floor.

Mr. HENDERSON. I supposed the gentleman had yielded. I beg pardon. I had no intention to take the gentleman off the floor.

Mr. WANGER. What is your question?

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the purport of your amendment is to give the newspaper correspondents the right to use the hall outside and the parlors.

Mr. WANGER. The right to use the hall under such regulations as the Speaker may prescribe.

Mr. HENDERSON. You apply that to those rooms right back of the Speaker's desk?

Mr. WANGER. I do.

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg your pardon. I thought you had concluded your remarks.

Mr. WANGER. Not quite.

I have heard an intimation that it is proposed to secure other rooms in which to meet the representatives of the press, and it may be that there are other rooms which are available for that purpose which would answer as well as these rooms will; but the provision "under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe" covers the case. I do not believe that there can be any abuse of the privilege, if it is possible to conceive that there would be any abuse. I take it there was none during the last Congress, and the representatives of the press are gentlemen who will respect the rights and privileges of this House under whatever regulations the Speaker may prescribe, and that there will

be a promotion of our own convenience as well as preserving the utmost order and decorum.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the proposition, as I stated when, in error, I supposed the gentleman had yielded the floor, is to allow representatives of the newspapers to occupy that hall and the parlors back of the Speaker's chair. In antagonizing that proposition I know I incur, and those voting as I shall vote will incur possibly, the displeasure of the representatives of the able journals of this country; but I do not believe in this amendment, nor do I think it is right for this House to shirk its responsibility and throw it upon the presiding officer. Let us decide whether we want to share with others the use of those parlors and that hall. My judgment is that it is an unwise thing to do. For the accommodation of members rooms were taken away where I am now pointing—to the left—that were used by the Speaker besides the comfortable room that he now enjoys.

They were taken out and thrown into that large hall in order to give better accommodation to the members of this House. We know perfectly well that any representative of the press desiring to see us will see us, for if there is any strong hand that we are always willing to shake it is the hand that wields the quill, and we will never fail to see a member of the press when he desires it. But, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that that is a spot that should be sacred to the rest and the conferences of members of this body. That was the intention in constructing that lobby, and I believe it should be kept for that purpose. Besides, since we have established a more strict rule against smoking, a larger latitude may be needed in that respect outside of this Hall, and gentlemen desiring to smoke who have hitherto indulged upon the floor may be driven into that corridor to enjoy their cigars. I wish the members of this House to understand exactly what this amendment means, and then they must take the responsibility of determining whether we shall keep those quarters for ourselves, treating them as a part of this Chamber, or whether we shall share them with others.

Mr. QUIGG. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa whether, under the regulation which was in force in the last House, newspaper men had any privilege of entering the lobby except upon the invitation of members?

Mr. HENDERSON. They came in there freely, as I understand.

Mr. QUIGG. The regulation of the last House, as I understood it, was that when a card was sent in by a newspaper man to a member and the member desired to see him he might invite him into that lobby for the purpose of conferring with him. That was a very reasonable rule, it seems to me, and one which was certainly very useful to the members of the House. I do not think the newspaper men care much about it, but I should think the members would.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what regulations were issued. I simply know that members of the press were around that lobby constantly, so that at times you could hardly move around there without meeting some of them. I believe I am warranted in saying further that distinguished gentlemen, representing some of the great journals of this country, are opposed to this amendment. That is my information, and I believe it. At all events, I still adhere to my proposition that that piece of territory out there should be kept sacred for the use of members of this body. When we want to see a member of the press let us go out and see him, as we would go to meet any other American citizen who desired to see us. If I have a right to invite a member of the press in here I ought to have a like right to bring in any other citizen of the United States who may desire to confer with me in relation to his interests pending in this body.

The question being taken on the amendment, the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 18, noes 74.

Mr. WANGER. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER (after a count). One hundred and ninety members are present—a quorum. The noes have it, and the amendment is rejected. [Applause.] The Clerk will read the next paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

In Rule XLV, strike out the words in section 2 inclosed in brackets, so that the rule shall read:

"1. All documents referred to committees or otherwise disposed of shall be printed unless otherwise specially ordered.

"2. Motions to print additional numbers of any bill, report, resolution, or other public document shall be referred to the Committee on Printing; and the report of the committee thereon shall be accompanied by an estimate of the probable cost thereof. Unless ordered by the House, no bill, resolution, or other proposition reported by a committee shall be reprinted unless the same be placed upon the Calendar."

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I want to make an inquiry of the gentleman in charge of this report. Under the operation of this rule heretofore, House bills with Senate amendments and Senate bills sent to us have not been printed except by special order of the House. The rule only relates to bills introduced in the House. Now, I wish to say that my experience in considering such bills has been quite unsatisfactory, and I think there ought to be some provision made for the printing of House bills when amended by the Senate, so as to show how they have been amended by the Senate. In that body they print House bills when we send them over there, and the members of the Senate committee having charge of them have the benefit of such a print; but Senate bills and House bills with Senate amendments are never printed here until they are reported to the House by the committee. The clerk of the committee is charged with the custody of the officially enrolled bills, and it is his duty to keep them carefully, and the consequence is that members of the committee have not and can not have free access to them. Now, I think the proper consideration of legislation that progresses that far and is referred to the House committees requires that it should be printed as it goes to the committee, and I trust this rule will be made broad enough to provide for that.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the sole purpose of this amendment is to strike out a provision in the rules of the Fifty-first Congress which is no longer necessary by reason of the passage in the last Congress of what is known as the printing bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not understand from the reading how much of the text was proposed to be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. That portion which is inclosed between brackets in the second section is proposed to be stricken out.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes. The proposition is to strike out that part of the old rule which is now rendered unnecessary by the printing bill, so called.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This finishes the amendments reported by the committee, and the Chair will now call attention to the other rules. Is there any amendment——

Mr. McRAE (interposing). If the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] does not wish to offer the amendment I will move that Senate bills and House bills with Senate amendments be printed, the usual number.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not understand the gentleman's proposition. Probably he did not take in the scope of our amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The difficulty which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] has suggested is this: When a Senate bill comes to this House and is referred to a committee, that committee, under the arrangements which have existed heretofore, must depend upon the engrossed copy of the bill; and there is only one such copy sent. The gentleman from Arkansas suggests that there ought to be printed copies of Senate bills which come here; and I think he is correct in that suggestion.

Mr. CANNON. Does not the printing law provide for this?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It does not.

Mr. HENDERSON. I supposed this matter was covered by that law.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It never has been the practice under any law or rule for the House to print bills coming here from the Senate, though, as the gentleman from Arkansas has stated, the Senate rules provide for the printing of House bills which go to that body.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the proposition of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. McRAE. That the rule be amended so as to authorize the printing of the same number of Senate bills when they are transmitted to the House and also House bills as amended by the Senate.

Mr. HENDERSON. I suggest that the gentleman reduce his amendment to writing.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It seems to me hardly necessary that we should print more than a hundred copies of these Senate bills.

Mr. McRAE. I think there ought to be no objection to this amendment. I am not particular as to the number which may be printed so that enough be printed for the use of the committee that may be charged with the consideration of the bill. I know that in the Committee on Public Lands it has often been the case that when we were considering a bill of great importance there was only one copy in the possession of the committee, and that the officially enrolled copy. In such cases the manuscript copy is in the custody of the clerk, and can not be marked or changed; and when there are sixteen or seventeen members handling it, it is liable to be lost. The committees should at least have a print of the bills they are expected to consider, and these are usually given preference.

Under the arrangements which have existed heretofore we have had no printed copies of the Senate bills coming to the House, or of House bills passed by the Senate with amendments. After a House bill is materially changed by amendment in the Senate, members are often misled by getting the original print. From such causes I have often seen confusion arise on the floor and very great inconvenience in committee in the consideration of important measures. I sought to have adopted in the last Congress an

amendment such as I now suggest and to which I hope this House will agree.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will read the amendment:

Of bills which have passed the Senate and of House bills as amended by the Senate when referred in the House there shall be printed 100 copies.

Mr. HENDERSON. This subject was not considered by our committee, but the proposition seems to me eminently wise.

Mr. DINGLEY. In view of the large membership of the House, I suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee whether it would not be desirable to have 300 copies printed. These bills coming from the Senate are often of the greatest importance.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The suggestion of the gentleman from Arkansas was simply that these printed copies were needed for committees.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think often each member of the House will desire a copy.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then I modify the amendment by striking out "100" and inserting "400."

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to propose an amendment to Rule XIV—not affecting the substance, but only the form of that rule. The rule as already passed with the amendment reads as follows:

While the Speaker is putting a question or addressing the House no member shall walk out of or across the Hall, nor when a member is speaking pass between him and the Chair; and during the session of the House no member shall wear his hat or remain by the Clerk's desk during the call of the roll or the counting of ballots—

Up to that point the language is all right. It continues—

or smoke upon the floor of the House.

Then, after providing for the enforcement of that clause by the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Doorkeeper, the rule as now amended continues—

Neither shall any person be allowed to smoke upon the floor of the House at any time.

The point I make is that the prohibition contained in the previous words "or smoke upon the floor of the House" is repeated in the clause I have last read, and therefore it ought to be struck out.

Mr. HENDERSON. I shall have to object to going back to make that amendment. The matter has already been considered in committee. We thought we would rivet this thing.

Mr. BRUMM. But you have not riveted it; you have confounded it; that is the trouble.

Mr. HENDERSON. There can not be any confusion about it.

Mr. BRUMM. I will ask any member to read the rule as it now stands and say whether the most ordinary schoolboy could not have done better. I submit that, as it now stands, it is bad English and worse composition.

The SPEAKER. The committee amendments having been disposed of, the Chair will call the remaining rules in their numerical order for other amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word of the second rule, for the purpose of making a single remark to my friend from New York——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will confine himself to his amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. I am coming to that later on.

My friend from New York [Mr. CURTIS], in his reference to myself during the debate a few moments ago indulged in a little pleasantry at my expense to the effect that I had delivered a eulogy on a member of the House in which I made a misstatement in reference to his family relations. My friend has been led into an error. He got that statement from a newspaper paragraph, and he will find nothing in the eulogy to justify it. The story was a newspaper "fake," pure and simple, and had no basis whatever in fact.

That is all I desire to say, and I withdraw the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will proceed to call the remaining rules.

When Rule XXV was called,

Mr. MCMILLIN said: Mr. Speaker, as to Rule XXI—which has not been called.

The SPEAKER. That has been passed.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I understood that it was agreed to allow the committee's amendment to be first disposed of, and then, if other amendments were to be offered, we could proceed to do so in the order in which the rules were reached.

The SPEAKER. It would not be in order to offer an amendment to Rule XXI, because under the agreement it has been passed over. But the Chair will ask unanimous consent.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Then I misunderstood the order. My understanding was that we would consider the committee amendments first and then go back if other amendments were desired. But my seat is so far back in the Hall that I did not understand clearly what the arrangement was.

The SPEAKER. The understanding was that each rule was to be disposed of where there were committee amendments offered, and then go through the other list and ascertain if amendments were to be offered by any member of the House. Is there objection to recurring to Rule XXI?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I wish to offer an amendment to that rule in lieu of section 2 as reported by the committee. I want to offer the old rule that for very many years was in force in the House as section 2 of the twenty-first rule, and I send it to the desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill, or amendment thereto, changing existing law, be in order except such as, being germane to the subject-matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of the amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee, or any joint commission authorized by law, or the House members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject-matter of such amendment, which amendment, being germane to the subject-matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I will ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments only in explaining what I believe to be the merits of the proposition.

This is not an experiment, for, with the exception of one Congress, it has been the rule under which this House of Representatives has operated for more than fifteen years—I believe over eighteen. It allows the incorporation into the general appropriation bills of reforms in the law which tend to the reduction of the expenditures of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the object of this rule is to enable the House at any and all times, when considering appropriation bills, to retrench expenditures, abolish useless offices, or otherwise perfect reforms in the Government.

Sir, under the rules proposed for the government of this body, if the Committee on Appropriations finds an office that is useless, they can not abolish it. If they find where, by change of law, they could save money, they are not allowed to do it. They are mere figureheads, powerless for good, but may be forced to perpetuate an evil.

To further illustrate, if there is found on the statute book a law for an appropriation which is not necessary, it may still be put in, and there will be no power to amend the law on the part of that committee or that House which is called upon to make the appropriation. I for one have always believed that the House of Representatives ought to preserve its liberty even on appropriation bills to amend laws for the purpose of retrenching expenditures, abolishing useless offices, or so taking advantage of whatever light may fall on the conduct of Government affairs which may enable business to be performed more cheaply than it has been done under former methods. I think it is susceptible of absolute demonstration that the principle of this amendment to the rules which I propose has saved this Government more than $200,000,000. I do not hesitate to say also that I believe that the failure to incorporate it in the rules of the Fifty-first Congress was fruitful of the continuance of unnecessary expenditures and added to the enormous expenditures of that Congress. I believe that if this Congress returns to the methods of that Congress by the rejection of this rule, and the incorporation of the rule under which there was so much of what was complained of as useless expenditure, we may expect to find the same calamities overtaking the same folly. I have therefore offered the amendment in order to give the House an opportunity to judge between the two systems. I have little hope of its adoption. We are in the minority. But whether voted up or down it is right.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House in discussing this proposition. It is not a new proposition, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] says. It was laid aside in the Forty-ninth Congress. It failed of adoption in the Fifty-first Congress, and the rules of that Congress would seem to me to embody the proper practice. It is no function of an Appropriation Committee to do anything but appropriate money. It is no function of an Appropriation Committee to legislate. If this House desires to legislate on any subject, let it be done out in the open in a manly way, in such a way that the Senate and Executive shall have an opportunity to pass upon the legislation unburdened with any duty imposed upon them with respect to an appropriation bill. I trust the amendment will be voted down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOPKINS). The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by my

friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] that in my reference to his eloquent eulogy upon a distinguished member from Pennsylvania I did him an injustice. I spoke from information which was communicated to the public by a newspaper, he tells me, and not from a careful reading of his oration. If this is true, I have done him an injustice. I wish to withdraw anything in the nature of an imputation that he spoke ill-advisedly or inaccurately of our distinguished friend from Pennsylvania. I had supposed that the references in his oration justified the statement which I made, which I take great pleasure in correcting on the assurance of himself and others that I was misinformed.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry in regard to the last clause in paragragh 2 of Rule XXI, to which we are now addressing ourselves, which reads as follows:

Nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order to any general appropriation bill, or in any amendment thereto.

My inquiry is, whether that clause applies to the committee reporting the appropriation bill, or whether this debars the committee from reporting any amendment whatever to an appropriation bill which changes existing law?

Mr. CANNON. I suppose the same rule applies to the committee, acting as a committee, which applies to the individual.

Mr. PICKLER. Is that the holding of the Chair?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the answer of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] satisfactory to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. PICKLER. I should like to have it from the Chair.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is no question pending before the House upon which the Chair is called for a ruling.

Mr. PICKLER. I am making a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair would hold that such an amendment might be offered, but that it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. PICKLER. That is satisfactory. [Laughter.]

Mr. TERRY. I desire to ask unanimous consent to recur to Rule XXIV for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. I shall have to object to giving unanimous consent to return to sections that we have already passed over, at least until we get through with the regular order.

Mr. TERRY. You recurred to Rule XXI a while ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes; and now there is a request to return to another section. Let us go on under the arrangement, and then we can take the temper of the House afterwards as to unanimous consent.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. We have not passed Rule XXI yet, as I understand.

Mr. HENDERSON. No; we have not.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Then, I offer an amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I object.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. We returned to Rule XXI by unanimous consent, and we have not passed over it.

Mr. HENDERSON. We went back to Rule XXI by unanimous consent, on the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN], and we have not yet left it. No announcement has been made by the Chair that we would go to the next section, so I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILSON] is right. We have not left the section yet. I wish it was otherwise, because I want to get ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the explanation of the gentleman from Iowa the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILSON] to offer his amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I object. I say we have passed on, because another rule has been called up. A member had risen in his seat and said that he desired to propose an amendment to Rule XXIV, so that Rule XXI had been passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will overrule the objection of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] and will recognize the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Now, I submit to the gentleman from Iowa that this is the parliamentary position of that rule. We were considering Rule XXI, and still on it, when the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] rose and endeavored to secure consideration of Rule XXIV. We had not passed over Rule XXI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already held that the gentleman from Ohio is in order with his amendment. [Cries of "Read!"]

The Clerk read as follows:

Every bill or joint resolution intended to amend, modify, repeal, or supplement existing law shall contain an accurate reference to the law which will be affected thereby.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Now, Mr. Speaker, that amendment is not offered in any technical sense whatever. I presume every member of Congress is aware of the fact that it is a custom of amending laws, repealing laws, modifying and supplementing statutes of the United States without any reference to the statutes to be affected thereby. This would require every member of Congress who introduces a bill affecting the existing law to state what particular law, what particular section, or what particular part of the law his bill was intended to affect. This matter is of so great importance that almost every State in the United States has a constitutional provision that requires every bill proposing to amend or modify a statute to expressly set forth the entire statute which it is intended to modify or amend.

This proposition does not go to that extent, but it will require such a reference as will enable us when we read that bill to know what law is repealed or modified or affected by it. It may be claimed by some gentlemen here that it will be difficult to draw bills to exactly conform with this requirement. In my opinion a gentleman who can not draw a bill which distinctly cites the act which it is intended to repeal, to modify, or amend ought to get somebody else to assist him to draw that bill correctly. Why should I have to read a bill changing existing law and not know where in the statutes of the United States I can find the law which it is proposed to repeal? The usual method is to provide "that all laws inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed."

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. How would you manage in proposing to change existing law, when the existing law is not statute law at all, but common law?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I think it is clearly apparent that this amendment means legislative laws. It can mean nothing else. The common law is law that is applied in the courts, not statutes; but here it can only refer to Congressional action, and that question can not arise. I am not particular about making many remarks on this occasion, but I regard it as a reform which ought to be established by Congress. If it is worthy of constitutional amendments in States, why is it not worthy of consideration by this Congress, and thereby get down to some system which will enable us to know very soon and readily what statutes are on the statute books? [Cries of "Vote!"]

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The next rule is XXV. Are there any amendments to be offered to that?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire whether Rule XXIII has been passed under the order?

Mr. HENDERSON. It has been passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I did not understand that the order adopted by the House could have included those portions of Rule XXIII which were not included in the proposed amendment. There was a section of Rule XXIII included in the amendment offered by the committee; but there are several sections of that rule, to one of which I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia will allow me, I would state that Rule XXIII had an amendment to it, which was voted upon, after which the Chair asked if there were any other amendments, and the rule was passed; and under the arrangement made when we made the report that rule can not now be returned to unless by unanimous consent.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I will state to the gentleman from Iowa that my understanding of the order, as originally made, confined it to those amendments that were proposed by the committee.

Mr. HENDERSON. No; not at all. We were first to consider the rules where amendments were offered by the committee. After those amendments were disposed of any amendment to them could be introduced at that time, and after all the amendments reported from the committee were disposed of, then the Speaker was to go over the list of rules not heretofore considered and entertain amendments thereto.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I desire to say that I simply wished to offer an amendment to the second section, which defines a quorum of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will say to my friend that I would have to object, as I have in other cases, until we can get through, and then leave it to the House to determine whether they will follow the order or return.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I will not persist further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore then gave opportunity to offer amendments to Rules XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, XL, XLI, XLII, XLIII, and XLIV. No amendments were offered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That completes the rules.

Mr. HENDERSON. That completes the work. Now, if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] desires consent to go back, I for one will not object.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Availing myself of the courtesy of the gentleman from Iowa, I will ask consent to return to the second section of Rule XXIII.

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend sec-

tion 2 of Rule XXIII by striking out the words "which shall consist of 100 members"; so that a quorum of the Committee of the Whole shall be the same as a quorum of the House. The question is an old one, familiar to members who have served here for any length of time, and I do not desire to debate it.

The amendment of Mr. TURNER of Georgia was read by the Clerk, as follows:

In Rule XXIII, section 2, strike out the words "which shall consist of 100 members."

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in order that we may all understand the effect of this proposed amendment, I will say that under the rules of the Fifty-first Congress 100 members constituted a quorum of the Committee of the Whole, and this amendment proposes to go back to the old system which required a majority of the House to constitute a quorum in Committee of the Whole the same as in the House. It is a question that has been fought over here for a long time, and the committee are in favor of adhering to the rule of the Fifty-first Congress, believing that it will often be found difficult enough to get even 100 members to attend.

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. TURNER of Georgia; and the Speaker pro tempore declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 46, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to propose an amendment to a portion of Rule XXIV.

Several members objected.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, as I am indebted to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] for his courtesy a moment ago, I wish to avail myself of it a little further to try to throw some light on the question whether the gentleman from Arkansas is not entitled under the agreement to have his request granted. I read from the record of what was said at the time we entered upon the consideration of this report from the Committee on Rules:

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a report from the Committee on Rules, which I send to the desk.

In this connection I would like to say, for the information of the House, that the committee wishes, if agreeable to the House, to take up and dispose of the amendments recommended by the Committee on Rules first, and we ask for unanimous consent that the understanding be had that the Speaker shall call all of the rules in their order afterwards, so that any member may have an opportunity to offer amendments and have them considered. That, I think, will be agreeable to both sides.

Mr. CRISP. The proposition is, as I understand, to dispose of the amendments of the committee first?

Mr. HENDERSON. That is the request.

Mr. CRISP. And after that the rules are to be considered as read through, and amendments may be offered to any of them?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that it would be better, perhaps, for the Speaker to call for amendments to each section of the rules, and if any gentleman desires to offer an amendment, that particular section will be read; if not, the Chair will proceed to call the next section, and so on.

Mr. CRISP. That will answer my purpose; and I have no objection to the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I would ask the gentleman from Iowa whether, under the arrangement he proposes, we would be required to complete the sections that are amended in the report of the Committee on Rules before proceeding to the body of the rules, or whether we would have authority to recur to these sections afterwards, for the purpose of offering amendments, under the plan suggested by himself?

Mr. HENDERSON. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that my proposition was first that the amendments should be considered on the report of the Committee on Rules, and disposed of, as well as the rules touched by them, after which the Speaker, under the agreement, would ask if there was any amendment to be offered to the other rules as they are reached in their order. That will give full opportunity to the House to touch every one of the rules and determine what amendments may be necessary.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then the Speaker asked whether that would be satisfactory.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Yes. I can understand, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Iowa may have understood the arrangement in the way he suggests, but I can also see how other gentlemen may have understood it differently in view of the inquiries made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. HENDERSON. We have proceeded all the way through on my understanding of it.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not care to pursue the question further. I am indebted to the gentleman from Iowa for his courtesy and I return him my thanks for it.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is still pending the amendment reported from the Committee on Rules which was passed over.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. WILSON of Ohio, pending the motion to adjourn, the Committee on War Claims was discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 254) in relation to certain nominations to military offices made by Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States, and it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. ODELL was granted leave of absence for three days, on account of important business.

The motion of Mr. HENDERSON was then agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting the claim of Bridget Lane, postmaster at Summit, N. J., for a credit on account of loss by burglary—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills were reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the House Calendar, as follows:

Mr. STEPHENSON, from the Committee on the Public Lands: A bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an act entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889, in lieu of House bill No. 3199. (Report No. 28.)

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas, from the Committee on the Public Lands: The bill (H. R. 1238) granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College and of the Kansas State Normal School thereon, and for a public park. (Report No. 27.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 3729) to create the Sacramento River commission, defining its duties, and making an appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: A bill (H. R. 3730) relating to claims of laborers, workmen, and mechanics, removing the bar of the statute of limitations, and giving the right of appeal in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): A bill (H. R. 3731) imposing licenses upon itinerant musicians in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request): A bill (H. R. 3732) authorizing the attorney for the District of Columbia and his assistants to administer oaths and affirmations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 3733) to amend the tariff act of August 27, 1894, and to fix the duty on beans—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 3734) amending an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARTMAN (by request): A bill (H. R. 3735) for the relief of certain homestead settlers—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. AITKEN: A bill (H. R. 3736) to provide for the unlimited coinage of silver and gold and to impose an import duty upon foreign silver equal to the difference between its bullion value and its coinage-value—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 3737) to regulate and discharge the payment of contracts in any money made a legal tender by law for the payment of debts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 3738) to repeal section 16 of the act making appropriations for the Army, approved July 15, 1870, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3739) for the private sale of public lands in Missouri—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3740) to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," which took effect the 28th day of August, 1894—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 3741) to create the Indian Pipestone national park, in Pipestone County, Minn.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COOPER of Florida: A bill (H. R. 3742) to repeal sec-

tion 553 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, requiring the district judge for the southern district of Florida to reside at Key West—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McEWAN: A bill (H. R. 3743) for testing the Belduke combination propeller—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 3807) providing for the retirement of employees in the Executive Departments of Government classified service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A resolution (House Res. No. 102) authorizing the employment of certain additional employees of the House of Representatives for service in the post-office of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A resolution (House Res. No. 103) providing for a clerk to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. TOWNE: A resolution (House Res. No. 104) directing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to consider and report as to the establishment of a permanent court of arbitration for the United States and Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. APSLEY: A resolution (House Res. No. 105) providing for the employment of a clerk to the Committee on Manufactures—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LOUD: A resolution (House Res. No. 106) of inquiry relating to delay in construction of post-office building at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TOWNE: A concurrent resolution (House Con. Res. No. 12) concerning the definite location of the boundary line between the United States and the possessions of Great Britain from Lake Superior to the Lake of the Woods—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the following change of reference was made:

The bill (H. R. 3420) for the relief of C. C. Roberts—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. AITKEN: A bill (H. R. 3744) to correct the military record of David Patterson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 3745) granting a pension to Benjamin L. Nolan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3746) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 3747) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Richmond, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 3748) for the relief of Abram Tewilliger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 3749) to increase the pension of Mrs. Eunice Ida Rhoades—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 3750) for the relief of Samuel M. Nelley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 3751) for the relief of L. Robert Coates & Co., of Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 3752) to remove charge of desertion against William H. Nember—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COWEN: A bill (H. R. 3753) granting a pension to Martha E. Kenly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3754) for the relief of the estate of Richard Lawson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3755) to increase the pension of Mary C. Thompson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 3756) for the relief of Patterson & Striffler, of Springfield, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 3757) for the relief of Daniel W. Perkins—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3758) for the relief of Pay Inspector John H. Stevenson—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3759) granting an increase of pension to Edward Geller, of Toronto, Kans.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3760) for the relief of Talton T. Davis, of Marion, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3761) granting an increase of pension to Beverly B. Hurst, of Osage City, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3762) to pension Mrs. Esther Ann Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3763) granting a pension to Eunice I. Godfrey, of Madison, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 3764) granting a pension to Mary Clare Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 3765) for the removal of the charge of desertion against Aaron Reynolds—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 3766) for the relief of William A. Lowe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 3767) for the relief of Joel A. King—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3768) for the relief of Benjamin B. Rhoads—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWE: A bill (H. R. 3769) granting an increase of pension to David C. Waring—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 3770) granting a pension to J. K. Boone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 3771) for the relief of Stratton H. Benscoter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3772) to correct the muster roll of Company I of the Seventh Iowa Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 3773) for the relief of Henry Fields, of Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3774) for the relief of Rosa M. Wyatt, of Bryan County, Ga.—to the Committee of War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3775) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 3776) granting a pension to William J. Lockhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3777) granting a pension to William A. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 3778) for the relief of Mrs. Hannah N. Jones—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3779) for the relief of George O. Dixon and Ella Dixon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3780) granting an increase of pension to John S. Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McEWAN: A bill (H. R. 3781) for the relief of Jacob R. Smith, of Jersey City, N. J.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCLURE: A bill (H. R. 3782) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter R. Eddy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 3783) for the relief of Thomas C. Simpson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3784) for the relief of Nathan Eldrige—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 3785) granting a pension to Lowell H. Hopkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 3786) for the relief of Charles Speare—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 3787) for the relief of H. C. Herndon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3788) for the relief of Mrs. E. Taylor—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 3789) for the relief of the estate of Edmund Rose—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3790) for the relief of Mary E. Brady—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAY (by request): A bill (H. R. 3791) granting a pension to Etta S. Stillson, widow of Philo B. Stillson, lieutenant-colonel One hundred and ninth Regiment New York Volunteers—to the Commitee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3792) for the relief of John C. Robinson, major-general, United States Army, retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3793) increasing the pension of Henry Heady, late of Company F, Eighty-ninth New York Volunteers, to $150 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER: A bill (H. R. 3794) for the relief of Frank Dunn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 3795) granting a pension to Mary Cochrane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3796) for the relief of George W. Lipps, Company K, Fortieth and Fifty-first Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 3797) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Patrick Burke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3798) to pension Laura E. Davenport—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 3799) for the relief of Conrad Bohn, of Winona, Minn.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 3800) to increase the pension of Nathan Falkner, veteran of the Indian war of 1836—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 3801) granting a pension to James F. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3802) granting a pension to Lucy Lozan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3803) granting a pension to Sarah M. Nyman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3804) granting a pension to Alanson H. Cogswell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRELOAR: A bill (H. R. 3805) to increase the pension of Clark W. Harrington, late sergeant of Company I, Ninety-third New York Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 3806) to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to the Japanese indemnity fund," approved February 22, 1883—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition for the relief of Eugenia M. Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Memorial of the Porkopolis Bicycle Club, concerning good roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK of Iowa: Memorial of Ed. Hamlin Post, Grand Army of the Republic, as to pensions—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: Memorial address from the National Federation of Colored Men of the United States, depicting the humiliating condition of the colored citizens in certain States of the Union, and asking Congress for its cooperation in securing perfect equality of all citizens under the Constitution of the United States; prepared by Hon. D. Augustus Straker, president, and James M. Henderson, secretary—to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. COWEN: Petition of the Baltimore Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, December 22, 1895, praying for the preservation of peaceful relations between the United States and Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition to accompany a bill to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to the Japanese indemnity fund," approved February 22, 1883—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Petition from the citizens of Kansas, asking for a change in the internal-revenue laws, so as to prevent the granting of liquor licenses to persons not authorized to sell the same under the law of the State—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DALZELL: Two petitions of sundry people of Allegheny County, for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition and papers to accompany a bill for the relief of William A. Lowe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: Three petitions for amendment of postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Petition of John J. Anderson and others, in favor of the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition and statement of railway postal clerks in Montana in support of House bill No. 1—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HICKS: Petition of W. M. Ankeny, N. M. Hursel, W. H. Baer, B. J. Smith, A. C. Hartman, M. D., and 70 other citizens of Myersdale, Pa., and vicinity, praying for the passage of an act to secure a better grade of immigrants, etc., said act being known as the William A. Stone bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of Hon. Charles A. Works, of Rockford, Ill., and 66 others, residents of the Ninth Congressional district of said State, asking for the passage of the bill (H. R. 1) to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of George W. Hewitt Post, No. 398, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, urging the passage of the general pension bills now pending before Congress—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULING: Petition signed by a number of citizens of Kanawha, Clay, and Webster counties, W. Va., to improve Elk River by a system of locks and dams—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEIGHTY: Petition of citizens of Warterloo, Ind., to take action toward the recognition of Cuban insurgents as belligerents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Petition of citizens of Jackson County, Minn., favoring an increase in the tariff on wool, barley, butter, and eggs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: Two petitions, of Sheridan Donohew, Lewis Brownell, John Gerlach, and 53 others; together with H. C. Showalter, C. K. Pierpont, H. B. Wood, B. F. Ayers, and 410 others, citizens of West Virginia, praying for the passage of the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MORSE: Two petitions, respectively, by the Tremont Temple Baptist Church of Boston and the Brookville Baptist Church of Brookville, Mass., against the appropriation of public money for the support of sectarian schools—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: Two petitions of citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., engaged in the navigation of the Great Lakes, asking that the harbor of the city of Manitowoc be improved—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition, in form of resolution, of 500 citizens of late Sisseton and Wahpeton Indian Reservation, S. Dak., asking for free homes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. POWERS (by request): Petition of H. Livingston Rogers and others, first-mortgage bondholders of the Union Pacific Railroad, praying for the passage of a bill therein referred to—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. STAHLE: Resolutions of the Pennsylvania State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, in favor of equitable protection—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELE: Resolution of the Board of Trade of Indianapolis, Ind., expressing sympathy for the Cuban insurgents, by its secretary, Jacob W. Smith—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3713—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAFT: Memorial of Porkopolis Wheelmen, in behalf of good roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *January 13, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

THE GOLD RESERVE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from the Secretary of the Treasury; which was read, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1896.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Senate resolution dated the 3d instant, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate if the sum of $100,000,000, or any part thereof, has at any time since the establishment of the so-called gold reserve, been actually segregated or set apart from the other currency or money in the Treasury Department, in gold coin, or gold coin and gold certificates, or either, for the redemption of the legal-tender notes and different forms of paper money of the Government; and when and by what act of Congress, giving the title of the act and the date of its approval, said so-called gold reserve was established, and if not established by act of Congress, state by what authority, if any, it was established."

In reply thereto the Senate is respectfully informed that at no time since the establishment of the so-called gold reserve has the sum of $100,000,000, or any sum, been segregated or set apart from the general cash in the Treasury for the redemption of the legal-tender notes of the United States, or for the redemption of any other form of paper money for which the United States is liable. There is no provision of law requiring a separate fund or separate account to be kept, and all moneys received into the Treasury, from whatever source, are deposited in the general cash. The fund for the redemption of United States notes was accumulated under authority of the act of January 14, 1875, which directed the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and provide for such redemption on the 1st day of January, 1879. No specific sum was prescribed, but the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to use the surplus revenues from time to time to sell certain descriptions of bonds to an extent necessary to carry the act into full effect.

In the exercise of the discretion thus conferred upon him the Secretary sold for resumption purposes in 1877 and 1878 United States 4 per cent and 4½ per cent bonds to the amount of $95,500,000 and deposited the proceeds, $96,000,000 in gold, in the general cash in the Treasury. This, with other gold which had been received as surplus revenue, constituted the fund prepared and provided by the Secretary of the Treasury for the redemption directed in the act of January 14, 1875.

The existence of the reserve fund was generally recognized from the time of its establishment, as above stated, and one of the measures adopted by the Secretary of the Treasury to prevent its unnecessary depletion was the discontinuance of the issue of the gold certificates authorized by the act of March 3, 1863. This act authorized but did not direct such issue.

Some inconvenience resulted from this discontinuance, and by section 12 of the bank act of July 12, 1882, the Secretary was authorized and directed to receive deposits of gold coin and bullion and to issue certificates therefor; but it was provided "that the Secretary of the Treasury shall suspend the issue of such gold certificates whenever the amount of gold coin and gold bullion in the Treasury reserved for the redemption of United States notes falls below $100,000,000."

No other reference to the reserve fund is contained in the laws of the United States.

Very respectfully, yours,

J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT PORTLAND, OREG.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 5, 1895, certain information as to what steps, if any, have been taken by the Department to prepare or procure plans for the construction of a public building at Portland, Oreg., etc.; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon subsequently said: A communication came in this morning, in my absence, from the Secretary of the Treasury, in response to a resolution passed by the Senate at my instance some time since, in regard to a public building at Portland, Oreg. I move that it be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I also ask that the communication be printed in the RECORD. It is an important matter, relating to all public buildings.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1896.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the following preamble and resolution, adopted by the Senate on the 5th of December, 1895:

"Whereas the Congress, March 3, 1891, passed a bill, which was approved by the President and became a law, appropriating $250,000 for the purchase of a site and the commencement of the construction of a public building at Portland, Oreg.; and

"Whereas on March 2, 1895, the Congress passed another bill, which was approved by the President, appropriating an additional $100,000 for the continuation of the construction of such public building; and

"Whereas in pursuance of such appropriations the United States purchased from one John McCraken block No. 51 in Couch's Addition to the city of Portland, Oreg., for a site for such public building, and received from said McCraken and wife a deed therefor, dated June 3, 1892, the consideration therefor being $160,000: Therefore

"*Be it resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to advise the Senate at his earliest convenience as to what steps, if any, have been taken by the Department to prepare or procure plans for such building and for proceeding with the construction thereof; and if no steps have been taken, then the reasons fully why not, and the cause of the delay in reference thereto.

In response to this inquiry, I have the honor to state that, by an act approved January 24, 1891, Congress authorized the construction of a public building at Portland, Oreg., and fixed the limit of cost of the site and building at $500,000, and by an act of March 3, 1891, an appropriation of $250,000 was made for the purchase of the site and the commencement of the building. By an act of March 3, 1893, the limit of cost for the site and building was increased to $750,000, and the act of March 2, 1895, made a further appropriation of $100,000.

On the 7th of September, 1892, the Department purchased a site for the building, but as yet no drawings have been prepared for the reasons herein stated. At the date of the convening of the Fifty-first Congress (the Congress which authorized the public building at Portland, Oreg.) there were upon the books of this Department appropriations for 163 public buildings, all of which were in various stages of construction. That same Congress authorized the construction of 70 additional public buildings and provided for the extension of 7 marine hospitals at an aggregate limit of cost of $12,916,890.77. The Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses authorized altogether the construction of 12 additional public buildings and improvements to 5 marine hospitals and other structures, at a limit of cost of $5,843,000, making an aggregate of 94 buildings authorized to be constructed and improved, at a cost of $18,759,890.77, which, in addition to the 163 buildings above referred to, make a total of 257 buildings upon which construction operations have been in progress since December, 1889, of which number there are at this time 25 buildings for which no drawings have been prepared.

It has been the general practice of the Department to begin work upon the various public buildings in the order of their authorization by Congress, and under this practice there remain 6 buildings which claim priority over the public building at Portland, Oreg.

Notwithstanding the large number of public buildings authorized by Congress, no increase in the force of the Office of the Supervising Architect has been provided for, although a specific request to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives was made by this Department on January 22, 1895, that the amount allotted for that office for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, should be increased from $200,000 to $250,000, the reason given being that such an increase was necessary in order to enable the Department to employ a sufficient technical force to bring the work up to date. This request, however, was not complied with, and the usual allowance of $200,000 was made.

Since the 6th of March, 1893, this Department has made every effort possible with the limited appropriation allowed by Congress for the support of the Office of the Supervising Architect to expedite the preparation of drawings and specifications for the various public buildings under its control and to take up new work as rapidly as the force would permit and to proceed with the construction of buildings with all possible expedition. The sum of $200,000, which the Secretary is authorized by Congress to use during each fiscal year for the preparation of designs, plans, specifications, and drawings for public buildings, does not exceed the amount of the usual charges of a competent architect for the preparation of designs, plans, and specifications and superintending the construction of a single public building of the first class, and it must be evident, therefore, that the Office of the Supervising Architect must be relieved from a very considerable part of the labor now imposed upon it, or adequate provision must be made for the pay of a sufficient number of skilled employees, or that the work upon many public buildings must continue to be delayed as heretofore.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, yours,

J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

BRIDGET LANE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in compliance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 9, 1888, the claim of Bridget Lane, postmaster at Summit, N. J., for credit on account of loss by burglary November 20, 1895, and recommending that authority be granted to credit the postmaster with the amounts mentioned; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled joint resolutions; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A joint resolution (H. Res. 19) for filling vacancy on Board of Regents, Smithsonian Institution; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 60) concerning the completion of the United States court-house and post-office at Mankato, Minn.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States, praying for the enactment of such legislation as shall confer upon the officers of the Medical Corps of the Navy the same status, pay, and emoluments as are now accorded to the medical officers of the Army; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PALMER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Macoupin County, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I present resolutions of the Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association, representing the planters and manufacturers of sugar throughout that State. The resolutions are in the nature of a petition praying for the protection of sugar and all other American industries. I ask that the petition be read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the petition was read, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas the Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association, representing the planters and manufacturers of sugar throughout this State, is heartily in favor of protection to sugar and all other American industries: Therefore

Be it resolved, That we respectfully ask that sugar should receive the same increase of duty in the emergency tariff bill as is accorded other articles contained in said bill.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our Representatives and Senators and to the chairmen of the Committee of Ways and Means and of the Finance Committee.

I certify the above to be a true copy of a resolution passed at the regular monthly meeting of the Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association held January 9, 1896.

REGINALD AKERS, *Secretary.*

Mr. KYLE. I present a letter from Vernon Center, Minn., relating to the pension claim of William Brown. I ask that the letter be referred to the Committee on Pensions, to accompany the bill heretofore introduced by me to grant him a pension.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. CALL. I present a paper in the nature of a petition to Congress, signed by L. S. Light, of Reddick, Marion County, Fla., accompanied by tabular statements showing the names of the growers and the number of vegetables produced and shipped, and the gross sales and commissions from net sales.

From this paper it appears that in the year 1895 there were sold 88,333 crates, the gross sales being $92,371.74; that the freight paid was $45,110.93, and the net proceeds to the growers $38,096.65.

The petition or letter with the tabular statement seeks for some regulation by Congress of freight charges on railroad transportation in the interstate commerce of the country. I move that it be printed as a miscellaneous document, and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

I ask the committee to give the paper immediate and favorable consideration, and to report a bill which will enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate rates in the interest of the people. This statement discloses practically a confiscation of the products of the farm and of the labor and property of the people.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The paper will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and printed as a document, in the absence of objection.

Mr. CALL. I present a large number of petitions from different parts of the United States asking for immediate action on the part of Congress for the recognition of the state of war in the Island of Cuba, and according belligerent rights to the government established in that island by the people of Cuba.

These petitions state that those people are fighting for their independence against a power which for centuries has governed the island with a rod of steel, that they have refused them the commonest rights to which all men are entitled, taking from them property and life without warrant of modern law, and whipping them with the lash of mediæval rule from the monarchical shores of Europe. The petitioners pray that Congress may take immediate action. These petitions are from all parts of the United States, and comprise citizens of every class and every pursuit. I ask that they be printed as a miscellaneous document for the use of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, without objection.

Mr. PLATT. Does the Senator from Florida desire to have all the petitions printed as a miscellaneous document with the names of all the petitioners?

Mr. CALL. It will comprise a very short space. The petitions are made up principally of names and localities.

Mr. PLATT. The names of all the signers?

Mr. CALL. Yes; the names of the signers. Has the Senator any objection? I see none to it. It is a subject of very great importance.

Mr. PLATT. It is a very unusual request.

Mr. CALL. It may be unusual, but I see no impropriety in it. Certainly there is no subject of greater importance. There are 2,000,000 people lying upon our immediate shores who have maintained for eight months the most heroic struggle for independence the world has ever seen, and who are now being forced to seek relations with other countries in consequence of our failure to give them any kind of encouragement.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the rule in a moment.

Mr. PLATT. I do not want to enter into any discussion of the question as to the importance of affairs transpiring in Cuba, but it seems to me that to grant the request of the Senator from Florida is setting an exceedingly bad precedent. Here he presents some twenty petitions asking Congress to take some notice of what is going on in Cuba and to grant belligerent rights to the insurgents. They are numerously signed. I presume there are one or two thousand names. I do not see what object is to be gained by printing them as a public document, and if it is to be done in this case it is to be done at the request of every Senator who thinks that petitions are presented here upon an important subject. Very often we have petitions coming in by the thousands, containing hundreds of thousands of names, upon subjects which are thought at the time to be of exceeding great importance. If an objection will prevent the printing of these petitions, with all the names attached, as a public document, I will enter the objection, or I will move a reference of the motion, if it is a motion, to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Florida will suspend a moment, the Chair will call attention to the rule.

Mr. CALL. I will obviate any further discussion. If there is any further objection to it I will withdraw the request that I made. I wish, however, to observe that the observations of the Senator from Connecticut disparage the influence of public opinion among the people of the United States upon legislation. If there is any one thing important for this body to know it is that the people of the United States, the intelligent, influential people, the men of character, have formed a positive opinion upon any subject. That, in my judgment, is the most important thing for the Senate and the other House to know.

It was for that object that I desired to have the petitions printed, to show that they comprise the business men, the intellectual men, some of them being from colleges, some professors, and some from business men, and that they embody the public opinion of the people of the United States. That, I think, is the most important consideration.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the Vice-President will have the rule read, so that we may definitely understand what it is that controls the question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will have read the rule to which attention has been called.

The Secretary read as follows:

Ordered, That when petitions and memorials are ordered printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the order shall be deemed to apply to the body of the petition only, and the names attached to said petition or memorial shall not be printed unless specially ordered by the Senate.—*Senate Journal*, Forty-ninth Congress, second session, page 280.

Mr. PLATT. This objection of mine does not go to the question of the Cuban warfare or Cuban independence at all; it goes to the matter of the ordinary conduct of the business of the Senate. All these petitions are, with one exception, the same in printed form. Why should we print twenty petitions in a single form as a public document? The request has been withdrawn, and therefore I do not care to say anything more about it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Kansas City, Mo., indorsed by members of the Board of Trade of Ardmore, Ind. T., praying for the enactment of such legislation as will give relief to the people who have located in the various towns of the Indian Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, relating to the survivors of the Indian war of 1855 and 1856; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorial in relation to the survivors of the Indian war of 1855 and 1856 in the Territory (now State) of Washington.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Washington, would respectfully represent that many of the early settlers of the Territory of Washington during the years 1855 and 1856, in the protection of the lives of themselves and families, and their property, having to contend against the hostile Indians occupying the country at that time, upon the call of the governor of the Territory freely volunteered to suppress the hostility of such Indians; that while fighting these Indians many valuable lives were lost and much property destroyed; that of those volunteer and early settlers but few now survive; that while the services of the soldiers of the Regular Army during that war were promptly provided for by the Government without diminution of any kind, and they received full recognition at the hands of the General Government for their services, the brave men who volunteered and defended the Northwest Territory from the hostile Indians in the war of 1855 and 1856, responsive to the call of the governors of the Territories of Washington and Oregon, have failed to receive that recognition and consideration at the hands of the Government of the United States to which they are entitled.

That by the eleventh section of the act of August 18, 1856, the Secretary of War was directed "to examine into the amount of the expenses necessarily incurred in the suppression of Indian hostilities in the late Indian war in Oregon and Washington by the Territorial governors of said Territories for the maintenance of the volunteer forces engaged in said war, including the pay of the volunteers"; and he was authorized, if in his judgment necessary, to appoint a Commission of three persons to ascertain and report such expenses. That by an order issued from the War Department September 4, 1856, Capt. A. J. Smith, United States Army, Rufus Ingalls, United States Army, late Quartermaster-General, and Lafayette Grover, afterwards governor of the State of Oregon and United States Senator from said State, were appointed a Commission to ascertain and report upon the expenses incurred by the Territories aforesaid.

The Commission met at Portland, Oreg., October 20, 1856, organized a board, proceeded to the discharge of the duty assigned them, and after full investigation and consideration found, among other things, that the aggregate number of troops engaged in this war from the Territory of Washington was 1,896; that the approximate number of troops engaged at any one period was 1,000; and in taking action upon the pay of the volunteers from Washington Territory the Commission—in the absence of any law of the Territory upon the subject—deemed it proper and just to recommend the same rates of pay and allowance as were reported in the case of the volunteer troops of Oregon.

The Oregon statute provided as follows: "Whenever such volunteers are called and received into the service of the Territory * * * each noncommissioned officer and private shall be entitled to receive $2 per day and rations, and $2 per day for the risk of his horse, except for horses actually killed in action, unavoidably lost, or reported unfit for service; in which cases the owner shall receive the appraised value thereof. All commissioned officers shall receive the same pay as officers of the same rank in the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That commissioned officers shall receive the same pay for the use and risk of horses as noncommissioned officers."

The Commission, upon that basis, found that there is due for troops in the service of the Territory of Washington a total of $519,593.06; and it was further found, in examining into the amount of expenses necessarily incurred for the maintenance of these volunteers, that the total amount due for expenses was $961,882.39.

That said Commission visited extensively both Territories with the view of being fully informed as to the nature and extent of the Indian hostilities—means employed for their suppression, the rates of labor, the prices current for the property furnished for the service, and the facilities and expenses of transportation.

They examined into each distinct department of the service, and filed an exhibit of the total expense necessarily incurred in the suppression of Indian hostilities in the late Indian war by the Territorial governors of said Territories, and further found that the expenses for the maintenance of the volunteer forces engaged in said war from the Territory of Washington, including pay, was $1,481,475.45, and for the State of Oregon the sum of $4,499,949.33; and the total amount reported by the commissioners as due the Territories of Oregon and Washington was $6,011,457.36.

That on the 7th day of February, 1860, the Third Auditor of the Treasury reported to the House of Representatives upon these claims, and allowed, under said report, only $2,714,808.55, thus leaving a balance justly due these early pioneers of $3,296,648.81.

Your memorialists respectfully refer you to the report of the Commission above named and the adjustment by the then Third Auditor of the Treasury, and respectfully ask that an appropriation may be made sufficient to cover the claims above set forth as due the volunteers from the State of Washington and State of Oregon during the Indian war of 1855 and 1856; and, to that end, your memorialists will ever pray.

Mr. SQUIRE. I also present a petition of the Business Men's Association of Newport News, Va., calling attention to Senate bill 334, providing for fortifications and other seacoast defenses, and giving reasons for immediate action on the part of the Government in providing appropriations for such defenses.

The petitioners refer to the increasing commercial importance of Newport News, its facilities for the construction of naval vessels, and the accessibility of the harbor and the accommodation it affords for vessels of all classes. They recite the fact that the great interests of Newport News and the surrounding country are dependent upon Fortress Monroe and a sea force for protection, and express their belief that prompt action should be taken to provide proper safeguards.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHEES presented a petition of the Methodist Episcopal Ministers' Association of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation instituting certain reforms on the subject of marriage and divorce; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McMILLAN presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Eighth Ward Republican Club of Detroit, Mich., indorsing

the stand taken by Secretary of State Olney in his correspondence with Lord Salisbury and approving the message of the President on the Venezuelan question; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens and taxpayers of the District of Columbia, remonstrating against the establishment of an isolated hospital in the block bounded by Bismarck and Princeton streets, Seventh street, and Sherman avenue, in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHERMAN presented petitions of 45 citizens of Welshfield, Ohio; of 53 citizens of Solon, Ohio, and of sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to raise the age of consent, to repeal the divorce law of Oklahoma Territory, to provide a Sabbath law for the national capital, to provide a committee to investigate the labor problem, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. NELSON presented the petition of J. N. True, of Grand Rapids, Minn., praying for the restoration of homestead rights in certain cases; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented a petition of 613 citizens of North Carolina and Virginia, praying that lumber be placed on the dutiable list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TURPIE presented resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Indianapolis, Ind., sympathizing with the people of Cuba in their efforts to achieve independence and establish a republican form of government; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented the petition of George Abbott, of Tacoma, Wash., late a private in Capt. L. Smith's Company A, Eighth United States Infantry, praying for the enactment of legislation removing the charge of desertion from his military record; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TILLMAN presented a petition of the Cotton Exchange of Charleston, S. C., and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, S. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for fortifications and other seacoast defenses; which were referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

Mr. SMITH presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of sundry citizens of Plainfield, N. J., in reference to the Armenian troubles, and praying that Congress take such action as will put a stop to the outrages; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WHITE presented a petition of the common council of San Diego, Cal., praying that the harbor of San Diego be given the protection of proper fortifications, and for the establishment of a military post on the United States military reservation of 1,400 acres on Point Loma by the permanent location of at least one war vessel in that harbor; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Oakland, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the further development of the mining industry in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the board of directors of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation relieving vessels from the requirement to pay State pilots for services not rendered; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Lieut. George W. Walden, of the United States Revenue-Cutter Service, praying for the enactment of legislation granting him 25 per cent of the present sea pay of a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the memorial of Eliza J. Gray, widow of Isaac P. Gray, late United States minister to Mexico, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by an amendment intended to be proposed to the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill, and moved that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations with the accompanying report and papers; which was agreed to.

REAL-ESTATE ASSESSMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 3) to extend the time for making an assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia, to report it favorably, without amendment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The joint resolution was read, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. CALL. That seems to me to be a very important measure to be passed without more mature consideration. However, I shall not make any objection to it on that score.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TARIFF ACTS.

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Printing I report a substitute for the resolution instructing the committee to have the acts heretofore passed by Congress imposing duties upon imports printed and bound in one volume. I ask for its immediate consideration. Let the substitute be read.

The substitute was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Printing be, and are hereby, authorized to cause to be printed, indexed, and bound in cloth in one volume all of the acts, as they appear in the United States statutes, heretofore passed by Congress imposing duties on imports, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. Was the resolution as amended read or the original?

Mr. FAULKNER. The substitute was read.

Mr. HALE. The substitute is what was read.

Mr. MILLS. I offered a resolution of the same kind a few days ago, and had it referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. HALE. This is the Senator's resolution changed to a concurrent resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, which has been read.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the report accompanying the resolution be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

CUSTODY OF MINOR CHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT.

Mr. FAULKNER. From the Committee on the District of Columbia I submit a report upon the resolution offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], in reference to the law governing the testamentary disposition of minor children in the District of Columbia. The committee has acted in accordance with the instructions of the Senate in ascertaining the law, but makes no recommendation. I understand that the Senator from Maine desires the resolution to lie on the table. Let the resolution lie on the table and the report of the committee be printed.

Mr. HALE. I did not quite understand the Senator. The report is upon the resolution which I had sent to the committee some weeks ago, is it not?

Mr. FAULKNER. It is.

Mr. HALE. And the committee, as I understand the Senator, has collected together and perhaps collated what the law is on the subject here and in different States?

Mr. FAULKNER. I will state that the committee has submitted in its report the law as it has existed and exists to-day in most of the States of the Union, in the District of Columbia, and in England, with all the modifications found in the different States, showing how the act of Charles the Second has been modified by statutory enactment in the United States.

Mr. HALE. But the committee does not report any bill?

Mr. FAULKNER. The committee does not report any bill for the simple reason that there was some division in the committee in reference to the matter, and the committee was of opinion that it was better to submit in a written report the entire law bearing upon the subject, with the laws especially applicable to the District of Columbia, to lay the report before the Senate so that the Senate have the benefit of the law and all the modifications in the States, and if any Senator deems it proper to bring in a measure to modify or change the law of Charles the Second, he can do so by introducing a bill.

Mr. HALE. I am very glad the Committee on the District of Columbia, under the guidance of the Senator from West Virginia, who is a good lawyer, has brought out all the law upon this subject. I am, however, very sorry that the committee did not, as a result of that investigation, come to the conclusion to report a bill wiping away the statute of Charles the Second. I shall certainly prepare a bill to that effect and submit it to the Senate for its action. I should like to have the report printed as a document, and let the matter go to the Calendar, and I shall seek to call it up at some future time.

Mr. GALLINGER. In connection with this matter, and as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I will say that I consented to the report as it has been made. However, my sympathies are entirely with the Senator from Maine in his contention. I believe that such a statute, notwithstanding it exists in my own State, is a relic of barbarism and ought to be wiped

from the statute book. The idea that a dissolute and worthless father can will away his child from the mother absolutely, and that the only way she can regain the control and guardianship of that child is to go into a legal controversy, after which the court may possibly remand the child to her custody, it seems to me is not in accordance with the civilization of the age.

I shall be glad to support the bill the Senator from Maine says he will prepare and submit to the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be printed.

PURCHASES OF FORFEITED LANDS.

Mr. McBRIDE. I am instructed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 43) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes,' approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof," to report it favorably.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill just reported by my colleague. If the Senate will hear me for a moment, I think I can give satisfactory reasons why this should be done, and why I think there is no objection to the passage of the bill. I ask that the bill be first read for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes,' approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof," approved December 12, 1893, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That section 3 of an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes,' approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof, be, and the same is, amended so as to extend the time within which persons entitled to purchase lands forfeited by said act shall be permitted to purchase the same in the quantities and upon the terms provided in said section, at any time prior to January 1, 1897: *Provided*, That actual residence upon the lands by persons claiming the right to purchase the same shall not be required where such lands have been fenced, cultivated, or otherwise improved by such claimants, and such persons shall be permitted to purchase two or more tracts of such lands by legal subdivisions, whether contiguous or not, but not exceeding 320 acres in the aggregate."

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. If I can have the attention of the Senate I will make a brief statement in reference to the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. When was the bill reported?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I will state. A bill in the precise form of this was reported favorably during the last session of Congress by the Committee on Public Lands of each House, passed both Houses, and went to the President, but was one of the some forty-odd bills which were not signed by the President for want of time. The bill was again introduced by me at the present session, referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and has been reported this morning by my colleague with the unanimous consent, as I understand, of all the members of that committee.

The bill in brief is simply this: In the act of 1890 forfeiting certain railroad lands, there was a provision that persons in possession of odd sections of land forfeited should be permitted to purchase not exceeding 320 acres by paying $2.50 an acre to the Government. The Department in construing that act for some considerable length of time under the former Administration held that actual possession was not meant nor required by the act, but that the full measure of the demands of the act were met by fencing and improving the land without actual residence. That was the construction placed upon the act under the former Administration by both the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior, and a great number of cases were adjudicated and patents were issued to parties who were in possession of the land by fencing and improving, but who did not actually live on the land. In 1893, some two years ago, the present Commissioner of the General Land Office adhered to this ruling, and he still adheres to it; he still believes that the ruling was right, but somebody in the office of the Secretary of the Interior has placed a different construction on the act, and the Secretary, of course, has approved it, I suppose, perhaps, without giving it any personal attention, holding that it requires actual living on the land. The intention of this bill is simply to correct that construction so that those persons who are in possession by fencing, improving, and cultivating land may receive patents on the conditions named, although they do not actually live on the land. That is all there is in the bill.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator from Oregon a question?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. From whom did these persons receive their title?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Whatever title they have they have received from the railroad company.

Mr. GRAY. They have bought from the railroad company?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Yes; and were in possession, cultivating the land. In my own State there are quite a number of persons who have been in possession for twelve or fifteen, and some of them perhaps for twenty years, cultivating the land under the impression that the railroad company would get title and ultimately give them patents; but the company failing to build the road the Government forfeited the land, but made this wholesome provision in the interest of those people. This is a bill purely and simply in favor of those settlers.

Mr. SQUIRE. I simply wish to say that I earnestly advocate the passage of the bill and concur with what has been said by the Senator from Oregon.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MILLS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1481) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, entitled "An act for improving Aransas Pass"; also to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass," approved January 22, 1894; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1482) to authorize the Corpus Christi and Padre Island Harbor Company to import free of duty certain materials for the construction of an outer harbor on the coast of Texas; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 1483) to repeal an act entitled "An act for the punishment of certain crimes therein specified," approved January 30, 1799, being section 5335 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. GRAY. I intended to ask that the bill might lie on the table, but on reflection I ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It proposes to repeal the section of the Revised Statutes that gave rise to some little debate the other day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1484) granting a pension to Charles Forster; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1485) granting a pension to Mary Zollinger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1486) granting a pension to Charles Forster; which was read twice by it stitle, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1487) granting arrears of pension to Theodore W. McCoy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1488) appropriating $6,332.30 in payment of the claim of C. M. Kirkpatrick for paving the street adjacent to the United States arsenal at Indianapolis, Ind.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1489) for removal of charge of dismissal against military record of Lieut. George Murray; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1490) for removal of charge of desertion standing against Samuel French; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PUGH introduced a bill (S. 1491) for the relief of Dr. John B. Read; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 1492) to remove the charge of desertion from John Lyons; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1493) granting a pension to Mary Clare Kelly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1494) to protect the pensioners of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1495) granting a pension to Hans Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1496) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to place the name of Margaret Cahill on the roll of pensioners as the widow of James Cahill, late captain, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1497) to provide for a public building at Cleveland, Ohio; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1498) to punish the carnal and unlawful knowing of any female under the age of 18 years; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1499) to purchase a portrait of Daniel D. Tompkins, late Vice-President of the United States, painted by Jarvis in 1812; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1500) for the relief of William M. Masi, ex-postmaster, and Benjamin Hellman, Lawrence R. Bresnahen, John W. Griffin, George W. Hoyt, and Charles W. Riner, as sureties upon his official bond as postmaster at Cheyenne; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1501) for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Alexander Payne, widow of Capt. J. Scott Payne, Fifth United States Cavalry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILSON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1502) for the relief of Lorenzo Thomas, jr., and Henry C. Thomas, both of Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1503) to authorize the creditors of insolvent national banks to elect a permanent receiver, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on National Banks.

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (S. 1504) to amend the act approved March 3, 1891, granting the right of way upon the public lands for reservoir and canal purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1505) granting an increase of pension to Rufus H. Paine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1506) for the relief of Holmes & Leathers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1507) for the relief of Henry Ware; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1508) granting a pension to Talbot A. Routon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 1509) to restore homestead rights in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1510) to pension Mrs. Susan M. Sessford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1511) granting a pension to Mrs. Jane Stewart Whiting; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1512) imposing licenses upon itinerant musicians in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1513) to regulate the use of the public parks and improved reservations in the District of Columbia under the charge of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1514) to amend sections 720, 721, 722, and 723 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, in relation to marriages; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1515) to incorporate the Columbia Telephone Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1516) authorizing the attorney for the District of Columbia and his assistants to administer oaths and affirmations; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1517) in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 1518) authorizing and directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate all violations of the act approved July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," and all amendments thereof; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. CAFFERY. I desire to direct the attention of the Judiciary Committee to the provisions of the proposed act just introduced by me.

The intendment of the bill is to provide sufficient and adequate machinery to carry into execution the act of July 2, 1890, against monopolies, combinations, or conspiracies in restraint of trade.

I discover that the main difficulty of instituting and prosecuting successfully cases under the act of July 2, 1890, lies in the want of sufficient testimony. The bill introduced by me provides a machinery adequate and appropriate to the obtaining of testimony upon which the Attorney-General or the district attorneys, as the case may be, in the several circuits of the United States can institute proceedings looking toward the prohibition of all such restraints as are denounced in the act of July 2, 1890.

It is known, Mr. President, that the Government made an attempt to reach one gigantic institution, the sugar trust, through a proceeding instituted in the circuit court of the State of New Jersey, and that that proceeding failed. In looking over the report of the case it is plainly to be seen that the failure of the district attorney in that case was largely attributable to the paucity of evidence and the difficulty of obtaining evidence. The provisions of this bill constitute the Interstate Commerce Commission the instrumentality by which the evidence is to be elicited, and that Commission is selected by me for the reason that the members of it are familiar with the investigation of cognate offenses to those denounced under the act of July 2, 1890. I hope this instrumentality will be efficient and adequate in the bill I have introduced.

I direct the attention of the Judiciary Committee to this matter, and hope for a favorable and early report.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 1519) to make an appropriation for the improvement of the battlefield at Lexington, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1520) to place upon the pension roll the name of Rhoda Burnham, and to grant her a pension; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1521) to finally adjust the swamp land grants, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1522) granting a pension to Catherine Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1523) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Bell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1524) concerning the rank and pay of certain officers of the Navy having served a full term as chief of a bureau in the Navy Department; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1525) for the relief of Charles E. Behle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1526) for the relief of Capt. Francis A. Beuter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1527) to refund the outstanding United States and Treasury notes with bonds bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH introduced a bill (S. 1528) to grant John T. Nagle the privilege of applying for a medal of honor for conspicuous bravery in action while serving as an acting assistant surgeon of the United States Army with troops in the field during the late civil war under the orders of commanding officers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DUBOIS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1529) for the payment of arrears of interest on Chickasaw trust funds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 1530) for the relief of James J. Person and Isabella M. Person; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1531) to provide for the unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 of silver to 1 of gold, and to impose an import duty upon foreign silver equal to the difference between its bullion value and its coinage value; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1532) to amend section 2306 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to homestead entries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1533) to provide for the relief of aged and disabled letter carriers; which was read twice by its

title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1534) granting a pension to Parmelia Robinson, daughter of Oilver Robinson, who was a private in the Revolutionary army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1535) for removal of charge of desertion from the military record of George Abbott, alias Andrew C. Adams; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 1536) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to rehear and render judgment in the case of William Donnelly and Patrick Egan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1537) to provide for the private sale of public lands in Missouri; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1538) granting a pension to Joseph M. Waddell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1539) granting a pension to Laura Barnes, widow of Thomas J. Barnes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1540) granting a pension to M. W. Linton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1541) granting a pension to Chesterfield Bosford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1542) granting an honorable discharge to George W. Bowling; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1543) to grant to railroad companies in the Indian Territory additional powers to secure right of way, depot grounds, etc.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1544) to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. WOLCOTT (for Mr. TELLER) introduced a bill (S. 1545) for the relief of the legal representatives of A. G. Boone; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

RECOGNITION OF CUBA.

Mr. KYLE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 51) directing the President to accord belligerent rights to Cuban insurgents on certain conditions; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. KYLE. I ask that the joint resolution be read at length and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, empowered and directed to receive such persons as may present themselves, satisfactorily accredited to represent and act for and upon behalf of the Cuban patriots or so-called insurgents of the Island of Cuba, and upon the production of evidence showing that the said Cuban patriots have established a seat of government in any part of said Island of Cuba and that a majority of the native-born residents of said Island of Cuba are actively supporting and defending the same with arms, or are in sympathy with the cause of said Cuban patriots, he shall enter into compact or treaty in the name and on behalf of the United States with said Cuban patriots, through the representatives aforesaid forthwith, to the end that full and complete belligerent rights may thereby be accorded and extended by the United States to said Cuban patriots during the continuance of the war being waged in said Island of Cuba.

REPRINT OF PACIFIC RAILROADS BILL.

Mr. ALLEN. On the 7th of this month I introduced and had referred a bill (S. 1369) directing the foreclosure of the Government lien on the Pacific railroads, and for other purposes, and it was printed under the rule. As the bill is printed there are several errors in it. I ask unanimous consent to have the bill reprinted as I send it to the desk corrected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. An order to reprint the bill in its corrected form will be entered.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. SQUIRE submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 291) to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to vessels propelled by steam, gas, fluid, naphtha, or motor; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SQUIRE subsequently submitted seven amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

JAILS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. PLATT submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General is hereby directed to inform the Senate as to the number of United States jails in the Indian Territory; the character, condition, and accommodations of each; the number of prisoners confined in each; the nature of crimes or offenses for which such criminals are imprisoned; whether in any of said jails the hardened and abandoned prisoners are separated from those of youthful age or those confined for misdemeanors; whether occupation of any kind is provided for prisoners; whether any measures of prison discipline or measures looking to the reformation of prisoners have been adopted, and, in general, whether the character and condition of such jails, or any of them, is such as the humane and proper treatment of criminals requires.

SITES FOR COAST DEFENSES.

Mr. SQUIRE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to inform the Senate what amount is necessary to be appropriated for payment of the cost of sites for the purpose of erecting fortifications and coast defenses.

PAYMENT OF COIN OBLIGATIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER], which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. BUTLER December 21, 1895, as follows:

Whereas it was the purpose of Congress to keep gold and silver coin at a parity by investing the Secretary of the Treasury with the discretion of paying the coin obligations of the Government as they mature in either metal: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed, when liquidating either the interest or principal of the Government's coin obligations, to make such payment in gold coin whenever the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold is less than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, and to continue to pay in such gold coin until the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be equal to the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, but when the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be greater than the market value of 412½ grains of pure silver he shall pay said coin obligations as they mature in silver coin, and continue to pay the same in silver coin until the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver shall be equal to the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I ask that that resolution may be passed over informally without prejudice.

Mr. BUTLER. All right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the resolution will be passed over informally and without prejudice.

RESTORATION OF PROTECTIVE DUTIES.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. President, on Friday last when I rose to reply to the criticism of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] the Chair recognized the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE]. I was thus unable to proceed, and I therefore beg the indulgence of the Senate for a few moments this morning.

The Senator from New York, who in his free lance way is the champion of all the wings, ends, and factions of the Democratic party, and who enjoys the distinction of originating the "I am a Democrat" slogan, misstates, unintentionally of course, Mr. President, the position of my colleague [Mr. BUTLER]. In his speech several days ago on the reorganization of the Senate my colleague said in reply to a question by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS]:

I will answer the question with pleasure. I hold my seat by such a cooperation for the simple reason that the party in my State which you belong to got to be so corrupt the people in the State rebelled against its management. Your party could to-day have been in full power in North Carolina if it had stood by its pledges and promises. A cooperation of all who opposed its methods was made, but that combination could not have driven the Democratic party from power in North Carolina if that party had been true to its pledges, true to its promises, and true to its people. It not only deserted the principles of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, thereby disgusting the great rank and file of the party, but it tried to keep itself in power by stealing and perjury at the ballot box, by ballot-box stuffing and manipulating the returns. This made fair elections, the purity of the ballot box, the overshadowing issue in North Carolina politics.

There is nothing equivocal in this statement over which the Senator from New York can possibly quibble, and it is too plain for misrepresentation. The issue that gave life and success to the political combination in North Carolina, and which ended forever Democratic supremacy in that State, was honest elections. While the abandonment of our people by the Democratic party in the construction of the Wilson bill and their position on the financial question have resulted in large accessions to the Republican party in my State, at the last election it was, in the main, political emancipation that inspired opposition to Democratic abuses and united all who were opposed to Democratic election methods. When the combination was formed neither of the parties to the compact were required to surrender their views in regard to political matters, but each maintained its identity. When the legislature met it was composed of Republicans and Populists, the two

parties being about evenly represented, and as a result my colleague was elected as a Populist and I was elected as a Republican.

As a further result of the combination the legislature repealed the unjust election law by the aid of which the Democrats had been able to maintain their supremacy, and enacted in its stead a law which guarantees to each citizen the right to cast his vote and have it counted as cast. The principle involved in our contest in North Carolina was in a great measure the same that resulted in Republican success in the Empire State of New York, so ably represented in this Chamber by the distinguished Senator, and the place that holds the champion of the defunct Southern Democracy now will hold him no more as a consequence of that success. I do not say this by way of exultation. It is fortunate that the sad spectacle does not confront this already distracted country of a discredited Administration without a leader in the Senate. And is not the grave responsibility, Mr. President, enough, that the Senator from New York should pause in the discharge of that momentous service to reconcile assumed differences between my colleague and myself? If impelled by a sense of duty to vindicate that rare jewel consistency, may I venture to ask the distinguished Senator what service has he rendered in that behalf that entitles him to acclaim himself mentor in this school of public virtue? Did the Senator vote with his colleague on the Wilson bill? Is it not worth his while to reconcile the difference between himself and his colleague on the tariff question?

As a matter of history, I know that the honorable Senator did not vote for the Wilson bill, but until an examination of the RECORD I had supposed that he was influenced by conscientious scruples. I had supposed that he was profoundly impressed by what the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] said in a colloquy with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. I ask the Secretary to read the report of the incident sent out by the Associated Press at the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

When Mr. HOAR had expressed his convictions that the Finapce Committee did not approve the bill and that most of the men who were to vote for it would, when they did so, violate their oaths to support the Constitution as they understood it, he was asked by Mr. GRAY whether he meant to say that the persons who would vote for the bill would violate their oaths.

"I do," was Mr. HOAR'S blunt answer.

"That is a very remarkable charge for the Senator to make of his colleagues in the Senate," Mr. GRAY remarked, with a tinge of anger in his manner.

"It is a very remarkable thing to do," Mr. HOAR said.

"I repeat that charge as unworthy of the Senator from Massachusetts, and as unworthy of a Senator in this place," Mr. GRAY exclaimed, with increasing anger.

"The Democratic party," said Mr. HOAR, argumentatively, "acquired the confidence of the country in 1892 by a platform which declared that protection was a robbery and a fraud and was a violation of the Constitution, and they have got a bill now crowded with protection. They have put in it new protecting duties. They have put a duty on sugar, which they are going to increase, for protection, and for nothing else. Now, when that is done, does the Senator from Delaware think that I am going to be deterred by a little bluster from him?

"There is no logical escape for a man who says that a duty for protection is robbery and is a violation of the Constitution, and who then comes in and takes an oath that the Constitution as construed by him he will support. He violates that privilege and that oath when he puts into legislation a new duty or increase of an old duty—both of which this does in abundance—for the mere purpose of protection; and when it is well known that they could not pass the bill except with the aid of persons who want those duties for protection."

Mr. GRAY. "Does the Senator think that what he has said is entitled to any better designation than 'bluster' when he charges his colleagues and peers in the Senate with violating their oaths?"

"The Senator," said Mr. HOAR, "is violating the rule of the Senate."

"I leave it to that greater tribunal, the public," Mr. GRAY replied, "as to who has violated the proprieties and the duties which a Senator owes to his constituents."

After some further interchange of remarks in the same spirit, Mr. GRAY made the point of order on Mr. HOAR that he had charged his colleagues with violating their oaths by their action in the Senate. The point of order was overruled.

Mr. PRITCHARD. This was high ground. It put country and patriotism above party, and had this lofty conception of public duty influenced the honorable Senator from New York, I could afford to submit in silence to his harmless criticism of my colleague and myself. But alas for human greatness! When the proposition to put even a higher duty than the McKinley duty on collars and cuffs was offered the resonant voice of the honorable Senator was as silent as the grave. Does it lie in the mouth of the Senator from New York, Mr. President, to preach consistency to others?

Now, Mr. President, the colleague of the honorable Senator voted for the Wilson bill and clamored for the highest protection possible on collars and cuffs, the manufacture of which is an important industry at Troy, N. Y. The two distinguished New York Senators were elected by Democratic legislatures which owed their Democratic majority to election methods like those of Mr. Bat Shea, who now, I understand, is residing temporarily at Sing Sing, counting the hours until his electrocution, and to "Boss" John Y. McKane, who is permanently established at Sing Sing penitentiary. Would it trouble the honorable Senator too much to look after his own tariff infelicities and party incongruities before meddling with affairs in North Carolina?

Speaking in part for North Carolina, I will say to the Senator from New York, in conclusion, that if combination is necessary to complete Democratic defeat in the State in this woeful year of Democratic disaster, it will be effected. My colleague is abundantly able to speak for himself, but I will suggest to the Senator from New York that the difference between them is, that my colleague left the Democratic party because its abuses could not be corrected inside of its organization, and the Senator from New York was kicked out of the Democratic party and branded as a traitor because his opposition to the Wilson bill threatened that hybrid measure with defeat. Between the consistency of my colleague and the self-stultification of the Senator from New York, who still maintains his adherence to the Democratic party, the comparison is no disparagement to my colleague.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not know exactly what is before the Senate, but I assume that the rules are so elastic that I may be permitted at this time to notice the elaborate remarks of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD], who has just taken his seat.

The Senator has taken considerable time to prepare an elaborate defense of himself and his record. I am not aware that I have said anything which calls for this elaborate defense of himself or of his efforts to make my own record appear inconsistent. I called the attention of the Senate and the country the other day to his rather remarkable speech. He spoke upon the subject of the tariff. I have no doubt he expressed his own views when he said that he favored the reenactment of the McKinley law. He probably has always been a high protective tariff man, for all I know. I have not taken the trouble to look up his long record, if he has one, in that regard.

But I also called the attention of the Senate to the fact that it was only a few days before when his colleague [Mr. BUTLER] had read a lecture to the Democratic party in this Chamber, because it had abandoned the principles of tariff reform by the enactment of the Wilson law. One of the Senators assured us that the people of North Carolina wanted a high protective tariff, and I understood the other Senator to say that the people of North Carolina wanted extreme tariff reform. I therefore, properly, as I think, called the attention of the Senate to the fact that it was utterly impossible for this Congress, potent though it may be, to gratify both Senators or, what is more important, to gratify the people of North Carolina, because we have the assurance that they want two entirely opposite things.

This morning the Senator who represents the Republican part of the combination in North Carolina assures us that in some form or other the Democracy has lost the control of that State, not upon any tariff principles, not upon any great measures on which the two parties differ, but because of some election matters down in that State. I do not know anything about them except what I have heard here. I am not familiar enough with North Carolina affairs to say whether those charges are well founded or not, and they are entirely immaterial to this question. But while advocating a high protective tariff the Senator still gives us the assurance that the hearts of the people of North Carolina beat favorably to the principles of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. I think well, then, of the people of North Carolina. They favor the principles of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, and yet they are in favor of a high protective tariff! I can not understand that. It strikes me there is a little inconsistency in that statement.

Beyond that the Senator has seen fit to speak of my own individual record in the Senate and reminds me—I do not know where he gets his information; it may have come by way of the North Carolina Associated or United Press, or some other wire—that I have been kicked out of the Democratic party.

Mr. President, that the Democratic party has met with some reverses in the last two or three years is true, but I think I may flatter myself that I am still a lively member of what there is left of that organization. [Laughter.] I believe after I voted against the Wilson bill the Democracy of New York rather insisted, if I recollect aright, upon my being the candidate of their party for governor, to lead a forlorn hope, and, sir, I responded to the call of my party and made the best fight possible under adverse circumstances, and I should do so again under like circumstances if defeat stared me in the face.

I did vote against the Wilson bill; I gave my reasons for that vote here; I pointed out some little difficulties in the Wilson bill, particularly as to the constitutionality of its features pertaining to the income tax. I am not now going to be diverted into any defense of myself about the provisions of the income tax. It is sufficient to say that I regarded those provisions as unconstitutional. I gave my reasons for so regarding them. I think those reasons were sound. I assail no man's judgment who differs with me. It was a question of law, a question of judgment, a question about which honest men may well differ. I did vote against the

Wilson bill, and for those reasons, principally, and I should do so again for like reasons.

The Wilson bill was assailed the other day by the same combination, if I may use that term, because it was a protective bill. I am not called upon to defend the Wilson bill, for I did not vote for it, but I can simply say that I suppose it was a fairly good tariff reform bill when the leader of the Populists in this Chamber, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], voted for it. We have not forgotten that vote in this Chamber. Possibly it was through his influence that the bill was passed. Not only the leader of the Populist party here, but I think I can safely say the leader of the Populist party in the United States thought that that bill was better than the McKinley law, and therefore voted for it, and thus gave it a fair certificate of good character in the direction of tariff reform. Other Populist leaders who come here may want to assail that vote. I do not. Other independents in this Chamber also voted for the Wilson bill.

Mr. President, the Wilson bill in some particulars was not as I liked it, and I exercised my right of voting against it. My distinguished colleague [Mr. MURPHY], who is not here to-day, exercised his right and voted for it. I was not bound by any caucus; it was distinctly understood I was not so bound; and thus I exercised my privilege.

There is only very little difference on this side of the Chamber. We all believe in tariff reform; some of us not to such an extent as others. We are all going to the Democratic heaven, only by little different routes. My friends upon the other side are going in the other direction. [Laughter.]

I did not quite catch what the Senator from North Carolina had to say about the Senators from New York owing their seats in this Chamber to some of the frauds perpetrated by Bat Shea and John Y. McKane. I could not quite catch what he said, owing to the noise in the Chamber. Bat Shea, so spoken of, got into a row a year ago last spring in a local election fight in the city of Troy, which started at a Republican primary. My colleague and myself were both elected years before any such affray occurred. Bat Shea was a Republican. The row occurred first in a Republican caucus in a Republican ward, in a contest between two Republicans running for the same office. John Y. McKane at the time I was elected was a Republican, and marched at the head of the procession which came from Brooklyn at the inauguration of Harrison in 1888. John Y. McKane, through his influence, gave a majority of about 1,500 to 1,600 to Harrison, and about 700 to 800 for Warner Miller against myself. Although it was ordinarily a Democratic constituency, yet it flopped over to the other side, and only returned to its Democratic allegiance a few years ago, after both my colleague and myself were elected. That shows how dangerous it is for the distinguished Senator from North Carolina to accept the statements of somebody else, put them upon paper, and come here and read them off. [Laughter.] So much for that question.

So far as the Democratic party is concerned, we have our differences on the silver question. We have a few differences on the tariff question. The State of New York, while it has been variable in its political fortunes, it is true, when Democracy is in power, is in favor of tariff reform, and its Senators endeavor to carry out that policy in this Chamber honestly and faithfully. I am not here to say that New York wants a high protective tariff and at the same time that New York wants extreme tariff reform, because the two things are entirely inconsistent.

Mr. President, that is all I care to say in regard to the very elaborate remarks of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York reminds me of the fact that John Y. McKane was not a member of the legislature when the Senator was elected to the Senate. If the distinguished Senator will read my remarks, he will find that I did not allege that McKane was a member of the senate or of the house.

Mr. HILL. I did not say he was. He was never in the legislature.

Mr. PRITCHARD. The Senator is hard to hold to any proposition. What I was going to say was that John Y. McKane never got into the penitentiary until he joined the Democratic party. That is the fact of which I wished to remind the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. PRITCHARD. I do not care to be interrupted any further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina declines to yield.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I also wish to remind the Senator that McKane was sent to the penitentiary in consequence of misconduct growing out of Democratic election methods in the State of New York. That is the point I wish to make. The Senator seeks to evade the force of it by reminding me that some time in the past this man was a decent man and a Republican in the State of New York. We have a great many instances in history where men had a good character, whose character was unquestioned, and in an evil moment they lost their character. I can not help that. I am sorry that he is a Democrat and I am sorry he is in that attitude.

The position I take is that had it not been for the dishonest election methods of the Democratic party the Republican party in North Carolina would have obtained a majority of the votes at every election in that State since the war until 1894. The point I wish to make is that in consequence of corrupt Democratic election methods, similar to the methods employed in the State of New York, the people have been deprived of their rights of suffrage at the ballot box and a minority in North Carolina has been permitted to rule our people.

I do not care to reply to anything else the Senator has said, for he does not attempt to defend his party in regard to the Wilson bill; in fact, he virtually admits that his party has passed a law which is not what it should be. Therefore I do not care to discuss that question one way or the other.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I do not care to reply to anything the distinguished Senator from New York has said to-day, but I wish to make a statement, inasmuch as my name was used by the Senator from New York a few days ago when I was out of the Chamber. The Senator from New York of course did not intend to misquote me, but his remarks as they appear in the RECORD do misrepresent what I said. He quoted me as saying that the people who left the Democratic party and joined the People's Party in North Carolina did it solely on account of the treachery of that party on the tariff question. The Senator no doubt thought I said that, but if he will turn to the RECORD and read my remarks in reply to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] he will see that I made no such statement.

I will state plainly why thousands upon thousands of the people in North Carolina left the Democratic party, and are still leaving it there and all over the country. They left it chiefly on account of the betrayal by that party of the people on the great financial question, because that party which had in the past taught the doctrines of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson on the financial question, as soon as it got an opportunity to carry out those pledges, repudiated them and took up the record and policy of the Republican party where it left off, and began to serve the gold combine. It was the vote of leading Democrats here and in the House of Representatives on that question and the known position of Grover Cleveland, whom that party had nominated for President the second time, which caused the first great break from the party. When that party came to legislate on the tariff question it caused more people to leave it. Why? They had made "the robber barons of the North and the East" their campaign slogan; they had charged that the Republican tariff was a discrimination in favor of the North and the East and against the South and West, and they pledged the people on the stump that if they ever got an opportunity they would stop that robbery and discrimination. When the Democratic party got into power, what did it do? Instead of stopping the discrimination Southern Democrats turned against their own section and their own people; they put the products and the raw material of the South and the West on the free list, and left the manufacturer with his high protection. That caused many more men to leave the Democratic party.

The South and West understand that a certain amount of tariff is necessary. The action of the distinguished Senator from New York and other Democrats in opposing the income tax, followed by the surprising decision of the Supreme Court, makes it necessary to have a very high tariff to raise the revenue necessary to run the Government. There is great incidental protection and bounty accompanying even a tariff for revenue only. Now, shall that tariff be raised, I ask any Democrat on this floor, by giving all the incidental protection to the manufacturers, to the "tariff barons" in the North and the East? You say that your doctrine is a tariff for revenue with incidental protection. Then I ask you in the name of high heaven and justice, why you did not give an equal share of the incidental protection to the raw material of the South and West when you formed and passed the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill? That is your crime in tariff legislation. Whether the Wilson law is better or worse than the McKinley Act is not the question. The rank and file of the Democratic party condemns that party for its wanton betrayal of the people of the South and West by the discrimination against them in the Wilson-Gorman Act.

On those two great questions chiefly, then, the people who have left the Democratic party have joined the People's Party. The cooperation in North Carolina of the Populists and Republicans came because the voice of the people could not be heard at the ballot box on those questions. It came on account of dishonest election methods resorted to by the Democratic party to stay in power in spite of the condemnation of the people, and it was necessary for everybody who was in favor of fair elections to combine to drive that party from power in order that we might have a free ballot and a fair count and get an honest expression of the will of the people. But I would call the attention of the Senator

from New York [Mr. HILL] to the fact that the other Senator from North Carolina stands nearer to-day to the great principles of Thomas Jefferson then does the Senator from New York. I can cooperate with my colleague in principles easier than I could with the Senator from New York. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD] stands for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratin of 16 to 1, for honest elections, for a graduated income tax, and is opposed to the further issue of interest-bearing bonds in time of peace. The Senator from North Carolina does not want to further increase the taxes of the people without at the same time increasing their ability to pay. On the other hand, the Senator from New York stands on the opposite side of every one of these great questions. He refuses to vote for any legislation to increase the ability of the people of this country to pay their debts, to pay their taxes, or to live by honest industry. He is opposed to and fights to the bitter end all such legislation.

Mr. KYLE. Will the Senator from North Carolina allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. KYLE. I should like to ask whether, in the Senator's judgment, the Wilson law as it passed the Senate is better than the McKinley Act which preceded it and which was repealed by the passage of the law?

Mr. BUTLER. I have just stated to the Senate that that is not the question under discussion; but in answer to the Senator from South Dakota I will say that I consider both of those acts bad and unjust to the people of the South and the West; and I do not want to waste time in quibbling between tweedledum and tweedledee, as the old parties have been doing for years, when there is a greater issue to which I wish to call attention. I consider the financial legislation of these two old parties a hundred times more ruinous to the prosperity of this country than the difference between any two tariff bills enacted by Congress.

Mr. KYLE. Will the Senator allow me one moment further?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. KYLE. He is old enough in human experience so that when he is confronted with two evils he naturally chooses the lesser. What would he have done had he been placed in the position of the North Carolina senators who preceded the present senators from that State in this Chamber?

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator asks me what I would do if I were loanding between the devil and the deep blue sea. I would not htmp in either direction if there were a chance to stand still. I sujuld shun both evils.

Mr. KYLE. Then the Senator does not wish to give an expression of opinion upon that point?

Mr. BUTLER. I say that the passage of the Wilson bill was a betrayal of the trust put in the hands of the Democratic party, because it increased the discrimination against the people who make the raw materials and in favor of the manufacturers of this country, by taking from the producers of raw materials every particle of protection that they had, while leaving the manufacturers with high protection, and some of them higher protection than they had theretofore enjoyed.

Mr. KYLE. Granting that to be true, had the Senator from North Carolina been in this Chamber at that time he would have been compelled by his vote or his silence to determine whether the McKinley Act should remain upon the statute books or whether the new act should take its place. I wish to know point blank, yes or no, whether the Senator thinks the Wilson law as it passed the Senate is better than the McKinley Act which preceded it.

Mr. BUTLER. I will answer the question by saying that if at any time I am confronted with two propositions and am bound to favor one or the other, I shall use my judgment at the time when the question arises and cast my vote for the lesser of the two evils. I presume that those who were then in this Chamber did that according to their judgment when the emergency was before them.

I have only a few words to say in conclusion. The position of the Democratic party on these two questions, as well as on others, has caused a revolt in the ranks of the party, has caused the men who were taught true Democracy to rebel against false and treacherous leadership.

The Senator from New York says it is hard to satisfy North Carolina. You can not satisfy North Carolina with a gold standard. You can not satisfy North Carolina by issuing more bonds and piling up a larger debt in times of peace. You can not satisfy North Carolina by casting your vote to prevent Congress from taxing the accumulated wealth, the millionaires, and the monopolies of this country while at the same time you place all the burden of taxation upon the poorer people and on the productive industries of the country. You can not satisfy North Carolina by giving all the incidental protection of a so-called revenue tariff to New England and taking it all from the people of the South and West. If it is hard to satisfy the people of North Carolina because they stand for those just principles and measures, then I am proud to boast that my State is hard to satisfy. She asks for simple justice; she demands justice; she will be satisfied with nothing less. As long as Congress legislates only for the benefit of monopolies and the British gold trust, North Carolina will not be satisfied. Until this Government is run on the great fundamental principles of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none," as taught and practiced by Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, North Carolina will not be satisfied, and her solemn protests will continue to be heard on this floor.

The Senator from New York says he is glad to learn that the people of North Carolina stand for the principles of Jefferson and Jackson. I challenge him to show that the course of the national Democratic party is according to those principles. His own record is the opposite of true Democracy. The People's Party is the only party in this country to-day which represents those great principles of justice and good government. The people recognize this, and therefore the People's Party is daily receiving accessions by the thousands from both the old monopoly-ridden, British-gold parties. The People's Party stands for the principles of true Republicanism as put forward by Abraham Lincoln and for true Democracy as enunciated by our forefathers. On those great questions we stand, and adherents of both of the old parties are coming to us because they believe their parties have deserted those principles.

The people have begun to recognize the difference between party principles and a party name. They refuse to desert their principles to follow a name. They will not follow an agent of the gold combine though he hoists the dear old party banner. Therefore they are repudiating the two old traitorous parties and flocking under the banner of the People's Party, where they can worship the true god of their fathers.

Mr. HILL. The only thing upon which North Carolina seems to be united is the principles of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. The two Senators from North Carolina do not interpret those principles alike, but nevertheless they are for the principles of Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson. I do not quite understand the two Senators yet. The Senator from North Carolina, Mr. PRITCHARD, when last upon the floor said that North Carolina is Republican, and would have been Republican ever since the war if there had been fair elections; and yet during all that time and until within the last year or so the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BUTLER, was a leading member of the Democratic party, and assisted in keeping that party in power in the State by fraud.

I regret that one Senator has seen fit to make this vicious attack upon his colleague. [Laughter.] I am disposed to defend him and to say that I doubt whether the charges made here so easily and flippantly are true. I am rather inclined to believe that there have been reasonably fair elections in North Carolina. As I said, I have not studied the details of the matter, but year after year the Democratic party in that State has won victories upon settled principles, and during all that time the Democratic party has had the voice and the pen and the vote and the influence of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] who has just taken his seat.

Mr. President, I doubt whether North Carolina has been Republican at all since the war. These changes of party fortune come now and then. It is no reflection particularly upon a party that the people once in a while desire a change locally. Undoubtedly there may have been some local causes which have produced changes in North Carolina, as elsewhere, but I firmly believe that when the great contest of 1896 comes around the people of North Carolina will still be for the true, not the spurious, principles of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, and that they will stand by the Democratic party in that election.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HILL. With great pleasure.

Mr. BUTLER. Then the Democratic party will have to nominate a man who does not stand for the gold standard and a man for whom, I suppose, the Senator from New York will not vote. North Carolina will not cast its vote in the next election for a gold-standard man of either party or of any party.

North Carolina is for free silver, and our people know that the only way to secure it is to put a free-silver man and a patriot in the White House.

Mr. HILL. "Still harping on my daughter." [Laughter.] Every discussion that comes up has interjected into it something about the gold standard. I am pretty well convinced from what I have heard here to-day that North Carolina is not going to be satisfied in the next election. I think that either the Democratic or the Republican ticket will be elected—I hope the Democratic ticket will be—but I am inclined to think from the inconsistent claims made here to-day that it is utterly impossible for either of the great parties to gratify the fickle constituency of North Carolina.

They do not agree upon the tariff. They send two representa-

tives here who tell us what the State wants, and each makes different claims. The Democratic party may sometimes straddle questions, but I do not think we are straddling much upon the tariff, and I hope not with respect to any other question upon which we are called to pass. Let the people of North Carolina fence themselves in, set up in business for themselves, arraign the two old parties as corrupt, establish a little Populist dynasty of their own, and we could then see whether they would fare any better than do the other people of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from New York permit me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HILL. "Still another Richmond in the field." [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from New York can not escape the issue——

Mr. HILL. Can the Senator from Nebraska tell me what is the precise issue?

Mr. ALLEN. I will tell the Senator in a moment. He can not escape the issue by referring to the condition of affairs in North Carolina. I do not know what the condition there is, and I care nothing about it.

Mr. HILL. The condition of affairs there is a little bit mixed, according to the Senators from that State.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from New York stated a moment ago that the Democratic party is united upon every issue.

Mr. HILL. Did I say upon every issue?

Mr. ALLEN. Upon every issue.

Mr. HILL. I hardly think my remarks would bear that interpretation. I admit that there is a trifling difference upon the silver question—just a little.

Mr. ALLEN. Can the Senator from New York point out a solitary issue that has come up within the last three years upon which the Democratic party has been united?

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes.

Mr. ALLEN. What is it—on the question of appropriations?

Mr. HILL. Yes; upon the subject of economical appropriations, the party has been substantially united. Upon the great question of State rights and the right of the people of each State to conduct their own elections, the Democratic party has been united. On the great question of tariff reform, it has substantially been united. Once in a while a stray fellow gets out of the party, like myself, but after all the great party is united.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from New York permit me?

Mr. HILL. I am not quite through, but the Senator can proceed.

Mr. ALLEN. I wish to state that there was a unanimity upon the part of the Democratic party in the repeal of the election laws, and the Democratic party was supported in that position by the Populists. You have disagreed upon the financial question. There are about seventeen of you on this side of the Chamber who belong on the other side. You have disagreed upon the tariff policy. I remember the Senator from New York distinctly stated in one of his speeches here that the Supreme Court as it would be reconstructed would probably hold the income-tax feature of the Wilson Act unconstitutional and void. What is the issue upon which you have been united?

Mr. HILL. My friend from Nebraska scatters worse than an old shotgun. He started upon the election question, then he was on the tariff, and now he is on the question of an income tax. In a few days from now I hope to have an opportunity, under the liberal rules so properly described the other day by the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE], to express some opinions of mine upon the income-tax matter. However, I shall not be drawn into that question now.

But I assume, sir, and I repeat, that the Wilson bill, aside from the income-tax feature, must have been a pretty good measure or else my critical friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], would not have cast his vote for and given his influence to it. I know that the new Senators who now appear in this Chamber as the true champions of the Populistic doctrines are rather inclined to give the Wilson Act the cold shoulder. But after all the great Populist party will rally around the Senator from Nebraska, and I hope it will, and sustain him in his vote for that portion of the bill. An income tax, Senators will recollect, was one of the cardinal principles of the Populist party. Some Democrats tried to steal it from the Populist party, and I recollect that I called attention to that fact at the time.

Mr. President, there is another thing. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD] said that the Wilson Act is a Northern measure; that it absolutely does injustice to the products and interests of the South, and that it protects the New England people. I am not especially called upon to defend the Wilson law, but upon that proposition I am rather a free lance, and possibly can defend it as well as some others who are more committed to its provisions. My friend, the Senator from North Carolina, ought to read the debates in Congress on that bill. Some one should present him with a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1894. He should read the speeches made upon the other side of the Chamber, in which Republican Senators arraigned the Wilson bill as emphatically a Southern measure, by which Southern interests were protected at the expense of Northern interests. I can point out dozens of speeches made upon the other side where Senators expressly charged that "this is in the interest of the South; that is in the interest of the South, and the other thing is in the interest of the South." I think they were wrong. I think they pointed out those instances in the heat of debate, and that the measure, in that respect, is neither a Southern nor a Northern act. It was designed as a bill for revenue, and it now seems that in the effort to get revenue the framers did not provide for quite enough, according to the other side.

We still come back to the question as to what North Carolina wants, a high tariff or a low tariff, a protective tariff or a tariff-reform measure. Upon that question each of the Senators from that State claims to represent the State fairly and impartially, and each makes inconsistent claims.

Mr. BUTLER. May I interrupt the Senator from New York?

Mr. HILL. I do not want to take too much time from the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], who desires to take the floor soon. However, I will hear the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUTLER. In answer to the question as to what North Carolina wants, I will state that she wants a just system of taxation; she wants more money, every dollar a full legal-tender dollar standing on its own bottom, not to be redeemed in gold dollars, and enough of them to maintain the stability of prices. If you will give us that, the people of North Carolina can pay the McKinley tariff or the highest tariff ever passed easier than they can pay a 10 per cent tariff under the gold standard. North Carolina also wants an income tax that will make the wealth of the country pay its just proportion of the taxes of the country. She wants a stop put to these infamous bond issues; she is opposed to increasing taxes and piling up an interest-bearing debt in times of peace; she would rather cut down expenses than increase taxes; she would rather pay debts than to pile them up. That is what she wants. Is it not plain?

Mr. HILL. It is very plain [laughter], and it is very plain further that North Carolina is not going to get what she wants, either from the present Congress or from any other Congress for a great many years to come. The Republican party is not going to surrender to any such demands as those which come from North Carolina. The Democratic party is not. Therefore North Carolina will still have to wail, because it can not be comforted.

The Senator from North Carolina wants to pass an income-tax law. Is there any objection to his passing it if he wants to? Let him introduce such a bill. It simply violates the Constitution; but as our friend, Timothy J. Campbell, of New York, says, "What has the Constitution to do between friends?" [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from New York yield to just one question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I have introduced a bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution so as to provide for an income tax. Will the Senator from New York vote for it? Let us get the alleged constitutional difficulties to a just and righteous law out of the way. Will he vote for my bill to amend the Constitution in this respect? The people of North Carolina thoroughly understand that justice can not be gotten through either of the old parties, as the Senator has frankly admitted.

Mr. HILL. I shall have to be a good deal older than I am now before I will ever vote for such an unwise constitutional amendment, permit me to say.

Mr. BUTLER. Your party can not hope for a much longer lease of power by pursuing such an un-American and ruinous course. The Populist party is growing rapidly because of just such betrayals of trust. Of course I mean nothing personal. The gold trust and the monopolists control both old parties, and the people are forced to leave them and rally under the banner of the People's Party to fight for their lost rights, their lost liberties, and their lost prosperity.

Mr. HILL. The Democratic party has stood a good deal; it can stand a good deal more, and it will live notwithstanding that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina has left its ranks. It has had adverse times; it will have them again; but I think, sir, that in the future, the near future, too, the grand old party, the party of Jefferson and Jackson, I beg to remind the Senator, will triumph. It has survived prejudice upon one side; it has survived bad advisers upon the other. It is a party which, in my judgment, is necessary to the welfare of this country. It has accomplished much in that respect. It is the party which has always stood in behalf of the liberty of the citizen against the encroachments of power. While we may differ as to some details, upon the main vital questions of the hour the party is substantially united.

The income tax was not a question which either party placed in its political platform in 1892. Every man had a right to vote as

he pleased upon the question and be loyal to his party platform. This debate started upon the question of the attitude of North Carolina, and we have now diverged into a debate on the income tax, the tariff, and the silver question. From the looks of things we are going to have the silver bill before us for several days yet, and there will be ample opportunity for any Senator who desires to express his views to do so. Then we shall have up the tariff question, and I desire to hear again what North Carolina wants on the tariff question. I shall wait and listen again with great interest to what the people of that State desire with reference to tariff legislation.

I still think that they want tariff reform—genuine tariff reform. I doubt the statement of one of the Senators from that State that it wants a high protective tariff, and I doubt the statement of the other that it wants an extreme tariff reform bill. It wants a reasonable bill, a fair bill, a just bill. Not a bill in the interest of the North, nor a bill in the interest of the South.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. HILL. I was just about through.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute reported by the Committee on Finance, on which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I ask for the reading of the resolution offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] on a subject cognate to the one that is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution referred to will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. SHERMAN December 31, 1895, as follows:

Resolved, That by injurious legislation by the Fifty-third Congress the revenues of the Government were reduced below its necessary expenditure and the fund created by law for the redemption of United States notes has been invaded to supply such deficiencies of reserve; that such a misapplication of the resumption fund is of doubtful legality and greatly injurious to the public credit, and should be prevented by restoring said fund to the sum of not less than $100,000,000, in gold coin or bullion, to be segregated from all other funds, to be paid out only in the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes; and such notes when redeemed to be reissued only in exchange for gold coin and bullion.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I have called for the reading of this resolution because in that movement of the Senator from Ohio there is concentrated the whole force of the attitude of the anti-silver, high-protection Republicans on the political questions that arise in this debate.

It would be a difficult and needless effort on my part to attempt to improve upon the able and conclusive argument of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] in his presentation on last Friday of the views of the Committee on Finance in support of the measure now under consideration. I cheerfully accept that argument as the basis of the observations I have the honor to submit to the Senate, which will relate more particularly to the application of the truths so thoroughly demonstrated by that honorable Senator to existing conditions of serious embarrassment that appeal to Congress for the relief of the Government and the people.

It is not surprising that in our chronic state of party antagonism we should feel disinclined to give precedence to any other considerations during this Presidential year than the political strategy that will most likely result in a party triumph and the rich inheritance of power and patronage that falls to those who capture the Presidency.

Yet, Mr. President, it can not be creditable or pardonable if we put the sufferings of our people out of mind until we have matured the plans and provided the strategy and tactics by which one of the two parliaments of political managers and intriguers which will meet to nominate candidates for the Presidency in the coming summer can probably capture that great prize.

Those parliaments will provide instructions to the Congress of the United States as to the legislation that is to be enacted; but if they can again so cloud their phraseology as to leave the victorious party in a fog of doubt and uncertainty, as is the custom of national conventions, we shall at least have the good fortune to escape from their follies through the meshes of their insincerity and to be left still untrammeled in our duty of providing, by law, for the welfare of the country. If the people, who are really unrepresented in these parliaments of the politicians, have no better guaranty for their protection and relief than their wind-shaken platforms can give, they will be neglected and trampled upon until they will find it necessary "to rise in the majesty of their might" and overwhelm with their power those who sacrifice them to their selfish purposes.

It will either be this, or some day, not too distant to be easily conjectured, one of these conventions will meet after an election to declare that their candidate has been elected, and to swear him into the Presidency. And if this may be done by an assumption of power after an election, why may it not be done as well before the election? France, when her people were as enlightened as we are, did wilder things than these in the name of liberty, equality, and fraternity. I can not drive away the conviction from my mind that the House tariff bill and bond bill were sent to the Senate merely as the component parts of a party platform, to be submitted to the Republican parliament of politicians as the best scheme for party success, and that neither of them was expected to be finally placed upon the statute book as a law.

The bond bill of the House had the ill fortune to encounter a true and sincere majority in the Senate Committee on Finance, who have reported the measure under consideration for the relief of the people and the Government on lines of justice and expediency that have the unbroken proof of more than a century of American experience to sustain this measure. The tariff bill of the House is in a state of lingering illness that seems to be destined to save it from the ax of the headsman who wields the veto. It is imprisoned in the sick bay of the caucus, and seems to have encountered the malady that afflicted the Wilson tariff bill, from which it recovered only by heroic surgery after many days of "innocuous desuetude," but in such shape that its own father did not know it and refused to recognize it. The Reed bill is, indeed, "a bruised reed," that his party seems afraid to trust. Whether the fire in the wool tax, like "the smoking flax," can be quenched, seems to be a question as to whether the water supply of the manufacturers will hold out. I am afraid that the President will not have the opportunity to veto the Reed tariff bill.

I think I can discern in the faltering step of progress in these measures that neither of the leading political parties is satisfied that there is any hope of relief to the country in either or both of them.

There is a serious and respectful attitude in Congress toward the reconsideration of our last twenty-five years of unhappy experiences, and a comparison of that period with the previous eighty years of growth and uninterrupted prosperity, when gold and silver coins dwelt together in unity and their parity was preserved under the laws of nature's God, who was then considered to be as wise as the average Secretary of the Treasury. I welcome this harbinger of deliverance.

It is bound to come, and I feel convinced that it is not far off. The slight apparition of war that recently scared the golden calf into dreadful bleating for the protection of its progenitor, John Bull, has started the inquiry as to how we could afford to fight without gold. The last and hardest blow that we struck John Bull, in the war of 1812, was delivered by Andrew Jackson, in whose honor the Senate adjourned on the 8th of January, and it is doubtful if many of his brave comrades ever saw a gold coin. Silver was the money with which they were armed, provisioned, clothed, and paid, and not much of that. It will be the money that will pay our Army and Navy if war ever again becomes our hard duty. So when the eagle ruffles his feathers we look to his picture on the standard silver dollar and repeat our motto, "In God we trust."

As a part of the programme that came over from the House—the tariff bill and the bond bill—the Senator from Ohio came to the front as the leader of the hosts. His great reputation as a king maker entitled him fairly to this eminent distinction.

The Senator had elected every Republican to the Presidency who had defeated him before a nominating convention save one, and as he is not now known to be a candidate, his remarkable success in electing his opponents in his own party may fail to attend him in the effort he made in the Senate a few days ago in favor of the Reed tariff and the Reed bond bill. The effort of the Senator from Ohio was only an exploit for party success, and was not what the country had the right to expect from his long experience as a leader in financial legislation.

Even his vindictive declamation against the coinage of silver on equal terms with gold goes unheeded by a people who suffer in hunger, asking for bread, while he hurls stones and anathemas against them. His eloquent denunciations echoed and reechoed among the groined arches of a temple that seemed deserted, with no approving voice from the multitudes outside, against whom the doors were closed. The great appeal has gone to the people, and their decree will be no uncertain sound. A vote in favor of this bill will be the law at a not distant day. I will read a very clear statement of our relations to legal tender and other paper money made to the Senate on Tuesday, December 31, by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]. He said:

Manifestly and palpably, then, our greenbacks have been the instruments and not the real cause of gold withdrawals. Had these instruments not ex-

isted, others would have been found. The burden would simply have shifted to other shoulders.

Our national-bank notes are, under existing laws, redeemable in greenbacks, or in so-called Sherman notes; in fact, in any legal-tender money. But if the greenbacks and the Sherman notes are retired, are destroyed, then the national-bank notes will become redeemable in gold, and their 25 or 15 per cent reserves and their 5 per cent redemption fund will all have to be made up of gold, and they will have to bear nearly all the gold burden which the Treasury now bears on behalf of the greenbacks and the Sherman notes.

* * * * * * *

The outward flow of gold can not be stopped permanently either by the sale of bonds to foreign syndicates nor by the retirement of the greenbacks and other Treasury notes. The flow can only be permanently and steadily checked by restoring the ultimate balance of trade in our favor. For years to come Europe must of necessity continue to have upon our stocks, mortgages, and bonds a large credit balance in her favor. This balance we should meet and overcome, not by the shipment of gold, but by the balance of traffic in merchandise in our favor. Our tariff and revenue laws should be so adjusted as to leave us a creditor rather than a debtor nation, with a merchandise balance sufficient to meet and liquidate the adverse credit balance, and with a revenue ample to meet all the expenses of the Government. Ample revenues and a clear balance of trade in our favor can alone stop the flow of gold and effect permanent and substantial relief.

There, Mr. President, is a demonstration that our Government can not escape the wastage of the endless-chain draft upon our gold resources so long as we have any form of redeemable paper issues in existence, except our present form of gold and silver certificates, if we continue to pay gold alone upon coin debts. The Senator argues that our gold supply will be exhausted in a few years by the withdrawal of that metal to meet the annual balances of trade that are against us, and demands the prohibition of trade by the enactment of high tariffs in order to turn the balances of trade in our favor.

The argument fails at this point, that other countries will not take our exports if they are denied the privileges of bartering their productions in exchange for them. Our productions are not like tea, coffee, and sugar, that we do not produce in exportable quantities, but each of our great staples and manufactures is in full competition with those of many countries in all the zones. Our balance of trade would give us no necessary concern if our people and our near neighbors could consume all that we can produce, but they are too poor to consume our surplus, whatever is the cause. We go abroad to find mouths to feed, backs to clothe, and houseless people to shelter.

If all hungry, ill-clad, and homeless persons, even in our own country, had all they really need to bring them up to the standard of their wants created by the decencies of our own civilization, there would be little surplus left of the redundancy of our productions. The want of money creates a surplus of labor by denying to those who are industrious the inducement to work. Unless our manual industries are prosperous we can never have balances of trade in our favor in our commercial dealings with foreign countries. If we are to rely for our financial independence upon selling to other countries more than we buy from them, we shall always be in financial slavery if we refuse to supply our industrial classes with the means of increasing the productions that enter into commerce.

It is very true that at home and abroad the profit of labor engaged in production, when counted in dollars, depends upon the ability of the consumers of our products to buy them at a remunerative price. It is equally true that when money is scarce among the consuming classes they can not take our surplus productions in full measure as compared with their actual wants. Their poverty fixes the price of our productions, not only as to the surplus left after our home demand is supplied, but it measures the price, at home and abroad, of the whole mass of our productions.

It is something even stranger and more cruel than "the irony of fate" that, as to wheat, corn, provisions, tobacco, and cotton, the rich people in Europe have these indispensable supplies priced to them at the rates that paupers can afford to pay for them. We are prevented, as it is said, by our Constitution, from protecting our surplus productions by an export tax, and so we are left at the mercy of the financiers of Europe as to the prices that they and the poor of that country shall pay us for our productions.

Why should the wealthy men of the British Isles, whose country can not feed its people two hundred days in the year, feel interested to enable their poorer classes to buy and consume more of our staple productions, when the increased demand thereby created for them would increase the amount of their personal expenses?

The balance of trade which the Senator from Minnesota seems to rely upon alone to check the outflow of gold from our country will never exist if Europe can prevent it. The way to prevent it, and the only way they can prevent it, is to keep their lower classes so poor that they can not consume what we produce.

Meat twice a week, white bread once in a month, and a cotton garment once in a year is all those poor people can find the money to pay for. If they were allowed to have more money in their reach, they would work very hard to get it that they might feed the stomachs and clothe the backs that God made as parts of the image of His Majesty—man, to whom He gave dominion over all things in the world. Without the use of an adequate supply of money we can not produce and sell, nor can they buy and consume our products, so as to give to this rich country and to our splendid people the balance of trade upon which our financial security as a single gold standard country is supposed to depend.

When gold marks the price of our productions the price must be short, because the supply of gold is short. And the prices must continue to decline as property, production, and population increase, because the increase of the gold supply can not keep pace with the march of civilization. Every year and every day must record a loss instead of a gain, like a leaking cistern. The ruin of such a country is certain and speedy.

The Senator from Ohio is the author of five new measures of finance that have given the people and the Government more trouble in handling the little remnant of $346,000,000 of greenbacks than it did to pay $12,000,000,000 of annual expenditures for the support of the Government and more than $3,000,000,000 of principal and interest of the national debt that we have raised by taxation and have paid in the last thirty years. These measures are the demonetization of silver in 1873, the sequestration of the gold reserve in the Treasury in 1878, the power given to the Secretary of the Treasury in 1890 to preserve the parity between the metals, the power to sell bonds at private sale, and the power to enable private persons, by contract, to dispense with the legal-tender laws in their transactions.

The Senator from Ohio thus emptied the evils of Pandora's box upon the country, and comes forth now as the great leader of the Republican party and of a faction of the Democratic party headed by our President, to vindicate his course.

This Napoleon of finance, as he is admiringly called, was retired to his Elba by the combined efforts of the old Jackson Democracy and the Grant and Logan and Teller and Jones Republicans, and the Bland-Allison Act. He has returned now, and marches his Old Guard to the attack upon the President, who sacrificed everything in his cause. The Senator refuses him the shelter even of the Senate tariff, which he disdained to sign and called "perfidious," but now raises it above his head as a shield and loudly proclaims that it is all-sufficient to relieve the country from all financial embarrassment, present and prospective, and to meet the future demand for gold for shipment to London.

The one hundred days of the Senator's final campaign against bimetallism are nearly up. His Waterloo has been fought and lost. He has not yet reached his rock in the sea. He has not yet embarked on the hospitable *Bellerophon*. His former great allies, the friends of Garfield and Conkling and Harrison and Quay, stand ready to decree his immolation in the political prison of another St. Helena. It is yet time for the Senator to do what the pride of Napoleon alone prevented him from doing, to his utter ruin. The Senator, instead of relying upon the honor of the British, which is never violated except for gain or revenge, had better seek refuge in America. Instead of trusting his future to British capitalists and Rothschild and Seligman, whom he has greatly enriched, he had better cultivate the love and gratitude of the toiling and suffering millions of Americans who are in poverty and distress and will forgive everything for the sake of peace.

The great radical wrong and mischief that the Senator from Ohio has inflicted upon the country was the gratuitous and unnecessary destruction of silver as primary money—the money of redemption of debts. This destruction, in a constitutional sense, has done great violence to the individual rights of American citizens.

The right of the British subject to contribute by his labor to the volume of legal-tender money of the realm existed in full force when our Constitution was ordained. It had also received the express recognition and sanction of the Articles of the Confederation and of the States in that capacity, and also while they were colonies.

This right belonged to the citizen, and could be fully enjoyed without the consent of any bank or banker, and it had existed for more than two centuries in Great Britain and the colonies. Under the Confederation a majority of the States could regulate the alloy and the value of the coins, but Congress could not coin money. When, under the Constitution, the power to coin money was given to Congress, it referred to striking the coins of gold and silver that were then in use. It referred to both, and not to one of those metals. I am only stating the conclusions that are undeniable, and do not propose to argue the question of their soundness. I suppose that the opinion of Daniel Webster on this subject, which I will now quote, is entitled to as much respect, as a judicial utterance, as any that could be given on this floor to-day. Mr. Webster said:

I am clearly of the opinion that neither Congress nor any other authority can legally demonetize either silver or gold. If one coin can be dethroned as money then the other one can be, and thus the Constitution can be disregarded, yes, overthrown. The command to Congress is to coin money, not

to destroy it, to create legal-tender money for the use of the people, and the grant of authority to create money can not be construed to mean authority to destroy money.

This opinion is reenforced by a fact to which little attentino seems to be given—that no such thing as a gold dollar existed or had ever existed when our Constitution was ordained. All coined dollars at that day were silver dollars.

When the framers of the Constitution come to provide for that precious liberty, the right of trial by jury, they fixed the sum in controversy in civil causes which should determine the application of this right at "$20;" thus giving recognition to silver dollars (for there were then no gold dollars) as the measure of a civil right that had been the pride of Anglo-Saxon civilization since the battle of Runnymede. No less distinct was the recognition of silver as a money metal in the prohibition placed upon the States against their making "anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

One sentence in section 9 of Article I of the Constitution is full and perfect proof that the power "to coin money" given to Congress in section 8 of the same article is mandatory, and includes both gold and silver without discrimination. The defining sentence in section 9, which relates to the power given to Congress in section 8 of the same article, is as follows: "No State shall coin money," or "make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts."

Thus, the right of the American citizen to have equal laws for the coinage of the gold and silver bullion which he might produce was an ancient and valuable liberty, which the Constitution did not destroy or abridge, but was designed carefully to preserve.

But our sense of the value and sacredness of constitutional rights is so dulled and obscured by the demands of political parties for those measures that, no matter how, will control the elections that I am quite aware that these arguments are too often addressed to ears that refuse to listen.

The Senator from Ohio, when he first essayed to destroy legal-tender silver money, declared, in 1872, to the great financial authorities of Europe that the American people were in favor of the British policy of the single gold standard of legal-tender money.

If he had any authority for such a statement he has never produced or referred to it, so far as I am informed. I have never heard of any such American declaration. I have heard of many to the contrary. If the Senator, whose opinions have weighed so heavily against our people, can sustain this serious assertion by any facts then existing, it behooves him, now that he is in the humor of taking the world into his confidence, to produce the proofs to support that unfortunate declaration. I do not believe it.

I will not attempt now to measure or describe the evil, wrong, destruction, and misery that has been inflicted upon a great country and a trustful people by the act of the Senator from Ohio in the demonetization of silver. Those evils and wrongs have been described by the present Secretary of the Treasury in language almost equal to the burning eloquence of the Apocalypse, not as a prophecy, but as a narrative of dreadful history, when he said they were worse than war, pestilence, and famine. As the present and the former Secretary of the Treasury are now in league for the final destruction of silver as a money metal, I will leave them to the adjustment of their former quarrels.

The resolution of the Senator from Ohio is plainly intended to indicate the attitude of the Republican party in the coming Presidential campaign. It is not in the least surprising that the Senator from Ohio is assigned to the duty, in advance of the reports of the Committee on Finance on the bond bill and the tariff bill, of stating the main issues on which they prefer to go before the country and of endeavoring to compel the Republicans in the Senate to align themselves upon those issues. He embodies the principles of that party more fully than any living man, and his record will be everywhere accepted as the record of the Republican party.

It is true that his record is a garment of many colors, but in that respect it is in keeping with the varied aspects of his party, which agrees in but one principle applicable to domestic affairs, that of a tariff, such as the McKinley law, levied for the purpose of giving the aid of the tax laws to enrich the favored classes by levying burdens upon those whose necessities compel them to yield tribute to the rich. In his assault upon the legislation of the Fifty-third Congress he specifies the Senate tariff bill as the principal point of attack. In this he has been met and so completely answered and unhorsed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] that nothing remains to be said on that subject.

The Senator from Ohio was far more responsible than the minority of the Democrats in the Senate who voted with him for the repeal of his great financial act of 1890. That was the pet of the President and was made a sort of crucial test of true Administration Democracy in the "injurious legislation" of the Fifty-third Congress. That act was, by the averment of the President and the confession of the Senator, a great cause of the panic of 1893, and its repeal was agreed upon by them as the curative measure that would heal all of our troubles.

Instead of that the panic increased, gold rushed out of the country, and the President was forced to sell bonds to recall it.

The Senator has now discovered that the hegira of gold is due to the fact that we are buying more than we sell in Europe, and he advises the country to check importations from abroad, so that the balance of trade will be in our favor. What is to become of the revenue in that case?

The increase of taxes on the people is a matter of slight consideration with the Senator, but the people shiver while he advises that during this cold weather they shall dispense with some of their woolen garments.

Whether it is in the form of bond and mortgage, or in the form of a tax on woolen goods, the remedy offered by the Senator and the President is the same in its effects. They agree that the people shall be taxed in one form or the other to get gold to pay their coin contracts. Whether such taxes shall threaten the parity between the souls and bodies of the people seems to make no difference, so that parity is preserved between the metals described in our contracts by the word "coin."

I am firmly opposed to the repudiation of any part of our national obligations by our Government, and equally opposed to their repudiation by our creditors. If Congress should excuse, as they have never excused, our creditors from the obligation to accept legal-tender silver dollars in payment of our coin contracts, it is indisputably true that in doing this Congress would repudiate a sacred trust, duty, and obligation imposed upon them by a suffering and still confiding constituency. When Congress refuses to assert and enforce a just demand on the part of the people, secured to them by contract, such refusal can be nothing else than a repudiation of the contract.

If the Senator from Ohio had complained of the Fifty-third Congress because it did not demand some information or hint that an issue of two hundred and sixty-two millions of bonds would be demanded to keep the gold in the country, and that our paper currency was to be destroyed so as to make room for the national banks to regulate currency, business, and the price of crops and labor, I would have listened sadly to his "tale of woe." That failure of the Fifty-third Congress was far too melancholy for the Senator's wounded sensibilities. He does not allude to it. As to the manner of putting our bonds on the market, the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] has proven that it was in accordance with a bad precedent set by the Senator from Ohio.

This is another dreadful warning and example which I hope the Senator from New York will reflect upon, and that he will, in his maturer years, remember how dangerous a thing it is for a Democrat to follow a great Republican leader when he is parading the streets of the New Jerusalem, paved with gold and made royal with banners of gold bonds, of which the Senator from Missouri spoke in such a vivid way. Gold bonds have been the chief desire of the Senator from Ohio, and we have learned that it is dangerous to give him all that he wants.

The payment of $500,000,000 in gold is not a very serious undertaking for a Government that has raised and paid out in the thirty years since our civil war more than $12,000,000,000 in current expenses and more than $3,000,000,000 in bonded debt and interest, and whose bonds, exempt from taxation, are still worth 20 per cent more than their face value in gold.

Gold becomes a very cheap commodity when it is compared, in the estimation of the wealthy classes, with bonds guaranteed by the tax-paying capacity of the people of this great Republic that are free from all taxation, local or Federal, direct or indirect.

Such a form of wealth, so thoroughly guaranteed, is the ideal embodiment of the power that intellect, ambition, and the sword have always hitherto concentered in the ruling elements of all the enlightened nations of Europe, and that we are now fastening upon our country. Here is a movement that demands the consideration of every lover of republican institutions. For the increase of its power, it has the assistance of that most efficient instrument of the new order of feudal authority, the power of corporations, which takes the place of entails. The vassalage is the same. Public securities, in the form of interest-bearing bonds, are the foundations of this money power, while banks, like those of France, Germany, England, and the Treasury of the United States, furnish the perfectly safe means of controlling all the profitable industries of mankind, and the debtor Governments furnish, in addition to the profits thus realized, a fixed income of interest provided by the taxation of the people. It is no wonder, then, that the wealthy classes regard a national debt a national blessing, and that they and their political supporters are always eagerly seeking to issue more bonds. Nor should we be surprised that the taxpayers should set their faces like steel against any increase of the national debt in time of peace and without some demand of imperious necessity.

The political parties in this country are now aligned on the one side and the other of this vital policy of issuing bonds to borrow money on a mortgage of the labors of posterity, to pay debts, and

to force these debts into premature demands for their liquidation when they need current money. These demands, if they must be paid as they are presented, and as taxation of the people is the only means of paying them, should be taxed upon the present generation. They should not be buried in mortgages to eat up the substance of our children.

The American people have a just dread of mortgaging the power of taxation by the Government, to come upon their children with threefold weight and to increase the power hereafter, in the distant future, of the wealthy classes, who eagerly absorb Government bonds.

Our people are alert and jealous of the aggregation of power in the control of favored classes. They are not ignorant of the evils of the old feudal system in Europe, nor of the fact that ours was the first Government to expel it and to make its reestablishment impossible in connection with land tenures, church establishments, the laws of primogeniture, and titles of rank and nobility. In our Constitution this form of feudal dominion was abolished and virtually destroyed.

We also have political doctrines that tend strongly to support this constitutional programme, such as the equality of all men before the law, and of equal rights to all, with exclusive privileges to none, in view of which we have felt very secure against the establishment of a feudal system in this country in connection with landed estates.

Following our lead, the sword of Napoleon greatly crippled the old feudal system on the Continent, and even in Great Britain, although the Irish people are still the feudatories of English lords. I need not bring to mind the horrors of the feudal system, or its abasement of men into very degraded servitude to the holders of power, in order to make it more odious to true American sentiment. But we must not suppose that the love of power and the self-assertion of the classes who instituted that system of human slavery has died in their bosoms, and that the same motives will not influence them to strive for the same results whenever opportunity is presented to them. The standing armies of Europe are not organized in such dreadful force to keep the peace between the poorer classes, or the middle classes, in the different countries of Europe, nor yet to keep the peace between crowned heads. The real purpose is to compel the obedience of the people to the supremacy of the wealthy and higher classes. When the old feudal tenures were so crippled that the yield of revenue from lands was much reduced, there sprung up in Europe a new feudal power based upon the war debts that Napoleon created, which assumed the control of finance and money, and that power has spread to the United States with all its train of evils, and is the power with which our people are contending to-day.

It is a power that acknowledges no distinctions save those of wealth, and is controlled, in perfect harmony of action and purpose, alike by Jews and Gentiles throughout Europe. We wonder how it is that the rich Jews, like Baron Rothschild and Lord Beaconsfield, are admitted to the nobility and the peerage in countries that despise and persecute their blood kindred. We wonder still more why the nations of Europe, and now this Republic, should find more wealth in the coffers of the Rothschilds than can be counted in the treasury of any Government, and why we should petition them, hat in hand, to take charge of the protection of our National Treasury against our own people.

The wonder ceases when we see that the feudal lords of Europe and America have transferred their holdings from the ownership of lands to national bonds and gold, and that every individual, in perfect harmony of action, moves in concert on the same lines to compel and secure the vassalage of the laborer and taxpayer the whole world over. It is this feudal power, this political combination of the wealthy classes, thus consolidated, that I am contesting with, having a people yet free and their Constitution yet in force to whom I can yet appeal for support.

The magnitude of this conflict will be better understood in the light of the fact that the national debts of the nations of the world, evidenced by various forms of obligation that are interest bearing, amount to $25,498,920,279. Ninety per cent of this vast sum is owned or controlled by the feudal barons of the empire of gold, whose throne is in London. The little sum of $700,000,000, to which we have reduced our enormous national debt, is a diminutive factor in the great sum of national bonds in which the feudal lords of this earth have laid up their wealth.

The Senator from Ohio long since chose his ground on the other side of the line and in favor of this feudal policy, but the people have refused to follow his lead, and they still insist upon being relieved from national debt.

The people of the United States were so outraged by the demonetization of silver that, in the Congress that counted Mr. Hayes into the Presidency, Stanley Matthews, a Republican from Ohio, offered the following resolution in the Senate, which passed both Houses:

Resolved, That all the bonds of the United States issued, or authorized to be issued, under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States, containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to the coinage of such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not a violation of the public faith nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor.

The yeas on the adoption of the foregoing resolution were: Democrats—Messrs. Armstrong, Bailey, Beck, Coke, Davis of West Virginia, Dennis, Enstis, GORDON, Grover, Hereford, Johnston, Jones of Florida, McCreery, McDonald, Maxey, Merrimon, MORGAN, Ransom, Saulsbury, Thurman, VOORHEES, Wallace, and Withers; total, 23.

The nays were: Democrats—Messrs. Barnum, Bayard, Eaton, Kernan, Lamar, McPherson, and Randolph; total, 7.

This resolution reached to the bottom of the subject. It reserved to the people of the United States the right to pay their bonds and other obligations according to the terms of their contract.

In 1868 the Senator from Ohio went even further than the Stanley Matthews resolution, and, in a letter to a friend, which the late Senator from Kentucky quoted from, in a speech in the Senate, the Senator from Ohio declared the duty of the bondholder to be that he should receive pay for his bonds in the sort of money he had paid for them. I will read from that letter:

DEAR SIR: I was pleased to receive your letter. My personal interests are the same as yours; but, like you, I do not intend to be influenced by them. My construction of the law is the result of careful examination, and I feel quite sure an impartial court would affirm it if the case could be tried before a court. I send you my views as fully stated in a speech. Your idea is that we propose to repudiate or violate a promise when we offer to redeem the "principal" in legal tenders.

I think the bondholder violates his promise when he refuses to take the same kind of money he paid for the bonds. If the case is to be tested by law I am right; if it is to be tested by Jay Cooke's advertisements I am wrong. I hate repudiation or anything like it; but we ought not to be deterred from doing what is right by fear of undeserved epithets.

If under the law as it stands the holders of the five-twenties can only be paid in gold, then we are repudiators if we propose to pay otherwise. If the bondholder can legally demand only the kind of money he paid, then he is a repudiator and extortioner to demand money more valuable than he gave.

Truly, yours,

JOHN SHERMAN.

The Stanley Matthews resolution distinctly affirmed our right, under the contracts with our creditors, to pay all of our obligations in silver legal-tender money.

On this point there has been such an exhibition of false pretense of public virtue and so much of dilettanti parade of our high intention to rob our own people rather than give to foreigners an excuse for elevating their noses at their honest poverty that it is all that man's respectability is now worth to admit that he voted for the Stanley Matthews resolution in company with Beck, Coke, McCreery, McDonald, Saulsbury, and Thurman.

I had the honor to cast such a vote, and I am still here to defend its correctness with the Senator from Ohio, who has turned his kaleidoscope to catch the sun of British glory and to please the smiling audience of European oppressors.

The Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] has also joined the hosts who repudiate the coin obligations of our country by his repudiation of those who contend that they are still payable, as they were originally, in gold or silver coin, at the option of the United States.

I am quite willing to be repudiated by these repudiators of the stipulations in all our obligations, whether bonds or currency, in favor of our own country, who would alter the obligation while it is in the hands of a bona fide owner because we suppose that it may benefit our creditors. We have no such right, and this fact is entirely overlooked, it seems, by the Senator from New York.

The Senator from Ohio was deeply engaged in his game of solitaire when he was rudely jostled by the Stanley Matthews resolution, coming from another great Republican Senator from Ohio. In the same session of Congress it resulted in a bill which passed the House for the full and free coinage of silver. That bill was amended in the Senate and resulted in its being carried before a committee of conference, which reported the Bland-Allison law. That act passed both Houses, and was vetoed by President Hayes, and was then passed over his veto.

The Senator from Ohio, who was then Secretary of the Treasury, came to the bold and defiant resolution to defeat the will of the people, as expressed by more than two-thirds of each House of Congress, and to demonetize silver a second time by the use of gold only in the payment of our paper obligations. To do this effectually, he set aside $100,000,000 of gold in the Treasury as a fund for the redemption of our bonds and currency obligations.

If it is conceded, by a very loose construction of the resumption act, that the Secretary of the Treasury had authority to sequester $100,000,000 in the Treasury as a fund to anticipate the demand that might be made for the redemption of the outstanding Treasury notes, it can not be argued, with the least respect for the then recent action of Congress, that he could assume that the word "coin" used in the resumption law meant that gold coin, and only gold coin, should be used in redemption of the greenback circulation. I am just informed by the Senator from Arkansas

[Mr. JONES] that the Secretary of the Treasury has this morning reported that there is no law to require the sequestration of $100,000,000 of gold in the Treasury.

The resumption act took effect on the 1st day of January, 1879. It was enacted on January 14, 1875. It related alone to the redemption of legal-tender notes outstanding on the 1st of January, 1879. It had no reference to our bonded debt. The Stanley Matthews resolution had sole reference to the resumption of specie payments, then about to take place. It was adopted early in 1878. It was followed by the Bland-Allison Act, passed over the President's veto, on the 28th of February, 1878. This act made silver dollars a legal tender for all debts, public and private. The order of the Secretary of the Treasury that the outstanding legal-tender notes (the greenbacks) should be redeemed only in gold coin was a threefold repudiation. It repudiated the coin contract by converting it into a gold contract. It repudiated the law that made these legal-tender notes redeemable in silver legal-tender coin, and it repudiated the action of Congress in declaring that our coin obligations were payable alike in silver or gold coin.

The repudiation would have been none the less distinct if the Secretary of the Treasury had openly declared that he refused to obey the mandate of the statute. To repudiate silver as a legal-tender coin to be used in the redemption of these Treasury notes is no less a violation of the law than would have been the repudiation of gold. Not only so, but it was a defiant and cruel blow at the expressed will of the people, who were then suffering the pangs of a heavy contraction of the currency, which depressed all values to zero and filled the country with tramps who had lost business, employment, and homes—starving wanderers seeking alms in a country filled with abundance.

This repudiation of silver money was unnecessary. There was no public demand for it, and no good could possibly come from it. It was approved only by those who owned or controlled the gold resources of the country and by the national banks, because it increased the purchasing power of that metal by depreciating the prices of all the products of free industry. They saw in the legal-tender silver dollar a noninterest-bearing rival in the market for their usury-bearing paper money, and they declared war against the silver dollar. They refused to receive it on general deposit, and thus backed up the repudiation inaugurated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Secretary of the Treasury became alarmed—at least I hope he was—at the issue of bonds to buy the large pile of $100,000,000 in gold he had determined to put on exhibition in the Treasury to advertise our national solvency, and he began to buy gold from the people with Bland-Allison silver certificates. Here is what Mr. Beck had to say about that novel and interesting policy of the Secretary of the Treasury:

I may observe here that silver certificates are now and have always been a popular currency.

The Treasurer in his last report, page 24, says:

"The issue of silver certificates by Treasury officers in the South and West for gold coin deposited with the assistant treasurer at New York, under departmental circular of September 18, 1880, was discontinued in January last. The amount which had been issued in that manner to the date named was $80,730,500."

The Treasury order referred to reads thus:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
"*Washington, D. C., September 18, 1880.*

"Until further notice the United States assistant treasurer in New York will pay out at his counter standard silver dollars or silver certificates in sums of $10, or any multiples thereof, in exchange for like amounts of gold coin or gold bullion deposited with him.

"Upon the receipt by the Treasurer of the United States in this city of an original certificate of deposit issued by the United States assistant treasurer at New York, stating that there has been deposited with him gold coin or gold bullion in the sum of $10, or any multiple thereof, payment of a like amount in standard silver dollars or silver certificates at the counter of any United States assistant treasurer designated by the depositor will be ordered.
"JOHN SHERMAN, *Secretary.*"

The Treasurer of the United States in his report to Congress dated November 1, 1880, says:

"The demand for silver certificates under the circular of the Department dated September 18, 1880, authorizing their exchange for gold coin and bullion, has been quite extensive at New Orleans, St. Louis, Chicago, and Cincinnati, and there were paid out at these points during the month of October $3,485,000 in silver certificates for an equal amount of gold coin deposited in the subtreasury in New York."

And in December, 1881, the Secretary of the Treasury in his report says:

"The Department has issued silver certificates at the several subtreasury offices, upon a deposit of gold coin in like amount with the assistant treasurer at New York, and through this means certificates have been issued for nearly all the silver held by the Treasury. These certificates amount to about $66,000,000 and are now outstanding."

That condition of things doubtless rendered the following order necessary, as all or nearly all the silver coin in the Treasury was represented by outstanding silver certificates:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
"*Washington, D. C., November 1, 1881.*

"Until further notice the exchange of silver certificates for gold coin deposited at the office of the United States assistant treasurer at New York will be suspended, and Department Circular No. 75, of September 18, 1880, is hereby modified accordingly.

"H. F. FRENCH, *Acting Secretary.*"

Subsequently this restriction was removed for a time, and over $80,000,000 of silver certificates were taken, principally by the people of the South and West, in exchange for gold coin. The privilege was finally withdrawn in January, 1885. I ask in view of these facts how it can properly be charged that the people will not use the silver coinage, that they are hoarding gold, that the depreciated paper will soon greatly impair the purchasing power of the poor man's wages, and that we are on the verge of a financial crisis unless we bring all our transactions at once to a gold basis?

It must not be forgotten that all the gold coin deposited for silver certificates became at once the property of the United States; it was not held in the Treasury for their redemption. An equal amount of silver coin took its place for that purpose at once. Men who owned gold all over the South and West, in Louisville, Indianapolis, Nashville, and other places, as well as those cities named in the report, sent their coin at their own expense to the assistant treasurer in New York in order to have silver certificates delivered to them for use as currency at home. Yet during all that time the bullion value of gold in London was at least 15 per cent more than silver, and the country was being periodically alarmed, and Congress advised by our officials that gold was leaving the country, that silver was a degraded standard of value, and that its coinage must be stopped or its weight increased or ruin would speedily be upon us because of its depreciation in the London market.

The facts I have stated overthrow all the speculations of the theorists. Our business men gladly exchanged their gold coin for silver certificates and did not ask any better security for the paper they took than the silver dollar deposited in the Treasury. So far from hoarding gold because of its greater bullion value in a foreign market, they sent it to a distant depository to get the paper we are advised is dishonest money because it is depreciated 15 or 20 per cent below gold in London. I have thus imperfectly outlined the reasons why I can not sustain at this time a policy which seeks to withdraw either our legal-tender notes, the silver certificates, or stop the silver coinage, and I see no propriety in increasing the weight of our silver coin beyond the standard value fixed by law in July, 1870, under and by which all our outstanding bonded indebtedness is regulated. I am convinced that we can no longer look with safety to the national banks to furnish the country with a stable currency.

Now, was there ever a more flagrant case of repudiation without excuse or necessity than when the Secretary of the Treasury refused to pay silver coin in redemption of our legal-tender notes, and bought gold coin with the same money from our people and paid it out to redeem our obligations? All had been done that could be done to drive silver out of circulation and to depreciate its bullion value. It was refused coinage at the mints and legal-tender power by the Senator from Ohio in his act of 1873, and that of itself, without the connivance of Great Britain or any foreign power, was quite sufficient to drive it down to one-half of its commercial value. And yet with the people it was as good as gold, and is as good to-day.

In 1873 Great Britain seemed, so far as the United States were concerned, to have realized its policy of 1816, of compelling the nations that had important commercial relations with that country to come to their standard of money, which had then been fixed in gold. For more than fifty years it had waited to find a body of capitalists in the United States whose interest would be sufficient to induce our Government to adopt this policy of Great Britain. The gold discoveries of 1849 and the war of 1860–1864 concentrated money, bonds, and stocks in the hands of a few, and in the control of the national banks, railroads, and other corporations to a degree that promised British success.

Her plea that gold was the money of the world, and her more specious plea that gold is the money of the rich and silver is the money of the poor, gave a very attractive glow to that theory of the academies that the world can not be harmonious until it has gold alone as the universal basis of the redemption of all contract obligations.

The then Secretary of the Treasury, now the Senator from Ohio, seems to have been under the spell of this hallucination, and he has never recovered from it; yet his activity, which was rewarded with success, in the introduction of this British policy into our financial system in 1873 was not the final doom of silver money in its results.

The people of the United States, as soon as they learned the fact from General Grant, who was belated in this sudden foray, that silver money had been destroyed, rallied to the ballot box and demanded its restoration. Great Britain had been trying, unaided, to hammer down the price of silver bullion for nearly sixty years without success. On the contrary, our silver dollars were worth 3 per cent over gold at the time of their demonetization.

The value of silver bullion began to run down rapidly after 1873; but when the people got to understand the situation, they sent a Congress here in 1877 that, in obedience to their will, did all that then seemed possible to reverse this policy of Great Britain, laid like "a rook's egg in the eagle's nest." With our assistance to help the decline, and the refusal of our Presidents to obey the will of the people, often expressed, Great Britain at last succeeded in forcing down the price of silver by taking from it the rights of coinage in the European States and in India. It could have as easily depressed the price of gold by the same means; but Great Britain controls nearly all the gold-producing regions of the earth, and produces little silver in her vast realm. It follows that the demonetization of silver increases at least twofold the value of her gold products, and she demands that her policy shall prevail. In like manner it increases the value of our securities held in the centers of wealth in the United States, and so the British policy becomes their policy as well.

The segregation of the reserve fund of $100,000,000 in gold in our Treasury has made it an easy matter for the dealers in bullion and exchange to corner the market for gold and to force the Treasury to buy it in order to keep the reserve at its maximum.

We see that within the last few days another tremendous scramble has occurred in the efforts of the people of this country and foreign countries to become possessed of our bonded obligations, and that in that effort this reserve fund is sustaining a very fierce assault, and is being depleted with great rapidity. This reserve fund has been kept up as a standing advertisement to the world that whatever Congress might do or declare, there should be no resumption of specie payments in coin, but resumption should be had only in gold.

With startled apprehension the people have inquired when it was and how it could be that the silver feature of their coin obligations could thus be repudiated with impunity by the ukase of the executive department. The answer has been and is that the Executive holds the veto power and would not and will not permit the power of the people, expressed in Congress, to be used for their relief.

This $100,000,000 dead money has been held in the Treasury since 1878—eighteen years. It has cost the people, in interest, more than an equal amount in that time, and there has been added to it $162,000,000 of principal, with another $100,000,000 now about to be added. Five hundred million dollars would scarcely cover the loss to the Treasury from the mere handling of this repudiation fund, while one-fourth of its capital sum is lost and not one dollar has been redeemed of our legal-tender obligations.

The law that required the legal-tender notes to be reissued and kept in circulation after they had been redeemed was in its effect a suspension of the resumption act of 1875 as to such notes. Notwithstanding this clear indication of the popular will that these notes should not be redeemed in coin, the one-hundred-million dollar fund for their redemption has been kept at the maximum, still, by the orders of the Secretary of the Treasury. These evils would seem to fill the measure of woes which this act of repudiation was capable of engendering; but far from it; the attendant evils are still more severe upon the people and their posterity. Who can compute the losses in the value of crops and productions that have occurred during the eighteen years we have kept all this gold reserve out of circulation among the people and the bankruptcies that have followed the constant depression of prices?

What man of business would be trusted who for eighteen years would keep one-sixth or one-fourth of his active capital in a show window as a proof of his solvency, while the people all knew that it was borrowed money, on which he was paying interest? That is our folly repeated in sight of a scoffing world, and we call it statesmanship.

The credit of a great Republic of forty-five sovereign States, each abounding in wealth, with a debt-paying record that no other country ever enjoyed, must have its solvency tested by a barometer set up in the Treasury, which records the weather and indicates whether the European Jews, or the London bankers, or the syndicate, or the speculators, or the American banks have the control of the finances of the Government of the United States. From time to time our Secretaries of the Treasury fly to cover, like frightened partridges, from tuft to tuft, wherever shelter seems to be in sight, rather than insist upon the terms of our coin contracts.

They fear their enemies much less than they do their friends, and yet when they find themselves enveloped in difficulties from which there seems to be no other chance of extricating them they still appeal to a confiding and an outraged constituency for authority to tax them to buy more gold by the issue of more bonds in order to keep the "endless chain" continually at work.

The Senator from Ohio, when he found, in 1890, that the people still insisted upon their rights and would not be quieted into submission, again got a free-silver bill into conference, and again his inventive powers were taxed to find a way to nullify the silver features of our coin contracts. Again he succeeded—by a new programme that eclipsed all his previous machinations. He ascertained to his own satisfaction that it was within the power of Congress to give to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority, by manipulation, to preserve the parity between the metals of gold and silver. It is not the parity of the legal-tender coins of gold and silver that is to be preserved by the policy declared in the act of 1890. That parity is preserved by the legal-tender laws, and no human effort, aside from the change of those laws, can disturb it.

The Senator from Ohio did not impose this duty, from which the Creator shrank, upon the Secretary of the Treasury by the mandate of the statute. He merely declared that it was the fixed policy of the Government that he should preserve the parity, and left the Secretary to his own devices as to how he should best perform this divine act. He wisely concluded that it could not be done so long as there was any gold and silver money, and he cut the gordian knot by destroying silver as far as he could, and by refusing to it any sort of recognition. To preserve the parity between gold and silver as metals is not an easy task when either metal is excluded from coinage, and the one stands at the maximum and the other at zero.

As there is no comparison in the condition of silver that is refused coinage at the mints with gold that has full and free coinage, the question of the parity between them is simply an absurdity when one is destroyed and the other is coined. This question has thus been decided against silver by the Secretary, and the further consideration of the question of parity is a matter of no importance. How it ever became possible for a Senator to conceive of such omnipotence in a Secretary of the Treasury has given much serious food for reflection among the people of the United States.

This vague hint at the power to preserve the parity between the metals in the act of 1890 was enough to give a pretext to an anxious mind in the direction of paying all our debts in gold coin. It was a prudent and also a plausible pretext for attributing to Congress the repudiation of the silver feature of our coin obligations when its repudiation was a simple negative act that declared a policy. This feature of the act of 1890 was denounced by the Chicago convention as a cowardly makeshift, and the repeal of the entire act was demanded as the quickest and cleanest way of disencumbering the statute book of an evil presence. But when the speculators in gold and investors in bonds considered the prospect of having the gold reserve disturbed and replaced by a better system, they insisted on repealing the silver section of the bill and retaining the parity clause. It is too late now to discuss this in a party sense. I allude to it only to show that no pretext is too slight to enable those who are bent on making money according to the statute, and at the expense of the people's best interests, to justify any attitude they may find it necessary to take.

The Secretary of the Treasury could as easily preserve a common, perfect, and continuous tide level between the waters of the Pacific and the Atlantic as he could preserve the actual parity, commercial or financial, between the metals of gold and silver. As to the coins, the laws create and regulate the parity.

Until the world can do without silver as money in every form it will not answer the common sense of mankind to say that a dollar is sound money in the form of two half dollars, but is unsound money when it is coined in one piece and has 7 grains of pure silver in it more than there is in two half dollars. The Secretary of the Treasury could much more easily answer his own arguments in favor of silver as sound money than he could balance himself on the slack rope of parity and preserve the equilibrium between two silver half dollars and one silver dollar, with the difference between them of 7 grains of pure silver in favor of the dollar. The law, however, finds no difficulty in this.

It is the placing the Secretary of the Treasury above the law and giving him the power to condemn either gold or silver money as the money of redemption that impresses upon this feature of the statute the hideous reproach of epitomizing the odious doctrine of the one-man power. It is still worse to derive this terrible usurpation from a doctrine or purpose stated in the statute which refuses to confer it in direct terms.

The true Democracy of the United States finds a painful reason for criticising the present Administration, because it has sought to preserve and utilize this worst doctrine of the Republican party in order to give to the Secretary of the Treasury a pretext for repudiating the right of the people of the United States to the benefits of their coin contracts.

The Senator from Ohio also aimed a deadly blow at the liberties of the people guaranteed expressly in the Constitution when he provided in the act of 1890 that money declared by law to be a legal-tender can be deprived of that quality by agreement between debtor and creditor.

No Government in Christendom has failed to give to the borrowing classes and the debtor classes the rights that stand for their protection in interest laws, usury laws, and legal-tender laws.

Such a Government would be a nursery of human slavery. Our rights as to legal-tender money are planted in the organic law and are no less sacred than habeas corpus and trial by jury. If these can be set aside by agreement, so as to compel a court of justice to render a judgment in gold dollars, or in British sovereigns, or Russian rubles, or Indian rupees, or in anything but dollars, lawful money of the United States, there can be no limit to the duress and hardship that a creditor can impose upon his debtor. A marshal of the United States can no more sell the property of a defendant for gold coin, under a writ of execution on a judgment for dollars, than he can hang him for the nonpayment of the debt. When the law has given judgment, through a court, upon any money demand, the antecedent contract is merged in the judgment and that judgment can only be expressed in dollars, which means the lawful money of the United States, whatever description of money may have been embodied in the original agreement.

In the act of 1890, and in the repealing act of 1893, this feature is retained, whereby the people are informed that the legal-tender privileges and liberties of the debtor, granted to him by the Constitution, may be sold to the creditor. That although the laws may make greenbacks or silver dollars a legal tender for debt, finding such to be a public policy of the highest importance to the country, yet the people can, by contract among themselves, destroy the legal-tender money of the country, reverse the public policy, and barter their liberties to those who are the masters of their necessities. Such a doctrine is not known to any civilized country.

But the "cowardly makeshift" of 1890 and the craven makeshift of 1893 both contain this principle or provision, and hundreds of millions of contracts have been made with reference to it, as if it was sound constitutional law.

Congress, under the limitations of the Constitution, is the agent of the people and the States. Its trusts are sacred and limited. None of them are purely discretionary. When a contract is made on behalf of the people and is concluded by the delivery and acceptance of the obligation, it is as much beyond the power of Congress to change it, to the detriment of the people, as it is to revoke or change a grant of lands, once it has been perfected, or a pardon after it has been signed. Our bond contracts read as follows:

This bond is issued in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt, approved July 14, 1870, amended by an act approved January 20, 1871," and is redeemable at the pleasure of the United States after the 1st day of May, A. D. 1881, in coin of the standard value of the United States on said July 14, 1870, with interest in such coin from the day of the date hereof, at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, payable quarterly on the 1st day of February, May, August, and November in each year. The principal and interest are exempt from the payment of all taxes and duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority.

Extract from face of United States 4 per cent bond:

This bond is issued in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, amended by an act approved January 20, 1871, and is redeemable at the pleasure of the United States after the 1st day of July, A. D. 1907, in coin of the standard value of the United States on said July 14, 1870, with interest in such coin from the day of the date hereof at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, payable quarterly on the 1st day of October, January, April, and July in each year. The principal and interest are exempt from the payment of all taxes or duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority.

This contract is certainly irrevocable until Congress, with the consent of the holder, has changed it. For a Secretary of the Treasury to interpolate the word "gold" before coin, so as to make it read "gold coin," would be a void and criminal act. It is only less than this where the Secretary repudiates the term of the contract which empowers the Government to pay in legal-tender silver coin of the standard value of the United States on the 14th of July, 1870. In these bonds we go behind the act of 1873, which demonetized silver, and agree to pay in silver coin of the standard value of 1837, if that shall be our preference. But for this act of repudiation, all would have been well with us. The present Administration, feeling and acknowledging the just reproach of having followed a bad example of its Republican predecessors, comes to Congress with threats as well as implorations, and asks us to change the coin obligations in our bonds and convert them into gold obligations. We have not the power to do that. If we had, it would be a cruelty to our posterity that only cowardly peoples ever impose upon their offspring.

The one hundred million bonds now on the market have thirty years to run. That is the life of a generation. There are not ten men here who will live to see the maturity of these bonds. At 4 per cent, they will, without compounding the interest, grow to $220,000,000. Should we double the difficulty of payment to our posterity in order to quiet the regrets of the present Democratic Administration for having followed the bad example of Republican Administrations in the repudiation of our coin contracts?

For whose advantage is it that we have kept up this vain and idle show of one hundred million in the Treasury for eighteen years? It has not been for the benefit of foreign holders of our bonds. Their interest has been paid to them from another fund. This fund, called the "gold reserve," is only for the redemption of our legal-tender notes, none of which are held abroad or could be there redeemed. All this agony over the gold reserve has been suffered in order to promote the sort of paternalism that a nursing mother gives to her baby, in favor of the bond-holding and bullion-speculating classes in the United States. It has been mothers' milk for the innocents who deal in stocks and bonds, in futures, puts and calls, monopolies and corners, and for foreign investors in our corporations, who earn profits, interest, and dividends under the shelter and privileges of our laws and out of the necessities of our people, and then tax them to borrow gold that their income may be shipped to Europe and converted there into their domestic money.

The Senator from Ohio says that the balances of trade are against us and must be paid in gold. If that is so, it is not because we produce or export less in recent years than we did formerly. It is because the gold policy in Europe, which is but the policy of the feudal age repeated in different form, has deprived those people of the ability to consume our surplus productions except at pauper rates. But, whatever is the cause, is it the business of this Government to furnish gold to pay balances of trade? When did that sort of paternalism become a part of the creed or practice of the Democratic party? When England and France find that gold is leaving them to pay foreign balances of trade, they raise the rate of interest and stop the outflow. We tax the people to raise gold to facilitate the outflow and refuse to pay our debts in silver according to the contract, because the foreign creditors of our merchants demand gold of them.

No man knows what is the approximate amount of the stocks and bonds of our corporations that are held abroad. We know that it includes every variety of stocks and bonds created in this country, and their name is legion.

We know that bonds of our corporations are seldom sent abroad for hypothecation unless they are accompanied with equal amounts of the stocks to be held as collateral. These stocks are voted in the corporate proceedings and draw dividends if any are declared.

The foreign money that comes here under such conditions comes as an investment, and if the investors came with it they would consent to collect their dividends in the money earned by their companies. Then we would have no trouble in paying them. But they do not come here and use our greenbacks, Sherman notes, and silver certificates as the resident stockholders use them, and we are required to repudiate our coin contracts to raise gold to keep them in a good humor and to maintain our respectability in their eyes and in the eyes of the snobs at home who worship them and barter their wealth for titles for their daughters which the Constitution forbids their fathers to receive.

It is these feudal princes, at home and abroad, now united in the control of the empire of gold monopoly and owing their highest allegiance to the shylocks of Europe, that object to any plan for breaking the endless chain that has become such a terror to this Administration.

If the wheel that carries this chain continues to revolve, the Treasury crank by which it is kept in motion will grind out an increase of our bonded obligations that will amount to $1,000,000,000 in the next three years, at the rate at which it has progressed in the last two years. This, added to the remaining war debt, including the greenbacks, aggregating more than $1,000,000,000, will throw the country back to a worse condition than we were in at the close of the civil war. Does this dreadful prospect, this certain fate, alarm the bondholding princes of the houses of Rothschild and Belmont? They rejoice, indeed, in the return of the old regime, the new phase of the feudal power and the vassalage of the people!

The threats of the President that the wheel that carries the endless chain shall continue to revolve and the renewed diligence of the Secretary of the Treasury in grinding out bonds bring dismay to the people, who are ready to cry out, "Tax us, tax us to buy gold to destroy the paper money on which our industries depend. We will make bricks for you without straw; but do not turn our children over to the gold princes as feudatories, to become their vassals and slaves when their fathers have passed away."

The present condition of our country as to indebtedness, finance, and taxation is a state of prostration, almost of despair, in which the will of the people, the votes of their representatives in Congress, and the injunctions and mandates of the Constitution are all in turn silenced and nullified by the will of a single man. What one man has done to shelter wealth from taxation by a judicial sentence will never be forgot while a record remains of the eloquent expressions of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

The President declares that our coin contracts are only and exclusively gold contracts, and vetoed a bill demanded by the people to coin the silver bullion in the Treasury because his approval of such a measure would be an admission that silver is a money metal.

He demands that Congress shall change all our coin bonds and other contracts into gold contracts by express statute so that when they mature our children shall have no excuse for demanding from the bondholding princes the right to pay them in silver. We have that right, and the President demands that we shall surrender it on pain of having the wheel to run with increasing velocity that drags the endless chain through the heart of the country. One word—an honest, sincere, and just word, the word of truth—uttered by the President would relieve the country of these terrors. That word would be, "The rights of the people, as they are expressed in their obligations, must and shall be preserved."

Such an utterance would be even as potent and would be welcomed with as much honest joy by the people and is as necessary to the salvation of the country as was the thrilling, trumpet-toned proclamation of Andrew Jackson when he declared, "The Federal Union; it must and shall be maintained."

But our Jacksons are mute, and the "triumphant democracy" go about the streets in weeds of mourning. The voice that might save us is hushed in adoration at the altar of the golden calf.

The happiness of our people and their love of the independence of our country and its honor, according to the standard raised in 1776, and confirmed in 1823, has been intensely realized and expressed in the truly American declarations of our Chief Magistrate within the present month.

That standard of honor and duty is not accepted in Great Britain; neither was the standard of 1776, which gave to the name of "rebel" a distinction, when it is connected with a struggle for the right, that I love to enjoy.

We do not measure American questions by British standards, either of honor, justice, or duty, and the people are humiliated when our national money standards, established in laws approved by Washington and Jackson, are hauled down by our modern Presidents because they are not approved in London, and are not permitted to be again established without the consent of Great Britain.

The Senator from Ohio built the wheel that moves the endless chain that carries the wealth of our industry and property into the coffers of the wealthy bondholders of the world, and is now ready to pour another $100,000,000 of the earnings of the people into that cold and deadly vortex.

The wheel and rack of the Spanish Inquisition was scarcely less deadly in its martyrdom of free religion than is this wheel and chain in the Treasury of the United States to the prosperity of free industry. If its movement is not arrested by some benevolent word—and only a word is needed—from the class that is now possessed of the exclusive privilege of controlling the money supply of this country, the people will crush out the political parties that are now pandering to these cruel exactions and will drive them from power.

The debt of Great Britain gives the common people no concern, because if it was ever paid some other device would be substituted for it that would impose upon them equal burdens in some other form. The feudal power, which the upper class cling to in whatever form it may exist, and is most lucrative and agreeable to them, will never be relinquished while that monarchy exists.

Only a Republic deriving its powers of government and the methods of its administration through the will of the people often expressed can prevent the crystallization of money and monopoly into some combination that will place the industrial classes under the dominion of accumulated capital.

The people of the free Republics dread a national debt as a foe to their prosperity and liberty, while the ruling classes in a monarchy consider a national debt as a bond of union and strength for the state, because they hold the debt as creditors, and gather their profits entirely from taxation of other people.

The anxiety to own our bonds that are free from taxation, on which the interest is collected in gold at 3 per cent, has grown into such a mania among the rich people of the United States that they run over each other to get the chance to buy them.

It is the only property in the United States that is really sought after as an investment, and the longer the bonds have to run the higher the premium ranges above their face value in gold.

The power lodged in these bonds to depress prices by increasing the purchasing power of the gold they represent at the enormous premium of 20 per cent and their freedom from all taxation make them the most complete embodiment of class despotism that human ingenuity has ever invented. When we extend their redemption to longer periods, or indefinitely, they will go still higher and the moneyed classes will, as they have often done, torpedo the people and the markets with panics until they consent to the issue of bonds to absorb all of their net earnings as they accumulate. This is the destiny to which we are drifting with blinded eyes and ears that refuse to listen.

In 1817, at the close of the Napoleonic wars, the national debt of Great Britain, English and Irish, was £840,850,491, or about $4,204,252,455. This debt, funded in bonds and exchequer bills, is to-day the foundation of the wealth of the ruling classes in Great Britain. They are payable at the pleasure of the Government, which means that they are never to be paid. We speak of Great Britain as the great creditor country without recalling the fact that she is more largely in debt than any other Government. We could easily have pursued the same course of indefinite extension of our national debt, and could have saved to this generation an enormous outlay of money and energy by casting the burden upon posterity. The advocates of this plan have not been numerous, but they are still very powerful and terribly dangerous to American liberty. They have hungered after increase of national debt as Abraham hungered for a posterity. The great masses of wealth recently piled up in new estates that have astonished mankind have grown in this country upon the fertile soil of the national debt.

But the patriotic people, who feel that they are entitled to a posterity as free and independent of personal vassalage as their fathers were, have demanded and will still demand with an emphasis that will yet be respected that the national debt shall be paid, and that the country shall be rid of this monstrous octopus. All patriotic Americans value the liberty of their children above the shackles of the wealthy classes, and they demand that a feudal aristocracy shall not hold bonds, reenforced by taxes, for which their labor and all they possess and all their children may possess is mortgaged, but they shall be compelled by self-interest to invest their wealth in productive industries that will give employment to human labor. Pay the bonds, and the wealth of the country will seek investment in property that is productive. So long as we issue bonds we lock up the wealth of the country and prevent investment in property. The issue of each $1,000,000,000 of bonds will decrease the productive capital of this country by $2,000,000,000.

The present premium on our bonds is boastingly referred to as an indication of the wealth of our country, when it is in fact a mark of the unproductive character of our property and industries as compared with the power of gold. If lands would produce a certain income of 3 per cent above all taxes, repairs, and improvements, the value of real estate in this country would be increased by a sum that is almost incalculable, and the material prosperity of the country would be more attractive to all classes of laboring men than the gold and diamond mines of South Africa.

As it is, all our property is shrinking in value from year to year, while our debts remain unpaid, with accumulating interest. In Alabama, which has rich and varied fields of industry in active operation, that are yielding the most useful productions, the shrinkage in the value of taxable property for two years past has exceeded $30,000,000 per annum. In other Southern States the per cent of shrinkage has been still greater, and it has gone on in arithmetical progression until beautiful towns have been abandoned, and in many places elegant houses for business and residences have been turned over to any person who has chosen to occupy them. All this and far worse than I have the time or ability to describe has been brought upon the people of the United States by centering the whole financial power of the Government and the people, first, to collect gold to ship to foreign investors in our corporations, to pay them their interest and dividends on stocks and bonds that are the creatures of our State laws, not the laws of the United States; and second, by the monstrous wrong of destroying one-half of the money of the people, with which they might have been able to bear these grievous burdens.

Nothing but the marvelous, yes, truly miraculous wealth of our natural resources, aided by the courage, virtue, skill, and industrious thrift of the best population on the earth, could have saved us from utter ruin under the oppressions of the ruling powers, whose greed for gold has stricken with death every human sympathy. In the cruel waste of the homely earnings of honest industry, which has virtually enslaved all labor to new and heartless masters, the old feudal spirit has found its permanent dominion in our midst. It has come to a sincere and patriotic people, and, appealing to them in the name of the honor of our country, has told them that they must waive their rights under their coin contracts to pay their debts in silver because the knightly lords of finance in Europe—the Rothschilds, the Seligmans, who used to sell cheap clothing in Alabama, and others of the great brotherhood of money changers—would think ill of us and call us names if we refused to pay the commercial balances of trade in gold which have been created, if at all, by the denial of proper food and clothing to their own miserable subjects.

They turn to us, who are defending our people against this wrong to the present generation, which, if we shall fail to arrest it, will harden into chains upon our children, and accuse the Almighty for having hidden silver in the mountains of Colorado and the Senators from that State for desiring to direct the labor of their people to its production. In the meanness of a sordid spirit they conceal the fact from the world that Colorado produces more gold also than any other State in America. With frantic declamations of woe these prophets of evil warn us against the awful chasm at the bottom of which we shall find all our financial system if it shall be hurled down to a silver basis. That is the basis on which the Senator from Ohio, when he was Mr. Hayes's Secretary of the Treasury, placed $80,000,000 of the Treasury gold reserve which he had established without authority of law, when he bought it from the people at par with Bland-Allison silver certificates. And yet no damage but only good came from that largest sale of silver for gold at par that was ever made in America.

Silver, at par with gold, not held in parity by some velvet-handed Secretary of the Treasury, but by the mighty grasp that placed both metals in their cradles of quartz rock in the beginning, has bought and paid for almost every acre of public land east of the Mississippi River. It has furnished the sinews of war in all our conflicts with foreign nations as the most reliable source of finan-

cial strength. These wars, that gave us all of our vast possessions except Alaska, were fought on the now degraded plane of the odious silver basis.

If I have a debt to pay, or an article to purchase, or a family to provide for, a physician to employ, or a loved one to bury, I find that our legal-tender laws do not compel me to climb the golden stairs into the elect presence of the syndics and crowned princes of finance to beg them, as our Secretary of State begs them, for a little gold to meet my necessities.

The silver basis, which we now have, is a good basis for all of our domestic needs, and if others need gold to assist their foreign operations there is no justice in making our own people pay all their debts in gold, at half prices for labor and crops, merely to allow the merchants, shipowners, railroads, and bankers to handle our production more to their satisfaction. For a people to become alarmed at falling to a silver basis when they are already upon it in all their vast commerce at home, is a species of nightmare that people should not be called upon to endure in their waking hours.

If Mr. Cleveland and the Senator from Ohio had told the people frankly in 1893 what was their real plan of finance, they would have said that it was their purpose to bring the country to the single legal-tender standard of gold coin and to use the powers of the Executive in leading them in the bonds of party allegiance to this fate, while they were being flattered to hope for and to expect better things. If they had then told us that their real purpose was to destroy all redeemable paper money issued by the Government, except national-bank notes, and to leave it to the pleasure or interests of those banks to enlarge or diminish their circulation to suit their own purposes, and also that it was their purpose to sell gold bonds to enable the gamblers in stocks, the banks, the merchants, and our corporations in the control of foreign stockholders to have exceptional prosperity, and, finally, to redeem the issues of the national banks in gold, they would have driven every sound Democrat in the United States into an attitude of open hostility to such a plan, even if it had cost them an additional censure of "party perfidy and dishonor."

When this bill has passed the Senate and has gone to a conference committee, if such should be its history, it may turn out that the people will be permitted to purchase the restoration of their full constitutional right to have the coinage of silver placed on the same legal footing with the coinage of gold at the mints. The price to be paid for this boon, that will rid us of an evil that "is worse than war, pestilence, and famine," will not be too great, whatever it may be, if it does not stain the honor of the people.

If such an arrangement should also divorce the Government, as a Government, from the banking business, that return to sound principles would be worthy, if need be, and if it must be, of great sacrifices.

The outstanding greenbacks represent the part of the war debt that has not been already paid or funded in our bonds, and it must be paid at some time. It has been kept in circulation to prevent a harsh contraction of the currency, and only for that purpose, and has been changed, so far as that could be done by Executive action, from a coin obligation to a gold obligation.

I for one would be willing to fund those obligations in gold bonds if silver certificates are issued dollar for dollar to take their place in the volume of currency as they are retired, and if the silver to secure their redemption is supplied from the coin and bullion in the Treasury, and from the free coinage of silver under the principles of the act of 1837, approved by President Jackson.

I have observed with pleasure that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who reported this bill, has heretofore, in the Fifty-third Congress, offered a bill much to the effect of the suggestion I am now presenting. His bill provided for the issue of coin bonds to redeem the greenbacks, in connection with the free coinage of silver and the issue of silver certificates in lieu of the greenbacks so redeemed. That is the just view to take of the matter, and it would remove every difficulty that is now in the way except the pride of opinion that a long and painful controversy has raised to the distinction of a national question, or folly, as we choose to think about it. No American shall drive me from his side by slight considerations when we are trying to unite our efforts in the honest service of our country.

If we must make mutual sacrifices in order to render effective service to the people, we have the great example of our fathers to guide and assure us, when they made many compromises of their most inveterate convictions in order to lay down safe foundations for our Constitution, which is the ark of our safety and the covenant of peace which binds together the hearts of all true Americans.

If it is necessary, in order to bring our country back safely to the conditions that existed prior to the destruction of silver money in 1873, that the chasm shall be bridged with gold bonds, I will vote for them, but I will not vote now or at any time to throw our people into the gulf that a way shall be smoothed for a triumphal procession of Jews or Gentiles, native or foreign, over the wreck of their fortunes and their hopes.

As to the bonds to be issued for that purpose, without changing the tenor of any other obligations, I will vote for their payment in gold upon the condition that the other provisions I have mentioned are incorporated in the act.

The present bill, with slight alterations, furnishes a plan upon which, for the sake of peace and harmony, I would vote to ingraft such an amendment.

I do not believe such a provision of law would be wise, just, or necessary, but I would vote for it for the sake of the reconciliation of my countrymen, and in order to divorce the Government from the banking business, and above all because it would destroy all excuse for the further issue of bonds by causing the rupture of "the endless chain."

While that chain inflicts its exhausting and disastrous effects upon the country we can only sink deeper in debt with each succeeding day. The rate of this submergence is but little less than that which piled up the national debt while the civil war was at its worst.

The power to stop it is so simple and just that the people stand in mute silence and astonishment that the President does not adopt it. It is to apply the honest declaration of the Stanley Matthews resolution to the interpretation and payment of our coin obligations, to pay them according to the agreement.

Such a declaration of our purpose, even without the free coinage of silver, would at once cause every holder of our obligations to become as active, firm, and strong in lifting silver into legal and commercial parity with gold as they have been energetic, unjust, and malevolent in decrying this money of the Constitution and of the people. Then "the stone which the builders rejected" would be lifted on their willing shoulders and set in its high place as "the chief stone of the corner."

We have another power that our Supreme Court has affirmed in cases that have arisen on the reciprocity clauses of the McKinley tariff law, which, if it was exerted, would not only lift silver to par with gold here and in Europe, but it would speedily cause New York to take the place of London as the commercial clearing-house of the world. A discrimination in our tariff laws by which we would give a drawback or remission of, say, 10 per cent of the duties on imports in favor of all countries that admit silver to coinage at their mints on equal terms with gold, or that extend the privilege of free coinage to silver bullion the product of our mines, would draw the trade of all silver-using peoples to our ports, and they number nearly two-thirds of the population of the world.

But such a result would not be agreeable to the Rothschilds, the Seligmans, or the Belmonts, and that is quite enough to deter any modern Democrat or Republican from attempting so bold a scheme. An amendment to this effect on the tariff bill, whose low state is now giving such deep concern to the doctors and the hospital nurses of the Republican caucus, would bring it forth in such strength and beauty that the American people would embrace it with fond affection.

But, I must turn away from these flattering hopes. Congress, as it is now constituted, has not the power to assert the rights or wishes of the people against the veto power of the President, who has never intimated a truce, even, in his campaign for the British gold policy. It is our duty to omit no effort to record the voice of our people, whatever may be the opposition, or the cost of the sacrifice, and to turn again to them for support.

It may be that, in the Republican or Democratic parliaments of politicians that are to meet very soon, the voice of the people may be heard pleading at least for release from the thraldom of the endless chain invented and wrought by the Senator from Ohio, and one of these parliaments may give attention to their demands. Failing in this, the people will stretch their mighty limbs for a march to deliverance, before which European syndicates and their American agents will fly into outer darkness, where they belong.

Mr. BUTLER. I think it is too late to proceed further to-day with the discussion of the bill which is now before us, but with the permission of the Senate I should like to take the floor now with a view of addressing the Senate to-morrow.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from New Hampshire kindly allow me to ask unanimous consent to pass a little bill for my colleague, who is away, he having been called out of the city?

Mr. CHANDLER. I will yield if it leads to no debate.

Mr. HILL. I think it will not.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well; I yield.

AMERICAN REGISTER FOR STEAMER MIAMI.

Mr. HILL. Without displacing the pending bill or interfering with the right to the floor of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER], I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up

the bill (S. 628) to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami*.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator from New York whether the Committee on Commerce have approved the bill.

Mr. HILL. They have reported it unanimously.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CHANDLER. I renew my motion that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. HILL. I suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire whether it is not advisable to have an executive session. There is one postmaster that a member of the Senate has telegraphed here he would like to have confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is not in order, let me remind the Senator from New York, to make such allusions in open session. There are reasons why it is desirable that the Senate shall adjourn at this time. Unless the case is one which will not admit of delay, I decline to yield.

Mr. HILL. It is the case of a Democrat. He is very anxious, but I suppose not quite so anxious as our Republican friends, and therefore we shall have to yield to the caucus.

Mr. CHANDLER. We had thought at one time we should soon welcome the Senator from New York to that caucus; but the case is hopeless now.

Mr. HILL. I am inclined to agree with the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLANCHARD in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 14, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 13, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. H. M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

ARMENIAN SUFFERERS.

Mr. MORSE. I desire permission to have read at the Clerk's desk a resolution which I have drawn on the subject of the Armenian outrages. Mr. Speaker, the blood of the dead and wounded, the starving, and the dying Armenians cries out to heaven and appeals to our common humanity throughout the wide, wide world. I am overwhelmed with letters, petitions, and memorials upon this subject from my constituents. I am sure it is high time that this Government should make some expression on this tremendous subject, upon this appalling crime of the nineteenth century.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that a resolution prepared by himself shall be read to the House.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. And be published in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. COX. Then I object.

Mr. MORSE. I do not ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks simply to have it read.

Mr. COX. In that case I think there is no objection.

There being no objection, the resolution of Mr. MORSE was read.

Mr. MORSE. At the suggestion of a number of members on this side, I now ask that the resolution as just read be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LOUD. I object.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill (S. 650) to incorporate the Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Printing be, and are hereby, authorized to cause to be printed, indexed, and bound in cloth, in one volume, all of the acts, as they appear in the United States statutes heretofore passed by Congress, imposing duties on imports, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House.

HIGHWAYS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. This day being set apart by the rules for the consideration of District business, I desire to call up the bill (S. 30) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," approved March 2, 1893.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the act approved March 2, 1893, entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. That said court in special term may certify to the court of appeals of the District of Columbia for decision there, in the first instance, any question of law that shall arise during any proceedings in said court in special term under this act. Any party aggrieved by the final order or decree of said court in special term fixing the amount of damages, or the assessment for benefits as to any parcel of land, may take an appeal to said court of appeals, and shall be entitled to a bill of exceptions as in civil cases triable by jury, and said court of appeals may affirm, reverse, or modify the order or decree appealed from: *Provided*, That said court of appeals shall consider only questions of law arising on such appeal. From a final judgment of said court in special term under this act, distributing the damages among contending claimants, any party aggrieved may in like manner take an appeal to the court of appeals, which court in such cases shall consider both questions of law and fact. Any appeal under this act to the court of appeals shall be taken within twenty days after the making of the final order or decree appealed from, and not afterwards, and shall be subject to the laws and rules of court regulating appeals to said court of appeals. Cases arising under this act shall have precedence in said court over all other cases, except criminal cases, and the decision of said court of appeals upon any question arising under this act shall be final: *Provided*, That from any judgment or order of said court of appeals involving any question as to the constitutionality of this act or of any part thereof, any party aggrieved may, within thirty days after such judgment or order shall be entered, appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. Said court shall determine only the questions of constsitutionality involved in the case, and shall have power to make such special rules and regulations applying to appeals under this act as may be proper to bring such cases to a speedy hearing and determination."

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the Senate on the 12th day of December last. It is important that it receive prompt action in this House. In order that the measure may be fully explained I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HULICK], who made the report in this case.

Mr. HULICK. Mr. Speaker, it is very important that this bill amendatory of the act providing a permanent system of highways in the District of Columbia outside of the cities therein should be passed at once. It has already been passed by the Senate—on the 12th of December last. The object of this amendment is to declare expressly to what court appeals from proceedings under the original act of 1893 will lie. When that act was passed there was no court of appeals in the District of Columbia, and it was provided that the supreme court of the District, which holds general and special terms, should, at a special term therein provided, have jurisdiction of proceedings under the act. After a plat should be made of the outlying territory it was to be reported to the court in special term; that court would then call a jury to hear testimony and make report of its findings as to damages.

Pending that measure a bill was introduced in Congress creating within the District of Columbia a court of appeals. After the introduction of that bill and before its passage this act of March 2, 1893, was adopted, providing for an appeal from the supreme court of the District of Columbia sitting in special term to the same court sitting in general term. There is now a doubt in the minds of the court and members of the bar as to where appeals lie—whether to the District court in general term or to the court of appeals. The bill now before us for consideration expressly provides that such appeals shall lie to the court of appeals instead of the general term of the supreme court of the District of Columbia. Provision is also made for appeal from the appellate court of the District on constitutional questions to the Supreme Court of the United States. The original act provides that the judge sitting in special term may certify up any question of law or fact to the supreme court of the District of Columbia in general term. A doubt is raised whether such appeals should go to the District court in general term or to the court of appeals. This bill provides expressly that such questions shall go to the court of appeals. It is important that this amendment be adopted at once, because proceedings have been already begun before Mr. Justice Cox, sitting in special term, and a verdict was rendered a few days since upon which a judgment is not to be rendered until some action is taken by Congress upon this bill, so that parties litigant, or any other parties in interest, may know exactly to what court appeals will lie.

Mr. McMILLIN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HULICK. Certainly.

Mr. McMILLIN. This bill, I understand the gentleman to say, provides for appeals in certain contingencies to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. HULICK. Yes, sir; after the case has been passed upon by the court of appeals the question may be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. McMILLIN. Is it provided that as a prerequisite of the appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States the case shall have the ordinary jurisdictional characteristics as to the amount of money involved, etc.?

Mr. HULICK. No, sir. The original act of 1893 providing for a general system of highways outside of the city of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, places no limit to the amount involved.

Mr. McMILLIN. What I wish to get at is, if you do not require a jurisdictional qualification as to the amount involved, and required under the present law, will not the effect be to fill the Supreme Court of the United States with petty lawsuits growing out of these transactions?

Mr. HULICK. I can not say as to that; possibly it may have that tendency. The statute of 1893, to which this bill is an amendment, has no provision as to the amount involved, but any party in interest can appeal from the special term to the general term.

Mr. McMILLIN. That I do not object to; but what I wish to ascertain is, whether under this provision as now reported there is not danger of crowding the Supreme Court with cases involving these small amounts.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The law is not changed in that respect.

Mr. HULICK. I think there is no danger of that. The court is authorized to hear all cases, however small the amount may be, which are carried up, and any party may carry up his case on appeal, in which he has an interest, without reference to the amount involved.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HULICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I understand this refers to street-opening cases?

Mr. HULICK. Exclusively.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. That is, cases arising under the law of eminent domain?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Under the law passed March 3, 1893.

Mr. HULICK. A special act.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. But is not that act a law under eminent domain?

Mr. HULICK. No, sir; a special act providing for street extension in the District of Columbia outside of the city of Washington.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. That is, for laying out streets, etc.?

Mr. HULICK. Yes, sir; and for assessing damages.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. How many appeals are allowed now under the existing law?

Mr. HULICK. Under the law of 1893 one appeal lies from the special term, in which the case is originally heard, to the general term of the supreme court of the District of Columbia. There now it ends. If, however, a question of constitutionality is involved under this amendment, when the officer shall attempt to enforce the judgment of the court of appeals a party in interest can go to the Supreme Court of the United States by an appeal alleging that the act or some part thereof is unconstitutional. Therefore, this amendment makes clear the right of the party to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the constitutionality of the law.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Where does the case go originally, before a special term of the District court?

Mr. HULICK. Before a judge sitting in special term of the supreme court of the District. Where the case is certified to a special term of the court, it takes jurisdiction and empanels a jury of seven residents of the District, a majority of whom may report a verdict of damages or on other matters affecting the rights of the parties. An appeal is then made to the court——

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. To what court?

Mr. HULICK. To the court in general term, as the law now provides.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Then you have originally a trial by jury?

Mr. HULICK. Yes; by a jury of seven.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Then it goes to the court in general term?

Mr. HULICK. Yes, sir; under the act of 1893; and the object of this amendment is that the case shall not go on appeal to the supreme court of the District in general term, but to the court of appeals for the District.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. From the special term?

Mr. HULICK. Yes, sir; it will go from the special term to the appellate court.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Why should you do that?

Mr. HULICK. Because at the time of the passage of the act of 1893 there was no court of appeals in the District.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. But is there not a general term now?

Mr. HULICK. It does not go to the general term at all.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. But is there no general term?

Mr. HULICK. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Then why not appeal from the special term, affirming the finding of the jury, to the general term, instead of to another appellate court?

Mr. HULICK. For the reason that we have a court now provided expressly for appeal cases. In the case of an appeal from the court in special term to the court in general term the judge who heard the case in special term sits with the other two judges in general term and hears the case over again, a practice that does not commend itself, but now, as there is a court of appeals, it is doubtful whether that court would have jurisdiction or not under the act of 1893. But this amendment expressly provides that appeal shall go to the court of appeals. I know of no reason why it should not go there. It is an independent court.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. But why should there be an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. BABCOCK. That is only on constitutional questions.

Mr. McMILLIN. Does not that lie now?

Mr. HULICK. No, sir; it does not. A party in interest who is not satisfied with the verdict or judgment of the inferior court can not now go there and raise the constitutionality of the law, and that is now proposed to be done. It is a very grave question whether the original act of 1893 is constitutional.

Mr. McMILLIN. If the gentleman will permit me——

Mr. HULICK. Most certainly.

Mr. McMILLIN. I had an apprehension that if there was no restriction on the right of appeal in these damage cases to the Supreme Court of the United States that we might load up the docket of that court with an unnecessary amount of litigation involving small amounts; but I find upon examining a copy of the bill which has been handed me that the appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States is provided for only to test the constitutionality of the act.

Mr. HULICK. That is all. The gentleman has properly apprehended it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is any other question——

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I should like to have the gentleman explain one part to me. The first proviso on page 2 is:

That said court of appeals shall consider only questions of law arising on such appeal.

In line 17 the court is authorized to consider both questions of law and of fact. I wish the gentleman to explain the difference between those provisions, and when one is applicable and when the other.

Mr. HULICK. The court of appeals is a special court, provided by the act of February, 1893, probably a few weeks later than the act of 1893 that provides for a general system of highways outside of the city. The proviso to which the gentleman refers is:

Provided, That said court of appeals shall consider only questions of law arising on such appeal. From a final judgment of said court in special term under this act, distributing the damages among contending claimants, any party aggrieved may in like manner take an appeal to the court of appeals, which court in such cases shall consider both questions of law and fact.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Then, am I to understand that upon the general question there is no appeal as to questions of fact, but that when it comes to divide the proceeds between contending claimants there can be appeals in every direction?

Mr. HULICK. That is correct. In other words, the original act in regard to the assessment of damages is a matter to be determined in the special term of the supreme court of the District, and the parties in interest have no standing in that court, except under the order of the court to come in and determine the question of the amount of damages; but when they appeal to a higher court the question is to be determined between contending parties who may have a right to that distribution. If there is no contention between parties as to the ownership and the right that they have in the judgment that is entered in the special term, then they get an order for their money; but if there are two contending parties who claim the amount awarded by the court, that question can be taken on appeal to the court of appeals, and there the court can determine the right between parties which is not determined in the special term of the District court.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I should like to ask the gentleman one question. Why do you give no right of appeal on questions of fact, or the amount of damages?

Mr. HULICK. Well, the parties are all in court, before the court and jury in the special term.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Yes; but suppose the finding there is inadequate? Suppose the damages awarded are not sufficient, then is there to be no appeal? As I understand it, the judge at special term confirms the finding of the jury, and then the appeal lies only on questions of law. Is that right?

Mr. HULICK. No, sir; I think the act provides another appeal.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. There is another appeal.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. The general term, in proceedings under the law of eminent domain, can then set aside the amount of damage where it appears that the amount that has been

allowed to A is less than the amount allowed to his adjoining neighbor.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. They can do that.

Mr. HULICK. I refer you to page 2, line 5, of the bill:

Any party aggrieved by the final order or decree of said court in special term fixilng the amount of damages, or the assessments for benefits as to any parcel of land, may take an appeal to said court of appeals, and shall be entitled to a bill of exceptions as in civil cases, triable by jury.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. And provided that said court of appeals shall consider only the question of law arising on said appeal if the question of damage award is not a question of law.

Mr. HULICK (reading):

From a final judgment of said court in special term under this act, distributing the damages among contending claimants, any party aggrieved may in like manner take an appeal to the court of appeals, which court in such cases shall consider both questions of law and fact.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. That is where the question is as to the amount to be distributed between the landlord and the tenant, but not as to the amount of the claim on the whole.

Mr. HULICK. I think the gentleman has stated it correctly.

The SPEAKER. If the House would like to hear the discussion gentlemen will please cease conversation. It is impossible for the House to hear.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULICK. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Is not this the same bill that the Judiciary Committee of the last House had before it and reported favorably?

Mr. HULICK. I am not advised upon that point, but I think not. I think this bill was prepared by the counsel representing the District since the beginning of the condemnation proceedings now in progress before Mr. Justice Cox. There is a hearing going on before the special term of the court. A verdict or report of the jury has been rendered, and this bill seeks to remove all doubt on the question of appeal.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. This is simply a bill for the correction of the administration of appeals wherein the bill which fixed the process of litigation in this district was deficient?

Mr. HULICK. To repeat what I have already said——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Answer the question. Is not this simply a bill to correct an error that was made in the other bill?

Mr. HULICK. Not an error, but rather to remove a doubt existing under the act of 1893, which provides for appeal from the special term to the general term. This amendment expressly provides for appeal to the court of appeals.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I understand that.

Mr. HULICK. After the enactment of that act of 1893 there was a court of appeals provided for, and there is a doubt in the mind of the bar as to whether it is still governed by the act of 1893 or goes to the court of appeals. This act removes that doubt.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The court of appeals, which has been created since the law of 1893, does not provide the machinery for getting these cases into court?

Mr. HULICK. It did provide for appeals. There are two provisions authorizing an appeal under this act of 1893 from the special to the general term. This now expressly states that these cases under this act of 1893 shall be appealed to the court of appeals.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is practically the same bill that was before the Committee on the Judiciary in the last House. It was considered very fully by that committee, which heard different members of the bar of the District of Columbia upon the subject, and the committee reached the conclusion unanimously that this bill ought to pass. It was reported and put on the Calendar, but was never reached. It is practically the same proposition.

Mr. HEPBURN. I desire to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. HULICK. With pleasure.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman tell the House from what fund these judgments are to be paid?

Mr. HULICK. They are all to be paid from the funds of the District of Columbia. The United States in these cases does not pay a dollar.

Mr. HEPBURN. The United States does not pay anything?

Mr. HULICK. Not under the act of 1893, as I understand it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Now, will the gentleman tell us the estimated amount that under the act of 1893 will probably be paid for the extension of these streets?

Mr. HULICK. That would only be guesswork.

Mr. HEPBURN. It is believed to be in excess of $5,000,000.

Mr. HULICK. Much greater than that, I am advised.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then, ought not the whole act to be repealed rather than be tinkered with?

Mr. HULICK. That is a matter for the consideration of the gentleman and for the House. That question is not before the House at this time. There are proceedings of condemnation now pending, and the verdict is not yet opened. The court is waiting for action here.

Mr. HEPBURN. There is an expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars involved in one little section, is there not?

Mr. HULICK. Oh, yes; possibly more than that.

Mr. BRUMM. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. In the first place, how are the juries that assess these damages selected? Are they selected from a panel drawn annually as jurors are usually selected in civil cases in other courts?

Mr. HULICK. No, sir.

Mr. BRUMM. Then how are they selected?

Mr. HULICK. Section 10 of the original act provides that—

When any right of way is to be condemned under this act said court, in special term, shall cause a jury of seven jurors, disinterested men, not related to any person interested in the proceedings and not in the service or employment of the District of Columbia or of the United States, to be summoned by the marshal, and shall administer an oath or affirmation that they will, without favor or partiality to anyone, to the best of their judgment, determine such questions, etc.

Mr. BRUMM. That answers my question and shows that the jurors are to be summoned by the marshal.

Mr. HULICK. They are to be selected by the court and summoned by the marshal.

Mr. BRUMM. Yes; but the marshal selects them practically. Now, in the bill under consideration the proviso does not allow the court to have any jurisdiction over matters of fact, as, for instance, the amount of damages assessed, even though they may be assessed at ten times the proper amount. The jurors are selected by the marshal of the District, and the court has no jurisdiction to regulate the assessment, whether it is too high or too low; but afterwards, when there is a dispute between the parties who are to receive these damages, the court is permitted to have jurisdiction. Now, what sense is there in denying to the court jurisdiction when the damages are first assessed and then allowing the court jurisdiction when the men who are to receive the damages quarrel among themselves?

Mr. HULICK. The gentleman is discussing propositions that might properly arise if the question of the enactment of the original law or the question of its repeal were before the House.

Mr. BRUMM. Well, if the original bill is wrong, why not amend it by striking out this proviso and allow the court to have jurisdiction over the amount of damages as well as over questions of law? You allow the marshal to draw the jury, but an assessment made by those seven men can not be appealed from, no matter how excessive it may be, no matter how much it may have been "set up." Now, it has been said that in the District of Columbia there have been combinations formed in regard to these matters, and probably there has been more of such combining, and even more rascality, in the matter of assessments here than in any other place of which we have knowledge.

I think therefore that anything looking toward an investigation or inquiry into the amount of the damages assessed ought to be made as broad and liberal as possible.

Mr. HULICK. The enactment of this amendment will not interfere with action on the lines suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRUMM. No; but it ought to remedy these defects.

Mr. HULICK. Then you ought to prepare a bill expressly for that purpose.

Mr. BRUMM. No; that is not necessary. Let us strike out this proviso and let the court have jurisdiction both of the law and the facts. Your proviso is that the court of appeals shall consider only questions of law. Now, strike that out and let the court have jurisdiction over the facts as well as the law.

Mr. HULICK. Mr. Speaker, if any other gentleman desires to ask questions in regard to this bill I shall be glad to answer them if I can. The measure is an important one which concerns the interests not only of the city, but of the people generally, and it is to be followed by a very large expenditure of money; but in view of the present investigation it is important to have some action of the House on this question now, and the adoption of the amendment proposed will not interfere in any way with other action hereafter upon the suggestions made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HULICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I wish to ask the gentleman from Ohio whether he makes this proposition: That, without regard to the propriety of the original act of 1893 or its provisions, we ought to proceed this morning to amend the existing statute because some particular case is in the hands of Judge Cox?

Mr. HULICK. I only mentioned that fact as a reason having some weight why this bill should be considered at this time, and if there are no valid objections to this amendment, I think we ought to consider this measure without delay. Of course, if there

are other amendments that are important to be acted upon now, it is for the House to consider them.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the purpose of this bill is only to provide a system of appeals, to provide how they shall be taken and where they shall be taken.

Mr. HULICK. That is all.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It does not undertake to correct the act of 1893 in any other respect?

Mr. HULICK. No, sir; except that the act of 1893 does not provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. This bill provides, in addition to what is contained in the original act, for an appeal from the special term to the court of appeals and from the court of appeals on constitutional questions to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The bill does not treat of any other subject than that of appeals?

Mr. HULICK. None whatever.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. And the reason of asking the passage of this bill is that, under the act to which it is supplementary, it is doubtful to what court appeals should be taken, and this bill proposes to set that question at rest?

Mr. HULICK. That is it, precisely.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is all there is of it?

Mr. HULICK. I have already stated that that is all there is in it. The bill does not propose to modify or amend or enlarge any of the rights of the court or of the parties in interest in this investigation.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The bill does not undertake to correct or change the act of 1893 in any other respect?

Mr. HULICK. As I understand, it does not.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not see any objection whatever to the passage of the bill, and I call for a vote.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BABCOCK, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ASSESSMENT OF REAL ESTATE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. I call up the resolution (H. Res. 25) to extend the time for making assessments of real estate in the District of Columbia.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the time fixed for the return of assessment by section 7 of the act of August 14, 1894, providing for an assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia be, and the same is hereby, extended to the first Monday in April, 1896, as to the real estate in the present limits of the city of Washington, and that the time for returning the assessment of real estate in that portion of said District outside the present limits of the city of Washington be, and the same is hereby, extended to the first Monday in September, 1896.

SEC. 2. That the time fixed by section 9 of said act for the meeting of the board of equalization and review be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the 1st day of September, 1896, so far as it refers to that portion of the District of Columbia outside the present limits of the city of Washington, and the said equalization and review shall be finally completed on or before the first Monday in November, 1896.

Sec. 3. That section 4 of the act entitled "An act for the support of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1877, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to make the whole tax levied under the assessment of that portion of the District of Columbia outside the present limits of the city of Washington herein provided for, due and payable on the 1st day of May, 1897, instead of one-half on the 1st day of November, 1896, and one-half on the 1st day of May, 1897, as by existing law: *Provided*, That these amendments shall not extend beyond the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], who made the report in this case.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I believe this bill is on the Union Calendar, and if the point is made it will have to be considered in Committee of the Whole. I ask unanimous consent, however, that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DOCKERY. Does the bill appropriate any money?

Mr. BABCOCK. No, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It simply extends the time for assessing real estate in the District.

Mr. HEPBURN. I object.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will make a brief statement, after which perhaps the gentleman from Iowa will not press his point. As I have just stated, the bill simply extends the time for completing the assessment of real estate in this District. The committee find that the act passed during the last Congress providing for this assessment does not allow sufficient time for the completion of the work. Therefore they have asked this slight extension. The measure is recommended by the Commissioners and unanimously concurred in by the committee.

Mr. HEPBURN. I withdraw my objection.

There being no further objection, the House proceeded to consider the joint resolution in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RICHARDSON. This bill is a very simple one. During the last Congress an act was passed providing for a new assessment of all real estate in this District. The Commissioners have found it impossible to complete that assessment within the time limited by the existing law, and they ask a brief extension of time, so that the work may be completed.

Mr. DOCKERY. An extension from what time to what time?

Mr. RICHARDSON. From January 1, 1896, until the first Monday of April, 1896.

Mr. TERRY. Does this bill in any way affect the old question between the District of Columbia and the street-railroad companies with regard to assessments and payment of taxes?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Not at all.

Mr. HULL. Will not this bill postpone the collection of the taxes on property in the District of Columbia for a year?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, sir. The last section provides that the act of 1877 be amended—

So as to make the whole tax levied under the assessment of that portion of the District of Columbia outside the present limits of the city of Washington herein provided for due and payable on the 1st day of May, 1897, instead of one-half on the 1st day of November, 1896, and one-half on the 1st day of May, 1897, as by existing law.

Mr. HULL. But it postpones the time for the collection of taxes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It makes all taxes collectible as stated in that section.

Mr. HULL. Has the District government revenue enough to carry on its business in spite of this postponement?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, sir. The Commissioners are entirely satisfied with this bill.

Mr. HULL. Does not the presentation of such a bill as this emphasize the necessity of a general law for equalization of assessments, instead of having these applications brought here from time to time for a special assessment and equalization?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Possibly that idea may be emphasized by this bill, but it does not touch that question.

Mr. DOCKERY. This bill, as I understand, will not operate so as to require the Government of the United States to advance any money to the District of Columbia?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Not at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in drawing this bill as reported, under the direction of the committee, I was led into an error by reason of a clerical mistake in the letter sent to the chairman by the District Commissioners. That error consists in striking out in the seventh line of the bill the words "Monday in April, 1896," and inserting "day of May, 1897." The bill as read at the desk by the Clerk, in the form in which it was originally introduced, is entirely accurate. I therefore ask the passage of the bill in that form, and not with the amendment reported by the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOPKINS). Then the gentleman asks unanimous consent that the bill as read by the Clerk be substituted for the bill as reported from the committee?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That would possibly be the best way of disposing of the question.

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. HOPKINS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the first bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriation for payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I ask that the bill be read.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I desire to raise the point of order against one of the provisions of this bill—that is, the last provision, which changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. That can be done on the second reading of the bill when the section is reached for consideration.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations, which has reported this bill, has very little to offer in explanation of its provisions. The bill practically appropriates the amounts required by the estimates of the Commissioner of Pensions. There are only a few material alterations or changes in the appropriations from the amounts estimated by him. The amount estimated by the Commissioner to pay the fees of examining surgeons was $800,000, but it appearing from the report that only $750,000 have been expended during the last fiscal year, the committee thought it advisable to reduce the amount to $750,000 which is the amount carried by this bill for that purpose. The amounts, for instance, for stationery and for fuel were reduced to some extent, but not in any particular degree.

The first amount carried by the bill, $140,000,000, is the same amount that was appropriated for the last year. The Commissioner of Pensions estimates that the pension roll has now about reached its maximum limit, and that there will be no further increases in the amounts necessary to pay pensions hereafter, but on the contrary, he estimates that there will be a decrease from now on. There has not yet, however, been a sufficiently perceptible decrease to authorize and justify the reduction of the amount of the appropriation of last year, and so the committee agreed on the amount which is provided for this year, which is, as I have said, just the amount estimated by the Commissioner of Pensions.

The committee have reported two amendments to the bill, which will be found on page 2. These amendments apply only to the act of June 27, 1890, and do not refer to any other of the several laws applicable to the granting of pensions.

The first amendment provides that where any application has been rejected under the act of 1890, and then subsequently a new application is filed in the case and the case prosecuted to a final adjudication and the pension allowed, that the date of the payment of the pension shall begin with the filing of the first application, provided that the disability for which the applicant is pensioned existed at that time. Under the present law, where a soldier, a soldier's widow, or his minor child files an application for a pension, and that claim is rejected and the case closed, and again in two or three years another application is filed and the pension is allowed—under the present law the applicant begins to draw pension from the date of the filing of the second application. Now, this amendment provides that if the applicant is pensioned for the same cause set forth in the original application, and the cause existed at that time and was overlooked and the case disallowed through the fault, perhaps, of his own testimony, or of the pension agent, or the Commissioner of Pensions, or through some of the Departments, that he should not suffer by reason of that, and therefore the pension is dated back to the date of the first application.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a single question?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does it refer to any case of rejection except where the case is rejected on account of informality or some defect in the testimony? Suppose it is rejected on the merits of the case?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. This amendment, I will say to the gentleman from Maine, has no reference to any rejection except the rejection or dismissal of the case because of some defect or informality.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is what I supposed—that it applied only to that particular class of cases.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is all. It does not apply to a case where there has been a full hearing of the case and the case is finally rejected because it was not deemed meritorious, but only to those cases where there is a substantial defect in the application or some informality in it. I may say that the committee considering this bill were pretty generally of opinion that the amendment ought to pass.

Mr. PICKLER. Suppose the second application is defective, then what?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Well, I should suppose that that same rule would apply until he files an application that is not defective; because until he does that, legally speaking, he files no application whatever, and until he files an application which is neither defective nor informal he is not to be prejudged by any mistake which may have been made by the clerk, or the scrivener, or the agent who wrote it for him.

Although I am not the Commissioner of Pensions, and the consideration of that act may be susceptible of very serious changes as you change Commissioners of Pensions, yet I will say that if I were the Commissioner of Pensions I should hold that the applicant was entitled to the benefit of this amendment no matter how many defective applications he made.

Mr. STEELE. I should like to know whether or not the gentleman, in his experience, has come across cases where the proof has apparently been all that was required to establish the case, and yet the application has been rejected and the intimation made to the pensioner to file a new application, when the pension has been immediately allowed under the new application, apparently for the purpose of cutting off the arrears. I should like to know if the gentleman has had any experience of that kind?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] that personally I have had no experience of that kind.

Mr. STEELE. Well, I have.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Because I have not had many cases; but I have heard and read of numerous instances of that kind. That, however, is a mere criticism of the Pension Commissioner.

Mr. STEELE. I should like to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes.

Mr. STEELE. Whether in the case of officers' widows, where they have proved up their claims so that the examiners have reported in favor of them in the Pension Office, so that the field examiners have reported the claim as proven up to the satisfaction of those officers, and where the examiner having the case in charge has certified it up as being made, that some unknown influence has given this officer the direction to reject the claim, and then the applicant asked to file a claim under the law of June, 1890, because under the proof the amount of pension allowed will be $12, under that act, instead of $21 or $30, or whatever the sum might be under the old act? Has the gentleman had any experience of that kind?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Let me ask the gentleman if he means that the pension application rejected had been applied for under other laws than the act of June 27, 1890?

Mr. STEELE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Well, this amendment would have no relation to any other act of Congress except the act of June 17, 1890. I have heard of cases such as the gentleman suggests, but as to their correctness or authenticity I am not able to say. The purpose of this amendment, however, Mr. Chairman, is to prevent any difficulty of that kind occurring again in cases where pensions are applied for under this particular act.

Mr. LACEY. Why not make it broad enough to apply to all acts as well? This act is certainly not one that we should favor so much as the old law, which refers to disabilities contracted during the war.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That might be very properly done. The fact is, however, that under the old laws, the act of 1862 and the various other early acts pertaining to pensions, there are very few applications now. All that were entitled to pensions under those old laws were pensioned some years ago, and nearly all the applications now pending, or that will be received hereafter, are under the act of June 27, 1890.

The next amendment, Mr. Chairman, is one that I think will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. PICKLER. Before the gentleman leaves the other, knowing the construction given to pension acts over at the Pension Office, I think it would be as well to have this as definite as we can get it. This reads as follows:

Provided, * * * a new application shall have been or shall hereafter be filed, and a pension shall hereafter be allowed under such claim, such pension shall date from the time of filing the first application; *Provided*, That the evidence in the case shall show the disability to have existed at the time of filing such first application.

Now, if a disability is shown to exist the last time that was not alleged in the first application, is it the intention that the applicant shall be pensioned for a disability that did not appear in the first application at all?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. PICKLER. Does it not so read?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not so understand.

Mr. HAGER. If the disability existed it does.

Mr. PICKLER. The language is—

Provided, That the evidence in the case shall show the disability to have existed.

Now, suppose it did exist, and that is shown, but that it was not alleged in the first application?

Mr. HAGER. This covers that.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not think, if the gentleman will allow me to say so, that a careful examination of this act would entitle the pensioner to the pension from the date of the first application——

Mr. PICKLER. We must make this very plain.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE (continuing). When the first application did not disclose the disability for which he was pensioned.

During the fiscal year 1897, in expending this appropriation, whenever a claim for pension under the act of June 27, 1890, has been, or shall hereafter be, rejected, suspended, or dismissed because of any defect or informality in the application, and a new application shall have been, or shall hereafter be, filed, and a pension has been, or shall hereafter be, allowed in such claim, such pension shall date from the time of filing the first application, provided the evidence in the case shall show the disability to have existed, or to exist, at the time of filing such first application, anything in any law or ruling of the Department to the contrary notwithstanding.

When we reach the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule, for amendment, a word could be put in there to save all question of that. If the gentleman will bear it in mind, we will do so.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman a question in line of the question asked by the gentleman from South Dakota, whether he has made any estimate of the amount that will be necessary and the necessity for a large appropriation arising under this section. Have you made an estimate as to the amount of the allowances which will be made in the next fiscal year by reason of this legislation, of the amount of money that will be required to pay the pensions for the time intervening between the first and the last allowed pension?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The committee did take that into consideration, and it was not thought necessary by the committee to raise the amount beyond the estimate.

Mr. SAYERS. I will suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the report of the Commissioner of Pensions shows that about $138,000,000——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Not quite $138,000,000.

Mr. SAYERS. Not quite $138,000,000 were expended during the last fiscal year in the payment of pensions. Without any special information as to what increased expenditures would be incurred on account of this new legislation, it was supposed that the difference between the expenditure of last year and $140,000,000 would meet this increased expenditure. Is not that correct?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is correct.

Mr. HERMANN. Will the gentleman from Texas state his basis for that supposition? In other words, was the Commissioner called upon to make an estimate before the committee?

Mr. SAYERS. I do not know. I am not a member of the subcommittee on the pension appropriation bill; but I believe the gentleman from Kansas, who had charge of the bill in subcommittee, can give you the information.

Mr. BLUE. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the interrogation, the committee desires to say that at the time these amendments were put in the proposed bill an inquiry was made of the Commissioner of Pensions as to the second amendment, by direction of the committee, and he replied in that connection that he was unable to make an estimate, and that he could not give any definite information as to what the effect of that would be. As to the first one no inquiry was made by the committee; and while I am on the floor answering that suggestion I wish also to attempt to answer the last inquiry of the gentleman from South Dakota.

The first section of this amendment is intended mainly to cover the character of cases which I will explain. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] made an inquiry a moment ago in regard to the experience of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I will say to him in reply that I have had frequent experiences of the character he names, where an application has been made for a pension and after pending for many months has been rejected. Under the law of 1890 the ruling of the Bureau has been that if no additional evidence was filed and no further steps taken to revive the application, after the expiration of ninety days the pensioner would be compelled to file another application in order to revive his claim. Then, when the time came that the Commissioner of Pensions allowed the pension, he dated it from the date of the last application, in that way depriving the pensioner of the advantages that he might have had if the disability existed at the time of the first application.

In reply to the gentleman from South Dakota, I will say that it was the purpose of the committee to make that section in spirit reach to this extent: That if the disability for which the pension was granted existed at the time of the first application the pension should date from that time; so that the pensioner, by this practice of the Department, should not be deprived of the advantages of his first application if the evidence showed the disability for which he was pensioned existed at the time of his first application. That was the intent and purpose of that provision, and if it does not cover the ground it should cover it. But you observe that it refers only to applications under the law of 1890. Comparatively few cases arise under the old law. Many of you are doubtless familiar with the fact that under the present rulings of the Department the former rulings of the administration of the Bureau by Commissioner Raum were reversed, and it was held under this latter ruling of the present Commissioner of Pensions that the law of 1890 was intended to reach only those incapacitated for manual labor in such a degree as to render them unable to earn a support.

Commissioner Raum held that under that law it was not necessary that one should trace the disability to the service, and that when application was filed showing the disability, in the determination of the degree of disability he would follow the old law up to the extent of $12 a month. Under this recent ruling the first thing to be ascertained is whether the disability prevents the earning of a living by the applicant by manual labor. If it is determined that the disability does not interfere with his making a living by manual labor, that then the party applying should not be entitled to a pension. In other words, under the ruling of the Bureau at this time, if a man has lost an eye it is held that that does not interfere with his making a living by manual labor; if he has become deaf in one ear that that does not interfere with earning a living. Still it may be that in the pursuit of his vocation it may materially and perhaps absolutely deprive him of the power of earning a livelihood; and it was with a desire to cure these defects in the expenditure of this money that this provision was put in the bill.

Mr. HERMANN. I will ask the gentleman from Kansas, as he seems to have given special attention to this particular portion of the subject, and inasmuch as it will become a very important one as we proceed, whether he has ascertained from the Department the number of first applications which were rejected and which will necessarily come up for consideration in estimating for an appropriation?

Mr. BLUE. I have not, and neither has the committee.

Mr. HERMANN. So that you can not even approximate the amount of money that will be necessary to appropriate for this particular purpose?

Mr. BLUE. No, sir, I can not; but in that connection I will say that an examination of the report of the Commissioner will show that a board of revision has been created, and that under the investigation of that board and the law of 1890, as governed by the newly established rule, somewhere near 100,000 pensions were affected in one way or another, either by having been cut down or dropped or in some other way, but the committee should understand that this provision is to apply only temporarily during the expenditure of this appropriation.

Mr. HERMANN. In connection with a reference made by the gentleman to the discrimination between cases under the act of 1890 and cases under the old law, I will ask him whether he does not think that this section discriminates to a certain extent as against payments under the old law whose applications were rejected and subsequently reopened; in other words, does he not think that an application made under the old law should receive the same favorable consideration that he proposes to give to applications made under the act of June 27, 1890?

Mr. BLUE. In regard to that I will say that the committee felt some little delicacy in regard to amendments of this character, and desired to be as cautious as possible and to propose only those that they thought would be likely to meet the general approval of the House. So far as the other cases are concerned, as I said a moment ago, they are comparatively few in number, but if the House sees fit to amend the bill so as to include all of them, I do not know that the committee will have any objection.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the committee to one or two matters, and I should like to have about ten minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the time for offering amendments has not yet arrived.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not want to offer an amendment, but simply to discuss the general subject somewhat with a view to an amendment to be offered later.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Full opportunity for offering amendments will be afforded later, and I shall be glad to give the gentleman plenty of time, but we desire now to go on in the regular way.

Mr. GIBSON. Very well. I prefer to speak in my own time.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that the real reason for the amendment suggested by the committee arises from two constructions which have been placed by the Pension Bureau on the law of 1890. In the first place, the Bureau holds that the only date permissible under that law for the commencement of a pension is the date of the application; and secondly, that the written application must be filed setting up the specific disability under which the claim is made. It therefore follows that if the application does not specify the actual disability that is shown by the testimony, that application must be rejected and a new one filed, and the pension must begin from the time of the second application. Now, it is proposed to correct that by allowing the applicant to file an amended application setting forth clearly his disability and allowing the pension to run from the date of the first application, provided the testimony shows that the disability did actually exist.

Mr. SAYERS. The provision incorporated in the bill is intended, is it not, to cover a practice which already exists in the Department?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Unquestionably. In concluding the observation I was making, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the law originally was that a pension should be granted if it appeared that the claimant suffered from any disability, either physical or mental, not the result of his own vicious habits. I submit the proper construction of the law would be to allow the granting of a pension without requiring the setting up of any specific disability, and in my view the amendment should go even further than is proposed by the committee of which I am a member. The amendment that should be made, I think, is that whenever a person files a written application stating in general terms that he is suffering from some disability, either physical or mental, which is not the result of his own vicious habits, and which interferes with his ability to obtain a living by manual labor, the pension should be granted; leaving it to the testimony to show the precise nature of the disability. However, it was to improve the methods of the Department and to meet some of the objections which are made by a technical Bureau adverse to the soldier that this particular amendment was recommended in the bill.

Mr. SAYERS. I would ask the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER], in view of what he said in reference to the action

of the Bureau in this matter, whether the Bureau is not doing the very thing which this provision contemplates.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Oh, no!

Mr. SAYERS. I understood the gentleman to say just now that the Bureau in allowing a pension upon a second application dates it back to the first application.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Oh, no; it does not, except in one class of cases—where the disability which was informally set out in the first application is in the second set out in technical language, or where the disability is such as could readily have been taken for the disability originally set out. Only in that class of cases does the pension date back, under the present practice, to the date of the first application.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, the second amendment, and the only remaining one reported by the committee, has reference to the applications for pension made by widows of deceased soldiers. Under the act of 1890 a soldier's widow applying for a pension is obliged to prove to the satisfaction of the Pension Department that she is without other means of support than her daily labor. The committee thought this provision of the law should be modified, and has reported an amendment—not in the sense of an addition to the existing law, but directing how the money which we appropriate shall be distributed. This amendment provides that—

> During the fiscal year 1897, in expending this appropriation, it shall not be necessary for a widow, in establishing her claim to a pension under the provisions of the act of June 27, 1890, to prove that she is without other means of support than her daily labor: *Provided*, That before she shall be entitled to a pension under the provisions of said law she shall prove that her net income does not exceed $500 per annum.

Under the law as it now exists a soldier's widow can not get a pension without first proving that she is a pauper. She must show that she has no means of support whatever except her daily labor. If her husband left her two or three thousand dollars, or a little house and lot which merely affords a shelter for herself and her children, she is barred from obtaining a pension, although her husband was not under any such bar in reference to his application.

Mr. STEELE. The gentleman will allow me to ask whether the Department has not required in every case that the soldier's widow when applying for a pension shall show that she was living with the soldier in lawful wedlock—that she was his lawful wife? In other words, has it not been necessary under the practice of the Department for a widow to show, in the first place, that she was lawfully married to the soldier; that she was living with him as his wife; that she raised his children, and that at his death she was lawfully his widow? And after all this proof, has it not been necessary for her to show that she never had a divorce?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes; and that she never had an opportunity to marry another man! [Laughter.] The Pension Department has required proof of a great many absurd and ridiculous things; and none more ridiculous than in this particular. I must say, however, in justice to the present administration of the Pension Office, that the ground for criticism of this kind has existed for some time. The construction of the pension laws as adopted by every Pension Commissioner has been narrow. It is the most ridiculous thing in the world to call upon an old gray-headed woman with married sons and daughters, who, with her, belong to church, to prove that she was not living with the father of those children without being formally married to him. That is simply one of the many ridiculous and absurd things which are required to be proved. Another is this requirement that the widow shall show she has no visible means of support. If she is supported by a son or a daughter or by the church—no matter how her support may be derived, if she has any visible means of support, that fact is made a pretext for declining to grant her a pension. The provision inserted by the committee, which we deem a reasonable one, is that it shall not be necessary for a soldier's widow to prove that she has no means of support except her daily labor, unless she has an income exceeding $500 a year. I do not think they ought to limit it to that. There are some women, the wives of soldiers who served in the late war, who, if their husbands died, would find it a very inconvenient thing to attempt to live on $500 a year. It all grows out of the way the pension is regarded.

In the examination of Judge Lochren, the present Commissioner of Pensions, he stated in his testimony before the Committee on Appropriations that the pension is a mere charity or gratuity granted by the State at its own will—granted by the sovereign power—to be withheld at will or withdrawn at any time it shall see fit and proper. I believe the soldiers who took part in the late war have regarded it otherwise. I believe a pension is a sacred right—a vested right, belonging to the soldier and growing out of a contract for which due and valuable consideration passed to the Government of the United States years ago, and that it is not a mere charity or gratuity to be doled out and repealed, withdrawn or changed, to suit the will or legal construction which is passed upon it by any administration or party in charge of that Department of the Government. It belongs to him as a matter of right, and he is as much entitled to it for his present disability as a member of Congress is to his salary. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the committee deemed it best not to modify this law so radically as to startle anyone, but to at least give the widow of the soldier an opportunity to secure a pension after proving her right to it without the necessity of proving that she was a pauper. The examination of the testimony that will be found accompanying the report of the committee shows that there were 104,000 cases—and I make this statement in response to some questions which have been asked by some member, I do not now remember who—that there were 104,000 cases considered during the last year with a view to changing the pensions they are now receiving. My colleague on the committee [Mr. BLUE] spoke of the difference in the construction of the act of 1890.

You all remember that the act of 1890 was passed during the late Administration preceding the present one. That was a law which added a great many cases to the pension roll. The intention of the law was to pension every disabled soldier without regard to the origin of the disability. Stated in as few words and as concisely as I can state it, the purpose and intent of the law was to pension every soldier without regard to the origin of the disability if it was lawful. The first construction of the act was given to it when it came before General Raum, then the Commissioner of Pensions. He decided, in his construction of the act, and issued a general order to that effect, that in considering the rate of pension to be allowed in those cases under the act of 1890 the rate of disability should be considered the same as if it was of service origin. In other words, a soldier applying for a pension should have it adjudicated precisely as if the disability for which he applied was incurred during the war—that is, up to the extent of $12 per month—the law limiting it to that.

For instance, if a man lost a leg or an arm in a thrashing machine in the last five years, and applied for a pension under the disability act, and had it allowed, it would give him a rating up to $12 a month, or the rate he would have gotten had he lost a limb in battle up to that extent, because, of course, under the act it could not go beyond that sum. The intention of the law, in other words, was to allow a pension to the fullest extent warranted by the law. The law says the time has come in the history of this war, and the history since the war, when every disabled soldier shall draw a pension without it being necessary for him to prove that he incurred the disability in the war. Mr. Lochren, when he came into the office of Commissioner of Pensions, and Mr. Bussey and Mr. Smith—Mr. Bussey, I believe, having retained his position, and being Assistant Secretary of the Interior under a former Administration—decided that there was an error made in the construction of the act, and therefore they reconsidered something like 104,000 cases——

Mr. NORTHWAY. If the gentleman will allow me to make a correction, they reviewed all of the cases under the law of 1890—104,000 last year and 108,000 previously.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I have said that this was in the last fiscal year, when 104,160 cases were considered. In 4,149 cases the pensioners were dropped from the roll as not disabled for manual labor in any pensionable degree. For instance, if a man was pensioned for the loss of a leg or an arm under the act of 1890, he was dropped from the roll because he was not disabled from the performance of manual labor to any pensionable degree according to this ruling.

In 2,279 cases the pensioners were dropped as not entitled under said act of June 27, 1890, and were restored and previous pensions granted them under the general law, which I will venture to say in every instance was a smaller pension than they were receiving under the act of 1890.

Mr. MORSE. I guess that is true.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not know that anybody testified to that, but I will venture that assertion without any fear of serious contradiction.

In 20,359 cases the rate of pension was reduced, and in 77,373 cases in which further evidence was filed the pensions were continued at the former rate. The difference in the construction between these two laws by these two Commissioners of Pensions has made all this trouble in reference to pensions of which we have heard so much during the last three years.

Therefore I say it all grows out of the definition to be placed upon a pension. We hold, or at least I hold, and I believe a majority of this side of the House hold, that a pension is the consummation of a contract; that it is something which belongs to the soldier as a matter of right, and that it should not be disturbed when once it has been allowed him, unless the most plain and apparent fraud is established by the verdict of a jury.

I have only, Mr. Chairman, to refer to the different amounts of money appropriated in former years, which I will do in a very brief way, and then leave the bill for such consideration as the committee may deem proper to give it.

In 1894 the total amount appropriated was $166,831,350. It has been reduced, therefore, something in the neighborhood of $25,000,000 up to the present time. If no laws are passed increasing the payment of pensions and adding to the pension roll, the next fiscal year—not the one for which we are now appropriating, but the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898—will, in my judgment, see this roll reduced to considerably below $140,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. There is a proviso on page 3, as follows:

Provided, That before she shall be entitled to a pension under the provisions of said law she shall prove that her net income does not exceed $500 per annum.

Does that apply to widows of Mexican and Indian wars as well as to widows of the late war?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That only applies to widows applying under the act of 1890.

Mr. HARRISON. It makes a distinction between the widows of different classes of soldiers?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes; as I understand it, it only applies to widows applying for pensions under the act of 1890. As I understand it, the widows of soldiers of the Mexican war apply under a special law.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the gentleman regard the contract between the Government and the soldier as any different in the different wars?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Not at all. I think it is the subject of a very proper amendment, if the gentleman desires to offer it.

Mr. BRUMM. The only difference is that the soldiers of the Mexican war are better provided for.

Mr. MOSES. I am opposesd to any pauper clauses; but at the same time the law requires Mexican soldiers, although of the average age of 75 or 80 years, to prove that they can not earn a livelihood by manual labor, and also that they are paupers, in order to receive $12 a month. Would you have any objection to doing away with that pauper clause in that act and to adding it to the amendment here?

Mr. BINGHAM. As I understand the law, the pension given to soldiers of the Mexican war is a service pension. All you have to prove is that the soldier served sixty days.

Mr. BRUMM. It is a service pension.

Mr. PICKLER. And in the Indian wars only thirty days' service.

Mr. MOSES. But under the act providing for soldiers of the war of 1812, which is a service pension, they receive $12 per month. The pensioners of the Revolutionary war receive $12 per month; and we have established the precedent of allowing $12 per month as a service pension. Yet these old men, survivors of the Mexican war, must prove that they are paupers, and although they are 80 years of age they must prove that they can not earn a livelihood by manual labor in order to receive $12 per month.

Mr. BRUMM. You are entirely mistaken.

Mr. MOSES. I am not mistaken.

Mr. BRUMM. They draw their pensions the moment they show they were in the service for sixty days.

Mr. MOSES. I know what I am speaking about. They draw $8 a month as a service pension; but they can not draw $12 per month unless they swear that they are paupers, and Southern men do not generally swear to any such thing.

Mr. GROUT. If I may have the attention of the gentleman, he is mistaken in saying that the regular service pension is $12 a month. The service pension is $8 a month.

Mr. MOSES. I say the service pension allowed to the survivors of the war of 1812, and all other wars except the Mexican war, is $12 a month.

Mr. GROUT. Eight dollars a month, as I understand it, is the usual service pension, and the Mexican soldiers receive $8 a month; but when they show they are dependent upon manual labor, then they can draw $12 a month.

Mr. MOSES. I understand that the amendment which we are considering is not to require these widows to prove that they are paupers; and I say, let us not require these old Mexican war soldiers to prove that they are paupers.

Mr. GROUT. We are not talking about the soldier; we are talking about the widows in this connection; and I hope the gentleman in charge of the bill will not consent to any amendment whatever in that way.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The difference between the case of a widow under this law and the Mexican pensioner is that under this law the widow has to make proof that she is a pauper before she gets a pension, while the Mexican soldier gets his pension as a service pension.

Mr. MOSES. I want to do away altogether with this idea of pauperism. The State of Georgia gives more to Confederate pensioners than any other seven of the Confederate States. To the widow of any Southern soldier who was killed we give a pension, even if worth half a million, and I am opposed to all pauper laws in regard to pension legislation.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I am not sufficiently familiar with the provisions of the laws that my friend from Georgia referred to to answer the question, but I only want to say this, that we, who represent the survivors of this war, only want the same pension and the same privileges and the same immunities that have been granted to others in other wars heretofore.

Mr. MOSES. If the gentleman will allow me, I will state that the proposition I have made is one that was unanimously agreed to by the last Congress, without a dissenting voice.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me to ask him a question before he retires? How much does the State of Georgia give to its Confederate soldiers?

Mr. MOSES. About $800,000 per annum to soldiers and widows.

Mr. PICKLER. We give to Union soldiers in Georgia $483,569.98.

Mr. MOSES. Yes; they are all leaving your country and coming down there.

Mr. PICKLER. They are good citizens.

Mr. MOSES. That is right; and they are all turning Democrats when they come there.

Mr. PICKLER. There will never be a rebellion when you get them there.

Mr. LACEY. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to line 12 and line 14 of page 2. I am afraid from the manner in which that is drawn that a hostile construction might be put upon that amendment as you propose it, and it would be held to apply only to cases where, during the time that this appropriation was being expended, claims should not have been rejected. Now, let me suppose a case. A case is rejected in 1893. Afterwards, when the claimant has filed all the evidence, he is in the same condition in 1897 as in 1893; but because of a defect in filing the first claim, failing to assert, for instance, that the disability was not the result of vicious habits of the soldier, the original application was rejected altogether. Now, should there not be inserted, between the words "has been," the words "at any time," and in line 14, after the word "application," also the words "at any time"; so that if the application has been rejected before 1897, and before this appropriation in 1897 falls in, it would also cover all these cases?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The difficulty is that that would make it subject to the point of order that it is new legislation.

Mr. LACEY. If it is new legislation, why would not the same objection apply to the amendment you offer?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The committee thought it would not. The committee thought in the language in which this paragraph was drawn it would not be subject to that criticism.

Mr. LACEY. Nine cases out of ten that this amendment would be applied to, are cases where the rejection has been prior to the enactment of this limitation.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I fully agree with you, but for the fact that it will be subject to the point of order.

Mr. LACEY. If this is subject to the point of order, let us pass to the next paragraph. It also provides that during the fiscal year and the expenditure of this appropriation a certain law shall apply.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. What is to prevent the Commissioner of Pensions, in determining the cases of widows' pensions, from limiting the payment and allowance to the period covered by this appropriation?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. By that time we hope to have a Commissioner of Pensions who will not think of misconstruing the law. [Applause on the Republican side.] The force of public opinion will be such as to prevent anything of that kind again.

Mr. LACEY. I desire to offer the amendment I have suggested in lines 12 and 14 and to take the chances on the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. When the time comes we will be glad to give the gentleman an opportunity.

Mr. BLUE. Let me make a suggestion to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that when the time comes when this amendment can be offered the gentleman can offer the amendment for general legislation, and if the point of order is not made, let the matter then be determined.

Mr. LACEY. I remember that in the last Congress Mr. Hatch of Missouri, as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, overruled a much more important point of order than this would be, and I think we are rather more favorably situated in that respect now than we were then. [Laughter.]

Mr. ERDMAN (to Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE). How many widows' pensions will this affect?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I can not answer that question.

Mr. ERDMAN. Is not the number in the neighborhood of 100,000?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Does my colleague mean to say that there are 100,000 applications for widows' pensions not allowed?

Mr. ERDMAN. I speak of the number of applications made and not granted because the widows were not dependent.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, my colleague asks me as to the number of widows who will be affected by this amendment, which provides that it shall not be necessary to prove that they have no other means of support. I am unable to answer that question. I do not know how many cases this amendment will affect, but whether the number be 1 or 100,000, the amendment ought to pass. [Applause.] This country is in a pretty bad shape financially, I will admit; it could not be much worse; but the time has not yet come, and the prospects are that it will not come in the future, when we can not afford to pay the widows of the soldiers who put down the rebellion. [Applause.]

Mr. ERDMAN. Another question. Do you provide any appropriation for the payment of these additional pensions?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes, sir. The answer to that question is found in the inquiry of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS]. The official reports show that nearly $138,000,000 of the amount appropriated for pensions for the last fiscal year was expended. The Commissioner of Pensions insists on $140,000,000 for the current year. We thought that if possible the $1,500,000 that would be left unexpended of the amount appropriated last year would perhaps cover any additional payments that might be required under the operation of this amendment.

Mr. ERDMAN. Then, if you are mistaken about that, your purpose is to trench upon the funds set aside for the pensions of the soldiers in order to provide for the widows?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Not at all. If it should become necessary we will do what our friends on the other side have done repeatedly—provide for a deficiency; and there will be no soldier and no soldier's widow left unpaid when this fiscal year ends. [Applause.] Now, Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF] for twenty minutes.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk an amendment which I intend to offer at the proper time.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, what provision is there for time on the other side?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. There is no arrangement as to time, but if there is anybody on the other side who desires to address the committee at this time, I do not suppose there will be any objection.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, are we not now in general debate on this pension bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. PICKLER. So that any member who gets the floor will be entitled to an hour.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. We are in general debate, and I think we had better run along in that way until we ascertain how many gentlemen desire to address the committee on this bill. I do not wish to enter into any arrangement as to time just now, but I do not think there will be any difficulty.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have an hour, though I probably shall not occupy it all.

Mr. DOVENER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] whether there is any division on this subject—whether there is any "other side"; and if so, which is "the other side"?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. There may be some gentlemen who desire to speak in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. DOVENER. Well, I simply want to know who are "the other side," because I have taken for granted that we were all in favor of pensions.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have read the amendment which I have sent to the desk, so that it may be incorporated in my remarks, and then after the general debate I will at the proper time offer the amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Add to the conclusion of the present bill the following:

"*Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1897 in expending this appropriation no pension shall be reduced, suspended, or dropped except for fraud in obtaining the pension, which fraud shall be established by the verdict of a jury of the United States circuit or district court of the circuit or district in which the pensioner resides, either by indictment or issue framed in the civil branch of the court, at the relation of the Attorney-General of the United States, of which the pensioner shall have notice and appear and plead as in other cases, except where title to said pension has ceased to exist under provisions of law. A certified copy of the indictment or issue, and the proceedings, verdict, and judgment, shall in all such cases be forwarded by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner of Pensions free of cost."

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. GRAFF. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I am not offering the amendment at this time. I have merely asked to have it read as a part of my remarks. Mr. Chairman, I have had this amendment read to this committee not for the purpose of precipitating discussion, but for the purpose of fulfilling one of the important pledges that I made to those constituents who supported me in my Congressional district at the election held last fall. It seems to me that as compared with measures calculated to enlarge and make more liberal the present pension laws, permitting those who are now seeking pensions to obtain them more readily, this measure is higher in importance, because it gives to those who are already honestly and honorably upon the rolls some security of remaining there. It is a matter of general importance and a subject of general discussion among the 900,000 widows and soldiers who are now upon the rolls. Nor is it necessarily unrepublican, Mr. Chairman, to put a rider upon an appropriation bill. A part of the history of the Republican party is connected with a rider which was placed upon an appropriation away back in antebellum times for the purpose of preventing the use of United States troops to aid lawless invaders in the Territory of Kansas who sought to force slavery upon that Territory. That case affords an instance of rider legislation which certainly can not be condemned and is entitled to much praise.

Grave conditions make excusable heroic remedies. This amendment has been carefully drafted along the very line of the two amendments which have been submitted by the Committee on Appropriations, and is no more subject to criticism as interfering with or changing or modifying existing law than the amendments affecting widows' pensions, and that providing that pensions shall date from the date of the original application. This amendment has been so drawn that by its terms it simply limits the conditions under which the appropriation shall be expended, and is confined in its effect to the fiscal year for which this appropriation is to be passed.

I am proud of the methods of the legislation of this House during this session, so far as this side of the Chamber is concerned. The anomalous condition caused by Democratic legislation and Democratic policy has thus far been met by emergency legislation. Emergency legislation as I believe and as I think the people of this country will feel, is not only excusable and defensible, but is indeed praiseworthy where there is a necessity for immediate action, and where the emergency legislation is commensurate with the needs of the hour.

We have passed thus far as emergency measures a bond bill and a tariff bill. These two measures were for the purpose of restoring confidence in commercial circles. I have now sent to the desk an emergency measure, the object of which is to restore confidence to 900,000 anxious but honest and honorable veterans upon the pension roll, who are apprehending—and not without good reason for their fears—an attack from an unseen source. The bond and tariff measures were passed because permanent legislation was impossible. This emergency policy operates, Mr. Chairman, very much like a porous plaster. It is administered by the Republican party at this time to the anatomy of the Democratic Administration to cure political ænemia. It is going to be a little painful to them, but we hope that the two emergency measures already passed will create a healthy circulation, although they may draw the dark red blood to a painful congestion at the point where the remedy is applied. While I did not approve the bond bill, and did approve the tariff measure, both were passed to restore and maintain the public credit, and it is hoped they will have that effect if they become laws.

The amendment I present is to restore and maintain the national honor and fulfill our sacred obligations.

It is a well-known fundamental principle of law in all courts that a final judgment can not be set aside except for fraud. That principle obtains in every tribunal having judicial powers. Not only that, but the burden of proving such fraud rests not upon the person in whose favor the final adjudication is had, but upon the person who attacks it. This principle applies not only in law, but on the chancery side of our courts; it is operative in all forms of procedure, whether in common law or a code. And it is further a universal principle of law that when you seek to set aside a final adjudication by a charge of fraud, the inquiry does not go so far as to permit a retrial of the issues. The only point of inquiry to which the court will direct its attention is the question whether the particular fraud charged is established. Not only this, but the universal rule of pleading is that when a final judgment is attacked upon such a ground, a general charge of fraud is not sufficient to entitle the court to institute an inquiry, but the particular charges must be laid with specific certainty. These principles, fundamental in their nature, are every one of them violated under the mode of procedure adopted in the administration of the present Commissioner with respect to stopping pensions. These are rules which would govern a controversy over a Texas broncho worth $15. Is there any reason (and I appeal particularly to this side of the Chamber) why it shall be considered presumptuous for a man to demand the same rights concerning his pension that he has concerning all other property?

The whole trouble, as intimated by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] arises from the particular theory which may be adopted concerning pensions. One theory of construction is that a pension is a simple gratuity; the other is that it is the payment of an honest debt. I adopt the same construction as my friend from Pennsylvania—that a pension which has been granted is as solemn an obligation as a bond in writing. And the consideration is the reverse of the Shylock bond. The obligation

there was to render the pound of flesh. In this bond the conditions are reversed: the consideration is the past relinquishment of flesh and blood and life and health. [Applause.]

When a party called upon to construe pension laws takes the position which I am just advised the present Commissioner took, that a pension is simply a gratuity which the Government has voluntarily offered to the recipient, the irresistible ground for him to take to be in harmony with that position would be that a strict construction would follow as against the recipient. But if the opposite theory is taken, that a pension is a vested right, then the irresistible conclusion follows that such a construction of the law should be adopted as to facilitate, not to prevent, the payment of the honest debt which the Government owes.

The Commissioner of Pensions, while he has treated me personally with the greatest of courtesy, and while I would not personally attack him, possesses too much judicial power for any executive officer. There is not a single tribunal in the United States having nisi prius powers that has as sweeping a jurisdiction, deals with as many people and as important interests, as the man who sits at the head of the Pension Bureau. I say, whether the Commissioner of Pensions was inimical to pensions or not, that it is unfair to place in the hands of any man an arbitrary right or power to pass upon such important cases, especially after the pensioner has applied, produced his evidence, and obtained a final adjudication of his claim on the merits of the case so presented. There the case ought to rest.

As an instance I have but to refer, Mr. Chairman, to the notification that is sent out to the pensioner when information is given that an inquiry is to be instituted in his case. There is nothing in the law at present which prevents the Commissioner of Pensions from putting a pensioner to the trouble and expense of an inquiry on his own arbitrary and unreasonable decision. No man ought to be driven to the necessity of a retrial or a rehearing of his case or the anxiety of again going over these old rights and reproducing evidence unless there is something substantial that has come up which justifies the necessity for such a reinvestigation. In that investigation every member here knows that no fair notice is given to the pensioner, who is simply told that his pension will be dropped unless he furnishes testimony to the contrary within sixty or ninety days. All of God's mercy can not sweeten a heart which has no outlet, but I have been endeavoring—I say this especially to my friends on this side of the House—to meet this question not from the standpoint of generosity or patriotism, but to measure it by the cold but just rules of the law.

Here is a man who is put upon an inquiry concerning a vested right simply by the arbitrary notice of an official that his pension is to be dropped unless additional testimony is offered within a limited time; and yet, contrary to all rules of pleading, the Commissioner is not bound to put into the notification the point on which he desires this investigation or on which investigation what additional testimony is wanted. The Commissioner is not even compelled to comply with a requirement that would be necessary in a court of the most inferior jurisdiction of the land and concerning the smallest amount. Not only that, but he is called on to produce testimony within sixty days to rebut what? He knows not. What kind of a trial would a man think he would be subjected to were he required, by any known rules of procedure, to rebut testimony of which he was absolutely ignorant?

Even the members of Congress here, who enjoy privileges which no one else enjoys over in that Pension Office, go there and are assured blandly that they have a right to examine papers; but many of us have gone there to examine papers and found them in the hands of the Commissioner on the opposite side of the desk, and received our information filtered through his construction of what they contained. If, then, a member of Congress, who has the privilege, which I am now exercising, of protesting against this policy in the Halls of Congress, can obtain no better treatment than that, what can the poor pensioner, who is a thousand miles from the administration of the office, obtain in the way of information as to the testimony which he is called upon to rebut? Not only that, but the present Commissioner was called on by myself and by other members on this floor, whom I have heard talk of it, to be allowed to inspect a report made by a medical board concerning the standing, rating, or nonrating of a pensioner who had applied, and we were told we could receive the information, but it was upon the strict limitation that we were upon our honor not to reveal the contents of the verdict of that medical body to the pensioner, the only man who was interested in it! Measured by the strict rules of law, would you consider your rights safe if you had to go to the judge, or, still worse, to the attorney on the other side, for the purpose of obtaining the evidence to be used in court on which your rights were to rest, and receiving not only the construction that he chooses to put upon it, but limiting that knowledge to your own bosom and not being permitted to recite it to your client?

Mr. Chairman, if there is any one principle which is embodied in the constitution of all the States in the Union it is that all the private citizens of the State have an unlimited right to view all public records, and that is supplemented by the still further and undisputed doctrine that every litigant has a right to view all pleadings, evidence, depositions, and other documents submitted in support of the testimony on the opposite side of the case. There is another legal principle violated by the present policy. Suppose you were bound to submit important rights and the determination of a case, when you are not only not permitted to know what the testimony of the other side is, but on testimony given by witnesses whose names you were not permitted to know and whom you have no privilege and opportunity of cross-examining.

The right of cross-examination obtains in the giving of testimony in all courts, whether civil or criminal, whether the testimony is taken in open court or by deposition. The animus of the witness is thus obtained, as well as the reasonableness of his story, his means of knowledge, and all the other valuable details which are elicited by a cross-examination in the interest of truth.

The time of Mr. GRAFF having expired, by unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. PAYNE, it was extended fifteen minutes.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Chairman, there need be no fear on the part of the members of the Committee on Invalid Pensions that this emergency proposition will in any way interfere with the passage of a permanent law containing similar provisions.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. GRAFF. Yes.

Mr. PICKLER. I want to say to the gentleman that I think he will find that every member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions is in favor of any proposed pension legislation on any bill where it can be enacted.

Mr. GRAFF. I believe that, and I want to say to my friend the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER], that in private conversation with him before the introduction of this amendment he gave his hearty indorsement to its passage.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there can be no difference of opinion in regard to the propositions thus far laid down. I desire to occupy the time of the House concerning the wisdom of the remedy by a reference to the United States court. It may be said in reply that the district attorneys in the various Federal courts have the power to institute wholesale charges against pensioners. What limitation is there on the Commissioner at the present time to prevent his instituting the same sort of a wholesale charge, covered by the cloak of secrecy and without that measure of responsibility which follows upon an open, daylight investigation which the district attorney would incur for improper or unwise action? It is well known that the judicial powers are more safely confided to those departments of the Government which are peculiarly judicial in their functions than to any administrative officer under the name of discretion.

A certain amount of discretion must be necessarily allowed every administrative officer, but this goes a great way beyond any reasonable definition of that word. The practical effect of this amendment, if ingrafted upon this bill, would place upon the district attorney in each of the districts the burden of responsibility, if he did not take the precaution, as every wise and able prosecutor takes it, to make a preliminary examination of his case before he files it in the court. It would be necessary even if he did not want to do it. He would have to make an investigation into the facts in order to legally draw his information or indictment. He would have to draw it with a great deal more legal certainty than this order of notification. He would have to establish fraud under all those well-founded principles of law to which I have adverted.

Those of us who are lawyers of any experience in Federal courts know that while the Federal courts are under the law bound to adopt the procedure under the laws of the State in which the district is situated, yet on account of their independent position they adopt that flexible construction of those laws of procedure which make the Federal courts at once a terror to the guilty and the security of the innocent. If I were an innocent man under indictment for an alleged crime there is no court in the land where I would more gladly submit my rights than in a Federal court properly organized. It is well known that the judges who sit upon the bench are divested of partisan interest and bias as much as any man on the sod. It is a well-known fact among lawyers that when a prejudiced man, filled with partisanship, is chosen to go upon the bench he leaves behind him, in a way that is surprising to his former associates, that partisan bias which has been a part of the warp and woof of his character before.

Remember that the provisions of this law do not add a dollar to the expenditures of this Government. They do not make the necessary appropriation a cent larger. This law can not be called extravagant, because it calls for the appropriation of no new money. It simply demands the security of those who are already drawing pensions.

I do not make the appeal from a partisan standpoint. I would place the veterans who are honestly upon the roll above the reach of the criticism and whim of either the Republican or the Democratic party. I will say, however, with regard to the Democratic

policy of writing letters to Democratic postmasters throughout the United States for the purpose of finding out if a witness who has testified in favor of a pensioner is disreputable and thus affecting the rejection of the testimony upon the report, either sworn to or otherwise, by the postmaster away out in the West, or away from the capital, that that policy is infamous.

I think that witnesses who, under the cover of secrecy which they invite, stab a neighbor by condemning and vilifying the character of a witness who has furnished testimony in favor of a pensioner—that the fact that they seek the protection of the Commissioner by having their letters withdrawn from the files, so that there can be no examination, shows that those fellows ought to have somebody to vouch for them. As to the general policy of this Administration toward pensions, as to the proposition that this Administration has not treated the soldiers fairly in reference to their application for pensions, I might enter a plea of res judicata to that.

There was a trial of that issue, among other issues, in 1894, and we are now entering into the fruition of that verdict; and we will complete it in 1897. [Applause on the Republican side.] It seems that this hanging up of pension claims is a part of the general policy of the Democracy, not so much that they are against the soldier as they are against any sort of commendable action. They seem to have a sort of conception that the noblest sentiment in man is niggardliness instead of action and achievement. It seems that they prefer timid inaction to courage, because courage carries with it responsibility. They hesitate to meet the needs of a great nation, because they must needs make appropriations. They leave our rivers and harbors unimproved and unprotected; they do not inaugurate an active policy of internal improvements; they meet none of the great possibilities of a growing Republic, because they must appropriate money with which to do it.

I want to refer gentlemen on the other side to a book of rules which needs no amendment. I commend to them, not only as their guide in this House, but outside, that rule wherein the doctrine pertaining to stewardship is correctly given in the parable of the talents, wherein the Lord gave unto one of his agents, who was a Democrat, only 1 talent, and he gave to a Republican 10 talents. [Laughter.] The Democrat, remembering his Democratic policy and notions, "was afraid and went and hid the talent in the earth." The Republican, with the 10 talents, went out and made other 10 talents, and when they came back to report the man with the 1 talent said, "I knew thee that thou art a hard man," which, in effect, is the position of the Democratic party toward the people, saying, "I know that you are narrow enough to be deceived by such so-called economical policies"; "I knew thee that thou art a hard man," and therefore "I hid thy talent in the earth: lo, there thou hast that is thine." On the contrary, the Republican, who had the 10 talents, yielded up 20 to the Lord; and the Lord said unto him, "Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord." [Laughter.] And he said to the Democrat, with the little, measly, dried-up, rusty 1 talent, "Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath 10 talents; and cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." [Laughter and cry of "Amen!"] Now, the only Republican perplexity is what we shall do with this single rusty Democratic talent. We can manage the talents which are our own by original gift and honest acquirement. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, we have just heard from the gentleman from Illinois as to his views on this pension legislation. Now, in reference to the particular amendment which he advocates, it possibly is not worth while to waste a great deal of time, as it is so clearly subject to the point of order which I shall raise against it. I for one do not believe that the Lord would ever favor taking away an executive or semiadministrative power that has reposed in the Commissioner of Pensions from time immemorial, that is, so far as the history of this country is concerned, and clogging the calendars of the United States district courts and the United States circuit courts with thousands and hundreds of thousands of pension claims.

I shall raise, subsequently, upon the second reading, a point of order against that provision changing existing law, which opens wide the door of the Treasury to a large class of widows; but it is perhaps well that at this stage of the debate I should define more in extenso my views on the existing pension laws and on the proposed pension legislation. It is not in many ways a pleasant duty. It is not agreeable entirely to make oneself a target for that misrepresentation which must ensue in the future. It is not entirely agreeable to find that I am the one speaker on this side of the House who shall probably raise his voice against the pernicious, iniquitous legislation which would seem to find favor so largely on the other side of this House. But, occupying as I do a position on the Committee on Appropriations, from the great State of New York and from the great city of New York, I should feel that I had been recreant to my duty if through any fear or dread of misrepresentation or invective against myself in the future, or of personal abuse, I should be voiceless on this emergent occasion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman permit me one minute?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Is there any sentiment in the great State of New York or in the city of New York, which the gentleman claims to voice, to strike down a liberal construction of the pension laws of this country in behalf of the men who followed the flag in the late rebellion?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I do not know whether it is necessary for me to give the gentleman time to interrupt me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I did not hear him say that he would not allow an interruption. I asked him the question because he stated that he represented the great State of New York in part, and the city of New York in part, where I understood him to say that there was a sentiment against this kind of legislation. I think he said that. Certainly he did permit me to interrupt him, but I do not desire to be guilty of any discourtesy to him.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I am aware that probably any inhibition against interruptions would be of little avail; but I will say to the gentlemen from the other side that I believe there is a sentiment, not only among the Democrats in New York, but among the best Republicans, adverse to an enlargement of pension legislation and to the looting of the Treasury of the United States under pretenses which are not justified.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I beg the gentleman's pardon, but that is not the question I asked him.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I decline to yield.

Let me here, at the inception of my remarks, state that I am a friend of the soldier; that I believe that any man who fought in the civil war has positive rights which should be protected. The leader of one of my districts, and a gentleman most potent in according me the Congressional nomination, is a man who has a splendid war record, who was wounded severely in the civil war, and who now suffers day and night from wounds received on the battlefield. Another gentleman from the same district, who now represents it in the assembly at Albany, also served gallantly in the Union Army. I may add that I am personally in favor of pensions being accorded to all men who either contracted disease or received wound or injury in the line of service, either on the battlefield or in garrison duty or on the march. In other words, Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly in accord with all the pension legislation which had been enacted by the Congress of the United States until the dependent pension act of June 27, 1890.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman permit another interruption?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Well, Mr. Chairman, either the gentleman is my interlocutor and proposes to carry on a discussion with me, or else I have a right to proceed without interruption.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I have asked permission to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Very well, I will accord it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Oh, if the gentleman is so particular about it, I will not interrupt him.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, I am not particular; go on with your query. Mr. Chairman, if there were any logical inquiry which the gentleman desired to submit, I should be glad to answer it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Very well. Do I understand you to say that you are opposed to all pension legislation on the line of the act of 1890?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. What I did say, and the gentleman's memory must be short if he can not remember it—what I did say was that I was in favor of all the pension legislation enacted by Congress up to the act of June 27, 1890. Now, I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that I shall discuss the provisions of that act. It has been passed and is on the statute book, and we are paying out $60,000,000 per annum under its provisions. Let that act remain on the statute book. I do not propose to attack it, but I do oppose any enlargement of the provisions of that act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I hope that my memory is not so short as the gentleman's patriotism. I desire to ask him this question: If a soldier has served his country faithfully for three years and is now utterly disabled from causes not traceable to service in the army, and is absolutely poverty-stricken, does the gentleman think that he ought to receive a pension at the hands of the Government which he saved, or that he ought to go to the poor-house?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I very much doubt whether there is any way in which the provisions of the dependent pension act of 1890, differing from all pension legislation in any other country in any part of the world, can be logically justified; but it has pleased the Congress of the United States to pass that act and it is manifest that it will never be repealed.

That act is on the statute book and let it stand. I do not attack the provisions of the existing law, but I do oppose enlarging the provisions of that law. Now, if the gentleman from Indiana desires to embarrass me any more, he can continue with his questions.

Mr. DOVENER. I would like to hear an answer to the question of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, without regard to these charming interruptions from the other side of the House, I wish to state an initial objection to the new legislation which is here proposed, On Saturday last, when we were considering the new rules (the rules of the Fifty-first Congress with certain amendments thereto), it was proposed that the second paragraph of Rule XXI should be amended, and when my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] proposed an amendment providing that a change in existing law should be in order upon an appropriation bill provided it tended to retrenchment or to the reduction of expenditures, a provision for which many strong arguments can be urged, when that proposition came up the able lawyer and distinguished Representative from the State of Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who is a member of the Committee on Rules, laid down a broad and salutary principle. He said in substance:

It is no function of an appropriation committee to legislate. The simple function of that committee is to appropriate money. Let us legislate out in the open, in a manly way, in such a way that the Senate and the Executive shall have an opportunity to pass upon our legislation unembarrassed by any duty imposed upon them of approving or disapproving appropriations.

I do not know that I quote the gentleman's exact words, but I have stated the substance of them. And yet, Mr. Chairman, after that amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee has been voted down and the rule of the Fifty-first Congress has been acted upon favorably, and after the clear, lucid, vigorous statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been accepted by the House, the very first appropriation bill that comes here from one of the great Republican committees of this Congress contains a provision which, if adopted, would change existing law in a very salient and material point. Now, for one, I accept the rule laid down by the Committee on Rules of this House. I believe that no provision changing existing law should ever be incorporated in an appropriation bill. Why? Because such amendments, such riders, are always inserted for some purpose which should not find favor with legislators. If you desire to amend the pension laws, bring in, as you will in the future, your amended pension code. Bring in the bills which are now being considered in the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and let us then, if we are allowed to have a voice, fight the objectionable provisions of those bills in the open, in a manly way, as was suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Let me say a word or two about pension legislation. You gentlemen on the other side of the House are naturally cohesive, as you always are. You cling together on every question which is ever brought up for consideration before this House. You cling together in your money views, so that you are afraid to give us a gold bond, although many of you are sound-money men. In reference to pension legislation, we are placed naturally at a great disadvantage. You can not expect gentlemen who come here from the Southern districts, many of whom fought gallantly in the Confederate army, to rise and oppose any pension legislation, however objectionable and wrong in principle such legislation may be. And to some extent on this side of the House a reign of terror has obtained in the past in reference to the discussion of pension legislation. Gentlemen on this side have often feared that if they honestly opposed any objectionable provision of a pension bill they were certain to be misrepresented in their districts and to be attacked for their action. While you all admire physical courage, the courage which showed itself in the last war, you would gladly deprive a man of moral courage enough to stand up and tell his convictions on questions such as these.

Now, gentlemen on the other side of the House, you have no monopoly of patriotism. We on this side believe in the maintenance of the Union in its integrity quite as much as you have ever done, or as you do to-day. I, for one, say that I rejoice in the outcome of the civil war, that I rejoice that the Union was maintained in all its integrity, that I rejoice that the Constitution of 1787 is still a firm bond of union holding our forty-five States together. And I also rejoice that the great incidental benefit of the abolition of human slavery came to us as one of the outcomes of that struggle. And I tell you now once again that not one of you has any greater admiration for the soldier who fought in the Union ranks than I have. But because you believe in the men who fought the battles of the Union, is that any reason why the Treasury of the United States, in times such as these, should be looted, pillaged, and further depleted? For myself, I can say that I truly believe, had I been of years sufficiently mature when the first cannon boomed across the harbor of Charleston on the morning of April 12, 1861, I should have found my place among the enlisted men who took part in the civil war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. On which side?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. On the side of those who fought to maintain the Union—on that side on which I presume the gentleman who has just interrupted me served so gallantly. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. If I did not serve gallantly in the Union Army, I, at least, am not disposed to deny a just recompense to those who did.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I lost that remark.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the true test in pension cases—it no longer obtains in this country—should be whether the injury or wound received or the disease contracted was received or contracted in the service and in the line of duty.

Let us glance for a moment at the pension legislation of the past. Let me call attention to the fact that in 1866 our pension roll amounted to only $13,000,000, and that thereafter it steadily increased until the arrears of pension act of 1879 gave it an enormous additional burden. Let me call attention to the facts that with a Treasury depleted as we have it to-day our pension roll is still enormous; that while it reached the highest mark in 1893—some $158,000,000—still it was last year about $140,000,000; and the burden for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895, was as great as in any previous year, with the exception of two, the greater burden being in 1893, when it amounted to $158,000,000, and in 1892 when it amounted to $141,000,000.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman pardon a suggestion?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I suggest to the gentleman that it is hardly fair to call this appropriation a "burden" on the people, as the money goes back to the people. In that respect it is different from the ordinary charges of the Government.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. The gentleman from Nebraska says that "the money goes back to the people." So, according to that theory, if you tax sixty-five, or sixty-six, or sixty-seven, or seventy million people for the benefit of a few thousand or a few hundred thousand, the taxed masses can not complain, because what is wrung from them goes back to a limited number of their fellow-citizens.

Let me remind you that in other countries where there have been great wars—in Russia, and in Germany, and in France—there are to-day but two classes of claims for pensions; one based on long service in the army, extending over a period of from ten to twenty-five years, and the other based on the fact that the disability was actually incurred in the line of duty.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman allow me at this point a question which goes to the root of the matter?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Yes, if the gentleman will be brief.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Is it not true that in France, Germany, and Russia soldiers are employed regularly and constantly, while in this country our Army was extemporized from the people? Is it not true, also, that in the countries just named, besides the amount paid directly for military service, the loss resulting from taking so many people out of civil employment is very much greater than the amount which we pay here in the way of pensions?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. That is the amount for their standing armies?

Mr. MILLIKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. The amount paid for the standing army of any country in the world is not as great as that which we now pay in this country for pensions.

Mr. MILLIKEN. But the amount of loss of time and loss of services of men taken away from commercial or agricultural pursuits and put in the standing armies amounts to much more than their pay.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. The same rule applies there as elsewhere. In time of war the standing armies of the great European countries are recruited by the introduction of fresh levies, and all of the rules which apply to the compensation of standing armies proper apply to all the additional levies incorporated into them under such circumstances.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a single question as to his contention on this question?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I will allow the gentleman a question.

Mr. BINGHAM. I simply desired to ask the gentleman if his contention now is that Congress, by its pension legislation in the past, has marked that legislation by unwise action, and that the statutes now on the statute books should not be there? Is that the gentleman's contention?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, sir; it is not. I have stated, and will repeat now for the third or fourth time, that my contention is that the pension laws should not be further enlarged; that we should stop where we are, and that we should not go further in extending the provisions of the dependent-pension act of June 27, 1890. Of course you can go to any extent; you can introduce

a bill and pass it to give a pension to every widow in the land, and that would be far more defensible than the amendment which is now under consideration.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman now yield to me for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Well, if my time is not too limited. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, how much time I have?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has thirty-three minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Then I will yield for a question only.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York this question: He states that he is not in favor of extending the pension laws to others than those who contracted disabilities in the service or in the line of duty——

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No; I did not say that.

Mr. HARDY (continuing). Now, does not the gentleman from New York think that a man who left his home and remained with the Army from 1861 to 1865, who went out with the Army, endured all of its marches and privations, fought its battles, slept in the swamps, and returned home after five years of service—although he may not be able to prove by his comrades and commanding officers that he contracted the disability in the line of duty, is any less entitled to a pension than the man who is able to prove that he absolutely did his duty, and contracted the disability from which he suffers? [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I object to any gentleman making a speech in my time. I hope hereafter these attempts at stump speeches, in the form of interrogatories, will be prevented by the Chair. I recognize the fact that it is hard to keep gentlemen from making them—gentlemen who keep on reiterating the same statements.

I say this, sir, that I am in favor of the pension being given, as it is given under the general laws, to all men who contracted disease or received a wound or an injury in the service in the line of duty, and that in reference to these men I would gladly give them, for total disability, double the rates they are now receiving under the law. That is to say, if a man has lost the sight of both of his eyes, or has lost two arms, or two feet, that he should receive double the amount he now receives under the statute. In reference to the statute of 1890, that law is on the statute book, and let it there remain. I am not attacking the pensions granted by that law, but I do attack the amendments, such as those now before us, which have been brought up for consideration to-day; and before I proceed to discuss the amendment in reference to the enlargement of the rule as to widows, let me say a few words in reference to the amendment which was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, who assumed to be so conversant with the views of the Lord on this pension matter. He offers an amendment by which it is proposed to take from the Commissioner of Pensions all power to suspend a pension for any other cause than fraud; and which goes further even than that by inserting a provision that when a pension is suspended for fraud, or rather when it is questioned for fraud, that there shall be no interlocutory power of suspension in the Commissioner, but that it shall be necessary for the Government to do one of two things—either to have an indictment brought in either the United States district or circuit court, or to bring a civil action, to test the validity of the claim, in the same courts.

Now, a provision such as that is absolutely indefensible in principle. I have, with a great deal of pleasure, heard it admitted to-day by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE], that he had no word to say against General Lochren or his administration of the Pension Bureau. And in all this debate, criticise as some of you may the administration of the Pension Bureau, there is not a gentleman upon either side who can lay his hands specifically upon any case of injustice or of unjust treatment by the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No; I can not. It is impossible.

The CHAIRMAN. If any gentleman wishes to interrupt any member entitled to the floor after this, he must rise in his seat and address the Chair.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. We find that until 1890 no such proposition as that which is contained in the law of June 27 had ever found voice or advocacy. We find for the first time in the history of this country this law with a different test, brought forward before the National Legislature. What was the new test? Not that any disease should have been contracted in the service, not that any wounds should have been received upon the battlefield, but that in the process of time, as the years rolled on, when the man who fought for ninety days at any time subsequently should die of any disease, his widow, in every case, provided she was dependent for support on her daily labor, should be pensioned, and that in every case, if a man were incapable of earning his support by manual labor by reason of his mental or physical disability, he should then receive a pension.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, sir. Now, what was done in June, 1890? In the previous January the House of Representatives had passed an act in reference to dependent parents, and the law then passed by the House, that is, the new bill, had removed the necessity of the existence of dependence on the part of parents at the time of the death of the person through whom the claim was made. Then in the Senate bill certain propositions were made, and in the House other amendments were proposed. The House bill, if I mistake not, provided for a general service pension. That proposition found no favor in the Senate, and in conference it was rejected.

When we come to the consideration of the provision as to widows, which is found in the law of 1890, we see that it provides that in the case of any soldier who has died or who shall hereafter die leaving a widow without other means of support than her daily labor, such widow shall, upon due proof of her husband's death, be placed on the pension roll. Under that provision, which found favor in this House, and which was accepted by the Senate of the United States, she was obliged to demonstrate, as a condition precedent, her dependence upon her daily labor for support. Nothing was said in that debate in June, 1890, either in the Senate or in the House of Representatives, as to any proposed enlargement of that rule. It was conceded on both sides that the test of the widow's right to receive the money was to be the fact that she was dependent upon her daily labor for her support. And this I believe is the first time, sir, that it has ever been proposed to enlarge that requirement in the illogical and indefensible way now submitted to this House.

And let me say that under the law of 1890, as it stands, there are now over 91,000 widows pensioned, and that the proposed amendment would enlarge the number by at least 50,000 persons. The lowest estimate that I have heard is 25,000. But I believe that at least 50,000 would be added to the pension roll. Now let me ask you, if we start with the premise that $144 a year is enough for a widow, how can you defend the proposition to give another widow $644 in addition to her house or homestead?

Another objection lies in the peculiar phraseology of this amendment. It is that before she shall be entitled to a pension she shall prove that her net income does not exceed $500 per annum. Now what does that mean? What do the words "net income" import? We can find no solution of that question in other pension acts, in acts in pari materia, because there are no pension laws which contain any provision as to income, or from the language of which we can deduce any explanation of the term "net income." But if you turn to the provisions of the tariff act of 1894 and read section 28, you will find what "net income" means in the last statute referring to income, passed by the Congress of the United States. It means that from the income received by the individual there must first be deducted all the expenses of her profession, occupation, or business; in the second place, all the taxes she pays; and in the third place, all the interest on her existing indebtedness. So it is conceivable that a woman might have a gross income, aside from her house or homestead, of $10,000 a year, and yet under the income-tax act have a "net income" of less than $500. So you are virtually proposing in this amendment to give pensions to people who do not need them, and who are not entitled to the additional money coming from a pension, under any theory of equity or justice.

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has twenty minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I have thus far addressed myself to the consideration of two amendments, one the extraordinary amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois, and which was so indefensible when considered by our committee that it was hurled from the room. That is the proposition to take away from a Department of the Government a power which has existed in that Department and in the Commissioner of Pensions ever since a period anterior to the commencement of this century. You propose to do that while you are powerless to make any charge against the present incumbent of that office, whom I know to be a man of great ability, of the highest integrity of character, and a man who is in no degree adverse to the interests of the Union soldier or the pensioner; and before I conclude my remarks I shall call the attention of members of this House to two decisions of the Department of the Interior which show that there is every disposition on the part of every officer of this Administration to give the Union soldier his just rights.

And I say right here that in legislation such as that you now propose there can be but one of two objects. The first object is to capture the soldier vote. The first object is to deceive the soldier voters of this country, and to say that because Democrats do not believe in the introduction or inauguration of a carnival of pillage on the national Treasury they are, forsooth, for that

reason, opposed to the interests of the Union soldier. It is, in other words, gentlemen, an argument to be used upon the stump; but I tell you that you can not deceive the American people any longer; and I tell you that I do not believe that any proposition to enlarge the pension roll finds favor with the conservative leaders of your party. Of course you can not all be controlled; you can not all be held back; and where you have a large number of soldier votes in your State you may rush forward with amendments and bills for purposes of future use upon the stump. That is the first reason for offering amendments such as this. That is the first reason for the introduction of the bill by my gallant friend from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER], to whose eloquent remarks in reference to Union soldiers in the Army I have often listened with so much pleasure, and who the other day, in an argument on the question of having obituaries of members of this House discontinued, could not forbear the opportunity to make an allusion to the burial of a soldier in the Army in the time of the civil war.

The bill introduced by the gallant captain of the Third Iowa Cavalry is, if I mistake not, the same in substance as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. In other words, Commissioner Lochren does not decide every pension case in favor of the pensioner. It was argued that no proof of marriage should be necessary in a pension case; that is, that the law of evidence which obtains with reference to any claim involving property should be abrogated. I suppose, according to that theory, it ought to be necessary only for a woman to come forward and say, "I am the widow of John Smith," and that then the court, though she produce no record of her marriage anywhere in the world, should hold her claim proven merely because she alleges that she was the wife of a man who fought in the war.

Now, is that a sound view of law? Is that common sense, to inveigh against the pension laws because the ordinary rules of evidence which make it necessary to prove the initial facts which give jurisdiction are enforced by the Commissioner of Pensions?

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Not now; later. I do not now believe that even on your side of the House, when your calmer judgment comes to consider this question, you will be in favor of any measure of law designed to take from an officer acting under the Secretary of the Interior and under the President of the United States the power of either admitting or rejecting pensions. You can not logically give him the power to grant a pension certificate if you deprive him of the power to reject.

Let me say one word about the practical failure of the operation of any such amendment. You say that it must be necessary to indict a man. Well, we had a case in the State of New York of one pension agent who filed 8,831 fraudulent claims, which was tried, if I mistake not, in the city of my distinguished friend, the member from New York [Mr. DANIELS], and in the case of this man, W. Bowen Moore, it was shown that the physicians who signed the examination papers never took the trouble to see the claimants. It was shown that the people who signed the claims and petitions never appeared before the notaries, and all the various steps of the proving of the claims, or alleged proving of the claims, were tainted with fraud; and yet, in spite of the evidence, it took two or three years of prosecution, until several indictments had been quashed, before this man was finally convicted and sentenced to a term of eighteen months in the penitentiary. So I tell you that that case shows how difficult it would be to try these cases in a period shorter than one covered by ten or twenty years. That is, it would be impossible to try all the actions which might arise under any such system of procedure.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Will the gentleman allow me call his attention to the fact that that was the case of a pension agent or attorney, and not the case of a pensioner, and therefore this amendment would not have any application to it?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. It was the case of a pension attorney; but the length of time which was required to convict that man shows how difficult it would be for the courts within any reasonable period of time to pass upon the heavy calendar of these cases which would arise.

Let me indicate one further objection to the amendment, because it applies to a bill which will be subsequently before this House, the bill introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] taking away all power to suspend the pension in any case for collusion or illegality, and confining the power of suspension to cases where fraud exists. Now, fraud is not collusion, nor does the word "fraud" apply to any case where the illegality is patent upon the face of the papers. There are many cases to which existing provisions of law apply where there is no question of fraud, but where some disability depriving the claimant of the right to a pension has arisen since the granting of the original pension, yet in reference to all such cases—for instance, cases of remarriage or any case of disability of that nature arising subsequent to the granting of the pension—it is proposed to take away from the Commissioner the power to suspend.

As to the first amendment to this bill, the one which provides that in the case of a second application where it is shown by the evidence that the disability existed at the time of the first application, the pension shall be allowed to date back to the time of the original application, I shall raise no point of order, because I believe that it does not change existing law. It does not change the ruling made by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, the Hon. John M. Reynolds. I call the attention of this committee to the ruling of Mr. Reynolds in the case of Mr. Charles J. Bryant, on December 20, 1894, and I say that that case demonstrates in the clearest and most convincing manner the disposition on the part of this Administration to do full justice to Union soldiers claiming pensions. What is the rule laid down by Mr. Reynolds? It is, in the first place, that where it was difficult for the petitioner or claimant to understand the character or symptoms of the disease or disability under which he suffered, and where, pathologically considered or from the standpoint of the symptoms, the disease was liable to be mistaken for another—that in such cases, if the actual disease is shown to have existed at the time of the filing of the original application, the pension should date back to that time.

In that particular case the man, although suffering from locomotor ataxia, supposed that he was suffering from rheumatism, and the decision was that the pension should be made to commence from the date of filing the original application, it being shown to the Commissioner that the disability existed in point of fact at the time when the first application was made. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior went one step farther. He said that even in cases where the diseases are not similar in any way, and where the mistake on the part of the claimant or petitioner is not capable of explanation, still, even in such cases, when in point of fact another disability existed at the time of the filing of the original application, the grant of the pension, under the second application, may date back to the time of the original filing. Gentlemen, do you want any greater justice than that? Is not that all you can ask? Is it not all you do ask for in this first amendment? Therefore, I say this amendment does not change existing law because it is merely a reaffirmation of the pension law as construed by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior on the 20th day of December, 1894. For that reason I shall make no point of order against the first amendment.

I believe that in the course of some remarks made by one of the gentlemen on the other side who addressed the committee in defense of these amendments—if I mistake not it was the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE—some reference was made to the Raum decision—that is, to the order which was subsequently revoked, Order No. 164.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Let me say a few words in defense of the Department in revoking that order. What was the order made by Mr. Raum? It must be remembered that we have in our pension laws two great divisions or subdivisions. We have, first, those claimants to whom pensions are granted because the injury was received or the disease contracted while in the service and in the line of duty. The provisions of our pension laws in reference to that class of cases have my hearty approval and support. Then, apart from cases special in their nature, we have the second class of cases, where the granting of a pension depends on the provisions of the act of June 27, 1890.

What is the test in those cases? The test is incapacity to labor, incapacity to such an extent as to make the applicant unable to earn a support by manual labor. That is, there is a double test. In the first class of cases it is enough that the man shall have received the injury or shall have contracted the disease in the line of duty in the service. In the second class of cases there must be a disability and that disability must incapacitate the applicant from the performance of manual labor and must exist to such an extent as to render him unable to support himself. Now, what was order 164, made by Commissioner Raum? It was that in reference to all cases arising under the act of June 27, 1890, the same rule as to disability should apply as that which had been in force under the general pension law.

A case arose in this way: A man who was a private in an Indiana regiment and who served, I believe, from September, 1864, until June of the following year, alleged that he had incurred a disability in the line of duty in the service, owing to a sunstroke, for which he was entitled to a pension. He did not discover that he had incurred this disability until July, 1886, many years after the close of the war. That disability was a loss of hearing, and he claimed that he had incurred it in the war. The evidence against him was conclusive; that is, he was unable to prove that he had sustained any injury or contracted any disease in the war. The only disability found was a slight deafness in both ears, but he failed to show that he had been injured in any way during the war. He then filed an application under the act of 1890, and, according to the ruling of Mr. Raum, it was not necessary for the claimant to show that he was incapacitated for the performance of manual labor.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I ask for some additional time.
Mr. CRISP. I hope the gentleman's time will be extended.
Mr. PICKLER. How much time does the gentleman want?
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. About fifteen minutes.
Mr. PICKLER. I hope that extension will be granted.
Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I want to give notice that as soon as the gentleman from New York has concluded his remarks I will move that the committee rise. I hope he will have unanimous consent to conclude.
There was no objection.
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. This order of Commissioner Raum, issued in October, 1890, purported on its face and by its caption to fix the rate of pensions under the so-called dependent pension act of June 27, 1890. It provided, in substance, that cases showing disabilities under the act of June 27, 1890, should be rated the same as like disabilities of service origin.
The practical operation of that order was that a man claiming under the act of 1890 was not obliged to show that he was disabled to such a degree as to be unable to support himself. In practice Commissioner Raum neglected to take into consideration the ability of the applicant to perform manual labor.
This case of Charles T. Bennett came before the Department of the Interior May 27, 1893. When the original claim was filed under the general law, the evidence showed that Bennett had not been in any way disabled or injured in the war. When he filed his claim under the act of June 27, 1890, the evidence showed—what? That he had a slight deafness in both ears. Now, under the act of 1890, what was he obliged to show? That he was suffering from a mental or physical disability—of what kind? Of a permanent character. And to what extent? One that incapacitated him for the performance of manual labor. That was a condition precedent; he must be unable to perform manual labor. And to what extent must that incapacity exist? To such an extent that he can not earn a support; in the language of the act, "in such a degree as to render them unable to earn a support."
Now, this man Bennett showed what? That he was deaf in both ears, although he could hear the ticking of a watch when placed within half an inch of either ear. On that condition of facts, he not having received any wound or injury, and not having contracted disease in the line of duty while in the service, and failing in his application under the general law, he claims that he is entitled to a pension under the act of 1890, and that because he has a slight deafness of both ears he is incapacitated for manual labor to such an extent as to be unable to earn a support.
So it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the only just course which could possibly have been adopted by the Commissioner of Pensions or the Secretary of the Interior was to revoke at once that order of Commissioner Raum which has led to so much misunderstanding and to so many untenable applications—whether the number of claims thrown out, whether the number of petitions properly rejected amounted to 100,000 or not. In the very nature of things where we have laws dependent on papers, too often improperly or improvidently executed—where we have all the decisions made upon ex parte applications, where we have almost every avenue of fraud or illegality open, it would seem sometimes by design, there is no reason why all the claims improperly filed should not be rejected, whether they amount to one thousand or two thousand or a hundred thousand. In other words, the number of claims rejected, if the claims be improper and fraudulent, matters not; because I think on both sides of the House no argument will be urged in favor of a fraudulent or dishonest pension. The only thing we differ about is whether the doors should be opened wide or not and whether or not the ordinary rules of evidence by which fallible human testimony is tested shall be used in respect to pension claims or shall be abrogated entirely.
Mr. STEELE. Does not the gentleman know that the ordinary rules of evidence do not apply in these cases?
Mr. BRUMM. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT], whose time has been extended indefinitely, allow me a question in the nature of an inquiry for information?
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I will, provided it be brief.
Mr. BRUMM. It seems that the burden of the gentleman's position rests upon the fact that he believes, as he has stated, that the criterion for granting pensions should be the disability incurred in the service. Am I correct in that?
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I have not said that; I have not said it, although attempts have been made to make it appear that I have done so.
Mr. BRUMM. Do you mean that it is not a criterion—disability incurred in the service or the line of duty?
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I say this, in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the general criterion which has found favor among the civilized nations all over the world is that the injury should have been received or the disease contracted in the service and in the line of duty. But that includes all the cases where, for instance, seven or eight hundred pensions are being drawn in a regiment which never left the limits of its own State because it was doing garrison duty in guarding prisoners in the State of Ohio or Illinois. The regiment was just as much in the service, or in the line of duty, as if it were on the battlefield, and there are thousands of pensions being paid in this country to men who never heard the report of a cannon or a musket shot.
Mr. BRUMM. That is an entirely different question. Is the gentleman not in favor of treating all the soldiers of this Government who served in the wars alike?
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. In what wars?
Mr. BRUMM. All of the wars; the Revolutionary war, the war of 1812, the Indian wars, the Mexican war, and the war for the suppression of the rebellion.
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I heard a very interesting conversation between my friend from Georgia [Mr. MOSES] and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE], in which they endeavored to arrive at an equitable adjustment between the widows of the several wars, that is, between the widows of the soldiers of the civil war and some other war. Now, I am not in favor of any distinction in this regard. I believe that the widows of the soldiers of all of our wars should be treated exactly alike and placed upon an equality; but I do not think if there has been a wrong in one instance that two wrongs can possibly make a right. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that putting the widows of the soldiers of the civil war upon the pension list, unless their financial necessities require it, is either just or proper. I do not believe in paying them what they do not need, that is, in paying pensions to those who have an income—a net income of $500. I do not believe it would be just to all the other people in the country, and for that reason I oppose it.
Mr. BRUMM. Do I understand the gentleman to refuse to answer my question?
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Well, sometime when I have two or three hours at my disposal, I will endeavor to look into the matter and answer the gentleman's questions? [Laughter.]
Mr. BRUMM. I simply wanted to know whether you think that all the soldiers who have fought for our Government should be treated alike in reference to pensions? It is a very plain and a very simple question.
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Well, I do not know——
Mr. MOSES. Will the gentleman allow me——
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I would like to enjoy the floor, Mr. Chairman, for a few moments myself. [Laughter.] I have given a very large part of my time to the various members, and I have not been able to make any connected remarks, or to continue very long, without interruption.
The gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has just interrupted me, I presume has looked up some statute bearing upon the subject. I suppose he has been delving back into some of the old statutes——
Mr. BRUMM. No, I do not delve backward; I delve forward. I am a Republican. [Laughter and applause.]
Mr. BARTLETT of New York (continuing). Or has found some vote, or some provision in favor of the point he is trying to make, on which he desires to commit me without examination. Now, I decline to be trapped in this manner until I have had an opportunity of examining the various pension laws. I have done that to some extent already, but shall do so further hereafter, when I have more time.
Mr. BRUMM. I simply suggest that inasmuch as the Mexican soldiers are considered to be entitled to their pensions——
The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, sir; I decline to yield the floor. The gentleman who has just addressed the House in reference to the Mexican war I presume has discovered some occult point on which he wishes light. However, I will hear the gentleman's question. What is the point?
Mr. BRUMM. I have asked a very simple question. Do you believe that all the soldiers of this Government, in all the wars, should be treated alike in our pension laws? The soldiers who have fought for our Government, I mean; not those who fought against it.
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Well, I do not know. There may be varying circumstances. If you give one man wrongfully $10, I do not see anything to justify you in giving another wrongfully $10. Two wrongs certainly do not make a right.
Mr. BRUMM. Well, which is right or wrong? Have you done justice to the Mexican soldiers in this case or have you done injustice to the Union soldiers in regard to the matter of pensions? It is a very simple and a plain question, and the gentleman can answer it without any difficulty or delay.
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. The gentleman seems to imagine that all the legislative power in this Union has been vested in me.
Mr. BRUMM. Oh, no; not that; but the gentleman certainly can answer a plain and simple question.
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I am not accountable for past legislation on this subject. If it was wrong, it is no reason why

we should do wrong now. The time has come when it is proper for us to do what is right and just to our people. I do not care anything about the status of the Mexican soldiers. It is not a question for us at this time. I propose to discuss the question which is now before the House, if I can be allowed to continue my remarks for even a very few minutes without interruption.

There is one question to which I desire to draw the attention of the House, and which will be interesting to all of you who are lawyers. There seems to be a great fear of stating what a pension is. It is termed a vested right; and you went so far, in the urgent deficiency act of 1893, as to declare that it is a vested right, apparently ignorant that it was beyond the power of Congress to make a pension different from what it is in nature.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I thought the understanding was I was to finish.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. My request was that the gentleman be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] will be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I shall endeavor to conclude my remarks within a very few minutes, provided I am not interrupted more than a dozen times. Whenever it is intimated that a pension is what it is in reality, that it is a bounty or a donation from the Government, great horror is expressed. They say on the one hand that it is a vested right, and on the other that it is a contract. What I conceive it to be is, that when there has been any disease or wound or injury in the service, in the line of duty, in such case there does arise a moral obligation and an ethical duty; but it is not a contract in a legal sense, nor is it in any sense a vested right.

Mr. STEELE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. What is the question? I will yield provided it be a query and not a stump speech.

Mr. STEELE. It is a query. Take two soldiers starting into the service to-day——

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Take them where?

Mr. STEELE. One of them is wounded in the first battle in which he is engaged. The other fights in twenty battles, and at the end of his term of service he is discharged and goes to work to earn his living. Suppose, then, he falls on a saw and loses a limb. He has been in nineteen battles more than the other man. My question is, would you give a pension to one and deny a pension to the other?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is in substance the same question that I asked the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I have stated a number of times that in the case of a man receiving a wound or injury in the civil war, whether he fought in one battle or a hundred battles, I would gladly pension him. I think he is entitled to a pension; and if he loses his vision entirely or loses both arms or both feet, I would double the pension given him under existing law.

Mr. STEELE. But how about the man who was in twenty battles?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. In the case of a man who contracted a disease in the service, I should pension him, even though he never left the State of Ohio or Illinois, but had passed the whole of his time at some camp of instruction.

Mr. STEELE. My question is, if a man who has been engaged in twenty battles, who is poor and is engaged in manual labor, meets with an accident by which he loses both arms, he having been in twenty battles and having been a good soldier, would you deny a pension to that man?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. The dependent pension act, so called, of June, 1890, is not up now for passage.

Mr. STEELE. I know; but I want the gentleman's opinion. The gentleman says he would favor giving a pension to a soldier who contracted his disability in the service. I am only asking him whether he would not give it to a soldier who was in twenty battles in the war, but who was injured afterwards?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I do not know any soldier who could have been in twenty battles within ninety days.

Mr. STEELE. I am not talking about ninety days. We will say he served five years.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Ninety days is the limit of the act of June, 1890.

Mr. STEELE. I am not talking about the act or 1890, or any other act. I want to know whether you would deny a pension to the man I have described?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. If he was in twenty battles, I would give him a pension. Produce your man who was in twenty battles, and I will vote for a pension for him at any time.

Mr. BINGHAM. If it does not divert the gentleman from his argument, I should like to ask him a question for information. The gentleman has stated that some estimates base the number of those who would be added to the roll by this proposed amendment in reference to widows at 25,000, and the gentleman states his judgment to be that if this amendment is adopted 50,000 names will be added to the pension rolls. I should like to ask the gentleman where he gets that information. In the Commissioner's report I find that the widows' claims rejected under the act of 1890 numbered but 17,000, and the abandoned claims amounted to but 6,000. That is the sum total under the operation of that law of rejection and abandonment of widows' claims. I wish the gentleman to give the information on which he bases the estimate which he has stated.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I have conferred with some of the gentlemen most familiar with the statistics of pensions, and the result of their estimate was that probably there would be an increase of at least 25,000; that is, that about that number would be included in the addition.

Of course, all such estimates would be matters of conjecture and guesswork. It is impossible to arrive at a correct estimate. But on reflection you will see that the class of widows to be benefited must be enormous. You take any widow who spends the greater part of her income, either in the conduct of her business in running a little store, or any other business, who pays out several thousands or even a thousand dollars in the way of taxes, or who happens to be indebted by way of a loan and who is paying interest on such loan, with all those exemptions included and embraced within the term "net income," it must necessarily let in a very large class of widows. It is estimated that 25,000 would be let in were the limit $500 income, and the words "$500 net income" would let in 20,000 or 25,000 widows more.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am unable to imagine any logical reason which can be brought forward in support of this proposition to give those ladies who are amply provided for a pension. After careful reflection, in 1890, when this matter was considered, and ably considered, in both Houses, the test put in by the Republican majority of this House and accepted by the Senate was dependence—that is, the widow was required to be dependent upon her daily labor for support—and yet, when six years have elapsed, you propose to come in and enlarge the whole scope of that act. It would not be just to the widow who to-day receives $144 a year. Why give her more affluent sisters the same pension which you allow to the woman who needs the money?

Under no logical theory can that proposition be defended. The train of my thought was interrupted a few moments ago when I was treating of the real nature of a pension. I say that a pension is no vested right. I say that a pension is not a contract, and I cite in favor of my position the rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States commencing in that case reported in the 19 Howard, where the decision was rendered by Judge McLean as far back as 1856, and where the pension involved was a Revolutionary pension received under the law of 1832. That is the first case I find on this point, and Judge McLean then said:

> The pension is undoubtedly a bounty of the Government, and in the hands of an administrator of a deceased pensioner it would not be liable to the claims of creditors had the acts of Congress omitted such a provision. * * * There can be no doubt that Congress had a right to distribute this bounty at their pleasure, and to declare it should not be liable to the debts of the beneficiaries.

This ruling was followed and sustained later, and the whole question of the power of Congress over pensions was considered in the case reported in the ninety-eighth volume of United States Reports, the case of the United States against Hall, where the opinion, if I mistake not, was rendered by Mr. Justice Clifford. He says:

> Concede that—

That is the proposition that the control of Congress over pensions arose from the general power to declare war and to maintain the Army and Navy; that is, that it was a derivative power received under the general provision of the Federal Constitution. He says:

> Concede that, and it follows that Congress may grant such donations to the officers, soldiers, and seamen employed in such public service.

Thus these great judges of the Supreme Court of the United States had no scruple or hesitation in calling attention to what a pension is—that it is a bounty or donation depending upon the Government.

Mr. PITNEY. Will the gentleman answer this question? Is not the citation given contrary to the contention of the gentleman? Does it not go on the supposition that the pension is in payment for services previously rendered and on the supposition that there was a contract that the services should be compensated in that way?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, sir; there would seem to be nowhere such a view of the law as that a pension is a contract. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that

Congress had the power to give or withhold any pension, and that there is no limit upon that power in reference to disposing of it. Now let me look a little later. We find in volume 107, United States Reports, in October, 1882, the following language used by Mr. Justice Woods in reference to a pension, and I believe that was in the case of the United States against Teller, Mr. Henry M. Teller, who was at one time Secretary of the Interior. That is a case where the question was raised as to whether Gen. Ward B. Burnett could draw a pension under a special act and a pension under the general law concurrently, and this is the language used as to whether a pensioner has a vested legal right to a pension.

No pensioner has a vested legal right to his pension.
Pensions are the bounties of the Government, which Congress has the right to give, withhold, distribute, or recall at its discretion.

Then we come to 1894, and in the one hundred and fifty-seventh volume of the United States Reports you will find an opinion by Mr. Justice Brewer, concurred in by all the members of that great court, in which this very pension act, the dependent pension act, so called, of 1890, was under consideration. There we find the same rule again reiterated and the court, after citing the case in 19 Howard, decided in 1856, and the case of United States *vs.* Teller, said:

The pension granted by the Government is a matter of bounty. No man has a legal right to a pension, and no man has a legal right to interfere in the matter of obtaining pensions for himself or others.

I have spoken on this question of law, Mr. Chairman, because when we are considering legal and constitutional questions I can not understand why we should be prevented by some feeling of quasi cowardice from calling a pension what it really is, whether we are in favor or not of the provisions of any particular pension law. A pension is a bounty dependent upon the Government; but, on the other hand I concede that where there has been a wound or injury sustained in the service, or where there has been disease contracted, a duty is imposed upon the Government of the United States, a moral obligation to pay the applicant, the soldier so wounded or injured, a sum adequate to supply his needs during the remainder of his life.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Yes, sir.

Mr. PICKLER. Notwithstanding those decisions, will not the gentleman concede that it ought to count for something that in the war of the rebellion, when these Union soldiers were being enlisted, the Government held out the promise that if they were wounded in battle a pension should be given them, and if they were killed their wives and families would be taken care of? Every recruiting officer in the country was telling every soldier who enlisted that such was the intention of the Government. Now, does the gentleman count that for nothing? Was not that a part of the contract?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, the remarks which I have made upon this question of law have been addressed rather to the use of language than to the substance of the question. They have been made in criticism of calling something a contract which is not a contract, of calling that a vested right which is not a vested right. There are many things which are binding upon us in ethics which are not binding upon us in strict law. I concede that a duty is imposed, that a moral obligation does rest upon the Government to make provision for its wounded or disabled soldiers. I admit that, and I admit that the moral or ethical obligation is just as binding as though the enforcement of a strict legal contract were in question, only I have no patience with the improper use of language by lawyers, and I think we should follow the rulings of the highest court of the United States when we speak of "vested rights" or "contracts."

Mr. PICKLER. I would ask the gentleman if it was not a Democratic House which, in the first session of the Fifty-third Congress, declared a pension a vested right?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. That matters not. Of course a declaration that something is a vested right which is not a vested right is merely brutum fulmen. It is of no legal force to term that a "vested right" which is not in its nature a vested right, and it has been so held. The only change that was made by the requirement contained in the urgent deficiency act of 1893 was that it required thirty days' notice by the Commissioner. I think that was a very proper provision, and the only question in reference to it was as to the manner of its passage. It should have been brought up squarely and honestly as a part of our pension legislation, and should not have been slipped into an urgency deficiency bill. Aside from the question of the time, mode, and manner of its adoption, I do not find any objection to that provision of law, for I think it is proper that notice should be given by the Commissioner.

In so far as the moral aspect of this question is concerned, I concede to the gentleman from South Dakota that a moral obligation is imposed on the Government where a man has been wounded or injured in the discharge of his duty. The act of July 27, 1890, provides for granting a pension although the man has not been injured and although he has not contracted disease in the service. Since it pleased the Congress of the United States to put such a pension law upon the statute book, I shall not, as I have explicitly stated several times to-day, raise any question as to the validity or wisdom of that legislation, and in what I have said so far on that subject I have spoken against any unnecessary enlargement of the provisions of that law.

We have a depleted Treasury. We have a Treasury as to which it must be admitted that the existing conditions are not promising. We have a gold reserve which is running down day after day and being steadily depleted. In view of the existing condition of the Treasury of the United States, in consideration of the fact that immense appropriations will be required for public purposes during the fiscal year, realizing that it is our duty as patriots to provide adequately for proper coast defenses and for our system of fortifications, whether we are to have war with any foreign power or not, and in view of the many urgent calls which the Treasury of the United States will be called upon to meet, all unnecessary and indefensible enlargement of existing pension laws should find no favor either upon this side of the House or upon the other side, which is almost omnipotent in its numerical strength.

Mr. NORTHWAY. The gentleman forgets that we have a "surplus" of seventy-seven millions. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. So I hope gentlemen on the Republican side will go slow in the advocacy of any such proposition as this, which will open wider the Treasury of the United States, and will prepare the way for numberless attacks upon it to which it is not liable under existing law.

I say in conclusion, let the existing pension laws stand if you will——

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman allow me a question on the legal aspect of this matter?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Yes, sir.

Mr. PICKLER. Why did not Mr. Commissioner Lochren take the advice which the gentleman now gives us about letting the laws remain? Commissioner Raum, the Commissioner in office during the Fifty-first Congress, which passed the act of June 27, 1890, gave that act a construction which conformed to the intention of the legislators who passed it. Now, why did not Commissioner Lochren, having no greater authority than his predecessor, and no greater light—why did this judge, with simply the same jurisdiction as his predecessor, undertake to reverse the decision of that predecessor? Why did not Commissioner Lochren allow the same force to the pension law of 1890 that had been given to it by the preceding Commissioner?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. The answer to that question is this: The decision of Commissioner Raum was absolutely wrong——

Mr. PICKLER. Who says so? Nobody but Commissioner Lochren.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. It was so held by the Secretary of the Interior and by the Attorney-General.

Mr. PICKLER. It was so held only by officers of the present Administration.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I do not believe that any lawyer who will make a careful examination of that question from a judicial standpoint will uphold the decision of Commissioner Raum. That decision was to the effect that when a pension application was made under the dependent-pension act of June 27, 1890, it should not be incumbent on the applicant to show that he was incapacitated for earning his support by manual labor.

Mr. PICKLER. But when a man has had a rating for some disability under the general law and has been allowed, for example, a pension of $4 a month for that disability, is there any good reason why he should not have the same rating under the act of June 27, 1890, until the maximum of $12 a month is reached? If he has been allowed $4 a month or $6 a month, for instance, under the general law, what reason is there in law or common sense why the disability should not be rated in the same way under the act of June 27, 1890, until the maximum of $12 a month is reached?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I can not answer all these conundrums of gentlemen who advocate this bill.

Mr. PICKLER. That is the "milk in the cocoanut" on this question.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I will state, however, that the ruling of Commissioner Raum is, in my judgment, absolutely indefensible. I do not believe the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] can make any argument in support of it. It can not be sustained from any legal or equitable standpoint. Commissioner Raum ruled, as I have already stated, that it is unnecessary for an applicant under the law of 1890 to show the existence of those conditions which are absolutely conditions precedent to the granting of the pension. In other words, Commissioner Raum held that a man might be granted a pension without showing that he was incapacitated to the extent of being unable to earn his support.

Mr. PICKLER. How can you better judge of the incapacity than by the rating which has been made under the general law?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I must decline to yield further.

In conclusion, let me say, it has always been held by the Supreme Court of the United States that the whole matter of pension legislation is in the hands of Congress, which may adopt such laws on the subject as it may see fit. Still this power would seem to be limited to the right to grant pensions where such pensions are necessary. I do not believe there can be found anywhere any decision holding that a pension should be granted where it clearly appears that it is unnecessary to grant such pension. That is the exact condition in which we find ourselves to-day. It is proposed to grant pensions to soldiers' widows who have $500 net income, amounting, as I have shown, in probably every instance, to giving a pension to women who have several thousand dollars over and above the $500 net income. It is proposed that we grant pensions to this class of women, while it appears on the very face of the proposition that they do not need the money we are asked to appropriate.

I do not believe it can be right, so many years after the end of the civil war, no matter how much sympathy we may feel for those women who were wedded to soldiers now dead—no matter how much sympathy we may feel for any widow who is in want—I do not believe the proposition can be defended that, with no paramount necessity, we should deliberately vote money not needed, in times of dire distress such as those with which we are confronted to-day. I do not believe the American people will be in favor of any such proposition. I do not believe they will favor any further extension of existing pension legislation.

I do not believe that the American people will favor unnecessary taxation of thousands and hundreds of thousands of our citizens for the benefit of a certain privileged class in our country who do not need the appropriation of one dollar of the money. I do not believe that this is the proper exercise of the power of taxation, whether it be a constitutional exercise or not. I think we should give our money to the soldiers who need it. I think we should give our money to the men who fought and the men who lost arms and legs or eyesight in the civil war, or who incurred disease or contracted disability in any way. And if we go a step further and favor those who fought for ninety days, but who incurred no disability in the war, and give them an appropriation and pay the money under the act of 1890, I say let that be the extremity to which we shall go.

I, Mr. Chairman, for one, honor and admire the loyalty and patriotism of the men who fought in the Union Army throughout that dire period which lasted from the breaking out of the civil war in 1861 until the surrender at Appomattox in 1865. There is no man on this side of the House who admires the men who fought during that period on the Union side more than I do. I for one admire and honor the valor and courage of the men who fought during that period on either side—that is, I admire the valor and courage of the men who fought under the Union flag, and the valor and courage of the men who fought on the other side, because I always admire courage and valor wherever I find them.

But let me, in conclusion, say to you, let us stop where we are. Let us not appropriate any more money, but let us pay these men who are entitled under existing statutes—that is, the men who are entitled under the provisions of the general pension law which is found in the Revised Statutes, the men who earned pensions by reason of wounds or injury in the line of duty in the service—and let us pay those who are entitled to pensions under the pension act of June 27, 1890, and let us then pass the present bill, containing $140,000,000, and then stop and avoid the throwing of any more unnecessary money into a bottomless pit. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I have been prevailed upon to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. WILLIS], after which I shall move that the committee rise.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, there is a patriotism of policy, a patriotism of duty, and a patriotism of sentiment. In dealing with this subject of our veterans, our brave soldiers who stood in the breach in the day of our country's peril, we need them all—policy and duty and sentiment. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] who has just concluded his remarks declares, in this presence, that there is no one here who admires more those veterans who fought the battles of this country and stood in the hour of danger in the front than himself, I am inclined to join issue with him. [Applause.] As I understand the plain purport and effect of the amendment to which the gentleman objects, and to which he addresses his remarks, it is simply this: To make it more difficult to take away one of these men's pensions—a four, six, or eight dollar pension—than it has been heretofore. Is that right? [Applause.]

Several MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Will the gentleman allow a single interruption?

Mr. WILLIS. Excuse me. I can not answer questions or permit interruptions in five minutes. Give me a half hour and I will be very glad to engage in a colloquy on this floor with the gentleman as long as he chooses upon this subject. But now I have not the time.

I say, is it not right to make difficult the taking away of the pensions of these men? Is it not right to make it difficult to hang a person or imprison a man charged with crime? Does not the gentleman, himself a lawyer, give voice before jury and court to the old sentiment—has he not quoted it a thousand times over—that it is better to let go ninety-nine guilty men than to condemn one innocent man? And the same principle that will apply to a criminal in a court of law ought to apply to these men who get seventy-five or eighty or a hundred dollars a year.

The gentleman says that this is not a vested right—this right of pensions. I say to him if it is not it ought to be [applause], and the first thing that will be becoming in the gentleman to-day is to devote his time to making it a vested right. He can not be engaged in a more patriotic duty, or one that will accomplish a juster or a grander result. It would be one of the beautiful paragraphs of his life, that would stand as an encomium of his patriotism, and a testimony to his manhood long after he was dead and in his grave. It is a vested right. He admits that it is a moral right, and what is a vested right except a moral right incorporated into law? And if it is not incorporated into law it is time it should be.

Suppose, for instance, by way of illustration, that there is a derelict on the ocean, and a brave sailor with his crew saves this dismasted, abandoned vessel and bring her into port. What is done? Why, they give him at least half of her valuation and probably he gets all.

That is just the relation that these men sustained to this grand old ship of state when she was in the trough of the sea. Every timber in her was wrenched, and everybody aboard of her was in alarm.

These brethren of ours from the South went whoring after strange gods. The gods made them mad. In the hour of their anger they tried to pull down the house over their own heads and over our heads. These brave men came to the front and stood in the breach and saved the country. To whom does the country belong, sir? Who has a better right to it? It is a case of salvage without comparison in history. [Applause.]

If the gentleman wants precedents and exemplars that he may safely follow with regard to these matters, let him follow that brave old hero whom I saw upon the floor a few minutes ago, Gen. Daniel E. Sickles. [Applause.] Let the gentleman get his inspiration from him, and he will safely follow the light in a brave man's hands.

No, sir; you may traduce these pension laws and the men who receive these pensions. You may suffer these heroes to be buried in the potter's field. You may subject them to the narrowest and most stringent circumstances of financial and of social life, and they may go down at last in shame and poverty, amid the regrets of those around them, but—

> On fame's eternal camping ground
> Their silent tents are spread,
> And glory guards, with solemn round,
> The bivouac of the dead.

[Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WILLIS, for five days, on account of important business.

To Mr. LAWSON, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. SHAW, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BRUMM, for six days, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the engineer officer formerly in charge of the Washington Aqueduct, inviting attention to the fact that certain plans encroach upon the Government land, and inclosing certain plans, correspondence, and recommendations—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. FLYNN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2769) to authorize the leasing of lands for educational purposes in Arizona, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 30); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HULING (by request): A bill (H. R. 3808) to amend the act of March 2, 1893, relative to highways of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3809) to prevent the reduction or discontinuance of pensions without first giving notice to the pensioner of such intended reduction or discontinuance and allowing testimony to be submitted in defense thereof, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 3810) to provide for the construction of a bridge across the Detroit River at the city of Detroit, in the State of Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 3811) fixing salaries for the clerks of the United States circuit and district courts for the district of Minnesota—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 3812) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMICK: A bill (H. R. 3813) authorizing the establishment of a free port at Fort Pond Bay or elsewhere in the waters of Long Island, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON (by request): A bill (H. R. 3814) to finally adjust the swamp-land grants, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 3815) for the improvement of the harbor at La Crosse, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 3816) providing for the adjustment of accounts of laborers, workmen, and mechanics arising under the eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3817) concerning the rank and pay of certain officers of the Navy having served a full term as chief of a bureau in the Navy Department—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 3818) fixing salaries for the clerks of the United States circuit and district courts for the district of Minnesota—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 3819) to repeal section 2 of the act of May 14, 1880, relating to contested land cases—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3820) to discontinue issuance of certificates for deposits of gold coin—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 3821) to restore homestead rights—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 3822) to abolish the office of Solicitor of Internal Revenue, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. WALKER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3823) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reexamine and resettle the accounts of certain States and the city of Baltimore growing out of moneys expended by said States and the city of Baltimore for military purposes during the war of 1812—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A bill (H. R. 3824) to provide coast defenses for the sea and lake ports of the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SAUERHERING: A bill (H. R. 3825) for the erection of a public building at Watertown, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SCRANTON: A bill (H. R. 3826) providing for the election of a Delegate from the District of Alaska to the House of Representatives of the United States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3827) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 3828) to appropriate $4,000,000 to continue the improvement of the Missouri River from its mouth to the south line of Sioux City, Iowa—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 3829) to provide for the location and purchase of public lands for reservoir sites, and granting right of way for water ditches and irrigating canals over public lands in the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona and the States of Montana, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyomng, Utah, and Colorado—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3830) to aid the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, and South Dakota to support schools of mines—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 3831) to incorporate the Lake Erie and Ohio River Ship Canal Company, and defining the powers thereof, and to establish the canals and works herein authorized as military post-roads—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3832) to amend section 1225 of the Revised Statutes so as to provide for the detail of officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military instruction in the State normal schools and in the public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 3833) to provide for the summary hearing of certain cases in the Supreme Court of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLER: A bill (H. R. 3834) providing for the erection of an addition to the United States public building at Canton, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 3835) to amend section 11 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1895—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 3836) granting increase of pension to survivors of the Mexican and Indian wars and to their widows—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 3837) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSES: A bill (H. R. 3946) granting increase of pension to survivors of the Mexican and Indian wars and to their widows—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAHANY: A bill (H. R. 3947) to appropriate $500,000 to begin the work of completing the Buffalo breakwater—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 3948) to provide for free homes on lands purchased from the Indian tribes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 3949) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for District of Columbia Volunteers, the first to serve before April 18, 1861, for the defense of the city of Washington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: A joint resolution (H. Res. 77) providing for the adjustment of certain claims of the United States against the State of Tennessee and certain claims of the State of Tennessee against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHANY: A joint resolution (H. Res. 78) tendering the thanks of Congress to Rear-Admiral Richard Worsam Meade on the completion of forty-five years of brilliant service to the Republic—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE: A resolution (House Res. No. 107) calling on the Committee on Foreign Affairs to take action with reference to the Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A resolution (House Res. No. 108) calling on the Secretaries of War, Navy, Interior, State, Treasury, and Agriculture and Commissioner of Pensions for information as to number of old and infirm persons unable to perform official service yet retained on pay rolls—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a resolution (House Res. No. 109) calling on the President for information regarding the distribution of patronage to induce members of Congress to vote for the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A resolution (House Res. No. 110) in regard to the report of Henry W. Elliott on the condition of the fur-seal fisheries of Alaska, etc.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOWE: A resolution (House Res. No. 111) instructing the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to appoint a committee of three from said committee to investigate the workings of the Pension Office in regard to rulings on the dependent-pension act—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2833) for the relief of Col. Jesse H. Strickland, Eighth Tennessee Cavalry, United States Volunteers, and it was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY: A bill (H. R. 3838) to pension Mrs. Sarah Crippen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 3839) to correct the military record of Jesse Closser, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 3840) to increase the pension of Michael Leahey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3841) granting a pension to John Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3842) to increase the pension of Edward Vunk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3843) to restore to the pension roll the name of Phillip Laudfried—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3844) to restore to the pension roll the name of Cyrenius Dennis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 3845) granting a pension to Eunice Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3846) to pension John Roof—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARKE of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 3847) for the relief of Claude H. Mastin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3848) for the relief of the creditors of the Deposit Savings Association of Mobile, Ala.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3849) for the relief of the Mobile Marine Dock Company—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 3850) restoring Pattie D. Oliver to the pension roll and granting her a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 3851) to reimburse Col. Phillip Kirschner for money paid for the services of a band for the Sixteenth Regiment of Ohio Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3852) to amend the record of William H. De Freest—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 3853) for the relief of the estate of Nathan P. English—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 3854) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Daniel Gallagher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3855) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Corless—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3856) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 3857) granting a pension to Thomas Brewer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3858) granting a pension to Charles L. Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3859) for the relief of John Allee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 3860) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Futhy Barfell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 3861) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3862) for the relief of John Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 3863) for the relief of Jehu Wherry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 3864) for the relief of Jeremiah Wilkie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3865) granting a pension to Samuel Binnix, late a private Company A, Putnam Rifles, Fifth Battalion District of Columbia Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3866) for the relief of George W. Goodman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 3867) for the relief of R. L. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3868) for the relief of J. C. Wood—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3869) for the relief of George W. Quick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3870) for the relief of James A. Cook—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3871) increasing the pension of Francis A. Field to $72 a month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3872) increasing the pension of William S. Demott, late first lieutenant of Company F, One hundred and twenty-first Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 3873) granting a pension to George K. Knowlton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3874) to correct the military record of Louis W. Mayer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3875) relative to the Rancho Colus, in the State of California—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3876) to correct the naval record of G. K. Knowlton, late of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 3877) granting a pension to Henderson Marple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 3878) granting a pension to Henry Fishering, late private Company D, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 3879) for the relief of the legal representatives of Patrick Elliott, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3880) granting a pension to James Harrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 3881) for the relief of J. M. Fidler and T. O. Marrs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3882) for the relief of Wesley Rowe—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3883) for the relief of the heirs of John Samuels, deceased, of Montgomery County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KULP: A bill (H. R. 3884) for the relief of John T. Brewster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEIGHTY: A bill (H. R. 3885) granting a pension to Mary M. Hyer, of Fort Wayne, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3886) to reimburse W. W. Rockhill for moneys erroneously paid United States—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3887) to pension Ellen D. Merrell, of Fort Wayne, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 3888) for the relief of the heirs of William Wesley Turner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 3889) for the relief of the board of trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Arlington Heights known as Hunter's Chapel—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 3890) granting a pension to George William Hodgdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOZLEY: A bill (H. R. 3891) for the relief of R. W. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3892) granting a pension to Alexander Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILNES: A bill (H. R. 3893) for the relief of William D. Mack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3894) for the relief of William Hommelsberg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3895) for the relief of Rebecca Knapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3896) for the relief of Ira S. Havens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A bill (H. R. 3897) for the relief of Lincoln W. Tibbetts—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3898) granting a pension to Herbert W. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3899) for the relief of the heirs of William Pitcher and Axel Hayford and Samuel Otis and George B. Ferguson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3900) for the relief of the owners of the brig *Abby Ellen*—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3901) granting a pension to James Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3902) to remove the charge of desertion against James E. Gray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3903) granting a pension to Olive Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3904) granting a pension to John Dow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3905) granting a pension to Robert W. Groves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3906) for the relief of Samuel Robbins—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3907) granting an increase of pension to William Zuilling, late a private in Company B, Twenty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 3908) for the relief of W. H. Copley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3909) for the relief of James E. Littleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3910) for the relief of Thomas Dean—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3911) for the relief of William E. Shepperd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3912) for the relief of Francis M. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY: A bill (H. R. 3913) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of John Mix, and granting him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3914) to increase the pension of Enoch B. Chadborne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3915) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joel B. Townsend—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 3916) for the relief of George O. Donnell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SNOVER: A bill (H. R. 3917) for the relief of Joseph Carrol—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE (by request): A bill (H. R. 3918) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth L. Traweek, of Sebastian County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3919) for the relief of C. W. Threlkeld—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 3920) for the relief of the heirs of A. Lawrence Foster, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SORG: A bill (H. R. 3921) for the relief of W. T. Alexander—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 3922) for relief of H. R. Farmer—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3923) for relief of Robert Huff, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPALDING: A bill (H. R. 3924) to correct the war record of Franklin Benham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3925) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Shepard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3926) to correct the war record of David Sample—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: A bill (H. R. 3927) for the relief of James B. Russell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3928) for the relief of Ellen Wright, hospital nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOKES: A bill (H. R. 3929) for the relief of Agnes E. Craig—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 3930) for the relief of M. M. Beavers—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 3931) to refer to the Court of Claims the claims of Abner M. Darling, administrator, and Jerome J. Getty for Indian depredations—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 3932) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 3933) for the relief of Mary A. Dougherty and Marshall Davis, of Yazoo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3934) for the relief of Franklin Sessions—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3935) for the relief of David K. Patterson, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3936) for the relief of T. B. Stewart, administrator of Joseph W. Stewart, deceased, of Scott County, Miss., as found due by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A bill (H. R. 3937) granting a pension to Miriam V. Kenney, widow of Samuel W. Kenney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 3938) to grant pension to Mrs. Louisa McKean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 3939) to pension Daniel Giles for services in Oregon Indian wars—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3940) for the relief of B. F. Dowell—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3941) granting an increase of pension to John Irvin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 3942) reimbursing T. F. McGourin, late postmaster at De Funiak Springs, Fla.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3943) for the relief of Joseph Y. Porter, late captain and assistant surgeon, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLER: A bill (H. R. 3944) granting a pension to George Fetterman, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3945) granting a pension to Thomas J. Thorp, late a private Company K, Third Ohio Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: Petition of John A. Magee and other citizens of Clarion, Pa., for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Resolutions of the Cincinnati Daily Newspaper Association, concerning proposed increase of rate of postage on second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BROWN: Petition of Rev. J. O. Blanton and 16 other citizens of Tracy City, Tenn., favoring the passage of a bill for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BULL: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3749, to increase the pension of Mrs. Eunice Ida Rhoades—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARDY: Petition of 20 citizens of Calhoun, Ky., asking for the passage of the Stone bill on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: Petition to accompany House bill No. 3756, for the relief of Patteson & Striffler, of Springfield, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, certificate of mayor and city engineer, to accompany House bill No. 3756, for the relief of Patteson & Striffler, of Springfield, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CORLISS: Petition to accompany bill to reimburse Philip Kershner—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROW: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3143, granting a pension to James O'Conner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of 518 merchants and manufacturers of the United States, praying for immediate action upon the invitation from the French Government to take part in the International Exposition to be held in Paris in 1900, and asking for an appropriation for certain purposes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARMER: Petition of Francis Marr, asking to have the charge of desertion standing against him removed from the records of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Resolutions adopted at a public meeting in Cascade, Iowa, protesting against the treatment of the Armenians, and urging our Government to use every influence to arouse the civilized world against the brutality of Turkey—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, paper from the S. P. Wetherill Company, of Philadelphia, in respect to the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3576, appropriating $6,332.30 for paying the claim of C. M. Kirkpatrick for paving the roadway of Clifford avenue, in Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2947, increasing the pension of D. D. Jennings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2946, removing the charge of desertion from the military record of John Jenkins, alias John F. Jenkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2949, appropriating $1,537.28 for paying the claim of George W. McCray for paving Hanna street adjacent to the United States arsenal in Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2950, appropriating $4,006.73 for paying the claim of the Western Paving and Supply Company for paving streets adjacent to the post-office and court-house in Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2732, placing Julius R. Frederick, one of the Greely expedition, on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3044, removing the charge of desertion now standing against the name of Samuel B. Alexander, alias Jordan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2948, increasing the pension of Thomas M. Chill, an Indian war veteran of 1832, to $50 a month—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3400, appropriating $4,323.15 in payment of the claim of A. Brown—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HITT: Resolutions adopted by the Union Park Congregational Church, of Chicago, Ill., January 10, 1896, concerning the recent massacres in Armenia, and strenuously protesting against their continuance—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUBBARD: Papers to accompany bill to pension Henderson Marples, private in Capt. A. J. Hart's company of Provisional Missouri Militia of 1864, under Order No. 107—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KULP: Petition of J. C. Furman, B. F. Crispin, E. K. Freeze, C. B. Jackson, F. W. Hildbrand, S. C. Zayne, and 160 other citizens of Berwick, Pa., and vicinity, praying for the passage of an act to secure a better grade of immigration, etc., said act being known as the William A. Stone bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOCKHART: Petition of the heirs of John W. Strauss, deceased, late of New Hanover County, N. C., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition for the recognition of the insurgent Cubans as belligerents in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Two petitions, respectively, of citizens of Dorchester, N. J., and 17 citizens of Leesburg and Dorchester, for the passage of the Stone bill, relating to immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LOW: Petition of the Drug Trade Section, New York Board of Trade, protesting against the passage of House bill No. 3114—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Leopold Salomon, late of Company H, Twentieth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: Petition of Robert W. Groves for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Olive Brown for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Herbert W. Loch for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: Petition of the citizens of Tombstone, Ariz., favoring the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: Petition of C. H. Varney and 34 citizens of Welshfield, Geauga County, Ohio, in support of an act to secure a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of William Zwilling for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of citizens of O'Brien County, Iowa, asking for legislation with reference to forfeited Sioux City and St. Paul lands in said county—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SORG: Petition of William T. Alexander, of Dayton, Ohio, for allowance of his claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the First Baptist Church of Dayton, Ohio, for a Sunday-rest law at the national capital—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petition to accompany a bill to correct the war record of Franklin Benham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Letter concerning Armenian troubles, from the Humphrey Street Congregational Church, New Haven, Conn.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Petition of 128 homesteaders, settlers on lands in Ashland County, Wis., who have been ordered to vacate the lands because of a recent decision of the Supreme Court giving the lands to the Wisconsin Central Railroad Company—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Memorial from the legislature of the State of Minnesota, requesting the enactment of the arbitration law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. TERRY: Petition of the board of aldermen and a large number of the citizens of Dardanelle, Ark., for the protection of the harbor and town of Dardanelle against the action of defective or improper Government dikes near that point—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TRACEY: Papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers relating to the bill for the relief of A. K. Bailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, statement of A. W. Bishop, of Buffalo, N. Y., with reference to a bill for the relief of W. S. Riggs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYLER: Four petitions, respectively, of the heirs of Orloff M. Dorman, deceased, late of Norfolk; estate of Naharai Foreman, deceased, late of Norfolk County; estate of Josiah Culpeper, deceased, late of Norfolk County, and Jonathan Martin, of Norfolk County, Va., praying reference of their respective war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 14, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ADJUSTMENT OF CLAIMS WITH TENNESSEE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 11, 1895, copies of all papers on file in the War Department touching the seizure of and operation by the United States of the Memphis, Clarksville and Louisville Railroad, the Edgefield and Kentucky Railroad, the McMinnville and Manchester Railroad, and the Winchester and Alabama Railroad, together with a letter from N. R. Batchelder, Quartermaster-General United States Army, inclosing all papers now on file in the office of the Quartermaster-General appertaining to the claims in question; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EQUIPMENT OF MONITORS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 3d instant, a statement as to the cost of equipping with guns and machinery and putting in suitable condition for purposes of harbor defense all monitors not now in commission or undergoing repairs; which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th instant, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, not including those for which provision was made at the last session of Congress and which required an appropriation for their payment; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 30) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," approved March 2, 1893.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 25) to extend the time for making an assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of the American Society of Church History held in New York City December 27, 1895, sympathizing with the persecuted Christians in Armenia, and praying for the prompt qualification of consuls to that country and an extension of the work of the Red Cross Society to the persecuted in Armenia; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GORMAN presented the petition of F. M. Satterfield and sundry other citizens of Rock Hall, Md., and the petition of J. M. Burdett and sundry other citizens of Browningsville, Md., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Baltimore (Md.) Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, praying the President of the United States and both Houses of Congress to consider the great importance of the preservation of peaceful relations between the United States and Great Britain; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALLEN presented twenty-two petitions of members of the Nebraska National Guard, praying for the enactment of such legislation as will authorize the War Department to exchange the Springfield rifles now in use by them for those of caliber .45 with the latest improvements; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying that improvements be made for the relief of the cities, towns, farmers, and settlers situated upon and near the valley of the Skagit River, in Skagit County, in that State; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of 45 citizens of Long Bottom, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CAMERON. I present a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, held at Williamsport, Pa., December 12, 1895, praying for the adoption of what is known as the "Lubin

proposition" for the protection of American agriculture and shipping in the foreign trade. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA STATE GRANGE, PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY,
Office of Secretary.

To Hon. JAMES DONALD CAMERON,
United States Senator from Pennsylvania.

DEAR SIR: At the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania State Grange, held at Williamsport, Pa., December 12, 1895, the following resolutions and address to the American people and the Congress of the United States were unanimously adopted, and it was directed that they be officially forwarded to the Representatives and Senators from Pennsylvania to be presented to Congress as expressing the views of the farmers of our State upon the important question of protective legislation.

Respectfully submitted.

LEONARD RHONE,
Master Pennsylvania State Grange.

Attested:
J. T. AILMAN, *Secretary.*

EQUITABLE PROTECTION.

To the American people and the Congress of the United States:

At a conference of the representatives of chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and delegates of the Farmers' National Congress, and other commercial organizations from the various sections of the Union, and delegates of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, under the auspices of the National Grange, Worcester, Mass., November 14, 1895, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Whereas agricultural staples, being exports, can not be protected by a tariff on imports, as are manufactures, and American ships in the foreign trade, being built by partly protected material and under protection wages, are at a disadvantage in the world's competition with ships constructed and operated in cheap-labor or free-trade countries:

"*Resolved by this conference*, That this depressed condition demands the enactment of such legislation as will put both these great industries upon a footing of equality with those now specially fostered by the Government.

"*Resolved*, That we call upon Congress to equalize the protective system by extending to agricultural staples and American shipping in the foreign trade that just measure of protection to which they are entitled so long as protection is the controlling and public policy of the nation.

"*Resolved*, That we recommend to the consideration of the Congress of the United States and to the American people what is known as the 'Lubin proposition' for the protection of American agriculture and shipping in the foreign trade."

The same resolutions, in substance, have been recently adopted by the Chambers of Commerce of San Francisco; Seattle, Wash.; Portland, Oreg.; the Board of Trade of Bath, Me.; the leading Atlantic Coast shipbuilders at a meeting in Philadelphia, and the Farmers' National Congress at Atlanta, Ga.

THE "LUBIN PROPOSITION"

is for the protection of American agricultural staples, a portion of which are exported, by the payment of a bounty by the Federal Government upon such exports and the protection of American shipping in the foreign trade, to the end that all industries in the United States which in any manner compete with the cheaper labor of foreign countries may be protected equally with such industries as are now protected by a tariff on imports.

For seventy-six years a similar policy was in successful operation in Great Britain, and it only ceased when that nation no longer exported agricultural staples, after which the tariff upon imports protected her agriculturists until the repeal of what are known as the "corn laws."

It is believed that the enactment into laws of this proposition will have the effect of making steadily profitable the pursuit of agricultural employment and replace present threatened disaster to our farm-owning population by prosperity, the result of which would have an equally beneficial effect upon our great manufacturing industries, which are so vitally dependent upon our farming population for the purchase of their products. And it will effect for shipping in the foreign trade a stimulus to shipowning and shipbuilding to such an extent that our own home-built, home-manned, and American-owned vessels shall once more carry the larger share of our foreign commerce, thereby creating a much greater home market for American farm and factory products among those engaged in shipping and the retention in the United States of the many millions of dollars which we now expend annually to enrich foreign shipowners and shipbuilders.

We earnestly urge upon the American people and the Congress of the United States the early and favorable consideration of such measures on the lines here indicated as shall give prosperity to all American industries by equitable protection.

Unanimously adopted.

J. H. BRIGHAM,
Chairman, and Master National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry.
HUGH CRAIG,
Vice-President, and Vice-President San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.
ALEX. R. SMITH,
Secretary, representing leading Atlantic Coast Shipbuilders.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of Council Chamber of Chosen Knights Commandery, No. 174, Ancient and Illustrious Order of Knights of Malta, of York, Pa., praying that relief be granted to the suffering Armenians; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. THURSTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of North Platte, Nebr., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the State Council of Nebraska, praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VEST presented the petition of F. J. Chandler and sundry other citizens of Kansas City, Fayetteville, and St. Louis, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Tacoma, in the State of Washington, in behalf of the bill which I introduced to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses.

The petitioners state that the events of the past few weeks, growing out of the President's message on the Venezuelan question, disclose more clearly than ever the utter lack of means to defend the unprotected ports on the Pacific Coast against the encroachments of a possible enemy.

They call attention to the fact, which is well known, that the British Government maintains the headquarters of its Pacific squadron at Esquimalt, on Vancouver Island; that British men-of-war are permanently stationed in that harbor; that for the past three years the British Government has been quietly erecting strong fortifications at that point, and that at the slightest intimation of hostilities a fleet of British men-of-war could be sent from Esquimalt, a distance of only a few miles, across the Straits of Fuca into Puget Sound, which could levy tribute on the important cities or reduce them to ashes within a few hours.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY presented petitions of William B. Coit and 54 other citizens of New London, Conn.; of Charles B. Jennings and 48 other citizens of New London, Conn.; of Walter A. Town and 86 other citizens of New London, Conn.; of the professors, instructors, and students of Williams Memorial Institute, of New London, Conn.; of President Robert P. Keep and the professors of the Norwich Free Academy, of Norwich, Conn.; of the president and professors of Trinity College, of Hartford, Conn.; of the professors and students of St. Margaret's School, of Waterbury, Conn.; of Mrs. William M. Olcott, honorary State regent, and the officers and members of Faith Trumbull Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Norwich, Conn.; of Grace T. Arms, president, and the officers and members of Jonathan Brooks Society, Children of the American Revolution, of Connecticut; of John K. Buckley and 123 other citizens of Mystic, Conn.; of Mrs. Cuthbert H. Slocomb and 55 other residents of Stonington, Conn.; of Charles J. Hoadley, president, and 10 other officers and members of the Connecticut Historical Society, of Hartford, Conn.; of Elizabeth J. Camp, regent, and 23 other members of Sarah Ludlow Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Seymour, Conn.; of Mrs. A. J. Muzzy, regent, and 33 other members of Katharine Gaylord Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Bristol, Conn.; of Mrs. Albert S. Comstock, regent, and 69 other members of Hannah Benedict Canter Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of New Canaan, Conn., and of Lizzie F. Litchfield and 31 other members of Anne Wood Elderkin Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Willimantic, Conn., praying that the Government purchase certain lots adjoining old Fort Griswold, in the town of Groton, Conn.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 259) granting to the Columbia and Red Mountain Railway Company a right of way through the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 147) granting a pension to Elvira Bachelder;

A bill (S. 136) granting an increase of pension to Horace Townsend;

A bill (S. 137) granting an increase of pension to William W. French;

A bill (S. 140) granting a pension to Mary A. Wise;

A bill (S. 836) for the relief of William J. Murray;

A bill (S. 944) granting a pension to Robert Gamble;

A bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to Florence W. Buskirk;

A bill (S. 149) granting a pension to Helen M. Jacob;

A bill (S. 730) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Helen Morrell Carroll;

A bill (S. 1051) granting a pension to Elizabeth New, widow of Jethrow New; and

A bill (S. 710) granting a pension to Ada J. Schwatka, widow of the late Lieut. Frederick Schwatka.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 145) granting an increase of pension to Maud Ardelle Bliss; and

A bill (S. 746) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Donahoe.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom

were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon:

A bill (S. 1311) granting an increase of pension to Dudley F. Brown;

A bill (S. 585) granting an increase of pension to Martha R. Hitchcock;

A bill (S. 341) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon B. Breedlove;

A bill (S. 148) granting a pension to Catharine Dillon; and

A bill (S. 640) to increase the pension of Joseph W. Fisher.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 352) granting a pension to Philip Kershner, late lieutenant-colonel of the Sixteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 332) granting an increase of pension to Philip Kershner, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1037) for the relief of John Clyde Sullivan, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 15) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the Mountain View Cemetery Association, at Oakland, Cal., certain cannon, etc., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PEFFER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 466) granting a pension to William Brown, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 507) to pension Mollie Crandall, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 748) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Dent, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1303) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Holly, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP. Both these bills were passed by the Senate in the last Congress.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bills will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. MCMILLAN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom the subject was referred, reported a joint resolution (S. R. 52) appropriating the sum of $50,000 for the completion of dry dock No. 3 at the Brooklyn Navy-Yard; which was read twice by its title, and, on motion of Mr. MCMILLAN, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1203) granting an increase of pension to Mary Doubleday, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Abner Doubleday, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

MRS. EVA DAVIS COGSWELL.

Mr. LODGE. I am instructed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell, to report it back favorably with an amendment and submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the general pension laws, the name of Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell, at the rate of $75 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Massachusetts who reported this bill please explain to the Senate the grounds upon which the pension is granted? Is there a written report?

Mr. LODGE. There is a written report with the bill which was unanimously agreed to by the committee, I will state.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps the Senator, however, can state it more concisely.

Mr. LODGE. The bill is for the benefit of Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, the widow of Gen. William Cogswell, who was for many years a member of the House of Representatives, undoubtedly well known to the Senator from New York and others. He died last spring. He was an officer of distinguished gallantry. He was in active service all through the war. He was seriously wounded at Chancellorsville. He commanded a brigade at the close of the war. This pension is for the benefit, as I have said, of the widow, who is left without any provision of any kind. He was the youngest brigadier-general, I believe, in the service.

Mr. HILL. I ask for information because I have given no special attention to these pension matters, and confess my ignorance in regard to them. Is there a pension of any sum granted to the widow of a brigadier-general as a matter of course, irrespective of any other consideration?

Mr. LODGE. Not to a brigadier-general of volunteers, I understand. I think there is no pension provided for except such as Congress sees fit to grant.

Mr. MILLS. What is the regular rate paid to the widow of a brigadier-general?

Mr. LODGE. There has been no regular rate.

Mr. MILLS. What rate has been paid heretofore?

Mr. GALLINGER. Under the general laws, if the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me, the rate is $30 for all officers above the grade of lieutenant-colonel.

Mr. MILLS. What is the rate usually paid to the widows of generals who held the rank of General Cogswell?

Mr. GALLINGER. By Congress? By special act?

Mr. MILLS. By special act.

Mr. GALLINGER. There has been no uniform rate, I will say to the Senator; anywhere from $50 to $200; but perhaps it is safe to say that $75 has been about the average rate.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if the widow has a family dependent on her?

Mr. LODGE. She has no family dependent upon her.

Mr. ALLEN. Does the Senator know of any reason why she should receive a greater pension than the pension of the widow of some private soldier?

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that I think the services rendered by General Cogswell while in command entitle him to a higher pension. It is recognized by every law of the United States that in view of the services of officers the pension of officers and their widows shall be proportioned in some degree to their rank. The pension proposed by the bill is in no degree an excessive one. On the contrary, it is lower than many that have been granted by Congress to men of no more distinguished service than General Cogswell.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me, I will state that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], I think last week, brought in a bill to grant a pension to the widow of General Jardine. In that case a pension was allowed at $50 a month to the widow of a general of the same rank as General Cogswell. Why should this lady receive $25 more than the widow of General Jardine? I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts the propriety of reducing the amount to $50 a month.

Mr. LODGE. I must decline to do that without a vote of the Senate. The bill has been reported unanimously by the committee at $75 a month as a reasonable and proper pension in this case.

Mr. ALLEN. I am decidedly opposed to an irregular method of allowing pensions to the widows of officers of the volunteer army in the late war. A few days ago, as I suggested a moment since, the Senator from Connecticut brought in and had passed a bill to pension the widow of General Jardine at $50 a month, a man of the same rank, and who I presume performed services equally as meritorious as those of General Cogswell. The Senator from Connecticut asked for a pension of $100 a month, but he was satisfied to take $50. My recollection is that in no instance since I have been a member of the Senate has the sum been over $50. The Senator from Massachusetts says this lady has no family dependent upon her.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Nebraska will permit me, I will state to him that there are scores of precedents. Of course I do not want to enter into a controversy with the Senator, but there are scores of precedents where the widows of survivors have been granted $100 a month, and scores of other precedents where they have been granted $75 a month.

Mr. ALLEN. I presume that is true; I do not doubt it; but the chairman of the Committee on Pensions ought to present to us some rule. I am myself decidedly opposed to discriminating between men of equal rank or their families. I know nothing about General Cogswell except as a matter of history and from having met him on one or two occasions, but I presume it is true that every brigadier-general during the late war performed his duty.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I will not interrupt him further. He says the chairman of the Committee on Pensions ought to present some rule. I served upon the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives and for five years upon the Committee on Pensions of the Senate of the United States. That question has been constantly under discussion in the committee, and we have been utterly unable as a matter of justice to formulate any rule. These cases must necessarily be considered as individual cases on their merits, and the Senate must decide for itself whether the action of the committee is to be indorsed or otherwise. The committee will find no fault in

any individual case if the Senate reverses the action of the committee. We act upon our best judgment in view of all the circumstances and conditions surrounding individual cases, and make our reports accordingly, and it is then in the hands of the Senate to do as the Senate may see wise in regard to the cases.

Mr. ALLEN. That is not satisfactory to me, however satisfactory it may be to the chairman of the Committee on Pensions. There ought to be a rule in this Chamber and in the other branch of Congress with reference to the amount of pension that is given to the widows of officers of like rank under like circumstances. The Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, says that this lady would draw $30 a month under the general law without a special act in her behalf. I wish to place myself on record here as being opposed to making any discrimination whatever between the widow of a private soldier and the widow of a brigadier-general, or a major-general, or a lieutenant-general, or any other kind of a general. I want to announce, so far as I am concerned, that I am utterly opposed to discriminations of that kind.

Mr. President, I had some experience during the late war in following the brigadier-generals, sometimes following them and they sometimes following us. I understand quite distinctly that their services were not at all times quite as meritorious as they have sometimes been described in later years. If we would pay attention to the Committee on Pensions and the laudations indulged in here from time to time by certain Senators who had no experience whatever as soldiers we would suppose that the battles of this country had been fought alone by brigadier-generals and major-generals, and that no person below the rank of a brigadier-general could be found in the late war on either side. I want to say that it was the services of the humble private soldiers during the last war that put stars upon the shoulders of some of the gentlemen whose widows are now being pensioned in fabulous sums.

I say it is decidedly un-American to discriminate between the poor struggling widow of a private soldier and the struggling widow of a brigadier-general. I know of thousands of honest women in this country, intelligent women, struggling upon a pension of ten or fifteen dollars a month, supporting a family, raising and educating children, who are or should be as meritorious in the eyes of this country as the widow of the most distinguished general in our late army. It is a species of namby-pambyism, of flunkeyism, to make this discrimination.

I am in favor of giving liberal pensions to the wives of deceased soldiers and to their children. I have a deep and an abiding sympathy for every man who gave his services to his country, and for every poor woman and child who suffered as a result of that great struggle. But I am not prepared, Mr. President, to make a discrimination between American women who are equally meritorious any more than I am prepared to make a discrimination between American men who are equally meritorious.

While I shall not oppose the passage of this measure any further than to vote against it if a yea-and-nay vote is taken (or on a viva voce vote, for that matter), I want to say here and now that as a private soldier, who served during the late war, I shall at all times and under all circumstances do what I can to put down and wipe out discrimination between soldiers of the late war.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska desires entire uniformity in the matter of pensions. That, sir, is an absolute impossibility for any committee that has any sense of justice or fairness. There is variety in rank, which the world regards, whether the Senator regards it or not. There is variety in the degree of necessity, in the situation of the family, and the suffering of the soldier—the dead husband and father. There are circumstances that inevitably compel any committee of common humanity to make some discrimination.

Why are these bills here, Mr. President? Because this is a court of equity. Because the Pension Bureau is absolutely bound by the letter of the law. It not only grades men that it would not otherwise, but it rejects cases in which it is perfectly convinced that there ought to be a pension, and frequently suggests to the applicant for a pension that he go to the Congress of the United States because the Bureau can not, under the letter of the law, grant any pension whatever. Wherefore I say we are here as a court of equity, which, as Blackstone says, in substance, supplies that wherein the law, by reason of its universality, is deficient.

Now, the Senator indulges in talk that I can not characterize as I would wish or ought to characterize here about the poor private soldier; that the brigadier-general did not amount to anything; that he perhaps followed instead of leading, and all that. If the Senator wishes to go into that, it is not necessary to argue that there must be officers by any manner of means, but I might suggest one small fact to him that might mollify him a little. The losses among officers were very much larger proportionately than the losses among the men, and inevitably such is the case. It is worth a little something more in that way, if you choose to make a dollar-and-cent matter of it, to be an officer than it is to be a soldier, and so governments have thought. It is supposed to be worth a little something more to be a member of the Senate of the United States than to be an humble lawyer in the country, as the Senator from Nebraska and myself have found out. In short, there is a difference among men; there is a difference in the reward for their services; there is a difference in the circumstances of their families; and so there must be discrimination.

It would be a comparatively easy thing to settle the whole matter of pensions if you could establish one uniform scale for all; but the next day after you had established your uniform scale, there would come up a case that would compel you to differ from it and to wish the rule had not been made so, and to desire some equitable reconstruction of the case. Many people suppose—no Senators, I hope or think, suppose—that the laws of the country should be made equal, and they are always telling the people that the laws ought to be so uniform and so complete and so clear that there will be no occasion for exceptional cases. You may take the best constructed statute in the world, and after it runs years, like two or three of the famous statutes upon the books concerning limitations, etc., you will have whole libraries of commentaries upon cases that are supposed to come just within or without the letter of the law. You can not by any set of rigid rules meet equitably the situation of everything.

I think this pension is entirely reasonable—quite so—and I shall bring up one in a day or two where I shall hope to get a pension of $100 a month for the beneficiary.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, whatever the Senator from Nebraska may think of the brigadier-generals of the war, I suppose he will not question that an officer who went into the war as a captain of a State regiment, stayed all through it, was badly wounded, had his health shattered, was selected by General Sherman for a position on his staff on his merits, having had no personal acquaintance with General Sherman before the war and no possible opportunity for favoritism, is entitled to our respect and gratitude.

Now, I hope the Senator from Nebraska, whose kindness of heart I am sure nobody will question, will see that it would be very hard on this lady, who has been left penniless, if he compels her to wait until the Pension Committee of the Senate have devised a general and just rule applicable to all cases. That committee say they can not devise such a rule, that it is impossible in the nature of things. The members of the committee say so unanimously, I think. But suppose they are wrong; would it not be rather hard on this lady that she should be compelled to live without adequate support after the great public services, civil and military, which her husband had rendered to his country, until the Senator from Nebraska has converted the Pension Committee, and has converted the Senate, to his policy of a uniform general rule? I submit to him, whether he is right or wrong, it is rather hard to make this lady the victim of that suggestion.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me, I said I was perfectly willing to vote for this pension at $50 a month, exactly the same as the pension of General Jardine. I am not willing to discriminate.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, there are numerous other cases where the chairman of the Pension Committee says $75 or $100 a month has been paid. Why does the Senator select the lowest one and put that down, instead of selecting the highest one or the average pension?

General Cogswell's is a very peculiar case. There may be others, and I suppose the case of Mrs. Gresham will probably come up at some time, where the same doctrine may perhaps be applied. General Cogswell was a man whose whole service had been given to his country or his State. He was one of the class of men like Agassiz, who had no time to make money and was never a money getter or a money keeper. He was a man whose pocket could not hold money if there was a comrade in distress, an old soldier who came around to his door. General Cogswell had a good deal of the habit, so far as he was personally concerned, of sharing what he had with his fellow-soldiers who were in distress.

He went into the war with a captain's commission; he came out at the head of a brigade. He stayed all through. He was in some of the most dangerous and difficult military operations and in some of the most important battles of the war. He was badly wounded. He was, late in the war, selected by General Sherman as a member of his staff. When he came out he was made mayor of his own city. He was elected to Congress in a district where the two parties were close. They would keep a man in one or two terms and then turn him out. He went in having a nomination by a majority of 1 in the nominating convention, but at his last election he had a popular majority of between ten and twelve thousand, carrying every town, every city, and every ward of every city in the entire district. With the love and affection, not only of his own constituents and his neighbors, but of his comrades and members of the House of Representatives, I suppose it

is not improper to say that had he lived and his health been spared he would have been at the head, perhaps, of the most important committee of the present House.

I think, with deference to my honorable friend from Nebraska, who I am sure does not speak from any individual unkindness to this case, but only from a general view of his duty as he regards it, that this is not a case where it should be said that the scale of living for the widow of such a person as that, who has been all her life among the best companionship that the public service here and elsewhere would bring her, is precisely the same as that of a widow of a man who got a living for 60 cents a day shoveling gravel on a railroad or even the widow of a private soldier.

The Senator from Nebraska would be obliged by his logic to move at once to make the pay of the General of the Army $13 a month. Is the Senator quite prepared to say that when the army appropriation bill comes here he will move to make the pay of the General of the Army $13 a month, the same as that which the private soldier now gets, on the ground that the services of the private soldier are just as good, or that the private soldier shall have $15,000 a year?

Mr. ALLEN. I think, if the Senator will permit me, that $13 a month would perhaps cover the value of the services of the General of the Army in some instances.

Mr. HOAR. If it is the Senator's argument that the generals in the war on both sides—Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, and Logan, and Lee and Stonewall Jackson—were not men of exceptional brilliancy and ability, and that this American Republic of ours can not turn out generals who are above the ordinary capacity and character, entitled to receive and enjoy a greater reward than the commonest men, who are only worth $13 a month, I differ with him.

I have as high an opinion of the private soldiers of the American Republic as any man, and I believe every private soldier in Massachusetts knows and believes that an honor or mark of affection and public regard to a general or to a general's widow is an honor to him. In the nature of the case you can not give that honor to every private soldier where a million of men have been engaged in a war. But soldiers feel that honor paid to their general, their representative and leader, is an honor to them. They like to come to Washington to see the statue of Thomas; they like to see the statues of Sherman and Logan and Grant; they like to see the soldiers' monument surmounted and adorned with the statues of the great generals and great officers of the war; and the private soldier says to himself, "That is an honor to me, too; it is my service; it is I that is being recognized; it is my beloved commander who is being honored; it is the feeling that was in my bosom that actuated the bosom of the whole American people when they paid this honor."

Mr. President, there is not a private soldier in Massachusetts, and I believe there is scarcely a private soldier in the whole country on either side, who would not say when this honor, this mark of regard, and this provision for the widow of this brave soldier, this noble and honorable man, and this eminent statesman, is proposed, "Give her all she asks, and, God bless her, more."

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I do not believe that either the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from Connecticut has any higher appreciation of the distinguished services of the soldiers named than I have. I have seen every one of those men, Sherman, Grant, Sheridan, Logan, and others, and more especially Thomas, under circumstances under which the Senator from Massachusetts never saw them—that is, upon the field of battle. I have very great appreciation of them. I have come from boyhood with all the prejudices of youth with me in favor of the Union soldier and in favor of the American soldier for his gallantry wherever he was. I have not the language to express my appreciation of the meritorious services of those gentlemen.

I have not the faintest objection in the world to General Cogswell or his widow. I would do anything within my power that was just to relieve this worthy woman, but it strikes me that the discrimination which the Senator from Massachusetts makes between the private soldier and General Cogswell, or any other general, is an obnoxious and invidious distinction. If I had it within my power I would raise the pensions of a great many pensioners in this country higher than they are, and I would reduce the pensions of some to a lower scale than they are now receiving.

It has been a common thing to bring in bills here to pension Mrs. John Smith, the widow of Gen. John Smith, from some particular State, and to allow her all the way from $50 to $100, as has been stated, without a solitary thing appearing in the evidence, or appearing before the Senate, authorizing or warranting a pension in that sum.

Now, what has General Cogswell done for this country? Grant that his services have been great and meritorious, what has he done for this country, Mr. President, that 2,000,000 other men have not done? He gave his services as a gallant soldier during the late war. That is true of a million of unknown dead to-day. He gave his services in an official position which perhaps a hundred thousand men were equal to fill if they had been called upon to do so. Why should the widow of such a man receive a greater pension than the meritorious widow of a man who served in the ranks? There is no reason excepting that which has grown up in a discrimination between these two classes of men in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to answer his question, as he interrupted me?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. For the same reason that the Senator pockets every year $5,000, when some humble neighbor of his gets but 75 cents a day.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not pocket anything more than $5,000.

Mr. HOAR. Yes: your mileage.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, there is a better reason than he states. He says it is simply the action of the Senate and House of Representatives on these special bills. I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that the general laws make these distinctions, and before the Senator can reach the point he seems to be aiming at he must entirely revise the laws of the United States relating to pensions.

Mr. ALLEN. There is nothing in that.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is just that in it. The widow of a lieutenant-colonel receives $30 a month and the widow of a private soldier receives $12 under the laws of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN. Thirty dollars is a very small sum, and the others ought to be raised up to that. The truth is, the Senators beat about the bush on this question. You will not get the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Pensions to stand at his desk in this Chamber and declare that there should be a discrimination between these persons.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me again—and I think I shall say nothing further—I will repeat what I said a moment ago. I served on the Pension Committee in the other House under a Democratic chairman, and I have served on the Committee on Pensions in the Senate under a Democratic chairman, and we found it impossible, although it was discussed scores of times, to make a uniform rating for officers and the widows of officers. This very morning a bill was authorized to be reported by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] for the widow of an officer at $100 a month; the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was authorized to report a bill for another widow at $75 a month, and I was authorized to report a bill for the widow of a brevet brigadier-general of my State at $30 a month. I believe justice was done in each case, considering all the circumstances and conditions surrounding it.

Mr. ALLEN. I am not referring to the discriminations which have been made by the committee as between officers of equal rank. The discrimination to which I refer is that discrimination between the man who carries his musket and discharges his duty upon the field of battle, and the man who carries epaulettes upon his shoulders. One would think from the argument of the Senator from Connecticut that God had made a distinction between these men.

Mr. HAWLEY. If He did not, who did make it?

Mr. ALLEN. Gentlemen like the Senator from Connecticut made it. It is a part and parcel of the English system, which has come to us, of discriminating between men who perform equally meritorious services. There is no distinction. When the Senator from Connecticut stands at his desk and urges that there is a distinction between men who perform equally meritorious services, I do not believe that the American people are prepared to adopt his views or act upon them.

I state to you, Mr. President, that from the Atlantic to the Pacific, all over this country, are widows of meritorious private soldiers and meritorious noncommissioned officers who have families that they are caring for and educating who are drawing a pittance of $15, $20, and $25 a month, and many of them not so much. Is it possible that this lady, to care for herself alone, needs more money than the widows of those private soldiers and noncommissioned officers? The services of the husbands of those widows were as meritorious and necessary as the services of General Cogswell or any other officer. It was through the gallant and meritorious services of these men that it was possible to restore these States and to bring about the present desirable condition of our Union.

The Senator from Connecticut says that the percentage of loss among the commissioned officers of the Army was greater than among the private soldiers. I deny it. I say the percentage of loss was greater among the private soldiers and noncommissioned officers of the Army than it was among the commissioned officers, and it is idle for the Senator to stand here and contend for the contrary.

Mr. President, I desire, with a view of making a motion, to ask the parliamentary status of the pending bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] asked unanimous consent for the immediate con-

sideration of the bill under discussion. The Chair submitted to the Senate the question whether there was objection. No objection was interposed, when the bill was read in full and the Chair stated that it was before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. The question then was upon the amendment reported by the Committee on Pensions, which was agreed to, and the bill was reported to the Senate. Then the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] made an inquiry of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. ALLEN. If in order, I desire to amend the bill by moving to strike out "seventy-five" and inserting "fifty," so as to read "$50 a month."

Mr. HOAR. What was the amendment adopted by the Senate?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Reducing the amount to $75 a month.

Mr. HOAR. Then I suggest that it is not in order, after "seventy-five dollars" has been inserted in the bill, to amend that by striking it out.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is not.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator can make that motion in the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well; I will withdraw the motion, and will move to reconsider the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, my father fought and died a private soldier for his country. My mother was left perhaps as needy and destitute as any widow of that great conflict. For almost thirty years, and down to extreme old age, she drew from this Government a pittance of $8 a month. I stand here to-day upon this floor, the son of that father and of that mother, deeply sensible of the scant and pitiable justice which has been done by this country to the survivors of the late war and to their widows and their orphans. But, sir, I am profoundly grateful to every man who fought that this Government might live. I have enjoyed and have shared the blessings and opportunities of the glorious Republic which they left to me, and I shall never stand upon this floor and seek to reduce any pension reported by the committee of this body to the widow of any man who fought for his country. I would gladly use the figure put in this pension bill as an argument why the pension to every other widow in this country should be increased. There has been scant justice done to the widows of the private soldiers, but has there been too great a measure of justice meted out to the widows of the officers, those distinguished men whose gallantry not alone, but whose military genius prevailed under Grant and Sherman and Sheridan against one of the most splendidly officered armies that the world has ever known? Rising here for the first time in my place in the Senate of my country, I go upon the record as being in favor of every pension to every widow of every soldier of the Republic, and as being opposed to any reduction in any amount which the committee of this body sees fit to recommend. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. ALLEN. I now move to amend the amendment by striking out "seventy-five" and inserting "fifty."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. ALLEN. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COCKRELL. I want to suggest to the Committee on Pensions that the better way is when it reports these bills to have the reports printed and placed upon the Calendar. Then every Senator who takes any interest in them may examine and understand them, and unless he has a valid objection no opposition will be made. I regret that the committee has commenced by asking the consideration of bills immediately after they have been reported to the Senate, when Senators have no opportunity of examining them or of considering the facts upon which they are based. I should much prefer that the committee would let this bill lie over until to-morrow, and let the report be printed so that we may see what it is. I hope that rule will be adopted hereafter. If a different course is pursued I shall have to object to the immediate consideration of such bills.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator knows it is not the policy of the committee to immediately call up these bills, but sometimes a member of the committee asks unanimous consent to call up a bill in which he is interested.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the members of the committee will not call up these bills out of their order. It is not a pleasant duty for a Senator to have to object every morning when these bills come up; but I give notice that, if I am present, unless they are purely exceptional cases, I shall object to the consideration of bills which have just been reported and about which we have had no opportunity of obtaining information.

Mr. VILAS. Has the report been read?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report has not been read.

Mr. VILAS. I ask that the report may be read. If it is an exceptional case, I shall cheerfully vote for it; but if it is an ordinary case, we ought to follow the ordinary rule.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, this day submitted by Mr. LODGE:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Eva Davis Cogswell, have examined the same, and report, and refer to the following military record:

It is shown by the official records that William Cogswell was mustered into service as captain of Company C, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, May 25, 1861, to serve three years; was detailed as acting major of the regiment September 25, 1862; was mustered in as lieutenant-colonel February 28, 1863, to date October 23, 1862; as colonel, same regiment, July 11, 1863, to date June 25, 1863. Under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 3, 1884, and the acts amendatory thereof, he has been recognized by this Department as commissioned to the grade of colonel, Second Massachusetts Volunteers, to take effect from June 6, 1863. He was appointed brevet brigadier-general of volunteers, to rank from December 12, 1864, and commissioned as such January 12, 1865. By direction of the President he was assigned to duty as brevet brigadier-general of volunteers January 12, 1865, whereupon he was designated to command the Third Brigade, Third Division, Twentieth Army Corps, January 16, 1865. He assumed command of that brigade on the same day, and continued with the same until June 13, 1865, when the Twentieth Army Corps was discontinued. He was mustered out and honorably discharged the service as colonel, Second Regiment Massachusetts Infantry, and brevet brigadier-general of volunteers, July 24, 1865. During the period of his service this officer was almost continuously on active duty in the field with his successive commands.

On May 3, 1863, in the Chancellorsville campaign, near United Ford, Va., while lieutenant-colonel of the Second Massachusetts Infantry, he received a severe wound of the left arm, on account of which he was furloughed for thirty days on May 9, 1863.

Your committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill with an amendment. Amend by striking out the words "one hundred," in line 7, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "seventy-five."

Mr. VILAS. I believe the ordinary rule in Senate bills is to award the widow of a brigadier-general a pension of $50.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that in answer to an inquiry I stated it as a matter of personal knowledge that there is no rule; that scores and scores of cases have been passed at $100, scores and scores of others at $75, and a great many at $50.

Mr. FAULKNER. If the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me, I believe I was upon the Committee on Pensions for six years. I do not think I was niggardly in my votes in giving pensions on that committee. But during the last three years I served on the committee I think the rule almost universally established in the committee was $50 a month for the widow of a brigadier-general. This rule was so well recognized that when an application came from my State in a very worthy case, the widow of an admiral, and I was asked to secure a pension of $100 a month for her, I refused to introduce the bill at that amount, stating the general consensus of opinion in the committee, and that I would only introduce a bill granting the rate of $50 a month, which I did, and the committee reported the bill favorably. I wish to say that I felt that that was a liberal amount, for the reason that the general pension laws of this country fix $72 as the limit of pensions for men who served in the ranks who are totally disabled and who absolutely need the attendance of a person to assist them in performing the usual and necessary duties of life.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from West Virginia will permit me, he will recall the circumstance that in the last Congress I made a report in favor of granting the widow of General Corse a pension of $100 a month, and it passed the Senate without a word of dissent from either the Republican or Democratic side.

Mr. FAULKNER. I am not speaking of the time to which the Senator from New Hampshire refers. I was not then on the committee. That was during the last Congress. I refer to the preceding Congress and to time antedating that period. For that reason I think that $50 a month is a liberal, fair pension to a widow when we allow only $72 to a person totally disabled by reason of injuries in the line of duty and requiring the assistance of an attendant.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, it does not occur to me that this case affords an occasion for a very great exhibition of patriotic fervor or devotion to the surviving soldiers of the war. I think no one here will hesitate to vote a fair and just pension in every case where a pension is due. At least, for myself, I shall always be ready, I trust, to support any just application for a pension.

But the element of unfairness which has crept into the distribution of pensions by reason of some special applications due to peculiar influence is a thing that touches pretty hardly upon the feelings of old soldiers. I think I know something of the sentiments which actuate them; and while in no case do they desire to abridge or diminish a fair allowance, they do feel that that allowance ought to be measured by some principles of justice as between different cases.

I confess that I hoped when I asked to have the report read that I should have heard something in it that would warrant me in feeling authorized to go beyond the ordinary allowance that is given to a soldier's widow, but all that the report shows is simply that in January, 1865, the last year of the war, General Cogswell became a brigadier-general, commanding a brigade a part of that time. What service he rendered I do not know, nor is it particularly material to this question. This pension is not to reward him

for his services in any way. The pension proposed is to deal properly with his widow, and I hope she will be dealt with generously and fairly, but upon the same principles on which the widows of other brigadier-generals have been dealt with who have also rendered the service that belongs to their rank.

I do not discover that there is a word said in the report of any peculiar condition of necessity of Mrs. Cogswell. I do not discover that it is said in the report that there are any children or other persons a charge upon her, so that there ought to be a special or peculiar allowance for her. If any Senator knows of a reason why there should be an additional and peculiar allowance made in this case I shall be very glad to hear it, for I would rather vote for a liberal allowance than otherwise. But I do not wish to add another instance, if it can be prevented, to the discriminations which have been made most unjustly and most unfairly to the injury of the credit of the pension laws in this country.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has asked why some statement was not made about the necessities of the widow. I will tell him. It was because the committee did not feel it necessary to drag such a matter as that into public discussion in the Senate. They had some feeling of delicacy in regard to that part of the case.

The Senator has also spoken about "peculiar influence." I do not know what he means by that phrase, but I will take this occasion to state to the Senate that Mrs. Cogswell has never said one syllable to me or to anyone, nor has any friend of hers spoken to me about this matter. She has never asked one dollar from the Government. She is left absolutely penniless. She is trying to get work. She has not come here to ask for money. It has been asked for her by the representatives of her State on this floor and on the floor of the other House, because they feel that it is not too much to give $75 a month to the widow of a distinguished soldier who died without any property after years of public services.

I had no desire to drag her or her affairs into this debate, but since it has been done by others, it is just as well that the Senate should know the facts. She is left with no money. She has asked for none. No friend has asked it for her. She has sought to get employment. I have asked for this money for her on my own motion alone, because I thought it was discreditable to leave the widow of a distinguished soldier like that without anything whatever from the Government.

I am amazed, Mr. President, at the attacks that have been made upon a helpless woman—implications that she ought to be earning her living instead of asking for money, when she has not asked for one dollar. I think Senators could be engaged in a better business than that. This pension is not excessive. When I laid the bill before the committee, I said that I asked nothing excessive; that I asked only what is usual, for I am a new member of that committee. The committee without a dissenting voice voted $75 as a reasonable pension for Mrs. Cogswell, based on pensions in similar cases. When the Senator from Wisconsin states that he sees nothing peculiar in that record which has been read, I will say to him that many men consider that a very brilliant record for the youngest brigadier, as I believe he was, in the American Army. He was in the service from the beginning to the end. He was always in the field. He served his country in civil life. He died honored by his fellow-citizens, with clean hands, and without a dollar, and we come now and ask for $75 a month for his widow. She does not ask it. The representatives of Massachusetts ask it for her.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I have stated and I want to repeat that since I have been a member of this body the pension allowed to widows of brigadier-generals in nine cases out of ten has been $50 a month. There have been but very few instances where the amount was any greater.

No one has made an attack upon this lady. I do not know of a Senator in this Chamber who has urged that she should be required to earn her living by the ordinary means open to a person to gain a livelihood. Certainly not one word of that kind has fallen from my lips, and I have not heard it from the lips of any other Senator upon this or the other side of the Chamber.

I feel perfectly willing to vote for a pension of $50 a month to this lady. I am informed that she is a lady about 50 years of age and in good health. It occurs to me that $50, under those circumstances, ought to take care of Mrs. Cogswell fairly well.

The Senator from Massachusetts refers to the distinguished services of General Cogswell, all of which I admit. But, Mr. President, it must be remembered that the opportunity to make provision for his family was very much greater than has been the opportunity of thousands and hundreds of thousands of private soldiers and noncommissioned officers. I have not heard the junior Senator from Massachusetts grow impassioned or scold in this Chamber on the subject of granting a pension to some private soldier or private soldier's widow. I have not heard him deliver a eulogy upon the services of the private soldiers and the noncommissioned officers. But as soon as it strikes the blue blood a little, then the junior Senator from Massachusetts undertakes to scold those of us on this side who refuse to adopt his views with reference to this matter.

I do not want my position to be misunderstood, I repeat, it is my sincere desire to see every meritorious soldier in this Union pensioned, and pensioned adequately. I want to see every meritorious soldier's widow and his dependent children pensioned adequately. But I can not for the life of me see the distinction that is made in this Chamber between the services of the man who carried his musket through the mud and in the rain and storm, who performed his duty upon the skirmish line, in the camp, and in the field, and the man who rode on horseback and happened to command the brigade of which the private soldier was a member.

There may be something for gentlemen to grow eloquent upon with reference to this matter; but it strikes me that it would be far more consistent with American principles and American sentiment to say that all men who performed equal service and who were equally meritorious, regardless of their position in the Army, should receive equal treatment in the receipt of pensions. I can not understand why the widow of a private soldier, struggling upon the prairies of Nebraska to raise a family of children, whose husband died as the result of exposure in the war or who was killed upon the field of battle, should be discriminated against and receive a pension of perhaps $15 or $20 a month, when some brigadier-general, who was doing staff duty and was perhaps 3 miles in the rear of the column when it was engaged, should receive fifty or seventy-five or one hundred dollars a month.

Mr. HAWLEY. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows of any such case as that? Did he ever hear of one?

Mr. ALLEN. Of what case?

Mr. HAWLEY. Such a case as he has just described.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not understand.

Mr. HAWLEY. That a general or an officer who did nothing but staff duty is getting a pension of $75 or $100 a month. He never heard of a case like that.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; I have seen cases of that kind.

Mr. HAWLEY. I wish the Senator would bring the statistics, and while he is about it bring along statistics to show that the officers did not suffer a greater loss proportionately than the private soldiers. There is a variety of information he might bring which would be comfortable to himself.

Mr. ALLEN. No; I will not undertake to prove a negative. The dist nguished Senator from Connecticut made an assertion. He claims to be a lawyer. He knows the burden of proof is upon him, not upon me.

I will not speak disparagingly of these gentlemen; at least I do not mean to speak disparagingly of them. They were useful and necessary. But, Mr. President, they were no more necessary and not even as necessary as the private soldiers. I want to say to the Senator from Connecticut that the officers who rode in front of their lines upon a field of battle were not numerous during the last war. There was once in a while a fellow who was foolish enough to do it, but not many of them.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the Senator will allow me once more, I will not trespass much longer upon his time.

Mr. ALLEN. I say it was customary for the commander of an army embracing two or three corps to go to an elevated point where he could supervise the affairs of the battle, and where his staff officers were with him. Now, is there anything wrong in that statement?

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator reproached the officers who did not ride in front of their commands. The brigadier-general would have rebuked with a good deal of vigorous language the foolish colonel who at the head of his men went about and ordered them to fire. So with every grade of officers. I have heard officers severely rebuked for being at the head of their places even more than I have heard them rebuked for being behind their places.

Mr. ALLEN. The conduct of different officers varied as much as did the officers themselves. I have seen men in front of their lines when I thought they ought to have been in the rear. I remember a distinguished general of our Army, a soldier of long and meritorious service, who now lives in Missouri, in the city of St. Louis, and his name has not fallen from the lips of any Senator upon the other side of the Chamber. He used to follow what, in my judgment, was the foolish practice of keeping between his lines and the lines of the enemy when the battle was going on. I thought his place was in the rear. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], as a man of experience, knows well that the services of those gentlemen varied just exactly as the services of other soldiers varied. Some of them were at the head of their columns, some in front, and some in the rear.

Now, what is the necessity of growing virtuously indignant over a motion to amend the pending bill? Nine-tenths of the pensions granted to the widows of brigadier-generals since I have been a member of this body have been at the rate of $50 per month, occasionally more.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit me for a moment?

Mr. ALLEN. I will permit the Senator from New Hampshire to do anything.

Mr. HOAR. Then let us pass the bill without further debate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope we shall soon come to a vote on the bill. I think there has been a disposition to criticise the action of the committee as at present organized, and I wish to state to the Senator from Nebraska that I hold in my hand a book containing the reports of the Committee on Pensions for the third session of the Fifty-third Congress, during which Congress the distinguished soldier and Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] was its chairman. The Senator from Wisconsin says he understands it to be the rule that we will grant $50 a month. I have stated otherwise, and I wish to call attention to the fact that within twenty pages of this book I find four cases where more than $50 a month was granted. The widow of Gen. Nathaniel P. Banks was granted $100 a month.

Mr. VILAS. He was a major-general.

Mr. GALLINGER. He was a major-general. A bill passed the Senate proposing to pension the widow of Gen. Samuel Sprigg Carroll at the rate of $75 a month; the widow of Rear-Admiral Samuel Powhatan Carter was granted $75 a month, and the widow of General Crittenden was voted $75 a month. There are four cases which I find in going over merely twenty pages of the reports. I have not time to look through the rest of the volume, but I stand upon the statement I made that there are scores and scores of precedents where we have granted $100 and $75 a month. I think I am safe in saying that the rule has been to grant $75 a month on the average. However, I shall look up the matter and present the result to the Senate at my convenience.

Mr. LINDSAY. I wish to state that General Crittenden was a major-general.

Mr. GALLINGER. Unquestionably that is true.

Mr. ALLEN. I have been speaking of the bills which have been passed granting pensions to the widows of brigadier-generals. I care not how much the chairman of the Committee on Pensions may examine the record, as he calls it. My distinct recollection is that in the majority of cases during the last Congress we amended the bill, making it $50. There are no peculiar or exceptional circumstances in the present case. This lady is in good health, she is comparatively young, and a pension of $50 seems to be adequate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to make a correction in a statement which I made. I stated that the widow of General Crittenden was granted $75 a month. I find she was granted $50 a month.

Mr. VILAS. General Crittenden was a major-general.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true.

Mr. PALMER. The Senate passed the bill at the rate of $100.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN].

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAFFERY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

Mr. CARTER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON], who at present is out of the Chamber.

Mr. COCKRELL (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], who is absent. Does his colleague know how he would vote if present?

Mr. GEAR. I think my colleague would vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should vote "yea," and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. CULLOM'S name was called). I was requested to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. DANIEL (when his name was called). I beg leave to state that I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE]. Otherwise I should vote "yea."

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON], who is out of the Chamber, and I therefore withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MCMILLAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

Mr. MORRILL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE], but I have not the slightest doubt as to how he would vote on this question. He would vote "nay," and I shall therefore vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DUBOIS (after having voted in the negative). I desire to ask whether the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted, the Chair is advised.

Mr. DUBOIS. I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CARTER. I understand that an arrangement has been made whereby my colleague [Mr. MANTLE], who is absent, will stand paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON]. I therefore desire to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BERRY (after having voted in the affirmative). I am informed that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] has not voted. I am paired with the Senator from Colorado, and will therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. DUBOIS. I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] that he transfer his pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], which will allow both of us to vote.

Mr. BERRY. Certainly. That is entirely satisfactory. My vote can stand.

Mr. DUBOIS. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 36; as follows:

YEAS—23.

Allen,	Chilton,	Kyle,	Tillman,
Bacon,	Faulkner,	Lindsay,	Turpie,
Bate,	George,	Martin,	Vest,
Berry,	Gorman,	Mills,	Vilas,
Blanchard,	Irby,	Pasco,	Walthal.
Butler,	Jones, Ark.	Pugh,	

NAYS—36.

Caffery,	Hale,	Nelson,	Sherman,
Cameron,	Hansbrough,	Palmer,	Shoup,
Carter,	Hawley,	Peffer,	Stewart,
Chandler,	Hill,	Perkins,	Thurston,
Davis,	Hoar,	Platt,	Voorhees,
Dubois,	Lodge,	Pritchard,	Wetmore,
Elkins,	McBride,	Proctor,	White,
Frye,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Roach,	Wilson,
Gallinger,	Mitchell, Wis.	Sewell,	Wolcott.

NOT VOTING—28.

Aldrich,	Clark,	Gray,	Murphy.
Allison,	Cockrell,	Harris,	Pettigrew,
Baker,	Cullom,	Jones, Nev.	Quay,
Blackburn,	Daniel,	McMillan,	Smith,
Brice,	Gear,	Mantle,	Squire,
Burrows,	Gibson,	Morgan,	Teller,
Call,	Gordon,	Morrill,	Warren.

So the amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1546) for the relief of Levi Stoltz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1547) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DANIEL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1548) for the relief of Alexander Stoddart, of New York; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1549) for the relief of the heirs of the late Mrs. Mary Ann Randolph Custis Lee, of Fairfax County, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1550) for the relief of Arthur Connell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PASCO introduced a bill (S. 1551) granting a pension to Mrs. Selena McKay, of Suwannee County, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1552) for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1553) to increase the pension of Patrick Culhan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILSON introduced a bill (S. 1554) for the relief of Clinton F. Pulsifer, of the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1555) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States revenue cutter *Gallatin*

off the coast of Massachusetts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1556) granting a pension to George W. Vaughn; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEAR (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1557) for the appointment of commissioners to effect an adjustment between the United States and the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company in relation to certain bonds issued by the United States in aid of the construction of said railroad; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 1558) granting a pension to Benjamin W. Marshall; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1559) to complete the military record of James A. Sams, and for an honorable discharge; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 1560) to regulate the procedure in pension cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1561) to amend section 673 of chapter 9 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1562) amending section 604 of chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1563) to grant an increase of pension to Chester Ogden; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1564) for the relief of John Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1565) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Howland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1566) making an appropriation toward the construction of a dry dock at the Mare Island Navy-Yard, Vallejo, Cal.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 1567) providing for State regulation of railroads incorporated under the laws of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Railroads.

Mr. ROACH (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1568) to provide for the care and cure of inebriates in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 53) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Rawlins Post, No. 23, Grand Army of the Republic, at Stockton, Cal., certain cannon, etc.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FRYE (for Mr. MORGAN) introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 54) authorizing the National Dredging Company to proceed with the work of dredging the channel of Mobile Harbor, under the direction of the Secretary of War; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. LODGE. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1159) to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses. I ask that the proposed amendment be read and referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read, in the absence of objection.

Mr. TURPIE. I object to the reading.

Mr. LODGE. I desired simply to have the amendment read for information and that it might be printed in the RECORD; but as the Senator from Indiana has thoughtfully and courteously objected to the reading, let the amendment lie on the table for the present. I shall call it up to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will lie on the table, and it will be printed under the rule.

Mr. SQUIRE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KYLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 630) regulating the procedure in criminal causes in the States of North and South Dakota; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment reported from the Committee on Finance to the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

FINANCIAL POLICY.

Mr. MILLS. I submit a series of resolutions which I ask may be read and laid upon the table until to-morrow, when, after the usual morning business, I give notice that I shall ask the permission of the Senate to submit some remarks upon the subject.

The resolutions were read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, first. That the United States legal-tender notes now outstanding should not be retired, canceled, or funded into interest-bearing bonds, but when received into the Treasury they should be paid out again and kept in circulation.

Second. That the whole of the silver bullion now in the Treasury should be coined as rapidly as possible. The coins from the seigniorage should be paid out in the current expenditures and the other in the redemption of the Treasury notes issued on its purchase.

Third. That when from any cause there should be a deficit in the Treasury, the Secretary of the Treasury should issue legal-tender notes sufficient in amount to meet all demands for current expenditure, and when said notes are returned into the Treasury they should be destroyed.

Fourth. That all laws now existing which authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell interest-bearing bonds of the Government should be repealed.

Fifth. That it is not only the established policy of the United States to keep all kinds of money issued under their authority at par, but it is also the established policy of the United States to require all creditors, public and private, to receive the gold and silver coins in payment of all obligations where the terms of the contract stipulate for coin payment, and that it is the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to pay United States notes when presented in both gold and silver coins.

Sixth. That we repudiate the idea that a public debt is a public blessing; on the contrary, it is a burden which the interests of the people and the preservation of the public credit demand should be removed as rapidly as practicable.

Seventh. The sinking fund established by law should be rigidly complied with, and the amount now provided should be reenforced so that the whole interest-bearing debt should be extinguished as rapidly as possible without imposing unnecessary burdens upon the resources of the country.

NAVY RETIRED LIST.

Mr. TURPIE (by request) submitted the following resolution; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs ascertain if any officers of the Navy are being held as on the retired list in contravention of the laws.

LOUISIANA LAKE LANDS.

Mr. BLANCHARD submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether the lands constituting the beds of Cross Lake, Soda Lake, Clear Lake, Ferry Lake, and Caddo Lake, extending from the Texas State line to or near the city of Shreveport, La., are claimed by the Department as the property of the United States, and to this end to cause to be examined the character of said lands, and make inquiry in regard to said lakes, with the view of determining whether the area covered by them was land conveyed, or intended to be conveyed, in the opinion of the Department, to the State of Louisiana, under the terms of the swamp-land acts of 1849 and 1850.

Resolved further, That the area embraced in the beds of said lakes be approximately stated in acres for each lake; also what part, if any, of the beds of said lakes is embraced within the public surveys of the United States, and the extent of the area of said lakes not included in any public survey.

Resolved further, That the Senate be informed whether or not the beds of said lakes, or any parts thereof, are claimed by the State of Louisiana, the Caddo Parish levee board, or by private parties, and if so, under color of what authority claim, conveyance, or title; also whether any parts of the beds of said lakes have been entered upon, inclosed, or otherwise taken possession of.

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY.

Mr. KYLE. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee to Establish the University of the United States 1,000 copies of Miscellaneous Document No. 222, being a memorial in regard to a national university.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under the rule the Chair thinks the resolution should go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. KYLE. I think it comes within the limitation of expense which is permitted for printing to be done for a committee.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

DISTRICT REAL-ESTATE ASSESSMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. Res. 25) to extend the time for making an assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I ask unanimous consent that that joint resolution may now be put upon its passage, the Senate having yesterday passed a similar joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. KYLE. I should like the chairman of the committee to explain the joint resolution. I should like to understand it before voting upon it.

Mr. MCMILLAN. A similar joint resolution extending the time for making assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia

was passed by the Senate yesterday, and this joint resolution, being in the same terms, has been passed by the House and sent over to us. I therefore ask that the House resolution may be considered and passed, and then I shall move to indefinitely postpone the joint resolution heretofore passed by the Senate.

Mr. KYLE. I asked to have the joint resolution which is now pending before the Senate explained.

Mr. MCMILLAN. It is simply to extend time for assessing property in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KYLE. I should like to understand why that is to be done.

Mr. MCMILLAN. It is simply to give a little longer time to make the assessment for the purposes of taxation.

Mr. KYLE. The Senator has not explained it; nevertheless, I presume the joint resolution is all right.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I now ask that the votes by which the Senate yesterday ordered to a third reading and passed the joint resolution (S. R. 3) to extend the time for making an assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia be reconsidered and that the joint resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to inquire if the joint resolution which I presented some days ago is on the table so that it can be called up? If it is in that position, I should be very glad to have it laid before the Senate. I think it is resting on the table for further action.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the resolution is on the table, and presumes it went over under the rule, subject to be called up.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well.

SAC, FOX, AND IOWA INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 491.

Mr. CALL. I do not object to the Senator's request; but there is a resolution lying on the table, subject to be called up at any time in the morning hour, and I now give notice, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] being present, that I shall ask the Senate to-morrow morning to take up for consideration the resolution appointing a special committee to investigate the influence of corporations in elections.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 941) granting to the Atchison and Nebraska Railroad Company and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, its lessee in perpetuity, the right of way over a part of the Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian Reservation in the States of Kansas and Nebraska.

Mr. CULLOM. Has that bill been considered and reported by a committee?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir; it has been unanimously reported with an amendment by the committee.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well.

The amendment reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs was, in section 1, line 24, after the word "within," to fill the blank by inserting the word "ninety"; so as to read:

Provided, That this grant is upon condition that the grantees hereof shall, within ninety days after the approval of this act, pay to said allottees or their heirs, or to a parent or guardian of any minor allottee or heir, or to the Indian agent at the Pottawatomie and Great Nemaha Agency for their use at the rate of $25 per acre for the land hereby granted; and the receipts of any such persons, acknowledged in the manner provided for the acknowledgment on instruments conveying real estate in the State where said land is located, filed with the officer keeping the public record of land titles in the county in which said land is located, shall be evidence of such payment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALL. I should like the Senator to give a very brief explanation of the purport of the bill.

Mr. ALLEN. I can explain the bill, I think, in a word. This railroad runs along the valley of the Missouri River. The old right of way has been encroached upon by high water within the last few months, and the railroad company has had to move the right of way and track back inland to prevent future encroachments and to enable the company to operate its road. As to the new right of way, the price per acre has been agreed upon between the railroad company and the Indians, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs stated in a special letter written in April last that the price agreed upon is a fair compensation for the land.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issuance of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute reported by the Committee on Finance, upon which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. I gave notice that I should offer an amendment to the substitute reported by the committee on this bill. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be read. I only wish to offer one amendment at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from North Carolina to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment reported by the committee by striking out section 4, and in lieu thereof inserting:

SEC. 4. That the issuance of interest-bearing bonds of the United States for any purpose whatever, without further authority of Congress, is hereby prohibited; and that the Secretary of the Treasury when redeeming United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, and Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, and when liquidating either the interest or principal of any of the Government's coin obligations is hereby directed to make such payment in gold coin whenever the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold is less than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, and to continue to pay in such gold coin until the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be equal to the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver; but when the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be greater than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, he shall pay the interest and the principal of said coin obligations as they become due in silver coin, and continue to pay the same in silver coin until the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver shall be equal to the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold, and said notes, commonly called greenbacks, when so redeemed, shall be reissued, as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, certainly every man who is opposed to further increasing the public debt favors this amendment. And I can not see how even the men who favor a further issue of bonds can oppose it. The effect of it is simply to prohibit the President from issuing more bonds without the advice and consent of Congress. I deny that he has that power now, but inasmuch as he claims he has that power, and inasmuch as some Senators on this floor admit the same, while many others deny or question the authority, we should promptly pass this amendment and settle the controversy. If the President has power to issue the bonds which he has already sold, under this law of 1875, then he has the power to issue a thousand millions of such bonds without the advice or consent of Congress. Such tremendous and dangerous power can not safely be put in the hands of any one man. It is the power to bankrupt a nation at one stroke of the pen.

The power to control our finances was vested by the Constitution not in the President, but in Congress, and we should lose no time in assuming our sworn and constitutional duty in this respect. The language of the Constitution is as follows:

Congress shall have power to borrow money on the credit of the United States.

But nowhere does it give that power to the President, and nowhere does it authorize us to delegate that power to the President. It is the duty of Congress to deal with these questions. It is the duty of Congress to decide, first, whether or not bonds shall be issued to borrow money, and if they are to be issued it is the duty of Congress to determine how and under what conditions.

I offered a bill containing this same provision before the President made his last call for bonds. If Congress had promptly passed it then $100,000,000 of debt, with the interest that will accumulate, would have been saved the American people. We do not know what day or what hour the President may see fit to again burden the people with debt without their consent or the consent of their representatives in Congress.

If we are opposed to bonds let us be honest and say so; let us pass this amendment, and do it now. Neither the Democratic party nor the Republican party can escape responsibility by claiming not to have a majority of this body. I pledge six People's Party votes in this Chamber to either party that will vote to stop the further issue of bonds, and six votes will give to either side a majority. In fact, either party can have a majority in this body any hour that they desire to pass any law in the interests of the American people. The Democratic party had a majority in both Houses of the last Congress, and yet they sat still and saw the President issue over $162,000,000 of interest-bearing bonds without raising a protest or passing any law to prohibit it. Only the other day we were confronted with the remarkable spectacle of Republican leaders criticising the President in his course. They seem to be criticising him and the Democratic party for having indorsed and pursued, in the main, the financial policy fastened upon this country by the Republican party, and when they were asked to go squarely on record in favor of bonds or against bonds on an amendment which I offered to the resolution submitted by the Senator from West Virginia we found it impossible to bring the question to a vote.

This body did not act at that time. The next day the President issued a call for bids on the $100,000,000 bond issue, and he called it "a popular loan." The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] showed conclusively in his masterly speech a few days ago that the terms of the call are such that it is next to impossible for the people to subscribe or pay for the bonds. The denomination of the bonds is too large; the price at which the bonds are to be sold is not fixed; any bid may be refused, and, besides, no kind of money will be taken for the bonds except gold, while there is probably not as much as $100,000,000 of gold in circulation among the people of the whole country. Everybody admits that the gold is cornered by a syndicate.

What would Senators say if the President was to advertise to sell bonds for wheat only, and they were to discover that I had a corner on the wheat of the country? The people are aroused, and justly so, against such conduct. The President seems to be smarting under their criticism, and now there comes in the papers a letter from the President to a Senator on this floor, in which the President indignantly denies that he ever thought of having anything to do with the bond syndicate. Why should the President now grow so indignant and loudly deny that he was about to do an evil thing, when he did the same evil thing less than a year ago, in February, 1895? But, let that pass. The chief wrong that he is committing against the people of the United States is in issuing bonds at all. The burden will be just as great upon the people, and the interest will be just as hard to pay, whether it is paid to a syndicate, or to the bank, or to anyone else.

On yesterday the New York World, which has been severely criticising the President, came out with a great flourish of trumpets and said that the gold ring had been whipped and that the people had triumphed. The World knows that this is not true. The World knows that whenever bonds are issued at all that the gold ring triumphs and that the people have been whipped and robbed. The World, while pretending to be the friend of the people, is really trying to deceive them; it is trying to cover up the main issue and to call the attention of the people from the overshadowing wrong of issuing more bonds in times of peace. The World's criticism of the President means no more than the criticism of certain Republican gold Senators on this floor.

Now, let us see what this Republican criticism of the President means. Their position, as stated by the distinguished Senator from Ohio and others, is that all of the financial troubles of our Government are due to the want of sufficient revenue and to the fact that the balance of trade is against this country, all of which they charge up to the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill. They say that a tariff bill furnishing sufficient revenue would be a complete remedy.

If this is so, then, from even a Republican standpoint, the further issue of bonds is unnecessary and unqualifiedly wrong. If the Republicans have faith in their remedy, then why are they not ready and anxious to vote for this provision to prevent the further issue of bonds? Certainly they are not in favor of borrowing money and piling up a still larger interest-bearing debt unless it is absolutely necessary. And besides, if the troubles of this Government are due to the want of sufficient money—that is, if the expenses of the Government are greater than its income—then why do not our Republican friends bring in a bill to cut down expenses instead of a bill to increase taxes? Taxes are already too high. Instead of bringing in a revenue bill to increase taxes, why do they not bring in a bill that will equitably adjust the tariff taxes and that will justly distribute the incidental protection as between the different sections and the various industries of each section? Why not take some of the protection from those who already hold the lion's share and give it to those in the South and the West who produce the raw materials? This is the position of the People's Party, and it is just.

But let us return to the bond question. What is the Democratic position? The Democratic President and leading Democratic Senators upon this floor say, on the other hand, that there is revenue enough now for the needs of the Government, and that an increased revenue, even to double the necessities of the Government, would not relieve the present embarrassment of the Treasury, because the taxes and duties levied by the Government are not paid in gold. They say that the whole trouble is due to the want of gold, and that, therefore, they must issue bonds to buy gold.

Now, if the Republican party admits that the Administration is justified in paying the coin obligations of the Government in gold alone and in redeeming the greenbacks and United States notes in gold alone they will be forced to admit that the Democratic position is correct. And the Republicans are forced to admit this unless they have the patriotism to confess their errors and mend their ways, because it was the Republican party that inaugurated this policy of paying the coin obligations of the Government in gold alone in defiance of law. This is what Mr. Carlisle, the Secretary of the Treasury, is doing to-day, and when the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] was Secretary of the Treasury he set him this example. The fact is that the leaders of both parties are to-day in favor of issuing interest-bearing bonds. Not a single protest has been raised on either side of this Chamber by the Representatives of either the Democratic party or of the Republican party against this policy of piling up an interest-bearing debt in time of peace. They have simply been fighting a sham battle over this question—quibbling as to details and sparring for party advantage. The Republicans have tried to make party capital by criticising simply some of the details about how the bonds should be issued. The main question is whether the bonds should be issued at all or not. Both the Democratic party and the Republican party are on the same side of this question, both are in favor of increasing the interest-bearing debt of the country, and the policy of both parties means ruin to the productive industries of the nation.

I repeat they both favor the great wrong of issuing interest-bearing bonds in time of peace; they differ simply as to the details of committing the wrong. Both sides unite in refusing to do right; they differ simply as to the most plausible method of doing wrong. One party would stab you in the back; the other criticises that method of stabbing you and insists that you should be stabbed under the fifth rib. Both would stab you, both would murder you. They quibble, however, about the method of committing the murder; that is all. The Senator from Ohio believes in hanging, the Senator from New York believes in electrocution. The difference between these two parties on this great question is the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum—if one side has its way, bonds will be issued in tweedledee fashion; if the other side has its way, bonds will be issued in tweedledum fashion. They are both in favor of bonds, more bonds! More bonds! They are both for piling up the debt of the nation to be paid by future generations; they are both for contracting the currency to curse the present generation. The policy of either party means falling prices, stagnation of business and the paralysis of every productive industry.

I appeal to both sides to reverse their policies and to stop this great wrong. Your crimes against the American people have been great and grievous, but it is never too late to mend. I call upon you to do it now. Let either of the old parties bring in a bill that will stop these wrongs and settle our present difficulties with equal justice to all sides, and the People's Party will at once join you in such laudable and patriotic efforts. We will even sacrifice our party organization if by so doing we can save the nation from British rule and restore prosperity to our people. The great majority of the voters of the Democratic and Republican parties are opposed to this wrong. Every member of the People's Party is opposed to it. If the wishes and demands of the great majority of the American people were heard in this Chamber as the wishes of Wall street are heeded in the White House and too often in Congress, this amendment repealing the law under which the President claims the right to issue bonds would be passed in an hour.

I said above that if the policy which both the Democratic and Republican parties have adopted in administering the finances of this country is correct, that then it is clear that bonds must now be issued to buy gold. Let us see what that policy is that has raised all of this cry about gold leaving the country and the necessity for the Treasury to keep gold in its vaults.

In the first place, this Government owes a very large debt. A part of this debt was contracted during the great war. The Government issued its interest-bearing bonds to raise money. The Government took any kind of money it could get for these bonds—and some of them were sold at as low as 47 cents on the dollar. The Government promised to pay these bonds in lawful money—gold, silver, greenbacks, or any kind of money. When the war closed, these bonds were almost doubled in value, because they were at once worth par everywhere. But the holders of these bonds were not satisfied with having made 100 per cent out of the misfortunes of the Government. They at once began to lobby Congress to change the contract which the Government had made with them and make the bonds payable in coin instead of in lawful money.

Through the influence, largely I may say, of these bondholders, a bill was passed by Congress in 1879 pledging the faith of this Government to pay all of its obligations in coin, and so careful were these bondholders to clinch the hard bargain which they were driving with the Government that they insisted, when the act of July 14, 1870, was passed, upon having the law to state that the bonds should be paid in coin of the present standard value. Not only this, but they insisted that a statement of this fact should be put across the face of every bond. By this act the Government deliberately changed its own contract and promised to pay to the bondholders more than was due. Besides, every bond issued since 1870 also contains the provision which I have quoted above—that is, that the bonds "shall be paid in coin of the present standard value of July 14, 1870."

But the bondholders were not satisfied. Heartless greed is never

satisfied. They began to ask for payment of principal and interest in gold; in fact, they began to demand gold and say that they had a legal right to demand it since the passage of the act of 1873 demonetizing silver. To refute this claim and demand of the bondholders and to forever put to rest any question about this matter, Congress passed, in 1878, a resolution which will be found on page 564 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 7, part 1, Forty-fifth Congress, second session.

I will not have the resolution read, because the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] read it only a few days since, and the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] read it again on yesterday. Every Senator knows what the law is and is thoroughly familiar with the provisions of this resolution, but I hope that every man who speaks on this question will read it or put it in his remarks, so that the people may know what the law is and be able to judge whether or not their trusted agents obey or violate this law. When the people know the facts, they will condemn some men who now hold and abuse their confidence.

I ask permission to print the resolution as part of my remarks in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas by the act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," approved March 18, 1869, it was provided and declared that the faith of the United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment, in coin or its equivalent, of all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had expressly provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver; and

Whereas all the bonds of the United States authorized to be issued by the act entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, by the terms of said act were declared to be redeemable in coin of the then present standard value, bearing interest payable semi-annually in such coin; and

Whereas all bonds of the United States authorized to be issued under the act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, are required to be of the description of bonds of the United States described in the said act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt;" and

Whereas, at the date of the passage of said act of Congress last aforesaid, to wit, the 14th day of July, 1870, the coin of the United States of standard value of that date included silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains each, declared by the act approved January 18, 1837, entitled "An act supplementary to the act entitled 'An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,'" to be a legal tender of payment, according to their nominal value, for any sums whatever: Therefore

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That all the bonds of the United States issued, or authorized to be issued, under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited, are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars, of the coinage of the United States, containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in violation of the public faith, nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor.

Here is the vote in both the Senate and House on that resolution. I ask leave to print it in my remarks in full.

IN THE SENATE, *January 25, 1878.*

Two votes were taken on the passage of the foregoing resolution, the first on the resolution and the second on the preamble. The vote on the resolution was as follows:

YEAS—43.

Allison,	Davis, Ill.	Jones, Fla.	Plumb,
Armstrong,	Davis, W. Va.	Jones, Nev.	Ransom,
Bailey,	Dennis,	Kirkwood,	Saulsbury,
Beck,	Dorsey,	McCreery,	Saunders,
Booth,	Eustis,	McDonald,	Spencer,
Bruce,	Ferry,	McMillan,	Teller,
Cameron, Pa.	Gordon,	Matthews.	Thurman,
Cameron, Wis.	Grover,	Maxey,	Voorhees,
Chaffee,	Hereford,	Merrimon,	Wallace,
Coke,	Howe,	Morgan,	Withers.
Conover,	Johnston,	Oglesby.	

NAYS—22.

Anthony,	Conkling,	Lamar,	Rollins,
Barnum,	Dawes,	McPherson,	Sargent,
Bayard,	Eaton,	Mitchell,	Wadleigh,
Blaine,	Edmunds,	Morrill,	Windom.
Burnside,	Hamlin,	Paddock,	
Christiancy,	Kernan,	Randolph,	

ABSENT—11.

Butler,	Harris,	Ingalls,	Sharon,
Cockrell,	Hill,	Kellogg,	Whyte.
Garland,	Hoar,	Patterson,	

The vote on the preamble was as follows:

YEAS—42.

Allison,	Davis, Ill.	Jones, Fla.	Plumb,
Armstrong,	Davis, W. Va.	Jones, Nev.	Ransom,
Bailey,	Dennis,	Kirkwood,	Saulsbury,
Beck,	Dorsey,	McCreery,	Saunders,
Booth,	Eustis,	McDonald,	Spencer,
Bruce,	Ferry,	McMillan,	Teller,
Cameron, Pa.	Gordon,	Matthews,	Thurman,
Cameron, Wis.	Grover,	Maxey,	Voorhees,
Chaffee,	Hereford,	Merrimon,	Wallace.
Coke,	Howe,	Morgan,	
Conover,	Johnston,	Oglesby,	

NAYS—20.

Anthony,	Christiancy,	Hamlin,	Paddock,
Barnum,	Conkling,	Kernan,	Rollins,
Bayard,	Dawes,	Lamar,	Sargent,
Blaine,	Eaton,	Mitchell,	Wadleigh,
Burnside,	Edmunds,	Morrill,	Windom.

ABSENT—14.

Butler,	Hill,	McPherson,	Whyte,
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Patterson,	Withers.
Garland,	Ingalls,	Randolph,	
Harris,	Kellogg,	Sharon,	

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *January 28, 1878.*

YEAS—189.

Aiken,	Davis, Joseph J.	Jones, John S.	Robinson, Milton S.
Aldrich,	Deering,	Keifer,	Ryan,
Atkins,	Dibrell,	Keightley,	Sampson,
Baker, John H.	Dickey,	Kelley,	Sapp,
Banning,	Dunnell,	Kenna,	Sayler,
Bayne,	Durham,	Killinger,	Scales,
Bell,	Elam,	Kimmel,	Sexton,
Bicknell,	Ellis,	Knapp,	Shallenberger,
Blackburn,	Errett,	Knott,	Shelley,
Blount,	Evans, James L.	Lathrop,	Slemons,
Bouck,	Evins, John H.	Ligon,	Smalls,
Boyd,	Ewing,	Luttrell,	Smith, William E.
Bragg,	Felton,	Lynde,	Sparks,
Brentano,	Finley,	Mackey,	Springer,
Brewer,	Forney,	Manning,	Steele,
Bridges,	Fort,	Marsh,	Stephens,
Bright,	Foster,	Martin,	Stone, J. W.
Brogden,	Franklin,	Mayham,	Stone, Joseph C.
Browne,	Fuller,	McKenzie,	Strait,
Buckner,	Gardner,	McKinley,	Thompson,
Burchard,	Garth,	McMahon,	Thornburgh,
Burdick,	Gause,	Metcalfe,	Throckmorton,
Butler,	Giddings,	Mills,	Tipton,
Cabell,	Glover,	Money,	Townsend, Amos
Cain,	Goode,	Morgan,	Townshend, R. W.
Caldwell, John W.	Gunter,	Morrison,	Tucker,
Caldwell, W. P.	Hanna,	Muldrow,	Turner,
Calkins,	Harris, Henry R.	Neal,	Turney,
Chandler,	Harrison,	Oliver,	Vance,
Cannon,	Hartridge,	Pacheco,	Van Vorhes,
Carlisle,	Hartzell,	Page,	Waddell,
Caswell,	Haskell,	Patterson, T. M.	Walsh,
Chalmers,	Hatcher,	Patterson, G. W.	Welch,
Clarke, Ky.	Hayes,	Phelps,	White, Harry
Clark, Mo.	Hazelton,	Phillips,	White, Michael D.
Clark, Rush,	Henderson,	Pollard,	Whitthorne,
Clymer,	Henkle,	Pound,	Williams, C. G.
Cobb,	Henry,	Price,	Williams, Jere N.
Collins,	Herbert,	Pridemore,	Willis, A. S.
Conger,	Hewitt, G. W.	Randolph,	Willits,
Cox, Jacob D.	Hooker,	Rea,	Wilson,
Cox, Samuel S.	House,	Reagan,	Wren,
Cravens,	Hubbell,	Reilly,	Wright,
Crittenden,	Humphrey,	Rice, Americus V.	Yeates,
Culberson,	Hunter,	Riddle,	Young.
Cummings,	Hunton,	Robbins,	
Cutler,	Ittner,	Roberts,	
Davidson,	Jones, James T.	Robertson,	

NAYS—79.

Bacon,	Eames,	Ketcham,	Rice, William W.
Bagley,	Eickhoff,	Landers,	Robinson, Geo. D.
Baker, William H.	Ellsworth,	Lapham,	Schleicher,
Ballou,	Evans, L. Newton	Leonard,	Sinnickson,
Banks,	Field,	Lindsey,	Smith, A. Herr,
Beebe,	Freeman,	Lockwood,	Starin,
Bisbee,	Frye,	Loring,	Stenger,
Blair,	Garfield,	McCook,	Stewart,
Briggs,	Hale,	Morse,	Swann,
Bundy,	Hardenbergh,	Muller,	Veeder,
Campbell,	Harmer,	Norcross,	Wait,
Chittenden,	Harris, Benj. W.	O'Neill,	Warner,
Claflin,	Hart,	Overton,	Watson,
Clark, Alvah A.	Hendee,	Peddie,	Williams, A. S.
Cole,	Hewitt, Abram S.	Potter,	Williams, Andrew
Covert,	Hungerford,	Powers,	Williams, James
Crapo,	James,	Pugh,	Williams, Richard
Davis, Horace	Jones, Frank	Quinn,	Willis, B. A.
Denison,	Jorgenson,	Rainey,	Wood.
Dwight,	Joyce,	Reed,	

It will be observed that the resolution passed by over a two-thirds vote in both Houses. It will also be observed that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] voted in favor of this resolution, and also the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES]. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] were paired in favor of it. This resolution passed here, as I have said, January 25, 1878, and the other House passed it by a vote of 189 against 79 January 28, a few days afterwards. Among those in the House who voted in favor of this resolution were John G. Carlisle, the present Secretary of the Treasury; ROGER Q. MILLS, who now holds a seat in this Chamber; William M. Springer, of Illinois, and ex-Secretary of the Treasury Charles Foster, of Ohio. There we have the present Secretary of the Treasury voting for it and an ex-Secretary who preceded him also voting for it. They both understood what the law was and voted for this resolution when they were in Congress. They both violated this same law afterwards when they held the office of Secretary of the Treasury. They can never explain their conduct to the satisfaction of the American people.

It will be seen that this resolution not only recites the laws relating to the issue of bonds and the payment of the same, which laws, on their face, are perfectly plain to the most ordinary mind that every obligation of this Government was payable either in silver coin or gold coin, but in addition this resolution interprets these laws, if they need interpretation, and says emphatically that every obligation of this Government is payable in silver if it is to

the interest or pleasure of this Government to so pay them. There has been but one law relating to this matter passed since 1878, and that was the act of 1890, which expressly makes it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury in paying these coin obligations to exercise the option which the Government reserves to pay these obligations in either coin and to pay them out so as to maintain the parity between the two metals.

And thus the matter stands to-day, that every obligation which this Government owes, except a few gold certificates, is payable, at the option of this Government, in either gold coin or in silver coin of the same standard value as that in use and authorized by the Government on July 14, 1870. But, strange to say, for some reason beyond human comprehension, Mr. Carlisle, the present Secretary of the Treasury, refuses to exercise this option on behalf of his own Government, which he has sworn to support, but pays out gold alone and at the option of the creditor. He did this until he drained the Treasury of gold, and then, instead of exercising the option which it was his duty to use in the interest of his Government and the people, and to pay out silver coin which he had in the Treasury, he proceeds to issue more bonds to buy gold, simply because the bondholders demanded gold.

That this is a betrayal of the high trust which he holds, it seems to me, should be plain and conclusive to every fair and unprejudiced mind of even ordinary intelligence.

It can not be claimed by anyone that any bondholder has ever had any reason to believe that he had any legal right to demand payment in gold. Not only is the existence of our statutes on this question sufficient notice to them and to all the world that these bonds may be paid in silver, but when the President made his bond deal with the syndicate in February, 1895, he sent a special message to Congress, under date of February 8, 1895, and urged this body to authorize him to issue gold bonds, saying that if the purchasers of these bonds could know that they would receive payment in gold that he could sell the bonds for $16,000,000 more than he could get for them as coin bonds.

I call special attention to the following paragraph of the message, which I ask to have read by the Secretary. Let him read the part that is marked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRYE in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

> The privilege is especially reserved to the Government to substitute at par within ten days from this date, in lieu of the 4 per cent coin bonds, other bonds in terms payable in gold and bearing only 3 per cent interest, if the issue of the same should in the meantime be authorized by the Congress.
>
> The arrangement thus completed which, after careful inquiry, appears in present circumstances and considering all the objects desired to be the best attainable, develops such a difference in the estimation of investors between bonds made payable in coin and those specifically made payable in gold in favor of the latter, as is represented by three-fourths of a cent in annual interest. In the agreement just concluded the annual saving in interest to the Government, if 3 per cent gold bonds should be substituted for 4 per cent coin bonds under the privilege reserved, would be $539,159, amounting in thirty years, or at the maturity of the coin bonds, to $16,174,770.
>
> Of course there never should be a doubt in any quarter as to the redemption in gold of the bonds of the Government which are made payable in coin. Therefore the discrimination in the judgment of investors between our bond obligations payable in coin and those specifically made payable in gold is very significant. It is hardly necessary to suggest that whatever may be our views on the subject, the sentiments or preferences of those with whom we must negotiate in disposing of our bonds for gold are not subject to our dictation.

Mr. BUTLER. The President of the United States in that document admits that this great Government is in the hands of and at the mercy of these gold gamblers. That is no doubt true with Grover Cleveland in the White House; but that such a humiliating condition could exist if we had an Andrew Jackson for President every true American will indignantly deny.

But what I wish to call special attention to is that in the very contract which the President then made with the gold trust there is a distinction made between a gold bond and a coin bond to an amount exceeding $16,000,000.

Now, if these bondholders were willing to give a certain sum for this issue of bonds, providing they were to be payable in gold, but were willing to give and did give $16,174,770 less because they were not to be payable in gold, then I wish to ask any intelligent man in what money should these bonds be paid?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. May I ask the Senator from North Carolina a question?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. If they should be paid in gold would they not on their own confession and their own admission receive a bonus of just that amount more than they say they are themselves entitled to?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly. That is plain to any man of ordinary intelligence. I am sorry that our Secretary of the Treasury and our President can not see it. Their stupidity in this, as in other matters, has already cost the people millions of dollars, and almost bankrupted the nation.

Mark you, the bondholders offered a gold price for these bonds and then offered a price $16,174,770 less as a coin price, which they said meant silver. Therefore, I say that there is no legal or moral obligation of this Government to pay these bonds in gold, or any part of them in gold, but it has every legal and moral right, and it is the duty of this Government, to pay every dollar of them, principal and interest, under the circumstances. in silver, and I challenge any Senator on this floor to contradict the correctness of this statement.

A few days ago the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], in a speech on this floor, attempted to justify the Administration in pursuing this sucidal course. Now, I would like to ask him a question, or, rather, to put a plain, simple, business proposition to him. It is this: Suppose on January 1, 1895, I had given my note to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], in which I promised to pay him on January 1, 1896, either 1,000 bushels of wheat or 2,000 bushels of corn at my option. Suppose on the 1st day of June my business called me to Europe, and, knowing that I could not return before the 1st of January, that I had asked the Senator from New York to act as my friend and trusted agent, and to pay this debt for me on the 1st of January, in the manner that would be most advantageous to me. Of course, I would have called his attention to the fact that my crop had not been harvested, that I did not know how my yield of corn or wheat would be, but that I feared that my wheat crop was short. Now, let us suppose that my corn crop was a bountiful one, but that my wheat crop was a failure. I want to ask the Senator from New York whether, under these conditions, he would have paid my debt to the Senator from Ohio in the corn which I had in my barn in abundance, or would he have mortgaged my farm to raise money with which to buy wheat to pay the debt?

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator want an answer to that long and complicated question now?

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator can use his own pleasure, but I would be glad to hear from him now.

Mr. HILL. I have forgotten what the first part of the question was.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the way with these gold bugs. They excuse their wrongdoing by ignorance and want of memory. [Laughter.] That is the only excuse for their sins of omission and commission.

Mr. HILL. I hardly think the Senator from North Carolina can expect me right off to answer a long question that takes about one page of recital—recital of the ridiculous fact that the Senator from Ohio would be apt to take the Senator's note for any very large amount.

Mr. BUTLER. Unless it was payable in gold.

Mr. HILL. Well, if payable in any way, possibly. There are too many assumptions in it, and it requires rather too much deliberation to answer it offhand in a reasonable time.

Mr. BUTLER. I will give the Senator from New York an opportunity to think over it and give the answer at his leisure.

Mr. HILL. It does not require very much time, but I hardly think I will indulge myself now to answer the question.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I will proceed to say what I think the Senator would and should do as my trusted friend. The fact that the Senator from Ohio——

Mr. HILL. The Senator can answer it himself if he wants to. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not catch the Senator's remark.

Mr. HILL. I say the Senator can proceed to answer it himself if he so desires.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from New York will have full opportunity to correct my statement as to how he would act if I do not state it correctly. I will state what it would be his duty to do, and leave it for him to say whether or not he would do his duty.

No doubt the Senator from Ohio would demand payment in wheat, but you would not for a moment consider his demand. You would call his attention to the letter of the contract and insist on paying him according to the contract, in the manner most advantageous to me. Especially would you do this if you had learned that the Senator from Ohio had cornered all of the wheat in the country, and besides had nearly every other farmer in the country in debt to him on the same kind of notes and was trying to force payment from them all in wheat, when there was no wheat to be had except you purchased it from him and at a price double what it was when the debt was made.

I say that if you had given up the option which I had in my contract and had mortgaged my farm to buy wheat at an enormously increased price, everybody would say that you were either a fit subject for the lunatic asylum or that you had been improperly influenced by a pecuniary consideration or otherwise by the Senator from Ohio. In short, your conduct would be infamous. It is true that the Senator from Ohio might threaten that he would ruin my credit if you did not pay my debt in wheat as he demanded, but you would promptly answer him that neither he nor anyone else could ruin my credit as long as I was able to pay my debts according to the contract and still have corn left in abundance in my barns.

You would furthermore tell him promptly that the surest way of ruining my credit would be by mortgaging my farm to buy wheat at a 100 per cent advance in price and thereby discriminating against the corn, the property which I had, and causing it to fall in price. The difference would be a man out of debt with plenty of means for support, or deeply in debt, paying twice as much as the value received, and with the property that he had left depreciated in value on account of the discrimination.

In case I pursued such a short-sighted and foolish policy I would find myself at the end of the next year, when the mortgage on my farm came due, forced to give another mortgage to buy more wheat at a still further advanced price to pay the debt. Thus, year after year, though my fields teemed with corn in abundance, I would be forced to plaster fresh mortgages upon mortgages on my farm until the mortgages amounted to more than the value thereof. Where would my credit be then?

Now, this is exactly what our Government is doing to-day. We are issuing bonds—putting a mortgage upon this country to buy gold to pay a debt when we have the option of paying that debt in silver. This policy was inaugurated by the Republican party, not only without shadow of law, but in defiance of law. The Democratic party denounced this policy and denounced it justly, and promised the people to put a stop to it. The Democratic party came into power, but it has adopted the Republican policy, which leads to bankruptcy and ruin. Both old parties have betrayed their trusts to the American people. They stand to-day hand in hand, mortgaging the property and liberty of this country away to foreign gamblers and speculators. You call Benedict Arnold a traitor. He surrendered but one army post to Great Britain. What will you say of those who are trying to surrender the whole American continent to Great Brltain?

But the Secretary of the Treasury says that the greatest danger in our currency system now is the greenbacks. He says that those who want to raid the Treasury and deplete it of its gold gather up greenbacks and come to the Treasury and demand gold. I want to ask what right they have to demand gold, and what right has he to pay gold. I want to ask if these greenbacks are not coin obligations, every one of them payable in silver at the option of the Government. If the Secretary would redeem the greenbacks in silver, if he would do his duty under the law, this raid upon the Treasury would stop, and stop at once. I challenge any Senator on this floor to contradict this statement. In short, the Secretary of the Treasury has the option of redeeming every one of these notes in either gold or silver coin, and, therefore, if any speculator or capitalist gets a single dollar of gold out of the Treasury it is the fault of the Secretary, who is the sworn officer of the Government to protect it; and it is his fault alone.

This is the same endless chain that we hear so much about. There could be no endless chain without the consent and connivance of the Treasury Department. How is it worked? The Secretary of the Treasury proposes to issue bonds to buy gold; the speculators, who are to get the bonds, gather up $50,000,000 of greenbacks, go to the Treasury, and demand $50,000,000 in gold for them.

Is the Secretary bound to pay them gold? No. But he does pay them gold, the very article that he is trying to get into the Treasury. The speculator receives the gold and then hands the same gold back over the same counter for $50,000,000 of bonds. What is the result of this transaction? The Government has handed its gold across the counter and taken the same gold back again, and therefore has not a single dollar more of gold than it had before. But it has something else. It has a debt of $50,000,000, and the interest commences from that hour and grows day and night. Yes, a $50,000,000 debt and not a single thing under heaven to show for it. That is financiering. If that is not incompetency, then, in the language of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], it must be something worse, which he called "dishonesty."

This is the endless chain, this is the folly, if not the crime, that our Government is guilty of; this is the way that our debt is piled up without receiving anything in return therefor. This is the way that the people are robbed by their own officers for the benefit of the speculators and gold gamblers. In short, this whole trouble, this whole cry about gold going out of the country, this whole clamor about bonds, is due almost entirely to the willful and persistent violation of law by the officers of this Government. They act as if they were agents for the gold combine instead of the trusted agents and servants of the people. Let the Secretary of the Treasury commence to-day and redeem the greenbacks and United States notes and pay the principal and interest on the coin obligations of this Government according to the letter and spirit of the law and all of these dark troubles that are now hovering over our Government will vanish as fog before a rising sun.

Inasmuch as the Secretary of the Treasury has not obeyed the law and used the legal option of the Government in the interests of the people, I have offered the amendment to the bill which was read at the beginning of my remarks.

I ask that the amendment be read again, and I call special attention to the last division of it.

The amendment was read, as follows:

SEC. 4. That the issuance of interest-bearing bonds of the United States for any purpose whatever, without further authority of Congress, is hereby prohibited; and that the Secretary of the Treasury when redeeming United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, and Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, and when liquidating either the interest or principal of any of the Government's coin obligations is hereby directed to make such payment in gold coin whenever the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold is less than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, and to continue to pay in such gold coin until the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be equal to the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver; but when the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold shall be greater than the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver, he shall pay the interest and the principal of said coin obligations as they become due in silver coin, and continue to pay the same in silver coin until the market value of 412½ grains of standard silver shall be equal to the market value of 25.8 grains of standard gold, and said notes, commonly called greenbacks, when so redeemed, shall be reissued, as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

Mr. BUTLER. The provisions of this section are perfectly simple and plain. It simply directs the Secretary of the Treasury, in express terms, with no option, to do what everybody thought he or any patriot would do in exercising the option of the Government in paying our coin obligations. The law expressly declares that he shall use this option to keep gold and silver at a parity. If that law means anything it means that whenever, for any cause, there is a greater strain on gold—that is, a greater demand for gold than for silver—that then he shall use the Government's option to pay our coin obligations in silver, and, on the other hand, whenever silver is scarce, whenever there is a greater demand for silver and the price goes up, that then he shall equalize the demand for the two metals by paying our coin obligations in gold and continue the strain on gold until the two metals come back to a parity.

I will answer here a question asked me by a distinguished citizen a few days ago. He asked why I insisted on putting this provision on the bond bill along with a provision reported by the committee providing for the free and unlimited coinage of silver. That gentleman, whose name I shall not call, rather chided me, and said, "You and every other advocate of free silver all over the world have been claiming that the free and unlimited coinage of silver on equal terms with gold would bring silver to a parity with gold; that is, have claimed that 412½ grains of silver would always practically be worth as much as 25.8 grains of gold." That is true provided that there are no other laws, or conditions created by law, to artificially disturb this parity.

I will illustrate. We can coin gold and silver on equal terms, but the Secretary of the Treasury can send silver to a premium or gold to a premium, just as he chooses, by an improper use of the option which is vested in him by law of paying out gold or silver on our coin obligations. This option was vested in him so that he could keep the two metals at a parity, but if he cares nothing for his oath of office, or for the interests of the people, or the credit of this Government, he can use this option to cause a disparity between the two metals. So far he has used his option for the profits of the gold trust, against the interests of the American people, and to the detriment of the credit of our Government.

There is another reason, and I wish to call particular attention to it. In the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 there was inserted a clause, known as the exception clause, making it lawful for a private individual, corporation, or company to take notes or mortgages stipulating payment in gold only. This was a very unwise and unjust provision. It was slipped into that act in the interest of the monopolists, the gold combine, and the creditor class, and was done to depreciate silver and to appreciate gold. Under this law—which, by the way, was inserted into a bill which claimed to restore silver as money—there have been thousands and millions of dollars of mortgages and notes taken in this country requiring payment in gold. There is, practically, not a town or hamlet in the whole United States to which the banks have not sent orders to the business men calling upon them to take gold mortgages and gold notes only.

That is the case in the State of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL]; it is so in my State; it is so all over the country. There are probably a thousand million dollars to-day due under mortgages containing this gold clause. Until every one of these notes and mortgages are paid there will be a greater strain all over the country on gold than on silver, which, of course, will have the inevitable result of artificially increasing the price of gold. Therefore if we pass a free-coinage bill here to-day gold and silver can not come to a parity until every one of these gold obligations are paid, unless the strain on gold is offset by a like and equal strain on silver, unless the Secretary of the Treasury and the President will observe and carry out the letter and spirit of the law.

They have been paying out gold alone. Under this policy gold has continued to advance in price, while everything else has fallen in price as measured in gold, and the disparity between gold and silver has grown greater every day. But Dr. Cleveland and Dr. Carlisle continue and persist in the same experimental treatment,

though their patient continues to grow worse, has had several severe spasms, and is now in a very low, humiliating, and critical condition. Does not common sense say that the experimental treatment which they are now trying with such disastrous results should be stopped?

Can they be justified in pursuing their wild, cranky, and fanatical treatment any further? If they care anything for the life of their patient, for the prosperity of the people or the credit of this Government, should they not try the other treatment, which is recognized by law? They have the option of two treatments. They have tried the gold treatment with disastrous results; if they will not try the other should not Congress take their discretion from them and direct them specifically to try the other treatment?

Does not Congress care something for the life of the nation and the credit of the country? If the President and the Secretary of the Treasury do not, then let us do our duty and let us specifically instruct them how to save our credit. Hence the necessity for this amendment which I offer directing the Secretary of the Treasury specifically to carry out the intent of the law, the spirit and letter of the law under which all of our coin obligations have been issued.

If the Secretary of the Treasury had done his sworn duty, there would be no necessity for issuing bonds. This section takes away the discretion which he has abused and forces him to do his duty. But to make assurance doubly sure that no further bonded debt shall be heaped upon an already burdened people, I have also included a provision that no further bonds shall be issued for any purpose whatever without further authority of Congress.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] says that another one of the troubles with this country is that the balance of trade is against us. I most heartily agree with him in that statement. But when he goes further and charges that as the sole cause for gold going out of the country, and that, therefore, the gold export is due to the difference between the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill and the McKinley tariff bill, I most emphatically take issue with him. Gold has gone out under high tariffs and low tariffs. Gold went out constantly under the McKinley Act. In short, for the last eight years, under varying tariffs, gold has continued to rise in price and to be steadily drawn out of the country.

I undertake to say and to prove beyond successful contradiction that the chief cause for the balance of trade being against this country is, first, the fact that the products that we ship abroad we are forced to sell at a price less than the cost of production; second, because, on account of the difference of exchange between gold-standard countries and silver-standard countries, that we not only can not export the products of our soil and our manufactured products at a profit, but that the countries that were once among our best customers are now not only manufacturing and producing nearly all of the goods that they need for their own consumption, but have actually turned the tables upon us and are exporting their products into this country at a cost below that which it is possible for our manufacturers to make them. On account of this difference of exchange, the silver-using countries in the world to-day have a hundred per cent advantage over us or any other gold-standard country.

Now the question arises, how can this be remedied or prevented by a tariff? If every schedule in the McKinley tariff was doubled, it would not protect this country against the competition of silver-using countries, nor would it turn the balance of trade in our favor sufficient to protect our farmers, laborers, and manufacturers, or to prevent the export of gold, so long as this fatuous and blighting financial policy is pursued. In proof of this position, I beg leave to submit some facts taken from our consular reports.

First I have the Consular Reports for June, 1895, containing the report made by Consul-General Jernigan, at Shanghai, on "Trade with China." I regret that time will not permit the reading of extracts, at least, from the report now. It is an official report from an official representative of this Government in a foreign country. It contains valuable and alarming information. It is the duty of every man on this floor who is charged with the responsibility of legislation and who to-day is confronted with the evil of Asiatic competition and financial distress to study for the real cause. Therefore it is our duty to seek carefully the significant facts in the Consular Reports. I ask leave to insert certain extracts in my speech.

COTTON, COTTON GOODS, AND COTTON MILLS.

China is America's largest market for domestic cotton goods. In 1892 China imported from the United States 65,859,000 yards of domestic cotton; in 1893 she imported only 27,706,000 yards. These figures are taken from the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1893, and they show a falling off in this one item in one year of 38,153,000 yards.

The annual statement of the trade of the United Kingdom for 1893 also testifies to the material loss in the importation by China of cotton yarn and domestic cottons from Great Britain. In 1892 China imported British cottons to the quantity of 497,475,000 yards, and in 1893 only 365,405,000 yards. The changes in the number of yards of this commodity imported during 1894 from the countries named do not affect the application of the principle I wish to present for consideration in this connection.

The cause of the falling off, indicated in the importation of domestic cottons, will not appear in the ordinary rules governing trade, and as regards the United States the loss is so marked as to excite anxiety. The study I have been able to devote to the subject and the information derived from the most reliable statistical reports bearing upon it influence the opinion that one of the main causes lies quite beneath the surface.

I advance the opinion that the manufacture of cotton goods by China and Japan promises to decrease the importation by these countries of such goods from the United States.

In the report of the Yokohama Chamber of Commerce, dated May 14, 1894, it appears that the first spinning mill erected in Japan was erected in 1883, with 5,456 spindles. At the end of 1883 there were 16 mills, with 43,700 spindles; at the end of 1888, 24 mills, with 88,140 spindles; at the end of 1892, 39 mills, with 403,314 spindles; 1893, 46 mills, with about 600,000 spindles.

No statistics relating to the cotton mills of China have been published so full as those relating to the cotton mills of Japan, but such as have been published evidence an increase in the number of mills and spindles. The large local cotton mill at Shanghai, destroyed by fire in 1893, has been rebuilt, and is now conducted on a larger scale; and it is the opinion of conservative business men that the end of the present year will witness in full operation at least 360,000 spindles and 3,000 looms, besides numerous cotton gins ready to operate in the fifteen cotton mills in course of construction at Shanghai, Ningpo, and the ports on the Yangste River.

The number of pounds of cotton annually produced in China has not been accurately given, but the production is annually increasing, and the soil and climate in many parts of the Empire are favorable to raising a much better staple than is seen in the markets. Much of the cotton raised in China is taken by the cotton mills of Japan, but as the new cotton mills are erected in China, these will consume the greater part of the home supply, forcing Japan to look to other fields for raw material for her mills.

Japan, by geographical position and the nature of the soil and its general aspect, must be the manufacturing country of Asia, as Great Britain has so long been for Europe; and this fact brings nearer to the attention of the cotton producer of the United States the importance of shorter ways between their cotton fields and the cotton mills of Asia, especially by means of the Nicaragua Canal.

The rapid increase in the manufacturing industry of Japan and China could not be sustained in the absence of a compensating remuneration, and if the statistics show the remuneration to be compensating, then the means of making it so should be inquired about. It is known that the manufacturing industry generally of the United States has not yielded merited returns for the labor and skill of those engaged in it.

Osaka is the great manufacturing city of Japan. In Osaka, twenty-one mills paid an average dividend of 18 per cent, the highest dividend being 28 per cent and the lowest 8 per cent. The dividends for 1893 are given at 12 per cent, and for the first six months of 1894 at the rate of 16 per cent. These figures show that the cotton mills of Japan are richly remunerative, while reliable figures show impoverishing returns for the cotton mills of Great Britain, and an unfavorable outlook for those of the United States.

The London Economist of February 17, 1894, presented the balance sheets of 93 spinning companies in Oldham, England, showing a net total loss of £72,768 ($354,089) in 1893, with the discouraging information, comparatively, that, at the end of 1890, only 8 of these companies had adverse balances.

In the United States the freight charges on cotton from the cotton fields to the great mills of the North now enter so largely as an item in their balance sheets as to make the removal of the mills to the places of production a subject of serious consideration. Wages and freight are ominous items in the balance sheets of the cotton mills of the United States and Great Britain and are the items which the prudent business man will keep constantly before him. There is something wrong when comparative tables show results so adverse to the industry and skill of the two nations which have heretofore easily moved in the van of the manufacturing progress of the world. The results must be admitted, and it is the province of the economist to find the remedy.

CURRENCY AND LABOR.

It is here that the subject of wages should receive careful attention; and it should not be forgotten that while the law of supply and demand with regard to commodities is international, it is only national, and often provincial, with regard to labor. A bale of cotton may have the same exchangeable value in New Orleans, Liverpool, or Bombay, but the price of a day's labor in Bombay bears no relation to the price of a day's labor in Liverpool or New Orleans, and no adjustment of the two opposing principles can be effected unless a cargo of coolies can be imported as easily as a cargo of cotton.

An intelligent understanding of the influential agency of the price of labor in regulating the profits of manufacturing enterprise may be had from this illustration: In 1873 the mills of the Orient and Occident were competing on equal terms and receiving equal returns. Now, in 1894, each mill employs the same amount of labor as it did in 1873, but the owner of the mill in the United States pays for the labor in gold at the old rates, while the owner of the mill in Japan pays for the labor in silver at the old rates also. The Japanese mill owner paid in 1894, as he did in 1873, from 18 to 20 cents a day for men, and from 8 to 10 cents a day for women. That meant, in 1873, from 18 to 20 cents in gold a day for men and from 8 to 10 cents in gold a day for women.

Now, during the greater part of 1894 $1 in gold has been about equal to $2 of Japanese silver, which makes it clear that, on account of the depreciation of silver alone, without taking into account the low rate of standard wages which prevail in the Orient, the mill owners of the United States are now paying twice as much for labor as the mill owners of Japan. This may be one reason why the cotton mills in Japan are showing such handsome returns, while in the United States and Great Britain they are comparatively struggling for existence. Not only does this principle of the difference in the value of currency in which labor is paid in the eastern and western countries apply to wages, but it applies to whatever is essential to the success of agriculture and manufacturing enterprise.

* * * * * * *

The same grade of machinery which a few years ago gave superiority to the cotton mills of the United States and Great Britain is now used in the cotton mills of Japan and China, and the enterprise that transplanted it to those countries sent with it foreign skill and ingenuity to superintend and utilize its capacity.

* * * * * * *

As to commodities in Great Britain and the United States, the average prices are the lowest of the century, while the average prices, comparatively, of twenty leading commodities of Chinese production were nearly the same in Shanghai in 1893 as they were in 1873, and a higher degree of prosperity in China and Japan has accompanied this stability in prices.

The extracts show that the Asiatic countries and all silver-using countries are rapidly increasing their cotton mills. They also show the wholesome effect of a stable currency on those countries, where a dollar will buy as much now as it would twenty years ago.

Next, I have the consular report for September, 1895, and read

an extract from the report of Consul J. B. Gorman, at Matamoras, Mexico:

Mexico is increasing her manufactures in every branch of trade possible, as heretofore she has been dependent on foreign countries for her manufactured goods.

The same consular reports show that the trade of Russia is in a most prosperous condition. We learn that the cotton weaving and spinning mills of Moscow are paying a dividend of from 25 to 35 per cent. Will some gold man boast of such profits in a gold country? The balance of trade is in Russia's favor, and she has accumulated gold instead of exporting it.

In this connection I also send to the desk and ask to have read an interview with Mr. Ransom, United States minister to Mexico, clipped from the Washington Post of last Monday, January 6. Mr. Ransom, I believe, now claims to be a gold man. Listen to what a gold man says about a silver country.

The Secretary read as follows:

Ex-Senator Ransom, present minister to Mexico, who has been in the city for a few days, leaves for his home in North Carolina to-day, but will be back in Washington on his return to Mexico in the course of a week or ten days. Mr. Ransom says a great deal of American capital is being invested in Mexico, and that a large number of American citizens are engaging in business there. The best of feeling prevails between Mexicans and Americans, and Mexico is generally very prosperous.

"The Diaz administration has been making unusual efforts to advance the Republic on the high road of substantial prosperity," said Mr. Ransom, "and these efforts have turned out successfully in every respect. With the Government like the present, Mexico has a great future before her. Commercial relations between the United States and Mexico are expanding on a constantly widening basis, and the increase in commerce is so large that it is utterly impossible for anyone to make an estimate of what it will be in the future."

Mr. BUTLER. It is hard to say how much of that kind of evidence it will take to convince Mr. Ransom that he was right before he got wrong. I hope the time is near at hand.

Thus we have the testimony of Consul Gorman and Minister Ransom to the effect that Mexico, instead of buying largely of our manufactured goods as she has in the past, is now increasing her manufactures in every branch of trade possible. Minister Ransom says that the exports of that country are rapidly increasing, that the country is in a wonderfully prosperous condition, and that American capital is leaving this country and going to Mexico to embark in manufacturing enterprises and other industrial pursuits. Now, Mexico is preeminently a silver country, and this testimony must be accepted as conclusive, emanating as it does from a man who enjoys the confidence of the President and is a mouthpiece of his gold-standard policy.

Poor, despised, silver-crank country, Mexico! And yet a gold man testifies that that country is progressing and prospering wondrously, and he can not say the same thing about his own country.

What does this testimony mean? It means one thing certain, that our manufacturers at home will lose the trade of Mexico, thus closing a number of our enterprises and throwing labor out of employment. It means that these enterprises will leave this country and go to Mexico to build up that country and make it rich. With this same thing going on not only in Mexico but in China, in Japan, in Russia, and other silver-using countries, does it not mean that the balance of trade will soon be turned more largely against us than ever, and that there will be an increased demand for gold, not only to pay the increasing interest of our increasing public debt but also to settle the large balance of trade annually against this country?

I wish to call the attention of the manufacturers of this country especially to this fact. It is time that they were taking notice of these facts and studying this question from a broader and higher point of view. If Great Britain continues to dominate our financial policy, she will also surely control our industrial policy. If she will sacrifice her own manufacturers, will she not also ruin ours? Besides, if this British gold policy is not stopped and this difference of exchange corrected, will not our farmers soon be in a worse condition than they are now? Will not the same silver-using countries soon produce all of their wheat and raw cotton instead of buying it from us, and at the same time supply Europe with those commodities, and destroy our market and deprive us of the power of buying gold there with our products, for if we do not buy gold with products we must buy it with bonds, which we are now doing to make up a deficit which is growing larger each year? This will be amply shown by extracts from other consular reports which I will insert in my remarks. From the consular report of November, 1895, being the report of Consul-General Jernigan, at Shanghai, on "Cotton mills and the cotton industry in China," commencing on page 354, I submit the following extracts:

COTTON MILLS IN CHINA.

The fourth provision, article 6, of the treaty of peace between Japan and China, made at Shimonoseki, Japan, April 17, 1895, reads as follows:

"Japanese subjects shall be free to engage in all kinds of manufacturing industries in all of the open cities, towns, and ports of China, and shall be at liberty to import into China all kinds of machinery, paying only the stipulated import duties thereon."

This provision materially enlarges the area for enterprise and trade in Asia, and as commerce is recognized as the great civilizing agency, Japan has accomplished more for Asiatic civilization on that line than a century of European diplomacy and arms. The opening has been made for the introduction of a great industry into the vast empire of China, and though for the present confined to the open ports and cities, the influence will be far-reaching, and public and private thought will be awakened and directed into new industrial channels.

Doubtless under the influence of the provision named, the Shanghai Chamber of Commerce, at the meeting on May 20, 1895, was able, through its chairman, to make the following announcements:

"The question as to the right of importing machinery for the purpose of cotton spinning has been settled in favor of Messrs. Jardine, Matheson & Co., who for some months past had machinery lying here waiting for permission to land it. A cotton mill under British management will be erected immediately."

The prospectus for the first cotton mill to be erected under the new auspices, and the announcement of which elicited the applause of the Shanghai Chamber of Commerce, is now before the public. The capital is 1,000,000 taels,* divided into 10,000 shares of 100 taels each. The prospectus states that "the company is formed to take advantage of the increasing demand on this market for coarse counts of cotton yarn by erecting, to begin with, a spinning mill of about 28,000 spindles; and availing of an abundant supply of locally grown cotton and plentiful cheap labor, a yarn can be produced which will command a ready sale at handsome profits."

A calculation is made upon the basis of the average cost of raw material during the last two years, the lowest price at which locally spun yarn has sold during its introduction, and making provision for the most liberal estimate of working expenses, estimated on the experience of existing mills, and writing off 10 per cent per annum from value of machinery, the prospectus anticipates for the company a handsome net profit on the capital proposed. The 10,000 shares were promptly sold.

At this writing there are in contemplation three large cotton mills, and a prospectus for each mill is now before the public—the one named, another for a mill of 40,000 spindles, and a third for 28,000 spindles. The larger mill will be under the general management of a well-known American firm, and in the prospectus an estimate of the expenditure on capital account of a cotton mill of 40,000 spindles is presented: The cost of the machinery for the plant is estimated at 500,000 taels, the land improvement at 40,000 taels, preliminary expenses and contingencies at 10,000 taels.

The ready value of the output of such a mill, working 300 days, with a proper deduction for brokerage, is estimated at 1,611,900 taels.

The expenditure, including raw material, cost of working, duty (if any is incurred), expense of management, and depreciation in machinery and building, is estimated at 1,475,630 taels, leaving a balance available for dividends of, say, 17 per cent on 800,000 taels.

The dividend anticipated from the expense and profit account thus stated is based upon other considerations. In one prospectus, it is argued that experiments, made and verified by the experience of existing local mills, show that locally produced yarns are superior to Indian yarns, in which so great a trade has, in recent years, been established; and that there is no reason why such yarns should continue to be imported when similar yarns can be manufactured at Shanghai, and of a superior grade.

The import of Indian yarns during the past four years at Shanghai annually averages over 195,000 bales of 3 piculs each (1 picul=133⅓ pounds), while the principal ports in the south of China have taken during the same period an average of 136,000 bales.

In the calculation, there does not seem to be any apprehension as to a sufficient supply of raw material for the mills. In 1886 the export of cotton from Shanghai to Japan was 47,600 piculs, and the total export 278,600 piculs. In 1894 Japan took 576,000 piculs, and the total amount of cotton which left Shanghai was 930,400 piculs. It may be noted that the large increase in the exportation did not increase the price of cotton, and this may confirm the opinion among business men here that the Chinese are prepared to extend the area of the cultivation of cotton in proportion as the demand arises. Along the Yangtse Valley the soil available for cotton cultivation appears as limitless as the supply of labor in China appears inexhaustible. It is seen, after supplying the local demand, what a large quantity of cotton was exported during the past year, and it is estimated that this exported cotton would run 360,000 spindles in addition to those already at work.

There are three cotton mills now at work here, with, in all, 66,200 spindles, and three more, with 49,000 spindles, about to begin operations. Adding these to the three the plans or outlines of which are now before the public, and which have been referred to, there will, ere a great while, be nine cotton mills in full operation, with a total spinning capacity of 265,200 spindles.

There are four ginning mills of 176 gins in all. These gins are Japanese imitations of foreign gins, and ginning machines are used throughout this cotton district, made in Japan and worked by the feet.

The machinery for the mills is made in Great Britain. The cost for a complete plant averages about $4 (American) per spindle. The native spindle is very rudimentary, roughly made of bamboo, and can be purchased for $1 (Mexican); but many of the Chinese women now prefer to receive the yarn spun at the mills and weave it into cloth.

Raw cotton is procured for the mills from the producer through Chinese agents, who travel the cotton-producing districts and arrange for the purchase and delivery of the raw cotton when ready for shipment, which is usually conveyed to the mills in junks and small boats, at a small cost and convenient alike to seller and buyer, as the mills are situated by the river side, favorable to the reception and export of the material. The price of raw cotton is about 12 haikwan taels per picul, and a bale of yarn of 3 piculs weight will average about 61 taels. Skilled male labor is worth 30 cents (about 17 cents gold) per day, and skilled female labor 20 cents.

With the same improved machinery, an ample supply of raw cotton, and labor at such low prices, the advantage of an Asiatic over a Western cotton mill is quite evident. Before China can manufacture fine cotton, however, there must be a very material improvement in the grade of the raw product.

* * * * * * *

When the Chinese are taught the advantage of properly spacing their cotton rows and thinning the cotton plant, so that the warm air and the rays of the sun can freely penetrate, the change from the present system of cultivation will be rewarded by an increased yield per acre and a much finer staple.

COTTON SPINNING IN JAPAN.

Having indicated the growing interest of the cotton-spinning industry in China, it will be interesting, by way of comparison, to trace the origin of the same industry which has grown to such proportions in Japan.

The first spinning factory in Japan was established in Kagoshima more than forty years ago by the greatest feudal prince of modern times. The name of this great Satsuma prince was Shimazu Harihisa, who, although born and bred to arms, and the lord of a province noted in Japanese annals for the martial prowess of its inhabitants, saw, with the eye of a statesman, the commercial advantage in the geographical position of his country, and that in peace Japan could win wealth as the manufacturing emporium for Asia. In

*The Tien-Tsin or trade tael equaled 76.1 cents in United States currency July 1, 1895.

1867 the second cotton mill in Japan was built in Oji, and these two were the only spinning factories until 1870. In 1870 two others were established by the Japanese Government, four more in 1880, four in 1881, one in 1882, one in 1883, and one in 1884. These factories are now operated by private companies, and are in a prosperous condition, working 92,978 spindles.

I also submit extracts from Consul-General Jernigan's report, contained in the same book, on "Trade with China," commencing at page 360:

TRADE OF CHINA IN 1894.

The report for the year 1894 on the foreign trade of China, prepared by the secretary of the British legation at Pekin and published by the foreign office in August of this year, is one of exceptional interest and deserves more than a passing mention. The writer of the report says the most remarkable feature of the trade reports for 1894 is the fact that good results have been obtained and a promising revival of commercial prosperity has set in, in spite of numerous obstacles to success.

In the early part of the year a serious drought prevailed in southern China, and the plague at Hongkong and Canton seriously affected business with the colony. The outbreak of war naturally entailed great uncertainty and dread of attack at the ports. Floods damaged cereals in the north, and during the autumn a succession of destructive typhoons in southern China injured the rice and sugar crops. Yet, notwithstanding all these hindrances, as well as the disturbance to industries caused by the mobilization of troops throughout the provinces and the increase of taxation for military expenditure, a satisfactory and prosperous year may be recorded as far as trade is concerned. The customs revenue was increased by every division of trade, with the sole exception of Indian opium. Both imports and exports show an advance, the receipts from the latter exceeding the maximum collected during the most prosperous days of the tea trade.

* * * * * * *

It is also remarked that "the country around the two cities produces cotton, and can be made to grow more if demand for it be stimulated. Ginning mills, spinning mills, and, finally, weaving mills must become numerous in the country.

These extracts show conclusively that the time is near at hand when the silver-using countries will not only manufacture all of their own goods and raise their own cotton and other raw materials, but will soon be flooding this country with their exports, to the ruin of our own industries.

Is it possible, under such conditions, for the balance of trade to be turned in our favor by any kind of a tariff? In fact, is there any remedy—if there is, I want to hear it—but to equalize exchange by opening our mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver on equal terms with gold?

I also have here advance sheets from the last report of Consul-General Jernigan on labor and wages in China and Japan, which will appear in the next publication of the Consular Reports.

LABOR AND WAGES IN CHINA.

* * * * * * *

Among western nations, the impression prevailed at one time that Asiatic races were more imitative than original, and that in the industrial departments where originality was the chief element of success the Occident need not fear the Orient as rivals. The test has been made, and the result has greatly modified, if not entirely removed, the impression. Within the last quarter of a century Japan has thrown off a most oppressive form of feudalism and advanced to the forefront as a nation of progressive ideas. Twenty-five years ago a system of government obtained in Japan which discouraged all liberal enterprise. Centuries of political slavery, intrenched in formidable prejudices, seemed to have crushed out the very soul of the Japanese people, and the Empire was dominated by the tyranny of great feudal chiefs, the remains of whose castles now scattered over Japan, attest to the traveler the strength and wealth of the former owners and the servitude and poverty of their retainers.

* * * * * * *

The gates of the Empire of Japan, so long closed to the Westerner, were opened to his coming, and the Japanese soon learned to appreciate and utilize the productions of Western thought and skill. To-day, the navy-yards, arsenals, factories, banks, and large commercial houses of Japan prove that there is in Japanese character a reserve force which is destined, if judiciously regulated and directed, to assure still greater achievements in industrial fields. The attestations are too numerous to leave doubt that the Japanese are not only original in conception, but possess the power of concentration and execution.

China is behind Japan in the civilization of the West, and an enchantment still lingers over Asia which Western civilization has not removed by the stern realities which follow in its wake. The awakening of China, as prophesied by one of her greatest statesmen, has not been realized. The Empire still sleeps, but passing events indicate that the hour of awakening is not far distant.

* * * * * * *

During the last fiscal year the value of the trade relations between Japan and the United States was estimated, in round numbers, at $28,000,000, but the figures show a balance against the United States of $19,000,000, yet Japan is nearer to the United States than any other Western nation, and during the same period the value of the aggregate trade relations between China and the United States was estimated at $24,000,000, with a balance against the United States of $16,000,000.

This shows that these silver-using countries are rapidly advancing in civilization, and that they have already turned the balance of trade against this great, glorious, prosperous, high-protective, but gold-cursed America.

Thus we see that our consuls and ministers tell us that our trade is suffering with these countries and will suffer worse in the near future. They see the present danger and see the threat and menace of the future. But there is one strange thing about their reports—neither Minister Ransom nor any of our consuls, with one exception, seems to understand what is the cause of this great danger and future menace to our trade. Either they have not studied the question deep enough or they do not feel at liberty to tell the real cause.

What remedy is offered by our Republican friends for this condition that confronts us? They offer the gold standard and high protection. When they offer the gold standard as a remedy they offer us a cure which is the very poison that has caused the disease. When they offer us higher protection as a remedy they offer that which can not protect the manufacturer or the farmer against the overshadowing evils caused by the single gold standard.

If the McKinley tariff was increased 100 per cent it would not protect our American manufacturers against the manufactured products of the silver-using countries. To do so it would be necessary to make the tariff so high that it would not only cover the difference between the cost of labor in the two countries, but also high enough, in addition, to cover the difference of exchange between gold and silver using countries, which is alone 100 per cent. No wise or patriotic manufacturer can ask for such an enormous increase of the protective tariff, for the enlightened opinion of the farmer and of the whole country would be against granting such a request, while the producer, who has no protection and who has already been impoverished, now has his products reduced in price more than one-half by Asiatic competition. At last the same causes which have for years been ruining agriculture are now reaching the manufacturers themselves, and if not corrected will in the end destroy both. The protection that the farmer needs above everything else is protection against the gold standard. The manufacturer will soon learn, if he has not already learned, that this is the only protection that will save him.

With a sufficient supply of full legal-tender money to meet the increasing needs of our people and preserve the stability of prices, the farmer and the manufacturer can go hand in hand in building up all of the productive industries of our country, but if the manufacturers insist upon a single gold standard then there can be nothing in common between them and the agriculturists of the country. The farmers are now perfectly aware that the tremendous fall in the price of their products is due to the scarcity of money and to Asiatic competition. Therefore they can not and will not consent to riveting their shackles more firmly by assisting in artificially raising the prices of manufactured products while no steps are taken to prevent the depreciation of the prices of the products of the soil.

This Congress can not afford to increase taxation without at the same time increasing the ability of the people to pay. Therefore we should not vote to pass any tariff bill for increased revenue unless we, at the same time and in the same bill, strike down the single gold standard and increase the number of legal-tender dollars in this country by the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

Commerce can not expand while money is contracted. Nothing can expand except debt and misery while the volume of money is contracting. The thing that has blessed the silver-using countries is that their silver money has remained stable in purchasing power and debt-paying power. The thing that is ruining us is the appreciation of gold.

But, to return to our consuls. I repeat that it is passing strange that they should point out the alarming menace to the prosperity of this country as they do and not at the same time point out the cause or suggest a remedy. They hold their positions by appointment from a most vicious, cruel, and relentless gold monomaniac. This may be the explanation. The silence of the bulk of the American press on this question is also very noticeable. A few papers have called attention to the dangers, but only a very few have pointed out the cause. Are they ignorant, or is it possible that so many of them are under the influence of British gold?

In this connection I wish to call attention to two high-tariff papers. Here is one, the American Economist, which I think is run as a kind of Republican campaign paper to talk tariff. This paper, in every column, is talking about tariff, tariff, tariff. Occasionally it finds room to put in a little paragraph giving some news item, and here is a news item that I find in its columns, which I ask the Secretary to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

Japan is the only country in the world that has bought more raw cotton from us, since the new crop year began, than in 1894. A year ago, in three months to November 30, Japan took only 810 bales, or 464,411 pounds, of our cotton. This season Japan has taken 5,800 bales, or 3,066,891 pounds, an increase of 5,000 bales. While the larger quantity is not alarming as yet, it is mighty significant to our cotton manufacturers, who may feel the effect of this cheap labor competition a little sooner than they anticipated.

Mr. BUTLER. The Journal points out the evil, but fails to point out the cause or the remedy for it. The editor says it is significant and dangerous, but he does not say that the tariff will remedy it, either because he knows it will not or because he did not want to admit that the tariff was not a panacea for all ills.

I hold another paper in my hand, the Home Market Bulletin, which is spending its days and nights talking about the beauty of the home market and high tariff. Here we have almost exactly the same news item. The article reads:

In 1893 Japan took American raw cotton to the value of 1,273,421 yen and in

1894 to the value of 2,680,671 yen. The yen is worth 99 cents and 7 mills in gold A business which more than doubles in one year may be said to be good.

But of course this means that we shall sell Japan little or no cotton yarn or cloth hereafter, and if Japanese cottons do not deluge our home market within five years it will be because our tariff is raised to keep them out.

This editor rashly says that the tariff is the remedy. But it will be noticed that he was careful not to say how high it would be necessary to build the tariff wall. If he had attempted to do so his statement would have fallen of its own weight and ugliness.

In this connection I want to quote what a business man says in an interview in the Washington Post of December 10, 1895, which I ask the Secretary to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

"Few people are aware to what extent the Japanese are becoming our competitors in the manufacture of certain lines of goods, and if something is not done to counteract it, there will ere long go up a big wail from our people," said Hon. George A. Maltz, of Detroit, at the Arlington.

"Not long ago a friend of mine in New York was waited on by the representative of a Japanese firm and shown samples of buttons made over there. The price asked was so low that my friend supposed there was some mistake, but he was convinced to the contrary, and gave an order of $9,000. This is but one instance. In the matter of making matches they can send every concern that produces them in the United States into bankruptcy. Of course the reason lies in the difference of wages. Fifty cents a week will pay for labor in Japan, and we can not compete against that."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, you see that that business man points out clearly the danger. He says that if something is not done "a big wail will soon go up from our people," but he satisfies himself by saying it is all due to the difference between labor. Here is direct testimony as to the great evil, but a dodging as to the real cause. If the difference in wages is a cause at all, it is a very small cause compared with the difference of exchange.

It is plain to any man who will investigate the question that the extraordinary development of manufactures in Japan is due absolutely to the fact that silver was demonetized here and in Europe. Japan is the rival of our manufacturers for that reason solely. Meantime, while the premium on gold gives huge protection to Japanese industry, it also acts as a huge bounty upon exports; so that, entirely apart from the difference in the price of labor, Japan would be able to beat us in our own market. Japan could well afford to multiply her present labor cost by 10 and then she could undersell us in this country.

No gold organ dares to print such a fact as this, and no gold advocate can answer these arguments. For years these journals and gold-bug politicians have been telling us that to have gold alone was to have high civilization and high advantage for our workmen. Now the fact is becoming clear, excepting to certain editors and politicians who are either dull or who do not dare to tell the truth, that with silver alone Japan is moving with wonderful rapidity toward a higher civilization, while her workmen are threatening ours with a fate which no intelligent man can regard without the gravest apprehension.

Now, let us for a moment notice the reports of the British consuls on this question. We are at once struck with the fact that, though they represent a gold Government, they seem to have either more acumen for ascertaining the real cause or to be allowed by their home Government more freedom to tell the cold, naked truth.

The British consul-general at Shanghai, Mr. George Jamison, and other British consuls have pointed out not only the danger but the real cause. They show by quoting facts and figures, backed by able and convincing reasoning, that it is the difference of exchange between gold countries and silver countries that has worked this marvelous change in the industrial affairs of the world. They show conclusively that in gold countries, where rents, taxes, and other fixed charges are to be paid in a constantly increasing gold measurement, the farmers and manufacturers, when they ship their products abroad, must get a higher price for these products, or cut down the wages of their workmen, or close their business. On the other hand, countries that have the benefit of a stable currency, countries where a dollar will buy no more labor and the products of labor than it would twenty years ago, and where, on the other hand, a dollar will pay as much taxes and debts now as it would twenty years ago, have a hundred per cent advantage of those countries where the purchasing power of the dollar has been doubled. They point out plainly that nobody in England is benefited by the gold standard except the money lender, and that it is his policy to increase the value of the dollar, so that annual interest on debts due from other countries may be doubled.

At this point I desire to call attention to the following editorial from the Mexican Financier, which I shall incorporate in my remarks. It contrasts in a striking manner the conditions existing in England and Mexico.

The article referred to is as follows:

One of our greatest of English merchants, doing business with the whole world, informs us that sensible people in Great Britain are getting their eyes well opened to the follies of their rulers. A body of eminently respectable business people up in Scotland got together the other day and passed resolutions favoring bimetallism. Meantime Mexican manufacturers are a contented lot. They are not filling the air with wailing, nor is their grief over the depression of British manufacturing such as to cause them to lose sleep or appetite. Ten dollars for a gold sovereign has served as a tonic to them.

Should silver continue low for two years more, as seems probable, hundreds of new manufacturing enterprises are certain to be started here (in Mexico). And the same thing will happen in all silver-using countries. The manufacturing "boom" has begun in the Orient, and that is the chief menace to the prosperity of Europe, for it implies the reduction of profits in the hitherto immense and lucrative trade with Asia.

The low value of silver naturally tends to keep money at home, and this is why the local traffic of the Mexican railways begins to reflect the more active internal movement. At the present rate of agricultural expansion here the railways will, in two or three years, begin to note a great improvement in their internal traffic. Exports will increase, and these in their turn mean additional imports.

Mr. BUTLER. I have also a recent editorial from the London Times, which admits that Asiatic competition and the gold standard are ruining everybody in England except idle holders of wealth. Commenting upon the marvelous growth of Japanese manufacturing, the article says:

The results already achieved are undoubtedly calculated to strike the imagination at first sight with astonishment and alarm. The most conspicuous of these results are those connected with the cotton industry.

In 1885 Japan imported only $800,000 worth of raw cotton; in 1894 she imported $19,500,000 worth, or more than four and twenty times as much. At the beginning of 1885 there were 19 spinning mills, with about 50,000 spindles, in Japan, and at the end of 1893 there were 46, with about 600,000 spindles.

The result was of course inevitable. The lower grade yarns, formerly imported from abroad, have practically disappeared from the Japanese market, the importation of middle grades is rapidly declining, and only the higher grades, which Japan has not yet set herself to produce, still maintain their footing. The importation of cotton yarns reached its high-water mark in 1888, when the growing supply from the native mills had not yet overtaken the growing demand arising out of a general increase of national prosperity and activity. In that year cotton yarns were imported from Great Britain and India in about equal proportions, to the total amount of 62,860,000 pounds. Six years later (in 1894) the importations from the same countries amounted to only 21,241,000 pounds, or barely one-third of the former figure.

If the pinch has not yet been more severely felt in England, it is due to the fact that the loss has so far fallen much more heavily on Bombay than upon Lancashire, for, while the imports from the latter have been reduced 40 per cent, those from the former have suffered to the extent of 90 per cent. Nor is this all; not only at the present rate of progress is the time within sight when Japan will cease altogether to import goods of this category, but last year, for the first time, she actually appeared an exporter, and for the respectable figure of 4,500,000 pounds.

* * * * * * *

While 93 spinning companies in Lancashire were working at a loss, the cotton mills of Japan were paying, in 1894, dividends of 16 and 20 per cent, and even more. These are results which may well provoke jealousy and apprehension among European manufacturers and importers of cotton goods, and, though not in the same degree, similar results may be already noted in connection with many other branches of industry. Ready-made clothing, boots and shoes, hats and caps, umbrellas, paper of every quality, beer, and matches are all represented by annually diminishing figures in the import columns of Japanese trade returns, while the corresponding figures in the export column are rising every year.

Silk manufactures exported from Japan have increased in value from $54,457 in 1885 to $8,400,000 in 1894. The annexation of Formosa may be expected to give an immense impetus to the sugar industry by securing to Japan a field of almost unlimited capacity for the production of raw sugar. Japanese coal, the exports of which have risen in value from under $2,000,000 in 1885 to over $6,500,000 in 1894, is rapidly driving English coal, except for special purposes, out of every market east of Singapore, and has already penetrated as far west as Colombo and Calcutta.

The manufacturers and farmers in England are suffering from this cruel policy almost as much as the people of the United States; but England can stand out against this competition longer than any other country, because the other nations of the world owe and pay to her annually over $1,000,000,000 in interest and other fixed charges. This keeps a steady stream of gold pouring into England, while at the same time it keeps a steady stream pouring out of every other country to England. If this difference of exchange, which the British consuls have pointed out so clearly, is ruining the trade of Great Britain, how much worse is it for a country like the United States, which owes large debts abroad and is forced to pay out annually $250,000,000 in interest alone, in fact about double that amount, when all the fixed charges are included? And if the gold standard is to be persisted in by our Government and this $500,000,000 of interest and fixed charges must be annually paid in gold, where is the gold to come from?

The annual production of gold in this country is only about $40,000,000 a year. This is only one-seventh enough to pay the annual interest that we owe on our foreign debts if we did not keep an ounce of gold in this country to fill teeth, for the arts and sciences, and not a single dollar for circulation. The annual output of gold of the whole world is not over $180,000,000. Therefore, if we had every ounce of gold produced annually in the whole world and presented to us as a free gift each year we would have only half enough to pay the annual interest that we owe abroad.

With this alarming condition of affairs, how can any sane man say that this Government ought to set up the single gold standard and thereby put a greater strain on gold, and thereby increase the price of gold against ourselves; thereby increase the price of the very commodity that we must have to pay our debts in by making it scarcer and dearer?

Mr. President, it seems to me like the policy of men run mad. It is deliberately establishing a policy that means a double tax upon the people and the industries of this country to pay to for-

eign creditors double what we owe. It is not only deliberately making it impossible for us to pay our debts in gold, but at the same time putting a blighting hand upon our wheat fields and our cotton fields and our factories and our industrial enterprises, and forcing them to bankruptcy instead of allowing them to prosper.

This enormous debt can not be paid in gold. We can continue to plaster mortgages on this country and borrow money from abroad to pay this interest, but there must be soon an end to any man's business or to any country's that is not making both ends meet in times of peace and prosperity but is forced to continue to pile up debt and increase the annual debt to be paid. If we continue to borrow now when will we be able to pay? Every dollar we borrow makes our burdens heavier next year. More interest must be paid each year. Can we ever get out of debt, can we ever prosper, under these conditions? Can we preserve our credit by running the country into bankruptcy? If we pursue this foolish policy, there is ahead of us, as sure as the sun shines, bankruptcy and repudiation. May God forbid that either should come.

But we can pay this debt, and we can pay it according to the letter of the contract; we can pay it as honest men and as an honest nation. How? By reversing this infamous, grinding, contracting policy, by legislating in the interests of Americans; by giving the people a sufficient volume of money to keep stability of prices and to encourage labor and industry. This money must be real money, real dollars, and not token dollars. It is the number of real dollars in circulation in every country that measures prices and controls prosperity.

Every dollar should be a full legal tender. Every dollar should stand on its own bottom and not be redeemed in other dollars. Every dollar must be as good as any other dollar, for a dollar that must be redeemed in another dollar is not as good as the dollar in which it is redeemed, and besides, such a dollar does not measure values or increase the ability of the people to pay debts. Let us have such an honest money as this, and then we will pay our debt in products instead of either gold or silver. Yes; we will prosper so that we will turn the balance of trade in our favor and have every country in the world to pay tribute to us for our products shipped to them. We will have a happy and prosperous country at home, for everybody will be busy, money can be secured to pay debts, money can be secured to supply the wants of our people, and besides, we will have surplus enough to pay every dollar that this Government owes, dollar for dollar, and in the dollar of the contract, and the money recognized and authorized by the Constitution.

A few weeks ago, when the President of the United States sent to Congress his message on the Venezuelan question, both Houses of Congress, irrespective of party, came forward and unanimously indorsed the President in upholding the Monroe doctrine. As I sat here in my seat and heard that message read, I began to hope that there was some change of heart in the Chief Executive of this country, or rather, I might say, I began to hope that he was no longer the victim of his evil environment. When I saw Senators of all parties rise on this floor and echo and reecho the patriotic sentiments of the President in upholding the great doctrine of self-defense and independence laid down by our forefathers, I also began to hope that American pride, that American honor, American patriotism, and American independence were still in the ascendency.

I began to hope that this session of Congress would not adjourn without wiping from our statute books some of the infamous laws enacted in the interest of English capitalists, if not by their influence, and would also enact such remedial legislation as would revive our drooping industries, as would put every idle laborer to work and every idle piece of machinery to turning.

Right here, however, it might be well to state that, according to my reading of the Monroe doctrine, the President did not state it as it was meant by President Monroe and his distinguished compatriots and as it is understood by the American people.

I call attention to the following paragraph in the President's message:

> Great Britain's present proposition has never, thus far, been regarded as admissible by Venezuela, though any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage and may enter into of her own free will can not, of course, be objected to by the United States.

If that is the Monroe doctrine, then the doctrine is a sham and a farce. That statement of the case leaves Great Britain or Venezuela to decide when the Monroe doctrine shall apply and when it shall not apply. If the Monroe doctrine means anything, it means that the United States Government will not allow any foreign power to gain any foothold on the soil of any American republic, or adjacent island, that might prove inimical to the welfare, independence, and stability of this Government, and that question, of course, was to be decided by our own Government. The opinion of Venezuela or the people of any other American republic or foreign monarchy does not enter into the matter.

If it is dangerous for Great Britain to push her dominions further in Venezuela, then it is just as dangerous for her to do it with the consent of Venezuela as it is for her to do it without the consent of Venezuela. Suppose that Venezuela should come to some agreement with Great Britain that was inimical to the safety of this country, or let us suppose that Great Britain should, to state an extreme case, bribe the officers of the Venezuelan Government and thereby get them to consent to turn over their whole territory to the protectorate of Great Britain, then what should the United States do? According to the President's interpretation of the Monroe doctrine, the United States should not interfere. Is that the Monroe doctrine? No. This seems to me to be too absurd for discussion. The Monroe doctrine is the doctrine of self-defense, and certainly we must decide when it is necessary for us to act in self-defense.

But let that pass. As I said before, this message of the President met the unanimous approval of Congress and the enthusiastic applause of the whole American people, not because they indorsed his interpretation of the Monroe doctrine, not so much for their interest at this time in the Monroe doctrine, but simply because it sounded, in a general way, like a frank, honest, patriotic, American sentiment, and chiefly because this independence was asserted against Great Britain. It has been so long since the people have heard a single patriotic American utterance from the White House, so long since they have seen a President who even claimed to live up to the Declaration of Independence, that they were ready to applaud anything that sounded patriotic—they were ready to applaud even the shadow of American patriotism.

The people, from Maine to California and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, were still applauding this message of the President, when another message was suddenly sent to Congress. It was sent to Congress in great haste. It was sent after the Senate and the House had passed a joint resolution to adjourn for the holidays. It was sent to the Senate five minutes before this body was to adjourn for the holidays. In fact, a telephone message was sent down to this body from the Executive Mansion asking us to remain in session until the message could get here.

What was that message? That message told us that there was a "crisis" hanging over us. That somebody's "unreasoning fear" had been aroused and was about to sacrifice the interests of the people. That message called upon us not to adjourn for the holidays, but to stay in session and do something to help the Executive lift this country out of the danger and distress in which it had been plunged "by our dangerous and fatuous financial operations." That message also gave us to understand that the President wanted authority to issue gold bonds, and at the same time indidirectly threatened to repeat the scandalous bond operations of last year if we did not comply promptly to his demand.

Mr. President, that message was received in this body with as little respect as any message that has ever come here from the Executive Mansion, and the applause of the people, which was still ringing out for the Monroe message, was at once hushed into silence—applause was petrified into fear and distrust. The great masses of the people, as well as the members of Congress, began to suspect that the Venezuelan message might not have been written in good faith.

Yes, I say, the people began to suspect that the President of the United States was trifling with their patriotic feeling, was masquerading in patriotic garb for the sole purpose of trying to serve our enemies; for the sole purpose of trying to score another point for the gold combine—to take one more step in carrying out the infamous gold conspiracy and drive one more nail in the coffin of American liberty and prosperity. In short, it was plain that the war scare was to be used as an excuse for piling up further the interest-bearing debt of this country, for further contracting the currency, for increasing the power of national banks, for fixing at once and forever the single gold standard upon us, and also, possibly, for the purpose of further increasing our standing army, to be used for the protection of that sordid despotism of wealth which seems has begun to fear the righteous indignation of a patriotic people.

In fact, when the plain people of the country come to think of this Venezuelan matter, they realize what a mammoth farce the whole affair is. In the first place, the President does not propose to prevent further British aggression on American soil, except with the consent of Venezuela or on condition that Great Britain can not influence that Government to change its ground. In the second place, the strip of land over which the controversy has arisen is of comparatively small consequence and owned, I understand, by a few private capitalists. In the third place, it is perfectly absurd to think of England going to war with this country over the few acres of bog, inhabited chiefly by crocodiles, down in Venezuela.

Why? For the simple reason that Great Britain makes now more money annually out of this country than the whole of the disputed territory, if not more than the whole of Venezuela, is worth. The fact is that the United States is the most valuable colony that Great Britain has got to-day. She does not want to fight us with arms when she has already conquered us in peace; or, rather, I

should say, when she has subjugated us and laid heavy tribute upon us by an industrial warfare more deadly and relentless to our interests and prosperity than any war that has been waged with sword and musket in the history of the world.

It is the resentment which our people feel against Great Britain on account of this industrial warfare; it is the hardships which our people feel from the heavy tribute which she lays upon us and our industries that caused the wonderful outburst of approval of the President's message on the Monroe doctrine, and, as I said before, our people are beginning to suspect that that message was used to divert the people's attention from the industrial warfare of Great Britain and to give Great Britain an opportunity to make a new raid upon our industries and our Treasury. Even the newspapers of this country that are friendly to the President's Administration admit that he used that message for the purpose of arousing the patriotic sentiment of this country and under that cover to get the people to submit to another bond issue. I hold in my hand a copy of the Evening Star of December 28. I ask the Secretary to read the part I have marked.

The Secretary read as follows:

WHY VENEZUELA WAS SELECTED.

More or less discussion has prevailed ever since the President's annual message was sent to Congress respecting his choice of Venezuela over Cuba as a subject for a patriotic deliverance. In the opinion of many of his friends, Cuba's case, being the more pressing, was the better of the two, and they wondered that he did not take it. Venezuela's case was good, but it was still open to arbitration. Cuba's, on the other hand, had passed into the field of open warfare and possessed so many likenesses to the case of the United States in the revolt against England that it touched American sympathies at every point.

Mr. BUTLER. This paper says pointedly that the President was in doubt for a time whether or not to send a message to Congress about Venezuela or about Cuba; that he hesitated about the choice that he would make; that his purpose was to select the one that would fire most the American heart. If Spain had been the country that was carrying on the industrial warfare against our interest, if Spain had been the country which had been influencing the legislation of our Government and was desirous of making a still further raid on us, then the President would have used a message on the Cuban question.

Yes, he would have sent to Congress a message telling us how in 1776 we struggled for liberty, how we took up arms to resent and defy unjust taxation—taxation without representation, and how to-day Cuba—poor, oppressed Cuba—was struggling against the same wrongs and fighting for the same priceless boon of liberty. Yes; he would have asked Congress to recognize Cuba as a belligerent in the contest with Spain. Similar statements have been made in other papers that are known to be friendly to the Administration and its policy. This certainly ought to be pretty good proof that the message was not sent to Congress in good faith, but for a sinister purpose. It sounds like Satan quoting Scripture. The people understood the game.

It is not the first time they have seen a man put on the livery of heaven in order that he might better serve the devil. I stand here to-day and warn the President of the United States and warn this Congress that the people have not been fooled by this ruse. They have their eyes open about this matter, and if either the President or this Congress suppose that under the influence of the patriotic sentiments contained in the message on the Monroe doctrine new crimes can be attempted against American prosperity and American liberty with impunity, they are treading on dangerous ground; they are outraging a people whose patriotism is not dead and whose manhood will surely assert itself—a people whose patriotism and manhood will as surely rise to condemn and brand their own faithless officials, to redeem this Government from the tyranny of British gold, as the manhood and patriotism of their ancestors over a hundred years ago redeemed it from British bayonets. We had Tories then; we have Tories now; but, thank God, the "sons of liberty" are still living, and this infamous conduct will make their tribe increase.

In the language of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], there is in this country to-day an "irrepressible conflict" between every honest industry, and the speculators and corporate vultures who live by organized greed and theft. I might say that there is an irrepressible conflict between the people and their own Government, because the voice, the interests, and wishes of the people of this country are not heard nor heeded, but it is the corporation vultures who have the ear of our Government and who are using it to squeeze and bleed those who create wealth, those who toil and spin.

This irrepressible conflict is more threatening to our future than the armies and bayonets of every foreign foe. My earnest prayer is that this conflict may be settled peaceably and with equal justice to all, but it can never be settled as long as the Executive Mansion of this country is occupied by a man who is either a willing or an unconscious tool of British gold and organized monopoly. It can never be settled until the people elect a President—until the people elect a man for President who is broad enough to see the needs of this whole country and who has the desire to do right with the same high patriotic unselfishness and devotion to duty as was exhibited by Jefferson, Jackson, and Abraham Lincoln.

There is no hope for relief, there is no hope for better times in the future, there is nothing ahead for us but despair and poverty as long as we continue to place at the helm of state such aliens, such enemies to American prosperity and liberty as Grover Cleveland and some of his predecessors. We must put in that high place a man who is an American, who is a patriot. How can it be done? Are not ninety-nine people out of a hundred in this country to-day suffering from the present evil conditions brought on us by bad legislation and mismanagement of Government affairs? Who brought about these evil conditions? It is not God's fault that this country is in distress. He has not visited us with plagues, famines, or pestilence, but has He not blessed us with sunshine and showers? Has He not blessed the American freeman with health and strength to labor and to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before?

It is not the fault of the people, for have they not used in an extraordinary degree the opportunities that have been placed before them? Each year they have worked harder than the year before. Each year they have created more wealth per head. In fact, they have created so much wealth that the gold bugs and the monopolists have raised the cry that the people are ruining the country by creating too much wealth—by making an overproduction of wealth. In short, heaven has given us the opportunity to make ourselves rich and prosperous; we have used that opportunity, and created enough wealth to make this country blossom like a rose and to surround every man who will work with comforts commensurate with his wants.

Then what has brought this distress to the country? What has thrown our laborers out of employment and turned them into tramps on the highways of the nation? What has brought starvation and poverty to the door of every farmer in the land? What has ruined millions of merchants and business men? I stand here to-day and charge—and defy contradiction—that it has been brought upon us solely by infamous laws enacted in this Capitol, and by a still more infamous execution or defiance of law by the Administration at the other end of Pennsylvania avenue.

The same thing has gone on whether the Republican party was in charge or the Democratic party in charge. The people are not to be blamed, except in one particular, and that is in allowing themselves to be cajoled or fooled or aroused by partisan prejudice into voting for and keeping in power their faithless agents who have robbed them. The great majority of voters in this country are opening their eyes to this infamy and to this betrayal of trust. The great majority of the people are throwing off their party yoke which they have worn so faithfully and so disastrously. They are anxious to get together under one banner and drive from power these gold conspirators.

The greatest hindrance to-day in the way of this, the men who are to-day the most to blame for keeping apart the people who would come together and right their wrongs and reestablish the Government of Lincoln, Jefferson, and Jackson, are some of the men who claim to stand by the people and for good government, the men who claim to oppose the gold standard and the rule of monopoly, but yet who sacrifice every principle of good government, who sacrifice the interests of the people for party success that they may remain in power and continue to draw their salaries. It is the duty of such men, placed in positions of trust by a confiding constituency, to put patriotism above party when the interest of the nation is at stake, and to point out to their people at home the sure way to relief. They ought to do it even if their advice resulted in crushing their own parties, for is not the country greater than party? Is not the welfare of the people more important than the success of any party? It is criminal for the people's representatives to try to hide the real issues and allow the people to be robbed in order that a party may triumph, in order that a few politicians may hold office.

The people can never get relief by simply voting for Congressmen and Senators who are pledged against this gold conspiracy, because too often such men are hampered, side-tracked, browbeaten, or converted in the interests of party harmony, if by no other means, after having come within these walls. Did we not have the humiliating, the shameful, spectacle of the Fifty-third Congress, elected by the people, pledged for the free coinage of silver, pledged not to repeal the Sherman law unless free coinage was put in its place, but yet that Congress, with a large majority pledged to stand by the people, yet changed by some mysterious and subtle power from the White House into a majority against the people and for the gold combine?

It was when President Cleveland and his gold conspirators of the two old parties were trying to strike down the only law that recognized silver and provided for the increase of the currency in this country that the late Senator Vance, who represented my State in this body for many years so faithfully, so patriotically,

said that the man who claimed to be a friend of the people, who claimed to be an American, yet who would vote for a bill to strike down the Sherman law without at the same time and in the same bill putting in its place a law providing for the free and unlimited coinage of silver on equal terms with gold, "was either a knave or a fool." Yet under the mysterious power behind the President a large number of men who were sent here pledged by their constituents to stand for free silver played either the "knave or the fool," or both.

I do not use those words. They were used by Zeb. Vance, the great commoner of North Carolina. He was a man not only with a big brain, but also with a big heart. He was a kind and genial man; he would never utter a word that was harsh or unpleasant if he could avoid it. But as he stood here in this Hall and saw the great crime that was about to be committed and the base betrayal of the people by their trusted agents and servants, he felt that it was his duty to speak out and place the blame where it belonged. He thought it was his duty to brand such men as unfit to represent the people in such a high and important position. Would that he were on earth to serve with his patriotic devotion the people to-day, when new crimes are about to be perpetrated.

The power which the President of the United States has is dangerous to human liberty; it is greater power than should be vested in the hands of any one man. No Congressman can get an appointment in his district without bowing to the autocratic will of the President. I repeat that the tremendous power in the President's hands is more potent for evil over the legislative department of this Government than if one-third of the silver men in each body were to, within an hour, openly declare for the gold standard. If the wonderful transformations which the country saw in the Fifty-third Congress is any criterion by which to judge the probable conduct of men, I venture the assertion that if we had had in the White House a President who was an American patriot that the last Congress would have stopped the issue of bonds, would have passed a free-coinage bill, and would also have passed a graduated income-tax bill.

Besides, there is another danger. The President has the power of veto. Any measure we pass that conflicts with the interests of organized greed is sure to meet his veto. This done, it requires two-thirds of each House of Congress to overcome a single stroke of his pen, and every Senator on this floor knows that it is next to impossible to get two-thirds of both bodies, at the same time, to favor any one measure to give the people relief and justice. You may pass ninety-nine bills in this body for the relief of the people by a majority vote where you can pass one for the same purpose by a two-thirds vote. Hence, the veto power of the President alone practically amounts to absolutely controlling legislation. Therefore, no man with these lights before him can any longer justify himself in voting for a gold bug for President and then hope to get any relief for his people.

The men who claim to be for free silver, yet who vote for a gold man for President, are the most valuable agents that the gold bugs have. They do work for the gold combine that no one else could do; they have the confidence of the people at home. They betray that confidence and lead their people in the road of sure ruin and poverty. Therefore, in the coming contest, the test of every man's patriotism should be who he supports for President of the United States.

How can any honest, patriotic American citizen support a gold man for the Presidency? The man who favors the British gold standard is at heart opposed to every principle enunciated in the Declaration of Independence. He is un-American; he stands for trusts, combines, and monopolies, and for everything that is dangerous to American prosperity and American liberty. There are not enough such men in this country to elect a President. There are not enough such men in this country to carry a single State with their own votes alone. They can only succeed by the help of those whom they rob and oppress. But the danger lies here: This gold combine controls the machinery of the two old parties. It will use that machinery to write the platforms and nominate the candidates, and then appeal to a suffering people to stand by their party. Will the people submit to this again? The path of duty is plain. Let every man who is opposed to the wrongs that have been committed; let every man who is opposed to the rule of monopoly, trusts, and combines; let every man who is opposed to the tyranny of British gold walk out of these two old parties and draw the issue squarely between the people and the common enemies of our country.

Let the Democratic wing of the gold party nominate its gold candidate. Let the Republican wing of the gold party nominate its gold candidate, but let nobody vote for these agents of the gold trust except the gold men themselves. Let every man who is opposed to this British gold trust and to all the evils, crimes, and wrongs that it includes and signifies join his hand and heart with the great majority of the American people and combine their votes on the day of election under the people's banner for the people's candidate. Let us do this, and then we will surely put in the White House a man who is an American patriot, a man who is opposed to piling up a bonded debt in times of peace, and a man who stands for the true Democracy of Thomas Jefferson and the Republicanism of Abraham Lincoln, for they are one and the same.

As a further answer to the question asked on yesterday by the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] as to what North Carolina wants, I will say that this is what North Carolina wants, and this is what a great majority of the American people want and are determined to have. They will get it. But it will be by repudiating the two old monopoly written parties of perfidy and dishonor; they will get it by enlisting in the next campaign under the American banner of the People's Party.

Mr. PEFFER. I desire to address myself to the subject before the Senate, but if it be agreeable to the members present I should prefer not to proceed this evening. I will simply take the floor, and will submit some remarks hereafter.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 15, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 14, 1896.

POSTMASTER.

Francis P. Bogardus, to be postmaster at Ypsilanti, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan, vice P. W. Carpenter, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

John A. Marshall, of Utah, to be United States district judge for the district of Utah, as provided for by act of Congress approved July 16, 1894.

Nat M. Brigham, of Utah, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Utah, as provided for by act of Congress approved July 16, 1894.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

John W. Judd, of Utah, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Utah, as provided for by act of Congress approved July 16, 1894.

ENGINEERS, REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Asst. Engineer Charles H. Foote, of Pennsylvania, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, in place of Alexander L. Churchill, deceased.

Second Asst. Engineer Horatio N. Wood, of New York, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Charles H. Foote, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Corps of Engineers.

Capt. William Trent Rossell, to be major, January 6, 1896, vice Post, deceased.

Cavalry arm.

Second Lieut. Clough Overton, Fourth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, December 21, 1895, vice Aleshire, First Cavalry, appointed assistant quartermaster.

Second Lieut. William Jefferson Davis Horne, Ninth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, December 21, 1895, vice Bingham, Ninth Cavalry, appointed assistant quartermaster.

Artillery arm.

Second Lieut. Edmund Molyneux Blake, Fifth Artillery, to be first lieutenant, December 21, 1895, vice French, Fourth Artillery, appointed assistant quartermaster.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 14, 1896.

SUPERINTENDENT OF MINT.

Herman Kretz, of Pennsylvania, to be superintendent of the United States mint at Philadelphia, Pa.

ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY.

Edward A. Bowers, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Comptroller of the Treasury.

COINER OF THE MINT.

William E. Morgan, of Pennsylvania, to be coiner of the United States mint at Philadelphia, Pa.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

Joseph R. Herod, of Indiana, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to Japan.

Stephen Bonsal, of Maryland, to be second secretary of the legation of the United States to Japan.

MISSOURI RIVER COMMISSION.

Lieut. Col. Amos Stickney, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

Maj. William Henry Huer, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

Maj. Thomas Henry Handbury, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Maj. Thomas Henry Handbury, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Third Lieut. William L. Maxwell, of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Charles E. Johnston, of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. James G. Ballinger, of Washington, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Henry L. Peckham, of Rhode Island, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Albert B. Stearns, of Massachusetts, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts.

INDIAN AGENT.

Stanton G. Fisher, of Blackfoot, Idaho, to be agent for the Indians of the Nez Perces Agency in Idaho.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

James W. Coman, of Alva, Okla., to be receiver of public moneys at Alva, Okla.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Fitzhugh Lee, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Virginia.

William D. Rutan, of New Jersey, to be collector of internal revenue for the fifth district of New Jersey.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Robert J. Ray, of Woodward, Okla., to be register of the land office at Woodward, Okla.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Albert H. Mickler, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of St. Augustine, in the State of Florida.

Cornelius B. Crandall, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for the district of Stonington, in the State of Connecticut.

COMMISSIONERS TO NEGOTIATE WITH INDIANS.

Alexander B. Montgomery, of Elizabethtown, Ky., to be a commissioner to negotiate with the Indians of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Muscogee (or Creek), and Seminole nations.

Thomas B. Cabaniss, of Forsyth, Ga., who was appointed April 13, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be a commissioner to negotiate with the Indians of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Muscogee (or Creek), and Seminole nations.

Frank C. Armstrong, of Washington, D. C., who was appointed April 13, 1895, during the recess of the Senate, to be a commissioner to negotiate with the Indians of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Moscogee (or Creek), and Seminole nations.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Ensign Wilford B. Hoggatt, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Ensign Albert M. Beecher, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Ensign Frank K. Hill, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Ensign Roger Welles, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Ensign John D. McDonald, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Ensign Walter O. Hulme, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Ensign Henry E. Parmenter, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Ensign Hilary P. Jones, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Ensign William R. Shoemaker, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Ensign Isaac K. Seymour, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Ensign Charles M. Fahs, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Ensign Charles P. Plunkett, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry S. Chase, to be a lieutenant.
Ensign Clarence S. Williams, to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Commander Nicoll Ludlow, to be a captain.
Lieut. Commander Chapman C. Todd, to be a commander.
Lieut. Gottfried Blocklinger, to be a lieutenant-commander.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Le Roy M. Garrett, to be a lieutenant.
Lieut. Perry Garst, to be a lieutenant-commander.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles C. Marsh, to be a lieutenant.
Lieut. Commander Joseph N. Hemphill, to be a commander.
Lieut. James K. Cogswell, to be a lieutenant-commander.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) John B. Blish, to be a lieutenant.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles W. Jungen, to be a lieutenant.
Lieut. Commander Abraham B. H. Lillie, to be a commander.
Lieut. Frederic Singer, to be a lieutenant-commander.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles Harlow, to be a lieutenant.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) William A. Gill, to be a lieutenant.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Thomas W. Ryan, to be a lieutenant.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles S. Ripley, to be a lieutenant.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Walter J. Sears, to be a lieutenant.

POSTMASTER.

Claude S. Hazelrigg, to be postmaster at Mount Sterling, in the county of Montgomery and State of Kentucky.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 14, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

Mr. HENDERSON. I ask the gentleman to withhold that for a moment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report back the bill (H. R. 3616) to limit the time within which prosecutions may be instituted against persons charged with carrying on the business of a retail liquor dealer without having paid the special tax as required by law, or with being a manufacturer of tobacco without having given bond as required by law, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means; and also the House resolution by Mr. ODELL (House Res. No. 96), directing the Committee on Banking and Currency to report an amendment to the general banking laws, to be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the corrections of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HOPKINS in the chair.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. NORTHWAY] this morning, if no gentleman on the other side of the House desires to speak. We had two speeches yesterday in favor of the bill, and but one on the other side of the House. If no one desires to occupy the floor, I shall yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am recognized in my own right as a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio in his own right, as a member of the committee.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Mr. Chairman, I should not desire to be heard on this measure at all if it were not for the fact that yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] saw fit to criticise somewhat severely the action of the committee in reporting this bill. I do not know how long I shall be able to talk in the matter, as I discover I am very hoarse this morning, having caught cold; but I ask your indulgence while I respond to some of the criticisms made upon pension legislation, and especially upon the pending bill. The discussion yesterday took a very wide range, and, besides mentioning the bill briefly, it went over the full subject of pension legislation, and involved all of the criticisms which are showered upon the Pension Bureau, past and present. I may feel called upon to respond somewhat in that broad manner to the criticisms that have been made. I may criticise some, in what I have to say, the Pension Bureau and the administration of the Bureau; but I trust my criticism will be dignified, and will correspond with the facts in the case.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that anything is gained by rushing into unjust criticisms, for while we lose confidence in ourselves by that criticism, we are at the same time arousing the animosity and the fear of the soldier; and we ought not to do that. The pensioners of our country during the last two or three years at times have had enough to arouse their curiosity and timidity without our unnecessarily arousing it on the floor.

With reference to the pending measure, I will say that I do not know that any difficulty arose over any feature in the bill. I understand that every item in the bill is agreed to unanimously

by the entire subcommittee and by the entire Committee on Appropriations, so that there is no controversy over any amount carried in the bill. I understand that there is but little opposition, so far as the committee is concerned, to any amendment offered to the bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] announced to the committee, to the House, and to the country that he reserved the right to oppose one or perhaps both of the amendments; and that was fair, for he announced his intention to do so. But besides that, besides his criticism on the amendment, I do not understand that he objects to any item in the bill. So I suppose that so far as the bill itself is concerned, carrying the appropriation, it is without opposition in the House, so far as I have heard; and the gentleman from New York nods assent.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the amount—that is, in round numbers, $140,000,000—carried by the appropriation bill. It is the wish of General Lochren that it should be that amount, and I do not object to it; but I do object to the new legislation.

Mr. NORTHWAY. So I understand; so that there is no controversy over the amount. The controversy occurs over the amendments that have been tacked on the bill. Besides the criticism which has been offered to the amendment, criticism has been offered on both sides as to the manner of the administration of the Pension Bureau, and I may venture somewhat, before I proceed with anything relative to the amendment, to pass over a little of the ground which has been traveled over here in criticising the administration of the Pension Bureau. In doing this I want to say that I do not care whether a pension is a vested right or a gratuity.

So far as I am concerned I found no argument upon the idea that pensions are a vested right. I found my argument upon the idea that pensions are higher than vested rights. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] yesterday spent a long time in arguing that pensions were not vested rights, that they were not given in accordance with the terms of any contract. For the sake of the argument let us agree to that. I will not quarrel with the gentleman from New York or with any other member of this House upon that proposition. Let us say, for the present, that pensions are not given responsive to the terms of a contract. Why, then, are they given? The gentleman from New York said they were a gratuity, an expression of the nation's gratitude to the soldier who fought to save the nation. For the sake of the argument I will accept that proposition of the gentleman from New York, and will then proceed to follow my own line of thought in reply to his argument. Accepting, then, the gentleman's proposition that a pension is a gratuity, let us see where we come out. How does the case stand from that point of view? Would a pension be of any higher authority or dignity if it were named in a contract than if it were merely a gratuity?

Can this nation say: "We give to the soldier a pension of $10 or $20 a month as a measure of our gratitude for the service he has rendered," and yet say that the relation between the soldier and the nation in that respect is of a lower character than if the money were paid under a contract to pay him that amount? Can a nation express its gratitude to a man and couple that expression with such conditions as to place that man in the attitude of a beggar or a thief? Can we stand here with a right to recall what we have given? As a lawyer I have always supposed that a gift when executed was as fixed and irrevocable as though it had been paid under the terms of a contract. If a man gives another $100 he can not recall it any more than if he had paid that amount under contract, and when a nation gives the same rule applies.

When this nation gives a man a pension, I care not whether it be given in accordance with the terms of a contract or as a gratuity, I insist that the nation is not in a position to recall that gift without belittling itself. Therefore, in what I say, I accept the statement of the gentleman from New York that a pension is in the nature of a gratuity and not a vested right. But does it then follow that because pensions are gratuitous the nation has a right to recall them, to cut them down, to insult the persons to whom they are given? I submit not. I submit that if the nation gives a gratuity to a soldier in recognition of his gallantry and patriotism in defending the nation, that gift stands upon the highest ground known to humanity, and the nation or the individual bestowing such a gift ought not and can not, in reason or in justice, undertake to qualify or to recall it, and certainly ought not to question the right of the person to whom it is given after he has received it.

So I submit that if pensions are gratuities they stand upon a higher ground, so far as the nation is concerned, than though they were vested rights. The nation can not afford to do anything to weaken the soldier's claim upon his country's gratitude. If this is so, then what should be the spirit governing us in the bestowal of these pensions? Should we treat the pensioner as a beggar? Should we treat him as an individual who comes and begs of the nation to bestow upon him something which is really his due? Should the nation hold out in one hand a gratuity and in the other a whip? Should it hold out in one hand a gratuity and say, "We give this to you because you gave your services for four years in the crisis of the national life," and then turn around and say, "But before you get it you must come and apply for it in the attitude of a beggar?" I submit not. The spirit which bestows a pension should be broad and catholic; it should be humane, it should treat the pensioner as a man—as a man who is crowned with glory because he fought to save his country, as a man fit to have bestowed upon him evidences of his country's gratitude, and that bestowal should not be made in a narrow spirit.

The pensioner should not be obliged to approach the Government in a cringing attitude and say, "Please, sir, give me this." The soldier should be able to stand up in the broad light of the sunshine of his country and feel that the nation places its hand upon his head in blessing, not in severity or humiliation. When we construe these pension laws and the duty of the Government to the pensioner, we should construe them all in the light of liberality, of humanity, of patriotism. We should not adopt any narrow interpretation of these laws or of our duty under them. If the nation is in duty bound to recognize the services of its gallant defenders, it should recognize those services in a broad, patriotic spirit, a spirit as broad as the nation which he saved, a spirit as patriotic as that which induced the soldier to offer his life, as it were, to save the life of the nation. Now, Mr. Chairman, from this view of the case how do we stand to-day? What is the spirit manifested in the Pension Bureau to-day relative to the bestowal of these pensions? Some things are palpable to the sense and yet indescribable in language. The sunlight is palpable to the sense, yet no human being can make use of language to fitly describe it. The blue vault of heaven is palpable to the sight, and yet who can describe it?

Not in the spirit of prejudice, but in a spirit of just criticism I appeal to your sense of justice to say whether there is not a spirit abroad in regard to the administration of pensions in our country to-day which is narrow, contracted, constrictive, and which seeks to heap a burden upon the soldier which no human people should ever place upon the gallant defenders of their country. It is a narrow spirit, a spirit of unfriendliness. We may not know just the acts to refer to; yet take altogether the acts growing out of the administration of the Pension Department we have this spirit just as clearly manifest as the spirit of patriotism is manifest to-day on the part of the American people as against one of the countries of the Old World. The spirit is manifest. Somehow we breathe it in—this idea that the administration of pensions in the Pension Department of to-day is unjust, is narrow, is unfriendly, and that the soldier is called upon to address the Department in a cringing attitude, bending low upon his knees and saying "Please, sir, have I not proven my case beyond the existence of a reasonable doubt?" I submit that this is a spirit which ought not to pervade this land. I submit that it is a spirit which ought not to meet the old hero when he comes to receive that which the nation in its gratitude should bestow with a liberal hand.

Then, too, besides the general spirit of illiberality, the want of humanity which pervades the administration of the Pension Department, we have many acts which are above the surface and which tell us clearly that there is a spirit of unfriendliness and that the soldiers are called upon to assume a burden which was never contemplated and which they never should be called upon to assume in this country when they come forward to ask that which the nation in its gratitude has seen fit to bestow.

Now, as we approach this subject we find that the period subject to our criticism may be divided into two parts, the criticism of the administration of the Pension Department under the old law and of the administration of that Department under the new law. It is well known that under the old law a soldier before he can receive a pension must prove that the cause of the pension originated in the service; that he was either wounded or injured in the service or contracted in it some disability, and that because of this he is entitled to a pension. That brings us down to 1890. The law of 1890 is founded upon a different consideration entirely. It grants a pension to a soldier who is disabled, unable to earn a living, whether that disability was contracted in the service or not. Now, in the administration of these two classes of legislation we may have reason to find fault or we may not. We may have reason to find fault with the administration under the one law and not under the other; or we may have reason to find fault with the administration of the Department under both laws.

I propose to say something with reference to this matter; and I do not want to venture one step without being backed by facts. If I allude to any case to-day I shall give the name of the soldier, with his company and regiment, so that anybody may know whether I am right or wrong. I will not venture a criticism in general terms. I will base my criticism upon the specific acts of the Department. Whether I am right or wrong shall be known by the facts in the case.

Now, take the law of 1890, for I consider that first. What is an

applicant called upon to prove under that law before he is entitled to a pension of $12 a month? While I concede that the Department has a right to say that for total disability the pensioner shall receive $12 a month, and that he must prove total disability, nevertheless I submit that the determination of what total disability is, is in my opinion absolutely impracticable, and it calls upon the soldier to prove that which he ought not to be called upon to prove.

Let me refer to the very first case that came under my notice after I was elected to Congress. I do not recall the name of the soldier, but it was a case coming from Summit County.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman is now referring to the construction of the law by the present administration of the Pension Office?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Yes, sir. I am referring to the construction of the law of 1890 by the present administration. I was written to by about thirty individuals in a township of Summit County stating that a pensioner under the law of 1890 had had his pension suspended—taken from him; and the facts they said were these: The pensioner was an old soldier; since coming home from the Army he had lost in an accident one arm and one leg; he could not wear an artificial leg or an artificial arm. In this condition he was hired by a railroad company to sit at a railroad crossing where a gate was to be lifted and let down. With his left hand he could turn a crank and let down the gate. For attending to that duty the railroad company paid him $20 or $25 a month. Under these circumstances, as I was informed, the Department took from him his pension on the ground that he was not totally disabled from earning a livelihood. Yet he sat there, simply part of a man, one leg and one arm gone; and because he was able to let down a gate the Department held that he was not totally disabled. Now, I submit that any Pension Department that places that kind of construction upon the words "total disability" is not friendly to the soldier; and such a thing should cause a tingle of shame to any nation that submits to it or any Department that proposes to enforce it.

Here is a man who has given three or four years of his time to the service of his country, who met with an accident which took him out of the ordinary business avocations of life; a man whose condition was such that he could not chop wood or pick up chips, could not split rails or lay up a fence, could not plow, or hoe corn, or enter into any of the active walks of life, and yet because some railroad company happens to have enough sympathy for the old man to give him a stool, and allow him to sit at some railroad crossing to shut down the gates for the protection of the public who cross the road, the Department holds that he was not totally disabled, and takes his pension away from him. Whether it has ever been restored to him, I do not know. But that was the first case that came under my observation as a member of Congress. I did not know then how to manage in such a case, but I should know now what to say.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a question?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. What is the test imposed by the act of 1890, as to what incapacitates a man to such extent as to deprive him of the power of earning his own support?

Mr. NORTHWAY. If the gentleman had listened to my statement——

Mr. BARTLETT of New York (continuing). Does not the act say in express terms "total disability to earn a subsistence"? Let us take the very instance the gentleman has himself cited. He was speaking of a man able to earn $25 a month. Was he totally incapacitated from earning a living?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Let me, in Yankee fashion, ask the gentleman from New York a question in response to his question. Would you take from that old man his pension of $12 a month because some railroad company charitably gave him an opportunity of earning a living? Do you back up the Administration in robbing him of his pension?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Let me answer the gentleman's question. If I was Commissioner I would construe a statute according to the written law. I should not construe it according to any other principle.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Then, how would you construe this law as applicable to the case of which I have been speaking?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I should construe it that if the man was not incapacitated to such an extent as to deprive him of the power to earn his own support, then he was not entitled under that act to a pension. He could not come under the provisions of the general law. But as there are two or three thousand special bills introduced in Congress each year for just such cases, a bill could be introduced for his relief.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Very well, then; we have your answer. I do not believe that you are that kind, but I am sure we can find men who will say that a man who would agree to sell his carcass to some medical college for $100 after he is dead should not be permitted to draw a pension.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the construction of the law as to total disability is narrow, unjust, and unfair. I submit that this law is not in accordance with the great heart and spirit of the American people when it passed resolutions of sympathy for the soldiers of this country, and determined that they should be entitled to pensions. I submit that the hearts of the masses of our countrymen beat responsive to the idea that such a man as I have described should have a pension, and that he should not be sent "over the hills to the poorhouse" because the country fails to do its duty to him. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are many other constructions which have been placed upon this statute by the Department; but I must hasten on, for I do not wish to occupy all of my time if I can help it. There is another construction, and that is applicable to the filing of applications for pension. You will notice that the first amendment proposed in the bill relates to the filing of applications for pension, and prescribes that where an original application is rejected, and subsequently another application is made and the pension is allowed, that the pensioner shall be permitted to draw pension from the filing of the first application, provided that the proof shall show the disability then existed.

Now, I do not believe that that amendment is made necessary by any law. I believe a fair and honorable—no; I will withdraw the word "honorable" and say a fair and legal—construction of the law would give the pensioner his pension to date from the time of the disability; that is, if it did not go back before the date of June 27, 1890. But the Department holds that where a claim is rejected, and the pensioner is not on the rolls, if a subsequent application is filed it shall date from that time, even though the proof shows that he was entitled to a pension under the first application. It is to meet that construction that the amendment is offered. I understand that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] agrees to that amendment. I do not understand that there is any disagreement about it. If a pensioner files one application and it is rejected, and then files another and shows that his disability existed at the time of the filing of the first application, he should have his pension from that date.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, I wish to suggest to him that that ruling was made prior to this Administration.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I understand that——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not want the gentleman to create the impression that it was established by this Administration. That has been the ruling ever since the law existed. He might also say that there is nobody here who objects to the amendment.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I understand so. I believe that is correct. I understand that the gentleman from New York agrees to it. You can see what an injustice the ruling has created which has made the amendment necessary. It is, in brief, this: An application is filed for a pension within the last two or three years, but rejected on some technical ground, because, for instance, the official who administered the oath was not perhaps competent, or on some like technical matter, and the application is rejected. After two or three years he files a new application, which is granted. And certainly it does not seem to be just that he should be deprived of his pension for the two or three years between the two applications. I submit that this amendment ought to be adopted as a matter of justice. If it is not the law it ought to be adopted as the law, and I do not understand there is any objection to it.

Now, another thing. This Pension Bureau has given a construction to the language applicable to widows which I do not believe is a fair and judicial construction of the terms of the statute. Here we differ. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] objects to this amendment and says that he proposes to oppose it, and has made a point of order against the amendment. I want to call the attention of the House to this matter. I submit that this second amendment ought to be adopted, even though you reject the other. We are dealing with widows. We are dealing with the widows of old soldiers. Now, in what spirit should you deal with them? In the name of heaven, has it come to this, that this Government will say to the widow of an old soldier, "If you are a pauper we will give you $96 a year, but if you are in receipt of $96 a year we will not give you anything, even though not one dollar of the $96 shall be expended for your support."

Look at the terms of the law which is applicable to widows who are without means of support other than their daily labor. How will you interpret the word "support"? Who does not know that the men who drafted that law and the Congress that passed it made use of the word "support" in its ordinary acceptation, as meaning that which pertains to the physical comfort and sustenance of the individual, and not to the receipt of money. Yet here is a widow who owns a little home, who owns a little piece of land mortgaged for all it is worth. She can rent that land for $96 a year, but it takes every dollar of that to pay the interest and

taxes. Not a dollar goes to her support; yet the Department construes it that she is not without other means of support than her daily labor, and hence will give her no pension. I submit that that is not a judicial construction of the terms of the law. I submit that a fair construction of the law should be, if she is without means of sustaining herself and her family in matters pertaining to her physical wants, if she is without means other than her own labor, then she is entitled to a pension. But the Department, in its arbitrary manner, makes the construction that if she is in receipt of $96 a year, the amount that she would receive from her pension, then she is not without means of support.

I should be glad to know why the Department places that kind of a construction upon that law. The law does not say $96 a year. It says "without other means of support." It alludes to the entire support of the individual, not to the fact that she can pick up a crust; not to the fact that she can live upon the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table, but to the fact that the widow is without the entire means of support other than her daily labor. Yet they say, because she receives $96 a year she shall be entitled to no pension whatever. I submit that is not a judicial construction to place upon the law. But because that construction is placed there we come to this amendment and provide that widows who are receiving less than $500 a year shall be entitled to a pension; if in receipt of more than that, applicable to their support, then they shall not have it. Is not that a fair thing to say to these widows? I appeal to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT], does he want to go upon record as opposing these widows? Does he want to say that no war widow shall receive a pension unless she shall stand as a beggar shivering at the door of the Treasury? Does he want the widow of an old soldier and the mother of an old soldier's children to come and prove to this Government that she is a beggar or is obliged to wash for a living before you will stretch forth your hands and restore a small gratuity to her?

Mr. HULICK. I indorse nearly all that the gentleman has said in regard to this. The arguments in favor of these measures sometimes give us the interpretation of the committee. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. The amendment he proposes is that her net income shall not exceed $500 per annum. Now, suppose a widow owns a farm that may be worth $5,000, and yet the income of that, after the taxes and repairs are paid, is less than $500, say $450. Would the Pension Department be authorized to grant her a pension under this act?

Mr. NORTHWAY. I can not tell what the Pension Department would do. If I was the Commissioner of Pensions I should grant her a pension.

Mr. HULICK. You are a member of the committee.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I am, and that is the interpretation I should place upon it.

Mr. HULICK. Is that the view of the committee, that she would be entitled to a pension?

Mr. NORTHWAY. I do not know. That is the way in which I would construe it. How the other members of the committee would construe it I would not say.

Mr. HULICK. In other words, would you have the Pension Department inquire exactly what her income is, without reference to what the value of her property may be?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Yes; she has got to live upon something, and she can not live upon what she has, but upon something which comes out of what she has.

Mr. HULICK. Now another question. Suppose she has a farm of 200 acres which is not productive. Suppose that the income of the farm is less than $500. Would she be required to give the value of the farm, and be compelled, if necessary, to sell any portion of it? Would that be your idea?

Mr. NORTHWAY. I do not understand that. I do not think the committee understood that she would be required to prove the value of the property or anything except the income; that if she should be able to show her net income was below $500 she would be entitled to a pension, and if above that she would not be. That is my construction of the language.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Ohio to ask me a question. I understood him to appeal to me to know whether I desired to go on record in regard to a certain matter with reference to pensions. Was that a mere form of debate?

Mr. NORTHWAY. That was mere form of debate. I did not ask you a question with view to your making a speech in answer.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I must hasten. I have spoken only thus far relative to the construction of the law of 1890. But it may be said that the law of 1890 is ironclad; and that there is no discretion vested in the Department. It may be said that all the Departments have given the same construction to it. So far as the construction of the law is concerned I want to call your attention to the old law, and the construction which this Department has placed upon it. I say this Department because the construction has been placed upon it by this Administration, where the construction has been placed on it by Commissioner Lochren and the Hon. John M. Reynolds, Assistant Secretary of the Interior. I want to call your attention to a case, and what was involved in it. We have found fault because the Department has suspended pensions that were granted under the new law, and have notified applicants that they must introduce additional proof within thirty days or they would be continued as suspended.

Now, I want to show you that this Congress or some Congress ought to do something to remedy the defect in the old law if the Department is right in its construction of the law. A constituent of mine, Amos L. Hood, living in the village of Niles, in Trumbull County, enlisted in the One hundred and seventy-first Ohio Infantry Volunteers. He had always lived there. He had grown up in that neighborhood; he enlisted there. He enlisted with those who had grown up from childhood with him, and men with whom he enlisted served side by side with him. When he returned from the Army he went to his old home, in the same neighborhood, and he has continued to live there from that time to the present. He is now a man beyond the prime of life, but he was born upon that soil and has gone in and out upon that soil for many long years. Now this is hardly a case where he could make a fraudulent claim, especially when he calls upon his neighbors for proof in his favor.

Now, let us see what was done in his case. One night—and his claim is proven by the hospital record—on the night of May 2, 1864, he was on Johnson's Island guarding prisoners. A rain came on in the early part of the night and it turned cold toward morning. He was without proper clothing, became chilled and took a severe cold; and the record shows that he had catarrhal fever for some length of time and that he became partially deaf, and now he is totally deaf in the right ear and almost deaf in the left. His claim was that of deafness, caused by catarrhal fever, resulting from that exposure, which is evidenced by the hospital record, which shows the length of time he was confined. The assistant surgeon of the One hundred and seventy-first Ohio Volunteers, who knew of his disease, testified to it and his attendance upon him. Then there is the affidavit of a second lieutenant, who swore to the same fact, that he had always known him, and knew that he was not deaf when he entered the service; and then the affidavit of his father's family physician, Dr. Bard, who is dead—died in July, 1886—in which he swears that he had known him for more than thirty years, that he had been his father's family physician for many years, and that he knew Hood from childhood, and swears he was not deaf when he enlisted, but was partially deaf when he came out of the service. Then there were the affidavits of three comrades who served side by side with the claimant, men who had enlisted with him, who came home with him, and who testified that he was not deaf when he went into the Army and that the deafness came on him afterwards.

Dr. Julian Hermann, now dead, one of the examining surgeons at one time of Trumbull County, swears that he had examined the case, and he gives it as his opinion that the deafness was the result of catarrhal fever. Then there is the affidavit of a doctor in Youngstown, who testified that he had examined the man, and gave it as his opinion that the deafness was the effect of catarrhal fever. Then there are the affidavits of half a dozen or more of his neighbors, each one of whom swears that they had known him from childhood, that they had attended the same school with him, had grown up with him, and knew that he was not deaf when he went into the Army, that he came home slightly deaf, and that it has increased upon him.

With this proof in the Department a pension was allowed to him of $4 a month from August 21, 1864, then $12 a month, then $14 a month, then $25 a month, and finally it was increased to $27 a month. He had been in receipt of his pension for many years, living in the very neighborhood where he was born, under the eyes of men and women who had known him all his life and with whom he had played as a child. But a man who had a lawsuit with him and who, as it appears, was beaten in the lawsuit, a man who had made an affidavit in support of the pensioner's claim, wrote the Department the deafness of this pensioner had existed prior to his going into the Army. Thereupon the pension was suspended on the 26th of June, 1894, and the Department notified the pensioner that a special examiner would be sent to reexamine his case and he would be permitted to attend the examination. Three special examinations were had. Those examinations resulted in bringing out contradictory evidence.

I will not go into the details, because I have here the opinion of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior Department, Hon. John M. Reynolds, which I propose to read to the House to show what has been going on in the administration of the pension laws. The result of these special examinations was that the Commissioner of Pensions, taking alone into consideration the result of the special examinations, held that the pensioner had not made a case establishing his title to a pension, and dropped him from the rolls. An appeal was taken to the Secretary of the Interior, or to the law bureau of that Department. At all events, the Hon. John M.

Reynolds, the Assistant Secretary, rendered an opinion sustaining the Pension Bureau in dropping this man from the rolls. Bear in mind what was submitted. There was no question of fraud, no claim that witnesses had sworn falsely; there was an overwhelming amount of testimony in support of the claimant, witnesses enough to send any ten men to the gallows, evidence which placed the case beyond a reasonable doubt, an overwhelming mass of evidence, the case not depending upon the testimony of any one man, but depending upon the testimony of the surgeon of the regiment, the hospital records, the lieutenant in command of the company, doctors, the family physician, neighbors, and others.

The Department sent to the nearest postmaster a letter of inquiry as to the standing of several of these witnesses. I have read the postmaster's reply, for the facts which I am now stating I have obtained from the Department. The letter of the postmaster states that he has interviewed three of the men, that they are all men of respectable character, and that they can not remember that the pensioner had any deafness before he went into the Army. The Department had all this evidence before it, and yet, without alluding to the evidence on file in the case, and taking into consideration only the evidence obtained by the special examiners, the man was dropped from the pension rolls. He took an appeal, and, as I have already said, I propose to read to the House the opinion of Hon. John M. Reynolds, the Assistant Secretary. After stating how the case comes before him Mr. Reynolds proceeds as follows:

This case was investigated by special examiners in 1893 and 1894, which resulted in great conflict of testimony. On one side witnesses who employed the applicant and worked with him as carpenter in 1859 testify that he was dull of hearing at that time. Nicholas Wender, with whom applicant served as an apprentice at the carpenters' trade during seven or eight months in 1858, says, "He (the applicant) was a little bit deaf, he could not hear well. I remember that claimant did not catch on well when talked to; he would say 'What?' Of course, he was not near so deaf then as he is now. Whenever I wanted to tell him anything I had to speak louder than I did to my other men. This deafness continued during the entire period he worked for me."

James H. Miller worked with applicant one summer before the war in building a barn for Samuel Goist, and noticed that he was hard of hearing. Jonathan Keefer, a comrade, testified that appellant was hard of hearing before he enlisted and at the time he was enrolled in Company D, One hundred and seventy-first Ohio Infantry. Jacob Miller remembers that the appellant was quite deaf at the time he worked for Samuel Goist in 1859.

On the other side—

Mark this—

however, a number of witnesses say that they were intimate with appellant from boyhood up to the date of his enlistment, but never noticed that he was dull of hearing until after his discharge from Company D, One hundred and seventy-first Ohio Infantry.

Now comes the argument; listen to it:

The witnesses who have testified to the origin of deafness prior to the service speak from personal knowledge, and as their reputations for veracity are unimpeached greater weight must be attached to the same than the negative evidence relied upon by the appellant. Some of the witnesses who testified against appellant appear to have had improper motives, but this testimony has not been considered in this opinion, but the appellant's right to pension has been determined upon other material evidence in the case; therefore, after a careful consideration of the facts of this case, the Department has failed to discover error in the said action of your Bureau. Action affirmed.

JOHN M. REYNOLDS,
Assistant Secretary.

The following order was entered in the Pension Bureau:

Hood was dropped from the rolls June 26, 1894, after due notice, under act of December 21, 1893, on the ground that pensioned cause existed prior to enlistment.

There you have before you the action of the Department, and it is just like this: A man under the law presents his claim for a pension; he introduces ten or a dozen affidavits, the men swearing most positively to facts which entitle him to a pension. They follow him from childhood up to the time when the application for a pension was made. The men who make the affidavits are men who knew him intimately. Upon that record the pension is granted and for years he is drawing it. Now, I submit that no power on earth ought to have strength enough to take from him that pension unless proof be introduced in some manner, of which he shall have due notice, which shows that he is wrongly in receipt of that pension. [Applause.] I submit that the Department which calls upon that pensioner after he has been suspended to introduce proof to show that he is entitled to that pension perpetrates an outrage which should stand as a blot upon the civilization of this nineteenth century. [Applause.] I do not care whether the law officers of the Interior Department or of any other Department sustain him or not.

See what is done. The man is suspended without taking into consideration the evidence filed originally in his case. The suspension is founded alone upon these special examinations. The ruling of the Assistant Secretary is founded alone upon the question whether Commissioner Lochren has committed an error in suspending the pensioner. He does not allude to one solitary word or line of the overwhelming mass of evidence upon which the pension was originally granted. The man is suspended before a trial is had, in which trial there is a conflict of testimony, and then, on appeal, the Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior affirms the suspension and supports his decision by an argument which ought to stand to his everlasting shame as a lawyer.

Look at it! The condition of a man as to his hearing is a fact, not an argument. That I can hear well to-day is a fact, and if anyone swears that I can hear, he swears to a fact. If the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] who sits beside me swears that I can hear now, he swears to a fact; and, on the other hand, if the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] chooses to swear that at a certain time I was deaf and could not hear, he swears to a fact and not to an argument. And in each case the witness is swearing to a fact, and the testimony of neither is "negative" testimony in the legal sense. Yet the Assistant Secretary holds that the witnesses who swear that the man was deaf before he entered the service give positive testimony, while those on the other side give negative testimony, and that the witnesses who give positive testimony should have greater weight; and hence the decision of the Commissioner should be sustained.

Mr. DINGLEY. May I ask the gentleman whether the Pension Bureau had given notice to the pensioner of the proposed inquiry, so that he might have an opportunity to be present and cross-examine the witnesses?

Mr. NORTHWAY. The applicant was notified that the special examination was to be held.

Mr. PICKLER. If the gentleman will yield a moment, I desire to call his attention to another case in the line of the argument he is making in regard to the holding of the Department. In this case a woman was trying to prove the death of her husband who had been gone a great number of years and not heard from. This same officer of the Department held in this case that, regardless of the number of years the husband had been absent, the woman must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he was dead.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Yes; and I know another case where the Commissioner of Pensions made a similar ruling. In this case the woman had been married away back in 1840, had been living with her husband up to the time of the war, and had raised a large family of children. Her husband went into the military service, came home, died, and left her penniless. She applied for a pension. She proved the marriage fifty years ago. Then she was called upon to say whether that husband had ever been married before he married her. And now that poor woman is struggling to find out where her husband came from before she knew him! He came from somewhere in the East to the West and married her. But she does not know from what particular part of the country he came; and that poor creature does not know where under heaven to go to prove that her husband never was married before he married her. As I have said, he and she lived together for fifty years; they raised a family of six or seven children, all of whom have gone across the river to the other shore. And she is denied a pension because she can not show that her husband who married her almost a quarter of a century before the war had no other wife living at the time. When the war came on, that husband took his gun, said good-bye to his wife and little children, and faced death that this nation might live. But now she is turned out of doors because she can not show that that brave old man was not married before he married her years and years ago.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Will the gentleman allow one question?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I should like the gentleman to give the names in these various cases. When a public official is attacked in this way, it is only fair that the name of each case upon which the attack is based should be given.

Mr. NORTHWAY. As soon as I go to my room I can give the gentleman the name of that case. I have given the name of Mr. Hood. The gentleman can go to the files of the Pension Office and find this case to be as I state it. I spent three hours in hunting down the facts on Saturday last, and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. GIBSON. If my friend from Ohio [Mr. NORTHWAY] will yield to me a moment, I will give the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] a case. It is the case of Selena Brewer, widow of Daniel Brewer, Company E, Third Tennessee Mounted Infantry; number of claim, 590484.

She was required to prove by the affidavits of two credible and disinterested witnesses—

I am reading from the Commissioner's letter—

She was required to prove by the affidavits of two credible and disinterested witnesses who are able to speak from personal knowledge by reason of continuous acquaintanceship with the soldier back to 1839, when he was 20 years of age, and with you back to 1832, when you were 16 years of age, as to whether he or you were ever married prior to your marriage with each other—

[Laughter]—

whether you or he were ever divorced from each other during the period from your marriage to the soldier's death.

Mr. NORTHWAY. There is one case which the gentleman from New York may investigate. But let me proceed with this Hood case. Since he was dropped from the rolls that old man has gone forward and has taken the affidavits of about fourteen individuals, every one of whom swears that he has known him from

childhood. He has produced the evidence of doctors and of others, of our best citizens, many of whom I personally know, who swear that he was not deaf when he entered the Army. It appears that he was engaged at one time in building a barn for Mr. Goist, at Niles, and the son of Mr. Goist and other men working on the barn have testified that he was not deaf in the least. That is not all. One of the strong affidavits taken against him was that of an old man who, as it appears, was at the time of making his affidavit utterly incapable of caring for himself, so that the special examiner bulldozed him or he stated what he could not know. Now, Mr. Hood has filed those affidavits, and I myself asked the Department that on the case as filed the pension be restored. The reply was, "No; it can not be restored. If the man ever gets on the pension roll again, he must come in upon a new application for restoration"; thus cutting off his pension for a considerable period for which he is entitled to receive it.

Now, this is the fairest case the Department can have in its favor. If it has a right to suspend a pension in any case upon a reexamination of the evidence, it has that right in this case. Now, upon what ground has the Department acted in this case? Simply upon the ground that the adjudication of a former Commissioner of Pensions in granting a pension was wrong upon the facts; that is to say, that in view of all the facts the man ought not to have been drawing a pension. I submit that there is no construction of law in any court in any part of this land or in any other department under heaven that would sustain such a ruling.

What would a man think of a court of common pleas, in an equity case, rendering a judgment in favor of a plaintiff, and placing him in ownership and possession of a farm, of which he retains the ownership and possession for twenty-five years, and then another judge of the common pleas court picks up the journal and sees the evidence and affidavits and says, "I do not think I would have rendered such a judgment as that; I would not have rendered a judgment in that way on these affidavits," and therefore directs the clerk of the court to enter judgment in favor of the defendant, to oust the plaintiff, and give him time to make a new claim if he desires to do so? I say, What would be thought of a case of that kind? And yet that is simply a parallel case with the one we have here.

Take the case of this man Hood, of whom I have been speaking; he was required to furnish new testimony. But, Mr. Chairman, years obliterate the memories of men, they wipe out the recollection of events, they wipe away persons; for every year, continually, we are passing away, crossing the river. What excuse can be offered for a case of that kind? The case is proven by honorable witnesses, there were no taints of fraud or pretense of fraud, and the only question raised afterwards is that notwithstanding the ruling which had been made by the Department, on the testimony submitted in the case, the present Commissioner holds that it would not have been sufficient, if the case had been before him, in the first instance, to warrant the granting of the pension; and, therefore, he insists on the production of this new testimony. What do you think of telling him, after all the witnesses have crossed to the shadowy shore, of telling that poor old man, who fought for the nation, for the lives of the very men who make rulings against him, that he must make his title good, or that they will take away the pittance which the Government has been doling out to him for twenty-five years? Mr. Chairman, I pronounce it an infamy, I call it a shame, and the time has come in this nation when brave, patriotic American people, the people of this country, recognize what has been done for them by these old veterans, and will pronounce emphatic condemnation upon the men who heap burdens upon the old soldiers by such constructions of law.

Now, I am tired and I propose to leave the matter. I did intend to say other things, but shall not take longer the time of the committee. Only a few words in closing. Let me say to you that the subject of pensions is a vital one; a subject which is dear to the hearts of the American people. It may be that we have grown weary of the matter. It may be that the American people are somewhat tired of hearing of the subject of pensions; but the time is coming, and it will last as long as the nation lives, when the American millions will refuse to be tired in defense of the old soldiers.

The time is coming when millions of patriotic men and women of this land will rise up and say, "Blessed forevermore be the brave men who fought in defense of the Union." [Applause.] The time will come when history will record in characters of everlasting glory the story of the patriotism, the bravery, and the heroism of the men who saved the nation. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have no criticisms to make upon any man or upon any party. In the criticisms I have offered, I have offered not a word upon any man or upon any of the men who fought against the country. God grant that the hour has come, and if not, that it will speedily arrive, when we shall be brothers and friends under one flag and in one country, where we may all move forward to the grand and crowning destiny of the American nation. I have no word of bitterness for any. So far as I am concerned, from over the fields of Gettysburg, Lookout Mountain, Spottsylvania, Shiloh, and the Wilderness shall come no breezes freighted with hate, but they shall be soft with forgiveness for all the erring, but, as God is just above us, these breezes shall be forever soft with love for all the brave men who made these battlefields of the nation glorious. [Applause.]

After the Revolutionary war, after the Mexican war, after the war of 1812 the people tired somewhat of listening to the soldiers and to their claims; and yet years ago the people of this country crowned with glory the defenders of our country in those wars, until to-day the patriotic sons and daughters of the land are looking backward still to the old Revolutionary records to find some ancestors in whose veins their blood flowed—men who made glorious the battlefields of the Revolution. I can remember how, after the Mexican war, we tired of the soldiers; and yet to-day we are pensioning these old veterans. Years ago we ceased to be tired in defense of the soldiers of the Revolutionary war, and history long years ago ingrafted their names upon the pages of undying fame, and the man does not live who dares lift his hand or crook his finger against one of the brave defenders of his country who fought against the aggressions of the British. [Applause.]

So it is with the soldiers of the Mexican war. So it is with the soldiers of the war of 1812. If our nation lives, it shall live because men fought to defend it. If it shall live, just so certainly shall the defenders of this nation live in everlasting glory, and the soldiers of the war of 1861 shall, as certainly as the soldiers of the war of the Revolution or the war of 1812, pass to the zenith above as fixed stars in the firmament of our nation's glory, forever to shine undimmed while we have a flag and a destiny. All the brave men of our country, then, ought to stand here to defend those who fought for our land. We ought to stand here as a wall against any narrow, contracted interpretation of any law which holds out a pittance to these brave men. We ought to stand here and insist that the law shall be fairly executed and that a broad, catholic spirit shall sweep over all, until all of us are lifted up with a patriotic spirit, to say "Blessed evermore," in defense of the soldiers of our Republic.

I know that gentlemen upon the other side are as patriotic in defense of their country as we. We can join hands, then, in defense of those who saved the nation for you and saved it for me. All that is bad of the past is gone. All that is good of the past lives. So we can stand here to-day looking upon these matters in the broad spirit of humanity, and we can say most truthfully that bitterness has faded, that all things have changed, and that we stand here all as patriotic citizens in a redeemed country. And, remembering all of the past, its bitterness all gone, its glories all saved, with thankful hearts we can sing—

Take heart; the waster builds again,
A charmed life old goodness hath.
The tares may perish, but the grain
Is not for death.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to take a few moments of the time of the House in discussing the amendment which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF] will introduce later on.

I favor the gentleman's amendment, with a few exceptions. I do not believe that his amendment goes far enough. It provides that no pensioner shall be dropped from the pension rolls hereafter unless fraud is clearly proven and proven in the United States courts of the different States. Therein I believe he is wrong. In place of saying that the fraud should be established in the courts of the United States he should provide that fraud must be proven in any court of record in any of the States. If this amendment should prevail, in my State it would have this result: All persons who live in the southern or the northern end of the State would have to travel 200 miles to get to the United States court in which this question is to be determined, and it would take two years' pension of the ordinary pensioner, receiving $12 a month, to go to the place where his case would be tried and there employ counsel to have it determined.

Then, gentlemen, we have no reason to believe that the Attorney-General of the United States is any more favorable to the soldiers than is the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, and if he is not, the result would be that informations would be filed in the different United States courts, and men would be dropped from the pension roll by the hundreds because of their inability to go to court to defend their cases. For that reason I believe that that amendment ought to be amended when presented, so as to provide that in any of the courts of record in any State these questions can be determined, and that the pensioner should have the right to appear in the court in his own county to have a determination whether his pension is based upon fraudulent evidence or whether it was properly granted.

Now, I desire to discuss for a few moments the amendment of the law granting pensions to widows. It is strange to me that in the Pension Department of the United States a widow, in order to secure a pension, is compelled to prove a great deal more than

she is compelled to prove anywhere else, in order to secure the amount due her as a widow, under the laws of any of the States. If you go into the Pension Department with one of these claims, what is it necessary for a widow to prove? She must first prove her marriage. Then she must prove that neither her husband nor herself had been previously married. If they were previously married, she must prove the death or divorce of the former husband or wife.

Now, what is the result of that? The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] a while ago asked the name of some person who has had difficulty in securing a pension of this kind. In my own district there lives a widow, a Mrs. Shaw, who had been married to her husband for forty-five years. They had lived together all that time. He had held her out as his wife; everyone there knew that she was his wife. She had given birth to children as his wife. Yet when he died, having served his country four years, the record of the marriage could not be found, because the records in the county in which they had been married had been burned.

She was confronted with this condition, and how could she secure a pension? We proved by citizens who had known her that for forty years they had lived together as man and wife. The answer came back that that evidence was not sufficient. We then had to advertise in the county in which they were married, asking anyone who was present at that marriage and remembered it to notify us. In that way we discovered an old gentleman who had been present at the marriage, and we proved the marriage by him. Then, after a great deal of argumant pro and con with the Pension Department, we succeeded in convincing them that that evidence was sufficient to grant the pension.

Why, gentlemen, out in the State of Indiana a man can be convicted of bigamy upon evidence of marriage that will not sustain the granting of a widow's pension in the Pension Department of the United States. In my own experience I convicted a man in the courts of Perry County, Ind., for bigamy, upon this evidence: He lived with a woman at Indianapolis for eighteen years, holding her out to the world as his wife, saying to those he met and those he knew, "This is my wife." Children were born to them, and he introduced them as his children. He afterwards deserted her, and came to the southern part of the State, where he married again. In the circuit court of that district we proved the fact that he had recognized these children as his children, and that he had recognized the woman as his wife, and that is the only evidence of marriage we had. We proved his marriage again in the southern part of the State, and one of the best judges of Indiana, and now one of the appellate judges of that State, decided that that evidence was sufficient and sent him to the penitentiary for two years; and yet that evidence of marriage would not establish the fact of marriage in the Pension Department, so as to allow a woman to get a pension.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Was any appeal taken?

Mr. HEMENWAY. There was an appeal taken, and the opinion of the court was sustained by the supreme court of Indiana, is my recollection.

I want to say to the gentleman from New York, as he has invited my attention here, that I believe he is in harmony with this Administration. I believe his opinions of the pension law are in harmony with the views of the Administration. He said yesterday upon this floor that he did not believe the act of June 27, 1890, was right. I believe he is honest in it.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I beg pardon, sir. I did not claim to make any statement in opposition to the act of June 27, 1890. I said the act was on the statute books. I knew it could not be repealed and I would let it stand, but I stated that I was against any enlargement of the act.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Did not you say that you were opposed to that legislation when it passed?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I did not have the pleasure of being in this House in 1890.

Mr. HEMENWAY. If you had had that pleasure, you should have voted against the act of 1890?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I do not make any statement in reference to that.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I did not suppose you would answer. Well, I will ask this gentleman a question. I know of a case in my district where an old German soldier enlisted in the Army. He was afterwards taken with smallpox and taken to a hospital in South Carolina, the records of which were destroyed, and are therefore not in the War Department. He came out of that hospital with the scars of smallpox all over his face, with one eye almost out, and his hearing partially gone; yet I say that that man can not secure a pension under the old law. Why? I say to the Commissioner of Pensions, "Is not the fact that he entered the Army a sound man and came out with the smallpox, in that condition, sufficient evidence to show that he contracted the disease in the Army?" He says, "No, because there is no hospital record," the records having been burned. "Is not that fact stronger than human testimony that he contracted his disease in the Army, when he was a sound man when he enlisted and came out with the marks of the disease upon him?" He says, "No; that might be, and still he might not have contracted the disease in line of duty." And so you see we can not grant a pension under the old law to a man who has lost the sight of one eye and almost lost his hearing, because of the fact that he can not prove the contraction of the disease in line of duty.

I believe the gentleman is also in harmony with the board of revision appointed by order of the Secretary of the Interior; and yesterday, while on the floor, the gentlemon from New York asked that some specific case be pointed out in which a wrong had been committed. I have a case before me, to which I call attention. It is No. 611234, adjudicated by the board of revision after that board of revision was appointed under the order of the Secretary of the Interior.

By Order No. 164 of the Bureau, all pensions under the act of June 27, 1890, are rated as pensions under the old law.

That is, if a man was disabled, the disability was rated just the same as the rating would have been made under the old law up to $12 per month. But after this Order 164 was issued, the order and manner of rating was changed. Now, the Secretary of the Interior also instructed Commissioner Lochren to change Order No. 164, and the Commissioner, in his report to the Secretary of the Interior of 1893, says:

The statement of the medical referee above mentioned made it appear probable that under Order No. 164 many pensions were illegally granted, and, pursuant to your order of May 27, 1893, a board of revision was formed of the ablest and most experienced men of the Bureau to examine the cases allowed under that act, and cull out such as had no legal basis to rest upon, but with instructions to disturb no case where, by the most liberal construction of the evidence, the right to the pension could be sustained under any law.

Now, you know he said the most able and experienced of the Bureau were appointed on the board of revision.

I want to call your attention to this case to show you how well this board of revision has complied with that order. In this particular case, in reply to a slip I sent to the Pension Bureau, I received this:

That the pension under the act of June 27, 1890, has been dropped and discontinued for the reason that the disability from disease of chest and rectum and eczema had ceased to exist in a pensionable degree under said act.

Now, I want especially to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the evidence in this case. They have determined here in this case that the diseases for which this man was pensioned had ceased to exist. I want to give you the evidence, and the only evidence, before the Pension Department. In the first place, this gentleman filed his claim for pension and swore that he had these diseases and that he was disabled by them.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. What was the disease?

Mr. HEMENWAY. There was disease of the chest, of the rectum, eczema, and heart trouble. He furnished evidence that he was almost totally disabled. He was examined by the board of examining surgeons appointed by the Pension Bureau, and they found, as the report shows, that by reason of heart disease he was disabled four-eighteenths; that he was disabled by lung disease six-eighteenths; that he was disabled by eczema four-eighteenths, making a total of fourteen-eighteenths, almost complete disability. That was the report of the board of examining surgeons. That was the evidence in favor of granting a pension, and the pension was granted. There is nothing in the office to show why the case was ordered to be reviewed, but, for some reason that I can not discover, the case was ordered up for revision, an order sent to the board of examining surgeons near where the pensioner lived to reexamine him, and he was notified to appear before them and be reexamined.

He declined to be reexamined by that board, assigning as his reason, in a sworn affidavit, that one of the members of the board was his personal enemy. The Commissioner did not issue a new order for the reexamination of the pensioner before another board, but the Pension Office received a letter from the president of the local board of examining surgeons before whom the pensioner had declined to appear. Before quoting the language of the letter let me remind the House that this board had not examined the man at all, but the president of it writes a letter to the Pension Bureau in which he says, among other things, that this claimant is "a man destitute of principle," that he is "the blackest and meanest man he ever saw"; that he is "no more entitled to a pension than a man who never saw the war," and that "there are a great many more just such men in southern Indiana."

That is the only evidence furnished on that side of the case. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] says there have been no wrongs committed in the Pension Bureau. I have called his attention to the proof in this case upon which the pension was granted, and now, in the face of this evidence showing that the man, on his own sworn statement, on the sworn statement of two of his neighbors, and on the report of a board of examining surgeons, showing him to have been disabled fourteen-eighteenths, almost totally disabled—when the pension had been granted upon that state of facts, I ask the gentleman from New

York whether it is just to disregard that evidence and deprive the man of his pension merely upon a letter using such language as I have quoted here, a letter written by a man that the pensioner swore was his enemy, and who this letter would convince any man was his enemy?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Does the gentleman want an answer?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. In the first place, you have not stated the evidence in this case; you have stated merely the conclusion of the first examining board.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I have given the House the number of the case. I have been compelled to summarize the case because I can not occupy sufficient time to go over it in detail. I have given you the number of the case and stated the nature of the evidence, including the report of the examining board showing fourteen-eighteenths disability, and I have read you a portion of the letter upon which the Pension Office acted in withdrawing the pension. Now, I ask you, first, whether the evidence on which the pension in this case was granted was not a sufficient basis for granting a pension?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. It is impossible for me to answer questions as to the weight of evidence when I am not conversant with that evidence.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Assuming that my statement is correct, what is the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I should like to ask the gentleman what evidence he has——

Mr. HEMENWAY. The Commissioner of Pensions would not allow me to bring the papers in here——

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. But what evidence have you that the ex parte letter written by this man in reference to the condition of affairs in southern Indiana with regard to pensions was the motive which actuated the Commissioner of Pensions?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I assume that it was because it is the only evidence on file in the Pension Office against this pensioner, and they have no right to hide away evidence in secret and pass adversely upon claims upon such secret evidence. Whatever evidence they have ought to be placed on file so that it may be inspected.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. If this claimant was really disabled, why did he refuse to undergo a second examination?

Mr. HEMENWAY. He made a sworn statement that one of the members of that examining board was his personal enemy, and if you, as a lawyer, had a witness produced in court and you knew that he had written a letter calling your client the "blackest and meanest man" on earth, you would contend that that witness's testimony was not worth anything and ought not to count for anything.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I see no reason to believe that that letter had any influence whatever on the action of the Commissioner of Pensions. The mere fact that an improper letter is written to a public official is no evidence that the action of the official is taken upon that letter, for which he is in no way responsible.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Then why was this man dropped from the rolls? That letter is the only matter that is filed after the original evidence in the case.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. How many men were upon that examining board before which the pensioner was ordered?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Three.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. And because he objected to one of the three judges appointed to try an issue of fact he declined to appear before them.

Mr. HEMENWAY. You claim, then, that because this man declines to go before a personal enemy and have that man pass upon his case he ought to be dropped from the pension roll, notwithstanding the fact that three reputable physicians, appointed by the Government, had already certified that his disability amounted to fourteen-eighteenths, or almost complete disability.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. If I were ordered, either as a claimant or as an attorney or counsel, to appear before three judges or referees upon an issue of fact, and I were aware as matter of fact that one of those judges was my personal enemy, I should still deem it my bounden duty to appear before the tribunal and proceed with my case.

Mr. HEMENWAY. You would not do your client justice if you allowed him to be tried before a judge whom you knew to be his personal enemy, and I do not believe that you, as a good lawyer, would any more allow a client to be tried in a court presided over by his personal enemy than you would allow your own case to be tried by such a court.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I will say one thing, if the gentleman will allow me.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. In my view, the fact that this claimant was unwilling to submit to another examination as to his physical condition must be taken as in itself strong proof against him.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Then I am certainly correct in my estimate of the gentleman, that he is in harmony with this Administration; and I am very glad that he has nothing to do with passing upon the claims in the Bureau of Pensions; and I hope that in a short time the gentleman whose rulings I have been criticising will not have any such power.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I was speaking of the evidence in this particular case.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, if this is a sample of what this experienced and able board of revision has done in these numerous cases where pensioners have been dropped from the rolls, their action is a disgrace to the Pension Office.

I do not know how many cases of this class have been passed upon by this board of revision. I have had only a short experience here, and have looked into only a few of these cases. But if this is a sample of the work of that board, it is a shame indeed that those gentlemen were appointed as a board of revision to revise the pensions of the pensioners of this country.

Now, I have another case in point. The gentleman from New York asked yesterday that these cases of wrong be pointed out, and he seems to be unable to determine when a case of wrong is pointed out. That I very much regret. But I have another case in my district, where a man received notice to appear before the board and be examined, and he declined to appear. About thirty days later he received a notice that "pursuant to the report of the board of examining surgeons" his pension had been decreased from $12 to $6 per month. What does that indicate to any man who has good common sense? It indicates that the very minute that board took that claim down from the files they marked the decrease from $12 to $6 per month, because, notwithstanding the fact that the pensioner did not appear before the board of examining surgeons, here comes the letter that "pursuant to the report of the board of examining surgeons" the pension had been decreased from $12 to $6 per month.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Will the gentleman give the number of that claim and the name of the party?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I can give the gentleman the name of the party, and later on I will furnish him the number of the claim. The name of the party is John C. Schafer, of Booneville, Ind.

Mr. PICKLER. The woods are full of such cases.

Mr. HEMENWAY. There is any number of such cases where notice has come in that way, that "pursuant to the report of the board of examining surgeons" a pension has been decreased, when, as a matter of fact, the person has not been examined. I can furnish quite a number of such cases.

But I have desired particularly to call attention to the case where that man was dropped from the pension roll, although the examining surgeon had declared he was almost totally disabled—dropped simply upon the strength of a vile, mean letter of a man who happened to be upon the examining board. Yet the gentleman from New York can not see that any wrong was done. He certainly does not mean what he says when he gets up here and says that he really does not believe any wrong has been done in such a case.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. When a member of the House rises and says to me that I do not mean what I say, I must protest. I mean absolutely what I say.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Then the gentleman will excuse me. I meant to say I hoped he did not mean what he said.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. The gentleman proceeds upon a wrong assumption. He assumes that this improper letter influenced the Government official.

Mr. HEMENWAY. How can I assume anything else? It is the only evidence filed after the original case is made out.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I have never known in any case an honest judge or an honest Government official who would be influenced by an ex parte attack; and I do not believe the Commissioner of Pensions was so influenced.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I coincide with the gentleman. I have never known an honest judge who would be influenced in that way. [Laughter.] The gentleman from New York, I have no doubt, is sincere in his idea concerning the pension laws. Surrounded as he is in his city with all the luxuries of city life, as all men are in ordinary circumstances in our cities, he does not realize the condition of these poor men out in the Western States who are receiving pensions. If you go down into the southern part of my State, or into Ohio or Illinois, or any of the great Central or Western States, you will find there these old men drawing pensions of $12 per month; and God knows they deserve them, for their pensions are generally their only support—all that they have to live upon. I have known such men during the last year to work for 40 and 50 cents a day.

This Democratic Administration that we have had to contend with for the last two years has been instrumental in throwing these men out of employment in the factories and other establishments in the cities, so that numbers of them have had to go out into the country. And I have known those poor fellows to be working for 40 and 50 cents a day, and trembling every day of their lives for fear their pensions would be discontinued.

During the last campaign there was a man in my district who came to me and said, "I am with you all right; I am a Republican; but I am afraid to say much at this time for fear I will lose my pension." That is the actual condition of things in that part of Indiana and all over the West. Men are so much afraid of losing their pensions that they hardly dare open their mouths. I do not blame them, because if a pensioner can be dropped from the rolls simply upon a letter from a member of a board of examining surgeons appointed by this Democratic Administration, a man has a right to fear that he may lose his pension. Why, if this practice is to continue, a man has no right at any time to believe that he is secure in the possession of his pension. Take the case cited by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTHWAY], the man who had lost an arm and a leg; if he can have his pension discontinued arbitrarily, what right has any man to believe that he is safe under the law?

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman allow me to make this suggestion: That they may be well alarmed about the condition of their pensions, and the probable loss of them, when the present efficient Secretary of the Interior, in a case of appeal, held that the excessive use of tobacco is a vicious habit and sufficient to deprive a soldier of a pension. I will bring in the decision in that case myself.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I have no doubt of it. That is in line with the general idea.

Mr. Chairman, I have already stated I do not believe that the Administration believes in pensions under the act of June 27, 1890. I do not believe this Administration tries to carry out the law in its spirit and to its proper extent. They are seeking in every way, apparently, to avoid the purpose of the law, and prevent the securing of pensions under that law.

Now they say, "What are you going to do about it?" "How are you going to help yourself?" In the last Congress the Republicans came here and protested against the action of the Commissioner of Pensions in matters of this kind, but it had no effect, because in the last year 4,149 pensioners have been dropped from the rolls and 20,359 have been reduced in amount. Let me say right here also, in this connection, that in my opinion the Commissioner of Pensions has no more right to reconsider a case which has been passed upon by a former Commissioner than a judge who succeeds another on the circuit bench has the right to review the decision of a former judge where on the face of the papers there is no defect ascertained and no evidence of fraud. I do not stand here to say that when on the face of the papers there is open and palpable defect or manifest fraud the Commissioner should not have the power to reconsider it. But in those cases where there are no defects, where the evidence required by the law has been filed, where the examination of the board of surgeons has been held and their findings filed, which findings show the requisite disability, and when the papers are all right and in proper form, and there is no evidence of fraud, I claim that he has no right to review the case, and that he ought not to be allowed to do so.

I make this claim, Mr. Chairman, because if that is the law or if it is right, when is the pensioner safe in his right? If every succeeding Commissioner of Pensions has the privilege of reviewing the decisions of the former Commissioners, and if he can reduce pensions already granted to the extent of thousands upon thousands of dollars, employing examining boards to pass on the claims which have been already adjudicated, where is the thing to cease? Only last year, for instance, there was expended nearly $800,000 for boards of pension examiners in examining cases of this character. The letter to which I have just called attention in the case I referred to a few moments ago, in which the writer says there are "many just such cases" in southern Indiana, was evidently an invitation to the Commissioner to send out examining orders in other cases. Why? Because they say, "We can make $2 by examining each case; we can examine ten cases a day, and therefore we can make $20 a day. Send along your cases." How else can you construe such a letter as that when it says "there are many just such cases"? It is an invitation to the Commissioner to send out examination slips and to make other examinations.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Will the gentleman permit me a moment?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Does the gentleman advance the proposition that no fraud, subsequently discovered, should be inquired into, and no ruling, however improper or fraudulent or corrupt, should be set aside by a subsequent Commissioner?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman from New York ought to have understood my statement. I said that in any case where fraud could be proven the pension ought to be inquired into, or where on the face of the papers it appeared that the pension was granted by mistake an inquiry ought to be made. But where on its face it shows that the law has been complied with, and that the pension was granted according to law, it ought not to be, and in my opinion the Commissioner has no power under the present law to permit an inquiry to be made into the matter.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. You admit that whenever fraud taints the transaction, or wherever it appears upon the face of the papers that there is some illegality coupled with the granting of the pension, or wherever collusion appears, the pension can be set aside?

Mr. HEMENWAY. When it has been proven.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. That is, fraud, illegality, or collusion?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Now, let me ask the gentleman, after all your cry of fraud, after all the cry of fraud we have heard as to the pension roll, how many cases are proven of actual fraud? How many men have been indicted and convicted of actual fraud in procuring pensions?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I think we indicted one man in Indiana, and he was at once elected to be the mayor of the town or village.

Mr. HEMENWAY. That showed that your indictment was not based upon any evidence.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman from Indiana allow me to answer the question of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Yes.

Mr. PICKLER. The year before last we gave the Department $400,000, and gave them 59 special examiners for the purpose of looking for fraud, and all the convictions they made were 39, and we do not know how many of those were soldiers. They were partly pension attorneys. That was the result reached by 59 examiners and the expenditure of $400,000.

Mr. HEMENWAY. With nearly a million names on the pension rolls, and with the aid that this gentleman says was given to the Department, he states that 39 persons, pension attorneys and all, were found guilty of fraud. That was the result, notwithstanding there are nearly 1,000,000 persons on the rolls who draw pensions.

Mr. PICKLER. There were not 39 convicted of drawing pensions illegally, but there were only 39 convictions, lawyers and all. In some of the cases the attorney was guilty of some fraudulent transaction and was convicted, and in such a case as that the soldier was not concerned at all.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. With the permission of the gentleman from Indiana, I will answer.

Mr. HEMENWAY. You have my permission.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Very often a pension agent is responsible for the commission of thousands of frauds. In one case in New York a pension agent filed 8,831 fraudulent declarations or affidavits.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Do you charge that to the soldiers? I admit that in New York you had some men who were adepts in fraud. [Laughter.] Do you charge that to the soldier?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I believe one of the worst cases was that of a pension agent in the State of Indiana.

Mr. HEMENWAY. But do you charge that to the soldier?

A MEMBER. That Indiana agent was a Democrat.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I am informed by a colleague here that the agent in Indiana who was convicted was a Democrat. Do you charge such a case as that against the soldier?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No; but in this Indiana case $439,000 were taken out of the Treasury of the United States. That money can never be recovered. The claimants themselves often were not cognizant of fraud, but still the money was taken out of the Treasury.

Mr. HEMENWAY. You are charging the crime of a New York lawyer upon the soldiers of the country.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I do not charge the soldiers with fraud except in those cases where they have committed fraud.

Mr. HEMENWAY. How many cases of that kind do you know of?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. There must be a great many.

Mr. PICKLER. Not by any means.

Mr. HEMENWAY. You have not been able to find them.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. There must have been a great many cases where the frauds have been committed.

Mr. PICKLER. Why do not they convict more of them, then?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. A great many applications have been rejected on the ground of fraud.

Mr. HEMENWAY. If you know of these cases, it is very strange that with three years of the Administration, with your

detectives scattered all over the country seeking to establish fraud, that you have not been able to establish more than a very few cases where the soldier himself has been guilty of fraud.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up any more of the time of this House, but in conclusion I want to say that when we call attention to these things the only answer we get back is, "What are you going to do about it?" We have had this Democratic Administration with its troubles, with the distress that it has brought upon the country, and the old soldiers have had to suffer along with the rest of us. They have had their pensions taken away from them in many cases, as I believe, simply because some man high up in power in the Democratic party has suggested to the Commissioner of Pensions that the man ought not to draw a pension. I do not like to criticise the Commissioner, but when I have laid down before me evidence, as I have in this case, I feel like simply telling the truth, showing to the people of the country, as far as I can, some few decisions that this board of revision has made in the Pension Department; and in conclusion I desire to remind the gentlemen on this floor who may be opposed to the granting of pensions that it is a question that will not much longer disturb their peace of mind.

The grand old men who compose the Grand Army of the Republic, and who saved this country and are to-day an honor to the country they saved, are being followed to their graves by their comrades in arms, victims of injuries, wounds, and exposure contracted during service, until in the near future few of them will be left to annually decorate the graves of their deceased comrades, and to assure them further that the loyal young men of this nation in reverence for their deeds of valor will be found assuming those duties, and year by year decorating their graves and keeping fresh in the memories of the coming generations the lessons of patriotism they taught. Then, in reply to the question as to what we propose to do, we propose at the next election in this country, in November of this year, to elect a Republican President. [Applause.] And then we propose to go right at the root of this evil. We do not propose to place at the head of the Interior Department a man who comes from the South, whose sympathies can not be with the soldiers, but we propose to place there a loyal man from the North who will administer the pension laws of this country honestly and fairly, as they ought to be administered. [Applause.]

Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration has my hearty approval and support. I hold that it is not only a duty, but a privilege to vote for any measure that tends to brighten the declining years of the "boys in blue." They are, sad to say, rapidly passing away; not, as of yore, are they marching on to glorious victory in the cause of union and liberty, but silently, one by one, they are marching on to final review before the Great Captain, where soon they will have been mustered out forever. While they are yet with us let us hasten to do all in our power to smooth their pathway to the tomb. This nation has done much for the brave boys; it should do more; it can never do too much. To them we owe a debt which can never be paid. A pension is not a gratuity or charity; it is a sacred debt, which no statute of limitations will ever bar, for there is no limitation—must not be—to the honor and patriotism of the American people. [Applause.]

As I have said, the whole debt can never be paid, and we should cease this prating of economy in pensions. The idea of measuring patriotic service in a cause the grandest for which men ever fought and died is a narrow, sordid view. No gold can heal their wounds; no gold can restore their shattered health; no gold, though we had Crœsus's hoard, can purchase a balm for the broken hearts of the widows and orphans of our land. But by this measure and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois we can do something to aid them and cheer them during the few years they yet remain with us. And by this bill we can do more of great value. We can teach that patriotism is not mere sentiment, a thing apart from one's self, but a noble, constituent part of our very being. We can teach, best of all, to the youth of our land that this United States appreciates and loves a patriot and that this great nation is not unmindful of them and ungrateful to them. The value of this lesson, deeply implanted in the hearts of American youth, can not now be measured, and from generation to generation will be bearing rich fruit so long as this Republic endures. [Loud applause.]

But the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] said yesterday that we are "trying to deceive the soldier vote." I deny the statement, both for my party and myself. As for myself, I need not vote or speak to gain, should I ask it, the soldier vote in my district, which sent to the front as brave men as ever drew swords. Every man of them knows now, and I hope will ever know, that I am sincerely his friend. It is not a matter of very great importance to this country whether or not I, and many others on this side of the House, come back to Congress for another term, but it is a matter of very grave moment to the brave "soldier boys" that I and we, while here, see to it that we are not faithless to them and to our duty in their behalf. The Republican party has never forgotten and has never deceived the Union soldier. From the dark days of 1861 and all the way along through that great civil strife where death followed closely his every footstep, down to this very hour, we have protected, defended, and stood by him against all opposition, and we shall continue to do so despite the taunts of the gentleman from New York.

Among other irrelevant matter in his speech, he actually gives us the appalling statement that some one pension agent has lately been convicted of procuring false affidavits to obtain a pension—subornation of perjury. I may say the rarity of frauds in pension cases is most remarkable, and no class of cases in all our courts is as free from false testimony as in pension cases. But, suppose occasionally, or even often, the poor soldier gets a pension which he is not clearly entitled to, or a little more per month than the law and facts fairly entitle him to. What of it? It is better, infinitely better, that ninety and nine get more than entitled to than that one poor deserving soldier should be refused, and go down to his death—his last sight and thought being of an ungrateful country, which he defended in her direst peril. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I would go further than this bill. There should be larger appropriations for clerical and other help in the Pension Department to facilitate and hasten the granting of pensions, if the delay is caused by lack of help. I confess the ways of the Pension Department resemble the ways of Providence—in one respect only—its "ways are past finding out." It possesses neither justice, pity, mercy, nor any other attribute except mystery. Allow me to read a copy of a notice frequently sent to applicants:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., ——— —, 1896.

SIR: Relative to the above-entitled claim, you are advised that it is now being considered with a view to its final disposition. The result will be communicated at the earliest practicable date.

Should it be found, however, that additional evidence is required, a proper call for such testimony will promptly issue.

Very respectfully,

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

This circular letter has a tendency to lighten the heart and brighten the prospects of the poor soldier, and the Pension Department is thanked for this much. But the poor, deluded soul waits weeks and weeks, and months and months, and no pension comes. He then writes his member of Congress again, who calls up the case, when, strange to say, it is discovered by the careful and generous officials in the Department that there is a conflict of testimony—one physician testifying that the applicant was afflicted with laryngitis, while another called it bronchitis, or perhaps one called it heart disease, while the other stated it was disease of the heart. [Laughter.] These are not actual experiences in given cases, but are fair illustrations of the trifling, technical excuses made by the Pension Department. Let me give you a copy of another familiar letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., ——— —, 1896.

SIR: In response to inquiry of Hon. ——, ——, for information as to the status of your claim for pension, above cited, you are advised that it awaits replies to letters of inquiry addressed by this Bureau to parties supposed to have personal knowledge of facts touching the merits of the claim. Upon receipt of the same the claim will have further attention.

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

What do these "letters of inquiry" mean? Mr. Chairman, it is high time that the old soldiers and all other citizens of this land should know the truth. These so-called "letters" are nothing less than calling on postmasters throughout the country to give opinion as to the merits of the given case. All sworn testimony of applicant, of his comrades, of physicians and others is thrown aside, to be supplanted by the opinion only of some country postmaster, which is not even sworn to. I have been plain in this matter, because I feel deeply the injustice thus done the applicants for pensions. I desire to refer to another just cause of complaint. An applicant—a widow, for example—inquires the cause of delay in her case, and she is informed that "testimony is required that she has not remarried." She obtains and forwards this testimony, and then waits weary months, hoping and praying, and then inquires again, when she is informed that she must furnish testimony of her marriage to the deceased soldier. This she promptly gives, and then another long period of waiting, and she asks again the cause of delay, when she is requested to furnish proof of her husband's death. And so it goes, it being the apparent purpose of the Bureau to delay the granting of the pension as long as possible. How easy and fair it would be to request at one time the testimony needed on all points. A pension applicant who has a just claim ought to have it made as easy as possible, consistent with justice, to obtain a pension. Their pathway through life should be strewn with roses and not with thorns. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I especially favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF], which provides that a pension can not be arbitrarily taken away, but only by procedure in a United States court. The conduct of the Pension Department

in cutting off pensions (to use a mild term) is most reprehensible. An order issues, according to the practice of the present Commissioner, that unless certain testimony is furnished within a very short time his pension will be cut off. Think, for a moment, what this means! Simply this: You, old soldier, your comrades, your physicians, and other witnesses have, in the opinion of the Pension Bureau, perjured yourselves, and unless you prove very quickly that you are not all perjurers we will cut off your pension. This is the order in sum and substance, and is an infamous reflection on American manhood and a disgrace to the American nation. [Applause.]

But the gentleman from New York fears, if this bill passes, that too many widows whose incomes are less than $500 will get pensions, and thus further deplete the Treasury. A pitiful and pitiable plea on the score of economy. Has it, indeed, come to this, that the brave soldiery of our nation and the deserving widows shall be deprived of pensions because of the free-trade heresy of the Democratic party? The gentleman referred yesterday to "our depleted Treasury," and to "our continuing deficit." Who depleted it, and what causes the deficit of millions per month? He knows the answer. The Wilson-Gorman bill of the Fifty-third Congress, passed by the Democratic party. You occupy, indeed, a desirable position before the country; you cut off revenues, deplete the Treasury, and then say to the soldiers and widows, You can not have any pensions because we have no money. Are not you proud of your conduct?

But I observed when we took a vote a few weeks ago on the revenue bill offered by my distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], which would give us some $40,000,000 of additional revenue, the gentleman from New York voted against that measure. So he is in this most peculiar and perplexing position: He will not vote for the pending bill, because the Treasury has no money to pay the pensions; and he did not vote for, but against, a bill that would give the Treasury the necessary money. I leave him in his midnight darkness, but first generously offering him this light and this text:

A protective tariff is the very inspiration of effort, while free trade is the lullaby of indolence.

I have prepared this thought for you; take it and ponder over it, and with your recognized ability I feel confident that you will never again give lack of revenue an excuse for depriving any soldier or widow of a pension. Had I my way, I would be most liberal with pensions, and by a protective tariff I would compel England to pay most of the bill.

I appeal to all of you to support this measure and the amendment, and thus show the soldier boys that we appreciate their heroism and patriotism, and that we love the Union they preserved. Let us see to it that the brave boys who gathered the roses of glory from the stone wall at Gettysburg, and plucked the rich, ripe fruit of human freedom on the field of Appomattox, shall not be forgotten. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, there is one point of view from which to examine the Pension Bureau which is not generally taken, and that is to consider it as a court. It is not only a court, but if we consider the multitude of cases adjudicated and the aggregate amount of judgments rendered, it is beyond all comparison the hugest court, not only in the world, but the hugest court that ever has been in the world. According to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions for the year ended June 30, 1895, for the last year there were 96,337 cases decided in favor of the claimants and 103,355 cases decided against the claimants, making an aggregate of 199,692 cases decided in all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in all the length and breadth of this world where is there a court that adjudicates so many cases? Not only that, but its judgments aggregate many millions of dollars, because every pension certificate granted is in the nature of an execution against the Government of the United States, which that Government honors and respects every quarter by paying the amounts allowed. There are now pending in that court 552,210 cases undisposed of. In the last year, in addition to the 199,692 cases adjudicated, 104,160 cases were acted upon by the board of revision. That board reduced 20,359 pensions, and graciously allowed 77,373 pensions to remain as they were in consequence of additional proof being submitted. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this House, here is a court, the most extensive that has ever been constituted in any Government upon the face of this earth, and yet, strange to say, there is not one syllable of law prescribing the pleadings, practice, and proof in that court. There is not a squire's court in the United States, there is not a recorder's court in any municipality of the American Government, that has not a law, enacted by the sovereign power, prescribing the pleadings, practice, and proof and the course of procedure, and yet the American people have stood by for thirty-odd years and allowed this pension court to go on in its adjudications without a syllable of law prescribing its procedure.

Mr. Chairman, what is the inevitable result of allowing a court to act exclusively on its own rules? I appeal to the lawyers of this House, what is the inevitable result of allowing a court to prescribe its own rules of procedure, to prescribe its own laws of evidence, to prescribe its own method of taking proof, and to prescribe its own way of adjudication when there is no appeal to a higher court? The result is that you have a court that is arbitrary, with a big A; you have a court that is sure to be technical; you have a court that is absolutely certain to be whimsical; and, what is worst of all, you have a court that is everlastingly certain to be despotic and tyrannical. [Applause.] I do not care what court it is. Those of us who practice in the United States courts, in those cases where there is no appeal granted to the Supreme Court of the United States, or to the court of appeals, know that many of them are intensely arbitrary and oftentimes domineering and tyrannical. Now, there is no appeal allowed from the decision of the Commissioner of Pensions except to the Secretary of the Interior, whose spirit oftentimes prompts the very decision complained of; and that sort of appeal amounts to no more than an appeal from a clerk to the judge presiding in the court. It is like an appeal from a servant for the injury done you by him to the master who inspired or commanded the injury you complain of.

Mr. Chairman, what are the results of the fact that we have a court with such stupendous jurisdiction, and yet no law prescribing its pleading, practice, or proof? The results are absurd rulings, arbitrary methods, and tyrannical decisions.

Let me go into particulars, and see if my general proposition is sustained by the facts which illustrate the history of the adjudications made by the Bureau of Pensions.

In the first place, let us take the question of marriage as it arises in the granting of pensions—for a large part of what I have to say here to-day will be in behalf of the widows of old soldiers. The old soldiers, to some extent, are with us still, thank God, to fight their own battles; and they have ballots in their hands which every man in this House respects; but the widows are poorly equipped to fight their battles; they have no ballots to wield and no voices to raise politically in their own behalf.

Where the question of marriage enters into the granting of pensions, and some special examiner of the Bureau of Pensions takes it into his head that a certain woman is not the lawful widow of the soldier, I care not what amount of proof is piled up in her behalf, that widow can never get a pension, or at least not without great difficulty. If any gentleman wants a case in illustration of this proposition, I will give him a case, the case of Mary F. Barker, for whose benefit I have introduced a special bill in this House. Mary F. Barker was found by a jury of the United States circuit court at Knoxville, Tenn., to be the lawful widow of James M. Barker, the man she claimed to have been her husband. The judge of that court, David M. Key, at one time Postmaster-General of the United States, once Senator from Tennessee, and for many years United States district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee—Judge David M. Key, who presided on the trial of that case, furnished a written opinion, which is now on file in the Pension Bureau, that, under the proof submitted in the case, the verdict of the jury was right, and that Mary F. Barker was the lawful widow of James M. Barker, the man whose widow she claimed to be. And yet, Mr. Chairman, that good woman, with a family of beautiful children, whom I have seen, has been declared by the Bureau of Pensions to have been an adulteress, and every one of her children have been branded as bastards.

When a widow undertakes to prove her widowhood, what obstacles are thrown in her way? I will recount some of them to show the absurd and arbitrary rules of this pension court. There may be gentlemen here who have not looked into this subject very thoroughly, and I ask them to give me their attention for a few minutes, because my duty to my constituents has required me to investigate this pension question thoroughly. When I was pension agent at Knoxville in 1883 I took pains to ascertain the number of pensioners in the different Congressional districts in the United States, and I found that at that time there were more pensioners in the Second Congressional district of my State than in any other district in the country. Those people are looking to me to see that their interests are properly represented here, and that their wrongs are brought to the attention of this Congress. For these reasons I have made the pension laws and the rulings of the Pension Bureau a special study, and I ask attention while I comment upon some of them.

First, then, as to the proof of marriage required of widows.

The Pension Bureau has a general letter, Form No. 3-360, requiring the testimony of "at least two disinterested witnesses having personal knowledge of the facts, showing whether the claimant was ever divorced from the soldier." That is the first thing put in her way to delay or defeat her pension. When the widow shows that her husband is dead, and proves that she had been married to him, producing her marriage certificate, then they send out this Form 3-360 requiring her to produce the testimony of "at least two disinterested witnesses, having personal

knowledge of the facts, showing whether the claimant was ever divorced from the soldier." [Laughter.]

Now, what does that circular require? First, it requires the applicant for a pension to prove a negative. She must produce two disinterested witnesses who have "personal knowledge of the facts." What facts? Why, the facts or the fact that there are no facts. [Laughter.] In other words, that she never was divorced. Now, where is the court in the world that ever required in any case such evidence as that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GIBSON. I thought I was to have an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman was given only ten minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to have three-quarters of an hour. I would not have started off if I had thought I was to have only ten minutes. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. All right. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee be allowed time to conclude his remarks.

Several MEMBERS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON] be allowed three-quarters of an hour to conclude his remarks.

There being no objection, it was so ordered.

Mr. GIBSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, the next general letter sent out by the Commissioner is Form No. 3-470, requiring the affidavit of the widow to "show whether her husband served in the military or naval service of the United States prior to the alleged muster, and after the date of his alleged discharge; and if he did that the names of all organizations in which he served, and the period of such service, should be stated in the affidavit."

Of course, not one widow in a hundred can properly make such an affidavit as that, showing all the military organizations in which her husband ever served before the alleged muster and after the alleged discharge; yet the widow applying for a pension is required to specify all the organizations in which her husband served and the periods of his service.

After she has managed to satisfy the Bureau on this point, they bring on another general letter, Form No. 3-479, which reads as follows:

It should be shown by competent evidence whether the claimant or soldier had been previously married. If so, the death or divorce of the former wife or husband should be proved by a verified copy of the public record, or other competent evidence.

Then comes a fourth requirement which applies in certain cases, as in the case which I read to the House a while ago—the case of Selena Brewer, widow of Daniel Brewer, Company E, Third Tennessee Mounted Infantry; number of claim, 590484. She was required to prove "by the affidavits of two credible and disinterested witnesses, who are able to speak from personal knowledge, by reason of continuous acquaintanceship with the soldier back to 1839, when he was 20 years of age, and with you (the widow) back to 1832, when you were 16 years of age, as to whether he or you were ever married prior to your marriage with each other; whether you or he were ever divorced from each other during the period from your marriage to the soldier's death." [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, that good woman, who lives in my county of Knox, and whose post-office address is Campbell, Knox County, Tenn., is obliged to hunt up witnesses who have known her continuously for the period of sixty-three years. Here is a woman 80 years of age, who is required to show by witnesses who have known her for sixty-three years "continuously" (that is the language of the requirement), and are "able to speak from personal knowledge by reason of continuous acquaintanceship" with her since 1832, that neither she nor the soldier who was her husband was ever married prior to their marriage to each other!

These are some of the impediments which are placed in the way of the widows of our gallant heroes to prevent their obtaining pensions. Now, after all this has been done here comes another general letter—Form 3-507. Why, actually there are not figures enough to enable the Pension Office to number their forms, and they have to go by a sort of reduplicating process! A poor widow writes on to the Department in terms something like these:

I have made all my proof; I have furnished everything that the Bureau of Pensions has required of me, and when, in God's name, is my pension coming? I am having a hard time. My husband had a hard time to support me and our children while he was living, and now he is dead—he has been dead for three or four or five years, and I and my fatherless children are starving. In God's name, shall we be forced to go to the county poorhouse? Let me know, Mr. Commissioner, what is to be done and why my claim has not been adjudicated.

And what is the answer she gets? He sends back Form 3-507, as follows:

Your claim, madam, awaits replies to letters of inquiry addressed by this Bureau to parties supposed to have personal knowledge of facts touching the merits of the claim.

[Laughter.]

How long does the Department wait for answers to these letters? It waits one, two, and three years. I have evidence in my possession showing that in some cases it has waited many, many months for answers to letters of inquiry addressed to these persons "supposed to have personal knowledge of facts." Now, who are these parties that have been written to by the Commissioner? Oftentimes personal enemies of the applicant for a pension; in a majority of cases political enemies—envious-hearted people, who would rejoice to see the widow and her children or the old soldier carted to the poorhouse. And how are the names of these parties obtained? By secret and confidential letters written by the Bureau of Pensions to the postmasters of the country, saying, in substance, that if they know of any suspicions, any rumors, any hearsay reports affecting the character of the claimant's witnesses and will write to the Bureau of Pensions about the matter, their communications will be treated as confidential. These are some of the ordeals these widows of soldiers have to go through in order to obtain pensions.

Mr. Chairman, what is the policy of the pension laws? The policy of the pension laws is that the prosecution of a claim shall be so plain and easy—that the road to the Pension Bureau shall be made so smooth—that any ordinary person can prosecute his claim without the assistance of an agent. And the law so declares by requiring the Bureau of Pensions to furnish the claimant with all the necessary forms and blanks. That is the policy of the law.

Now, what is the policy of the Bureau of Pensions? The policy of the Bureau of Pensions is to make the prosecution of a claim so difficult that not even a claim agent can understand how to prosecute one in accordance with the rules of procedure adopted by the Commissioner of Pensions. That is the difference between the two policies. The policy of the law is humane, is charitable, is patriotic; whereas the policy of the Bureau of Pensions is tyrannical and demoniac. [Laughter and applause.] I say here in my place that I do not believe the Commissioner of Pensions himself, if he were to assume the disguise of John Smith, could possibly get a pension claim through the Bureau of Pensions to save his life. [Laughter.]

Now let us see how easy they have made it for a claimant to prosecute his own claim. Let me read you Order No. 229.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1893.

[Order No. 229.]

In the preparation of testimony in support of claims in pension cases all statements affecting the particular case and not merely formal must be written, or prepared to be typewritten, in the presence of the witness and from his oral declarations then made to the person who then reduces the testimony to writing or then prepares the same to be typewritten. And such testimony must embody a statement by the witness that such testimony was all written or prepared for typewriting (as the case may be) in his presence and only from his oral statements then made, stating also the time, place, and person, when, where, and to whom he made such oral statements, and that in making the same he did not use and was not aided or prompted by any written or printed statement or recital prepared or dictated by any other person, and not attached as an exhibit to his testimony.

Any needless delay in the preparation of such testimony after such oral statement by the witness, or in forwarding the same to this Bureau, and any material alteration or erasure, will be cause for rejecting such testimony.

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Approved:
HOKE SMITH, *Secretary.*

Under that circular it is almost impossible for anybody but a shrewd lawyer to prepare an affidavit in a pension case that will pass muster in the Bureau of Pensions. Wagonloads of affidavits are received at the Pension Bureau every day, and cartloads of those affidavits are rejected because they do not comply with Order No. 229.

Now, Mr. Chairman, after all this has been done, after pensioners have gone through all this trouble, is that the end of it? When the soldier or the soldier's widow thinks, "Now surely my pension will be allowed"—when the applicant writes to the Bureau to find out what is the condition of the case, what news is received in reply? The Commissioner writes:

It has been deemed necessary to refer the case to a special examiner, who will notify you of the time and place of his examination.

[Laughter.]

Who are those special examiners? They are clerks detailed from the Pension Bureau to go out into the country to examine claims; and while no particular commission is given them for that purpose, yet human nature is so constructed that as soon as a man becomes a pension examiner he considers he is doing good service to keep as many claims from being allowed as he can. He becomes a prosecutor of every claimant and oftentimes the persecutor of every claimant, and thinks he is doing good work if he prevents a claim from being allowed. If he succeeds in doing this, he glorifies himself, rejoices and exults. [Laughter.] If he manages to keep a poor widow or an old soldier from getting his claim, he rejoices with great joy; but if he is compelled, as he sometimes is, to report in favor of a claim, he apologizes for it to the Bureau and halfway promises that if he is pardoned that time he will try and not do so again. [Laughter.]

This is the class of people who are sent out to investigate the pension claims and—God save the mark!—the Pension Commis-

sioner says he sends them out "to aid the claimants in perfecting their claims!" And so it is; the policy of the Pension Office is delay, delay, delay.

To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
To the last syllable of recorded time.

And the pensioner must wait patiently, and starve or perhaps die, before his claim is allowed. And after a pension has been granted, after the claimant has gone through the fiery furnace and escaped from the den of lions, so uncertain are the pensioner's rights that the Commissioner or any of his deputies can any day stop the pension and brand the pensioner as a fraud and a cheat. I hope there is no secret policy in these delays.

Now, sir, I was out in the Rocky Mountains several years ago, and I heard something there which may be of some use to the members of this House; and that is, that the regular soldiers out there do not want any of the Indians killed. They will chase an Indian for a thousand miles to capture him, and bring him back to the reservation; but they do not want to kill him. Why? Because when the Indians are all killed there will not be so much use for the Regular Army and its officers. [Laughter.] Now, I hope that no such spirit as that prevails in the Bureau of Pensions to cause this needless and vexatious delay in the granting of pensions. I hope that this spirit does not prevail there, and that the reason they do not allow pensions more rapidly is not the fear that when the claims are all allowed there will be no more work for the clerks and the examiners and other officials. I repeat, I hope that is not the spirit prompting the officials in the Pension Bureau, to so delay the decision of claims as to keep work for the clerks, messengers, examiners, Commissioner, and the deputy commissioners for the next one hundred and fifty years, they knowing that after these claims are all allowed there will be no more work in the Bureau for them to do and that Othello's occupation will be gone. I repeat, I hope that is not the spirit that prompts all these delays and all this denial of justice.

There is a class of people who find fault with the widow pensioners and the old soldiers, and would like to see all the pensioners dead. They are in their way, and whenever a pensioner dies they rejoice. They are ready to sing a song like that sung on one occasion by a lot of men who belonged to a society of undertakers. They had an undertakers' banquet, in which it was agreed that the best act of a man was to die. An undertaker does not have much use for a living man, but he has great respect for a dead one. [Laughter.] Some one at this banquet got up and sung the Indian plague song, with a glass in his hand, and the others with glasses in their hands:

So stand to your glasses steady;
'Tis here the revival lies;
A cup to the dead already—
Hurrah for the next that dies!

[Laughter.]

So, the enemies of our pensioners seem ever ready to rejoice when a pensioner dies.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I maintain that pension legislation has many grand features to commend it generally to the good opinion, not only of the American people, but to all mankind. In the first instance, the one hundred and forty millions of money expended in pension payments in this country is no burden on the people. It comes mainly out of the pockets of the rich and those who consume the luxuries of life, and goes largely into the pockets of the poor. It remains in the country, circulating freely everywhere, and it has tended more than anything else in this country to lessen and soften the hardness of the times through which we have been going as a result of a Democratic Administration. In the next place, it is a payment of a lawful debt—an honest obligation.

There may be some old soldiers present who remember that in May, 1865, when Grant's army and Sherman's army were marching up Pennsylvania avenue in this city, those war-scarred heroes, those veterans of a thousand battles, those saviors of the Union, those preservers of the grandest nation that God has ever permitted to live in all the annals of time—as they marched up Pennsylvania avenue with martial tread, and a hundred military bands thrilling the hearts of all, every tree blossoming with the Stars and Stripes, every window filled with the faces of beautiful women and gayly clad girls, and the sidewalks thronged with thousands and tens of thousands of patriotic men—as these old soldiers marched up the avenue there was seen placarded in front of this Capitol in enormous letters these words: "The only debt this Union can not pay is the debt it owes to the Federal soldiers." [Applause.]

Suppose a man had saved my life ten or twenty years ago? Could I afford to allow that man to suffer for the necessaries of life, even though he had not been injured a particle in his struggle to save my life. On the other hand, if he had lost his life or been injured, and I were to refuse to come to the rescue of his family in the day of their distress, I would be branded by all right-thinking people as a mean-spirited man, whose life was not worth the saving. Well, if it would be right and proper for an individual to reward a person who had saved his life, how much more so in a great nation? A man lives a few years and then passes away, and is gone and forgotten, but a great nation lives forever.

Do not let us flatter ourselves that we are going to have no more wars. How old are we as a nation? Only a little over a hundred years. And how many wars have we had? The war of the Revolution, the war of 1812, the war of 1846–1848 with Mexico, and the great rebellion from 1861 to 1865. Now, more than thirty years have passed by without any war. Never before in the history of the United States have we had so long a period without a war as the period between 1865 and 1896. Wars are bound to come, and when the next war comes—we know not how soon nor from what quarter; when the flag is run to the top of the pole, and the drum is beaten and the bugle blows; when the President issues his proclamation calling upon the sons of freedom to rally to the defense of their country's cause, what then?

Why, the sons of these old soldiers and the sons of their widows will spring up as from the ground, 6,000,000 strong, ready to bare their breast to any foe in defence of their country's rights, remembering that if they fall their widows will be cared for; if they are wounded or diseased they will be cared for, and that what they lay upon the altar of their country, their country will generously reward them for. [Applause.] On the other hand, suppose the country fails to take care of her old soldiers and of the old soldiers' widows, and then war comes in the land, what will they say? They will say, "I can not afford to risk my life for a country which, when her life has been saved, and my health is gone, will not care for me, or should I rest under the sod of the battlefield will not care for my widow or my orphan children."

So, Mr. Chairman, this pension legislation is a patriotic policy. It is big wisdom, it is grand statesmanship, it is lofty justice, and I hope never to live to see the day when my country fails to take good care of all old soldiers and all their widows and children. [Applause].

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution (H. Res. 25) to extend the time for making an assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 628) to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami;* and

A bill (S. 43) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes,' approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof."

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee again resumed its session, Mr. HOPKINS in the chair.

Mr. WALKER of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of this question I had hoped to remain a listener only; but some remarks made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] in my opinion make it necessary that I should say a word on behalf of the people of my State. The gentleman in his remarks said, "We will elect a Republican President and will place at the head of the Interior Department a man who does not come from the South, whose sympathies must be against the soldier, but some one who will fairly sanction and approve of the pension laws of the United States."

As a representative from a district of the State of Virginia, as the only Republican representative of that State, as a Confederate soldier who followed the fortunes of the Confederacy from Manassas to Appomattox, I rise to say that the gentleman misapprehends the sentiments of my people and the sentiments of the Southern soldier. [Applause.]

I rise to say that in my district and in my State there is no sentiment, no feeling against the Government paying pensions to the Federal soldiers, to their widows, and to their orphans.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. WALKER of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. My remark was, "no gentleman from the South whose sympathies are against the Union soldier."

Mr. WALKER of Virginia. I am glad to accept the correction of the gentleman. I want to say that with few exceptions, and those exceptions men who have no influence in my State or section, there is not a sentiment against paying pensions to the Federal soldiers. [Applause.] I come to speak here for the Confederate soldier, and I speak the truth when I say every Confederate soldier not only approves, but sanctions from the bottom of his heart the policy which would reward and keep from want and from suffering the men who fought for the Union in the war. [Applause.]

I want to say here to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] that there is a loyalty to the flag of this Union in the South to-day which can not be appreciated or understood by gentlemen who have not mingled with our people and who do not understand their sentiments and appreciate their principles upon this question.

Mr. Chairman, this is all I desire to say. I wish to put myself upon record in behalf of my people, and to say to the gentleman that you may well trust the fortunes and pensions of the Federal soldiers to the old soldiers of the South and to the people of Virginia. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to occupy the time of the committee but a few minutes, especially to speak on the amendment submitted by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF]. Before doing so, however, I wish to make a few remarks on the matter of pensions generally. There are two theories upon which pensions are based, as recognized by the best writers upon that subject. One grants pensions by the Government for wounds received or disease contracted while in line of duty. These have always been recognized as debts, and just debts, which our Government has recognized as binding by the act of July 14, 1862, which provided that these pensions should be paid. Every Union soldier who enlisted after that time, or who was in the service at that time and reenlisted as a veteran, had, at least, the right to regard the law providing the pension in the same light as the law that gave him his pay and his clothing. In the one case he got his pay by provision of law, in the other he received his pension by provision of law; and there was the same duty upon the part of the Government to discharge the one obligation as there was the other, and there was the same right of the recipient to receive one as the other.

The soldier who served was entitled to his pay; the soldier who was disabled in the service was entitled to his pension. There is another theory upon which pensions are granted—that is, upon distinguished services. These have been regarded by the best writers upon that subject as gratuities. A citizen is bound to render the best service that he can to his country in whatever capacity he may serve, whether in civil or military life, and the Government owes him nothing for bringing to the discharge of those duties the best efforts of his life. Now let us come to the act of June 27, 1890. I will concede for the purpose of this argument that that act taken by itself was a gratuity. It was not based upon wounds received or disease contracted in line of duty. But in order to fairly construe that act of June 27, 1890, we ought to consider a little antecedent history. Before that time many of the survivors of the late war who were unable to obtain a pension under the general laws had become enfeebled by age and disease.

Some of them were in poorhouses and almshouses throughout the land. Some of them were getting along as best they could through the charity of their friends. It became the policy of the Government, and that policy was crystallized in the act of June 27, 1890, that the old soldier who was so feeble or disabled by disease as to incapacitate him for manual labor, not the result of his own vicious habits, should, to the extent of $12 a month, be pensioned; that he should not be subjected in his poverty, weakness, and old age to rely upon the charity of the municipality in which he lived; that no charity need necessarily come to him from a municipality perhaps that had no sympathy with him or the cause for which he fought. To the extent of $12 a month it became the policy of the Government that he could look for a support to that Government whose uniform he had worn, whose arms he had carried, and whose flag he had followed, and for whose safety he had risked his life. It was the voice of the people as expressed through their representatives upon a question of policy; it was right. The voice of the people in a republic upon a question of policy is the voice of God. It then became as much the duty of the Government to fairly construe the act of 1890 as the act of 1862; and there is no difference in principle between pensions under the two acts.

It is said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] that pensions are a gratuity, and that the Government is only under a moral obligation to pay them, and not under any legal obligation. Assume that to be true, the moral duty and obligation upon the part of the Government is the same as the legal duty and obligation would be if it were a citizen from whom the duty or obligation was due on the same facts. It is the duty of the Government to make its moral obligations its legal obligations. Strictly speaking, in time of war there is no vested right between the Government and its subjects. Strictly speaking, the Government, for its preservation and safety, may invoke the service of all its ablebodied citizens. It may take their property. It may pay them for it or it may withhold that pay if it sees fit. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON], who spoke a few days ago, called attention to the fact that there were loyal people in Tennessee who had furnished provisions to our Army during several months, and although thirty years had passed away the Government had not yet seen fit to pay them, and all the remedy it had given was to refer them to the Court of Claims. Even after a favorable judgment there the Congress might defeat it by refusing to appropriate money for its payment.

Now, these amendments that have been suggested by the committee are right. Take the first. We are making an appropriation for pensions, and ought we not to be allowed to determine under what conditions and how it shall be used? Yet, Mr. Chairman, I do not, however, rely upon either of these as giving very much relief to the old soldier. The difficulty is not so much in the law as it now exists as in the construction of the law by the Department. After we have adopted this bill with the amendments suggested by the committee, an unfriendly Commissioner and an unfriendly Secretary of the Interior may nullify all we do here.

Mr. PICKLER. Will my colleague allow me an interruption?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. PICKLER. It seems to me it may be considered somewhat encouraging that only one gentleman on the other side has risen to defend the Bureau.

Mr. WOOD. On the question of any defect or any informality in the application upon which a pension shall hereafter be allowed, the gentleman from Tennessee has suggested a way that can very easily dispose of any relief that could be had under this first amendment. All that is necessary is for the Commissioner to write a few letters of inquiry to persons who are supposed to have some knowledge of the merits of the case and not to receive any answer to the letters. That could be easily done, if the parties inquired of were judiciously selected, and the application thus stayed until after this appropriation has expired.

The same is true with regard to that part which refers to the widow. There is only one method that has been suggested by this bill, so far, that will give much relief to the old soldier. That is by incorporating in it the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. GRAFF. And why should we not do it? We are appropriating the money. Why should we not say who shall have that money? We merely say that those now on the pension rolls shall have it; but why should we not say that those who are in danger of being cut off by the action of the Pension Bureau shall not be excluded from its benefits?

It is the people's money. We appropriate it. Ought we not to impose the conditions upon which it shall be distributed? The amendment suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF], if adopted, would probably give some relief. All the other provisions proposed are subject to unfriendly construction at the hands of an unfriendly Commissioner of Pensions. I was much interested in the Circular No. 229, read here by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON]. I have great respect for the legal ability of the gentleman from New York, who addressed this House yesterday. I have a high appreciation of the great sacrifice he made in quitting a very lucrative practice and coming here to make points of order against old soldiers. Yet, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that he, or any other man on this floor, is good enough lawyer to prepare the evidence in a pension case under Order 229 and be certain that it will not be rejected for some defect or informality.

It is required that the evidence shall be written by the witness or dictated by him and reduced to writing or typewriting, and shall be furnished without any needless delay, either in doing the work or in forwarding it to the Bureau, and that any such delay shall be cause sufficient for its rejection. Who determines what is "needless delay"? That question is determined by those who administer the laws, and I must say that, with a hostile Commissioner making the decision an old soldier would not have much more chance of getting a pension than a negro voter would have of getting a vote when he gave an interpretation of the provision of a State constitution to the satisfaction of an election officer in Mississippi or South Carolina. [Laughter.] After all, the best remedy to reach these evils, so far as this bill is concerned, is to adopt the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois, and God knows whether even that would do the work or not. Some Bowler might arise and make a point of order on that. [Laughter.] Possibly it might be "held up." It might be "decided" that the bounty of the Government, through its chosen representatives, should not be extended to the man who went out to defend his country in its hour of peril any more than it should be extended to the misguided and unsophisticated Louisiana sugar planters, who went out seeking "tariff reform" and came back shorn. I hope the amendment may prevail. [Laughter. Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, the people of my district are deeply interested in the bill under consideration, as well as the amendments proposed thereto. They are a loyal, patriotic people, who believe in pensions, not only in pensions, but in liberal pensions, to the old soldier of the late war, their widows and orphans, and there is no divided sentiment on that subject.

There does not seem to be any objection on the part of any gentleman on this floor to the bill now under consideration. There is, however, some objection to the provisos in the bill as well as to some of the amendments proposed. Now, I am inclined to be-

lieve that these provisos were inserted with the idea that, like the revenue bill passed the other day, it was to operate only temporarily; in other words, until the Democratic party ceases to control the nation. The committee, I apprehend, did not suppose for a moment that by inserting this proviso they could compel the Bureau of Pensions to correct the wrongs inflicted upon the old soldiers of this country, and I regret that the committee felt the necessity of adding these provisos. The language of these provisos is as follows, to wit:

During the fiscal year 1897, in expending this appropriation, whenever a claim for pension under the act of June 27, 1890, has been, or shall hereafter be, rejected, suspended, or dismissed because of any defect or informality in the application, and a new application shall have been, or shall hereafter be, filed, and a pension has been, or shall hereafter be, allowed in such claim, such pension shall date from the time of filing the first application, provided the evidence in the case shall show the disability to have existed, or to exist, at the time of filing such first application, anything in any law or ruling of the Department to the contrary notwithstanding.

During the fiscal year 1897, in expending this appropriation, it shall not be necessary for a widow, in establishing her claim to a pension under the provisions of the act of June 27, 1890, to prove that she is without other means of support than her daily labor: *Provided*, That before she shall be entitled to a pension under the provisions of said law she shall prove that her net income does not exceed $500 per annum.

There is much reason for attaching these provisos to this appropriation bill, and I apprehend that we shall have little difficulty in ascertaining what motive prompted the committee in this respect. The reason is manifest to the most casual observer. It is the narrow and unpatriotic construction placed upon the pension laws of this country by the Pension Bureau. It is the extraordinary requirements demanded of the pensioner that induced the committee to attempt to relax some of these technical and complex rules established by the Bureau.

I want to invite attention for a few moments to some of the extraordinary rules and presumptions now prevailing in the Pension Bureau. I say "extraordinary" because I apprehend that in no other tribunal on the face of the earth are such rules and presumptions to be found. I shall ask attention first to some of the presumptions indulged in by this Bureau in passing upon the question whether or not an applicant is entitled to pension. First and foremost, it is presumed by this Bureau that the man who enlisted in the service of his country in the prime and vigor of his youth, after having been examined by a physician and surgeon appointed by the Government of the United States to determine whether or not he was sound and fit for service, and after his three or four years of service, enduring all the hardship incident to a soldier's life, the Pension Bureau presumes that that man, at the time he entered the service of the Government, was unsound, diseased, and wholly unfit for military duty, and he is required to prove the contrary. That is the first presumption indulged in by the Bureau.

The next presumption indulged in by this Bureau, to which I ask attention, is this: After the soldier has enlisted, served his three years, and undergone all the hardships incident to a soldier's life on the battlefield and on the march, sleeping upon the cold ground, exposed to the burning sun of summer and the storms of winter, frequently without food, many times without sufficient clothing, after all this the presumption of the Bureau is that when the soldier was mustered out of the service he was absolutely sound in body and free from disease! I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that presumption is indulged in by the Pension Bureau because every soldier who applies for a pension is required to prove that at the time of his discharge he was in fact suffering from disease, wounds, or injuries to entitle him to a pension.

I invite attention now to another presumption indulged in by the Bureau—that is, when the soldier makes his application for a pension the presumption is that he is unworthy of belief; and he is required to support his application by the testimony of at least two of his neighbors. Not only that, but the character of these neighbors for truth and veracity is inquired into usually by the Bureau before it will accept their testimony.

Now, there is another presumption indulged in by the Bureau—every witness testifying in behalf of an old soldier is presumed to be unworthy of belief. The officer before whom his testimony is taken is required to certify that the witness is entitled to full faith and credit, that he is honest and truthful. Not only that, but the officer is required to write that statement in his own handwriting. It is provided that the ordinary method resorted to—typewriting—shall not be resorted to in this particular case, but the officer must write the statement with his own hand, certifying to the honesty and integrity of the witness.

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, that this precaution ought to be sufficient; yet, after this testimony has gone in, secret letters of inquiry are sent out and investigations made to determine whether or not the Bureau can rely upon the statements of the witnesses.

In the next place, boards of examining surgeons are presumed to be either incompetent or unreliable, because the power to determine the rate of the pension to be awarded is withdrawn from such board. I submit that a board of examiners, authorized and empowered by the Government to examine the soldier, having the soldier before them and able to look into his face, to examine his wounds and injuries, is better qualified to determine the character of the disease and the rate of pension which should be awarded the soldier than any board of review to whom the claim may be referred. And yet that power is taken away.

What is the next presumption indulged in? In case the old soldier dies—his claim perhaps pending for years—and his good wife makes application for a pension, then what is the presumption? The presumption is that the soldier whose widow makes this application had at the time of his marriage at least one living wife, if not more, from whom he had never been divorced; and the widow is required to prove the negative proposition, that such was not the case. Nay, more; the presumption of the Bureau is that the wife herself prior to her marriage with the soldier had at least one living husband, if not more, from whom she had never been divorced; and she is required to rebut the presumption indulged in by that Department by competent proof.

These are not mere idle statements. They are statements of facts which have come within my observation and experience in looking after pension claims.

Again, when an application is made on behalf of the children of a deceased soldier, the presumption indulged in by this Bureau is that these children are illegitimate, and the mother or their guardian is called upon to establish the fact of their legitimacy by showing not only the marriage of their parents in due form but that neither had a former husband or wife living from whom he or she had not been divorced.

I may be permitted to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is one class of individuals against whom these presumptions may not rest. There is one class of men who have the presumption running entirely in their favor, and in whom the Bureau seems to have the utmost confidence; and that class is the Democratic postmasters throughout the country.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLUE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to conclude his remarks.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I assure the committee that I will not occupy very much more time.

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I say the only presumption which seems to be worthy of adoption by this Administration is that the Democratic postmasters throughout the country are reliable and absolutely truthful; that the Department may rely upon their unsworn statements in all these cases; no improper presumption can run against them while this Administration lasts.

Now, sir, before proceeding further with my remarks I would like to read from the report of the Commissioner of Pensions a passage which is found on pages 11 and 12; and I commend to this committee the patriotic statements of the Commissioner therein expressed.

PATRIOTISM AND PENSIONS.

Every citizen owes to his country the duty of defending its chosen government, when endangered, against all foes, at the peril and, if need be, at the sacrifice of his life. Whoever does this freely and promptly, as soon as the occasion arises, does patriotically what his duty requires. Such men deserve their country's gratitude, and a grateful people, admiring their courage and devotion and thankful for the preservation of their country and its chosen institutions, will not allow such soldiers to suffer for the sacrifices they have made without such reasonable relief as can, under the circumstances, be given. This is the basis for pensions, and the only rational justification for expending the revenues of the Government, which are drawn from and belong to the public, in the way of pensions to soldiers. In this country such pensions are granted liberally, cheerfully, gladly, and with the consent and approbation of everybody, to all of the class of soldiers referred to who have been wounded or otherwise disabled in the service, or who have from any cause, save their own vice, become disabled from earning a support.

Now, I want to call attention to a few cases that have come under my observation, and I apprehend that other members have been confronted with similar experiences. I do this for the purpose of showing that the Department does not practice what it preaches, and that in many instances, under the intricate rules devised by the ingenuity of this Bureau, it is rendered utterly and absolutely impossible for a worthy claimant, in many instances, to obtain a pension, however just the claim may be.

I wish to call attention to the proofs required in a particular case—a case now under consideration by the Bureau. I do this for the purpose simply of showing that these intricate rules, these uncalled-for demands—these unpatriotic requirements, as they seem to me—are calculated to deter, to drive away from the Pension Bureau hundreds and thousands of worthy claimants. I received a communication from this lady humbly requesting me to look into her claim and see why it had not been allowed. Two years the claim had been sleeping in the Department without a word to gladden her heart, and she wished me to ascertain what had taken place in reference to it. I made a request at the Department and in due time received the information, which I forwarded to her. What do you suppose was still required after all the proofs she had offered? I will state the requirements, not in the exact language of the demand, but I will give the substance. She was required—

First. To show by two members of the soldier's company, officers or enlisted men having knowledge of the fact, when, where, and under what circumstances the disease of the lungs was contracted by the soldier.

Suppose, Mr. Chairman, for a moment, if you will, that this requirement was made of any man under the circumstances in reference to any case. Let us stop for a moment and analyze this requirement. The widow is required to show, by the comrades who served with her husband, when, where, the time and place, where the disease of the lungs was contracted. Let me suggest to you the difficulty of making this proof, whether he contracted this disease on the march with Sherman to the sea, or whether in the swamps of Alabama or Mississippi, wading some swamp, sleeping on the cold ground from day to day and month to month.

I submit in all fairness he could not remember or prove in many instances the time and place or circumstances under which he contracted the disease. There was no particular time, no particular place; it was the culmination of the hardship, the privations, he endured through a series of years. Nevertheless, his widow is required to give a specific account of the place, time, and manner in which the disease was contracted. She must establish the identical time and place where his lungs became affected. Hundreds, yes thousands, of men whose lungs became diseased during that terrible struggle are to-day unable to point to the time and place where the disease was contracted or the circumstances surrounding the same. Why? Because they contracted cold here or there; they slept in the rain or snow at one time, waded a cold stream on a wintry day at another, marched through rain and storms on another, fought a great battle on another. They were exposed to hardships at all times during their entire service, and the combination of all these hardships and sufferings resulted in diseased lungs; but it would be impossible for them to point out the place where or time when it actually took place. One thing is certain, and that alone should be sufficient, all that a patriotic people demand: It was contracted in the service of the United States, and in the line of duty.

But what was the next demand of the Department?

Second. The claimant should show by the testimony of the surgeon, assistant surgeon, or hospital steward of the soldier's regiment when and where the soldier was treated for disease of the lungs.

Thirty years have rolled by, and yet this woman is supposed to be able to hunt up the surgeon, the assistant surgeon, or the hospital steward and secure the testimony of some one of them as to where this man, her husband, was treated for the disease of which he died. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that hundreds, yea thousands, of men contracted diseased lungs during the war who were never treated in any hospital during their service, but who, without a murmur, stood firm and remained in the field until the last gun was fired.

Third. The claimant should show by medical testimony the physical condition of the soldier at the time of his discharge from the service and from that time to October, 1876.

That is, Mr. Chairman, she is required to show by medical testimony this condition of things. The testimony of his neighbors, the testimony of his friends, the testimony of those who knew him, who were in daily contact with him, is not sufficient. It must be the medical testimony, whether the soldier was ever treated by a physician during that time or not, and none other will be received until it is shown that medical testimony can not be obtained.

Fourth. The claimant should show by some one having personal knowledge of the facts whether the soldier served in the military or naval service of the United States prior to August 9, 1862; and if so, give each organization in which he served.

Fifth. It must be shown by competent evidence whether or not the claimant or soldier had been previously married prior to the time of his marriage with the claimant.

That must be shown by competent testimony in order to rebut the presumption I suggested in the first place.

Sixth. If either the soldier or the claimant were married prior to their marriage with each other, the death or divorce from such former wife or husband must be shown by competent testimony.

I have in mind a similar case in which the claimant is absolutely unable to comply with the rules of the Department relating to the proof of marriage, where every neighbor is as well satisfied of the truth of the proposition as they can be of any fact they did not witness with their own eyes or hear with their own ears.

Mr. PICKLER. May I interrupt the gentleman for a suggestion?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. PICKLER. I expect to bring in a case on some other discussion where the Pension Office actually set aside the findings of a court in a suit in a divorce case and declared that it was improperly granted.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I should not be surprised at any ruling or order that might be suggested.

As I was stating, in the case I had in my mind the wife of a soldier died while they were removing from the State of Texas to the State of Kansas. He subsequently married in the State of Kansas, and in eight or ten years thereafter died. His widow having made application for a pension was called upon to prove the death of the first wife, and learned that but one human being aside from the deceased husband was present at his camp at the time of her death; and that such witness had departed somewhere, the Lord only knows where, and that woman to-day is in her poverty, with no hope unless these arbitrary rules can be abolished and common-sense rules substituted therefor, and, Mr. Chairman, I apprehend before the adjournment some relief will be obtained, and I express the hope that any widow making application for a pension will be permitted to establish her marriage by proving the fact that at the time of the death of the soldier she and the soldier were living and cohabiting as man and wife and were recognized as such in the neighborhood in which they lived.

Seventh. It must be shown by the testimony of two witnesses that the widow has not since the death of her husband remarried.

Eighth. It must be shown by competent testimony that the claimant was not divorced from the soldier.

You see, they are hedging and guarding this matter in every particular. So afraid are they that the woman with whom the soldier lived all of his years, the mother of his children, is not the lawful wife of the soldier, that she is required not only to prove the marriage but must do so by record evidence if it can possibly be obtained.

Ninth. It must be shown by competent testimony whether or not the children claimed for are still living—

I apprehend in this case that the claim has been pending so long that the presumption has arisen in the Pension Office that the children are dead, and they desire additional proof to show that they are still alive—

and if any of them have died, the date of such death must be established by competent evidence.

Now, those are the requirements asked from this poor woman down in Kansas, three or four or five printed pages stating the testimony required. They send that back to her in her lonely cabin, and let her look over the demands of this great Government her husband gave his life to serve. Do you wonder that she fails to respond, or make the proof?

Let me call your attention to another case, to my mind more remarkable than this. That also came under my observation. The testimony required in that case is as follows:

First. The plaintiff should state under oath when, where, and under what circumstances he received the injury to left shoulder complained of.

Second. He should furnish the testimony of two additional persons, members of his company, showing when, where, and under what circumstances he received such injury.

Third. The claimant should show by medical testimony if possible whether or not claimant was disabled from the performance of manual labor by reason of such injury from April 23, 1895, the date of his application, to August 7, 1895, the date of his examination.

In other words, this pensioner made an application on April 23, 1895, and on the 7th day of August of that year he was examined by the board of examining surgeons. It was determined by the board that the soldier was absolutely unable to perform manual labor. Upon this the Bureau called upon him to prove that this disability found by the board existed at the time he filed his application and had continued up to the time of such examination. He had already testified to this in his application, and his testimony had been corroborated by two witnesses at least, and now the Bureau comes back at him with this proposition: "We want medical testimony showing that all the time from April 23, when you made this application, until August 7 of the same year, when you were examined, you were incapable of performing manual labor."

There was the examination of the board on the 7th of August, which showed his disability. There was his affidavit, in the first instance, that he was disabled, corroborated by two witnesses, and yet under the rules of this Bureau he is required to offer medical testimony covering that period of time. The thing that alarms me most, Mr. Chairman, is that before we can possibly get that testimony it will be several weeks at least, and then I fear we must submit to another examination to determine if we have not recovered since the last examination. After the second examination, then we will doubtless be required to go back and prove that during the time between the first and second examinations we were still unable to perform manual labor. These are some of the rules and regulations of the Bureau of which these old soldiers justly complain.

Now, I want to call your attention to that remarkable order or rule which has been referred to as No. 229, which I suggest is absolutely uncalled for, unpatriotic, calculated and designed, in my opinion, to hinder and delay the securing of pensions by old soldiers. It reads:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1893.

[Order No. 229.]

In the preparation of testimony in support of claims in pension cases, all statements affecting the particular case and not merely formal must be written, or prepared to be typewritten, in the presence of the witness, and from his oral declarations then made to the person who then reduces the testimony to writing, or then prepares the same to be typewritten. And such testimony must embody a statement by the witness that such testimony was all written, or prepared for typewriting (as the case may be), in his pres-

ence, and only from his oral statements then made; stating also the time, place, and person, when, where, and to whom he made such oral statements, and that in making the same he did not use, and was not aided or prompted by, any written or printed statement or recital prepared or dictated by any other person and not attached as an exhibit to his testimony.

Any needless delay in the preparation of such testimony after such oral statement by the witness, or in forwarding the same to this Bureau, and any material alteration or erasure, will be cause for rejecting such testimony.

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Approved:
HOKE SMITH, *Secretary.*

Now, I want to submit that there is not one attorney in a hundred, possessing the highest degree of skill, that could prepare an affidavit in compliance with that order unless he had the order right on his desk before him. This rule is not required by any court of justice in the land, and it seems to me that the purpose of this rule is only to hinder and delay these old soldiers and their widows in securing their pensions.

I want to suggest, although it may not be germane to this discussion, that many amendments or changes should be made to the existing pension laws and to the rules of practice in the Department to obviate as far as possible the wrong and injustice to which these old soldiers are now subject. First, the applicant for a pension should only be required to state the fact of his disease and disability to the very best of his ability. It is not to be supposed or expected that he should go to a physician and be examined in order to technically describe the disease of which he complains. It ought to be sufficient for him to set forth the injury of which he complains in his own language. He may call it heart disease, and yet his heart be not affected. He may complain that his lungs are affected, and yet the doctor's decision be to the contrary. He may complain that his spine is affected, and yet the doctor decides that it is his kidneys. So, I say, it should be unnecessary for the applicant to specifically give the ailment of which he complains; but when the testimony is received the pensioner should be awarded his pension if the testimony shows that he is entitled to the pension, notwithstanding the declaration he may have filed does not specifically describe the disease. In other words, if he alleges in his declaration that his spine is affected and the proof develops it is the kidneys, the pension should be allowed to him precisely as though he alleged his kidneys were affected in the declaration. That is the common-sense way that should prevail in any court of justice.

Again, the soldier should be presumed to have been sound when he entered the service of his country. It is unjust and unpatriotic to every man who entered the service of his country to suggest to him thirty years after he has devoted his time and energy and offered his life in defense of his country that he was unsound and diseased when he entered the service, and to require him to prove that he was capable of being a soldier. His three years' record upon the battlefield ought to be sufficient to satisfy the most skeptical upon that subject. [Applause.] The marriage of the soldier should be presumed to be valid, and no widow should be required to offer proof that her marriage to the man with whom she lived was not invalid.

Fourth, the children of the soldier should be presumed to be legitimate, and no proof of the marriage should be required of the mother except that the father and mother were living and cohabiting in the community in which they lived as man and wife, and were so recognized by their neighbors.

Neither the soldier nor the soldier's widow should be presumed to have had a former wife or husband living at the time they entered into marriage with each other. The witnesses of the soldier should be presumed to be honest in making their affidavits in attempting to prove up his claim under the law.

It has been suggested that there is an occasional case of fraud. That would naturally arise, regardless of all precautions you may take. Men will commit crime; and because an attorney in the State of New York, or in the State of Iowa, or in Nebraska, New Hampshire, or New Mexico may have violated the pension laws, committed crime, that is no reason why injustice should be practiced upon every pensioner throughout the length and breadth of the land.

There is another thing to which I desire to call attention. First, the soldier who carried the musket in the line when he comes to testify on behalf of his comrade is entitled to the same credit as the man who wore the shoulder strap. The evidence of the regimental physician should not be required except when shown by the record. Other evidence should be received on that subject. Thirty years have gone. Many of these physicians are dead; many of them entirely beyond the reach of the pensioner; many of them without any record or memoranda; and they must rely wholly and solely upon the record for their information. Therefore the only record testimony that should be required is that which is within easy reach and convenient to the Pension Bureau.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, notwithstanding the 300 or 400 or 500 pension bills pending before this body, introduced for the purpose of correcting some of the evils and abuses which I have pointed out, and notwithstanding many of those bills may be enacted into laws, I am clearly of the opinion that but little can be accomplished while an unfriendly Administration controls and dictates the policy of the Pension Bureau. No bill can be framed that will compel the issuance of liberal pensions by an Administration that does not believe in pensions.

There is but one remedy, and that remedy will come, in my judgment, early in November of the year 1896 [applause on the Republican side], when an indignant, patriotic people will rise in their majesty and power and set their seal of condemnation on the party at whose hands they have suffered these wrongs. And, Mr. Chairman, when that time comes you will see those old soldiers from one end of this land to the other, stooped with age and bowed with disease with their wounds and scars, together with their sons and their sons-in-law, standing up in solid phalanx on that November day, and you will hear their shouts and huzzahs as they march triumphantly to the ballot box to drive from place and power the party that has dealt so unjustly with them. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

That is the remedy. The remedy is not in these bills that we introduce here. Why, gentlemen, turn your eyes toward the east to-day and behold the spectacle! In the last Congress that whole side of this Chamber was not sufficient to contain our Democratic brethren, and now look in that direction. How and why did this great change occur? It was brought about by an indignant people visiting their judgment upon the unpatriotic party that had proven itself so incapable of controlling this country and its destinies. Yes, the Democratic party must again retire for a quarter of a century at least, until the people forget its incapacity and folly. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, if my friend from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] who addressed this body yesterday lived in my district, entertaining the sentiments which he has expressed on this floor, he could not be elected as pathmaster in a single road district in all that section of country. [Laughter.] We have a patriotic people out there. More than 6,000 of the old war veterans find homes in the district that I have the honor to represent, and not only the old soldiers but our patriotic people, regardless of party, are in favor of pensions, liberal pensions, to the men who saved the country. They believe in breaking down the barriers that have been interposed by this Administration and welcoming these old heroes to the public Treasury they offered their lives to save. They believe in clearing the way, removing barriers, and bidding them welcome to their own. Then, and not until then, will a patriotic people feel that justice has been done to the nation's defenders. [Loud applause.]

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words on the pending pension bill.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from New York proceeds, I will ask him how much time he desires.

Mr. POOLE. Ten minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Very well. I give notice, Mr. Chairman, that as soon as the gentleman from New York shall have concluded his remarks I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to give me five minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Of course. Anything that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] wants, he must have. [Laughter.]

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] who entertained us yesterday with a speech, which I looked for in vain in the RECORD this morning. The honorable gentleman said that he had favored all the pension legislation of the past up to the dependent pension act of 1890; but, claiming to speak for the Democrats of New York, and also for many Republicans, he was opposed to further pension legislation looking toward more liberal pensions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I admit the gentleman's right to speak for the Democrats of New York, but I deny his right to speak for the Republicans. We have on this floor 28 Republicans from the great State of New York, all of them in favor not only of all past pension legislation, but ready to vote for the pending appropriation act, including the amendment proposed by the committee. Furthermore, they are ready to vote at the proper time for more liberal pensions to the soldiers and the widows of the soldiers of the late war. [Applause.]

They are simply waiting, Mr. Chairman, till the time comes when we shall have a Republican President who will carry out the wishes of the Republican majority in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. That time, they believe, will come early in November next, when the people of this country will have elected as President of the United States one of their own political faith, possibly the honorable gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] who presides with such ability over the deliberations of this body; possibly the distinguished protectionist, Mr. McKinley, of Ohio, who has so ably served his country upon the field of battle, in the halls of

Congress, and as governor of his State; possibly the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], who has been this day re-elected to the position in the Senate of the United States which he has adorned for so many years and where he has done his party and his country great service; or possibly the good sense of the Republican convention that will assemble in St. Louis may lead it to choose the candidate presented by New York, the able statesman and financier, who served his country well upon the floors of Congress, as minister to France, as Vice-President of the United States, and who is now the model governor of the Empire State, Hon. Levi P. Morton. [Applause.] Either of these gentlemen, or any one of half a dozen others who may be nominated, can be elected, and will cooperate as President with the Republican majority in the Senate and House of Representatives in doing justice to the veteran soldier, and who will gladly sign bills giving them more liberal pensions, and in due time the service pension, which they have waited so many years for.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] speaks entirely for the Democrats of that State. I know there are many Democrats in his own district who will resent his speech by their vote next November.

A prominent Democratic soldier of the State of New York, Maj. Gen. Daniel E. Sickles, was on this floor yesterday and listened to the remarkable speech of the gentleman from New York, and was heard to express a wish that he had the opportunity to again speak upon the floor to the people of the country in opposition to the position taken by his former colleague from New York.

In regard to the pending bill, and particularly the amendments offered by the Appropriations Committee, I shall have but little to say. The first amendment, Mr. Chairman, simply provides that—

Whenever a claim for pension under the act of June 27, 1890, has been, or shall hereafter be, rejected, suspended, or dismissed because of any defect or nformality in the application, and a new application shall have been, or shall hereafter be, filed, and a pension has been, or shall hereafter be, allowed in such claim, such pension shall date from the time of filing the first application, provided the evidence in the case shall show the disability to have existed, or to exist, at the time of filing such first application, anything in any law or ruling of the Department to the contrary notwithstanding.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is always easy to criticise the administration of the Pension Bureau, but at all times we should do justice even to our political opponents. There are enough things in the present administration of that Bureau to criticise, but the fact is that the existing law, the act of 1890, is defective in some particulars, and I do not find much fault with the Pension Bureau because it rules under that act that if there is a defect in the original application, and a second application is made and the pension is finally allowed, that the pension shall date only from the time of the second application, even though allowed upon the original testimony.

That seems to me a fair construction of the law as it now exists, but it works unfairly to the pensioner. Now, in the State of New York within the last two years there have been unearthed some of the most stupendous frauds in connection with pension matters that have possibly ever been unearthed in this country. I refer to the frauds in the city of Buffalo. A man residing in that city who had at one time been connected with the United States Pension Bureau, and who claimed to have unusual facilities for the prosecution of pension claims, advertised far and wide his ability to secure pensions, and obtained a very large amount of business.

After he had filed some 2,000 claims in the Pension Office, it was discovered that he was doing "crooked" work, that many of the claims presented by him were fraudulent. An investigation was started which finally landed that agent in the State prison. And nearly all the cases which had been in his hands were rejected because of the fact that he had systematically, in the preparation of those pension claims, perpetrated frauds upon the Government. He had employed in his office young ladies as stenographers and bookkeepers who were accustomed to sign declarations as identifying witnesses and make oath to them as such, who afterwards admitted that they had no acquaintance with or knowledge of the applicants.

Now, I understand from officials of the Pension Bureau that over fifty of the claims which were rejected because of these irregularities were finally allowed and the applicants granted pensions; but they were not allowed until there had been long and tedious examination, nor until a period of two years had elapsed from the date of the original application. Then these men, upon the evidence already on file in the Pension Office, were allowed their pensions; but these pensions commenced only from the date of the second application, though the irregularities in the original declarations were in no case the fault of the claimants.

The amendment now offered by the committee as a part of this appropriation bill obviates this defect in the law. In each of these cases the Government has obtained the benefit of the difference of time between the original declaration and the declaration on which the pension was finally allowed. In some of the cases I have referred to the pensioners were defrauded of between two and three hundred dollars to which they were in equity entitled.

It is manifestly unjust that, because of any informality in the original declaration, the applicant should be deprived of a benefit which it was the intent of the law to secure to him. That intent the proposed amendment fully indicates.

Now, the second amendment reported by the committee, relating to proof necessary in widows' claims under the act of June 27, 1890, I approve of for the reason that it goes a part of the way toward remedying an existing wrong. Under the present rulings of the Pension Bureau, in order that a widow may obtain a pension under this law, she is virtually obliged to prove that she is a pauper. I hope the time may speedily come when every such requirement shall be wiped from the statute books of the United States; therefore I approve this provision of the bill that the soldier's widow shall be allowed a pension unless she has a net income exceeding $500. This seems to me to be a step in the right direction. In order to do full justice, the dependent clause should be eliminated from the law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF], I can not, speaking as a soldier and as a pensioner, approve of that proposition. It proposes (I have it not before me) that the Commissioner of Pensions shall not have the power during the year 1897 to suspend or reduce any pension unless the pensioner's right to a pension shall have been decided against him by a court of the United States.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. POOLE. I should like to have three minutes more.

Mr. DINGLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be allowed five minutes additional.

There was no objection.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Chairman, I shall oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois because it lets down the bars too far. It is a dangerous amendment, and it would not have been proposed in this House had not many members doubted the wisdom and possibly the integrity of the Commissioner of Pensions. It would be a dangerous thing to adopt such a proposition. Speaking as a soldier and as a pensioner, I desire above all other things to keep the pension rolls clean and honest [applause], and I object to any amendment that will prevent the punishment of fraud.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not venture into any defense of the Commissioner, but I want to say I believe it would be a dangerous thing for this Congress or any other to declare that the Commissioner of Pensions shall not under any circumstances be allowed to drop a pensioner from the rolls, for I know from experience that there arise from time to time undoubted cases of fraud—such cases have come within my knowledge—in which the Commissioner should have the right to suspend payment of pensions until further investigation shall determine whether a fraud has been committed or not.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that we can afford, as old soldiers, to allow these safeguards to be taken away. In our endeavor to protect the pensioner we are in danger of passing a law which will work to his injury. Most of us know something of the expense of conducting a suit in the United States courts. Suppose the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF] shall become a law. How easy it would be for a man who held a grudge against an old soldier to make some malicious charge against him and drag him before a United States court, where he would be compelled to defend himself against the injustice sought to be done him by his enemy. He might, and possibly would, in the course of time, be able to clear himself and prove his right to his pension, but in doing so he would probably sacrifice every dollar he had in the world in costs and expenses.

These old soldiers should be granted every possible safeguard which can be thrown around them by the law for their protection, but it is no favor to them to subject them to the possibility of such an infamous wrong as that. I believe this proposed amendment to be ill considered and ill advised. I hope it will not prevail.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I wish to say that we have before us for consideration several bills, one of which will probably be introduced at a very early date, which seeks to protect the pensioners in their just rights. We believe in vested rights. Most of us on that committee are old pensioners ourselves, and we may be safely trusted to fully protect our comrades. We do not want to see any legislation adopted that will jeopardize their rights or subject them to greater evils than they now endure. [Applause.]

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I shall heartily support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF]. [Applause.] I shall raise no objection to it. It is a step in the right direction, whether it goes out on a point of order or not. It is time that something radical was applied to the Pension Office. [Applause.] There is not a soldier's widow, not a Union veteran to-day drawing a pension who is not standing daily and hourly under the apprehension of a cowardly blow from this office. It comes silently like a thief at night. It strikes the widow and

orphan from the pension rolls without warning and without a hearing. [Applause.]

After years of patient waiting, after board upon board has examined and reported upon his case, he finally receives his pension. Suddenly, without warning, it is withdrawn from him. No charge is made against him, and if so, no opportunity is offered him to repel it. As the resolution of the gentleman from Illinois aims to strike at the root of the trouble, I take off my hat to it. By its adoption we may be able to ascertain why it is that the Union veterans are stabbed in the back from the very quarter where they should receive encomiums, encouragement, and justice. [Prolonged applause.] At all events we shall arrest the hand of the hidden despoiler, restore peace to many an apprehensive heart, and save many a hero from undeserved sorrow and shame.

I have a case in my own mind of a printer, a man with whom I have set type at the case, a man with whom I served in the Army. He was so honest that after he had received a pension he discovered that his health had improved. He was able to earn his own living. Governed by an exquisite sense of duty to his country, he asked the Commissioner of Pensions to withdraw his name from the rolls. He needed the pension no longer. The name was withdrawn. Within two years he was again taken sick. He was placed in a hospital in New York City, and was supported there by Typographical Union No. 6. In vain did he apply to the Pension Department for reinstatement. To-day he is without a pension, dependent upon the generosity of his fellow-craftsmen and the soldiers who served in the field with him. Twice has his application been rejected.

Now, I make no charges against the Pension Commissioner, but I do say this: Repeatedly instances have come to my attention where boards of examiners have steadily declared that the soldier was entitled to a pension, and yet it was rejected in the office here in Washington. [Applause.]

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Yes.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Is it not true that for the last two and a half years the Pension Bureau has been emphatically hostile to the pension claims of old soldiers?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I can not say that—but it has been emphatically unjust to them. [Applause.] There should be no further opportunity to continue the abominable practice.

Now, sir, the speech I heard from my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT] on this floor yesterday is not calculated to remove the painful apprehension from the minds of the dependent soldiers and widows. Cold sophistry may be good, but it ought to be applied to railroad legislation and to the Supreme Court rather than to the claims of pensioners. [Loud applause.] I repudiate that speech. [Applause.] On behalf of the constituents I represent, Republicans as well as Democrats, I repudiate it. [Applause.] I repudiate the speech on behalf of the Union veterans of New York. [Applause.] I repudiate it on behalf of all Grand Army posts and of the sorrowing widows who are drawing pensions in the city of New York. I repudiate the speech on behalf of the Democracy of New York City—on behalf of the Tammany Hall Democracy of New York. [Laughter and applause.]

Sir, I have not forgotten, and my fellow-members will not forget, on whichever side of the House they stand, that the Tammany Society organized, equipped, and sent to the front one of the finest regiments that ever appeared in the Army of the Potomac. Their bravery and their gallantry at Balls Bluff, at Gettysburg, and elsewhere challenged the admiration of the world. On behalf of the veterans of this regiment and of their dead comrades I enter my protest. [Applause.] Tammany Hall has always been intensely loyal to the Union. She has always been loyal to the veterans of the war. Her beautiful monument to her patriotic dead at Gettysburg is a living exemplification of her sentiments. I challenge any man to point out one flaw——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Can you not go a little further and repudiate the speech of the gentleman who said that every neighborhood was honeycombed with pension frauds throughout this country?

Mr. CUMMINGS. If I was the Commissioner of Pensions I might be able to do so knowingly. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I speak on behalf of every veteran, on behalf of every widow and of every orphan who draws a pension in the United States. They are all included in this nefarious work at the Pension Office. One exposure of fraud ought not to punish forty innocent people. It is monstrous. I believe that for every fraudulent pensioner who has been stricken from the list or suspended at least a thousand who were receiving only their just dues from the Government have been unjustly punished. Let us stop such work now and forever.

I shall vote for the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois with pleasure. If it fails it will have a good effect. It will call the attention of the Commissioner of Pensions to the fact that the patriotic people of the country are aroused and that in time we shall have a tribunal, either here or elsewhere, that will do absolute justice to the men who fought in the Union armies, and that will never supplement its action by gross injustice. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. PICKLER. Pending that, I should like to inquire of the gentleman how much longer it is expected that general debate will continue?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I am unable to answer that question. There are a large number of members who wish to speak on this bill, and unless the committee having it in charge are advised that some other measures are pressing for the attention of the House, I feel disposed, so far as I am concerned, to let the debate run for a day or two, at least.

Mr. PICKLER. There seems to be a great unanimity of opinion.

The motion of Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CURTIS of New York, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897; which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to reserve points of order on the bill, and to make the inquiry whether or not, under the practice of the House, it will be necessary to reserve points of order on appropriation bills when they are referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union?

The SPEAKER. The impression of the Chair is that it is necessary so to do.

REPRINT OF A BILL (H. R. 3010).

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. TAWNEY, leave was granted to reprint the bill (H. R. 3010) defining cheese, and also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of "filled cheese."

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a resolution with reference to printing for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be, and is hereby, authorized to have printed and bound such documents and papers for the use of the committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to ask the gentleman if the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have heretofore had that privilege?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know. I think it is proper that they should have it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not favor extending this privilege to committees which have not had it heretofore. Possibly some member of the committee can state whether it has had that privilege heretofore or not. I do not think every committee of the House ought to have the privilege of printing and binding every document that comes before it.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the important subjects before that committee are of a nature which certainly ought to lead to the granting of this privilege. There are some very important subjects before that committee. I am not certain whether they have had the privilege heretofore, but the subjects now before them are of unusual importance.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I shall not object to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HEPBURN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

REPRINT OF THE PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Before moving that the House adjourn, I ask for a reprint of the bill now under consideration. Copies of the bill are all exhausted, and there have been numerous inquiries for them. I ask a reprint of the bill and report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] asks unanimous consent for a reprint of the bill

(H. R. 3537) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, and the accompanying report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMISSIONERS OF CHICKAMAUGA NATIONAL PARK.

The SPEAKER appointed as Commissioners of the Chickamauga National Park Mr. GROSVENOR, Mr. KIEFER, Mr. STRONG, Mr. AVERY, Mr. BOWERS, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. COX, Mr. MADDOX, and Mr. CRISP.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

The SPEAKER. The admission of the State of Utah into the Union has rendered necessary the appointment of Territorial Delegates to certain committees, to supply the places left vacant by the Delegate from the Territory of Utah. The Chair announces the following appointments:

To the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. FLYNN.

To the Committee on Mines and Mining, Mr. MURPHY of Arizona.

To the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, Mr. MURPHY of Arizona.

The Chair would like the consent of the House that the Committee on Agriculture remain as appointed by the Chair, one more member having been appointed than the rules permit. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WOODMAN, for five days, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting the terms of the lease of public property made by him during the last calendar year, in accordance with 27 Statutes at Large, page 321—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of 300 copies each of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Board of Supervising Inspectors of Steam Vessels for the years 1895 and 1896—to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting the annual report of the expenditures of the contingent fund; report of the finances of the Department; report showing all contracts that have been made by the Department, other than for carrying the mails, and the report of the postal business and agencies in foreign countries for the fiscal year ended June, 1895—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate bill and resolution were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A bill (S. 650) to incorporate the Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A concurrent resolution to print, index, and bind in cloth all of the acts as they appear in the United States Statutes heretofore passed by Congress imposing duties on imports—to the Committee on Printing.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the following changes of reference were made:

The bill (H. R. 368) granting a pension to Nathan Hite—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 151) to pay the heirs of the late John Roach, deceased, $48,858.03 for labor and material furnished for the gunboat *Dolphin*—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 2137) to pay the heirs of the late John Roach, deceased, $330,151.42 for labor and material, dockage and detention, and occupation of yards and shops for the gunboats *Chicago*, *Boston*, and *Atlanta*—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 95) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas William Lynch, alias William Stevens, United States Navy—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 3313) for the relief of James Bigler—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 3332) granting a pension to Mrs. Fanny Warren—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 3806) to amend an act in relation to the Japanese indemnity fund, approved February 22, 1883—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 2029) for the relief of the widow of George C. Foulke, deceased—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 3657) for the relief of W. D. Gold & Co.—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3210) to provide for the adjudication and payment of damages sustained by citizens of the United States in the border counties of York, Adams, Cumberland, Franklin, Fulton, Bedford, Somerset, and Perry, in State of Pennsylvania, from Union and Confederate troops during the late war of the rebellion, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 42) in writing thereon; which said bill, amendment, and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1713) to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 41) in writing thereon; which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from the Committee on War Claims, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 2750) to carry into effect a finding of the Court of Claims in favor of the estate of George Case, late of Independence County, Ark. (Report No. 32.)

By Mr. NEILL: A bill (H. R. 2741) for the relief of Peter Cook, of Arkansas. (Report No. 33.)

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 130) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Augustus P. Burdett. (Report No. 34.)

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 36) for the relief of Flora A. Darling. (Report No. 36.)

Also, a bill (H. R. 71) for the relief of Capt. Francis A. Benter. (Report No. 37.)

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 1743) for the relief of the legal representatives of Thomas L. Young. (Report No. 38.)

Also, a bill (H. R. 3075) for the relief of John A. Lynch. (Report No. 39.)

Also, a bill (H. R. 897) for the relief of James Stewart. (Report No. 40.)

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 129) for the relief of Thomas B. Reed. (Report No. 41.)

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 3950) for the relief of William P. Buckmaster, reported as a substitute for House bill No. 3950. (Report No. 35.)

BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 3951) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Elizabeth, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 3952) granting to the State of Minnesota in perpetuity the old buildings and the ground upon which they stand, which constitute the old and original Fort Snelling, in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3953) for the improvement of the Minnesota River in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 3954) to reorganize the line of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 3955) to foreclose the lien of the United States upon the Union Pacific and Central Pacific railroads, and to incorporate a company for the purpose of operating the same until the debts due to the Government are fully paid—to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. SHERMAN (by request): A bill (H. R. 3956) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 3957) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 3958) to amend the charter of the Belt Railway Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 3959) to repeal the civil service laws—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGER: A bill (H. R. 3960) to further regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 3961) for a commission to devise and submit a plan for the consolidation and reorganization of customs districts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 3962) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Lake St. Francis, in the State of Arkansas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3963) to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the judicial districts of Wisconsin—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGLEY: A bill (H. R. 3964) to reorganize the customs collection district of Alaska—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3965) making an appropriation for duplicating machinery at the United States armory at Springfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 3966) to fix the salary of the collector of the customs for the district of Newport News, Va.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 3967) for the improvement of Byram River, Portchester Harbor, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3968) making appropriation for the improvement of Mamaroneck Harbor, on Long Island Sound, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3969) making appropriation for the improvement of Larchmont Harbor, on Long Island Sound, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3970) for the improvement of Echo Bay at New Rochelle, on Long Island Sound, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3971) making appropriation for the improvement of Eastchester Creek, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3972) for the improvement of the harbor of Peekskill, on the Hudson River, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COWEN: A bill (H. R. 3973) to validate deeds in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A joint resolution (H. Res. 79) granting use of White Lot and Monument Grounds to "The Committee of Eighteen Hundred and Ninty-six"—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARKE of Alabama: A joint resolution (H. Res. 80) authorizing the National Dredging Company to proceed with the work of dredging the channel of Mobile Harbor, under the direction of the Secretary of War—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A joint resolution (H. Res. 81) to provide for the presentation of medals of honor to the militia and volunteer troops of the several States who volunteered their services for the defense of the States of Maryland and Pennsylvania in the year 1863, prior to and after the battle of Gettysburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHUFORD: A joint resolution (H. Res. 82) to amend the Constitution of the United States relating to direct taxes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A joint resolution (H. Res. 83) to protect the harbor on Lake Michigan known as Holland (Black Lake) Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A concurrent resolution (House Con. Res. No: 13) to print 5,000 additional copies of Postal Regulations and Laws of 1893—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A resolution (House Res. No. 112) authorizing appointment of an additional reading clerk—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A resolution (House Res. No. 113) to employ Willis Bolls as an additional employee in the document room during the Fifty-fourth Congress—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KIEFER: A memorial of the Minnesota legislature for the conveyance by the General Government to the State of Minnesota of the site, and buildings thereon, of what is known as old Fort Snelling, for the purpose of converting the same into a natural, civil, military, botanical, and archæological history of this State—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A memorial of the Maine legislature for the repairing and reconstruction of the U. S. frigate *Constitution*, said repairs to be made at Kittery Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the Maine legislature against a free-ship bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 3974) for the relief of John L. Peters—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3975) for the relief of Charles Balmer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3976) for the relief of James Lindsay—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 3977) granting a pension to Frank J. Hood, of Georgetown, Colo., and late of Company D, Thirty-seventh New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Two hundred and fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3978) granting a pension to Lemuel Kingsbury, of Denver, Colo., and late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 3979) for the relief of John Ellis, of Kenton County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOUTELLE: A bill (H. R. 3980) granting a pension to Willard Spinney—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3981) granting a pension to Russell D. Royal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 3982) granting to Lincoln Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Valley Hope, R. I., one condemned cannon—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON (by request): A bill (H. R. 3983) for the removal of the charge of desertion standing against the military record of Andrew J. Lawwill, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth, and D, Twenty-fourth and Eighteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and the granting of an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 3984) to authorize the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of George W. Armstrong—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 3985) for relief of William McAdams, who survived William Marks, now deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 3986) granting an increase of pension to Frank McNeill, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3987) granting a pension to Henrietta Cox, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 3988) for the relief of John Daniels, of Pine Grove, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3989) for the relief of James B. Bazell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 3990) granting a pension to Mrs. Eliza G. Pyne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3991) authorizing the payment of the amount due Stella J. Coolbroth—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. HAGER: A bill (H. R. 3992) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa, the cost of constructing pavements and sewers in front of lots 1, 2, and east 20 feet of lot 3, block 6, Bayliss's first addition to Council Bluffs, owned by the United States Government in said city, and used as United States court-house and post-office—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3993) granting a pension to Joseph Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 3994) for the relief of A. W. Pollard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 3995) granting a pension to George K. Knowlton, late of United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 3996) granting a pension to Catherine Wiltse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEONARD: A bill (H. R. 3997) for the relief of Wilbur F. Loveland, late of Company E, Seventh Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 3998) granting a pension to Hiram Stanley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3999) granting a pension to Addison Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R, 4000) granting a pension to Elisha J. Essex—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4001) to reinstate William Waldrup on pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 4002) for the relief of Mrs. E. G. Tolson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 4003) for the relief of Maj. W. W. Lowe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A bill (H. R. 4004) for the relief of the legal representative of Leonard B. Pratt—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 4005) for the relief of Charles A. Pierson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4006) for the relief of E. A. Givens, sr., Arcadia, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4007) for the relief of Paul Chappin, Rapides Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4008) for the relief of Thomas Kergon, of Rapides Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4009) for the relief of Louisa Schraeder, widow of Charles Schraeder and tutrix of minor children, of Rapides Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4010) for the relief of Jeannette D. Calvit, of Rapides Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4011) for the relief of Jacob A. Wolfson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4012) for the relief of estate of Joseph Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4013) for the relief of Emily Dietrich, Mary T. Hickman, and Ernestine Lemee, of Grant Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OWENS: A bill (H. R. 4014) for the relief of the heirs of Catherine Morin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 4015) for the relief of Hyland C. Kirk and others, assignees of Addison C. Fletcher—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4016) for the relief of Hyland C. Kirk and others, assignees of Addison C. Fletcher—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 4017) to correct the military record of George B. Collins, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4018) granting an increase of pension to Jane S. Ransom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4019) for the relief of James A. Mitchell, of Sebastian County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 4020) granting a pension to Mrs. Loring Spencer, as the widow of George E. Spencer late of———to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4021) granting a pension to Sarah Kate Tibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 4022) granting a pension to Ellen McDaniel, formerly Ellen Hines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4023) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Mallery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 4024) for the relief of W. S. Hammaker—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 4025) for the relief of the legal heirs of William J. Wilber, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 4026) to remove the charge of dismissal standing against William H. Harlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4027) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Michael Quirk—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER (by request): A bill (H. R. 4028) for the relief of the estate of John R. Bigelow—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WATSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4029) to grant an increase of pension to Francis M. Galvin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4030) to increase the pension of Sidney W. Pyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4031) to pension Edson S. Winkley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4032) to grant an honorable discharge to James M. Schofield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4033) for the relief of William F. Denmure—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4034) to increase the pension of Henry C. Sutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4035) to increase the pension of Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 4036) for the relief of George Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4037) granting a pension to Joseph McGuckian—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAGER: A bill (H. R. 4038) for the relief of Dennis Kelly—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4039) for the relief of Daniel J. Ockerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4040) to correct the military record of Jacob Cheout—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4041) to correct the military record of Jonas O. Johnson, late of Company A, First Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 4042) for the relief of Samuel G. Morris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of 464 citizens of Franklin County, Mo., praying for continuance of the improvement of the Missouri River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Building Trades Council of St. Louis and vicinity, in favor of the bill authorizing the appointment of a nonpartisan labor commission—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BOUTELLE: Papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Willard Spinney—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Two petitions of sundry persons, of Pittsburg, Pa., for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): Petition of J. M. Downing, C. F. Adams, W. D. Burriss, and others, of Fayetteville and vicinity, Mo., asking for the passage of the William A. Stone bill to secure a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Three petitions, respectively, of the First Congregational Church; the Payson Church, and the Church of the Immaculate Conception, all of Easthampton, Mass., in behalf of the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: Three petitions severally of L. W. Sullivan, John Leer, H. G. King, and 26 other citizens of Kingwood, Pa.; H. D. Moore, J. W. Sanner, C. R. Griffith, and 34 other citizens of New Lexington and Kingwood, Pa.; J. S. Snyder, J. S. Pell, E. C. Harah, L. L. Weimer, and 31 other citizens of Markleton, Casselman, and New Lexington, Pa., for the passage of an act designed to secure a better grade of immigrants, known as the Stone bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILBORN: Two memorials, respectively, from the Oakland city council and the board of supervisors of Placer County, Cal., relating to measures of relief for the mining industry—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. HITT: Resolutions on Armenian outrages adopted January 3, 1896, at a public meeting in New Haven, Conn.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEONARD: Petition of citizens of Lycoming County, Pa., praying for the passage of legislation restricting immigration—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Two petitions of numerous citizens of South Carolina, praying for speedy settlement of contested-election cases—to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Mrs. E. G. Tolson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOODY: Petition of many citizens of Amesbury, Mass., asking Congress to take action which will result in the speedy recognition, as belligerents, of the Cuban patriots—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: Resolution of the First Congregational Church of Searsport, Me., asking that the Government take measures to prevent Armenian atrocities by the Turks—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OGDEN: Petition of the postal service committee of the New Orleans Board of Trade (H. H. Smith, secretary), asking for

an appropriation for a new post-office building—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Memorial from the mayor and citizens of West Tampa, Fla., asking for the recognition of the belligerent rights of the Cuban insurgents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SORG: Petition of the Dayton Ministerial Association, of Dayton, Ohio, asking (1) to raise the age of consent; (2) to repeal the ninety-day divorce law of Oklahoma; (3) to enact a Sabbath law for the capital equal to the best State law; (4) to enforce compulsory education and suppress child labor in the capital; (5) to pass a law for arbitration of railway strikes, and (6) to provide for a commission to investigate the labor problem—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. STAHLE: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3319, granting a pension to Jacob Witiner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 1122, to correct the military record of Edwin T. Lewis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Six petitions, severally, of citizens of Tarentum; two of citizens of Cameron County; citizens of Hazen, Jefferson County; citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., and citizens of West Virginia, praying for the passage of the Stone bill for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WALKER of Virginia (by request): Petition of the heirs of Burrell Wall, deceased, late of Wythe County, Va., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WANGER: Two petitions of Frank K. Reeder and 54 other citizens of Bucks County, together with Wilbert Merrick and 26 other citizens of Bucks County, Pa., for the passage of the Stone bill for consular inspection of immigrants (H. R. 58)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 15, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

BRIGHTWOOD RAILWAY COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting annual report of the Brightwood Railway Company of the District for the year ended December 31, 1895; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

BELT RAILWAY COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the Belt Railway Company of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the names of stockholders and the number of shares held by each, together with a statement of the receipts and disbursements for the year ended December 31, 1895; which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

ECKINGTON AND SOLDIERS' HOME RAILWAY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the names of stockholders and the number of shares held by each, together with a statement of the receipts and disbursements for the year ended December 31, 1895; which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF CONNECTICUT AVENUE EXTENDED.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, in compliance with a requirement in the deficiency appropriation act of March 2, 1895, a report relative to the reassessment of the cost of improving Connecticut avenue extended, in the District of Columbia, together with a draft of a bill prepared by the attorney of the District; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the assembly of the State of New York, praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition, signed by the mayor and sundry other citizens of Utica, N. Y., praying the Congress of the United States to use its influence as may seem most wise and efficient in speedily arresting the awful persecutions now in progress in Turkey and Armenia; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce, calling attention to the fact that for many years past the Chamber of Commerce and the citizens of Tacoma have maintained at their own expense a voluntary weather bureau, furnishing an office, rent free, for the use of the Signal Service observer. The Chamber of Commerce of Tacoma desire that a Weather Bureau station be established at that city by the National Government. This petition sets forth that the deep-sea craft stop at this place constantly, going and coming, the arrivals amounting to over 400 annually, with an average tonnage inward amounting to 600,000 tons, and that the tonnage of the Sound craft at that port arriving and departing exceeds 1,000,000 tons annually.

The petitioners state that they have been informed by the Chief of the Government Weather Bureau that no other State in the Union has so many Weather Bureau stations, or has received so large a share of the appropriation for the maintenance of the national meteorological service; but the Chamber of Commerce suggest that no other State in the Union has such an extent of coast line as the State of Washington, which must of necessity call for larger expenditure in this direction. Therefore the petitioners seek to have a larger appropriation made, for the purpose of establishing a Weather Bureau station at the city of Tacoma.

The petitioners go on to speak of the constantly increasing traffic between Tacoma and Oriental ports, as well as the United Kingdom, carried on by steamers and sailing vessels, requiring the shipping to be protected from danger and loss by such signals and information as is given by the Government at other ports. They humbly pray that this rising seaport may be accorded the measure of justice in this respect to which it is fairly and justly entitled.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SEWELL. I present a memorial of the Daughters of the Revolution of the State of New Jersey, praying that Miss Eliza Sandford, daughter of William Sandford, orderly sergeant in the Revolutionary war, be granted a pension. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Pensions, a bill granting a pension to Miss Sandford having been introduced and being before that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SEWELL presented resolutions adopted by the Lafayette Reformed Church, of Jersey City, N. J., favoring protection for the Armenian people and indorsing the resolution introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] in relation to the troubles in Turkey; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of L. T. Yeoman and 92 other citizens of Essex County, N. J., and the petition of Joseph McComb and 14 other citizens of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Massachusetts Wholesale Lumber Association of Boston, Mass., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Henry W. Sears and 21 other citizens of Middleboro, Mass., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. GORMAN presented sundry petitions of citizens of Bakersville, Mondel, Sharpsburg, Cumberland, Boyds, Damascus, Cedar Grove, Darnestown, Shepherdstown, Clarksburg, and Downsville, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. ELKINS presented the petition of L. E. Showalter and 2,000 other citizens of the State of West Virginia, praying for the passage of the bill to regulate immigration, known as the Stone bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. VEST presented a petition of sundry citizens of St. Louis, Mo., and a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the Massachusetts Wholesale Lumber Association of Boston, Mass., praying that an appropriation be made for the deepening and widening of the channels of Boston Harbor; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Massachusetts Wholesale Lumber Association of Boston, Mass., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Newton, Mass., expressing their approval of the Senate resolution introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to support the President in the most vigorous action he may deem fit to take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of the High Street Congregational Church, of Lowell, Mass., praying that Congress will take such action as may be deemed fit to establish law and order in the Turkish Empire, and commending the efforts of the Red Cross Society as worthy of cordial support; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present three petitions of citizens of Missouri, in favor of the passage of what is known as the Stone immigration bill, which passed the House of Representatives during the last Congress and is now pending in that body, it being the purpose of the bill to restrict immigration. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHEES. I present a memorial of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, on the subject of Venezuela and the questions relative to the boundary of that country. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HILL presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. GRAY. I present a memorial from the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela relative to the boundary of the latter and the intervention of the United States. The memorial is not very long. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the President of the United States and the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

The memorial of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware respectfully represents: That we have participated with many others of our fellow-citizens in anxiety and regret at the threatened disturbance of amicable relations between our Government and that of Great Britain relative to the boundary dispute between the latter and Venezuela, in South America. The efforts made by the Executive and Cabinet of the United States for months past to induce Great Britain to refer this question to arbitration meet with our cordial approbation and sympathy. We believe this is the true and Christian solution of all differences that may arise between either individuals or nations, in accordance with the benign rule instituted by the Supreme Lawgiver in his Sermon on the Mount: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets." (Matthew vii, 12.) But we think our Government is liable to lose the firm ground thus assumed in its peaceful intervention between the contending parties by holding out a menace against one of them that in case she did not accept our good offices in the mode we had prescribed the United States would "resist by every means in its power, as willful aggression upon its rights and interests the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands, etc., which, after investigation, we have determined of right belong to Venezuela."

The intense agitation of the public mind, both in the United States and England, which has followed the publication of the late state papers on the Venezuela question, involving as they do the thought of the possibility of war, indicate the sensitiveness of the thinking part of the two nations to anything that would refer to the arbitrament of the sword a difference between them. Surely nothing that we could gain by entering upon a contest of arms with Great Britain in such a cause could ever compensate for the unspeakable loss, both moral and material, which must result to both nations by such a conflict! Should not the minds of all good men shrink with horror from initiating even the entering wedge of so dire a calamity by using intemperate or offensive language in dealing with the question at issue, either in diplomatic or state papers, or by their public utterances when in official positions? For wars, in many instances, owe their origin more to the offended pride of rulers on trivial occasions than to the invasion of the just rights or property of the combatants.

The Saviour of men, who is the "Prince of Peace," has bestowed His blessing on the peacemakers; and His inspired Apostle declares that "the wisdom which is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, and the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace." (James iii, 17, 18.) It is this peaceable wisdom and a just regard for the rights of all at this critical period that we desire to commend to our rulers, and to beseech you that no haste to vindicate what may be supposed to be the honor and prestige of our beloved Republic may obscure the benign purpose of the religion we profess, which was ushered into the world by the angelic anthem of "Peace on earth and good will to men." We feel that any occasion should be carefully avoided which might kindle the flames of animosity between two of the foremost nations of the globe, who are bound to each other by the ties of a common language and race, commercial intercourse, and Christian civilization.

Signed by direction and on behalf of a meeting of the aforesaid representatives held in Philadelphia on the 3d day of the first month, 1896.

JOSEPH WALTON, *Clerk.*

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of citizens of Tower City, N. Dak., praying that relief be granted the suffering Armenians; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATOR FROM DELAWARE.

Mr. GRAY. I present the affidavits of Robert J. Hanby, State senator in the general assembly of Delaware; William T. Records, Charles A. Hastings, John B. Pennington, and Edward D. Hearne, all citizens of the State of Delaware, which I move be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I present sundry affidavits—that is to say, the affidavits of J. M. C. Moore, George Fisher Pierce, Samuel Alrich, Edgar T. Hastings, John S. Prettyman, jr., Frank Reedy, and George L. Townsend, and also portions of the senate journal of the legislature of the State of Delaware of April 9, 1895, pages 742 to 748; senate journal of legislative session of that legislature of Thursday, May 9, 1895, from 11 a. m. until noon, pages 1172 to 1183; senate journal of joint assembly of the State of Delaware on the same day, from noon to 3 p. m., pages 1183 to 1231, all relating to the question of the election of Mr. Du Pont by the legislature of the State of Delaware.

I ask that the affidavits and journal be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and printed as a document, not the whole journal, but the portion I have indicated. The senate journal is a very large document. I have indicated the pages that it is desired to have printed, and the only part of the journal which relates to the case. I move that the affidavits and the journal, as I have indicated, be printed, and that the whole be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1176) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Oregon and Washington Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Columbia River, between the State of Oregon and the State of Washington, and to establish it as a post-road," reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 214) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, from some suitable point between the north line of St. Clair County, Ill., and the southwest line of said county, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 636) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Chamberlain, in Brule County, and Lyman County, in the State of South Dakota, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 25) authorizing the Dyersburg and Mississippi River Railway and Improvement Company to bridge the Obion River, in the State of Tennessee, reported it with amendments.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 90) for the relief of William P. Buckmaster, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (S. 32) for the relief of the legal representatives of John C. Howe, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 271) for the relief of the Newberry College, Newberry, S. C., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MCBRIDE, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads, and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 654) to prevent citizens of the United States from soliciting or receiving and accepting titles, patents of nobility, or degrees of honor from foreign nations, and for other purposes, to report it adversely.

The committee are of opinion that it is hardly worth while to dignify with the form of legislation the fact that some American citizens receive titles from a foreign Government; that they ought to be laughed at rather than be sent to the penitentiary for a crime. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 39)

making an appropriation to defray the joint expense of locating the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and the British North American territory, to report it without amendment. I ask to have the joint resolution considered at the present time.

Mr. MILLS. I hope no Senator will ask unanimous consent this morning to bring before the Senate anything that will take up the time of the Senate.

Mr. GRAY. I do not think this measure will take any time.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to take the floor after a while during the morning hour, and my friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] has it at 2 o'clock. There will be ample time hereafter to pass all such measures.

Mr. SHERMAN. It will take but a moment to pass the joint resolution.

Mr. MILLS. I will withdraw the objection.

Mr. COCKRELL. I gave notice yesterday morning that I would object to the consideration of bills when reported unless in a purely exceptional case.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will state to the Senator——

Mr. COCKRELL. I will hear the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. This is a case where a commission is now at work, a commission on the part of Great Britain and on the part of the United States, fixing the boundary in Alaska. The fund has run out and it is necessary that money shall be appropriated immediately or else the work must be suspended.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the joint resolution be considered if it leads to no discussion. I think it is to meet an emergency.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read for information.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in view of the expediency of forthwith negotiating a convention with Great Britain for marking convenient points upon the one hundred and forty-first meridian of west longitude, where it forms, under existing treaty provisions, the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and the British North American territory, and to enable the President to execute the provisions of such convention without delay when concluded, the sum of $75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available, under the direction of the President, to defray the share of the United States in the joint expense of locating said meridian and marking said boundary by an international commission.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1569) allowing certain Lower Brulé Indians to take allotments of land on the Rosebud Reservation, south of White River, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1570) for the relief of Joseph Schwarz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1571) to amend the homestead laws; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1572) for the relief of W. L. Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1573) for the relief of Dr. A. S. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1574) for the relief of the First National Bank of Newton, Mass.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 1575) for the relief of M. M. Beavers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1576) for the relief of the Little Rock and Memphis Railroad Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1577) for the relief of James A. Mitchell, of Sebastian County, Ark.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1578) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth L. Traweek, of Sebastian County, Ark.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1579) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1580) granting a pension to Dennis Sheedy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1581) increasing the pension of Frank Hight; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORRILL introduced a bill (S. 1582) to pay to the widow of Samuel F. Miller, a justice of the Supreme Court, a sum equal to the balance of his salary for the year in which he died; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 1583) for the relief of L. Robert Coates & Co., of Baltimore, Md.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SQUIRE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1584) to provide for the establishment of national patriotic memorial universities; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 1585) to authorize and direct the Auditor for the Post-Office Department to credit the account of George H. Tice, postmaster at Perth Amboy, N. J., for postage stamps and money-order funds stolen from his office; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

COAST DEFENSE INQUIRY.

Mr. SQUIRE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Coast Defenses be, and the same is hereby, authorized, in the consideration of bills before said committee to provide for fortifications and other defenses, to sit during the sessions of the Senate, to visit such points as in the opinion of the committee may be necessary, to send for persons and papers, and to employ a stenographer; the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee.

PAYMENT OF COIN OBLIGATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] coming over from a previous day. The resolution will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. BUTLER relative to the purpose of Congress to keep gold and silver at a parity by investing the Secretary of the Treasury with the discretion of paying the coin obligations of the Government as they mature in either metal.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from North Carolina being absent from his seat to-day, I suggest the propriety of letting the resolution lie over subject to call.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FINANCIAL POLICY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] coming over from a previous day. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. MILLS, as follows:

Resolved, First. That the United States legal-tender notes now outstanding should not be retired, canceled, or funded into interest-bearing bonds, but when received into the Treasury they should be paid out again and kept in circulation.

Second. That the whole of the silver bullion now in the Treasury should be coined as rapidly as possible. The coins from the seigniorage should be paid out in the current expenditures and the other in the redemption of the Treasury notes issued on its purchase.

Third. That when from any cause there should be a deficit in the Treasury, the Secretary of the Treasury should issue legal-tender notes sufficient in amount to meet all demands for current expenditure, and when said notes are returned into the Treasury they should be destroyed.

Fourth. That all laws now existing which authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell interest-bearing bonds of the Government should be repealed.

Fifth. That it is not only the established policy of the United States to keep all kinds of money issued under their authority at par, but it is also the established policy of the United States to require all creditors, public and private, to receive the gold and silver coins in payment of all obligations where the terms of the contract stipulate for coin payment, and that it is the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to pay United States notes when presented in both gold and silver coins.

Sixth. That we repudiate the idea that a public debt is a public blessing; on the contrary, it is a burden which the interests of the people and the preservation of the public credit demand should be removed as rapidly as practicable.

Seventh. The sinking fund established by law should be rigidly complied with, and the amount now provided should be reenforced so that the whole interest-bearing debt should be extinguished as rapidly as possible without imposing unnecessary burdens upon the resources of the country.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, there has been for many years a controversy over the settlement of the financial question. It is as earnestly pressed to-day as it has been at any period in the past, and it will continue to be pressed until it is settled on he right principle.

The bill sent to the Senate from the House defines to some extent the line of policy to be pursued by those who hold one extreme and the substitute reported by the Finance Committee represents to some extent the other extreme. The substitute, instead of joining issue squarely with the policy outlined by the bill, rather avoids and presents its side without sharply antagonizing the measure of the House. What is the real power behind the House bill? What is the irrepressible force that for years has been opposing *all* silver circulation and demanding the retirement of all Treasury notes? Why is it so persistently demanded that the noninterest-bearing Treasury notes shall be converted into an interest-bearing bond of the United States? Why is it that one hundred and seventy-five millions of silver bullion is kept locked in the vaults of the Treasury instead of being coined and put into circulation?

Sir, all these results have been produced by a wealthy and powerful class who are interested in finding a safe and profitable investment for their money and having conferred on them the power to issue and control the entire circulation of the country. We have had this class with us from the beginning of the Government, and it has grown in strength as it has grown in years, and is to-day more powerful than at any other period in our history. It is to-day imperiously demanding that the Government shall abdicate its sovereign power and create corporations and invest them with the power of issuing, contracting, and expanding the circulation. Their slogan is, "The Government must go out of the *banking* business." The result of which is that the banks must go into the *governing* business.

The issue of currency, whether coins or paper, never was a part of banking business. It is a necessary function of sovereignty. Receiving deposits, lending money, buying and selling exchange, and discounting paper are the legitimate functions of banking. To create and regulate the currency is as much the function of government as to create and regulate an army or navy or post road.

I confess to some astonishment when I hear the advocates of these measures characterize them as Democratic. I would be glad if some Democrat who is old enough and well enough posted in the history of the great battles that have been fought by that party from its beginning would tell me when it became the advocate of bank circulation. Mr. Jefferson tells us that "coinage is peculiarly an attribute of sovereignty." Does not the coin and the paper currency perform the same function? Does not each have the same effect on property? He did not see any difference. When speaking of bank currency he said:

> Bank paper must be suppressed, and *the circulating medium must be restored to the nation to whom it belongs.* * * * Let banks continue, if they please, but let them discount for cash alone or for Treasury notes.

Again he asks:

> Are we to have no banks? Are merchants and others to be deprived of the resource of short accommodations found so convenient? I answer, let us have banks, but let them be such as are alone to be found in any country on earth except Great Britain. * * * No one has a natural right to the trade of a money lender but he who has the money to lend. Let those, then, among us who have a moneyed capital, and who prefer employing it in loans rather than otherwise, set up banks and give cash or *national bills* for the notes they discount.

Again:

> I have ever been the enemy of banks, not of those discounting for cash, but of those foisting *their own paper* into circulation and thus banishing our cash.

When the first bank of the United States was created, in 1791, it is well known that he earnestly opposed it. He not only denied the power of Congress to create it, but he opposed it on the ground of expediency as well. In 1803 he said it was an institution "of the most deadly hostility existing *against the principles and form of our Government.*"

These words of Mr. Jefferson prove conclusively that he claimed it to be the right of the sovereign alone to issue currency in both coin and paper, and that it was the duty of the Government to interdict the issuance of either by corporations, companies, or individuals.

Mr. Gallatin, who was Secretary of the Treasury under both Jefferson and Madison, held that—

> The right of issuing paper money as currency, like that of issuing gold and silver coins, belongs exclusively to the nation, and can not be claimed by any individuals.

Mr. Crawford, who was Secretary of the Treasury under President Monroe, said:

> Coinage and the regulation of money have in all nations been considered the highest acts of sovereignty. * * * As a paper currency is issued upon the national credit the whole property of the nation is pledged for its redemption whenever by any circumstance it may become the interest of the community that it should be redeemed. It is therefore manifest that it should not issue upon the credit of any individual or association of individuals. A part can never be equal to the whole. The credit of any individual or association of individuals can not be equivalent to that of the nation of which they form a part.

Another Democratic Secretary of the Treasury repeated the principle of Jefferson. Robert J. Walker said:

> I am opposed to investing in banks the power of manufacturing a paper currency. This power of creating a currency for a nation is one of the highest and most important attributes of a sovereign power, and more deeply affects all the diversified interests of society than the exercise of any other power whatever.

These are some, and only some, of the footprints that mark the road our Democratic fathers trod, the road we are now urged to abandon. Open, earnest, and undisguised opposition to bank paper has been the creed of Democracy from the days of Jefferson. When the first bank was created, General Washington, then President, called on Jefferson and Hamilton, his Secretaries of State and Treasury, for their opinions. Mr. Jefferson strongly opposed the charter and said to the President:

> The incorporation of a bank and the powers assumed by this bill have not, in my opinion, been delegated to the United States by the Constitution.

All through the life of that great statesman, the greatest, perhaps, in the history of the world, certainly the greatest this country has ever produced, he opposed banks of issue as unauthorized and mischievous, and never at one single moment of his life did he ever advocate a national-bank currency or any bank currency, but from the beginning to the end, whether in public or in private, he always claimed that the issue of currency was the prerogative of sovereignty, and always opposed the creation of corporations of any kind, either by national or State authority, and investing them with authority to issue notes to circulate as money.

One of the chief arguments of the advocates of the bank of 1791 was that it would regulate the currency and keep it uniform throughout the country.

From the date of its passage to 1811, when its charter expired, the country was deluged with the wildest of all the wild-cat currency that it had ever known in its history. State banks sprang up like mushrooms and issued paper money in dollars and fractions of dollars. Scarcely any of it circulated at par with coin even in the immediate vicinity of the banks. Little of it circulated 50 miles away. By overissues of notes specie was driven out of circulation. The standard of value was paper, and different in every locality, and *elastic* enough to satisfy the cravings of the most zealous advocate of "better banking facilities." This was followed, as it always must be, by collapse. On examination the banks were found to be bankrupt. All the banks of Massachusetts did not have as much specie as one of them had issued paper.

In 1812 the Eastern States became surfeited with bank *elasticity*, and imposed a penalty on all banks that refused to redeem their notes in coin when presented; but the banks south and west of New England continued to issue without restraint, and the result was that New England soon got all the specie, while the other States got all the *elasticity*. In 1811, when the first bank of the United States expired, the State banks had out $46,000,000 of their notes; in 1813, $66,000,000; in 1814, $70,000,000. In all the States south and west of New England the banks suspended payment, but went on issuing notes.

In 1815 the circulation of the State banks was $110,000,000 and in 1816 $200,000,000, based on $19,000,000 of specie. What was the result of this large extension of "banking facilities" so urgently demanded now? The paper money grew cheaper as its volume grew larger, and property of every kind went up just as paper went down. Note holders were offering everywhere to buy property, in order to get rid of the paper money that was every day growing less valuable. Others borrowed from the banks to buy property to sell again in order to profit by the rise. Speculation took the place of legitimate business and buying and selling was like betting on a game of chance.

From 1814 to 1817 prices continued to rise until in some localities they touched 200 per cent above the specie standard. It was a period of wild-cat money and wild-cat speculation. Everybody seemed to be drawn into the whirlpool, for whirlpool it was. In 1817 the *elasticity* began its retrograde movement. The banks began to contract their circulation. The notes began to rise in value and the property to fall. The agonies of contraction resulted in a panic in 1818. Property was changing hands. The debt of the country was twice the value of all its property. In 1819 the circulation of the banks was $45,000,000, a sum less than that of 1811. Lands that had sold in Pennsylvania at $35 per acre in specie in 1813 sold for $150 per acre in paper and on paper credit in 1816, and at $35 per acre again in 1819. Mr. Jefferson tells us that in 1819 good lands in Virginia were selling for one year's rent, and good horses at $5 apiece. The man who borrowed money from the banks in 1816 to buy land at $150 per

acre sold his land in 1819 at $35 per acre, and still owed $115 per acre. In their desperation they offered 36 per cent for money to get them out of the depths into which "banking facilities" had plunged them. But there was no money to be had.

Mr. Benton came to Congress from Missouri in 1820, and he says that—

He traveled from the Mississippi to the Potomac amidst the crash of failing banks, the wreck of a paper currency, and the lamentations of a suffering nation.

These lessons have been repeated since, and always from the same cause. And we are asked now to adopt the same system, or a kindred one, and send the country again through the same mournful experiences.

And these measures are now urged by Democrats, and we are told that they are in harmony with Democratic principles. In 1813, when the country was entering upon this era of paper prosperity, Mr. Jefferson wrote to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives that—

Paper is liable to be abused, has been, is, and *forever will* be abused in every country in which it is permitted; that it is aready at a term of abuse in these States which has never been reached in any other nation, France excepted. * * * Instead, then, of yielding to the cries of scarcity of medium set up by speculators, projectors, and commercial gamblers, no endeavors should be spared to begin the work of reducing it by such gradual means as may give time to private fortunes to preserve their poise and settle down with the subsiding medium.

In 1814 he says:

We are now without any medium. Congress may now borrow of the public and without interest all the money they may want to the amount of a competent circulation by merely issuing their own promissory notes of proper denominations for the larger purposes of circulation, but not for the small. Leave that door open for the entrance of metallic money.

We now have $500,000,000 of these notes issued by Congress without interest, but we are told they must be funded into "long-time" bonds, bearing interest, and bank notes for that amount must be issued and loaned at interest to the people instead of the Treasury notes which they have without interest.

In 1815 he said:

We are undone if this banking mania be not suppressed.

It was not suppressed then, and the country was swept with a desolating cyclone a few years after. We will be undone again if we do not now suppress the banking mania. During the same year he said:

Our money is much or little, real or imaginary, as our bitterest enemies choose to make it.

That is, it was *elastic* while the country was "dancing along the primrose way to the everlasting bonfire."

He was constantly warning the people of the perils that bank notes were placing in their path.

Put down the banks—

He said—

and if this country could not be carried through the longest war against her most powerful enemy without ever knowing the want of a dollar, without dependence on the traitorous classes of her citizens, without bearing hard on the resources of the people or loading the public with an indefinite burden of debt, I know nothing of my countrymen.

In vain did he warn them against the "frothy bubbles" and the "legerdemain tricks on paper." In vain did he beseech the legislatures—

to avert from their constituents such a catastrophe as the extinguishment of two hundred millions of paper in their hands.

Great as was Jefferson always with the democratic people of the United States, the bank mania was greater than he. It was a scourge then which he characterized as belonging to the family of "hurricanes, earthquakes, and other casualties." He told the bank maniacs that our medium was then "dropsical" and their cries for more bank facilities was "dosing dropsy with more water"; that no man knew what his property was worth; that while he was calculating it was "bloating."

In spite of all the warnings of the pilot, with flowing sails and bending masts, they sent the ship on the rocks, where it was broken to pieces. That is what we are urged to do now. Principles are the same now that they were then. Names only have changed. Jefferson did not call it "elasticity" then. He called it "bloating." He did not speak of the authors of these mischiefs as "business men," who he thought were endowed by Heaven with the exclusive right to dictate the kind and amount of currency for a self-governing people. He called them "speculators," "jugglers," "projectors," and "commercial gamblers."

Such has been the history of bank paper from the beginning of the Government up to 1861, when the Democratic party went out of power. There has been a struggle all the time against all banks of issue by a large part of our people, and a struggle between the advocates of State banks and those of national banks. Sometimes the friends of the two paper systems worked in harmony and sometimes in opposition. At last the national banks crushed the State banks by the 10 per cent tax on their circulation. The national-bank currency and the Treasury-note currency came into the circulation together during the civil war. And as soon as the conflict ended the banking fraternity began a war to the knife and the knife to the hilt against its rival, the Treasury note. There was no silver then in circulation against which it could direct its blows. The Treasury note was its sole antagonist, and it marshaled its clans to exterminate its adversary.

On the 12th of April, 1866, Congress passed an act to retire the Treasury note permanently from the field. As soon as it became known the people began to murmur, and the murmur swelled into tempest, and Congress was compelled to retrace its steps, and on the 4th of February, 1868, they repealed the law of 1866 and restored the Treasury note to the field of circulation. The banking forces, beaten and routed in this campaign, like a beaten army, went into winter quarters, drilled and disciplined their forces, reenforced their ammunition chests, and got ready to try results with the enemy again.

On January 14, 1875, Congress, at the demand of the banking interests, for the second time decreed the death of the Treasury notes. Again the storm gathered and broke with fury at the law that decreed the death of the Treasury note; and again Congress was compelled to restore it to the circulation. And on the 31st of May, 1878, a Democratic Congress, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] said the other day, in defense of a Democratic money, repealed the act of January 14, 1875, so far as it required the elimination of the Treasury note from our system. The contending forces are again on the field. The Treasury note now is reenforced by $500,000,000 of silver. The prize to be won is a field of twelve or fifteen hundred millions of circulation. The plan of campaign is to keep the $175,000,000 of silver bullion now in the Treasury from coming out to aid the $500,000,000 of coined silver and the $500,000,000 of Treasury notes. That bullion after a while must be sold for gold. The gold will be paid out by the Treasury and gathered in by the banks, and, using it as the basis of circulation, they will supply the whole circulation, fifteen hundred millions, with these notes, except such as can be supplied only by fractional coins and to a very limited amount.

The bank notes, in order to circulate throughout the Union, must circulate on the credit of the United States, and to have that credit, and at the same time to increase their profits, they must have United States interest-bearing bonds. And to make the system as permanent as possible, and as invulnerable to the attack as possible, bonds must be long time, and placed as far beyond the reach of the people as possible, so that when it is once established, no convulsions, no popular upheavals, neither Congress nor the people, can unseat them.

This is the plan, this is the prize to be won or lost. Now let the banking fraternity come on the field openly, with their drums beating and colors flying. Let them say openly and frankly what they demand, and then let the people decide. The party that dares to go before the country and honestly proclaim in its platform that it favors a permanent bonded debt as a basis for a permanent system of national-bank circulation, and for retiring the Treasury notes and funding them into long-time, interest-bearing bonds for the benefit of the banks, will, when the campaign is over, need the services of a first-class undertaker. I want to read some of the utterances of Democratic State conventions when the two efforts were made to destroy the Treasury-note circulation and put the bank-note circulation in its place. I have gathered these expressions from all parts of the Union, and they expressed then, as they do now, the sentiments of the Democratic people. I shall not quote from Republican platforms. I am sure there are many Republicans who favor the Treasury note in preference to the bank note, though a majority of that party are the other way. What said the Democratic convention of Arkansas? I will take them alphabetically. In 1878 they said:

National-bank notes shall be retired, their further issue prohibited, and United States Treasury notes substituted therefor. The power to issue paper money and coin as a legal tender is only vested in the National Government.

This is pure Jeffersonian Democracy. Mr. Jefferson said coinage was peculiarly an attribute of sovereignty, and that bank notes should be suppressed and the circulation restored to the nation, to whom it belonged. Such substantially were the words of Crawford, Gallatin, Walker, Benton, and the other great leaders of that party. To say that Congress should give to corporations the power to issue and control the circulation of the country is to me as absurd as to say that Congress should give power to corporations to declare or wage war, or to raise and support navies. These are powers that belong exclusively to sovereignty. Why not give to corporations the power to lay and collect taxes? All these are incidents of sovereignty. But let me proceed with the State platforms. They declare the principles of the Democratic party on national debts, national banks, and Treasury notes.

COLORADO.

In 1878 Colorado denounced "the retirement and destruction of legal-tender notes, and the maintenance of the national banking system," and said:

No further increase in the bonded debt and no further sale of bonds for the purchase of coin for resumption purposes; a gradual extinction of the public debt by the redemption of the interest-bearing portion thereof in such currency as the law will permit.

ILLINOIS.

That the present system of national banks can and should be abolished at once, and the notes of such institutions redeemed and their place relieved by noninterest-bearing notes of the Government, thus saving to the people annually $20,000,000.—*Illinois State Democratic platform, 1868.*

That it is the exclusive prerogative of the United States to issue all bills to circulate as money, and a right which ought not to be exercised by any State or corporation. That the national bank notes should be redeemed, and instead thereof there should be issued by the Government an equal amount of Treasury notes.—*Illinois State Democratic platform, 1878.*

INDIANA.

That the national-bank system organized in the interest of bondholders ought to be abolished and United States notes substituted in lieu of the national-bank currency, thus saving to the people in interest alone more than $18,000,000 a year, and, until such system of banks be abolished, we demand that the shares of such banks in Indiana shall be subject to the same taxation, State and municipal, as other property of the State.—*Indiana Democratic State platform, 1868.*

We are in favor of the repeal of the national-bank law and the substitution of greenbacks for the national-bank currency.—*Indiana State Democratic platform, 1874.*

1876: We declare in favor of the adoption of measures looking to the gradual retirement of the circulation of the national banks and the substitution therefor of circulating notes issued by the authorities of Government.

1878: The right to issue paper money as well as coin is the exclusive prerogative of the Government. * * * We demand that the national-bank notes shall be retired, and in lieu thereof shall be issued by the Government an equal amount of Treasury notes with full legal-tender quality.

IOWA.

That the national-bank system, organized in the interest of bondholders, ought to be abolished, and United States notes substituted in lieu of the national-bank currency, thus saving to the people in interest alone more than eighteen millions of dollars annually; and until such system of banks shall be abolished, we demand that the shares of such banks in Iowa shall be subject to the same taxes, State and municipal, as other property of the State.—*Iowa State Democratic platform, 1868.*

1869: A national debt is a national curse.

1875: We favor a sufficient supply of national currency for business purposes. Opposition to the present national banking law.

1876: The resumption law should at once be repealed.

1877: We favor the retention of a greenback currency, and declare against any further contraction, and we favor substitution of greenbacks for national-bank bills.

We deprecate the funding of our noninterest-bearing debt. * * * We oppose any further retirement of the United States notes now in circulation, and favor the substitution of national Treasury notes for national-bank bills.—*Iowa State Democratic platform, 1878.*

1879: We are in favor of the substitution of United States Treasury notes for national-bank notes, and of the abolition of national banks as banks of issue. * * * We favor a reduction of the bonded debt as fast as practicable and the application of the idle money in the Treasury to that purpose.

KANSAS.

We demand the repeal of the national bank law, and that the Government shall issue a legal-tender currency direct from the Treasury.—*Kansas State Democratic platform, 1874.*

1876: We demand that the act of Congress creating the national banking system be repealed; that the notes of the national banks be withdrawn from circulation, and in lieu thereof the paper of the Government of the United States be substituted. That as Congress has the sole power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, it should also have the sole power to provide a paper currency for the people.

1876: We are opposed to all banks of issue, whether chartered by Congress or the State legislature, and we desire that banking on the part of corporations or private individuals shall be confined by law exclusively to exchange, discounts, and deposit.

That as Congress has sole power to coin money and regulate the value thereof under the Constitution, it should also exercise the sole power of providing a paper currency to be used as money. * * * That we favor the retirement of national-bank notes and substitution of Treasury notes, commonly called greenbacks, in their stead.—*Kansas State Democratic platform, 1878.*

LOUISIANA.

1878: The Louisiana Democracy demands that the national banking system should be abolished and national-bank notes retired, and in lieu thereof that the Government of the United States should issue an equal amount of Treasury notes, commonly known as greenbacks.

MASSACHUSETTS.

1868: Every dollar received by taxation from the people not absolutely necessary for the economical and legitimate expenses of the Government to be applied to the payment of the public debt.

1877: *Resolved*, That the practice of borrowing money for other objects than those of strict public necessity has generated schemes of extravagant expenditure, until taxation has become well-nigh an intolerable burden. Honesty, economy, and "pay as we go" should be the rule in all the appropriations of the people's money. The power of the State, counties, cities, and towns to borrow money ought to be rigidly limited, so that an end may be put to the system which "anticipates the labor of coming ages and appropriates the fruits of it in advance; which coins the industry of future generations into cash and snatches the inheritance from children yet unborn."

MICHIGAN.

1879: We demand that all money, whether paper or metallic, shall be issued by the General Government only, and made a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, except as to such contracts heretofore made as were originally payable in coin. We are opposed to all banks of issue, and demand that greenbacks shall be substituted in place of national-bank bills.

MINNESOTA.

1878: We are opposed to any increase of the bonded debt, to the sale of bonds for the purpose of obtaining coin for resumption purposes. We are in favor of the gradual substitution of national Treasury notes for national-bank notes and making such Treasury notes the sole paper currency of the country, and placed on such basis as that the same shall be equal in value with coin, and as a legal tender the same as coin.

MISSOURI.

We regard the national banking system as being oppressive and burdensome, and demand the abolition and retirement from circulation of all national-bank notes and the issue of legal-tender notes in lieu thereof, and in quantities from time to time sufficient to supply the wholesome and necessary business demands of the entire country, and that all greenbacks so issued shall be used in the purchase and retirement of the bonds of the United States, so that the interest-bearing debt of the country may be lessened to the extent of the greenbacks thus put into circulation.—*Missouri State Democratic platform, 1878.*

MAINE.

That so long as the currency consists in whole or in part of paper money, issued under the authority of the National Government, such paper should be issued directly by the Government itself, and that the great and valuable privilege of issuing three hundred millions of this money, yielding a profit equal to eighteen millions annually in gold, has been too long enjoyed by favored individuals associated under the national-bank law, and should be forthwith assumed by the people represented by the political authority of the United States.—*Maine State Democratic platform, 1868.*

1878: The payment of the bonded debt of the United States as rapidly as practicable. No further issue of Government bonds whereby equal taxation with the other property of the country is avoided. * * * We are opposed to an irredeemable currency, but believe in a currency for the Government and people, the laborer and officeholder, the pensioner and soldier, the producer and the bondholder. We are opposed to the present national banking system and in favor of the gradual substitution of greenbacks for national bank bills.

NEBRASKA.

1878: We demand the gradual substitution of United States legal-tender paper for national-bank notes and its permanent establishment as the sole paper money of the country; the immediate repeal of the national banking act; no further issue of interest-bearing bonds; no further sale of bonds for the purchase of coin for resumption purposes, but a gradual extinction of the public debt.

NEVADA.

The substitution of the United States currency for the national-bank notes. No further sale of interest-bearing bonds for coin for resumption purposes, but the gradual reduction of the public debt.—*Nevada State Democratic platform, 1878.*

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

1878: One currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the officeholder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder. That whatever currency is issued by the Government should be issued for the benefit of the whole people, and not for the benefit of capitalists at the expense of the people.

OHIO.

1869: We denounce the national banking system as one of the worst outgrowths of the bonded debt, which unnecessarily increases the burden of the people $30,000,000 annually, and we demand its immediate repeal.

1870: We are opposed to the system of national banks, and demand the immediate repeal of the law creating them, and that in place of the notes of such banks Treasury notes of the United States should be substituted.

1871: Honor and duty alike require the honest payment of the public debt.

Believing that a better system can be devised, and one that will be free from unjust privileges, we are in favor of abolishing the franchises of the national banks to issue a paper currency as soon as the same can safely and prudently be done, and that the notes so withdrawn by the banks be replaced by the Government with legal-tender currency.—*Ohio State Democratic platform, 1874.*

1875: That the policy already initiated by the Republican party of abolishing the legal tender and giving national banks the power to furnish all the currency will increase the power of an already dangerous monopoly and the enormous burden now oppressing the people, without any corresponding advantage, and that we oppose the policy and demand that all the national-bank circulation be promptly and permanently retired, and legal tenders be issued in their place. * * * No paper currency except such as may be issued directly by and upon the faith of the General Government.

1876: The gradual but early substitution of legal tender for national-bank notes. * * * The issue by the General Government alone of all the circulating medium, whether paper or metallic.

1877: We favor the retention of greenback currency as the best paper money we have ever had, and declare against any further contraction. * * * We favor the issue by the General Government alone of all circulating mediums, whether paper or metallic, to be always of equal tender and interconvertible.

1878: The gradual substitution of United States legal-tender paper for national-bank notes and its permanent establishment as the sole paper money of the country. * * * No further increase in the bonded debt and no further sale of bonds for the purchase of coin for resumption purposes, but the gradual extinction of the public debt.

1879: The issue of money in any form and the regulation thereof belong to the General Government alone, and ought not to be delegated or intrusted to individuals or corporations. We oppose the perpetuation of the present national banking system as a means of control over the currency of the country, and demand the gradual substitution of Treasury notes for national-bank currency.

OREGON.

1875: The institution of the system of national banks was a fraud upon the country and an injustice upon the laboring classes, and we demand such prudent legislation as will gradually bring this vicious system to a close; that all currency which may be issued shall be convertible into coin upon demand and be issued directly by the Government.

That the gratuity of nearly $24,000,000 now paid to national banks by the Government is simply levying tribute upon the people for the benefit of the capitalists. We therefore favor the repeal of the law under which they were established and the direct issue by the Government of currency, receivable for all public dues, sufficient to supply the place of the present bank-note circulation.—*Oregon State Democratic platform, 1878.*

PENNSYLVANIA.

1875: That the policy already indicated by the Republican party of abolishing legal tenders and giving the national banks the power to furnish all the

currency will increase the power of an already dangerous monopoly and the enormous burden now oppressing the people without compensating advantage, and that all the national-bank circulation be promptly and permanently retired and full legal tenders be issued in their place.

1875: The honest payment of our just debts and the sacred preservation of the public faith.

1876: The honest payment of the public debt.

1878: Gold, silver, and United States legal-tender notes at par therewith are a just basis for paper circulation.

NEW YORK.

1874: Honest payment of the public debt in coin.

TENNESSEE.

That we favor the abolition of the present odious national-bank system and the payment of the bonds of the Government by issuance of its noninterest-bearing notes, according to the contract expressed and implied at the time of the creation of such obligations.—*Tennessee Democratic State platform, 1874.*

The substitution of Treasury notes for national-bank currency at the earliest moment practicable.—*Tennessee State Democratic platform, 1876.*

1878: The odious national banking act be repealed and greenbacks be substituted for the circulation of the national banks. * * * That no more interest-bearing bonds be issued; that all loans required by the Government be raised by the issuance of noninterest-bearing Treasury notes.

TEXAS.

1878: We favor one currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the officeholder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder. * * * The substitution of United States legal tender for national-bank notes and its permanent reestablishment as the sole paper money of the country.

No further increase in the bonded debt; no further sale of bonds for the purchase of coin for redemption purposes, but a gradual reduction of the public debt by payment according to the original contract by which it was created.

VERMONT.

1878: The honest payment of the public debt in such currency as its terms imply, and the preservation of the public faith.

One currency for all. We oppose the present national banking system and recommend the gradual substitution of greenbacks for national-bank bills.

WISCONSIN.

1877: Declares its opposition to a longer continuance of the national-bank currency and demands that the Government furnish its own notes in the place thereof.

I also submit here an extract from a speech delivered by the Hon. Allen G. Thurman at Hamilton, Ohio, in 1878, in support of the declarations contained in the platforms above quoted. In that speech Senator Thurman spoke as follows:

FELLOW CITIZENS: I have seen several statements in the public press to the effect that the object of my appointment to address you to-day was that I should "sound the keynote of the campaign." I wish, in the very outset of my remarks, to disclaim any such pretension. Under free institutions it is for the people to give the keynote; and so far as the Democracy of Ohio are concerned, they have discharged that duty in the platform adopted by our late State convention. I stand squarely on that platform. I have advocated its principles heretofore and I shall continue to advocate them. Perhaps this is all I should say about myself; but, inasmuch as in certain quarters I am denounced as a man who has surrendered his convictions to appease a popular clamor, it may be pardonable in me to occupy a few moments in repelling this charge. The accusation has reference to my support of the financial plank in the platform.

Now, what is this financial plank? It condemns contraction of the currency; demands the repeal of the resumption act; advocates "the removal of all restrictions to the coinage of silver, and the reestablishment of silver as a money metal, the same as gold—the same as it was before its fraudulent demonetization; the gradual substitution of United States legal-tender paper for national-bank notes, and its permanent establishment as the sole paper money of the country, made receivable for all dues to the Government, and of equal tender with coin—the amount of such issues to be so regulated by legislation or organic law as to give the people assurance of stability in the volume of currency and the consequent stability of the value; no further increase in the bonded debt, and no further sale of bonds for the purchase of coin for resumption purposes, but the gradual extinction of the public debt, rigid economy, the reduction of expenditures in all branches of the public service, and a tariff for revenue only." These are the financial doctrines of the platform, and now I confidently defy my critics, one and all, to name any vote that I have given during the nine years that I have sat in the Senate that was inconsistent with these principles.

I have steadily opposed contraction ever since it was inaugurated. I spoke and voted against the resumption act when it passed, and at the last session of Congress voted for its repeal. I worked hard to restore silver to the place it held before demonetization. Several years ago I drew a resolution for our State convention favoring the gradual substitution of greenbacks for national-bank notes, and that resolution, injudiciously amended, as I believe everyone now admits, was passed by the convention. I was one of the first to propose in the Senate that greenbacks should be receivable for customs duties, and at the last session I voted for the bill making them thus receivable. I have been the advocate of a stable currency, and your platform demands stability. I have contended that the precious metals ought not to be demonetized, and the platform asserts the same doctrine. I have spoken and voted against an increase of our bonded debt. I have advocated, to the best of my ability, strict economy, reduction of expenditures, and a revenue tariff. My course, therefore, has been perfectly consistent with the platform of our convention, as the journals and debates of the Senate will show. And I beg leave to add that I have never given a vote in the nine years I have sat in the Senate to which exception was taken by the Democracy of Ohio, so far as I know or have ever heard.

Fellow-citizens, I trust that I have not offended propriety or good taste by making these few remarks about myself. You are a portion of my constituents, and I have a right to know whether I have represented you correctly or otherwise. If I have a reputation worth preserving, it is for your interest as well as mine that it shall not be unjustly tarnished. But enough upon this theme.

When the currency part of the platform is carefully scrutinized, it will be found that its principal feature is the substitution of greenbacks for national-bank notes. I think that I do them no injustice when I say that the leaders of the Republican party are in favor of directly the opposite course—that is to say, they would retire all the greenbacks in order that their places might be filled with national-bank notes. Let either course be taken and the metallic money of the country remains the same. Use either kind of paper and the amount of coin in actual circulation, apart from the small coins used for change, will be comparatively small, so long as one and two and five dollar notes are freely used, for such notes always drive coin out of circulation. And whenever conversion into coin is practicable and desirable, it will be just as easy to convert greenbacks as to convert bank notes. The question then is narrowed down to this, Shall our paper money be national-bank notes or greenbacks? For several reasons that I will briefly state I think that the latter are preferable.

1. In the first place, a national-bank currency means the indefinite perpetuation of the national debt. The national banks, so far as their circulation is concerned, are founded on that debt. It is the security for their notes, and whenever the debt be paid the banks must retire their circulation and cease to issue notes. In order, therefore, to perpetuate their privilege of issuing notes they must strive to perpetuate the national debt; and you may rest assured that they will do so, and the influence of more than two thousand such institutions spread all over the country will be very powerful indeed.

Now, I am not one of those who believe that a national debt is a national blessing. I believe that the reverse of that is true, and that such a debt is a national curse. To say nothing of its corrupting influences, its drain of the resources of the people to pay interest is fearfully oppressive, especially when a large portion of the debt is held abroad. In a comparatively brief period the amount of interest paid exceeds the principal of the debt, while the drain continues in undiminished force. Heavy taxation is the necessary result, and everyone who has studied the subject knows that oppressive taxation is one of the worst foes to the industry and prosperity of a country. It is true that the national debt can not be speedily paid, but we ought not to put unnecessary obstacles in the way of its payment. The national-bank notes are such an obstacle, and for that reason are objectionable. Your platform wisely advocates "the gradual extinction of the public debt." It thus favors its honest payment and opposes its indefinite perpetuation. And, in strict harmony with this principle, it condemns the bank-note system that tends to perpetuate it.

2. A second objection to the national-bank system is, that it tends to combine, concentrate, and intensify the money power. I shall indulge in no declamation against the money power. I seek to excite no passion, no prejudice. I wish to reason fairly, and I wish you to judge fairly. And I do reason fairly when I say that, in view of the undoubted fact that during the whole period of the unlimited sway of the Republican party the legislation of Congress steadily favored the moneyed interest and thereby greatly added to the burdens of the people; that the purchasing power of money has immensely increased, while the exchangeable or purchasing power of everything else has remained stationary or has diminished; and in view of the further fact that the national-bank system confers special privileges upon the banks that no other institutions and no individuals enjoy; that it combines more than two thousand institutions now, and, if perpetuated, may combine a thousand more, in a common purpose and with a common interest to maintain their power and prolong their privileges; that these institutions are scattered all over the Republic and, acting openly or in secret, are able to influence legislatures, Congresses, and thousands of voters, it is not injustice, but, on the contrary, it is the expression of a wise anxiety to suggest that such a system is fraught with danger to the prosperity of the people and to the purity of their Government. If in the time of Andrew Jackson the existence of a national bank with a capital of only $35,000,000, and a few branches here and there, was considered dangerous to the welfare and the institutions of the country, what shall we say of a widespread combination of two thousand national banks now wielding nearly five hundred millions of capital, and destined, if perpetuated, to vastly multiply in number and to control thousands of millions?

3. A third objection to the national-bank circulation is, that it is a special privilege that puts many millions of dollars annually into the pockets of the shareholders and takes many millions annually out of the pockets of the people.

The general rule is, that a person pays interest upon what he owes; but in the case of a bank note this rule is reversed. The note is a debt due by the bank, but instead of paying interest upon it, the bank is authorized to loan it as money and take interest upon the loan. It thus enjoys a privilege that no one else enjoys. It draws interest upon its own indebtedness, and this privilege of the national banks brings them an annual income of probably $20,000,000. Their aggregate circulation is in round numbers three hundred and twenty-two millions. I think it may be reasonably assumed that three hundred millions of these notes are loaned at an average rate of interest of at least 7 per cent. If so, the annual interest they receive from the loan, not of money, not of capital, but of their own indebtedness, is $21,000,000. And this sum is taken out of the annual product of the country, before that product is divided between labor and capital. The general rule is, that the product of human industry is ultimately divided between labor and capital; but when a bank-note circulation is used, the banks first step in, and, by virtue of their special privilege, take a large slice in the shape of interest upon their own indebtedness. In the case of our national banks, this slice, as we have seen, amounts to twenty-one millions every year. Now, if there can be no sound paper currency but bank notes, then there is nothing left for us but to bear this burden or try to reduce the amount of the exaction. But if the greenback is as good as the bank note, and nobody denies that it is, why should it not be substituted for the bank note and an end put to the exaction?

And consider further that for every greenback it has issued the Government has received value. That greenback has paid for services rendered, or materials furnished, or it has discharged a portion of the interest-bearing public debt. There is thus a saving to the Government or to the people of an amount equal to interest upon the outstanding greenback circulation; for, had the greenback not been issued, the Government would have had to raise the money by loan or taxation to meet its expenditures. If it raised it by loan, it would, of course, have to pay interest for the loan. If it raised it by taxation, the taxpayers lose the interest their money would have earned had they not been compelled to give it to the Government.

The greenbacks now outstanding amount to $346,681,016. Computing interest upon this sum at the lowest rate at which the Government can borrow money, 4 per cent, and we have an annual saving to the people, resulting from the use of greenbacks, of $13,867,240. But if the greenbacks were substituted for the three hundred and twenty-two millions of national-bank notes now outstanding, there would be a further saving to the people of 4 per cent annually on that sum, namely, $12,888,000—making a total annual saving by the use of the greenback of $26,747,240. From this, however, deduct the taxes on their circulation paid by the banks, amounting to about three millions annually, and the net saving would be about twenty-three and three-quarter millions. Perhaps, in strictness, this deduction for taxes ought not to be made, for it is probable that the banks throw the burden of the taxation upon their customers, who in turn shift it to the shoulders of those with whom they deal, until, like all other taxation, it finally falls upon the great body of consumers, the people.

All these declarations show that when the issue was made and Congress attempted to destroy the Treasury-note currency and substitute that of the banks, the democratic people spoke with one voice against it. They demanded the extinction of that cur-

rency which was issued by corporations on the credit of the Government and loaned to them on interest, and the substitution of that which was issued directly by the Government, based upon the civilization, wealth, and honor of the people, and which costs them nothing for interest to the issuer. Why, then, in the light of our past history, is it now so persistently demanded that Congress shall sweep away this circulation and give to banks the sole power to provide the whole paper circulation of the country?

There are two very strong reasons why the corporations desire it and why the people oppose it. The silver and Treasury notes now outstanding supply a circulation of about one thousand millions. This costs the people nothing in the way of interest to maintain. But if it is swept away its place must be filled by bank notes. The bank-note system must stand on a pedestal of bonds which draw an annual interest from the people. Then we must have a thousand million of bonds. The annual interest charge at 3 per cent would take from the people thirty millions a year. If the notes are issued to the full face value of the bonds, as is recommended, a thousand millions of bank notes must be issued. They can only be put in circulation by lending. They will be loaned at from 5 to 10 per cent per annum. In the Eastern States the rate will be about 5 per cent; in the West, 7; in the South, 8 and 10 per cent. It will be safe to say the average rate will be 7 per cent. Then a thousand millions of bank notes will be loaned at an average rate of 7 per cent. That will make a tax of seventy millions annually. With the interest on the debt and the interest on the notes the people will be taxed one hundred millions annually. The silver and the Treasury notes cost the people nothing for interest. This is one reason why the banks want the circulation and the reason why the people do not. They do not want a circulation that loads their necks, shoulders, and backs with such an intolerable burden.

I regret that I must differ from the President on this question, but this is a Government that derives its vital force from public opinion. It is a Government where the freedom of speech and press are essential factors in the production of a correct public opinion. Public opinion to be right demands the freest and fullest discussion of all public questions; and I shall not hesitate to express my difference in opinion from the President and Secretary of the Treasury, highly as I respect them both. They both urge Congress to fund the five hundred millions of Treasury notes into "long-time" interest-bearing bonds and authorize the banks to issue notes to the face value of the bonds and reduce the tax on bank notes from 1 to one-fourth of 1 per cent. The President says he does not see why the bonds should not be payable fifty years from their date, and to bear interest not exceeding 3 per cent per annum. He says:

> We of the present generation have large amounts to pay if we meet our obligations, and long bonds are most salable.

And again:

> The increase of our bonded debt involved in this plan would be amply compensated by renewed activity and enterprise in all business circles, the restored confidence at home, the reinstated faith in our monetary strength abroad, and the stimulation of every interest and industry that would follow the cancellation of the gold demand obligations now afflicting us.

The statement that this generation has enough to bear now, and therefore it ought to be relieved by converting a noninterest-bearing debt into one that bears $15,000,000 a year, is to me rather strange. In addition to this, five hundred millions of bank notes are to be put into circulation by loans at 7 per cent, making $35,000,000 more. The measure recommended by the President adds fifty millions more to the burdens of the people annually, and yet he sees great advantages to the people in the change. And this is only a part of the plan. When the field of circulation is swept of the silver coins and Treasury notes it will require a thousand millions of bonds for a thousand millions of notes. The interest on both will cost one hundred millions a year, and in fifty years the people will pay five thousand millions of dollars for the maintenance of the system. This is an enormous price to pay for a circulation that now costs nothing.

It is something strange to me that it is considered no burden to pile a monument of taxes on the backs of people now living and curse with slavery our children, and children's children who are not yet born. This is slavery, and a slavery from which no power can extricate us or them. Ordinarily, if unwise legislation is enacted in one Congress a subsequent Congress can remove the evil. But if we issue and sell bonds redeemable only after fifty years we place ourselves, our children, our children's children, and our children's grandchildren and great grandchildren beyond the region of hope, for no power that Congress possesses can redeem them.

Mr. GRAY. May I interrupt the Senator at that point?

Mr. MILLS. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. I should like, if it does not interfere with the argument of the Senator from Texas, at that point to ask him whether he is in favor of the Government of the United States issuing Treasury notes and notes payable on demand which are never to be redeemed?

Mr. MILLS. Just on the same principle as I am in favor of keeping up taxation which is never to be stopped so long as the Government needs taxation to support it to keep it in existence and to protect the rights and liberties of the people.

Mr. GRAY. Does not that mean fiat money?

Mr. MILLS. No, sir.

Mr. GRAY. That is my idea of it.

Mr. MILLS. Oh, no. Everything the Government does is a fiat. The Government speaks in the language of command. When the Government puts legal tender on gold, silver, or paper it is fiat. When it says the bank note shall be receivable for all Government dues it makes the bank note a fiat money. When it imposes taxes and commands the collectors to gather them it is fiat. When gold and silver is coined at the mint it is fiat money. All this is fiat in one sense. But the sense in which "fiat money" has been used is a paper dollar which has no basis of intrinsic value. It does not promise to pay either gold or silver. It does not circulate on the credit of either. It is not intended by its advocates to be at par with either. This is not the situation with the Treasury note. It is redeemable—that is, it is exchangeable for gold and silver and kept in circulation.

The Senator from Delaware understands "redeemable" to mean the notes are to be taken up and destroyed and not returned to the circulation. The people who advocate Treasury note circulation understand "redeemable" to mean the notes are to be kept at par with the standard of value, equal in value with all other dollars, with the right of the holder to have a gold dollar or silver dollar in exchange for it when demanded of the Government, and the note to be paid out again and kept in circulation.

This brings me to the question of the redemption of these notes in coin. The President contends that they are gold obligations and must be paid in gold alone when presented. I maintain, on the contrary, that they are coin obligations, and payable by express statute in coin. But it is contended that, while the statute makes them payable in coin, the public credit would be impaired and the country put upon a silver standard if they were paid in silver. Both of these propositions I deny. I understand it to be a principle that is disputed by no well-informed person that where two kinds of money are authorized to circulate without limit as to volume the cheaper will supplant the dearer and become the sole circulating medium. And, again, that money takes its value in proportion to its units, everything else remaining unchanged. Mr. Jefferson recognized this law. Writing to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House in 1813 in reference to the proposed charter of a national bank, he said:

> They authorize this bank to throw into circulation $90,000,000 (three times the capital), which increases our circulating medium 50 per cent, depreciates *proportionably* the present value of a dollar, and raises the price of all future purchases *in the same proportion.*

Mr. Calhoun says:

> If we turn our attention to the laws which govern the circulation we shall find one of the most important to be that as the circulation is decreased or increased the rest of the property will, all other circumstances remaining the same, be decreased or increased in value *exactly* in the same proportion.

Mr. Clay says:

> The great law of price is determined by supply and demand. Whatever affects either affects the price. If the supply is increased, the demand remaining the same, the price declines; if the demand is increased the supply remaining the same, the price advances; if both supply and demand are undiminished, the price is stationary, and the price is influenced exactly in proportion to the degree of disturbance to the demand or supply.

I have read the definitions of many statesmen and economists, but none of them, in my judgment, have expressed this law so clearly as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES] in his very able and exhaustive argument made in this Chamber two years ago. This is what he says:

> There is one principle of monetary science that, if held steadfastly in view, will constitute an unerring guide through what would otherwise be a path of inextricable difficulty. That principle is, that the value of the unit of money in any country is determined by the number of units in circulation. In other words, the value of every dollar depends on the number of dollars out. The greater the number of dollars out, other things being equal, the less will be the value of each dollar; the fewer the number out, other things remaining the same, the greater the value of each, and this without any regard whatever to the material of which the dollars are composed. This is the key to the financial situation of the United States. Much more, it is the key to the financial situation in many lands. Without this key it is in vain that the student attempts to unlock the door leading to the arcanum of monetary knowledge. Unlike many of the locks made by men, the lock on *that* door is unpickable.

Ricardo says the principle is "incontrovertible." Every dollar, therefore, put in circulation takes its value according to the number of dollars in circulation. If the circulation is one thousand millions, every one represents the value of 23.22 grains of gold. If, in the United States, we add to-day one hundred millions in gold, the dollar will depreciate 10 per cent, and, as Mr. Jefferson says, it will flow out of our circulation to restore the level. If we add to the circulation $100,000,000 of silver and $100,000,000 of

paper, they will each take the place of $100,000,000 of gold because of their superior convenience. The gold would leave the circulation and the silver and paper would enter it, but the standard would remain the same. And until the silver and paper increase in volume beyond a thousand millions they will circulate at par and be exactly of the same value as the gold dollar. This fact is stated in the Herschel report, with which my friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], is familiar.

In Brazil, that report states, there is little or no gold, but their paper circulation is at par with gold, and kept at par by limiting the number of units. We maintain the equal value of all our dollars by limiting the number of the subsidiary dollars that circulate on the credit of the standard. The market value of the gold in a gold dollar is the standard in the United States to-day, and by limiting the units of silver and paper, and investing them with the power to pay every obligation in that standard, we make them precisely of the same value as the gold dollar. Then if the silver dollars are of the same value as the gold dollars, why should our Government give to note holders the option to demand gold alone in their payment? Every debtor has that right. Why should not the United States exercise it for the benefit of the people?

When the conspiracy was formed to attack the gold reserve, so called, it was intended by the large bankers and money owners of the world to bring our Government to its knees and bully the people into submission to their terms. They wanted a safe and profitable investment for their money. There is no longer room for profitable investment in railroads, mines, manufactures, and banks. And these "business men" demand that Congress shall permit them to invest their surplus in the muscle, blood, and sweat of the American people, and fix that investment far beyond the power of emancipation. When their demand was made, if the Secretary had said to them, "Back up your carts; I will fill them with silver dollars," the play would have ended. But the Secretary says that would have put the country on a silver basis. I have shown that the standard of value can only be changed by increasing the number of dollars in the circulation. No manipulation can do that. As long as every dollar, whether gold, silver, or paper, has the same value, will pay the same amount of debts, and purchase the same amount of property, neither the payment of the one nor the other will affect the standard. If the Secretary had paid the notes in silver, would it have changed the price of cotton, wheat, or corn? Would not the silver dollar have bought just the same amount after as before? Would a gold dollar have bought any more? Would silver dollars have paid any more debts after than before? That is the point upon which the standard changes. Then why continue to sell bonds to raise gold?

We have sold $162,000,000 of bonds, and in a few days it will be two hundred and sixty-two million. Why put this annual tax of more than eleven millions on the people to pay interest to these bondholders? If the Secretary had coined the silver bullion in the Treasury and paid it out, as Congress asked him to do, there would have been no deficit. Why was it not done? Because when silver once got into circulation it would occupy a field which the bankers wanted for their notes, and it would be more difficult to get it out than to keep it out; so the silver is kept under lock and key. Step by step they move upon the Government, sapping and mining as they go, blowing up one outpost after another until they get into the citadel and take it by storm. All this is done to preserve the public credit!

Did anybody ever hear of any man's private credit being injured by his performing with religious fidelity the terms of his contract precisely as he made it, at the time, at the place, and in the manner he contracted? Has anybody ever read in history of any nation on the globe that ever lost its credit or had it impaired by performing its contract in the very terms and letter of that contract? I am sure I never have. The note holders came to Congress in 1869 and asked Congress to declare that the Treasury notes should be paid in coin, and Congress so declared. The bond holders came in 1870 and asked Congress to declare that the bonds to be sold under the act of July 14, 1870, should be paid not only in coin but coin of the then standard value. It was done as they requested. And the notes and bonds are both payable in coin.

What is coin? When we speak of coin, what do we mean? We mean the gold and silver pieces struck by the mints of the United States. If, when the notes are presented, the Government tenders performance in the terms of the contract, there is neither a breach of public faith nor danger of going to a silver standard. I am as much in favor of the gold standard as anybody. I would do anything in my power to bring the silver up to gold. I am sure we all want both metals to be standard money. But this is no question of standards, neither is there involved in it any question of public credit. The question is, will we use both metals equally when coined in payment of debts contracted to be paid in either?

Will we treat the powerful moneyed syndicates just as we treat our own people? The Democratic and Republican parties both, in their platforms in 1892, declared that they held to the use of both gold and silver. Then why not use it and save the people from taxation? In 1869 and 1870, when they had Congress to declare the notes and bonds payable in coin, silver was worth 3 cents more than gold in our dollars, and while the silver dollar is now as valuable as the gold dollar, they demand gold, because silver will not enable them to carry out their purpose. They want bonds and bank notes. They demand gold, and the Government gives it until it is compelled to have more, and then it sells bonds to get it. The Treasury then pays out the notes again and the syndicates get them and repeat the same performance. And so goes the endless chain, effecting nothing, but carrying our people along into captivity to the money holders of the world.

The President admits that it accomplishes nothing. Then why continue it? He tried the experiment with the first fifty millions of bonds, then another fifty millions, then sixty-two millions; now we are to sell one hundred millions more in a few days, and it is admitted that this is to be followed by still another hundred millions in a few months. This policy was established by the Republican party. It has been adhered to by a Democratic Administration, and if it is to be continued in the future, it is only a question of time when our interest-bearing debt will go to fifteen hundred millions and more. For there is no stopping place until all the gold in the world that can be cornered and controlled by syndicates shall be safely invested in American muscle and our posterity delivered into hopeless slavery.

These much-coveted long-time bonds are never intended to be paid. They are to be perpetuated. Many years ago, when I was a member of the House of Representatives, a member of that body introduced a bill to refund the bonds—then soon to become due—into fifty-year bonds. I got ugly, as it is sometimes said I do, when I found him seriously urging such a measure, and I talked ugly. I said to him, if we were to recommend such a measure and it should become a law the people of the United States ought to hang every one that supported it, when he returned to his home. The bill was reported to sell forty-year bonds redeemable after twenty years. I spoke in the House against it. I showed that with the same rates of taxation and the same revenues coming to the Government we could pay the seven hundred millions in six years. The bill was greatly modified in the House and passed. President Hayes vetoed it because he said it contained—

> Provisions which, in my judgment, seriously impair the value and tend to the destruction of the present national banking system of the country.

Here were the banks again trying to perpetuate the public debt. What was the result? All the seven hundred millions were paid in six or seven years. Every dollar of that debt was extinguished. And in the controversy between Congress and the President our children and grandchildren were saved from the great evil.

It would seem from the expressions of the President in his message recommending the funding of the Treasury notes, that he does not entertain the same views about public debts that were held by the fathers. He speaks of the gold obligations that are afflicting us, as though there were any such. I have shown that there are none, and I trust in God that the American people will never let Congress make any gold obligations that will afflict us. The President seems to think there is much good that comes from public debts; that they bring in their train renewed activity and enterprise, restore confidence, and reinstate faith in our monetary strength abroad. This is a very different view of public debts from that entertained by his predecessors. I have not been able to find in any State paper a single expression in line with it. In 1865 Jay Cooke, who was agent to aid the Government to dispose of its loans, issued an address in which he said:

> The debt is public wealth, political union, protection of industry, secure basis for national currency, the orphans' and widows' saving fund.

In this address he says, in capital letters:

> We lay down the proposition that our national debt made permanent and rightly managed will be a national blessing.

He maintained that the national debt was necessary as a basis for national banking, and in a few years from that time we would want one thousand millions of bank notes and the generation then living had burdens enough to bear without having to pay the debt. This was the view of an enthusiast for bank-note currency and protective tariff. But these were not the views of the fathers.

I present to the Senate some of the utterances of our great leaders on the subjects of public debts and bank currency. I will begin at the beginning. These are the words of Mr. Jefferson:

> It is a wise rule and should be fundamental in a government disposed to cherish its credit, but at the same time to restrain the use of it within the limits of its faculties, "never to borrow a dollar without laying a tax on the same instant for paying the interest annually, and the principal within a given term; and to consider that tax as pledged to the creditors on the public faith." On such a pledge as this, sacredly observed, a government may always command, on a reasonable interest, all the lendable money of their citizens, while the necessity of equivalent tax is a salutary warning to them and their constituents against oppression, bankruptcy, and its inevitable consequence, revolution. But the term of redemption must be moderate and at any rate within the limits of their rightful powers. But what limits, it will be asked, does this prescribe to their powers? What is to hinder them from creating a perpetual debt? The laws of nature, I answer. The earth belongs to the living,

not to the dead. The will and the power of man expire with his life, by nature's law.

* * * * * * *

In seeking, then, for an ultimate term for the redemption of our debts, let us rally to this principle and provide for their payment within the term of *nineteen years* at the furthest. (Volume 6, pages 136, 137.)

We must raise, then, ourselves the money for this war, either by taxes within the year, or by loans; and if by loans, we must repay them ourselves, proscribing forever the English practice of perpetual funding; the ruinous consequences of which, putting right out of the question, should be a sufficient warning to a considerate nation to avoid the example. (Volume 6, page 197.)

At the time we were funding our national debt, we heard much about "a public debt being a public blessing"; that the stock representing it was a creation of active capital for the aliment of commerce, manufactures, and agricultures. This paradox was well adapted to the minds of believers in dreams, and the gulls of that size entered bona fide into it. (Volume 6, page 239.)

The misfortune is that in the meantime we shall plunge ourselves in unextinguishable debt, and entail on our posterity an inheritance of eternal taxes, which will bring our Government and people into the condition of those of England, a nation of pikes and gudgeons, the latter bred merely as food for the former. (Volume 6, page 409.)

Funding I consider as limited, rightfully, to a redemption of the debt within the lives of a majority of the generation contracting it; every generation coming equally, by the laws of the Creator of the world, to the free possession of the earth He made for their subsistence, unencumbered by their predecessors, who, like them, were but tenants for life.

* * * * * * *

And I sincerely believe, with you, that banking establishments are more dangerous than standing armies; and that the principle of spending money to be paid by posterity, under the name of funding, is but swindling futurity on a large scale. (Volume 6, pages 605-608.)

No earthly consideration could induce my consent to contract such a debt as England has by her wars for commerce, to reduce our citizens by taxes to such wretchedness as that, laboring sixteen of the twenty-four hours, they are still unable to afford themselves bread, or barely to earn as much oatmeal or potatoes as will keep soul and body together. (Volume 7, page 7.)

* * * * * * *

I am not among those who fear the people. They and not the rich are our dependence for continued freedom. And to preserve their independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between *economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.* If we run into such debts as that we must be taxed in our meat and in our drink, in our necessaries and our comforts, in our labors and our amusements, for our callings and our creeds, as the people of England are, our people, like them, must come to labor sixteen hours in the twenty-four, give the earnings of fifteen of these to the Government for their debts and daily expenses; and the sixteenth being insufficient to afford us bread, we must live as they now do, on oatmeal and potatoes; have no time to think, no means of calling the mismanagers to account, but be glad to obtain subsistence by hiring ourselves to rivet their chains on the necks of our fellow-sufferers. Our landholders, too, like theirs, retaining indeed the title and stewardship of estates called theirs, but held in trust for the Treasury, must wander, like theirs in foreign countries, and be contented with penury, obscurity, exile, and the glory of the nation. This example reads to us the salutary lesson that private fortunes are destroyed by public as well as by private extravagance. And this is the tendency of all known governments. A departure from principle in one instance becomes a precedent for a second, that second for a third, and so on till the bulk of the society is reduced to be mere automatons of misery, to have no sensibilities left but for sinning and suffering. Then begins, indeed, the *bellum omnium in omnia*, which some philosophers observing to be so general in this world, have mistaken it for the natural instead of the abusive state of man. And the forehorse of this frightful team is public debt. Taxation follows that, and in its turn wretchedness and oppression. (Volume 7, page 14.)

* * * * * * *

I place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared. We see in England the consequences of the want of it—their laborers reduced to live on a penny in the shilling of their earnings, to give up bread, and resort to oatmeal and potatoes for food; and their landholders exiling themselves to live in penury and obscurity abroad, because at home the Government must have all the clear profits of their land. In fact, they see the fee simple of the island transferred to the public creditors, all its profits going to them for the interest of their debts. Our laborers and landholders must come to this also unless they serenely adhere to the economy you recommend. (Volume 7, page 19.)

—

The incorporation of a bank and the powers assumed by this bill have not, in my opinion, been delegated to the United States by the Constitution.—*Opinion against the constitutionality of a national bank, February 15, 1791*, volume 7, page 556.

—

The bank filled and overflowed in the moment it was opened. Instead of twenty thousand shares twenty-four thousand were offered and a great many unpresented who had not suspected that so much haste was necessary. Thus it is that we shall be paying 13 per cent per annum for eight millions of paper money, instead of having that circulation of gold and silver for nothing. Experience has proved to us that a dollar of silver disappears for every dollar of paper emitted; and for the paper emitted from the bank 7 per cent profits will be received by the subscribers for it as bank paper (according to the last division of profits by the Philadelphia bank), and 6 per cent on the public paper of which it is the representative.—*Letter to Colonel Monroe, July 10, 1791*, volume 3, page 268.

—

Our public credit is good, but the abundance of paper has produced a spirit of gambling in the funds, which has laid up our ships at the wharves as too slow instruments of profit, and has even disarmed the hand of the tailor of his needle and thimble. They say the evil will cure itself. I wish it may, but I have rarely seen a gamester cured, even by the disasters of his vocation.—*Letter to Gouverneur Morris, August 30, 1791*, volume 3, page 290.

—

You will see further that we are completely saddled and bridled, and that the bank is so firmly mounted on us that we must go where they will guide. They openly publish a resolution that, the national property being increased in value, they must by an increase of circulating medium furnish an adequate representation of it, and by further additions of active capital promote the enterprises of our merchants.—*Letter to Colonel Monroe, June 12, 1796*, volume 4, page 140.

I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our Government to the genuine principles of its Constitution; I mean an additional article, taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing. I now deny their power of making paper money or anything else a legal tender.—*Letter to John Taylor, November 26, 1798*, volume 4, page 260.

—

The monopoly of a single bank is certainly an evil. The multiplication of them was intended to cure it; but it multiplied an influence of the same character with the first, and completed the supplanting the precious metals by a paper circulation.—*Letter to Mr. Gallatin, June 19, 1802*, volume 4, page 440.

—

From a passage in the letter of the president (of the United States Bank) I observe an idea of establishing a branch bank of the United States in New Orleans. This institution is one of the most deadly hostility existing, against the principles and form of our Constitution. The nation is at this time so strong and united in its sentiments that it can not be shaken at this moment. But suppose a series of untoward events should occur, sufficient to bring into doubt the competency of a republican government to meet a crisis of great danger or to unhinge the confidence of the people in the public functionaries, an institution like this, penetrating by its branches every part of the Union, acting by command and in phalanx, may in a critical moment upset the Government.—*Letter to Mr. Gallatin, December 13, 1803*, volume 4, page 519.

—

That we are overdone with banking institutions, which have banished the precious metals and substituted a more fluctuating and unsafe medium; that these have withdrawn capital from useful improvements and employments to nourish idleness; that the wars of the world have swollen our commerce beyond the wholesome limits of exchanging our own productions for our own wants, and that, for the emolument of a small proportion of our society, who prefer these demoralizing pursuits to labors useful to the whole, the peace of the whole is endangered, and all our present difficulties produced, more easily to be deplored than remedied.—*Letter to Abbe Salimankis, March 14, 1810*, volume 5, page 516.

—

One of the great advantages of specie as a medium is that, being of universal value, it will keep itself at a general level, flowing out from where it is too high into parts where it is lower. Whereas, if the medium be of local value only, as paper money, if too little, indeed, gold and silver will flow in to supply the deficiency; but if too much, it accumulates, banishes the gold and silver not locked up in vaults and hoards, and depreciates itself—that is to say, its proportion to the annual produce of industry being raised, more of it is required to represent any particular article of produce than in the other countries. And to fill up the measure of blessing, instead of paying, they receive an interest on what they owe from those to whom they owe; for all the notes, or evidences of what they owe, which we see in circulation, have been lent to somebody on an interest which is levied again on us through the medium of commerce.—*Letter to John W. Eppes, November 6, 1813*, volume 6, page 239.

—

Everything predicted by the enemies of banks in the beginning is now coming to pass. We are to be ruined now by the deluge of bank paper, as we were formerly by the old Continental paper. It is cruel that such revolutions in private fortunes should be at the mercy of avaricious adventurers, who, instead of employing their capital, if any they have, in manufactures, commerce, or other useful pursuits, make it an instrument to burden all the interchanges of property with their swindling profits, profits which are the price of no useful industry of theirs. * * * I am an enemy to all banks discounting bills or notes for anything *but coin.—Letter to Dr. Thomas Cooper, January 16, 1814*, volume 6, page 295.

—

Until the gigantic banking propositions of this winter had made their appearance in the different legislatures, I had hoped that the evil might still be checked; but I see now that it is desperate, and that we must fold our arms and go to the bottom with the ship.—*Letter to Joseph C. Cabell, esq., January 17, 1814*, volume 6, page 300.

—

I have ever been the enemy of banks, not of those discounting for cash, but of those foisting their own paper into circulation, and thus banishing our cash. My zeal against those institutions was so warm and open at the establishment of the Bank of the United States that I was derided as a maniac by the tribe of bank-mongers who were seeking to filch from the public their swindling and barren gains.—*Letter to President Adams, January 24, 1814*, volume 6, page 305.

—

From the establishment of the United States Bank to this day I have preached against this system, but have been sensible no cure could be hoped but in the catastrophe now happening. The remedy was to let banks drop gradation at the expiration of their charters, and for the State governments to relinquish the power of establishing others. This would not, as it should not, have given the power of establishing them to Congress. But Congress could then have issued Treasury notes payable within a fixed period, and founded on a specific tax, the proceeds of which, as they came in, should be exchangeable for the notes of that particular emission only.—*Letter to Thomas Cooper, esq., September 10, 1814*, volume 6, page 381.

—

Let us be allured by no projects of banks, public or private, or ephemeral expedients, which, enabling us to gasp and flounder a little longer, only increase by protracting the agonies of death.—*Letter to James Monroe, October 16, 1814*, volume 6, page 395.

—

The fatal possession of the whole circulating medium by our banks, the excess of those institutions, and their present discredit cause all our difficulties. Treasury notes of small as well as high denomination, bottomed on a tax which would redeem them in ten years, would place at our disposal the whole circulating medium of the United States; a fund of credit sufficient to carry us through any probable length of war.—*Letter to his excellency Mr. Crawford, February 11, 1815*, volume 6, page 419.

—

The Government is now issuing Treasury notes for circulation, bottomed on solid funds, and bearing interest. The banking confederacy (and the merchants bound to them by their debts) will endeavor to crush the credit of these notes, but the country is eager for them, as something they can trust to, and so soon as a convenient quantity of them can get into circulation, the bank notes die.—*Letter to Jean Batiste Say, March 2, 1815*, volume 6, page 434.

—

Their merchants (the English) established among us, the bonds by which our own are chained to their feet, and the banking combinations interwoven

with the whole, have shown the extent of their control, even during a war with her. They are the workers of all the embarrassments our finances have experienced during the war.—*Letter to Cæsar A. Rodney, March 16, 1815*, volume 6, page 449.

—

Like a dropsical man calling out for water, water, our deluded citizens are clamoring for more banks, more banks. The American mind is now in the state of fever which the world has so often seen in the history of other nations. We are under the bank bubble, as England was under the South Sea bubble, France under the Mississippi bubble, and as every nation is liable to be under whatever bubble, design, or delusion may puff up in moments when off their guard. We are now taught to believe that legerdemain tricks upon paper can produce as solid wealth as hard labor in the earth. It is vain for common sense to urge that *nothing* can produce *nothing;* that it is an idle dream to believe in a philosopher's stone which is to turn everything into gold, and to redeem man from the original sentence of his Maker, "In the sweat of his brow shall he eat his bread."—*Letter to Colonel Yancey, January 6, 1816*, volume 6, page 515.

—

The metallic medium of which we should be possessed at the commencement of a war would be a sufficient fund for all the loans we should need through its continuance; and if the national bills issued be bottomed (as is indispensible) on pledges of specific taxes for their redemption within certain and moderate epochs, and be of proper denominations for circulation, no interest on them would be necessary or just, because they would answer to everyone the purposes of the metallic money withdrawn and replaced by them.—*Letter to William H. Crawford, June 20, 1816*, volume 7, page 8.

—

The bank mania is one of the most threatening of these imitations. It is raising up a moneyed aristocracy in our country which has *already set the Government at defiance*, and although forced at length to yield a little on this first essay of their strength, their principles are unyielded and unyielding. These have taken deep root in the hearts of that class from which our legislators are drawn, and the sop to Cerberus from fable has become history. *Their principles lay hold of the good, their pelf of the bad, and thus those whom the Constitution had placed as guards to its portals are sophisticated or suborned from their duties.* That paper money has some advantages is admitted. But that its abuses also are inevitable, and by breaking up the measure of value *makes a lottery of all private property* can not be denied. Shall we ever be able to put a constitutional veto upon it?—*Letter to Dr. Josephus B. Stuart, May 10, 1817*, volume 7, page 64.

—

There is, indeed, one evil which awakens me at times, because it jostles me at every turn. It is that we have now no measure of value.—*Letter to Nathaniel Macon, esq., January 12, 1819*, volume 7, page 111.

—

The evils of this deluge of paper money are not to be removed until our citizens are generally and radically instructed in their cause and consequences, and silence by their authority the interested clamors and sophistry of speculating, shaving, and banking institutions.—*Letter to Mr. Adams, March 21, 1819*, volume 7, page 115.

—

The paper bubble is then burst. This is what you and I and every reasoning man, seduced by no obliquity of mind or interest, have long foreseen, yet its disastrous effects are not the less for having been foreseen. We are laboring under a dropsical fullness of circulating medium. Nearly all of it is now called in by the banks, who *have the regulation of the safety valves of our fortunes*, and who *condense and explode* them at their will. Lands in this State can not now be sold for a year's rent.—*Letter to J. Adams, esq., November 7, 1819*, volume 7, page 142.

—

If we suffer the moral of the present lesson to pass away without improvement by the eternal suppression of bank *paper*, then, indeed, is the condition of our country desperate, until the slow advance of public instruction shall give to our functionaries the wisdom of their station.—*Letter to Mr. Rives, November 28, 1819*, volume 7, page 145.

—

The plethory of circulating medium which raised the prices of everything to several times their ordinary and standard value, in which state of things many and heavy debts were contracted, and the sudden withdrawing too great a proportion of that medium, and reduction of prices far below that standard, constitute the disease under which we are now laboring and which must end in a general revolution of property if some remedy is not applied.—*Letter to Mr. Rives, November 28, 1819*, volume 7, page 146.

—

Interdict forever, to both the State and national governments, the power of establishing any paper bank, for without this interdiction we shall have the same ebbs and flows of medium and the same revolutions of property to go through every twenty or thirty years.—*Letter to Mr. Rives, November 28, 1819*, volume 7, page 147.

—

This State is in a condition of unparalleled distress. The sudden reduction of the circulating medium *from a plethory to all but annihilation is producing an entire revolution of fortune.*—*Letter to H. Nelson, esq., March 12, 1820*, volume 7, page 151.

—

I should put down all banks, admit none but a *metallic circulation*, that will take its proper level with the like circulation in other countries, and then our manufacturers may work in fair competition with those of other countries, and the import duties which the Government may lay for the purposes of revenue will so far place them above equal competition.—*Letter to Mr. Pinckney, September 30, 1820*, volume 7, page 180.

The following are the declarations of the national Democracy in their platforms:

A rigorously frugal administration of the Government and the application of all the possible savings of the public revenue to the liquidation of the public debt, and resistance, therefore, to all measures looking to the multiplication of officers and salaries merely to create indebtedness and augment the public debt on the principle of its being a public blessing.—*Platform of 1800*, article 4.

We declare unqualified hostility to bank notes and paper money as a circulating medium, because gold and silver is the only safe and constitutional currency.—*Platform, 1836.*

ART. 6. That Congress has no power to charter a United States bank; that we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and above the laws and will of the people.—*Democratic platform, 1840.*

Democratic platform of 1844 affirms article 6 of the platform of 1840.

Democratic platform of 1848 declares—

For the gradual but certain extinction of the public debt.

The platform of 1848 further declares that the triumph of 1844 had fulfilled the hopes of the Democracy of the Union in defeating the declared purposes of their opponents to create a national bank. In protecting the currency and labor of the country from ruinous fluctuations and guarding the money of the country for the use of the people by the establishment of a constitutional Treasury.

Also—

Resolved, That it is the duty of every branch of the Government to enforce and practice the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government and for the gradual but certain extinction of the public debt.—*Democratic platform, 1852*, article 8.

Article 9 of the same:

That Congress has no power to charter a national bank; that we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power above the laws and will of the people.—*Democratic platform, 1852*, article 9.

That Congress has no power to charter a national bank; that we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and the liberties of the American people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and above the laws and will of the people.—*Democratic platform, 1856*, article 7.

Payment of all the public debt of the United States as rapidly as practicable.—*Democratic platform, 1868*, article 3.

The following are some of the utterances of some of our great leaders in the past:

The expansion of the currency by the issue of paper in a period of prosperity will inevitably be succeeded by its contraction in periods of adversity.—*W. H. Crawford.*

—

The great object now in view is to terminate forever the evil of the present system, and to place the currency on a foundation so stable that it can not again be shaken. If a broad and sure foundation of gold and silver is provided for our system of paper credits we need not hereafter apprehend *those alternate seasons of abundance and scarcity of money suddenly succeeding each other, which have so far marked our history and irreparably injured so many of our citizens.*—*Report of R. B. Taney, Secretary of Treasury, April 15, 1834.*

—

Proneness to excessive issues has ever been the vice of the banking system, a vice as prominent in national as in State institutions. This propensity is as subservient to the advancement of private interests in the one as in the other; and those who direct them both, being principally guided by the same views and influenced by the same motives, will be equally ready to stimulate to extravagance of enterprise by improvidence of credit.—*President Van Buren's message, September 4, 1837.*

—

The history of trade in the United States for the last three or four years affords the most convincing evidence that our present condition is chiefly to be attributed to overaction in all the departments of business, an overaction deriving, perhaps, its first impulse from antecedent causes, but *stimulated to its destructive consequences by excessive issues of bank paper* and by other facilities for the acquisition and enlargement of credit.—*President Van Buren's message, September 4, 1837.*

—

The limited influence of a national bank in averting derangement in the exchanges of the country, or in compelling the resumption of specie payments, is now not less apparent than *its tendency to increase inordinate speculation by sudden expansions and contractions; its disposition to create panic and embarrassment for the promotion of its own designs; its interference with politics, and its far greater power for evil than for good, either in regard to the local institutions or the operations of a government itself.* What was in these respects but apprehension or opinion when a national bank was first established now stands confirmed by humiliating experience. The scenes through which we have passed conclusively prove how little our commerce, agriculture, manufactures, or finances require such an institution, and what dangers are attendant on its power—a power, I trust, never to be conferred by the American people upon their Government, and still less upon individuals not responsible to them for its unavoidable abuses.—*Van Buren's second annual message, December 4, 1838.*

—

The experiment has been tried, and local paper has failed as a national currency, and out of that failure arose the second United States bank. It will fail again and again, and forever. There is no safety for the Federal revenues but in the total exclusion of local paper, and that from every branch of the revenues—customs, lands, and post-office. There is no safety for the national finances but in the constitutional medium of gold and silver. After forty years' wandering in the wilderness of paper money we have approached the confines of the constitutional medium.—*Benton, December 14, 1836.*

—

The day of revulsion must come, and its effects must be more or less distress; but come it must. The present bloat in the paper system can not continue; violent contraction must follow enormous expansion; a scene of distress and suffering must ensue—to come of itself out of the present state of things, without being stimulated and helped on by our unwise legislation.—*Mr. Benton, 1837.*

Speaking of the bill to rescind the specie order and make the notes of local banks receivable for Federal dues, Mr. Benton said:

I separate myself from it; I wash my hands of it; I oppose it. I am one of those who promised gold—not paper. I promised the currency of the Constitution, not the currency of corporations. I did not join in putting down the Bank of the United States to put up a wilderness of local banks. I did not join in putting down the paper currency of a national bank to put up a national paper currency of a thousand local banks. I did not strike Cæsar to make Antony master of Rome.—*Mr. Benton, 1837.*

At this epoch, this second explosion of the paper system, I came into the Senate of the United States. I came here in the autumn of 1820. I traveled from the Mississippi to the Potomac amidst the crash of falling banks, the wrecks of a paper currency, and the lamentations of a suffering nation. I arrived here to see a Government without a dollar, and borrowing money to pay its daily expenses, which the year before boasted a revenue of forty-seven millions and tormented itself with schemes to get rid of surpluses. I commenced my Senatorial career under these circumstances—circumstances to make me meditate and to make me feel. Happily my associations were with the fathers of the Republic—with Macon and Randolph, whose intimacy I enjoyed and whose friendship I possessed. My reading was that of the early history of the Government—the Revolution, the Confederation, the formation of the Constitution of 1789, and the workings of the machinery of the Federal Government under the Administrations of the earlier Presidents, Washington, Adams, and Jefferson. The result of this association and of this reading was a thorough conviction (1) that the Federal Constitution was formed by hard-money men, and was intended to be a hard-money Government; (2) that it had been converted into a paper-money Government, contrary to the genius and intention of the Constitution; (3) that this departure from the Constitution was the cause of the money calamities during the war, and again at that time; (4) that the remedy for these calamities was to return to the plain meaning of the Constitution, as expressed in the revenue act of 1789, and to confine the receipts and expenditures of the Federal Government to gold and silver coin only.—*Benton, March 14, 1838.*

—

6. It tends to make and to break fortunes *by the flux and reflux of paper. Profuse issues and sudden contractions perform this operation*, which can be repeated, like planetary and pestilential visitations, in every cycle of so many years, at every periodical return transferring millions from the actual possessors of property to the Neptunes who preside over the flux and reflux of paper.—*Benton, February 2, 1831.*

—

The Bank of the United States was chartered in 1816, and before 1820 had performed one of its cycles of delusive and bubble prosperity, followed by actual and widespread calamity. The whole paper system, of which it was the head and citadel, after a vast expansion, had suddenly collapsed, spreading desolation over the land and carrying ruin to debtors. The years 1819 and 1820 were a period of gloom and agony. No money, either gold or silver; no paper convertible into specie; no measure or standard of value left remaining. The local banks (all but those of New England), after a brief resumption of specie payments, again sank into a state of suspension. The Bank of the United States, created as a remedy for all those evils, now at the head of the evil, prostrate and helpless, with no power left but that of suing its debtors and selling their property, and purchasing for itself at its own nominal price. No price for property or produce. No purchasers at execution sales but the creditor or some hoarder of money. No employment for industry, no demand for labor, no sale for the product of the farm, no sound of the hammer but that of the auctioneer knocking down property. Stop laws, property laws, replevin laws, stay laws, loan-office laws—the intervention of the legislator between the creditor and the debtor—this was the business of legislation in three-fourths of the States of the Union, of all south and west of New England. No medium of exchange but depreciated paper; no change even but little bits of foul paper marked so many cents and signed by some tradesman, barber, or innkeeper; exchanges deranged to the extent of 50 or 100 per cent. Distress, the universal cry of the people; relief, the universal demand thundered at the doors of all legislatures, State and Federal.—*Benton: Thirty Years' View*, volume I, page 6.

—

Gold and silver will never circulate where banks issue notes which come in competition with them, for it will invariably happen that when the circulating medium is composed of different kinds of money and one of them is of less value than the other, but not sufficiently depreciated to be discredited, the inferior will after a time become the general currency and the more valuable will entirely disappear.—*R. B. Taney, Secretary Treasury, April 15, 1834.*

—

The evils of a redundant paper circulation are now manifest to every eye. *It alternately raises and sinks the value of every man's property.* It makes a beggar of the man to-morrow who is indulging in dreams of wealth to-day. It converts the business of society into a mere lottery, while those who distribute the prizes are wholly irresponsible to the people. When the collapse comes, as come it must, it casts laborers out of employment, crushes manufacturers and merchants, and ruins thousands of honest and industrious citizens. Shall we then, by our policy, any longer contribute to such fatal results? That is the question.—*Buchannan, September 29, 1837.*

—

Paper money was the fatal cause of all the disasters of 1824; it produced the explosion of 1814, of 1818-19, of 1837, and of 1839, and will continue to produce here, as it ever has done elsewhere, periodical revulsions, suspensions, and disasters so long as the system is continued. Eradicate the paper system, and you will remove the great cause of all our evils, and anything short of this will be but temporary expedients; resumption will be but the signal for another suspension, until these revulsions shall become annual, and the system die by its own hand, the death of the suicide, or expel all the precious metals, destroy the standard of value, convert bank paper into a legal tender, not merely to the Government, but to the people, and thus overthrow the Constitution, subvert the liberties of the country and the rights of the people, and establish the reign of a bankocracy more sordid, ruinous, and despotic than that of any monarch, however absolute.

* * * * * * *

What is this bank paper? It is not labor, nor its products, nor wealth, nor capital, nor anything of intrinsic value. It is not money, for it is merely a promise to pay money, and is nothing in fact but circulating debts, and their issue and augmentation augments nothing but the debts of a country. Every bank note is only a debt due the holder of the note, and in every loan of its paper made by a bank, it augments nothing but the debts of a country; first, by creating a debt to it by the borrower to the amount of the loan, and, secondly, a debt by it to all the holders of its notes. The banks, then, are the great cause of all that vast load of debt which has almost weighed down the energies of this great nation.

* * * * * * *

But for the bank paper system the products of our industry would be more than double what they are now, and our population wonderfully augmented, and we should, long ere this, have passed England in the race for wealth and power, and will soon overtake and pass her now, if we will but abandon the wretched policy of debasing our currency by the bank paper system, and thus closing to the products of our own industry nearly every market at home and abroad.

* * * * * * *

Yes, sir; throughout this Union and throughout the globe wherever you find the banking system to prevail you will be sure to find periodical suspensions and revulsions and widespread ruin. Explosion is inseparable from the system; and when you speak to me of well-regulated banks of circulation, you speak to me of what never has been or will be. You might as well speak to me of well-regulated devils, whom even Almighty power found it impossible to regulate in any other manner than by casting in chains into billows of everlasting fire. And, sir, our bank-paper system, if not abandoned, may yet be regulated in the all-consuming blaze of popular indignation.

* * * * * * *

For myself, I am opposed to investing in banks the power of manufacturing a paper currency. This power of creating a currency for a nation is one of the highest and most important attributes of a sovereign power, and more deeply affects all the diversified interests of society than the exercise of any other power whatever. It is more important than coining money, for that must be preceded by the purchase of the bullion, but here is a power to manufacture paper money at pleasure, to constitute the currency of a State or nation, a power entrusted to the irresponsible directory of a bank, acting in secret, and whose chief interest is to abuse their power. In proportion as a bank increases in currency are its dividends and profits augmented, and hence the stimulus to over issues is irresistible, and especially is this the case where, as we have seen by the evidence before quoted, the very directors which manufacture the paper loan out, as a general rule, more than one-fourth of it to themselves. This power, then, of issuing their paper as money is truly fearful, and when united with the power of loaning at pleasure, in secret conclave, and to whom and for what purpose the bank directory may think proper, and of recalling it at pleasure, and of contracting and expanding as suits their caprice, is a power which few European despots would dare to exercise, and is utterly incompatible with the fundamental principles of a free government.—*From the speech of Robert J. Walker in the Senate January 21, 1840.*

—

In a recent report made by the Treasury Department on the condition of the banks throughout the different States, according to returns dated nearest to January, 1857, the aggregate amount of actual specie in their vaults is $58,349,838, of their circulation $214,778,822, and of their deposits $230,351,352. Thus it appears that these banks, in the aggregate, have considerably less than one dollar in seven of gold and silver compared with their circulation and deposits. It was palpable, therefore, that the very first pressure must drive them to suspension, and deprive the people of a convertible currency, with all its disastrous consequences. It is truly wonderful that they should have so long continued to preserve their credit, when a demand for the payment of one-seventh of their immediate liabilities would have driven them into insolvency. And this is the condition of the banks, notwithstanding that four hundred millions of gold from California have flowed in upon us within the last eight years, and the tide still continues to flow. Indeed, such has been the extravagance of bank credits that the banks now hold a considerably less amount of specie, either in proportion to their capital or to their circulation and deposits combined, than they did before the discovery of gold in California. While in the year 1848 their specie, in proportion to their capital, was more than equal to one dollar for four and a half, in 1857 it does not amount to $1 for every $6.33 of their capital. In the year 1848 the specie was equal within a very small fraction to one dollar in five of their circulation and deposits; in 1857 it is not equal to one dollar in seven and a half of their circulation and deposits.

From this statement it is easy to account for our financial history for the last forty years. It has been a history of extravagant expansions in the business of the country, followed by ruinous contractions. At successive intervals the best and most enterprising men have been tempted to their ruin by excessive bank loans of mere paper credit, exciting them to extravagant importations of foreign goods, wild speculations, and ruinous and demoralizing stock gambling.—*From message of President Buchanan, first session Thirty-fifth Congress.*

—

We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country, in its monetary interests, is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want. The revenue of the Government, which is chiefly derived from duties on imports from abroad, has been greatly reduced, whilst the appropriations made by Congress at its last session for the current fiscal year are very large in amount.

* * * * * * *

It is our duty to inquire what has produced such unfortunate results and whether their recurrence can be prevented. In all former revulsions the blame might have been fairly attributed to a variety of cooperating causes; but not so upon the present occasion. *It is apparent that our existing misfortunes have proceeded solely from our extravagant and vicious system of paper currency and bank credits, exciting the people to wild speculations and gambling in stocks.* These revulsions must continue to recur at successive intervals so long as the amount of the paper currency and bank loans and discounts of the country shall be left to the discretion of fourteen hundred irresponsible banking institutions, which, from the very law of their nature, will consult the interest of their stockholders rather than the public welfare.—*Message of President Buchanan at the commencement of the first session Thirty-fifth Congress.*

The lessons which we have learned from our fathers have taught us to regard public debts as great public evils, which are to be removed as rapidly as we can. We have learned from them that an interest-bearing debt feeds on the vitals of a state, that it saps its strength in time of peace and leaves it utterly unprepared for the exigencies of war. When General Washington took charge of the Government one of the first things he did was to call the attention of Congress to the importance of extinguishing the national debt. Besides the evil of constant taxation, he impressed upon them that the public credit demanded its extinction. He felt how necessary it was that the nation should be in possession of all its resources when it came to a trial of strength with a powerful adversary.

I wish to ask our friends north of the Ohio what do you suppose would have been your condition in the great civil war through which we passed thirty years ago if you had gone into that contest with a great public debt? I care nothing about the power of your numbers, your patriotism, the courage of your soldiers, your inventive genius to supply the wants of the military establishment, if you had entered that war with a national debt of two billion or two and a half billion dollars, as you came out of it,

requiring for interest $150,000,000 a year, what would have been your condition? Entering the war without any debt, before you had been in it three years your promissory notes had gone to 38 cents on the dollar, with all the resources of the country unpledged. But suppose you had had to borrow money and that you were already in debt to the extent of two and a half billion dollars, requiring an enormous taxation to meet its interest. Your paper would have gone to nothing, as the continental paper did. In a year or two it would have gone from 1 to 10, in the next year to a hundred, and finally, as the continental money did, it would have gone out. In spite of all your power, and all your soldiers, and all your patriotism, and your access to the whole world for supplies you would have met with ignominious defeat.

If we have the temerity to load down our people with debt and go on and exhaust them by taxation, and it then becomes necessary in the course of events for us to measure arms with one, two, or three of the most powerful nations on the globe, you will see how our credit will be shattered.

I wish to show what General Washington thought of public debts. He was not a Democrat. He could hardly be called a Federalist. He was elected by the whole nation, and by distinction he may be called the Patriot President. All his successors were elected by parties. He stood halfway between the Democrats and Federalists. His Administration was controlled in a great measure by the two powerful intellects of Jefferson and Hamilton, both of whom were in his Cabinet, and both urging opposing ideas. He pursued the middle course. Here is what he said in his messages:

Allow me, moreover, to hope that it will be a favorite policy with you not merely to secure a payment of the interest of the debt funded, but as far and as fast as the growing resources of the country will permit to exonerate it of the principal itself. The appropriations you have made of the Western lands explain your disposition on this subject, and I am persuaded that the sooner that valuable fund can be made to contribute, along with other means, to the actual reduction of the public debt, the more salutary will the measure be to every public interest, as well as the more satisfactory to our constituents.—*Washington's second annual address to Congress, December 8, 1790.* (*Williams's Presidents' Messages*, volume 1, page 38.)

No pecuniary consideration is more urgent than the regular redemption and discharge of the public debt. On none can delay be more injurious or an economy of time be more valuable.—*Washington's fifth annual address to Congress, December 3, 1793.* (*Williams's Presidents' Messages*, volume 1, page 49.)

GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The time which has elapsed since the commencement of our fiscal measures has developed our pecuniary resources so as to open the way for a definitive plan for the redemption of the public debt. It is believed that the result is such as to encourage Congress to consummate this work without delay. Nothing can more promote the permanent welfare of the nation and nothing would be more grateful to our constituents. Indeed, whatever is unfinished of our system of public credit can not be benefited by procrastination; and as far as may be practicable we ought to place that credit on grounds which can not be disturbed and to prevent that progressive accumulation of debt which must ultimately endanger all Governments.—*Washington's sixth annual address to Congress, November 19, 1794.* (*Williams's Presidents' Messages*, volume 1, page 59.)

Whether measures may not be advisable to reenforce the provision for the redemption of the public debt will naturally engage your examination. Congress have demonstrated their sense to be, and it was superfluous to repeat mine, that whatsoever will tend to accelerate the honorable extinction of our public debt accords as much with the true interests of our country as with the general sense of our constituents.—*Washington's seventh annual address to Congress, December 8, 1795.* (*Williams's Presidents' Messages*, volume 1, page 63.)

A reenforcement of the existing provisions for discharging our public debt was mentioned in my address at the opening of the last session. Some preliminary steps were taken toward it, the maturing of which will no doubt engage your zealous attention during the present session. I will only add that it will afford me heartfelt satisfaction to concur in such further measures as will ascertain to our country the prospect of a speedy extinguishment of our debt. Posterity may have cause to regret if, from any motive, intervals of tranquility are left unimproved for accelerating this valuable end.—*Washington's Eighth Annual Address, December 7, 1796.* (*Williams's Presidents' Messages*, volume 1, page 68.)

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.—*Washington's Farewell Address, September 17, 1796.* (*Williams's Presidents' Messages*, volume 1, page 75.)

The following words are from his successors:

The consequences arising from the continual accumulation of public debts in other countries ought to admonish us to be careful to prevent their growth in our own. The national defense must be provided for as well as the support of Government, but both should be accomplished as much as possible by immediate taxes and as little as possible by loans.—*President John Adams's message, 1797.*

When effects so salutary result from the plan you have already sanctioned, when merely by avoiding false objects of expense we are able, without a direct tax, without internal taxes, and without borrowing, to make large and effectual payments toward the discharge of our public debt and the emancipation of our posterity from that moral canker. It is an encouragement, fellow-citizens, of the highest order, to proceed as we have begun, in substituting economy for taxation, and in pursuing what is useful for a nation placed as we are, rather than what is practiced by others under different circumstances. And whensoever we are destined to meet events which shall call forth all the energies of our countrymen, we have the firmest reliance on those energies, and the comfort of leaving for calls like these the extraordinary resources of loans and internal taxes.—*Jefferson's second annual message to Congress, December 15, 1802.* (*Williams's Presidents' Messages*, volume 1, page 160.)

I am uneasy at seeing that the sale of our western lands is not yet commenced. That valuable fund for the immediate extinction of our debt will, I fear, be suffered to slip through our fingers. Every delay exposes it to events which no human foresight can guard against.—*Letter to James Madison, June 20, 1787*, volume 2, page 153.

The question whether one generation of men has a right to bind another seems never to have been started either on this or our side of the water. Yet it is a question of such consequences as not only to merit decision, but place also among the fundamental principles of every government. The course of reflection in which we are immersed here, on the elementary principles of society, has presented this question to my mind; and that no such obligation can be transmitted I think very capable of proof. I set out on this ground, which I suppose to be self-evident, that the *earth belongs in usufruct to the living;* that the dead have neither powers nor rights over it. The portion occupied by any individual ceases to be his when himself ceases to be, and reverts to the society. If the society has formed no rules for the appropriation of its lands in severalty, it will be taken by the first occupants, and these will generally be the wife and children of the decedent. If they have formed rules of appropriation those rules may give it to the wife and children, or to some one of them, or to the legatee of the deceased. So, they may give it to its creditor. But the child, the legatee or creditor, takes it, not by natural right, but by a law of the society of which he is a member, and to which he is subject. Then, no man can, *by natural right*, oblige the lands he occupied, or the persons who succeed him in that occupation, to the payment of debts contracted by him. For if he could he might during his own life eat up the usufruct of the lands for several generations to come; and then the lands would belong to the dead and not to the living, which is the reverse of our principle.

What is true of every member of the society individually is true of them all collectively, since the rights of the whole can be no more than the sum of the rights of the individuals. To keep our ideas clear when applying them to a multitude, let us suppose a whole generation of men to be born on the same day, to attain mature age on the same day, and to die on the same day, leaving a succeeding generation in the moment of attaining their mature age, all together. Let the ripe age be supposed of 21 years, and their period of life thirty-four years more, that being the average term given by the bills of mortality to persons of 21 years of age. Each successive generation would, in this way, come and go off the stage at a fixed moment, as individuals do now. Then, I say, the earth belongs to each of these generations during its course, fully and in its own right. The second generation receives it clear of the debts and incumbrances of the first, the third of the second, and so on. For if the first could charge it with a debt, then the earth would belong to the dead and not to the living generation. Then, no generation can contract debts greater than may be paid during the course of its own existence.—*Letter written from Paris to James Madison, September 6, 1789*, volume 3, page 103.

The earth belongs also to the living generation; they may manage it, then, and what proceeds from it, as they please, during their usufruct. They are masters, too, of their own persons, and consequently may govern them as they please. But persons and property make the sum of the objects of government. The constitution and the laws of their predecessors are extinguished, then, in their natural course, with those whose will gave them being.—*Letter to James Madison, September 6, 1789*, volume 3, page 106.

Then the contracts, constitutions, and laws of every society become void in nineteen years from their date.—*Letter to Dr. Gem*, ——— —, ——, volume 3, page 109.

As the doctrine is that a public debt is a public blessing, so they think a perpetual one is a perpetual blessing, and therefore wish to make it so large that we can never pay it off.—*Letter to Col. N. Lewis, April 12, 1792.*, volume 3, page 348.

My whole correspondence while in France, and every word, letter, and act on the subject since my return, prove that no man is more ardently intent to see the public debt soon and sacredly paid off than I am. This exactly marks the difference between Colonel Hamilton's views and mine, that I would wish the debt paid to-morrow; he wishes it never to be paid, but always to be a thing wherewith to corrupt and manage the Legislature.—*Letter to the President of the United States, September 9, 1792*, volume 3, page 464.

I consider the fortunes of our Republic as depending, in an eminent degree, on the extinguishment of the public debt before we engage in any war, because, that done, we shall have revenue enough to improve our country in time of peace and defend it in war, without recurring either to new taxes or loans. But if the debt should once more be swelled to a formidable size its entire discharge will be despaired of and we shall be committed to the English career of debt, corruption, and rottenness, closing with revolution. The discharge of the debt, therefore, is vital to the destinies of our Government, and it hangs on Mr. Madison and yourself alone. We shall never see another President and Secretary of the Treasury making all other objects subordinate to this.—*Letter to Mr. Albert Gallatin, October 11, 1809*, volume 5, page 477.

I keep up my hopes that if war be avoided Mr. Madison will be able to complete the payment of the national debt within his term, after which one-third of the present revenue would support the Government.—*Letter to M. Dupont De Nemours, April 15, 1811*, volume 5, page 583.

Having seen the people of all other nations bowed down to the earth under the wars and prodigalities of their rulers, I have cherished their opposites—peace, economy, and riddance of the public debt—believing that these were the high road to public as well as to private prosperity and happiness.—*Letter to Henry Middleton, esq., January 8, 1813*, volume 6, page 90.

It is a wise rule, and should be fundamental in a government disposed to cherish its credit, and at the same time to restrain the use of it within the limits of its faculties, "never to borrow a dollar without laying a tax in the same instant for paying the interest annually and the principal within a given term; and to consider that tax as pledged to the creditors on the public faith." * * * But the term of redemption must be moderate, and at any rate within the limits of their rightful powers. But what limits, it will be asked, does this prescribe to their powers? What is to hinder them from creating a perpetual debt? The laws of nature, I answer. The earth belongs to the living, not to the dead. The will and the power of man expire with his life by nature's law.—*Letter to John W. Eppes, June 24, 1813*, volume 6, page 136.

There have existed nations, and civilized and learned nations, who have thought that a father had a right to sell his child as a slave, in perpetuity; that he could alienate his body and industry conjointly, and *a fortiori* his industry separately, and consume its fruits himself. A nation asserting this fratricide right might well suppose they could burden with public as well as private debt their "*nati natorum, et qui nascentur at illis.*" But we, this age, and in this country especially, are advanced beyond those notions of natural law. We acknowledge that our children are born free; that that freedom is the gift of nature, and not of him who begot them; that though under our care during infancy, and therefore of necessity under a duly tempered authority, that care is confided to us to be exercised for the preservation and good of the child only, and his labors during youth are given as a retribution for the charges of infancy. As he was never the property of his father, so when adult he is *sui juris*, entitled himself to the use of his own limbs and the fruits of his own exertions. So far we are advanced, without mind enough, it seems, to take the whole step. We believe, or act as if we believed, that although an individual father can not alienate the labor of his son, the

aggregate body of fathers may alienate the labor of all their sons, of their posterity, in the aggregate, and oblige them to pay for all the enterprises, just or unjust, profitable or ruinous, into which our vices, our passions, or our personal interests may lead us. But I trust that this proposition needs only to be looked at by an American to be seen in its true point of view, and that we shall all consider ourselves unauthorized to saddle our posterity with our debts, and morally bound to pay them ourselves, and consequently within what may be deemed the period of a generation or the life of the majority.—*Letter to Mr. Eppes, September 11, 1813*, volume 6, page 196.

In seeking, then, for an ultimate term for the redemption of our debts, let us rally to this principle, and provide for their payment within the term of nineteen years at the farthest.—*Letter to John W. Eppes, June 24, 1813*, volume 6, page 138.

The misfortune is that in the meantime we shall plunge ourselves in unextinguishable debt and entail on our posterity an inheritance of eternal taxes, which will bring our Government and the people into the condition of those of England, a nation of pikes and gudgeons, the latter bred merely as food for the former.—*Letter to Colonel Monroe, January 1, 1815*, volume 6, page 409.

The multiplication of public offices, increase of expense beyond income, growth and entailment of a public debt are indications soliciting the employment of the pruning knife; and I doubt not it will be employed, good principles being as yet prevalent enough for that.—*Letter to Judge Roane, March 9, 1821*, volume 7, page 212.

That our Creator made the earth for the use of the living and not of the dead; that those who exist not can have no use nor right in it, no authority or power over it; that one generation of men can not foreclose or burthen its use to another, which comes to it in its own right and by the same divine beneficence; that a preceding generation can not bind a succeeding one by its laws or contracts; these deriving their obligation from the will of the existing majority, and that majority being removed by death, another comes in its place with a will equally free to make its own laws and contracts; these are axioms so self-evident that no explanation can make them plainer.—*Letter to Mr. Thomas Earle, September 24, 1823*, volume 7, page 310.

Can one generation bind another, and all others in succession, forever? I think not. The Creator has made the earth for the living, not the dead. Rights and powers can only belong to persons, not to things, not to mere matter, unendowed with will. The dead are not even things. The particles of matter which composed their bodies make part now of the bodies of other animals, vegetables or minerals, of a thousand forms. To what, then, are attached the rights and powers they held while in the form of men? A generation may bind itself as long as its majority continues in life; when that has disappeared another majority is in place, holds all the rights and powers their predecessors once held, and may change their laws and institutions to suit themselves. Nothing, then, is unchangeable but the inherent and unalienable rights of man.—*Letter to Maj. John Cartwright, June 5, 1824*, volume 7, page 359.

THE UNION—WHO ARE ITS REAL FRIENDS.

Not those who promote unnecessary accumulations of the debt of the Union, instead of the best means of discharging it as fast as possible, thereby increasing the causes of corruption in the Government and the pretext for new taxes under its authority; the former undermining the confidence, the latter alienating the affections of the people.

The real friends of the Union are those who are friends to the authority of the people, the sole foundation on which the Union rests;

Who are friends to liberty, the great end for which the Union was formed;

Who are friends to the limited and republican system of government, the means provided by that authority for the attainment of that end;

Who, considering a public debt as injurious to the interests of the people and baneful to the virtue of the Government, are enemies to every contrivance for *unnecessarily* increasing its amount, or protracting its duration, or extending its influence.

In a word, those are the real friends of the Union who are friends to that republican policy throughout which is the only *cement* for the union of a republican people, in opposition to a spirit of usurpation and monarchy, which is the *menstruum* most capable of dissolving it.—*No. 15, Writings of Madison, March 31, 1792*, page 480.

The deep solicitude felt by our citizens of all classes throughout the Union for the total discharge of the public debt will apologize for the earnestness with which I deem it my duty to urge this topic upon the consideration of Congress—of recommending to them again the observance of the strictest economy in the public funds.—*President John Quincy Adams's message, 1827.*

Free from public debt, at peace with all the world, and with no complicated interest to consult in our intercourse with foreign powers, the present may be hailed as that epoch in our history the most favorable for the settlement of those principles in our domestic policy which shall be best calculated to give stability to our Republic and secure the blessings of freedom to our citizens. Among these principles, from our past experience, it can not be doubted that simplicity in the character of the Federal Government and a rigid economy in its administration should be regarded as fundamental and sacred. All must be sensible that the existence of the public debt, by rendering taxation necessary for its extinguishment, has increased the difficulties which are inseparable from every exercise of the taxing power, and that it was, in this respect, a remote agent in producing those disturbing questions which grew out of the discussions relating to the tariff. If such has been the tendency of a debt incurred in the acquisition and maintenance of our national rights and liberties, the obligations of which all portions of the Union cheerfully acknowledged, it must be obvious that whatever is calculated to increase the burdens of government without necessity must be fatal to all our hopes of preserving its true character. While we are felicitating ourselves, therefore, upon the extinguishment of the national debt and the prosperous state of our finances let us not be tempted to depart from those sound maxims of public policy which enjoin a just adaptation of the revenue to the expenditures that are consistent with a rigid economy and an entire abstinence from all topics of legislation that are not clearly within the constitutional powers of the Government and suggested by the wants of the country. Properly regarded, under such a policy every diminution of the public burdens arising from taxation gives to individual enterprise increased power and furnishes to all the members of our happy confederacy new motives for patriotic affection and support. But, above all, its most important effect will be found in its influence upon the character of the Government by confining its action to those objects which will be sure to secure to it the attachment and support of our fellow-citizens.—*Jackson's message, 1834.*

If Providence permits me to meet you at another session, I shall have the high gratification of announcing to you that the national debt is extinguished. I can not refrain from expressing the pleasure I feel at the near approach of that desirable event. The short period of time within which the public debt will have been discharged is strong evidence of the abundant resources of the country and of the prudence and economy with which the Government has heretofore been administered.—*President Jackson's message, 1833.*

I can not too cordially congratulate Congress and my fellow-citizens on the near approach of that memorable and happy event, the extinction of the public debt of this great and free nation. Faithful to the wise and patriotic policy, marked out by the legislation of the country for this object, the present Administration has devoted to it all the means which its flourishing commerce has supplied and a prudent economy preserved for the public Treasury. Within the four years for which the people have confided the executive power to my charge, $58,000,000 will have been applied to the payment of the public debt.

* * * * * * *

The final removal of this great burden from our resources affords the means of further provision for all the objects of general welfare and public defense which the Constitution authorizes and prevents the occasion for such further reduction in the revenue as may not be required for them.—*President Jackson's annual message, 1832.*

It is one of the serious evils of our present system of banking that it enables one class of society—and that by no means a numerous one—by its control over the currency to act injuriously upon the interests of all the others and to exercise more than its just proportion of influence in political affairs. The agricultural, the mechanical, and the laboring classes have little or no share in the direction of the great moneyed corporations, and from their habits and the nature of their pursuits they are incapable of forming extensive combinations to act together with united force. Such concert of action may sometimes be produced in a single city or in a small district of country by means of personal communications with each other; but they have no regular or active correspondence with those who are engaged in similar pursuits in distant places; they have but little patronage to give to the press and exercise but a small share of influence over it; they have no crowd of dependents about them who hope to grow rich without labor by their countenance and favor, and who are, therefore, always ready to execute their wishes. The planter, the farmer, the mechanic, and the laborer all know that their success depends upon their own industry and economy, and that they must not expect to become suddenly rich by the fruits of their toil. Yet these classes of society form the great body of the people of the United States; they are the bone and sinew of the country; men who love liberty and desire nothing but equal rights and equal laws, and who, moreover, hold the great mass of our national wealth, although it is distributed in moderate amounts among the millions of freemen who possess it. But with overwhelming numbers and wealth on their side they are in constant danger of losing their fair influence in the Government, and with difficulty maintain their just rights against the incessant efforts daily made to encroach upon them.

The mischief springs from the power which the moneyed interest derives from a paper currency which they are able to control, from the multitude of corporations with exclusive privileges which they have succeeded in obtaining in the different States, and which are employed altogether for their benefit, and unless you become more watchful in your States, and check this spirit of monopoly and thirst for exclusive privileges you will, in the end, find that the most important powers of government have been given or bartered away and the control over your dearest interests has passed into the hands of these corporations.

The paper-money system, and its natural associates, monopoly and exclusive privileges, have already struck their roots deep in the soil; and it will require all your efforts to check its further growth and to eradicate the evil. The men who profit by the abuses and desire to perpetuate them will continue to besiege the halls of legislation in the General Government as well as in the States, and will seek, by every artifice, to mislead and deceive the public servants. It is to yourselves that you must look for safety and the means of guarding and perpetuating your free institutions. In your hands is rightfully placed the sovereignty of the country, and to you, everyone placed in authority is ultimately responsible. It is always in your power to see that the wishes of the people are carried into faithful execution, and their will, when once made known, must sooner or later be obeyed. And while the people remain, as I trust they ever will, uncorrupted and incorruptible, and continue watchful and jealous of their rights, the Government is safe, and the cause of freedom will continue to triumph over all its enemies.

But it will require steady and persevering exertions on your part to rid yourself of the iniquities and mischiefs of the paper system, and to check the spirit of monopoly and other abuses which have sprung up with it, and of which it is the main support. So many interests are united to resist all reform on this subject that you must not hope the conflict will be a short one, nor success easy. My humble efforts have not been spared during my administration of the Government, to restore the constitutional currency of gold and silver; and something, I trust, has been done toward the accomplishment of this most desirable object. But enough yet remains to require all your energy and perseverence. The power, however, is in your hands, and the remedy must and will be applied if you determine upon it.—*Jackson's Farewell Address.*

The creation, in time of peace, of a debt likely to become permanent, *is an evil for which there is no equivalent.* The rapidity with which many of the States are apparently approaching to this condition admonishes us of our own duties in a manner too impressive to be disregarded. One, not the least important, is to keep the Federal Government always in a condition to discharge with ease and vigor its highest functions, should their exercise be required by any sudden conjuncture of public affairs—a condition to which we are always exposed, and which may occur when least expected. To this end it is indispensable that its finances should be untrammeled and its resources, so far as practicable, unincumbered. No circumstance should present greater obstacles to the accomplishment of these vitally important objects than the creation of an onerous national debt. Our own experience, and also that of other nations, has demonstrated the unavoidable and fearful rapidity with which a public debt is increased when the government has once surrendered itself to the ruinous practice of supplying its supposed necessities by new loans. The struggle, therefore, on our part, to be successful, must be made at the threshold. To make our efforts effective, severe economy is necessary. This is the surest provision for the national welfare, and it is, at the same time, the best preservative of the principles on which our institutions rest. Simplicity and economy in the affairs of state have never failed to chasten and invigorate republican principles, while these have been as surely subverted by national prodigality under whatever specious pretext it may have been introduced or fostered.—*Van Buren's third annual message.* (*Statesman's Manual*, volume 2, page 1121.)

A few years ago our whole national debt growing out of the Revolution and the war of 1812 with Great Britain was extinguished, and we presented to the world the rare and noble spectacle of a great and growing people who had fully discharged every obligation. Since that time the existing debt has been contracted; and, small as it is in comparison with the similar burdens of most other nations, it should be extinguished at the earliest practicable period. Should the state of the country permit, and, especially if our foreign relations interpose no obstacle, it is contemplated to apply all the moneys in the Treasury as they accrue beyond what is required for the appropriations by Congress to its liquidation. I cherish the hope of soon being able to congratulate the country on its recovering once more the lofty position which it so recently occupied. Our country, which exhibits to the world the benefits of self-government in developing all the sources of national prosperity, owes to mankind the permanent example of a nation free from the blighting influence of a public debt.—*Polk's first annual message, December 2, 1845.* (*Statesman's Manual*, volume 4, page 1462.)

The amount of the public debt to be contracted should be limited to the lowest practicable sum, and should be extinguished as early after the conclusion of the war as the means of the Treasury will permit.

With this view it is recommended that as soon as the war shall be over all the surplus in the Treasury, not needed for other indispensable objects, shall constitute a sinking fund and be applied to the purchase of the funded debt, and that authority be conferred by law for that purpose.—*Polk's third annual message, December 7, 1847.* (*Statesman's Manual*, volume 4, page 1704.)

Besides making the necessary legislative provisions for the execution of the treaty, and the establishment of territorial governments in the ceded country, we have, upon the restoration of peace, other important duties to perform. Among these I regard none as more important than the adoption of proper measures for the speedy extinguishment of the national debt. It is against sound policy and the genius of our institutions that a public debt should be permitted a day longer than the means of the Treasury will enable the Government to pay it off. We should adhere to the wise policy laid down by President Washington, of "avoiding the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden we ourselves ought to bear."—*Polk's special message, July 6, 1848.* (*Statesman's Manual*, volume 4, page 1743.)

In my message of the 6th of July last, transmitting to Congress the ratified treaty of peace with Mexico, I recommended the adoption of measures for the speedy payment of the public debt. In reiterating that recommendation, I refer you to the considerations presented in that message in its support.

* * * * * * *

The public expenditures should be economical and be confined to such necessary objects as are clearly within the powers of Congress. All such as are not absolutely demanded should be postponed and the payment of the public debt at the earliest practicable period should be a cardinal principle of our public policy.—*Polk's fourth annual message, December 5.* (*Statesman's Manual*, volume 4, page 1774.)

The following are from Clay, Calhoun, Crawford, and Benton:

Mr. Clay said, in 1816, he would—

Lay down a general rule, from which there ought never to be a departure without absolute necessity, that the expense of the year ought to be met by the revenue of the year. If in time of war it were impossible to observe this rule *we ought in time of peace to provide for as speedy a discharge of the debt contracted in the preceding war as possible.*

And in 1824 he said:

The payment of that debt and the consequent liberation of the public resources from the charge of it is extremely desirable.

The moral value of the payment of a national debt consists in the demonstration which it affords of the ability of a country to meet and its integrity in fulfilling all its engagements. * * * Whoever may be entitled to the credit of the payment of the public debt, I congratulate you, sir, and the country most cordially that it is so near at hand.

I shall oppose strenuously all attempts to originate a new debt; to create a national bank; to reunite the political and money power—more dangerous than that of church and state—in any form or shape.—*Calhoun on the bill for the issue of Treasury notes, United States Senate, September 18, 1837.* (*Abridgment Debates Congress*, volume 13, page 363.)

An attentive examination of the rise and fall of public debts in other countries can not fail to impress the American Republic with the necessity of making suitable exertions in periods of peace to release the national revenue from so heavy an incumbrance.—*W. H. Crawford, December 16, 1816.*

What more unwise and more unjust than to contract debts on long time, as some of the States have done, thereby invading the rights and mortgaging the resources of posterity, and loading unborn generations with debts not their own? What more unwise than all this, which several of the States have done, and which the effort now is to make all do? Besides the ultimate burden, in the shape of final payment, which is intended to fall upon posterity, the present burden is incessant in the shape of annual interest, and, falling upon each generation, equals the principal in every periodical return of ten or a dozen years. Few have calculated the devouring effect of annual interest on public debts and considered how soon it exceeds the principal.—*Benton's speech on assumption of State debts: Thirty Years' View*, volume 2, page 173.

Mr. Jefferson, as I have shown, held that one generation had no right to bind another generation. He took the actuaries' tables of life insurance and demonstrated that the life of a generation is between nineteen and twenty years, and he held that we had no moral right to impose debts upon the generation that came after us. Every generation that succeeded had a right, he said, to the enjoyment of the earth without any incumbrance upon it. That is what he held. He demonstrated it over and over again. He condemned the increase of the public debt throughout his whole public life, beginning in 1787, and on page after page of our history he has written it, down to 1824.

Though in retirement, at 81 years of age he uttered a warning to the people of the United States to pay the little debt they had which was a danger to them. At 83 years of age, from the little Mount of Monticello, his spirit ascended to heaven. There was a man coming after him whom he did not well understand He feared General Jackson because of his military ambition. Jefferson dreaded a military chieftain. He loved the civilian. He dreaded to see Andrew Jackson come into the Presidency, and yet he did not know that that great man, like himself, was determined to extinguish the public debt of the United States, and during his Administration he paid every dollar of debt and congratulated the country upon its emancipation.

It has been the Democratic policy from the organization of the party to pay the public debt and keep the resources of the country unincumbered by debt and unnecessary taxation.

Mr. President, our people have not only talked that way, not only laid down those as essential principles of our party, but they have acted that way. Under General Washington's Administration they set apart as a sinking fund all the proceeds arising from the sale of public lands, revenue from stills, revenue from carriages and other sources, but it did not amount to a great deal. When Mr. Jefferson came into the Presidency in 1801, after having in the first year opened all the prison doors in which men were incarcerated for the free expression of their opinions about political subjects, he addressed himself to the question of emancipating the people from this devouring moral canker, as he characterized it. Under his influence Congress passed a law setting apart $7,300,000 of the revenues of the Government to be paid toward the extinction of the debt. In 1803 it was increased to $8,000,000 a year, and from 1803 to 1817 that law was enforced and $8,000,000 as a sinking fund was appropriated every year toward the extinction of the little debt which was $75,000,000 under President Washington. In 1817 it was increased to $10,000,000, and during that year over $20,000,000 was paid toward the extinction of the public debt.

These are the footprints of our Democratic fathers on the question of the payment and the extinction of the public debt. When we got out of the war and had a large debt our Republican friends acted very wisely. They went to work and established a sinking fund, and an enormous amount was paid by the generation that fought the war. There was a reduction of some twelve hundred million dollars in the principal of the debt, besides paying annually from one hundred to one hundred and fifty million dollars for interest.

That, Mr. President, was then and is now the established policy of the people of the United States—all of them.

Why is it that we are to stop now? Why is it that our sinking fund is to-day hollow when we touch the vault? It got down to two or three hundred thousand dollars, I believe, year before last, and $1,000,000, I am informed, has been paid this year. But there ought to be fifty or sixty or seventy million dollars paid annually into the sinking fund toward the extinction of the debt. Why have we stopped paying into the sinking fund and keeping up the reduction of the debt? Simply because within the last year or two the great moneyed corporations of the country have determined to make another death struggle to stop the extinction of the debt, to enlarge and perpetuate it, and to drive all rivals out of the field that they may have the power to issue all of the paper currency of the country. They are trying to control the politics of both the Republican and Democratic parties. The business men have come out, it is said. I saw last year the utterance of some of the business men. They said they had reproached themselves for not having taken a proper interest in public measures and that then, which was last year, they intended to make their influence felt in the politics of the country. It has been felt, and felt to the great injury of the people of the United States. We have reached the point when we must decide whether we will go on or turn back. Shall we go forward and pay the debt and keep our currency system, or shall we turn around, retrace our steps, and build up the debt, establish and fortify and keep an aristocracy to control the Government, and stop the vain pursuit of maintaining free institutions and transmitting them unimpaired to our children?

Mr. Jefferson said a long time ago that parties were the product of natural laws; that parties depended in a great measure upon the condition of men's minds; that the parties we have to-day were the parties that existed two or three hundred years ago. They were called Whig and Tory in Great Britain during the revolutionary times of 1688, when the great struggles were made for English liberty. They are now called the Liberal and the Conservative parties. In the organization of our Government it was Republican and Federalist. It is now Republican and Democrat. He said the proper designation of parties all the time would be Democrat on one side and Aristocrat on the other; that the principles contended for by the Liberals and the Whigs in England, the Republicans in the early day, and the Democrats of to-day were personal liberty, secured by local self-government, the creation of a national government for foreign purposes and to regulate questions at issue between the different States of the Union, but holding the great mass of powers close to the people, for the reason that they could control the administration of those powers toward securing their liberty.

We all have read the history of the great struggle which was made when the Constitution was formed and when it had no bill of rights to secure the liberties of the citizen. He wrote letter after letter from Paris to the leading citizens of the United States demanding that in that instrument before it was ratified the guarantees of personal liberty should be secured, the right of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, the habeas corpus as one of the chosen instruments to secure the liberty of the person, and trial by jury. All these great safeguards of our liberty he had written in that Constitution when it was ratified by the first Congress of the United States, and he lived to fight that battle and win that victory and send it down to us charging us to keep the faith, to walk in the precepts of the fathers and enjoy the blessings of free government ourselves, and like men transmit to our children that which our ancestors had transmitted to us.

What has their posterity done for them? They proclaimed

that Constitution and they said it was "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

This, Mr. President, is where I stand to-day. I will not vote for any bill that puts it out of the power of this generation to call in the debt and pay it and extinguish it. What was the character of the bills for loans that were passed by our Government in the days of the fathers? Only one went beyond twenty years, and that was in the Administration of General Washington. Go and look over the loans under Jefferson and Madison and Monroe, with this country involved in war, when Napoleon Bonaparte and all Europe was in arms and both sides fighting us on the ocean, and with war almost every moment, you will find written in loan after loan "redeemable at pleasure," sometimes redeemable after one year, sometimes after three and four years; but in the vast majority of instances they held the power in their hands to call their indebtedness and extinguish the debt at their pleasure and whenever they had the ability to do so.

Mr. Jefferson did not believe, nor did the Democrats a hundred years ago believe, that a public debt was a public blessing, or that it was anything but a public curse. Mr. Madison said it was a public curse, and worse in a republic than under any other form of government. And now we hear our President and our Secretary of the Treasury asking for bonds to be sold for gold to pour through a sieve that is to come back again and sell more bonds to get more gold to pour through the sieve and keep on. They say they want long-time bonds.

Mr. COCKRELL. Fifty-year bonds.

Mr. MILLS. Fifty-year bonds means a thousand years. That is what it means. It means bonds never to be paid. Are we providing to-day for the payment of bonds that were issued payable in 1907? Have we not stopped paying the sinking fund, stopped making any appropriation for their extinction? When they come due nobody will be prepared to pay them. The policy of the long bond is the policy of a perpetual bond. It was not the policy of our fathers. It is not the policy of the Republic. It is not in keeping with the interests of the people of the United States. It is at war with everything that we have been taught in our history from the foundation of the Government to the present time.

Mr. President, no power ought ever to rest on the pages of the statutes of a free people which would authorize a Secretary of the Treasury or any other man to sell the bonds of the Government at his pleasure. That is a most extraordinary power that our friends have put upon the statute books and guarded and kept for this purpose. Whenever such an exigency arises in the history of a people as that the ordinary means of gathering revenues can not be relied on, as when war comes, then it is the duty of the Executive to summon the Congress of the United States, that has the sole power to declare war and make provision for waging it, and say to them, "I want more money than can be obtained by taxation," and then leave it to Congress to provide for the sale of bonds.

But here in a time of profound peace we have upon the statute books of the United States authority discretionary with the Secretary of the Treasury to sell $10,000,000,000 of bonds if he wants to do it, and we can not help ourselves. See how that discretion has been exercised. He sold at first $100,000,000 of ten-year bonds. He received $117,000,000 for them. He next sells $62,000,000 of thirty-year bonds and gets $104,500,000 for them. He sells the long-time bonds for less than the short-time bonds. If money was the demand of the Treasury, if the exigency was such that we could not rely upon taxation to provide the necessary revenue and we had to resort to bonds, why not sell the bonds that would bring the largest amount of money to the Treasury at that time? But it was not done.

Why is all this, Mr. President? Just as I said, there is a tremendous money power in this country and in the world, the money-owning and money-lending power, that have no longer any field for the investment of their enormous capital. They have invested it in manufactures, in railroads, and in mines, some of them in farming, and in one way and another, but now they have accumulated an immense amount of capital which it is not safe to invest except in the securities of the nation; and they are pressing here to find a safe and profitable investment for their money.

Mr. Benton said in 1841, in the Senate of the United States, that the national banking system, with the power that was behind it, was "a monster born of Hell and Chaos." If a bank with $35,000,000 capital, and with eighteen branches in the United States, was a monster born of Hell and Chaos, what is our system, with nearly $700,000,000 of capital and nearly four thousand banks all over the whole country?

I do not mean to say that all the national banks in the United States are engaged in this conspiracy. The small country banks are engaged in a legitimate banking business. It was so in the early days of the State banks. Many of them were doing business legitimately and were not striking at the heart of the State. Many of the country banks are doing the same now.

I want to read a paper from the president of one of the banks in Texas who was called upon to contribute to the loan proposed to be made in a few days:

> Patriotic duty prompts us to refuse to have anything to do with an unnecessary issue of bonds to replenish an unnecessary reserve. Our people have such confidence in the credit of the United States that they do not care whether the gold reserve is one hundred or one hundred millions of dollars.

This is from President James Garitty, of the First National Bank of Corsicana, Tex.

He is a Democrat, an honest man, and a true patriot. He knows that this is a mere pretext, piling up bonds, piling up debts, piling up interest charges, year by year upon the people in order to establish a bankocracy in the United States which will have the power to lend the credit of the United States at 7 per cent interest when the United States can furnish the money without any interest, and is doing it now.

Mr. President, we have the old controversy, fighting against all silver for its removal, for that is what it means, and retirement of the Treasury notes. A few years ago these people pretended that they were afraid that the gold standard would be expelled. They were fighting in ambush. They had masked batteries, from which they were firing. The real fact was they wanted the field of circulation. They wanted the interest to come into their pockets from lending the credit of the United States, instead of seeing the United States lending its own credit without any interest. They wanted bonds, and if the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury is carried out and you permit all the banks to issue circulation to the full extent of the face value of their bonds and to reduce the tax on their circulation to a quarter of 1 per cent, while it is now 1, I suppose all the bonds of the United States will become bases for banking.

It will be profitable then to take all of them and issue all the circulation in lieu of that now occupied by Treasury notes and silver too. Every bond of the Government can be utilized then. That is not the case now, because it is unprofitable to buy bonds worth $120,000,000 and get only $90,000,000 of circulation on them. But when they can issue the whole amount and have their taxation reduced it is possible that they may extend their circulation, and not only occupy the whole field of circulation, but occupy the field of legislation as well. It will be a tremendous power, the influence of which will be felt in the Senate and House of Representatives, in the executive department, and will sweep the Supreme Court off its feet, for the power to construe is the power to make laws. If the courts do not adhere to the Constitution as it was expounded by the fathers who made it, there is no limit that I can see to their elasticity of construction. They can construe it into a monarchy or an aristocracy if they choose.

That would be absurd, of course; but the decision they made overruling all the decisions of a hundred years on the income tax is just as absurd as if they had said that this was a hereditary Government. I care nothing for the personal opinions of this, that, or the other lawyer. Every lawyer in the United States understands that it is a rule of law when a question has once been decided and held to be decided over and over again for a great length of time that it is the duty of the courts to have it stand decided. Rights of property are acquired and held under it and to reverse it is to unsettle everything, and it is the duty of the courts to adhere to and maintain the rule as it has been pronounced and enforced for a century.

But this power is getting so great that it seems the whole Government is about to be swept off its feet. My arraignment of this power may appear ridiculous to-day. John Randolph said in 1816 that you might as well attack Gibraltar with a pocket pistol as to attack the banking system; that you might as well preach Christianity in the streets of Constantinople as to argue against the banking system then in the United States. If that was the case in his day, what must it be to-day, when there is such a tremendous power organized all over the country? But I leave it with the people. As General Jackson said in his farewell address, so I say to them, "The power is in your hands, and the remedy must and will be applied if you determine upon it."

STATUE OF MAJOR-GENERAL STARK.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. On the 9th instant I reported from the Committee on the Library the bill (S. 130) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H. I find that there has been a misprint in the bill. It reads, in line 18, on page 2 of the bill, "the Joint Committee on Printing." It should read, "the Joint Committee on the Library." I desire to have the correction made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The correction will be made, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

FUNDS FOR COAST DEFENSES.

Mr. LODGE. I introduced yesterday an amendment which I asked to have printed, as I intended to propose it to the bill (S. 1159)

to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses. The amendment proposes to authorize a loan, the proceeds of the loan to be used exclusively for the purpose of seacoast defense. In printing the amendment a misprint was made, which omits the rate of interest, which was fixed in the amendment as I offered it at 3 per cent per annum. I should like to have that correction made and the amendment reprinted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to have the amendment referred?

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have it referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses, as it relates to a bill which that committee has under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so referred.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills:

A bill (S. 43) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes,' approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof"; and

A bill (S. 628) to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami*.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business of yesterday.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance, on which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President——

Mr. PUGH. Will the Senator from Kansas allow me to introduce a resolution and have it read, merely giving a notice regarding the disposition of it?

Mr. PEFFER. Certainly.

Mr. PUGH. I send to the desk a concurrent resolution, and ask that it be read.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas by the act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," approved March 18, 1869, it was provided and declared that the faith of the United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment, in coin or its equivalent, of all interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had expressly provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver; and

Whereas all the bonds of the United States authorized to be issued by the act entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, by the terms of said act were declared to be redeemable in coin of the then present standard value, bearing interest payable semiannually in such coin; and

Whereas all bonds of the United States authorized to be issued under the act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, are required to be of the description of bonds of the United States described in the said act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt"; and

Whereas at the date of the passage of said act of Congress last aforesaid, to wit, the 14th day of July, 1870, the coin of the United States of standard value of that date included silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains each, declared by the act approved January 18, 1837, entitled "An act supplementary to the act entitled 'An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,'" to be a legal tender of payment, according to the nominal value, for any sums whatever: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That all the bonds of the United States issued, or authorized to be issued, under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited, are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in violation of the public faith, nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor.

Mr. PUGH. The concurrent resolution I have introduced is an exact copy of what is known as the Stanley Matthews resolution, which passed both Houses of Congress in 1878 by a two-thirds vote. I ask that the concurrent resolution lie over under the rule until to-morrow morning, when I shall ask for a vote on it without debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will lie over as requested.

Mr. PUGH subsequently said: I gave notice a short time ago that to-morrow morning without debate I should ask for a vote on the resolution I introduced. Since that time I have been informed by several Senators that they will necessarially be absent and unable to attend to-morrow, and they requested me to let the resolution lie over until Monday, which I will do, and then ask for a vote upon it.

Mr. PEFFER addressed the Senate. After having spoken for more than two hours——

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. PEFFER. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. Unless the Senator from Kansas is nearly through, I desire to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. PEFFER. I am not nearly through; and if it suits the convenience of the Senate I should prefer to continue my remarks to-morrow, as I am getting somewhat fatigued.

[Mr. PEFFER's speech will be published entire after it shall have been concluded.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Before the Senator from New Hampshire submits a motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business, I hope he will yield to me, that I may make a motion.

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado for that purpose.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-morrow it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senator from Colorado will not insist on his motion. There are a good many resolutions that we want to have considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], that when the Senate adjourn to-morrow it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 16, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 15, 1896.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Chief Engineer George W. Melville, United States Navy, to be Engineer in Chief and Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, with the relative rank of commodore, in the Department of the Navy, from the 16th day of January, 1896.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Cavalry arm.

Second Lieut. Robert Lee Howze, Sixth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, January 9, 1896, vice Swift, Ninth Cavalry, deceased.

POSTMASTERS.

Charles R. Brandon, to be postmaster at Litchfield, in the county of Montgomery and State of Illinois, in the place of Edwin C. Thorp, resigned.

Wilbert W. Lewis, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Summit and State of Ohio, in the place of Isaiah B. Jones, whose commission expired December 17, 1895, this nomination being made to correct an error in name, Webster W. Lewis having been confirmed for postmaster at this office January 7, 1896.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 15, 1896.

CONSUL.

Albert E. Morlan, of Louisiana, to be consul of the United States at Belize, British Honduras.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Arthur K. Delaney, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for the District of Alaska.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Charles B. Simonton, of Tennessee, to be attorney of the United States for the western district of Tennessee.

Burton E. Bennett, of Washington, to be attorney of the United States for the District of Alaska.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Daniel W. Blake, of Mississippi, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Third Lieut. Walker W. Joynes, of South Carolina, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. John C. Cantwell, of North Carolina, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

POSTMASTERS.

Patrick H. McCarthy, to be postmaster at North Bennington, in the county of Bennington and State of Vermont.

Willis E. Fuller, to be postmaster at Enosburg Falls, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont.

John M. Winslow, to be postmaster at Nantucket, in the county of Nantucket and State of Massachusetts.

J. J. Eichar, to be postmaster at Clarksville, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa.

Soren P. Sorenson, to be postmaster at Albert Lea, in the county of Freeborn and State of Minnesota.

Thomas C. Tracy, to be postmaster at Island Pond, in the county of Essex and State of Vermont.

George W. Blair, to be postmaster at Lamoni, in the county of Decatur and State of Iowa.

Peter Stephany, to be postmaster at Manning, in the county of Carroll and State of Iowa.

Edward McCoy, to be postmaster at Rock Rapids, in the county of Lyon and State of Iowa.

William R. Flemming, to be postmaster at Armstrong, in the county of Emmet and State of Iowa.

John B. Connrardy, to be postmaster at Exira, in the county of Audubon and State of Iowa.

Julius F. Kerberg, to be postmaster at Sanborn, in the county of O'Brien and State of Iowa.

John Selby, to be postmaster at Prairie City, in the county of Jasper and State of Iowa.

William U. Sulser, to be postmaster at Ireton, in the county of Sioux and State of Iowa.

Edward M. Harrington, to be postmaster at Story City, in the county of Story and State of Iowa.

Jacob Burns, to be postmaster at Humansville, in the county of Polk and State of Missouri.

Orvin J. Rea, to be postmaster at Tracy, in the county of Lyon and State of Minnesota.

Hugh H. Gilday, to be postmaster at Janesville, in the county of Waseca and State of Minnesota.

Charles T. Hamilton, to be postmaster at Montgomery City, in the county of Montgomery and State of Missouri.

James H. Fleming, to be postmaster at Dexter, in the county of Stoddard and State of Missouri.

Weston Dawson, to be postmaster at New Madrid, in the county of New Madrid and State of Missouri.

Katharine Du Bois, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Saunders and State of Nebraska.

John F. Bradshaw, to be postmaster at Superior, in the county of Nuckolls and State of Nebraska.

George W. Bishop, to be postmaster at Wonewoc, in the county of Juneau and State of Wisconsin.

Ida B. Morse, to be postmaster at Atkinson, in the county of Holt and State of Nebraska.

Michael M. Huck, to be postmaster at Schuyler, in the county of Colfax and State of Nebraska.

John F. Early, to be postmaster at Wilber, in the county of Saline and State of Nebraska.

Joseph D. Baker, to be postmaster at Edgar, in the county of Clay and State of Nebraska.

James D. Robertson, to be postmaster at Grafton, in the county of Walsh and State of North Dakota.

Orlando S. Parmelee, to be postmaster at Tekamah, in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska.

Charles P. Livingston, to be postmaster at Whittier, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

Virgil O. Harter, to be postmaster at South Riverside, in the county of Riverside and State of California.

Thomas J. Wylie, to be postmaster at Nogales, in the county of Pima and Territory of Arizona.

Thomas A. Fleming, to be postmaster at Williams, in the county of Coconino and Territory of Arizona.

Robert M. Griffin, to be postmaster at Lonoke, in the county of Lonoke and State of Arkansas.

Howard B. Dudley, to be postmaster at Stuttgart, in the county of Arkansas and State of Arkansas.

Orlando Streshly, to be postmaster at Azusa, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

Robert J. Collins, to be postmaster at Hattiesburg, in the county of Perry and State of Mississippi.

Frank W. Barnes, to be postmaster at Wagoner, in the Creek Nation, Ind. T.

Bright B. Nunnally, to be postmaster at Marianna, in the county of Lee and State of Arkansas.

Lucas Rowntree, to be postmaster at Bartlett, in the county of Williamson and State of Texas.

Andy J. Chessher, to be postmaster at Jacksonville, in the county of Cherokee and State of Texas.

Edward M. Scott, to be postmaster at Rosedale, in the county of Bolivar and State of Mississippi.

Milton P. Tribble, to be postmaster at Anderson, in the county of Anderson and State of South Carolina.

Edward G. Winston, to be postmaster at Smithville, in the county of Bastrop and State of Texas.

Louis T. Walker, to be postmaster at Commerce, in the county of Hunt and State of Texas.

Joseph F. Gregory, to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Lancaster and State of South Carolina.

E. Ransford Clinkscales, to be postmaster at Fort Brook, in the county of Hillsboro and State of Florida.

Joseph F. Appling, to be postmaster at Jasper, in the county of Walker and State of Alabama.

Mary M. Connell, to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Robertson and State of Tennessee.

E. E. Poag, to be postmaster at Rockhill, in the county of York and State of South Carolina.

John P. Little, to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Laurens and State of South Carolina.

Fred W. Brush, to be postmaster at Salida, in the county of Chaffee and State of Colorado.

Angus J. McPhee, to be postmaster at Eureka, in the county of Jaub and Territory of Utah.

Caleb R. Barratt, to be postmaster at Salt Lake City, in the county of Salt Lake and Territory of Utah.

H. S. McDowell, to be postmaster at Highlands, in the county of Arapahoe and State of Colorado.

Charles H. Holt, to be postmaster at Buena Vista, in the county of Chaffee and State of Colorado.

Charles A. Crane, to be postmaster at Colorado City, in the county of El Paso and State of Colorado.

Jacob Weil, to be postmaster at Las Animas, in the county of Bent and State of Colorado.

Adelbert Van Deusen, to be postmaster at Lamar, in the county of Prowers and State of Colorado.

H. A. Noeckel, to be postmaster at Lansdowne, in the county of Delaware and State of Pennsylvania.

Robert W. Hutchins, to be postmaster at Wyoming, in the county of Luzerne and State of Pennsylvania.

William H. Dengler, to be postmaster at Quakertown, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania.

Collins Dean, to be postmaster at Annville, in the county of Lebanon and State of Pennsylvania.

Edward A. Mellon, to be postmaster at Patton, in county of Cambria and State of Pennsylvania.

Dora M. McElhany, to be postmaster at Brockwayville, in the county of Jefferson and State of Pennsylvania.

Hugh H. McClellan, to be postmaster at Marionville, in the county of Forest and State of Pennsylvania.

George F. Stearns, to be postmaster at Chester, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

George H. Ford, to be postmaster at Waterville, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

Asaph W. Shurtleff, to be postmaster at Weedsport, in the county of Cayuga and State of New York.

John Neafie Johnson, to be postmaster at Freehold, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey.

Timothy Barrett, to be postmaster at South Orange, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey.

Samuel E. Phelps, to be postmaster at Windsor, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

A. Winthrop Williams, to be postmaster at Highland, in the county of Ulster and State of New York.

Hiram Steele, to be postmaster at Arcade, in the county of Wyoming and State of New York.

John Kimmel, to be postmaster at Wayland, in the county of Steuben and State of New York.

Edward B. Burr, to be postmaster at Brewer, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.

George W. Beal, to be postmaster at Lisbon Falls, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine.

Herbert M. Bates, to be postmaster at Calais, in the county of Washington and State of Maine.

James A. Snow, to be postmaster at Medway, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

George L. Beals, to be postmaster at Florence, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts.

John L. Cummings, to be postmaster at Livermore Falls, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 15, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. CURTIS, asks to be excused from service on the Committee on Public Lands. Without objection, his request will be granted, and the Chair will appoint the gentleman from Utah, Mr. ALLEN.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

RIGHT OF WAY ACROSS PUBLIC LANDS FOR RESERVOIR AND CANAL PURPOSES.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the desk. I ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The bill (H. R. 3018) to amend the act approved March 3, 1891, granting the right of way upon the public lands for reservoir and canal purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to permit the use of the right of way through the public lands for tramroads, canals, and reservoirs, and for other purposes," approved January 21, 1895, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following:

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered, under general regulations to be fixed by him, to permit the use of right of way to the extent of 25 feet, together with the use of necessary ground, not exceeding 40 acres, upon the public lands and forest reservations of the United States, by any citizen or association of citizens of the United States, for the purposes of generating, manufacturing, or distributing electric power."

The SPEAKER. The question is upon granting unanimous consent.

Mr. CRISP. It is to be hoped that an explanation will be made of the bill before consent is given.

The SPEAKER. Reserving the right to object, an explanation can be made if the House desires.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical with the bill that was reported favorably to the House during the last Congress, but could not be taken up until late in the session. The bill has passed the Senate. The bill was drawn in the office of the Secretary of the Interior and of the Commissioner of the General Land Office. It is approved and indorsed by both of them, as will be seen in the report made to the last Congress. That bill was a substitute for the Caminetti bill.

It is my opinion that this bill—

The Caminetti bill—

should not become a law. I would recommend, however, legislation by way of amendment of the act of January 21, 1895, before mentioned, in effect as follows, viz:

"That the act entitled 'An act to permit the use of the right of way through the public lands for tramroads, canals, and reservoirs, and for other purposes,' approved January 21, 1895, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following:

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered, under general regulations to be fixed by him, to permit the use of right of way to the extent of 25 feet, together with the use of necessary ground, not exceeding 40 acres, upon the public lands and forest reservations of the United States by any citizen or association of citizens of the United States, for the purposes of generating, manufacturing, or distributing electric power."

Very respectfully, S. W. LAMOREUX, *Commissioner.*

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. McMILLIN. What amount of land do the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office recommend be given? Do they make a recommendation as to the quantum of land.

Mr. BOWERS. They do. They make this recommendation:

Permit the use of right of way to the extent of 25 feet, together with the use of necessary ground, not exceeding 40 acres.

That is all under the restrictions and regulations of the Secretary of the Interior. The existing law admits a right of way across public lands and reservations for ditches for irrigating purposes. This simply extends the right to construct that ditch for the purpose of conveying water to provide electric power across the public lands and reservations; and the bill, as I have said, if the gentleman from Tennessee will give me his attention, was drawn in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and indorsed by him to the House. There can be no objection to it. I will say that about 6,000,000 acres of land have been given, including the crest of the Sierra Nevadas, for reservations, the source of all those streams, and our people want to get water for the development of electric power for lighting towns, for machinery, and various other purposes. I hope there will be no objection to it whatever.

Mr. McMILLIN. Does the bill apply only to the State of California?

Mr. BOWERS. No; it applies generally to reservations.

Mr. McMILLIN. Does it include the National Park also, with all the other reservations of the Government?

Mr. BOWERS. It applies only to reservations under the control of the Secretary of the Interior. It simply amends the law, extending the same right and giving no further right than is now possessed by ditches carrying water for irrigation.

Mr. McMILLIN. Has this bill been recommended by any committee of this House?

Mr. BOWERS. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Lands of this House—by the full committee.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague on the committee will allow me, I will state that this bill does not grant or authorize the grant of any land. It only authorizes the Department to issue permits for the use of these lands for the purposes stated. It does not apply to the National Yellowstone Park, nor to military reservations, but only to lands reserved for forestry purposes.

Mr. McMILLIN. Does the bill provide that these grants may be revoked?

Mr. McRAE. The bill makes no grant.

Mr. McMILLIN. Well, these privileges.

Mr. McRAE. They are issued by and are all under control of the Secretary of the Interior. The bill makes no grant and vests no title to any lands.

Mr. McMILLIN. I observe that the matter is under the control of the Secretary so far as giving permission is concerned, but does the bill provide that he may revoke a permit if it should be abused or if it should become to the interest of the Government to have it revoked?

Mr. McRAE. He has the power to do that. But, Mr. Speaker, what I rose to say was that this bill does not make any grant or authorize the making of any grant, and that no person under it can acquire title to any land. No person can get anything but a permit to use for the purpose indicated in the bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. I was anxious, Mr. Speaker, to see that there should not be granted any privileges which would be beyond the control of the Government. I think that the interests of those who are to receive benefits from this action indirectly demand that the power of revocation should exist somewhere, so that privileges given to corporations furnishing light or power shall not be abused. I am glad to learn that that is provided for.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, and ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BOWERS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell; and

A bill (S. 941) granting to the Atchison and Nebraska Railroad Company and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, its lessee in perpetuity, the right of way over a part of the Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian Reservation in the States of Kansas and Nebraska.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—CHESEBROUGH VS. M'CLELLAN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Elections to present to the House its report in the contested-election case of Robert A. Chesebrough *vs.* George B. McClellan, Twelfth Congressional district of the State of New York, and to ask for the present consideration of the report.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on Elections No. 2 to whom was referred the contested election case of Robert A. Chesebrough against George B. McClellan, from the Twelfth Congressional district of the State of New York, respectfully report to the House that they have duly considered said case, and find the facts therein to be as follows:

The contestant was the Republican candidate and the contestee was the Democratic candidate for Representative to the Fifty-fourth Congress from said district at the regular election held therein on the 6th day of November, 1894; that at a meeting of the State board of canvassers of the State of New York, held at the city of Albany on the 14th day of December following, contestee was declared the legally elected Representative from the district, and that thereafter the secretary of state of New York duly issued to him a certificate of his election, all in conformity to the laws of the State; that afterwards, such certificate having been transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, his name was, by that official, placed upon its roll, and he now occupies the seat in the House; that after the election of contestee had been so declared, and within the time prescribed by statute, the contestant served upon him notice of contest of said election, alleging as

grounds for contest the casting of illegal votes thereat, and that during the political canvass which preceded the election contestee had instigated the Metropolitan Association of Cycling Clubs to issue and distribute among the electors of the district a circular which falsely charged him with having opposed the passage of a law in the State of New York which granted to cyclists equal rights with the users of all other kinds of vehicles in the public highways in the city and State of New York and in the public parks of said city, and which falsely charged that he had signed a petition opposing the passage of said law; that in this circular the users of cycles in said district and their friends were called upon to vote for contestee and against contestant, and that, because of and influenced by the false statements contained in this circular, many electors in said district who were cyclers were prejudiced against him and induced to vote for contestee who would but for such false charges have cast their ballots for him; that after the serving of said notice upon the contestee, and within the time fixed by law, the contestee served upon contestant his answer to the notice of contest, in which he denied the casting or counting of any illegal votes at such election, and also denied that he had instigated the issuing or circulation of a circular containing false charges against contestant, or that he had falsely charged him with having signed a petition against the passage of said law, or that such circular had advised cyclers and their friends to vote for him, but, in said answer, he alleged it to be the fact that in May, 1887, the contestant had signed his name to a petition protesting against the passage of a bill by the legislature of the State of New York commonly known as the "wheelman's liberty bill," which bill subsequently passed the legislature and became a law on the 27th day of June, 1887; that after the serving of the notice of contest, the contestant addressed a letter to the contestee in which he stated that he had observed that contestee had been quoted in a newspaper as saying that a petition signed by contestant remonstrating against the passage of the "wheelman's liberty bill" was in existence, and in which letter he further declared that if the contestee could procure and exhibit to him without delay such a petition he would agree to withdraw from his contest of the election, notwithstanding he had been advised that he could maintain a successful contest upon the other grounds set forth in his notice. In this letter he also informed the contestee that before serving notice of contest upon him he had made unsuccessful inquiry for such a petition as he had been alleged to have signed of parties claimed to have knowledge or possession of the same, and that he had also demanded of the authors of said circular the evidence of his having signed such a petition, and that he had been informed by them that they had no personal knowledge of the existence of such evidence, but had signed such circular upon the statements and at the request of others, and that, believing that a wrong had been done him by the wheelmen in the interest of contestee, and having been unable to obtain any evidence of his having ever signed such a petition, he had instituted the contest.

And your committee further show that, after the delivery of the said letter, the parties to this contest had a personal interview at the place of business of the contestant; that thereafter the latter addressed to the contestee a letter in which, after making reference to the conversation which had occurred between them at such interview, and admitting that the contestee had then and there exhibited to him a certain petition against the use by bicyclers of the driveways in Central Park, in the city of New York, signed by contestant and 100 other persons, nearly eight years before, notified contestee that he withdrew entirely from his contest of the election to Congress from said Twelfth Congressional district, and requested him to return to him the notice of contest previously served upon him in the case; that in this letter contestant declared that he was unable to recall the circumstances under which he had signed his name to said petition, and that he could not admit that the signing of the same by him justified the vindictive attack made upon him by the wheelmen.

Your committee still further show that afterwards, to wit, on the 26th day of February, 1895, the notice of contest and answer in said cause were filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, together with the affidavit of contestee; that no testimony had been taken in the case; that the said letters addressed as aforesaid to the contestee by contestant were before your committee while they were considering the case; and that the contestant has never appeared before your committee, either in person or by attorney, and that no testimony has, as the committee is informed and believes, ever been taken by either of the parties to the case, but that the contestant has in good faith withdrawn from his contest.

In view of the matters and facts hereinbefore recited, your committee do recommend to the House the adoption of the following resolution, to wit:

"*Resolved*, That Robert A. Chesebrough was not elected a Representative from the Twelfth Congressional district of the State of New York to the Fifty-fourth Congress, and is not entitled to the seat.

"*Resolved*, That George B. McClellan was duly elected a Representative from the Twelfth Congressional district of the State of New York to the Fifty-fourth Congress, and that he is entitled to the seat."

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolutions reported by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again read the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Robert A. Chesebrough was not elected a Representative from the Twelfth Congressional district of the State of New York to the Fifty-fourth Congress, and is not entitled to the seat.

Resolved, That George B. McClellan was duly elected a Representative from the Twelfth Congressional district of the State of New York to the Fifty-fourth Congress, and that he is entitled to the seat.

The resolutions were adopted unanimously.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolutions were adopted was laid on the table.

FORFEITURE OF LAND GRANTS.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, there is on the Speaker's table a Senate bill (S. 43) precisely similar in character to one reported this morning from the House Committee on Public Lands, and I ask that it remain for the present on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose?

Mr. ELLIS. In order that I may call it up later. It is similar to a bill which has just been reported from the Committee on Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that Senate bill No. 43, now on the Speaker's table——

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe I will ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered at this time.

There being no objection, the bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes,' approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof," approved December 12, 1893, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That section 3 of an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes,' approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof, be, and the same is, amended so as to extend the time within which persons entitled to purchase lands forfeited by said act shall be permitted to purchase the same, in the quantities and upon the terms provided in said section, at any time prior to January 1, 1897: *Provided*, That actual residence upon the lands by persons claiming the right to purchase the same shall not be required where such lands have been fenced, cultivated, or otherwise improved by such claimants, and such persons shall be permitted to purchase two or more tracts of such lands by legal subdivisions, whether contiguous or not, but not exceeding 320 acres in the aggregate."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just read?

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think it is proper that the gentleman from Oregon should make some explanation of this bill.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which was passed during the closing hours of the last Congress, but it did not get to the Senate until the 2d or 3d day of March, and it met the fate of some forty-five or fifty other bills which did not reach the President in time to be considered by him.

This bill does not enlarge the rights of settlers in any way. The first ruling of the Department when the settlers first went upon these lands was that those who had settled upon the forfeited railroad lands should have the right to purchase not exceeding 320 acres, without regard to the question whether the lands lay contiguous or not. Therefore some persons, wanting to get a water privilege, selected small tracts of land down in the canyon, where land would be comparatively worthless for tillage, and took the remainder of their tracts upon the plateau, on which, during favorable seasons, they could raise something of a crop. By a subsequent ruling of the Department of the Interior it was held that settlers must reside upon the land and that the different portions of the tract purchased must lie contiguous. Under this ruling persons who had segregated their selections in the manner I have just stated in order to get a water privilege were denied the opportunity to receive the maximum amount of land allowed under the law as originally passed.

Now, during the closing hours of the last Congress an act was passed granting to such persons the right to make up the quantity of land they had thus lost; but that bill did not get through the Senate in time to reach the President and secure his signature. The present bill has been unanimously passed in this Congress by the Senate and has received a unanimous report in its favor from the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Has this bill been recommended by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. ELLIS. It has been recommended by the Commissioner of the General Land Office in a long letter, which is embodied in the report of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Does this bill extend the time for the completion of purchases?

Mr. ELLIS. No, sir; it makes no extension whatever.

Mr. MCMILLIN. It grants nothing beyond what was granted by the bill passed in the last Congress?

Mr. ELLIS. None whatever.

Mr. MCMILLIN. What amount of land is involved?

Mr. ELLIS. The bill does not increase in any respect the rights of the settlers; they will not be able under this bill to purchase any greater amount of land than they could under the original law.

Mr. MCMILLIN. But what is the amount of land involved?

Mr. ELLIS. The maximum which can be obtained by any person is 320 acres, where a contract to that extent was made with the railroad company prior to the ruling of the Department.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The gentleman does not understand my question. I mean to ask what is the aggregate amount of land which will be affected by this legislation—not the amount which any one individual may purchase?

Mr. ELLIS. I am unable to answer the gentleman accurately on that point. For a considerable portion of the land purchased patents were obtained. This bill will not affect probably more than one-fourth of the amount covered by the original grant.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ELLIS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. LACEY. I suggest that the House bill of similar purport to the Senate bill just passed be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

AMERICAN REGISTER FOR STEAMER MIAMI.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill No. 628, which is identical in language with House bill No. 1713, which the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have unanimously reported with a favorable recommendation.

The bill (S. 628) to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami* was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Navigation is hereby authorized and directed to cause the foreign-built steamer *Nerito*, owned by Charles W. Hogan, a citizen of the United States, to be registered as a vessel of the United States under the name of *Miami*.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to cause the inspection of said vessel, steam boilers, steam pipes, and their appurtenances, and cause to be granted the usual certificate issued to steam vessels of the merchant marine without reference to the fact that said steam boilers, steam pipes, and appurtenances were not constructed pursuant to the laws of the United States, and were not constructed of iron stamped pursuant to said laws; and the tests in the inspection of said boilers, steam pipes, and appurtenances shall be the same in all respects as to strength and safety as are required in the inspection of boilers constructed in the United States for marine purposes.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the House committee be read for information.

There being no objection, the report of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries (by Mr. PAYNE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1713) entitled "A bill to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami*," having had the same under consideration, submit the following report:

It appears from the evidence before the committee that the owner of the vessel in question is an American citizen; that in September, 1894, while bearing the name of *Nerito* and sailing under British ownership, the vessel was wrecked off Sable Island, Nova Scotia, where she lay on the sand, high inshore, and abandoned by her owners for ten months; that after several expeditions had been sent out by the Merritt Wrecking Company to save her, she was finally floated, brought to New York, and sold as a wreck by the agent of the foreign underwriters to the present owner, named in the bill, for the sum of $10,229.28; that the contract between the present owner and the John N. Robbins Company, American shipbuilders, provides for repairs to the amount of $36,450, which were, by the terms of the contract, to be completed on or before January 15, 1896, and which, your committee are informed, are completed already; that this amount is in excess of the amount required by section 4136 of the Revised Statutes, viz, more than equal to three-fourths of the cost of the vessel when so repaired.

The only bar to the registry of this vessel under the general law is the fact that she was wrecked outside and not inside the waters of the United States.

The committee is of the opinion that the case comes within the spirit of the law, and that the bill ought to pass.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, House bill No. 1713, similar in its provisions to the Senate bill just passed, will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] being absent, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] will occupy the chair in Committee of the Whole.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. DINGLEY in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriation for payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to send to the desk and have read for the information of the House an amendment which I propose to offer to the pending bill at the proper time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the bill on page 3, in line 5, after the words "per annum," by adding the following:

"*Provided further*, That widows of pensioners under the general law shall be allowed $12 per month, notwithstanding the evidence may show that the husband died of diseases not contracted in the service, and for which he was pensioned."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to have this read simply as part of his remarks, because it would not be in order to offer it as an amendment to the bill at the present time?

Mr. MORSE. I do, sir. I desire to offer it and have it read as a part of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask the House to indulge me for a few moments in some remarks leading up to this amendment and argue the necessity for its adoption, and also some remarks upon the attitude of this Government with reference to the Armenian outrages.

First, I desire most heartily to indorse the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF] on Monday and supported by that gentleman with an eloquent defense.

There are not far from 900,000 soldiers and soldiers' widows on the pension roll of the country. That security in possession of this bounty of the Government, granted them by a generous nation, whose life they helped to save, which is necessary to peace of mind, security, and comfort in its possession, is denied them by the present Commissioner of Pensions.

I think it is safe to say that scarcely one of the 900,000 soldiers and soldiers' widows whose names are borne upon the pension roll of the country but what is in constant fear that their pension will be reduced or stopped altogether. And they have good ground for solicitude and fear, because hundreds and thousands of such worthy pensioners have either had their pension reduced or taken away altogether by the unwarranted, and I believe illegal and unjust, conduct of the Pension Bureau as now administered.

I think, in view of all that has been said upon this floor during this debate, I am justified in saying that the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions have overridden the acts of Congress and have assumed legislative as well as judicial functions.

There are a number of instances of men 80 years of age who have had their pensions reduced or discontinued on the ground that they were not incapacitated from manual labor in a pensionable degree.

It has been held by the present Commissioner that a man who lost an eye or who was deaf in one ear was not pensionable under the act of June 27, 1890, such soldiers not being incapacitated from manual labor under that law.

Could there be anything more foreign to the spirit and letter of the law, or the intention of the Fifty-first Congress, which passed this act, than these illustrations which I have mentioned.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the thermometer is 20° below zero over at the Pension Bureau for Union soldiers and loyal men.

Mr. Chairman, I denounce the use of the post-office officials as spies upon the pensioners. [Applause.] I go further than that, and I denounce the present general spy system as a whole, under the name of "pension examiners," as conducted at present by the Pension Bureau. I have somehow got the notion that these "examiners" believe that their continuance in their position is dependent upon their ability to find pretexts to take away the little stipends the soldiers are receiving from the Government.

In some instances that have come under my knowledge, the pensioner is approached by these examiners in the guise of a friend. The old soldier puts his best foot forward, he makes the best possible showing of his circumstances and his worldly condition to his new-found friend, and this information obtained in this way is used against him to reduce his pension or to take it away altogether.

Mr. KIEFER. That is un-American, too.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; as my friend says, it is an un-American policy.

It was never the intention of Congress, and is not the wish of the people of our country, that the pension laws should be administered in such a narrow, niggardly, contemptible manner; but it was the intention of Congress and the people who sent us here to legislate that these laws should have a liberal construction, and that the defender of his country and his country's flag, in his declining years, should be given the benefit of a liberal construction and a generous application of these laws.

As a justification of the conduct of the Pension Bureau, wholesale charges of fraud and dishonesty have been made against the Union soldiers by the highest officers of this Government, including the President of the United States, and when we demand specifications, and that they should tell us when and where these frauds have been committed, they are not forthcoming, and at any rate the number is insignificant and unimportant as compared to the whole number of pensioners borne upon the rolls.

I throw these charges back to the men who make them, and I say that the Union soldiers who periled their all that the country might live, and who took their lives in their hands to save us, a nation among the nations of the earth, are honorable, honest, and truthful men, and that these charges of fraud and dishonesty are unjust and untrue, and are a vile slander upon the brave defenders of the Union.

And now I come to the amendment which I have offered, and I offer this amendment to meet another unfair and unjust ruling of the Pension Bureau.

The motto of the Pension Bureau seems to be "how not to do it." Every possible pretext is used to delay action. The applicant is sent back again and again for "more evidence," and not infrequently the poor fellow gives up in despair and says, "It is no use; I can't get a pension."

Not infrequently during this Administration has the poor soldier been driven to suicide by the obstacles thrown in his way, by the reduction of his pension, or by the taking it away altogether. I know of a case of a man over 80 years old who had his pension stopped by the present Commissioner of Pensions who died within thirty days of a broken heart. He never spoke one pleasant word after his pension was stopped. Do you suppose, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, that Congress ever contemplated any such administration as this of the Pension Bureau or any such construction of the pension laws as this?

I come now, I say, to speak of my amendment. In the line of the general policy of the present administration of the office, it is the practice in all cases of soldiers' widows whose husbands were pensioners under the old law, and who are entitled to $12 per month in all cases where the attending physician fails to certify that death resulted from the disease or wound for which the soldier was pensioned—I say where the physician certifies some other cause of death the Pension Bureau assumes that the pension was fraudulent and the widow is not entitled to a pension under the old law.

Could there be anything more outrageous than this? If a soldier is pensioned for heart failure and dies of pneumonia he is a fraud. If he is pensioned for rheumatism or hernia and dies of consumption he is a fraud.

The Apostle Paul undoubtedly did not know as much about the relations of the different organs of the body as the present Commissioner of Pensions, but he knew enough by way of illustration to say "that when one member suffers all suffer."

And who is authorized to say that the pensionable disease or disability did not cause or aggravate the other disease which caused the soldier's death? The physician is not infallible; he may have made a mistake as to the cause of death.

True, the widow may apply for a pension under the disability act now, but she gets $8 instead of $12. It cheered the old soldier when he was dying to think that his wife and loved ones would have $12 per month when he was gone, and this trick by which the Pension Bureau would beat her out of $4 per month did not occur to him.

Such unfair, unjust treatment of the soldier's widow is unworthy of a great and generous Government like ours.

But I bid my comrades to be of good cheer; "weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." Cheer up, comrades; cheer up, soldiers' widows; there are only four hundred and fourteen days more of Grover Cleveland, Hoke Smith, and William Lochren, when the places that knew them will know them no more, and when the Republicans will have control of every Department of this Government, and when the pension laws will be administered in an honest, liberal, and generous manner.

Once more I say, Comrades, be of good cheer.

I feel like singing the Doxology, "Praise God from whom all blessings flow," over the fact that this unpatriotic Administration is drawing to a close.

Mr. SULLOWAY. And I would like to sing Watts's hymn:

Believing, we rejoice
To see the curse removed.

[Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that we may all rejoice that this unpatriotic Administration is drawing to a close, this bond-issuing, debt-increasing, factory-closing, wage-reducing, prosperity-killing Democratic Administration. [Laughter and applause.]

A MEMBER. And you might add in that connection this queen-restoring Administration.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; queen-restoring Administration, as my friend suggests, and a profligate heathen queen at that, that President Cleveland proposed to restore to the throne of the Sandwich Islands after she had threatened to kill and behead all of the Christian white inhabitants on the island and confiscate their property.

Like Belshazzar of old, it has seen the handwriting on the wall over against the candlestick, on the plaster of the King's palace; and it reads, "Thou art weighed in the balances and thou art found wanting."

There is every indication that the solid South is broken. West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Kentucky, Tennessee are already in the Republican columns, and I think we can safely add several other Southern States next year.

The shibboleth "Do you want your sister to marry a nigger?" has lost its force. Mr. Chairman, there is no argument like the bread and butter and business argument. Under the Republican policy of protection the Southern products commanded good prices and the South shared the prosperity of the country.

This condition has been reversed under the present Administration.

Mr. Chairman, to digress from the subject of the pension bill for a few moments. I am sure that the country and the world is appalled at the supineness of the Administration on the subject of the Armenian butchery and outrages.

On yesterday I introduced in the House of Representatives the following resolution on the subject, which was read from the Clerk's desk and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the chairman has advised me that his committee is likely to take some action shortly in the matter:

Whereas the most mournful tragedy of the nineteenth century has been and is now being enacted, under the apparent sanction of the Sultan of Turkey, by which hundreds of thousands of Armenians are being ruthlessly slaughtered in cold blood, women are being driven into a captivity worse than death, and inhabitants who have fled to the mountains are dying of cold and starvation;

Whereas the blood of these martyred dead cry to Heaven for justice:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs consider the expediency of reporting forthwith some expression by this Government in denunciation of these atrocities, and if they find we, as a nation, are powerless to act, that we invoke the cooperation of the allied powers to wipe the Turkish Government off the face of the earth and secure the freedom and independence of Armenia.

Congress and the country, I am sure, have been expecting some special message to Congress from the President upon this tremendous subject. The President sent us a message on the Venezuela boundary dispute, a comparatively trivial and unimportant matter, and I think the House voted a commission, which is now in session, and I think made the mistake of acting upon his recommendation too hastily and without due consideration as to whether there had been any violation of the Monroe doctrine.

But be that as it may, I have been pained and disappointed that we have not had some official utterance from the Administration, at least in denunciation, if nothing more, of this awful, appalling crime of the nineteenth century. The cry of these distressed people appears to be unheard by mortal ear that will help, and is heard only by the pitying ear of Heaven.

And this morning's paper brings the intelligence, through the Turkish minister, that the Sultan's Government will not allow the Red Cross Society to enter his dominion to distribute the charity of our countrymen, to succor the starving, the wounded, and confirming the general belief that the present massacres are a part of a systematic plan on the part of the Turkish Government to exterminate all the Christians in that Empire.

Oh, for a month of Ben Harrison and James G. Blaine. [Applause.]

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to read, as bearing upon this subject, some letters, among many, received in my mail this morning.

ROCKFORD, ILL., *January 14, 1896.*

MY DEAR SIR: May God bless you and yours for the resolution which you introduced in the House on yesterday regarding the Armenian question.

Your scheme has the right ring to it, and I sincerely hope it may go through without delay.

Respectfully, yours, A. W. BANKS.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE, *House of Representatives.*

—

SALEM, MASS., *January 14, 1896.*

MY DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for introducing in the House the resolution in regard to the poor outraged Armenians.

God and humanity will highly esteem the action you have taken to help this unfortunate class of people, which is of far greater importance than questionable boundary lines.

I have Armenians in my employ, and the heartbreaking letters they are receiving from dear ones at home is enough to arouse this Government to take a hand in wiping the Turkish Government off the face of the earth.

Thousands doubtless are to-night praying to God to give you power to move this Government, that some dear one in that wicked country may be spared to them.

Very sincerely, yours, JONATHAN BROWN.

—

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y., *January 14, 1896.*

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you warmly for the resolution introduced by you in the House and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with reference to the barbarities perpetrated in Armenia by the abominable and "unspeakable" Turk.

Every word of your resolution went to my heart, and I trust that you will not allow it to sleep in the committee room.

I have been wondering if our Government would not do something, and if it can not actively interfere, let it at least give such expression as your resolution calls for.

I especially like your invocation to the allied powers to wipe this hellish travesty on government, the Turkish Empire, from the face of the earth. May we live to see Armenia independent and autonomous.

Again I thank you.

Respectfully, yours, G. E. STROBRIDGE,
Pastor Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE.
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

—

BOSTON, MASS., *January 14, 1896.*

DEAR SIR: Although a most humble citizen of this Commonwealth and one whose opinions may not, therefore, carry much weight, I desire to express my unqualified approval of the preamble and resolution offered by you yesterday, and would take this occasion to thank you for the clear-cut phraseology and positive purpose, which delighted my soul within me.

I have the honor to be your most humble servant.

GEORGE HOWARD STREET.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE.

DOVER, DEL., *January 14, 1896.*

MY DEAR SIR: I notice your resolutions asking that if the Foreign Affairs Committee deem it inexpedient to act in resentment of Turkey's wholesale

butchery of Armenians that the powers of the Christian world should unite and exterminate in toto the Turkish Empire. And this is the feeling prevailing throughout Christendom—the feeling of millions of bleeding hearts for these whose oppression and sufferings have never been excelled in all the brutality of history. I am glad to see your stand.

Very respectfully,

HENRY CLAY COLLISON.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE,
House of Representatives.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT MASS MEETING IN HADDONFIELD, N. J., JANUARY 15, 1896.

Whereas the Government of the Sultan of Turkey has systematically deprived the Armenian people of its inalienable rights, including those of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness;

Whereas he has refused to carry out his oft-repeated promises to reform said evils, but has rather increased them by giving his assent for quartering large bodies of troops among them; for protecting these troops by a mock trial from punishment for any murders which they should commit; for cutting off the trade of Armenia with all parts of the world; for imposing taxes on them without their consent; for transporting them to different places to be tried for pretended offenses;

Whereas the Sultan has practically abdicated government in Armenia by declaring the Armenians out of his protection and waging war against them;

Whereas he has plundered their country, burned their towns, and destroyed the lives of their people;

Whereas he is at this time transporting large armies of mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation, and tyranny already begun, with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy not paralleled in the most barbarous ages and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation;

Whereas he has brought into their country the merciless Kurdish savages, whose known rule of warfare is an indiscriminating destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions; and

Whereas in every stage of these oppressions the Armenian people have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms, but their petitions have been answered only by repeated injury; and a prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant is unfit to be the ruler of a people;

Whereas the representative of the Imperial Government of Turkey at Washington has officially notified our Government that it will not permit any distribution among its subjects, in its own territory, by any foreign society or individuals, however respectable the same may be (as, for instance, the Red Cross Society), of moneys collected abroad: Therefore

Resolved, That we, citizens of Haddonfield, N. J., in mass meeting assembled, solemnly declare that, in our opinion, the Sultan of Turkey has forfeited all right to rule over the Armenian people; that we respectfully urge our Government to make every possible effort to induce the governments of Christendom to rouse themselves from their apathy and put an end to this intolerable state of affairs which threatens with extermination thousands upon thousands of innocent fellow-Christians; that we urge upon our Government, also, to do everything in its power to preserve the fruits of American missionary toil; that we express our ardent sympathy with the unutterable suffering of this persecuted race; that we call upon all the peoples of Christendom to insist that these unutterable sufferings shall cease, and that we heartily indorse the resolutions introduced by Senator HOAR in the United States Senate and by Representative MORSE in the House of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, Patrick Henry, of Virginia, said in his immortal speech: "Why stand we idle?" The country and the world is crying out for some action or expression on the part of this Government in denunciation of this monstrous crime of the nineteenth century. We can at least denounce the Turkish Government and the outrages and express our sympathy for the poor suffering Armenians. That, Mr. Chairman, is all I desired to say on the question at this time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I avail myself of the courtesy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania because I fear that some remarks made on this side of the House may have created a false impression as to the attitude toward this bill of the Democratic party of the Empire State and Empire City, part of which I have the honor to represent in this House. I have not had sufficient experience in dealing with the Pension Bureau to say whether the attacks made on its administration can be justified, nor do I deem this a material consideration upon the subject before us. The plain question seems to be whether we shall make it easier or more difficult for those who are entitled to pensions to get them. There can be no just cause of complaint at the limitation prescribed in this bill in the case of a widow of a soldier who has a net income of $500, because the additional pittance this Government allows would not inspire her with an exalted idea of this Government's generosity, and would add but little to the store with which she had been favored by fortune. But to compel a widow of a soldier to show that she has no other means of support than her daily labor before she is entitled to a pension is extending the limitation to a parsimonious degree, nor can the consideration as to whether a pension is or is not a vested right have much to do with the question; the Supreme Court of the United States has said that it was in the nature of a reward or bounty. But the spirit which underlies our pension law, the sentiment which is at the foundation of the law which gives preference to veterans in our civil service, the gratitude which dictates like provisions in many States of the Union extends to individuals, and the patriotic and generous neighbor, the overworked and overburdened son, the daughter who has sacrificed many social advantages, or the life savings of a venerable father may check the conscience of the widow who would apply under the act of 1890 and prevent her from swearing that she had no other means of support than her daily labor.

My friends, the men who went to the front for the Union suffered greatly, but they did not suffer alone. What moment of our lives is spent where the sympathy of woman does not find us? We live in it, we are moved by it; and, though we think we are the masters, we are subject to it. Who can say to-day that the gentle spirit we debate about pensioning did not inspire the patriotism that met its untimely end on the battlefield? Ah, men of the South, if I have read your history right, you have not been and you are not now strangers to this sublime influence.

Our women did not feel the warm bullets whizzing to their vitals, but they felt the pangs. They shuddered not at the chill steel which was to warm itself in our hearts' blood, but they washed the sword with their tears. They felt not the deadening tramp of the ruthless cavalry at Gettysburg, but they lived a death at the very recital of the details of that awful battle, and they tell the story of all these things to inspire a new generation with the patriotism of the old. Honor the men of North and South; honor the pure, devoted, sympathetic women of North and South; bless them for their sufferings, their fortitude, their patience, their sweet charity.

Let us assuage as far as possible their present sufferings.

Let our approval of this bill for their relief be emphatic.

I appeal to all in this side of the House to vote for this bill, and to my friends of the South, whose chivalry was never appealed to in vain, I especially appeal to help, by passing this bill, the surviving widows and orphans of those who met you in noble, honorable battle. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCCALL] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. MCCALL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I was delighted yesterday afternoon with the speech of my friend from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS]. We had been engaged for two days in the discussion of pension matters, and no voice had come from the Democratic side in support of pensioners or in condemnation of the present administration of the Pension Department. So his speech was like an oasis in the desert. It reminded us that there is yet hope that this great country, without regard to party, may reach the day when we can join hands and say truthfully together that we are all in favor of honest, liberal, just, pension laws, and the proper administration thereof. I should perhaps have said nothing, being content with voting upon this measure, but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF] gives notice that he will introduce an amendment which he thinks is a remedy for the ills we have. As a Republican, as a friend of the pensioner, I beg to differ from my friend upon that question, and as to the propriety of his proposed amendment. I ask the attention of this committee while I submit my objections to the amendment. I do not question the motives that inspire it. They are pure; but in my opinion the result will be disastrous, if the administration of the judicial department of this Government is in unison with the administration of the Pension Department, for it places in the hands of the United States marshals and district attorneys of this country the power to cut off many pensions and pensioners from the bounty of the Government.

These men can be notified by process issued from the Federal courts to appear at a term of court that is held perhaps 100, 150, or 200 miles from their homes. They are poor people. It will cost more to make the trip and employ lawyers to defend their cases than a year's pension amounts to. It is absolutely impossible for them to go. What would be the result? An order pro confesso will be taken against them because they fail to appear to make the defense, and they will be dropped from the rolls and their pensions cease because they have not the means to go into a lawsuit with the Government about their right to draw pensions.

Mr. GRAFF. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MCCALL of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. GRAFF. Can not the district attorney at the present time, under the general jurisdiction of the Federal courts, have indictments found against pensioners for having obtained the same by fraud in the same manner that he could under this amendment, and has not this been done? And is it not true that during the past year all they could find on which there could be any hope of obtaining a verdict of guilty was about 300 cases, with the assistance of the Commissioner back of them, sending information and letters to these district attorneys? And is it not true that out of that 300, in a total of some 12,000 criminal cases that were brought before the Federal courts, there were only about 110 that were guilty, and of the 110 not more than half were pensioners who had fraudulently obtained pensions?

Mr. MCCALL of Tennessee. What my friend says has some force; but when he remembers that there have been 103,000 cases dropped from the pension rolls or refused in this last fiscal year, he may begin to appreciate the fact that if you give this power to the Federal courts of the country, all this machinery will be transferred to their hands, and instead of having the number of cases that there were last year in the courts, the number will go up

by the fifties and hundreds, and these men will be dropped, not because they are not entitled to pensions, but because they are unable to go to court and enter their defense. Orders will be taken against them pro confesso, and they will thereby admit upon the face of the record that what has been charged in the indictment or declaration of the district attorneys in the several cases is true, whereas it may be false in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred.

Mr. GRAFF. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. I do not wish it to be taken out of my time. Your questions are rather long.

Mr. GRAFF. This is a short question. I desire to ask him whether, in this amendment that I have offered as to the power of the district and circuit Federal courts to try pensioners under indictment, there is any new power given by my amendment that is not in the law?

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. No, sir; but it transfers the entire detective agency of the Interior Department to the hands of the judicial department. It not only transfers the great swarm of detectives that is going up and down throughout the length and breadth of the land, nosing into every old soldier's condition in life and that of his widow, but adds thereto the United States marshals, and thus intimidates the people of the country. I am in favor of such legislation as will afford to the pensioners, when their pensions are once passed upon and allowed, security therein, and not to be disturbed again without grave consideration. Notwithstanding my disapproval of the action of the Commissioner, yet I believe that the proposed plan is dangerous, and that we had better stick "to the ills we have than fly to those we know not of."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I said that I should not perhaps have addressed myself to this question except for some mail I received yesterday. I have here a case in which I have taken some interest. It is the case of Mrs. Neely, of Tennessee, the widow of a brave soldier who died four years ago; and that widow has been striving for four long years to have her name placed upon the pension rolls to draw pension as the widow of that deceased soldier. I have written to the Department and I have been to the Department in regard to this claimant, and I have here the last letter that I wrote to the Department.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1896.

DEAR SIR: In answer to an inquiry from me in regard to the claim of Mrs. Rachel H. Neely for widow pension No. 543944, as widow of John B. Neely, late Company B, First West Tennessee Regiment, I had the honor to receive from you in reply that three things were necessary to complete the claim—

After four years he says there are three things yet necessary—namely, certified copy of record of marriage, affidavit from her stating that she did not apply for pension prior to February 2, 1892, and affidavit showing that Oscar J. M. was the only child of soldier and widow under 16 years of age at soldier's death. I send herewith the required copy and affidavits, and trust they will complete the file.

This lady is a most deserving one and is greatly in need of assistance. Her husband's estate was almost if not quite insolvent, and she has had very little to go on, and now that little is gone. Her claim has been waiting since 1892, and if at all consistent with your rules I should esteem it a personal favor if you will settle it at the earliest possible moment. I know all the facts in the case and know she is entitled to the pension, whether her proof comes up to the strict requirement of the law or not.

Very truly, JNO. E. McCALL.

Hon. WM. LOCHREN,
Commissioner of Pensions, City.

Now, here is the reply I received yesterday:

[Southern Div. J. C. B., Ex'r. No. 543944. Widow John B. Neely, Co. B, 1st Reg't W. Tenn. Inf.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1896.

SIR: In response to your personal inquiry of recent date for information as to the status of widow's claim for pension above cited, you are advised that it awaits replies to letters of inquiry addressed by this Bureau to parties supposed to have personal knowledge of facts touching the merits of the claim.

Upon receipt of the same the claim will receive further attention.

Very respectfully,
WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Hon. JOHN E. McCALL,
House of Representatives, City.

Mr. MORSE. They will not be received before resurrection day.

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. In the name of all that is good and holy, I ask how long, and what else will be required? He told me plainly there were but three things necessary, to wit, a certified copy of the marriage, an affidavit from her stating that she had not applied for pension prior to February 12, 1892, and an affidavit showing that Oscar J. M. was the only child of the soldier under 16 years of age. I furnished these, and yet he says his agency is at work, that is, parties have been written to who are supposed to know facts material to the investigation, and when these are heard from he will let me know. The poor old widow will have crossed the silent stream probably, as the gentleman here remarks, before they are heard from in that regard.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one other matter. I hold here in my hand a statement from a friend from Missouri. Listen to this case. It out-Herods Herod, if I may be permitted that expression. Here is the case of Mrs. Elizabeth Sanders, of Berryman, Mo., whose husband was shot through seven times during the war. He died, of course. His widow applied for a pension. These spies were sent out by the Department. One of them went to this widow's home. He was there for dinner, and during the forenoon she slipped out to her neighbors and borrowed enough stuff to give the man a decent dinner, and she set him down to a decent dinner obtained from her neighbors. That man reported the fact that that woman had set him down to an excellent dinner, as an evidence of her ability to gain a livelihood. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Where does she live?

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. At Berryman, Mo.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. In whose district?

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. I do not know.

Mr. PICKLER. Have you the name of that agent?

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. I have not.

Mr. PICKLER. We ought to have the name, and I hope the gentleman will ascertain it.

Mr. McCALL of Tennessee. I received another letter yesterday by the same mail that brought me this. It was in regard to a claim of Mr. James E. Carden, of my own county, a man that I have known since I was a boy. He went to the war, fought gallantly, fell into the hands of the enemy in some battle, and was taken to Andersonville. You all know what that meant. I have seen that man moving along the streets in my town day after day, dragging himself on his crutches, with a wound upon his leg, a putrid sore that had been made possible by the suffering and exposure that he had incurred at Andersonville, a place where a man suffered death every day, if the accounts which I have heard and read are correct. He had been receiving a pension of $6 a month, and the Pension Office proposed to cut it down $2 a month, and he wrote to me and asked me to find out what was the matter. I wrote to the Commissioner and here is his reply:

[Southern Div. C. L. H., Ex'r. Inv. Ctf. No. 537693. James E. Carden, Co. E, 7th Reg't Tenn. Cav.]

Address your reply to the Commissioner of Pensions.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1896.

SIR: In reply to your recent inquiry "as to why this pensioner was reduced $2," I have the honor to advise you that the reasons for such reduction were fully set forth in a notice received by him on May 12, 1894, the substance of which was that the evidence in his case showed that he was not entitled to a rating under the act of June 27, 1890, but that he was entitled to his former rate of $4 under the general laws.

In response to such notice sundry affidavits were filed, but these on examination were held not to change the aspect of the case.

Before final action was taken, however, the act of March 2, 1895, making the minimum rate of pension $6 had gone into effect; otherwise the reduction would have been $4 instead of $2.

There is nothing pending in connection with this case.

Very respectfully,
WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Hon. JOHN E. McCALL,
House of Representatives.

That is the reply of the Commissioner with regard to the case of a man on crutches, a man with a sore upon his leg that would almost nauseate you if you looked at it, a man unable to walk without crutches, a man who can not hoe or plow or do any kind of manual labor. He applied for a pension and got a pittance of $6 a month, and the Pension Office proposed to take part of that away. An inquiry was made and affidavits were presented, but it was held that they did not change the status of the case. Before action was taken, however, the act of 1895 making $6 the minimum rate had gone into effect. But for that the reduction would probably have been $4 instead of $2.

Now, I say to this House that I see no way by legislation to remedy these great evils, these great wrongs that are being perpetrated upon the old soldiers. The only effectual remedy is to put a man at the head of the Pension Bureau to enforce the laws who believes in a liberal and just pension system. I care but little who makes the laws; if you will permit me to execute them I will see that they are executed as I desire. That is the trouble with this pension business. That is the difficulty that the pensioners are in. The laws are all right. What we need is a man who will enforce them in the spirit in which they were enacted, a man who is not opposed to pensions, a man who will not indorse statements which describe the old soldiers as "coffee coolers" and as the "rag tag of the Army."

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to close my remarks without adding that so far as any personal interest in the pension laws is concerned I have none. I came into the world too late to remember the war. I had relatives upon both sides of that great conflict. My mother's people fought for the South, my father's people for the Union. I would not unjustly criticise the Confederate soldier, because he was as brave, as courageous, as any man, and he dared to do all that mortal man dare do. But he was wrong. I am opposed to the system which the Democratic party is exhibiting to the country through its administration, which makes it absolutely impossible for men who are entitled to pensions to get them without the greatest possible delay, a sys-

tem which, instead of enforcing the pension laws, denies pensions to men whose right to them is established by proof sufficient to hang an accused person, a system which, instead of permitting the veterans of the war to draw their pensions, throws obstacle after obstacle in their way, as has been shown in the Neely case, to which I have called attention. These things clearly show that there is "something rotten in the State of Denmark," and the Administration ought to be held to account for it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HANLY. Mr. Chairman, in entering upon my duties in this Chamber I have felt that a proper degree of modesty required that I should begin as a listener, not as a speaker, and I would have remained a listener for a longer period but for the most remarkable utterance of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] the day before yesterday. If, sir, I can claim but little for myself I may claim much for the people that I have the honor in part to represent; the people of one of the five States of the old Northwest Territory, within the borders of which there is now one-fifth of the population of this Republic, one-fourth of its aggregate wealth; a Territory, sir, which, as the five States carved out of it were admitted one by one, kept up the equilibrium between slavery and freedom; a Territory that has given to the service of this country such men as Lincoln, and Grant, and Garfield, and Harrison; a Territory whose people have always believed that this is a Union of States, indestructible, indissoluble; a Territory which, when the supreme moment came when by the arbitrament of war we were to know which of the two opposing constructions of the Constitution was to survive, gave to the Union Army 900,000 volunteers. So, Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from New York made his remarks here on the day before yesterday he spoke of my people; he spoke of those I have the honor in part to represent, and who can not speak here, save through their chosen representatives. I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from the State of Illinois [Mr. GRAFF]. It has been urged against that amendment that it would occasion hardship on the part of those who were called to defend their claims; that it would occasion long journeys; that it would involve expensive litigation, the cost of which they would be unable to bear.

I believe it is the practice of the Federal courts to pay the expenses—at least the witness fees—of those who, being called on to defend their rights in those courts, are indigent and unable to pay such expenses.

It has been urged that this amendment ought to be so worded as to refer these cases to the State courts—a thing which, in my opinion as a lawyer, we have not the power to do. We could not take from the Federal courts the jurisdiction which they already have of these matters. It is already the law that the attorneys for the United States may, and they do, begin prosecutions under the existing laws whenever an infraction of them is brought to their attention.

It has been urged that the amendment would open wide the door to much vexatious litigation. But, gentlemen, the report of the chosen officers of the Government for the last year does not bear out that contention. I find that during the year ended June 1, 1895, there were 12,495 criminal prosecutions in the courts of the United States. Of these, 149 were for violations of customs laws; 5,720 for violations of internal-revenue laws; 866 for violations of the post-office laws; 58 for violations of the election laws; 34 cases arose under the naturalization laws; 201 under the intercourse laws; and only 356, all told, under the pension laws. In those 356 cases there were only 235 convictions; and be it said to the eternal honor and glory of the men who are receiving the benefits of our pension laws, only 127 of the 235 persons convicted were pensioners. [Applause.] In the face of these statistics, do not tell me that this amendment will open wide the door to much vexatious litigation. The prosecuting attorneys in the several districts of the United States are no more fond than other lawyers of going into court with a hopeless case—a case in which they know they will receive no compensation if they can not win it.

But, gentlemen, I do not believe that this amendment will have the effect predicted. It will protect the honest pensioners upon the roll, while it will in no wise prevent the prosecution of any criminal by the Government of the United States. I have had handed to me within the last few minutes a telegram from Fred A. Baker, a distinguished lawyer of the State of Michigan—a gentleman who has been one of the counsel in the case of Judge Long, who sought to have his pension restored. I send that telegram to the Clerk's desk to be read, for in my judgment it states what may honestly be expected from this amendment. Before the Clerk reads, I will simply say that the sender of this message is not only a distinguished lawyer, but a Democrat.

The Clerk read as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *January 14, 1896.*

To Gen. GEORGE SPALDING,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Graff's amendment sending fraudulent cases to courts ought to pass. Present system is objectionable because Commissioner makes charges and is both accuser and judge, which ought not to be in cases involving the reputation and honor of the accused. Amendment protects honest pensions and affords Government every opportunity to proceed against the dishonest.

FRED A. BAKER.

Mr. HANLY. As I now see on the floor the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SPALDING] to whom that message was sent, I will ask him to state Mr. Baker's standing as a lawyer.

Mr. SPALDING. Mr. Fred A. Baker is a gentleman of eminent ability—recognized as one of the great lawyers of the Northwest, not only on legal but, also on constitutional questions. He is of counsel for Judge Long in the case now pending in the Supreme Court.

Mr. HANLY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment; but in my judgment it does not go far enough to cure the whole evil. The dependent pension act of 1890 was "An act to grant pensions to such soldiers and sailors of the war of the rebellion as served at least ninety days and were honorably discharged, and from disabilities of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, became unable to earn a support from manual labor."

Now, during the administration of Commissioner Raum there was a ruling of the Department which has been much discussed and which gentlemen well understand. But on the accession of the Democratic party to power in the Administration of the General Government a board of review was established, which went over, I believe, 212,000 cases which had been already adjudicated by the preceding administration. Last year that board reviewed 104,160 cases; it dropped from the rolls 4,149 persons as not being disabled in a pensionable degree; 2,279 were dropped and restored to pensions granted under the general law, and in 20,359 cases the rates of pension were reduced; the total being, I believe, something over 26,000.

Now, in my judgment, if we would correct the wrongs which have been committed under the banner of the Democracy during this Administration, we would restore to the rolls every man who has been fraudulently and dishonestly dropped therefrom. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, there is in my town a man who came out of the Union Army a captain. Somehow—I do not know how—the tide of adversity has risen strong and high against that man. He is now in the trenches, and must continue there during this Administration unless God in his mercy gives him a furlough. Under the last Administration that man received a pension of $12 a month; it has now been reduced to $6. I have known him from my childhood; I know his present condition, and I have promised him that if my voice and my vote can restore such as he to the pension rolls it shall be done. And that is another purpose of my standing here and occupying the attention of this committee. In keeping with that promise, I shall at the proper time offer the amendment which I now send to the desk to be read as part of my remarks—an amendment which, in my judgment, will supply the cure for the disease that has afflicted the Pension Office.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the last line in the pending bill add the words:

"That no pension that has heretofore or may be hereafter granted under any law of the United States shall be dropped or suspended or reduced on the ground of any ruling or construction of the law or evidence different from that found and applied to the case at the time of the adjudication and granting of such pension; and the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, directed and required to restore to the pension roll all persons whose pensions have been dropped or suspended and restore the original pension granted to all persons whose pensions have been reduced upon the grounds prohibited by the provisions of this act."

Mr. HANLY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to advert for a few moments to what I pronounced a short time ago as the very remarkable speech delivered on this floor by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT], who professes so much love and friendship for the Union soldiers, but who, with these professions on his lips, rises in his place in this Chamber and uses language concerning pension legislation and pension laws of the following character: "Pernicious and iniquitous legislation," "the Treasury should not be looted, pillaged, and further depleted," "the Democratic party does not believe in a carnival of pillage upon the National Treasury," and so on.

Speaking of a man who had gone years without applying for a pension, he said:

He did not discover his disability until about 1886.

Again:

Let me remind you that in other countries where there have been great wars—in Russia, and in Germany, and in France—there are to-day but two classes of claims for pensions; one based on long service in the army, extending over a period of from ten to twenty-five years, and the other based on the fact that the disability was actually incurred in the line of duty.

Let me say to the gentleman that there can be no comparison between the German soldiers and the volunteer soldiers who served in the civil war. Let me say to him that he is mistaken when he says, as he did in his most remarkable speech, that the cost of the maintenance of any standing army in Europe is no more than equal to the amount appropriated for pensions in this country. I can show to the gentleman that the great Empire of Russia, in 1891,

appropriated 226,652,168 rubles for the support of its army, and for the support of its navy about 43,000,000 more, making a total in round numbers of $270,000,000. France, in the same year, appropriated for war purposes a sum in excess of what we ask in this appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion?

Mr. HANLY. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I merely wish to suggest if the gentleman does not think that it is much to the honor and credit of the United States that it has passed these just and equitable laws and appropriated such an amount of money for the support of the men who saved the life of the nation? [Applause.]

Mr. HANLY. I thank the gentleman very much for the interruption. Instead of rebuking the Government the gentleman from New York should be among the first to heap encomiums of praise on the patriotism and devotion of a people who have been willing to do so much for these veterans. [Applause.]

The gentleman says he is the "friend of the Union soldier," but Mr. Chairman, when I express my love or my friendship for those who are close or dear to me in affection, I do not use such terms as I find in the speech of the gentleman from New York. [Applause.] He may be a friend of the Union soldier, but, sir, his is the kind of friendship that stabbed Cæsar and crucified Christ. [Applause.] He may be the friend of the Union soldier, but unfortunately the gentleman's language on the floor of this House does not support the assertion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman pardon me for another suggestion, merely to ask if he does not think that that would be a very peculiar kind of wooing on the part of the gentleman from New York if he should undertake to make love in that way? [Laughter.]

Mr. HANLY. I thank the gentleman again for the interruption. I know what would happen under such circumstances—I know what has happened—that the Democratic party has wooed and has been repulsed. [Laughter and applause.] It has wooed and not won.

There were none who heard the gentleman from New York—

> Damn with faint praise, assent with civil leer,
> And without sneering, teach the rest to sneer—

who did not feel that he was not the friend of the soldier, but an enemy, "willing to wound yet afraid to strike." When pressed and plied with inquiries asking him to state his position on the questions pending, he each time sought refuge in evasion.

I have no criticism, Mr. Chairman, for those who sit on that side of the Chamber and who but a few years ago were in armed rebellion against the Government. I have no criticism, because I know the men who followed the banners of the South were brave, sincere men, and I would not, if I could, tarnish their fame, and I could not if I would. They suffered together with those who wore the blue, and their sufferings and their bravery have become a part of the imperishable heritage of the Republic. They were brave, for they were our countrymen. They were brave—how brave only those who met them in the storm of battle can know.

I know how hard it seemed to them, as they found themselves compelled to care for their unfortunate ones by State appropriations; and I honor them that during the discussion of this question they have maintained a discreet silence.

"Oh, but," says the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT], "this bill carries too much. It opens too great possibilities. The cost is too much." Let me read; he said in conclusion:

> Let us pass the present bill, containing $140,000,000, and then stop, and avoid the throwing of any more unnecessary money into a bottomless pit.

That is the language. Too much, is it? Gentlemen, there was a time, as back from Bull Run came the shattered fragments of the Federal armies, when men stood in this Chamber and in answer to Lincoln's request for an appropriation of $500,000,000 to prosecute the war said it was too much. There was a time when, after the great carnival of death at Gettysburg, some men in the North said, "It is too much." There were times, sir, during the war when more men were asked, when more funds were demanded, that a few of the people of the North stood up and said, "It is too much." But history has vindicated those who fought to a successful conclusion that great struggle. Too much, was it? Thirty years of the best history that the world has seen—thirty years of stupendous achievement, of marvelous development, of a reunited land have said to you that it was not too much. Too much! Why, sir, when you have traveled over the battlefields of the South, when you have counted the bleaching bones, when you have numbered the tears of those who wept for those who fell, when you have counted the agony of those who in fevered dreams, in Andersonville and in Libby, saw the faces of loved ones at home; when you have weighed in the balance of an apothecary's scale, as you would these pensions, and have found the weight and measure and value of human liberty and of freedom, then, sir, you may say it is too much, but not until then. Until you can do that, until you can measure in full the value of these, let me, if you please, commend to you the conduct of your compatriots on that side of the Chamber, and ask that hereafter you remain silent and dumb when patriotism is mentioned on this floor. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARDY] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, when I was informed yesterday that if I chose I might have a few minutes of time in the discussion of this measure now before the committee, I thought I would occupy that time in paying my respects to the gentleman from the Seventh district of the city of New York [Mr. BARTLETT]. But, happily, sir, on yesterday evening the distinguished soldier and great journalist, the gentleman from the Tenth district of New York [Mr. CUMMINGS], rebuked the gentleman from the Seventh district, and repudiated, on behalf of the soldiers of New York, every word that had fallen from his lips. Therefore I would not this morning drive the searing iron farther into the soul of the gentleman from the Seventh district. However, I desire to call the attention of the committee for a moment, and the attention of the gentleman himself, to one remark that I find in his speech as revised and published in the RECORD of this morning:

> It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the true test in pension cases, which no longer obtains in this country, should be whether the injury or wound received or the disease contracted was received or contracted in the service or in the line of duty.

That rule, if adopted by the Pension Office, would work most admirably for a man who was wounded in the service, who had a hospital record, or for the soldier who contracted disease in the service and had a hospital record; but it does not work well for that brave youth who went out in 1861, who suffered all the horrors of war, who went into battle and was not wounded, but who went into the hell hole of Andersonville and there, with the 35,000 Union soldiers, slept in the mud and starved for months, and whose parched lips were paralyzed with thirst until the great God who rules the destiny of nations and watches over the welfare of men struck the dry earth and the miraculous spring of living water burst forth from the ground in the prison pen, where water had never been known before.

That man's comrades died about him on the field of battle; they went down to death, to starvation, and horror in the pen of Andersonville; but he went home, and now, thirty years after the war, he finds that he suffers from rheumatism or from other diseases which he is unable to prove by comrades or by hospital record to have been contracted in the Army. Yet my friend from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] would say that that man should not be entitled to a pension. Why, in my own district in the State of Indiana there is the Faith family of five brothers. The three youngest brothers went into the war, the two eldest remained at home.

One of the younger brothers was killed in battle, the other two died of disease since their return, and without pensions, while the two elder brothers are to-day hale and hearty men of 70 and 73 years of age. I declare, Mr. Chairman, in this presence, that it is a burning shame and a disgrace to this great nation of ours that any soldier who fought in that war or the widow of any soldier who died should to-day be suffering for the necessaries of life. [Applause.] And yet the Pension Office sends me letters every day, in response to calls I have made, that "the case is awaiting final disposition." I go to the Pension Office and ask one of the deputies, "How far behind is your board of review?" "Six weeks behind only." "Then how is it, Mr. Deputy Commissioner, that I hold in my hand now a case I called up eight months ago, which you said was ready for final disposition and would be immediately disposed of, and yesterday you sent me—eight months afterwards—another statement that it is still ready for final disposition, and you are only six weeks behind?" It is the policy of this Pension Office, as organized to-day, to see how few pensions it can allow and not how many it can allow.

Why, Mr. Chairman, when God called his servant Lincoln to become the herald of American liberty, the savior of a nation, the emancipator of a race, he declared to those who gathered around him to perpetuate the Union and uphold the flag that this Government would not see a soldier forsaken nor his children begging bread. And you men who marched up this Avenue with the weary, tattered ranks of Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan on that summer day in 1865 saw stretched across this Capitol a great banner. Upon that banner was inscribed these words: "The only debt this nation owes that it can never pay is the great debt it owes to the soldiers and sailors who saved the Republic." That debt has not been paid. The soldiers and sailors of the Republic will forgive the Government the principal of that debt if it will only pay the interest. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, as an humble member of this House I stand here to-day to vote for the protection of the American soldier, for the protection of the soldier's widow, for the protection of American credit, for the protection of American labor, for the protection of American industry, and for the protection of the American flag. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCLURE] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I had no purpose when this debate opened to engage in it, for I believed that the policy of the bill would receive the sanction of this House almost without division, and certainly without hostile criticisms. We are now in the fourth decade since the last shot was fired in the civil war. I believed that it was the settled policy of the American people, enforced both by the Republican and the Democratic parties, from whose ranks the mighty army of the Union was recruited, to extend a liberality, a princely liberality, to the disabled veterans of the Union. I believed that that was the ripe and deliberate judgment of 70,000,000 American people; but it seems I was mistaken. I heard from the lips of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] that there was a growing opinion in New York City, shared by the best Democrats and Republicans, that any further liberality toward the pensioner was inadmissible. I heard him in tones of rasping criticism inveigh against the enormity of the expenditure under existing law and compare it to the expenses of maintaining the naval and military establishments of Europe.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the very expenditure he decries I am proud of. I extol it; I laud it; I glorify it; I cite it as the proudest evidence that the Republic of the United States, having mustered under its flag the volunteer soldiers to defend the honor and the integrity of the nation, is now able and eager to take care of its disabled veterans and their dependents, when the war has long since ended, the flag been vindicated, and the victory won. Why, that expenditure is a notification to Great Britain and all the world that the American people have been so generous to the soldiers of 1847 and 1861 that they may now summon their descendants under the flag with a serene confidence that they will respond at the tap of the drum or at the bugle's call. The fact that we expend $141,000,000 every year so that no soldier who fought in the war with Mexico or in the war with the South shall ever darken the door of a poorhouse proclaims the exalted national character of the American people, announces their magnanimity, and is a sounder element of national strength than standing armies or ironclad navies. A nation so generous to its disabled veterans will fight at the dropping of a hat or the click of a trigger.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the liberality of the Congress of the United States, vindicated by the deliberate judgment of the American people, has filled this District with monuments in bronze and marble to commemorate the merits and services of your departed heroes and statesmen. While these visible symbols of patriotism speak loudly, your pension roll and pension expenditure in real, substantial, unmixed patriotism speak with far louder and more significant eloquence.

The gentleman from New York made an unguarded admission. He declared in substance that the time was inopportune for any fresh exhibition of liberalty on the part of Congress toward the pensioners, because the Treasury was in a state of depletion. Why, sir, I thought the Treasury was overflowing with unexpended revenue. During the discussion upon the emergency tariff bill I heard the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], of whom I speak with the utmost respect, for we are, or at least ought to be, attached by the ties of bimetallic friendship [laughter]—I heard that distinguished gentleman say, with warmth and emphasis, that there was $70,000,000 of unexpended revenue in the Treasury. I heard his distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], with sledge-hammer argument and caustic rhetoric, reenforce him, and I heard the able gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] throw his weight into the scale, and from all this I concluded that the revenues of the Government were ample to discharge all its current obligations, and that the Treasury was fortified against possible depletion.

Mr. Chairman, I suspect that the gentleman from New York meant that the Treasury was depleted in respect to the particular kind of money that he worships. [Laughter.] I will be entirely frank with the gentleman from New York. I am not acquainted with the composition of the First or Fifth assembly districts of New York, which he represents, but I am acquainted with the Democracy of the State of Ohio. If the gentleman should assert of the Democracy of Ohio what he has asserted of the Democracy of Manhattan Island I would resent it as an imputation upon their patriotism. Why, sir, I know that the Democratic masses in Ohio resented with sharp resentment the appearance of unfair dealing with pensioners which characterized the executive authorities of the nation, and they thundered that resentment at the ballot box in 1893, 1894, and 1895, and are likely to add to the thunder in 1896.

Now, sir, if I were called upon to select a city in any part of the Union in which we might reasonably expect some show at least of aversion to any manifestation of magnanimity to the pensioners of this country, I would not select the city of Atlanta, which felt the mailed hand of William T. Sherman and, amidst its blackened chimneys, realized the horrors of war; I would not select the city of New Orleans, although that city drunk to the very dregs the bitter cup of military supremacy and inexorable military law; I would not select, especially after the noble speech delivered here yesterday by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WALKER] the city of Richmond, although the Union Army for months drew around that city a circle of blood and desolation and it was for years the goal for the possession of which the military ambition of the nation chiefly aspired; I would not select even the city of Charleston, although within its municipal limits the first mad shot against the flag was fired. But, Mr. Chairman, I would select the city of New York, and I will tell you why.

In 1863, early in July, the United States of America were in great jeopardy. General Lee, with the Army of Northern Virginia, turning his back upon Richmond, ventured upon a dangerous irruption north of the Potomac. As he gathered his forces around Gettysburg, preparing, as he hoped, to strike a decisive blow, the most critical period in the war had arrived. The safety of Baltimore, the safety of Philadelphia, the safety of New York City, the safety of this capital depended upon the valor of our soldiers massed at Round Top and Cemetery Hill. And yet, at the very time when Longstreet was delivering his order to Pickett to make his charge upon the Federal position at Gettysburg, handbills were being distributed in the city of New York to stir up the dangerous classes in that great city to rebellious violence, and for three days a mob held possession of the city, overpowered its police, overpowered the State militia, and obliged the Federal authorities to detail three brigades from the Army of the Potomac to quell that rebellion in the rear. Now, the survivors and successors of the men who inspired and engaged in that riot doubtless live in the district which the gentleman from New York so fitly represents, and they have poured into his unwilling ear revengeful invectives against all pension legislation, and thereby corrupted and contaminated his otherwise patriotic nature. [Laughter.]

But to return to the episode of Gettysburg. Every drop of blood that trickled from the sides of Pickett's slaughtered division and crimsoned the wheat fields of Pennsylvania was a contribution to the nation's common stock of valor. Misguided and misdirected as it was, it glorified our common ancestry. And it will occur to the philosophic mind that the Confederate valor which signalized itself in the carnage of Gettysburg and the Union valor which planted our flag among the clouds on Lookout Mountain now make it possible to enforce the Monroe doctrine in the Western Hemisphere without the expenditure of blood or treasure. [Applause.]

But reverting to the gentleman from New York, who is the object, and the legitimate object, of my forensic affection [laughter], when that bloody drama was being enacted, when great problems of constitutional liberty were being solved on a hundred battlefields by brave men from North and South, the gentleman from New York was engaged in academic halls, in reading Cæsar's Commentaries, the Third Georgic of Virgil, and Livy's graphic description of Hannibal's descent into Italy. [Laughter.] The only bridge the gentleman ever crossed during the civil war was the pons asinorum. [Laughter.] On the other hand, the fiery and nomadic gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], now a member of this House, on the one side, and myself on the other, if we could have gotten at each other at any time from 1861 to 1865, would have fought a bloodless battle for the light-weight championship of North America. [Laughter.]

But, to be serious, I think the assertion will not be challenged that the exhibition of valor on both sides of the line in that unfortunate struggle furnishes the best guaranty that there will be no breach of international peace over the Venezuelan question, and that Great Britain will consent to submit her line-fence controversy to the adjudication of an impartial tribunal. But before I conclude I desire to put myself right with Manhattan Island. I fear that I may have offended the sensitive pride of the opulent denizens of that hive of human industry and of lucrative commerce; and I am induced to say what I do by the impassioned eloquence of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS], who addressed the committee yesterday at the close of the session.

Why, sir, I reside in a rural not an urban district, and am therefore likely to imbibe erroneous impressions as to metropolitan affairs. I confess that I was somewhat poisoned against Tammany Hall by the animadversions of a person named Lexow. But I now see how easy it is to become an object of groundless aspersion; and after listening to the indignant eloquence of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] yesterday, which came from his heart I know, my opinions of Tammany Hall have undergone a radical reformation. [Laughter.] I now and here renounce and disown my rustic antipathy to that famous organization, and shake hands with him in the name of American patriotism in support of the pending bill, including the amendment offered by my friend from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, I know, as every member in this Chamber knows, that there are thousands and tens of thousands of patriotic men and women in New York; and coming as I do from the great West, I would vote to expend—aye to lavish—any sum of money to make

that great commercial emporium impregnable against foreign aggression and to make it impossible for any line-of-battle ship that floats upon the ocean to exact unwilling tribute from it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Will the gentleman excuse me if I call his attention to the fact that at the outbreak of the war of the rebellion the city of New York appropriated out of the municipal treasury $1,000,000 to equip its troops, and has never received a cent in return from the General Government, and its people to-day are paying the interest on the bonds that were issued at that time?

Mr. McCLURE. I rejoice to hear from the gentleman of this creditable act of municipal loyalty on the part of New York City, because it softens my criticism and somewhat kindles my languid affection for Manhattan Island; and I have this to say, that the Government of the United States ought to recognize such opportune generosity and reimburse the city of New York for this patriotic outlay. No section of the Union should bear a disproportionate share of the war burden justly chargeable to the common defense. As I was saying, there are thousands and tens of thousands of patriotic men and women in the city of New York, and I would vote to protect that great city from foreign invasion, or the menace of it, as readily as I would vote to protect an Ohio city. This country is too great and too grand for the manifestation of a narrow provincial spirit on the part of any person who has the honor to hold a seat in this Chamber. But if the city of New York should ever become an object of foreign naval attack, its citizens, including the gentleman who represents the First and the Fifth assembly district, will then learn and acknowledge that it is bad policy for a great and a free people to be niggardly to its veterans in time of peace. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, the debate thus far upon this bill has taken a wide range. I desire to discuss only a single proposition. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF] has had read an amendment which he proposes to move to the bill at the proper time, and which has given rise to a good deal of discussion. I wish to say that the purpose he has in view meets my hearty approval and that the remarks he has made in support of his proposition do honor to his patriotism and to his affection for the old soldiers. But, Mr. Chairman, I fear that the practical operation of this proposed amendment would prove very disappointing indeed. The proposition in a nut shell is simply this: The Commissioner of Pensions, or some other authority, must have the power to change pensions—either to increase or diminish them—depending upon the circumstances that may arise after they are granted. For instance, there now comes to my mind the case of a comrade of my own, who was at one time broken down with inflammatory rheumatism, confined to his bed, and who made an application for the increase of his pension from $16 a month, which he was then drawing. He secured an increase to $72 a month, because at the time he was lying on his back, and had been for several months, requiring the personal attendance of a nurse all the time. Subsequently he got much better; and to-day, instead of being entitled to $72 a month, a rate of $16 or $14 would be ample for his present disability. I grant that this is an exceptional case; but exceptional cases must be taken into consideration when we enact sweeping and general changes in the pension laws.

Mr. GRAFF. Let me ask the gentleman whether anything in the amendment which I propose would prevent the Commissioner of Pensions from increasing the rate?

Mr. LACEY. Well, I was discussing the question of the reduction of the rate. I think there is nothing in the proposed amendment which prevents the Commissioner from increasing the rate. But why should a man 50 years of age, who has been drawing a pension of $72 a month, but whose disability changes so that he is entitled to only $14 or $16 a month, continue to draw $72 a month for the balance of his life because at one time he happened to suffer this increased disability?

Mr. MEREDITH. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion right there? The man whom he mentions ought to be turned over to Barnum, because I think he would be considered the greatest curiosity of this century.

Mr. LACEY. That is no doubt a very amusing suggestion to the gentleman from Virginia, but it often occurs that pensioners have had their disabilities changed. I remember one old comrade of mine who came to me and said that he had become entirely well and he wanted to know what he should do with his pension certificate. He had been shot through the leg and at the time of obtaining the pension was going around on crutches. His pension was granted; but at a later period he got well and wanted to surrender it. My friend from Virginia has an entirely erroneous impression of the old soldier. He has been looking at the question too much from the Manassas side of the river, and not, I think, from this side of the Potomac.

What is the present proposition? It is to turn the old soldiers and their pension claims over to the tender mercies of a court of chancery or to a criminal court. One hundred and four thousand claims, in round numbers, were rejected last year. Thousands—how many I do not now recall—have been reduced, while other thousands have been increased. But what I claim is that the power of review must rest somewhere. Let us not mistake the remedy, and while we are sending these cases to a Federal court, so as to have a judicial determination of them, let us understand exactly what we are doing. This proposition places it out of the power of any Commissioner, no matter how meritorious a claim may be, to reconsider it in future. It can only be done by the action of the court. We would therefore indirectly, by this action, confirm the rulings in these 104,000 cases which have been adjudicated, and no subsequent Secretary of the Interior can review or look over the evidence in the cases or restore those whose rights have been denied to them. The mistake is this: With a broad, liberal, and comprehensive pension law, a hostile Administration has come into power, and in seeking for somebody to administer the law adversely to the pensioner the present Secretary of the Interior was chosen. Let me suggest that the only possible remedy to meet the evils will be to change the Secretary of the Interior; and let us be thankful that we do not have to wait long for that.

On March 4, 1897, we will get rid of him, and then, with some one in that Department who has the interests of the veterans at heart, these 104,000 claims can be reexamined without injustice to anyone and restorations ordered in all proper cases without taking the claims into a forum 100 or 200 miles away. They will be considered before a liberal and enlightened Pension Bureau, controlled and administered under the direction of a Secretary of the Interior who will have sympathy for the old soldiers and their widows.

Mr. GRAFF. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa whether he thinks it is better to base the security of the veterans in their pensions upon the accidental friendliness of the Administration that happens to be in power—to base them on the favor of a man who happens to be the Commissioner—or to base them upon well-established principles of law?

Mr. LACEY. I shall come to that in a moment. For twenty-five years we have had no such trouble as this. It was not until Secretary Hoke Smith entered upon the administration of the Department that the mischief commenced. After the present administration is ended no such mistake will again be made while the present generation exists.

But let us look at the proposition in a cool and judicial frame of mind. I have in my neighborhood, for instance, a pensioner that the Secretary of the Interior concludes ought not to be receiving his $8 or $10 or $12 a month, as the case may be, although his claim has been supported by much evidence. The Secretary of the Interior professes a belief that the evidence is fraudulent. Instead of taking charge and trial of the case in the office, it will be referred under this provision to a Federal court.

Mr. BOATNER. Will my friend yield just there for a question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOATNER. Does the gentleman think that in the consideration of pension cases by the Commissioner of Pensions and by the force employed in the office a spirit of unfriendliness to the pensioners has controlled the action of the Department?

Mr. LACEY. I have no doubt of it whatever.

Mr. BOATNER. Is not the present Commissioner of Pensions a veteran himself?

Mr. LACEY. Unquestionably, and a good soldier.

Mr. BOATNER. Was he not an officer of high rank in the Federal Army?

Mr. LACEY. Not of high rank; he was a lieutenant and a good and brave soldier. But let me say that these sweeeping proceedings, such as we have had in the Bureau under the administration of the present Commissioner of Pensions, is only the result of an exercise of the power and the influence of the Administration itself. It is simply carrying out, on the part of the Secretary of the Interior, the views of the President himself; and in criticising the action of that Bureau I want to go back to the true fountain head, and that is the President, who inspires it.

Policies are not formulated by heads of bureaus. The Executive and Cabinet define the policy of the Administration, and heads of bureaus must carry out the policy that is adopted, or must give way to others who are in accord with the views of the rulers for the time being.

Anything short of a change of administration will be found ineffective, and fortunately we do not have long to wait. But the question that I am discussing now is a practical one, to which I wish to call the attention of the committee. A soldier is drawing a pension, we will say, of $10 or $12 a month. A question arises as to whether that pension was rightfully allowed. The Commissioner, under the present rules of the office, reexamines the case and perhaps determines that the soldier ought to be dropped. A second Commissioner can consider new affidavits,

open the matter up again, and restore him to the rolls, and it has been done in thousands, yes, tens of thousands of cases in the last thirty-odd years during which the pension law has been administered in this way. But now take that man to the United States district court, we will say, one or two hundred miles away. He goes into the court and fights his battle before the court and jury and wins his case, if you please. He is like Pyrrhus after his victory over the Roman army. With the illustrious Greek, he may well say, "One more such victory and I am undone." In fact, the soldier is undone before his victory, and he would have to live to be as old as Methuselah in order to draw pension enough to pay the expenses and attorney fees incurred in defending his rights in such a contest in the Federal courts. This proposition, while it is made in the utmost good faith and sincerity and for the most laudable purpose, is, in my judgment, a mistaken one, and we must view all these questions as practical ones. This situation can only last a little over a year longer, and if at the end of that time we should find upon the statute books permanent laws, enacted simply to carry us over a temporary difficulty, these laws would embarrass the subsequent administration of that office.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the soldiers, having got thus far along, would do better to wait a few months longer than to be embarrassed by legislation intended in the most friendly spirit, which would result in giving them trouble, involving them in expense and annoyance, and some of them possibly in financial ruin.

Take the case that was suggested here—that of Judge Long. Judge Long is a lawyer, and an able and skillful one, a member of the supreme court of the State of Michigan. He is able, perhaps, because of his ability as a lawyer, to make his contest in the courts of the land; but I will venture to say to-day that Judge Long has spent more money in vindicating his rights, and in vindicating the rights of other pensioners, in his struggle with the Secretary of the Interior than he will draw in a good many years, even if he should have his pension restored. I honor him for it. I respect him for it. He is fighting a grand and good fight, and has a good purpose in view.

Mr. GRAFF. I will ask the gentleman whether the Commissioner of Pensions, under the operations of my amendment, would have been permitted to cut off the pension of Judge Long without having first himself submitted the case to the verdict of a jury in the Federal courts?

Mr. LACEY. Judge Long's case was decided long ago. The gentleman seeks to lock the stable door after the horse is stolen, and he must be careful not to lock out a good many pensioners while doing it.

Mr. GRAFF. What remedy does the gentleman propose?

Mr. LACEY. The remedy that I propose is a very simple one.

Mr. GRAFF. Do you propose any remedy that shall operate right now?

Mr. LACEY. No, not now, as to these rejected cases. We can not do anything under the present Secretary. We can not hope for a friendly administration of that office during the time that he continues to rule over it; but, as I have remarked, the time is not long, and we should not, because of a temporary difficulty, remodel the pension laws and make them so burdensome and so inconvenient and so heavy upon the soldiers that when the time comes for these questions to be brought up again the Commissioner and the officers of the Pension Office will be embarrassed in their adjustment.

The proposition of the gentleman from Illinois is worthy of grave consideration. Many gentlemen have spoken in favor of this proposition, and very few of them against it. I remember seeing one gentleman [Mr. POOLE] with an empty sleeve who in his remarks before the House referred to the proposed plan as of doubtful propriety. I heard also from my friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCCALL], who takes the place of Mr. Enloe. And upon this pension question there can be no more striking object lesson than to find upon the Republican side of the House the successor to that brilliant Congressman, because you will remember that Mr. Enloe made much of his entire reputation in his daily contest against pensions on the floor of this House and by his attacks upon the Pension Bureau under the administration of Mr. Harrison. But the people of Tennessee have spoken in favor of the veteran of the late war. We have the evidence from all parts of the country that the people are friendly to the soldiers. Nothing has done more to make this House so nearly unanimously Republican than the hostile action of the Interior Department in the last two years and a half.

We have heard from the people on that question, and it is entirely safe to leave to a fair-minded administration the protection of the pensioners of this country without any such radical change as that proposed. I call attention to page 7 of the Commissioner's report. This very wrong that my friend wants to prevent has been done.

The Commissioner says:

> The board of revision, organized in pursuance of your order, upon the decision of the Bennett case and abrogation of Order No. 164, to examine and reconsider pensions allowed under that order contrary to the purport of said act, had so nearly completed its work that the board itself was dissolved at the end of the last fiscal year and the slight remnant of its work transferred to the board of review. The work is substantially completed. During the last fiscal year 104,160 cases were acted on by the board of revision.

The Commissioner informs us that the mischief has been substantially done.

Mr. GRAFF. How many were dropped or decreased of the 104,000?

Mr. LACEY. A very considerable number.

Mr. GRAFF. About 30,000 under existing law.

Mr. LACEY. But these men have already been reduced, and this proposed law does not restore them. Any practical legislation to restore them I should be glad to support. The proposition now before the committee does not meet the difficulty in the case at all. There are thousands, perhaps nearly a hundred thousand, cases to which legislation ought to be directed to undo the construction adopted in administering the pension law and to make it conform to the intention of the framers of the law. It is impracticable to refer these cases to the Federal courts.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCCALL] tells us that at least some of these courts are hostile to the pensioners. We know that in many localities the deputy marshal who has been making a living out of the "boot legger" is finding business dull. He would turn his attention to the pensioners under this proposed law, and the courts would be filled up with business in that way. He would be found a more dangerous enemy than any that the pensioner has yet encountered. The Secretary would regard the passage of this amendment as a direction and authority to him to turn every case over to the Federal courts where he suspected there was some fraud.

Mr. GRAFF. Does he not do that now?

Mr. LACEY. He does not do it now. The number of cases against pensioners in the courts is comparatively small. The number of convictions of those who have received pensions has been very trifling. The effort heretofore has been to convict attorneys. When there was a pension case allowed where there was fraud, they have endeavored to indict the attorney rather than the pensioner. Hereafter if we send these claims directly, under the proposed amendment, to the Federal courts for examination pensioners will simply be burdened by that action with a load too grievous to be borne.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. MILNES. Mr. Chairman, I shall attempt to occupy the attention of this committee for but a few moments. I desire, however, to say a few words in favor of the bill which is now pending, and especially that portion of the bill which grants to the widows of the war more liberal support.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT], who addressed this House day before yesterday in opposition to the pending bill, stated in his opening remarks that it was not a pleasant duty he had to perform. I am sure that this House and a vast majority of the people of this country fully agree with him in that statement.

He further said that his duty to his constituents compelled him to oppose any further looting or pillaging of the United States Treasury by increasing the pension list.

If the constituency of the gentleman from New York are in sympathy with him, I venture the assertion that it is the only constituency in the United States of America, East or West, North or South, that would indorse the statements he made upon this floor.

The patriotic citizens of this the grandest nation in all the world are now and ever have been in favor of dealing liberally with the men who saved this nation, and to provide for their widows and orphans.

In no other Congressional district in the great North would it be considered as looting and pillaging the Treasury to provide for the widows of deceased soldiers. The gentleman from New York was very emphatic in the statement that he was the friend of the soldier. God defend us from such defenders. He said that he was satisfied with the pension legislation of Congress up to 1890, and then he paused. He did not dare to say he was in favor of the repeal of the act of 1890. Yet he found much fault with its provisions, and yet that act of 1890 was one of the wisest measures, the most just legislative act ever passed by any Congress.

It did justice, Mr. Chairman, to a class of men who could not get a pension in any other way, and yet who were just as worthy, just as honest, and just as deserving as any other class of men that ever drew a pension. They could not draw a pension simply for the reason that the comrades with whom they served had either

moved into distant States and Territories or were dead and laid away, and for this reason could not furnish the necessary evidence required by the Pension Department.

I know, Mr. Chairman, what the soldiers of the late war endured. I know of the trials, dangers, sufferings, and privations through which they passed, and although I do not draw a pension myself, and never have applied for one, yet I never shall be satisfied until every man who served in the Union Army for ninety days or more and was honorably discharged therefrom is receiving from the Government he helped to save a pension large enough to keep him from want in his old age. [Applause.] This nation can not afford to see its gallant defenders eking out an existence in the poorhouses of the country.

The only fault I find with this bill is that it does not go far enough. It does not appropriate, in my judgment, as much money as we ought to appropriate. I do not agree with those who think that the payment of pensions has reached high-water mark.

There are thousands, yes, tens of thousands of applications on file in the Pension Office to-day; filed there by men just as honest and deserving as those who are now drawing pensions. Many of them have been on file for years, and ought to have been adjudicated years ago, and would have been had it not been for the unpatriotic and pernicious course taken by the present Administration. Thousands of men have also been dropped from the pension list or their pensions have been reduced, without cause, by the arbitrary act of a single man, seeking to make a reputation as an economist at the expense of the old soldier. These cases that are hanging fire in the Pension Office should be disposed of.

These men who have been dropped from the list without trial and without cause should be restored, and the law should be so amended and defined that it would be impossible for any one man, by his own sweet will, to deprive old soldiers of that which has been granted them by act of Congress.

I know that our friends say that the Treasury is depleted, that this is no time to increase pensions, because there is no money in the Treasury to pay increased pensions with. We all know the whole country is painfully aware of this fact. But whose fault is it? From the close of the great war in 1865 up to March, 1893, during which time the Republican party controlled wholly or in part the destinies of this nation, there never was a year, a month, a week, a day, or a minute that we did not have money enough in the Treasury to pay the men who saved the nation their just and honest dues. You took possession of this great Government a little less than three years ago; for the first time in thirty-two years the Democratic party came into full control of the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and immediately proceeded to enact into law your pet theory of "a tariff for revenue only." You immediately proceeded to drop from the pension list men who had been on that list honorably for years. You succeeded in robbing the men who saved the nation out of nearly $20,000,000 a year, and yet your Wilson-Gorman-Brice monstrosity failed to produce revenue enough to pay the current expenses of the Government, and for the first time since the close of the great struggle for the Union, in a time of profound peace, this the richest and most powerful nation in all the world has been compelled to borrow nearly a hundred and eighty-five million dollars, and is now about to borrow a hundred million dollars more for the purpose of paying the current expenses of the Government, and demonstrating to the world the total incapacity and unfitness of the Democratic party to govern a great nation.

But, Mr. Chairman, under these adverse circumstances, the old soldiers should not be left to suffer, for just as sure as there is a God in Israel the Republican party will again control the affairs of this Government and will again provide sufficient revenue to pay the current expenses of the Government, gradually reduce the public debt, and at the same time do justice to the men who in the dark days of the great rebellion saved the nation from destruction. [Applause.]

I have said that this bill does not go far enough. It should, in my judgment, provide what the law of 1890 clearly intended, that whenever a pension is granted under what is known as the dependent act of 1890, and the report of the board of examining physicians who have examined such case clearly shows that the claimant would be entitled to $12 a month under the general pension law, he should be paid $12 a month under the law of 1890.

This was the construction placed upon the law by Secretary Noble and Commissioner Raum and during their administration pensions were granted in every instance upon that basis. But when the present Administration came into power it not only revoked this just and liberal construction of the law, but also set to work to undo the work of Secretary Noble and General Raum by reducing and dropping from the roll hundreds of deserving and worthy pensioners who had been placed there by a solemn act of Congress as construed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions.

Since the present Administration has been in power a soldier applying for a pension under the act of 1890 has had to prove that he was totally incapacitated for the performance of manual labor before he could be allowed a pension of $12 a month.

Every man dropped from the pension roll by the nefarious rulings of the Commissioner of Pensions should by law be again placed on the pension roll. Every pensioner who, by the arbitrary and, as I firmly believe, illegal act of the Commissioner of Pensions, has had his pension reduced, should again be placed upon the roll at the same rate as before such reduction.

This is an appropriation bill to which, as I understand it, no new legislation can be attached, or I would at this time offer several amendments embodying and covering the points I have named. I have a bill now pending before the Committee on Pensions which covers this whole subject fully, which I expect to press and hope to see become a law before the end of this session. [Applause.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to take up but a very few moments of the time of this committee. I would not have spoken at all upon this question had not the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] intimated on the day before yesterday that there were no exceptions to be taken to the administration of the Pension Bureau. I want to call attention to the fact that this bill—or at least the provisos inserted in the bill now under discussion—is for the purpose of construing the pension law of 1890. The bill makes no extension whatever of the provisions of that law. It is simply an honest, legitimate, fair, legal construction of the law that was passed in 1890 for the benefit of the soldiers of the late war.

The gentleman from New York seems to congratulate himself that there is a Treasury to loot, and he says that these pensions to the old soldiers are a gratuity. I am sorry that the gentleman has taken the position that he has. I do not think that he represents even his own constituency. The fact is that there would have been no United States Treasury to loot if it had not been for the men who followed the flag from 1861 to 1865.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of this committee to what I deem a conspiracy. I hold in my hand a state paper, the message of the President of the United States to the two Houses of Congress in 1893, in which I discover this remarkable slander against at least one-twentieth of the American people:

Thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners, and recent developments by the Bureau establish appalling conspiracies to accomplish pension frauds.

Mr. Chairman, that was the keynote of the action of the Pension Bureau. It laid down a proposition which has been followed from that time to this. It was a proposition that was intended to destroy the validity and the effect of the law of 1890. That conspiracy has to a great extent accomplished its object. It has been followed to the line—so much so that $400,000 of the people's money was expended in one year for the investigation of these "frauds" and the bringing to justice of this remarkable number of pension swindlers. Not only was an army of special examiners sent into the field, but postmasters in all sections of the country were used to investigate the cases of fraud. What was the result? Thirty-nine pensioners were convicted of receiving pensions illegally—less than 1 in 20,000 of the men and women whose names were upon the pension roll! Less than 1 in 20,000! Why, Mr. Chairman, there is a greater percentage of defaulters among Democratic officials to-day than the percentage of fraudulent pensioners that were found on the pension roll. [Laughter.]

My friend from New York claims that the pension laws have been honestly administered. I have handled over four hundred claims since the 1st day of March last. More than two hundred of them have been at "final disposition" more than six months. In a large number of these cases letters of inquiry have been sent out to investigate the standing and the character of the men and women who have sworn to the truth of their statements. More than six months! Yet we are blandly informed by the gentleman from New York that the Pension Bureau is honestly and faithfully administered.

Mr. Chairman, there is one panacea above everything else for the evils existing in reference to this question. It is a service pension. It is in the interest of economy to the people of the United States. I am in favor of putting upon the pension roll the name of every man who carried a gun in defense of his country, and the appearance of his name on the muster roll should be prima facie evidence of his right to that pension. I do not care whether such a person is white or black; I do not care what his condition may be. [Applause.] Put such men upon the pension roll at a stated figure per month, and then you would have no seven-by-nine politicians trying to either reduce pensions or to cut the pensioner from the roll entirely.

Mr. Chairman, as to the suggestion of pensions being a "gratuity," it is an insult to the intelligence and patriotism of the men who served in the Army from 1861 to 1865 to intimate such an

idea. A pension is a reward for patriotism, and by that process we are building up a bulwark, a living bulwark, of strong arms and willing hearts that can always be called upon in defense of this nation and its flag. A pension is the expression of a nation's patriotic gratitude—the generous offering of a grateful people to the men who saved the Government. Mr. Chairman, the volunteer soldier of America is one of the grandest figures in our history, and when that history shall be fairly written that remarkable character, the volunteer soldier, will stand out in letters of silver upon pages of gold. The patriotism of the American volunteer soldier is one of the most wonderful things in our annals.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of this committee; but I do say that I am thoroughly in favor of this bill and all the provisos with but a single amendment. When the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF] shall come before this committee I want to see it amended so that these cases, if they are to go into the courts at all, shall go into the courts of the States; not into the Federal courts. This will enable every citizen who is affected to reach the place of final adjudication without enormous expense and waste of time.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that this entire question of pensions as it appears to me is reduced to a nutshell. Our Democratic friends must bear the responsibility. Upon their shoulders the burden of this action of the Pension Bureau in the last three years must fall. Enough evidence from all sections of the country has been presented here to indicate what has been done under Democratic rule. It was never done under the Republican administration of the Pension Office. Judas Iscariot betrayed the Son of God; Benedict Arnold attempted to betray the nation that had respected and honored him; and here comes along a Democratic Administration, the first in thirty-two years, that is attempting to betray the men who made it possible for a Democratic Administration to be elected. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LOW. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to discuss the merits of the bill now pending before the House until New York was drawn into the vortex of debate. It is patent to every person having a particle of regard for the rights of the veteran that some change is absolutely necessary in the laws governing the present administration of the Pension Department. The interpretations of existing law and the rulings by the present officials administering that great Department ostracise a class of poor and indigent men to whom the country is indebted for its perpetuity. That office by its rulings has ostracised the very men who in their early life were the donors of a national gift to the people of these United States. The nation to-day is the pensioner; and it has been drawing its lion's share of emoluments every day, yes, every hour, since the great historical events enacted at Appomattox. [Applause.]

I have listened to the remarks of various gentlemen on this floor; but my attention was especially challenged by those of my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] when he spoke about "looting" the Treasury, and added that the district which he represented did not want any change in the present pension laws.

Mr. Chairman, I do not trespass upon the delicate principle of modesty when I state that I, too, am from New York, and the district which I have the honor to represent is double the size numerically of the Seventh district, represented by my distinguished friend. My constituents do not want to see any law on the statute books that deprives the old soldier of one penny of his just dues.

I think my friend must have been hasty when he spoke about "looting" the Treasury, else he would have escaped that dangerous shoal. It was not the old soldier, nor the pension to the old soldier, that depleted our Treasury, but the Democratic party, which the gentleman represents; they, by enacting and upholding laws and principles which were absolutely disastrous to American interests looted not only our Treasury, but looted all American industries, and looted and destroyed the prosperity of millions of our workingmen. This last year to save the Treasury the Democratic party compelled the wards of the nation to contribute millions to its exchequer by reducing their pensions or by dropping them entirely from the roll. These methods we all know about. I would take the word of a man who fought at Shiloh, at Mission Ridge, at Gettysburg, or who stood on the deck of a man-of-war when it passed the forts of Mobile, sooner than I would take the sworn statement of any postmaster who prostitutes his position to go about his bailiwick for the purpose of securing information for the specific object of preventing a poor old soldier from receiving his just dues.

Gentlemen, vote for the bill and these amendments, protect the veteran, and make his rights vested rights. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Chairman, day before yesterday I offered a resolution asking for the appointment of a committee of three on the part of the chairman of the Invalid Pension Committee for the purpose of investigating the Pension Office, and especially as to its ruling on the law of 1893. I hope that the committee will be appointed, and that it will thoroughly investigate and return back to this House a report that will enlighten and make plain to us all the mode of procedure and rulings of the Pension Department.

Mr. Chairman, if a veteran is incapacitated and unable to earn a living, that fact duly authenticated should be sufficient for the granting of a pension; and, Mr. Chairman, this is the law, but the obstruction that surrounds the present law is such as to make it almost impossible for a veteran, though he be incapacitated, to obtain a pension. Previous to the coming into power of the present Administration, the Pension Office was conducted under the spirit and intent of the liberal pension laws of the United States. There was a disposition and feeling that the old soldier was worthy of a pension, and more, that the laws which were on the statute book should be executed.

General Black, the former Commissioner, and Secretaries Lamar and Vilas all agreed with this. The same class of evidence, the same liberal intent, the same basis of adjudication that had obtained up to their "reign" was adhered to, but when the present Commissioner came into office the whole matter changed, and radically so. New rules and regulations were made, new constructions were put on the laws, and every impediment and obstacle that seeming hatred for and disgust with the pension law has been put into action, with the result that, in fact and in truth, the pension laws are a nullity. Unheard-of requirements, impossible and impracticable calls for evidence are made. Soon after the present Commissioner came into office no less than 50,000 cases that had been partly prepared for allowance were turned back from the files, and were sent to the adjudication divisions to await additional evidence. And, Mr. Chairman, in invalid claims, new examinations were ordered, thus depriving the claimants of their pensions. Thousands of pensions have been rejected in the face of the best medical evidence and that of friends and neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the case of John E. Marren, of Brooklyn, N. Y., who is one of my constituents. This man was rejected where it was conclusively shown and admitted that he was totally incapacitated to do manual labor. I sent a letter to the honorable Secretary of the Department of the Interior, asking him to look the evidence over anew, and see if a mistake had not been made. I told him that he was incapacitated for manual labor. I appealed to him to see to it that injustice be not done to this worn-out soldier, a man who was sustained from day to day by daily portions of morphine.

Mr. Chairman, that letter was returned to me in a most ungracious manner, and I now read the letter that the members of this House may more fully understand the contempt in which they are held by the present Secretary.

I addressed the following letter to the Secretary of the Interior:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *July 30, 1895.*

MY DEAR SIR: I desire to call your attention to the case of Mr. John E. Marren, who is an applicant for a pension, the application having been rejected on the ground that he is not disabled from manual labor in a "pensionable degree." Allow me to state that I have known Mr. Marren personally for many years, and can speak in the highest terms as to his veracity, integrity, and scholarly attainments. I know of my own knowledge of his disability during the past two years, and that his nervous system and bodily strength have been kept up by daily portions of morphine. I fear the rejection is contrary to the evidence in the case. I believe you want to do the right thing in your Department, and will only be too quick to rectify a mistake made by the Bureau of Pensions.

I would respectfully ask you personally to look over the evidence in the case.

Very respectfully, yours,

JAS. R. HOWE, M. C.,
Sixth District of New York.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
Secretary of the Interior.

This is the reply which I received to the communication:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, August 15, 1895.

Hon. JAS. R. HOWE, *287 Broadway, N. Y.*

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your communication of the 30th ultimo, you are advised that if John E. Marren, whose claim for pension has been rejected, and concerning which you write, is dissatisfied with the finding of the Commissioner of Pensions, he has the right to appeal from this action to the Department; but the Department can not recognize you as an attorney authorized to prosecute such a claim.

Let me call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the rule governing such cases. I read from rule 14 of the practice:

No claims pending in this Bureau will be considered, out of the regular order of business, upon the request of attorneys, or agents, or any person whomsoever, except for good cause shown, and upon the order of the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that good cause was shown in the communication which I sent to the Department.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Interior Department, through its Secretary and Commissioner of Pensions, has in the past and now is nullifying the laws of Congress. For example, if the widow of a soldier with a half dozen children can be shown to have a gross income of $8 per month, a rejection of her claim as "not dependent within the meaning of the law" will follow. And an invalid has to be a good subject for the poorhouse before a pension is granted.

They have another cute saying in the Pension Department, "not disabled within the meaning of the act." They put their own construction upon the meaning and intent of acts of Congress, and override, upset, and annul all previous decisions.

Mr. Chairman, this bill and amendments now pending before the House should pass. They will stop the nullification of the laws of Congress, and will cause the Pension Commissioner to understand that a law of Congress is entitled to departmental respect.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say that the men who seek a pittance at our hands were heroes in war. Let us by our actions prove ourselves worthy of their heroism by voting for this bill and the amendments. [Applause.]

Mr. SPALDING. Mr. Chairman, I had made up my mind not to say anything upon the pending bill, but the latitude given in the discussion has been broad, and as there have been some views expressed here about a pension being a gratuity, a gift, or a bounty, I feel compelled on this floor and in this august body to declare that Congress by solemn enactment in 1893 decreed that a pension was a vested right, and being a vested right, it can not be taken away by the sweet will of the Commissioner of Pensions, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Bureau of Pensions. Believing that it follows along the line of the title to land given by the United States Government, it is as thoroughly a gift within the rights and province of the law as is the patent to a piece of United States land after settlement or homestead entry. It seems to me that the language of the statute is plain and can not be controverted. It makes every pension hereafter or heretofore granted as secure as a vested right and guarantees to that extent the payment thereof, and provides that the pension shall not be suspended without due notice. It is obvious that Congress intended to make a pension a vested right or it never would have passed such legislation. The homestead law recognizes the service of the pensioner, and it seems to me that beyond question the language there used covers this ground.

In the discussion of this question during the short time I shall occupy I shall not attempt to rake over the embers of the war, because I find that the gentlemen on the other side who followed the flag of the lost cause until it went down in defeat have not raised one word against this pension legislation. But we are astonished here to find that the opposition comes from the great city of New York, the metropolis of this nation, and I want to say to this House that when the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] was making his speech there was a grand scene on this floor. Sitting on this side there was a gentleman who bore the brunt at the battle of Gettysburg, who bears upon his body the wounds inflicted there. He was and is the personification of a hero, with the front of Jove, and was one of the grand heroes of that bloody field. I refer to Gen. Daniel E. Sickles. That gentleman, listening to the voice—not of the greater New York, but of the lesser New York, thank God—during the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT], said it was mere rot that he was talking and he ought to know better. I wish I could say it as emphatically as my grand old soldier friend from New York did. But when my Democratic friend from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] arose and in emphatic tone and gesture said that Mr. BARTLETT'S speech was not a fair representation of the sentiment of New York City, I felt that all further discussion was useless.

There can be no more question in my mind as to a pension being a vested right than there is a question about the patent to your land or the deed to the house in which you live, if you own it, giving you a vested right. I am told, and I believe it to be true, that the gentleman to whom I referred [Mr. Sickles], when a Representative in this House in 1893, proved to the satisfaction of every lawyer and every member in the House that it was a vested right. The very certificate of the pension itself pledges the faith of this Government to the payment of the pension. The Government does no more than that with reference to the payment of a bond. The bond and the pension go hand in hand, and damned be he who says they ever shall be repudiated.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me one question?

Mr. SPALDING. My friend from New York regrets that he was not of sufficient age when the war broke out; in other words, that he was not of the age of consent [laughter], and yet near my seat I can put my hand on two or three old soldiers who are of the same age as the gentleman, or somewhat younger, who helped to bear the flag to victory on many a hard-fought field for three years during that war. I am sorry, too, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] was not of sufficient age, because if he had enlisted under that banner I am satisfied he never would have made the memorable speech which he did make the other day.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Will the gentleman allow me one question?

Mr. SPALDING. The gentleman objected to being interrupted in his speech, and I have only ten minutes, and I decline.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I want to ask you about my remarks, and about their revision.

Mr. SPALDING. I am satisfied that the gentleman did not represent New York City in his speech here on this floor. I know something of New York City myself, and I know that during the war old Commodore Vanderbilt poured his money out like water for the salvation of this Government. I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] may represent himself and a choice few, or a certain number of gentlemen in New York, but he does not represent the constituency which sent him here to Congress in his position on the pension question.

It seems that no other gentleman from the South, the West, the East, or the North has stood up here and taken the position which the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] has taken. He is the only man, notwithstanding there are many gentlemen from Georgia, from Tennessee, from Alabama, and all over the South who carried the old Confederate flag. I honor them for it, and I am here ready to clasp hands with them over any bloody chasm that there may have been, and I say to them they fought well and bravely. I recognize here on this floor a gentleman from Alabama. They say his seat is the storm center now. It was a storm center during the war, Mr. Chairman, for wherever General WHEELER and his troops went, there you might expect to find trouble. I was confronted by that gentleman several times myself, and I recognize in him a brave soldier and a gallant gentleman. I have been in the South, and in the New South, and I have come to the conclusion from my experience with these gentlemen, and talking with them, that the only ones who never were satisfied with the outcome of that conflict were the noncombatants of the North and the South. [Applause.]

Mr. TRACEWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no apology to offer to this House for taking up the few minutes of time allotted me for the discussion of the pending appropriation bill and the various amendments proposed to the same.

I want it understood that in any place, at any time and under all circumstances, when the rights or interests of the old soldier are at stake, I desire to lift up my voice in his behalf and to speak a word in season or out of season in the interest of him, his widow or his orphan.

I must say that I admire the courage, if I can not agree with the sentiments, uttered on this floor the other day by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT], who bravely, if not wisely, came to the support of the present Administration and essayed a defense of its pension policy.

When the honorable gentleman goes back to his constituency in the approaching springtime, when Democratic conventions do most abound, and assumes a prominent part in them, as he doubtless will, and they each and all with great enthusiasm indorse the Administration of Grover Cleveland, as they all undoubtedly will, he at least will be consistent, though far from right. [Applause.]

I have been surprised, yea, amazed, to sit here for the last three days during the progress of this debate, and witness the painful silence of our friends on the other side of this Chamber, although the present administration of the Pension Department has been on all sides attacked, and its brutal and inhuman treatment of the applicants for pensions shown up in its true light.

Aside from the gentleman from New York, not a soul on that side of the House has lifted a voice in an attempted defense of the present outrageous Democratic methods and policies prevalent in the Pension Bureau; and yet we will find every mother's son of them voting in the very first Democratic convention he can set his foot for an indorsement of Grover Cleveland and his Administration.

If Mr. Cleveland does not inspire the present methods, which have in the last few years stricken thousands of worthy pensioners from the rolls and materially reduced the pensions of other thousands of worthy men and women, he is responsible for them, and the Democratic party, together with a contingent of mugwumps, are responsible for him.

I take it the remarks of the gentleman from New York, notwithstanding the silence of the other side of this Chamber, is an echo of the true Democratic heart of the nation and that he voices their true sentiments, which on this floor they dare not utter.

I prefer to judge this party by its acts rather than its words, and the voters of this country have at last awakened to the fact that the Democratic party is long on promises and short on performances.

The remarks of the only Democrat who has dared to come out from under the cover are, when boiled down, a covert attack upon the pension act of June 27, 1890.

The force of the amendments proposed to the bill reported by our committee is an effort on the part of this Congress to compel the pension authorities that be to respect in their administration of this law its plain and evident intent.

We have been twitted with the remark by the eminent gentleman from New York that the effect of these amendments, in

other words, the enforcement of the provisions of this law, would loot the Treasury; and our attention has been directed to the fact that we have a depleted Treasury. Of this latter fact we can make no successful denial, but we retort the present barren condition of the Treasury is the result of Democratic mismanagement if not imbecility.

But this House has passed and promulgated such measures as will remedy this deplorable condition of affairs, and, in any event, the sins of the Democracy should be no further visited upon the heads of the nation's defenders.

When millions of dollars are given to a foreign syndicate to float a loan of Government bonds, you men on the other side of the House call it protecting the public credit; when this side of the House asks for a reasonable appropriation, hedged about by such regulations as will prevent Hoke Smith from diverting it from its beneficiaries, the old soldier, his widow and orphan, you say it is a scheme to loot a depleted Treasury.

Your depleted numbers are an evidence of the ground swell of 1894, and in 1896 an aroused and an indignant people will finish the work they so nobly began, and you will find out that these men, maligned, traduced, and slandered by the hired spies of the Pension Department, know as well how to vote as they knew how to shoot.

The pension act of 1890, known as the dependent pension act, is either right or it is wrong. If this act is based upon correct principles, is laid down upon just lines, it should be fairly and liberally administered. If it is inherently wrong, is laid upon unjust lines, its fair and consistent administration would demonstrate its weakness and vice, and I believe the people of this country would, in common justice to themselves, demand its repeal in such tones as would not admit of its further enforcement, and it would be stricken from the laws of the land. In order, then, to ascertain the fact as to whether it is a fair and just act it is necessary to inquire what gave rise to the apparent necessity for its passage by Congress.

Under prior pension acts, having been fairly, justly, and liberally administered by the Republican party, the greater number of all those soldiers who were sorely wounded in battle or in the line of duty, or for disabilities resultant from injuries or disease received or contracted while in the military service of the Government, or directly traceable to the same, these worthy persons are, now enjoying, where this Administration has not taken away from them, pensions somewhat commensurate with their just deserts. But these laws, although wise and beneficent in their nature, left wholly unprovided for a large number of men, their widows and orphans, who, while they were not seriously or permanently wounded or injured during their period of service, and who perhaps never suffered a day's sickness during the long and weary years of the war, men who fought from Bull Run to Appomattox—the men who in reality fought the battles of the war, for wounded men and men who succumbed to the hardships of army life, while they are deserving of all credit and should be liberally compensated for their sacrifices, were not under the nature of things the men who bore the brunt of battles. The cases of these men who really did the fighting and saved the Union are only reached and covered by the provisions of this act of 1890, which by its terms provides for the payment of pensions to this class of men, their widows, orphans, and dependents, regardless of the time when the soldier became disabled, or whether he died from disease contracted in the military service, or if, living, he be disabled from earning a livelihood by manual labor, providing his disability is not the result of his own vicious habits.

If our pension system is founded upon natural justice and equity, who will contend that the men who did the fighting, when they become old, broken down, and worn out, should not share in the bounty bestowed upon its defenders by a grateful people.

These are the men who were as proud as they were brave, and while possessing the strength and vigor to battle with the world scorned to ask as a bounty what was justly due them as a right.

It may not be a vested right, as contended on this floor by the friend of the soldier, the gentleman from New York, but God save the old soldier from such friendship, for it is such friendship as this and from the same source that is compelling him to spend the remainder of his days in some poorhouse on account of a pension withheld, while these same friends are sending out letters to all the petty postmasters in the country trying to find some pretext for withholding his pension, or dropping him from the rolls, or materially reducing his pension already granted, and in most instances when this Department of the Government was in the hands of his true friends.

They publish this latter feat to the world as a reissue of pensions.

They have coined a new word, but it would be a deadly stab at the credit of the country to coin the silver bullion rusting in the vaults of the Treasury, and upon it issue silver certificates, and with these certificates, if short of other funds, pay to these brave defenders of our common country liberal pensions.

I think I can speak for a majority of the soldiers in my district and say they will not stand on the question of whether it is coined at the ratio of 15½ to 1 or 16½ to 1.

It will not go into the hands or coffers of foreign syndicates or bankers; there will be no semiannual interest to be paid and endanger our gold reserve, or more strictly speaking, our gold humbug, but it will flow out among the people and find its way back through the channels of trade and commerce into the Treasury of the Government.

We must either support a standing army in times of peace or adopt and honestly enforce a pension policy that will guarantee to the volunteer soldier a competence to him and his dependents when he is no longer able to earn the same.

A standing army not only has to be fed, paid, and clothed, but its members are taken out of the ranks of the producers of the country.

They are the drones of Europe and are eating up the substance of all the first-class powers of the Old World.

My choice of the two systems is already made. It is dictated by prudence, charity, and the common instincts of humanity, instincts common to all the human kind except the modern Democrat.

The act of 1890 is justified, supported, and fortified by all the above considerations, and yet it has been practically nullified, if the words and cases cited by honorable members of this House during the progress of this debate have a semblance of truth.

We have listened for three days to case after case, the name of the claimant and the number of his claim in most instances being given, of how the Pension Department, under the present management, does not grant a pension, and the flimsy excuses and subterfuges resorted to by it in order to reject the same, or if this is impossible, to hold it up, probably with the hope that while his claim is thus in chancery the old soldier will pay his last debt to nature instead of having the Government pay him his long overdue debt; how this Bureau exacts of him, and especially his widow, all kinds of impossible and frivolous proofs; how the sworn evidence of himself and his neighbor is, without warrant of law and contrary to all the known rules of evidence, cast aside, and the unsworn statement of a sneak, a spy, and often his bitter personal enemy, gathered and collected by persons called special pension examiners under circumstances of fraud and false pretenses, is used and accepted by this Department and relied upon, and his evidence cast aside as unworthy of belief; how from the very moment his application is filed he is looked upon and his every act and declaration is treated as an attempt by a dishonest person to wrong, injure, and cheat the Government he had fought to save.

I could cite to you many acts of cruelty, perfidy, and dishonor practiced by the agents of this Bureau upon the soldiers of my district that have come under my personal observation, and I assure you I am not, nor ever have been, a pension attorney. I never prosecuted or assisted in the prosecution of a single claim in my life—but of examples we have had enough.

But I can not refrain from reverting to the history of one pension claim and the peculiar methods of this Department, as evidenced by its action in the premises.

One of like kind, I believe, has not been mentioned in the long list referred to by the many speakers. I refer to the case of David B. Salts, a resident of my home town. I know this man well, and know him to be a brave and an honest man, though poor and broken down in health. He is one of the men who had his eyes opened in 1894, and this may have had something to do—I do not know, and will make no accusation—with his having been dropped from the pension rolls. I do know he was dropped in 1895. He was granted a pension in 1893 under the act of 1890 at the rate of $8 per month, as I now recall it, and dropped from the rolls in July, 1895. He holds an honorable discharge from the military service of the United States, having served in the First Tennessee Light Artillery from July, 1863, to the close of the war.

I wish I had this man, in his present physical condition and in the condition he was in when he was dropped from the rolls, here in Washington, so I could file him as a living exhibit with and in this Bureau; and his disabilities have not arisen from any vicious habits.

And what excuse do you imagine this Department offers for striking his name from the pension rolls? They informed him that he was dropped from the rolls because of disloyalty to the Union. It is true he served up to near the capture of Vicksburg in the Confederate army; and the records of the War Department show he deserted the Confederate army and at once joined the Union Army and made a good soldier to the end of the war.

What I do not understand is, that to have been a Confederate soldier, or the son of one, was an open passport to obtain employment in this Bureau, and the same fact deprives a man of a pension who deserted the Confederacy and made as good a Union soldier as ever wore a uniform or pointed a cannon.

I infer his desertion of the Confederate Army is the only reasonable conclusion to be drawn from the facts.

The truth is, this man was living in Greeneville, Tenn., and was notified that if he did not join the Confederate Army he would be conscripted, and you know that some people in those days were a little peculiar, and either did not want to hire a substitute or did not have the money to hire one, nor did they like to serve in the army as a drafted man. In fact, substitutes did not go in the Confederacy—they took them all, old and young, as recruits if they would, and if they would not, as drafted men.

Mr. Salts was one of these peculiar men, and being a stanch Union man deserted at the first opportunity and joined our forces in front of Vicksburg, and made a gallant soldier.

Some people in high places are not so peculiar in this particular, and hired a substitute and did their fighting at long range and entirely by proxy. Substitutes could be had in New York, and it is said certain persons availed themselves of the opportunity.

I do not believe there is a Confederate soldier on earth who would construe our pension laws so as to take away this man's pension. But the inspiration comes from other sources and from men who only fought by proxy.

In conclusion, I give this bill my hearty support, and only wish it went further and granted a pension to every man who had an honorable discharge from the Union Army, according to his necessities, and to this at last we will all come, and God speed the day.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. If nobody else on our side of the Hall desires to speak and no gentleman on the other side desires to speak, I will move that the committee rise, because a number of gentlemen who desired to take part in the debate have left the Hall. They understood that the debate would continue during the balance of the day. There are a number of members who have expressed their desire to address the committee, but as they are not in the Hall I will move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the committee do now rise.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, is this to continue to-morrow?

The CHAIRMAN. What was the inquiry?

Mr. PICKLER. Is the debate to continue to-morrow?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. We will take up the bill by paragraphs to-morrow if there are no other members who desire to address the committee.

Mr. PICKLER. If no one is ready I would like to have from five to ten minutes now on this matter.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his motion that the committee do now rise, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER].

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to detain the committee to make a speech upon this bill. The two propositions reported by the committee have been before the Committee on Invalid Pensions and discussed in an informal way. The proposition of the committee does not go far enough to suit us of the Committee on Invalid Pensions. We want that to be a permanent law, or something like that, and not confine it to the expenditures authorized by one appropriation bill. There has been so much said here in regard to the trouble in the Pension Office, and the difficulty in having pensions allowed, that it would not be improper for me to state to the committee that the Committee on Invalid Pensions have in an informal way had many of these propositions under consideration; and that later, as soon as we can hear from different committees who desire to address us on pension legislation, and hear from members of the House who have introduced bills upon these different subjects, it is the expectation of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to evolve a committee bill, a bill on the administration of the pension laws, a bill to facilitate, if possible, the allowance of pensions by changing the manner of proof in some instances, and in other directions trying to assist in rectifying some of the matters complained of here so earnestly at this time. In order that the committee may know some of the questions that are before the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I desire to have read from the desk a bill which I introduced and which was sent to that committee. That takes up the different subjects upon a large number of these points that have been covered in debate. Other gentlemen have introduced bills upon the same line, and the committee expects to take up all these bills and consider them together. Some of the bills introduced have a great deal better propositions than those which I have ingrafted in the bill I introduced. It is the calculation of the committee along the line of this suggestion, and others that may come from members of the House, to draft a bill upon the administration of the laws in the Pension Department, not seeking to present a bill containing any increase in pensions in any regard, but simply a bill to try to facilitate the allowance of pensions as they now exist under the law.

Now, I ask to have the bill read from the Clerk's desk in my time and as a part of my remarks, and I ask gentlemen to give it attention, because when it comes before them for consideration amendments will be in order, and I trust that we shall be able to perfect a measure which will facilitate the administration of the pension laws and do justice to the old soldiers.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill to prevent discontinuance of pensions, to restore pensions discontinued, to establish uniform rates of pension, to facilitate the allowance of pensions in matters of proof, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That no person otherwise entitled to a pension by virtue of any law of the United States shall be disqualified from receiving the same by reason of any prior service of such person in the so-called Confederate army or navy during the war for the Union, nor shall the widow, children, or dependent relatives of such person be deprived of a right to pension by reason of such service.

SEC. 2. That hereafter, when proof of marriage shall be required in the administration of the pension laws of the United States, marriage may be proved without other evidence than satisfactory proof that the parties were joined in marriage by some ceremony deemed by them obligatory, or habitually recognized each other as husband and wife and were so recognized by their neighbors and lived together as such up to the date of enlistment when such soldier or sailor died in the service, or, if otherwise, to date of death; and the children born of any marriage so proved shall be deemed and held to be lawful children of such soldier or sailor.

SEC. 3. That from and after the passage of this act no pension heretofore granted or which may hereafter be granted under the pension laws of the United States shall be discontinued or reduced except for fraud.

SEC. 4. That all persons whose pensions have been reduced or discontinued, except for fraud, since March 4, 1893, shall be restored to the pension rolls at the rate the pensioner was receiving at the date of such reduction or discontinuance; said restoration to take effect as of said date, unless such pensioner shall at the time of the passage of this act be receiving a pension equal to or in excess of the amount received at the date of such reduction or discontinuance: *Provided*, That in case of the death of any such pensioner subsequently to the reduction or discontinuance of his pension, the accrued pension under this act shall be paid to his widow or heirs, in like manner as the same would have been paid had no reduction or discontinuance been made.

SEC. 5. That the common-law presumption of death after the lapse of seven years without news or tidings of the missing person shall obtain and be of force in the administration of the pension laws: *Provided*, That if such person shall afterwards be discovered to be alive, any pension that may have been granted on account of his death shall thereupon cease.

SEC. 6. That in all claims for pension or increase of pension wherein the person on whose service the claim was based was present with his proper command at the time when disabilities claimed for were incurred, the soldier, sailor, or marine shall be presumed to have been in line of duty, but such presumption may be rebutted: *Provided, however*, That the records of the War or Navy Department showing disabilities to have been incurred or contracted in line of duty shall be conclusive.

SEC. 7. That in all notifications from the Bureau of Pensions to the claimant, his attorney, or other person entitled to be informed of the status of a case, such notification shall set forth each and every fact upon which further evidence is required to complete the same and the character of evidence necessary to establish such fact.

SEC. 8. That every claimant for pension or increase under the pension laws shall have the right, in person or by attorney, to examine and inspect each and every paper, memorandum, writing, or thing, in any Department, bureau, division, court, or office of the United States, which has or may contain any reference, allusion to, or bearing upon the claim of such claimant.

SEC. 9. That in all applications for pension or increase, and evidence submitted in support of any claim under the pension laws of the United States, the oath of a person who has served as a private or noncommissioned officer shall not have any less weight than if such applicant or witness had served as a commissioned officer: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to require a greater number of witnesses than heretofore for the establishment of any fact in relation to such claim.

SEC. 10. That in considering the claim for pension of any soldier or sailor under the act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890, a service of ninety days in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the war for the Union, and an honorable discharge therefrom, shall be sufficient to give title to pension under said act, notwithstanding a prior or subsequent service from which the soldier or sailor was not honorably discharged, and the service as shown in the discharge certificate shall be conclusive as determining enlistment and discharge: *Provided*, That the death of a soldier or sailor while in the service of the United States shall be construed and held as equivalent to an honorable discharge in determining title to pension in behalf of any person claiming under said act on account of the service of such soldier or sailor.

SEC. 11. That an application under said act of 1890 shall be sufficient, to all intents and purposes, if the applicant alleges therein the existence of disability which renders him unable to earn a support; and every disability found to exist which is recognized as pensionable under the general pension laws shall be taken into consideration in determining the degree of disability of such applicant, and the same rate of pension shall be allowed for the same disability as under the general laws, not to exceed $12 per month: *Provided*, That pensions heretofore allowed under said act at a rating less than herein provided shall be rerated, and the pensioner shall be paid from the time of failure to rate as hereinbefore provided.

SEC. 12. That in all claims for pension or increase of pension under said act of 1890 the presumption shall be that the disabilities alleged are not the result of vicious habits; but such presumption may be rebutted: *Provided, however*, That the pension shall be allowed unless it shall conclusively appear from the evidence that the disabilities proved are the result of the vicious habits established by the evidence.

SEC. 13. That upon the rejection of a claim for pension under said act of 1890, on the ground of no pensionable degree of disability, the applicant shall not be required to file a new or supplemental declaration, but on filing in his case the sworn statement of a reputable physician that a pensionable degree of disability does in fact exist, an order for the applicant's examination, before another board of surgeons if desired, shall issue; and in case such board reports the existence of a pensionable disability the pension, when allowed, shall commence from the date of filing the application rejected as aforesaid.

SEC. 14. That the term "without other means of support than her daily labor," in section 3 of said act of 1890, shall be construed and held, to all intents and purposes, to be equivalent to and mean "without an income of $200 per annum."

SEC. 15. That in the administration of the pension laws the acceptance into the military or naval service of the United States shall be conclusive evidence of soundness, except where it appears of record that the disability claimed for existed at time of such acceptance.

SEC. 16. That in the administration of the pension laws in cases of doubt the presumption shall be in favor of the claimant.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I only desire to add that in the bill which we hope to pass all of these points, or most of them at

least, will be covered, and any other propositions that may occur to members as tending to improve the bill and to facilitate the allowance of pensions should be brought before the committee and the House, so that we may have a general consideration of this whole subject; that every member who desires to be heard may have an opportunity to be heard and an opportunity to offer amendments, so that when the bill is passed it may be one that will give substantial aid in administering the pension laws of the country.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman whether, in his opinion, the proper way to legislate on these pension questions is not to bring in a bill from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, rather than to put "riders" upon appropriation bills?

Mr. PICKLER. I do not care to answer that question.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Dakota if he has any expectation that the bill which he has had read here in his time will ever come before the House in such shape as to give members an opportunity to vote upon it?

Mr. PICKLER. I certainly do.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Under the rules of the House is it not true that it will be almost impossible to reach that result unless the Committee on Rules will bring in a special rule?

Mr. PICKLER. No, sir. This bill does not appropriate any money, and the Committee on Invalid Pensions is a privileged committee, so I do not see how it would be possible to cut us off from having our bills considered. Besides, I do not doubt that if necessary the Committee on Rules would be very glad to give the House an opportunity to discuss such a bill.

Mr. DALZELL. There is no doubt of it.

Mr. PICKLER. One of the members of the Committee on Rules sitting near me says there is no doubt of it.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Do you think that the gentleman who sits at the other end of the Avenue would like to sign that bill? [Laughter.]

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether he would or not. It is presumed that every public officer will do his duty, but, however that may be, we certainly ought to do our duty whether he does his or not. [Applause.] I am in favor of passing such a bill as will meet the views of this House to remedy the evils that have been set forth here, if we possibly can pass it, and I am glad of the debate that has been provoked by these amendments on the appropriation bill. I am glad of this discussion, because it shows that there is a growing need for some legislation that will deal properly with this question of granting pensions.

Mr. STEELE. I want to ask the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] whether he does not think that the safe and wise thing for us to do is to pass the amendments that have been reported on this appropriation bill?

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, yes. I always vote for pension legislation, I do not care what kind of a bill it is on. [Laughter.] I do not think there has ever been an appropriation bill brought in here carrying an appropriation for pensions to which I have not offered amendments myself.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I want to say to the gentleman from South Dakota that my purpose in asking him these questions was, if possible, to demonstrate the fact that we had better adopt these amendments reported on this appropriation bill and make sure of something when we can get it instead of taking our chances on an uncertainty. I approve the provisions of the bill which the gentleman has had read from the desk, but at the same time I think we ought to pass these amendments now.

Mr. PICKLER. If the amendments stand in your bill against the point of order, if any point should be raised—and it certainly will not be raised on this side—I shall cheerfully vote for them, although they are not strong enough. Those provisions ought to apply not only to the appropriations made in this bill, but they ought to be the law for all time.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I concede that they are not strong enough, but they are better than the rulings of the Pension Office. They are an improvement on the present order of things.

Mr. PICKLER. Yes; they touch two points. The first question they deal with is the widow question, which is a very important one; yet I think there are other pension questions deserving of as much consideration.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. There is no controversy between the gentleman from South Dakota and myself. I approve of every part of his bill, but I think there would be grave danger in letting these amendments go and waiting for action on the bill which the gentleman proposes to bring up. I think we had better take what we can while waiting for a better and more comprehensive bill.

Mr. PICKLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want it to be inferred that I am not in favor of these amendments in the pending bill. The Committee on Appropriations are "stealing the thunder" of the Committee on Invalid Pensions [laughter], but it is all right. It will be observed, however, that the amendatory provisions reported by the Committee on Appropriations refer only to the appropriations made for the coming fiscal year. Now, what we want is that the two questions embraced in those amendments of the Committee on Appropriations, together with twenty other questions of similar importance, shall be put into a general bill which shall become a law for all time. Now, I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether, if I move that the provisions incorporated in his bill be made permanent in their application, he will accept the amendment?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. If the gentleman will first make sure that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole will sustain the provisions against any point of order which may be raised, I would be glad to accept the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. PICKLER. I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not sure that these amendments of his committee will stay in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. We are sure of nothing in this world. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. I observe that in the bill just sent to the desk by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] there is in the twelfth section a provision that—

> In all claims for pension or increase of pension under said act of 1890 the presumption shall be that the disabilities alleged are not the result of vicious habits; but such presumption may be rebutted.

Now, I wish to ask the gentleman why in the latter part of the section there should be a provision for reviving a presumption which the anterior portion wipes out and expunges?

Mr. PICKLER. The record might show evidence of the existence of such habits. The effect of this provision is that the existence of the "vicious habits" must appear affirmatively in evidence.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. But in the first part of the section you provide that the presumption now raised against the applicant shall be done away with, and then the section proceeds further to enact that "such presumption may be rebutted." If the former portion of the section takes effect there is no such presumption in existence.

Mr. PICKLER. All those matters will come up for discussion when this measure is regularly considered. I am very glad the gentleman raises the question. I wish to say in this connection that we want to secure such a change of ruling over in the Pension Office that the excessive use of tobacco shall not be construed as a "vicious habit." I have before me a decision where that ground has been taken.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to detain the Committee of the Whole with any discussion at this time upon the pending bill; but a suggestion of my colleague [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] has raised a question upon which I have had some little feeling since I have been a member of this Congress and the last. I refer to my colleague's allusion just now to what might be the views of the President of the United States. Sir, under the long established parliamentary law it has always been regarded as an invasion of the prerogatives of Parliament for anyone to refer in its discussions to the opinion of the King upon any question pending before it.

A MEMBER. Is Mr. Cleveland "the king"?

Mr. GROW. In reference to matters of this kind he occupies the same relation to the Houses of Congress that the sovereign in Great Britain does to Parliament. The President exercises the veto power; and if we do not have on any given measure the two-thirds necessary to overcome his veto, he is so far the king.

In the last Congress we had before us on one occasion a bill headed "The bill of the Secretary of the Treasury." What has that officer to do with presenting any bill to this House? We have had here attempts by the Secretaries of the different Departments to influence legislation. They have sent in here letters to be read with reference to pending measures; and in one case a letter was read here from the President of the United States having reference to a measure then pending in the House and just about to be voted on. I trust such practices will be discontinued.

This House owes it to itself to make the President understand that he has nothing to do with the action of this legislative body until a bill formally passed is presented to him for his approval. [Applause.] Only in that contingency has he the right to express his approval or disapproval of our action. Nor has any one of the heads of Departments, except the Secretary of the Treasury, the right to communicate his views uninvited to this House. That officer may report to this body on important questions affecting the revenues; but when he sends here a bill headed "The bill of the Secretary of the Treasury" the House owes it to itself to return that bill to him and inform him that he can not invade in that way the prerogatives of this body any more than can the President of the United States by having a letter read here just on the eve of a vote on an important measure.

I am well aware that the majority of this House to-day would take no orders from the present Executive; it is not in that view that I am raising this question. I simply submit that the legisla-

tive department of this Government owes it to itself to resent any attempt on the part of the Executive or his clerks to influence the vote of this House on pending legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, before moving that the committee rise I wish to state that unless there are other members who desire to speak in the general debate on this bill we shall in the morning take it up by paragraphs, and a vote will be reached as soon thereafter as practicable. I make this announcement so that members may understand that probably the vote may be reached to-morrow, and in view of that possibility I hope to see more members in their seats than there are now.

Mr. STEELE. There will be no attempt to prevent members from discussing the bill under the five-minute rule?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Not if there is anybody who wants to speak. I understand that there are gentlemen wishing to speak who are not here now, but who will be here in the morning. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DINGLEY reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriation for payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the president of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, reporting on the payment of certain certificates issued for street improvements on Conneticut avenue extended and transmitting a draft of a bill for the enforcement of the payment of certain costs in connection therewith—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the Brightwood Railway Company for the year ended December 31, 1895—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting the reports of the receipts and disbursements of the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company from January 1 to September 21, 1895, and of the Capital Traction Company from September 21, 1895, to December 31, 1895, together with a list of the stockholders of the latter company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill amending the act of Congress establishing a summary court-martial, and for other purposes, together with a communication from the Judge-Advocate-General of the Army in relation thereto—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS.

Mr. ELLIS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 793) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes,' approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 52) in writing thereon; which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3558) to aid the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, and South Dakota to support schools of mines, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 50) in writing thereon; which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. POOLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 162) amending section 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, relating to invalid pensions, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 51) in writing thereon; which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from Committee on Invalid Pensions, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 1141) granting a pension to Miss Mary E. Hull, sister of John A. Hull, deceased, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment of Illinois Infantry. (Report No. 49.)

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 147) granting a pension to George W. Case. (Report No. 53.)

Also, a bill (H. R. 925) granting a pension to Annie J. Corbett, of Providence, R. I. (Report No. 44.)

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 1605) granting a pension to Anna Kelley. (Report No. 45.)

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 1020) granting an increase of pension to Gilman Williams. (Report No. 46.)

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 994) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Keith. (Report No. 47.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4044) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 4045) providing for a model tank for the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 4046) to amend section 56 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the collection of internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved August 28, 1894, so as to allow loss in transportation of spirits in certain cases—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4047) to amend section 3328, Revised Statutes, imposing a tax on imitation wines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4048) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to amend the laws in relation to internal revenue," approved May 28, 1880, so as to extend its provisions to fruit distillers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 4049) relating to the compensation and duties of United States attorneys, clerks, marshals, deputy marshals, commissioners, and other court officials, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 4050) to supplement and amend an act entitled "An act for the erection of a new custom-house in the city of New York, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 4051) to protect lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 4052) approving certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico authorizing the issue of certain bonds of said Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4053) repealing chapter 148 of the Supplement of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 4054) to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 4055) to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4056) authorizing the persons herein named to accept of certain decorations and testimonials from the late Hawaiian Government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4057) in relation to cigarettes, and to limit the effect of the regulation of commerce between the several States and with foreign countries in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4058) to set apart certain lands now known as the Pacific Forest Reserve as a public park, to be known as the Washington National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4059) to provide for the establishment and maintenance of national patriotic memorial universities in the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 4060) to amend section 1754 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, giving preference to soldiers and soldiers' widows for civil offices—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. STOKES: A bill (H. R. 4061) to amend section 546 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the United States court for South Carolina, and providing for the same—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SETTLE: A bill (H. R. 4062) to provide for the enlargement of the Federal building at Greensboro, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4063) to equalize the rank and pay of certain officers of the Navy who have served full terms as chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4064) to extend the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of the United States and of the supreme courts of the Territories to all cases, civil and criminal, arising on Indian reservations or between Indians and white men in the respective judicial districts and Territories in which the reservations are located—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 4065) for the relief of applicants to purchase public lands under the timber and stone act—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4066) for the relief of claimants to public lands under the homestead laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4067) to amend an act entitled "An act for the sale of timber lands in the States of California, Oregon, Nevada, and in Washington Territory," approved June 3, 1878—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 4068) to enable the city of Tucson, in the Territory of Arizona, to issue bonds to construct a water and sewer system—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MOSES: A bill (H. R. 4069) to repeal section 4716, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4070) amending section 3480, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SETTLE: A bill (H. R. 4071) to provide for the coinage of the American product of silver, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 4072) to amend section 5 of an act to relieve certain appointed or enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps from the charge of desertion, passed August 14, 1888—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4073) amending paragraph 10 of section 238 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4074) for the relief of settlers on certain lands in Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: A joint resolution (H. Res. 84) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver condemned cannon to the Veteran Association of Fairhaven, Mass.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A joint resolution (H. Res. 85) relative to the medal of honor authorized by the acts of July 12, 1862, and March 3, 1863—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A resolution (House Res. No. 115) for the appointment of a committee of five to investigate the last bond sale—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS: A memorial of the legislature of the State of New York for an act directing the Treasurer of the United States to pay to the comptroller of the State of New York annually a sum equivalent to three-fourths of all sums expended by the State of New York in the maintenance of its canal system during the year last preceding—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. LINTON: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Michigan for the muster and pay allowance to Michael Sheehy—to the Committee on War Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Naval Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1485) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph B. Hull, late commodore, United States Navy, retired, and it was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBOTT: A bill (H. R. 4075) for the relief of Henry M. Swann—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 4076) for the relief of Abner Abercrombie—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 4077) for the relief of W. R. Miller, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 4078) for the relief of Thomas P. A. Leonard, of Sweetwater, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 4079) to increase the pension of McDonald Kincade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4080) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Michael Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4081) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John K. McPherson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 4082) for the relief of Jacob A. Henry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 4083) for the relief of James W. Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4084) for the relief of Gotlieb Feldmeyer, of Annapolis, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4085) for the relief of Henry Hubbard, of Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 4086) for the relief of John M. Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULBERSON: A bill (H. R. 4087) for the relief of C. W. Reid and Sam Daube—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4088) for the relief of the heirs of Matthew J. J. Cagle—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 4089) for the relief of W. L. Adams, of Oregon—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 4090) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. F. E. Marshall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4091) for the relief of Peter A. Becker—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4092) for the relief of J. A. Courtney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 4093) for the relief of Samuel D. Hubbard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 4094) for the relief of Charles Candy—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 4095) to remove from the rolls and records the record of dishonorable discharge now standing against Edward L. Friday—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4096) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Andrew Edgar—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4097) appropriating money to pay the claim of James C. Wheat for expenses incurred as adjutant of the Forty-ninth Indiana Volunteers, war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4098) for relief of Thomas F. Ryan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 4099) granting a pension to Mary S. Higgins, widow of Col. Jacob Higgins, late of Johnstown, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULING: A bill (H. R. 4100) to pay the claim of James H. Sentz—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 4101) for the relief of Frank S. Sowers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4102) granting a pension to David Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 4103) for the relief of Calvin J. Cowles and George B. Hanna—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 4104) granting a pension to Samuel Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4105) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Martin Van Buren Day—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4106) for relief of I. N. Cunningham, administrator—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4107) for the relief of Monroe Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4108) for relief of J. F. Holladay—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4109) to muster William H. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4110) for relief of William Cole—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4111) for the relief of H. S. Simmons's estate—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4112) for relief of Mollie B. O'Callaghan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4113) for relief of Joseph W. Wilson and David R. Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 4114) for the relief of W. E. Judkins, executor of Lewis McKenzie—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4115) to restore the name of Adam J. Brannan to the pension roll and to allow him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4116) to pension Willoughby M. Park for services rendered and disabilities contracted in the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES: A bill (H. R. 4117) granting a pension to Eason Stamps—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4118) to grant a pension to Mitchell Pearce, a soldier of the war of 1812—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4119) granting a pension to Mary L. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4120) granting increase of pension to William M. Shipp—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4121) granting a pension to Bailey R. Gill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4122) granting an increase of pension to James H. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4123) granting a pension to Tenderson Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4124) granting a pension to Samuel Burns—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4125) granting increase of pension to Daniel P. Copeland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4126) granting a pension to Nancy Piper—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4127) granting a pension to Nancy H. Coats—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWENS: A bill (H. R. 4128) granting a pension to Sallie B. Carter, of Woodford County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SETTLE: A bill (H. R. 4129) for the relief of W. R. Albright, of Alamance County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 4130) for the relief of John Feltis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLER: A bill (H. R. 4131) granting an honorable discharge to James Ammerman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: A bill (H. R. 4132) for the relief of John Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 4133) for relief of estate of Wright A. Moore, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4134) for relief of estate of Samuel Heard, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4135) for relief of estate of Ira A. Sprouse, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4136) for relief of estate of Evans S. Gilbert, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4137) for relief of George C. Harper, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4138) for relief of James H. Owen, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4139) for the relief of Susan V. Hedderman, administratrix R. P. Chambers, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 4140) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against the record of Henry C. Bliss—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Three petitions, respectively, of 460 citizens of Canonsburg, 89 citizens of Midway, and 45 citizens of Independence, Washington County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the Presbyterian Ministers' Meeting of Pittsburg and Allegheny, Pa., with reference to the sufferers in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: Memorial of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, to the President and Congress of the United States, on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela, relative to the boundary of the latter and the intervention of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of Josephus Vickroy and others, of Long View, Ill., in favor of a service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARDY: Petition of 190 citizens of Owensboro and Daviess County, Ky., praying for the passage of the Stone bill on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: Petition of W. L. Thompson and others, citizens of St. Louis, Mo., favoring an act to secure a better grade of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition and resolutions of mass meeting of citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, expressing sympathy for Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 65 railway postal clerks on lines centering at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, favoring the Linton bill to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of Phillip L. Stickel and others, favoring the passage of a bill for a better class of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Resolutions adopted by the First Baptist Church of Springfield, Mass., in behalf of Armenia and arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Two memorials, respectively, of James V. Wolf and August Varian, of Meigs County, Ohio, in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3575 for the relief of William O. Eagle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HITT: Memorial of representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela relative to the boundary of the latter and the intervention of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HULING: Petition of citizens of Upshur County, W. Va., requesting Congress to pass laws relative to immigration into the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KULP: Petition of the citizens of Shamokin, Pa., and vicinity, praying for the passage of the Stone bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD: Two petitions, respectively, of citizens of Lycoming County and citizens of Tioga and Potter counties, Pa., praying for legislation restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Massachusetts Wholesale Lumber Association, in favor of widening and deepening Boston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Massachusetts Lumber Association, in favor of the Torrey bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: Petition of Adam J. Brannan, praying to be restored to the pension roll, and to be allowed a pension; to accompany his bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Willoughby M. Park, with exhibits, praying for pension, to accompany bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORSE: Memorial of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela relative to the boundary of the latter and the intervention of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOZLEY (by request): Petition of members of Stevenson Post, No. 488, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pocahontas, Mo., asking certain pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: Petition of E. T. Baker and 95 other citizens of Andover, Ohio, and vicinity, praying for the passage of the Stone bill providing for a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of the Business Men's Association of South Milwaukee, asking that the harbor of South Milwaukee be improved—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of J. D. Neilson, H. E. Palmer, H. H. Norman, and other citizens of Rutherford County, Tenn., in favor of allowance of the claim of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Memorial of citizens of Delaware County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone bill to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Parkmount Mills Company, Limited, Lenni, Delaware County, Pa., from the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, praying for an adequate duty on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Grocers and Importers' Exchange, favoring a ship canal—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, memorial of representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela, relative to the boundary of the latter and the intervention of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, four petitions of citizens of Media County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition from citizens of Utica, N. Y., in behalf of Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: Petition of James F. Tripp, B. W. Kempton, and Fred M. Tabor, a committee of the Veteran Association, Grand Army of the Republic, of Fairhaven, Mass., for cannon to be placed on the soldiers' lot in Riverside Cemetery in that town—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG: Two petitions, respectively, of F. R. Stewart and F. H. Gibens, of Fostoria, Ohio, for the removal of the charge of desertion against Theodore Werner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of T. E. Hunter and 53 others, praying for the passage of a bill to secure a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: Petition and papers in support of House bill No. 3520, for the relief of Allen W. Philips—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition and papers in support of House bill No. 3524, for the relief of James McGowan from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition and papers in support of the following House bills: No. 3516, granting an increase in the pension of Sarah J. Paynter; No. 3517, for the relief of George Heishman; No. 3518, for the relief of David Melton; No. 3519, for the relief of John R. Watson; No. 3522, granting a pension to Handy Deputy; No. 3533, granting a pension to Catharine Pee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition and papers in support of the following House bills: No. 3521, granting a pension to Mrs. Ellen Quinn; No. 3523, for the relief of Sarah L. Smith; No. 3525, granting a pension to Mrs. Nancy Thurman; No. 3526, granting a pension to Mary J. Turner; No. 3528, granting a pension to David B. Salts; No. 3530, granting a pension to Peter Wendell; No. 3531, granting a pension to Dennis Sheedy; No. 3532, granting a pension to Lucy Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition and papers in support of House bill No. 3534, to remove the charge of desertion from John Dickson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 16, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

TITLES OF NOBILITY.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a matter that occurred yesterday. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations reported back the bill (S. 654) to prevent citizens of the United States from soliciting or receiving and accepting titles, patents of nobility, or degrees of honor from foreign nations, and for other purposes, with a recommendation that it be indefinitely postponed, which was agreed to. I was in the Chamber during the entire morning hour, but owing to the confusion which usually characterizes the transaction of business in the Senate I did not hear the report submitted by the Senator from Ohio, and did not know of it until I read the paper last evening. It is my desire to have the bill placed upon the Calendar, so that it may come up and be discussed and acted upon by the full Senate, and not by the committee alone. The Senater from Ohio in making the report said:

> The committee are of opinion that it is hardly worth while to dignify with the form of legislation the fact that some American citizens receive titles from a foreign government; that they ought to be laughed at rather than be sent to the penitentiary for a crime.

I do not believe that the American people think that way. I believe the patriotic people, the true American citizens of this country want to see a law passed by Congress that will punish as a crime any man who may accept a title or patent of nobility from a foreign government. I hope the Senator who had charge of this measure will permit an order to be made this morning placing the bill upon the Calendar for consideration. I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the matter.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have not the slightest objection to the course suggested. If the Senator desires, he has a right to move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was indefinitely postponed. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing that it shall be placed upon the Calendar. It was the opinion of the committee uttered by me, and I am surprised that the Senator did not hear my statement.

Mr. ALLEN. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. I spoke loud enough to call the attention of the Senate to the bill. I saw the Senator from Nebraska in his place and looking at me, and I supposed as a matter of course he heard what I said. However, I have no objection to the vote by which the bill was indefinitely postponed being reconsidered and having it placed on the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. ALLEN. I was surprised that the Senator did not call my attention to the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thought the Senator heard me.

Mr. ALLEN. I have no doubt the Senator thought so; but in consequence of the confusion in the Chamber I did not hear the Senator. I should like to have an order made placing the bill on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the vote by which the bill was indefinitely postponed will be reconsidered, and the bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

STATE WAR CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of January 28, 1895, a report from the Auditor for the War Department as to the amounts due the several States, from the claims now on file in the Treasury Department under act of July 27, 1861, for expenses incurred in raising troops, as provided for by the order of the Secretary of the Treasury of February 8, 1893; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3018) to amend the act approved March 3, 1891, granting the right of way upon the public lands for reservoir and canal purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PEFFER. I present the petition of Rev. A. M. Campbell, of Catasauqua, Pa., representing an association known as the American Anti-Usury Association, suggesting a means to abolish usury. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN presented sundry affidavits and petitions of members of the Santee Sioux tribe of Indians, of Nebraska, praying for the payment of annuities withheld from them by reason of alleged participation in the outbreak at Redwood Agency in the year 1862; which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SEWELL presented petitions of Monroe Lane and 18 other citizens of New Bedford; of Thomas W. Ross and 53 other citizens of Vincentown; of Charles A. Morris and 18 other citizens of Hamilton; of E. C. White and 33 other citizens of Glendola; of A. A. Tilton and 75 other citizens of Monmouth, and of L. L. Hansell and 44 other citizens of Jersey City, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called William A. Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Society of the United States Military Telegraph Corps, praying that they be granted by the Government the same recognition for their services in the late war as is given to the soldiers who served in the Regular Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHERMAN presented sundry petitions of citizens of Hannibal, Andover, and Middletown, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called William A. Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Troy, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation in the interest of morality; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Given Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Wooster, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions in certain cases to families or relatives of pensioners instead of to the pensioners themselves; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GRAY presented a memorial of the Delaware Peace Society, remonstrating against the enactment of any legislation which is designed or is liable to encourage wars and warlike movements, whether internal or foreign; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Pastors' Union of the city of Snohomish, Wash., comprising the resident pastors of the Evangelical churches in that city, urging upon Congress the passage of the resolution relative to giving relief to the Armenian people of Asiatic Turkey. The petitioners go on to recite that the massacre of guiltless thousands, the outraging of helpless women, selling into slavery innocent girls, the total destruction of the homes and the necessities of life of vast multitudes can not find a parallel short of the darkest days of the Middle Ages. They urge that the great Governments should unite for their suppression, and if diplomatic methods can not avail that they then invoke the arbitrament of force.

I call attention to the following passages in the petition proceeding, as it does, from the churches of Snohomish: These pastors ask that Congress insist that the Executive protect our American missionaries in Turkey, and the property which they hold for mission and educational work, and for personal comfort and good. They also ask that the Government extend to Cubans, struggling for liberty, the rights of belligerents and recognition at the earliest moment when their achievements shall show that they are entitled to it.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE. I also present a petition of citizens of Mason County, State of Washington, representing that the chief industries of the Pacific Coast, agriculture and horticulture, are to a great degree unremunerative and threatened with extinction for lack of cheap means of transportation to Eastern and European markets. The petitioners state that they are handicapped by the distance of nearly 10,000 miles in their competition with agriculturists in the Argentine Republic. They represent that the construction of the interoceanic ship canal at Nicaragua would enable them to compete with Argentina, and make their industries again prosperous and profitable. Therefore the petitioners, with the utmost earnestness, pray that Congress shall take immediate steps to secure the construction of the Nicaraguan Canal in a manner as rapid as modern engineering shall permit.

I move that the petition be referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE. I also present a petition of sundry citizens of San Juan County, in the State of Washington, expressing their belief that Senate bill 735, entitled "A bill to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy, to increase the usefulness and numbers of the Corps of Naval Engineers, to induce the scientific institutions to provide a naval engineering reserve for time of war, to establish a naval engineering experimental station, and to encourage the study of the mechanic arts and sciences, and particularly that of naval engineering, in the technological colleges of the country," is of the highest importance for the prosperity of that State and of the United States, and the petitioners urge that the bill be made a law. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TURPIE presented a memorial of representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela relative to the boundary of the latter and the intervention of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a service pension of $12 a month to each ex-Union soldier who has been honorably discharged from the service when he shall have arrived at the age of 60 years; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CALL presented the petition of Henry P. Fritot and sundry other citizens of Jacksonville, Fla., praying for a speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VILAS presented petitions of H. C. Rogers and 80 other citizens of Wisconsin; of Frank Patterson and 13 other citizens of Stevens Point, Wis.; of C. H. Tenant and 37 other citizens of Oshkosh, Wis.; of E. D. Bentley and 29 other citizens of Stevens Point, Wis.; of S. L. Priser and 14 other citizens of Stevens Point, Wis.; of A. E. Chase and 49 other citizens of Oshkosh, Wis., and of C. H. Crittenden and 15 other citizens of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. THURSTON. I present a resolution of the house of representatives of the State of Nebraska, praying that on the abandonment of Fort Omaha as a military post it be granted and conveyed to the State of Nebraska, on condition that the State convert it into a military academy and maintain it as such at State expense. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GEAR presented a memorial of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela relative to the boundary of the latter and the intervention of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VEST presented the petition of E. H. Robbins and sundry other citizens of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Skagit County, Wash., praying for the improvement of the Skagit River, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LINDSAY presented sundry petitions of citizens of Owensboro, Ky., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BERRY. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 502) to approve a compromise and settlement between the United States and the State of Arkansas, to report it without amendment and submit a report thereon. I ask that the report, together with the agreement and the report attached as an appendix, be printed, and that the bill be placed on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar and the report printed, as suggested.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1450) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1423) to protect the wages of seamen, reported it with amendments.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 248) granting a pension to Martha Allen, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 549) for relief of William Martin, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on the Census, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 47) relating to the Federal census, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. CAFFERY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1230) to extend the limits of the port of entry of New Orleans, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 227) to permit the withdrawal of certain papers and the signing of certain receipts by John Finn or his attorney, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 535) for the relief of William A. Starkweather, of Oregon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 82) for the relief of the heirs of James Bridger, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 529) for the relief of Peter Grant Stewart, of Oregon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 709) for the relief of W. L. Adams, of Oregon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am authorized by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins, to report it with an amendment.

I will state that two members of the committee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] desire to be recorded as opposed to the joint resolution.

I will state, further, that yesterday the honorable Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and was heard on this measure, and that as soon as the report of the hearing can be printed and laid upon the desks of Senators I shall ask for the consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1046) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory," reported it with an amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 1586) for the relief of Mary Sharp College, of Winchester, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1587) granting a pension to John D. Carpenter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1588) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John D. Carpenter; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SMITH (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1589) in relation to refunding certain sums to port wardens; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1590) for the relief of Edward H. Murrell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WILSON introduced a bill (S. 1591) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to lands embraced in the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 1592) for the relief of James G. Field; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1593) for the relief of Meyer B. Haas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1594) granting a pension to Maria L. Meserve; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1595) granting a pension to William H. H. Walker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1596) for the relief of H. K. Palmer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1597) for the relief of William H. Tibbits; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1598) for the relief of Richard L. Taylor, late private Company F, Fifty-first Illinois Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 1599) to place Francis W. Seeley on the retired list of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1600) to amend chapter 67, volume 23, of the Statutes at Large of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1601) for the relief of W. R. Albright; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1602) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane L. Fagg, widow of Col. John A. Fagg; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GRAY (for Mr. JONES of Arkansas) introduced a bill (S. 1603) for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 1604) for the relief of John A Fairfax, of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1605) for the relief of the administrator of the estate of John Kelly, deceased, late of Alleghany County, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1606) for the relief of Mrs. C. N. Graves, widow, etc.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1607) for the relief of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 55) relative to the medal of honor authorized by the acts of July 12, 1862, and March 3, 1863; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

TENNESSEE STATE CLAIMS.

Mr. HARRIS submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. R. 2) providing for the adjustment of certain claims of the United States against the State of Tennessee and certain claims of the State of Tennessee against the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THOMAS W. SPARROW, N. B. NOLAND, AND OTHERS.

Mr. DANIEL submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed, if in his judgment not incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate all information which has been received by him or by the Department of State in reference to the claims of Thomas W. Sparrow, N. B. Noland, and others, members of the hydrographic commission employed by the Government of Peru in 1872, against that Government for services on said commission, with the correspondence and documents bearing on the subject.

RIGHTS OF CITIZENS OF ARMENIAN BIRTH.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate, if consistent with the public interests:

First. Whether naturalized citizens of the United States of Armenian birth are allowed to visit Turkey on business or to visit their families, and whether United States passports held by them are recognized by the Turkish Government.

Secondly. Whether the families of such naturalized citizens, residing in Turkey, are permitted to leave that country and come to the United States. Also, whether naturalized citizens of the United States of Armenian birth have the same rights and protection in that country as have naturalized citizens of Great Britain, France, Germany, or Russia.

HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. FRYE. I submit a resolution which under the rule will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The resolution was read, and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. CALL. I submit a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to send to the Senate the dispatches of the consuls of the United States relating to the war now carried on in Cuba.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. FRYE. It seems to me the form of the resolution should be somewhat changed. It is a direction to the Secretary of State. I think it should be in the form of a request that the information shall be communicated if not incompatible with the public interests.

Mr. CALL. I accept the suggestion, though I do not see any reason for it. It seems to me that the Senate ought to command whatever information is in the State Department which may, in the judgment of the Senate, be deemed advisable. If it be desired to communicate the information in confidence, I have no objection to so modifying the resolution, but I think it should stand as it is unless objection is made by the Department to sending in the information.

I do not know that there is any information on the subject of importance. I have had no information from the State Department, but I have been informed by a person much interested in Cuban affairs, who has been in conference with some members of Congress, that there are such dispatches, and that they are known to some persons in Cuba, and it may be to the Spanish authorities. I know of no reason why Senators, charged with the responsibility, with the Representatives, of making war or preserving peace, of making treaties or rejecting them, should not have access to all state papers.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think it is very doubtful whether even the President ought to be called upon to disclose matters pending in respect to a country which is in a state of civil war evidently of great proportions, extending to every part of the Island of Cuba. To call for the information which is communicated by consuls and even by citizens of the United States to the executive authority might create embarrassment. It might cause even the killing of persons who gave the information on either side. They might be arrested for treason if they were on one side; on the other, they might be arrested for interfering with the progress of the rebels, as they are called.

I think we ought not to ask for the information. Certainly if it is asked for it ought to be requested from the President, with the usual condition that he should communicate it only in case it does not interfere with the public interests. I think, though, that it would be better, and that the Senator from Florida must see that in an inquiry of this kind an exposure of the communications made perhaps in confidence would not be wise. It would not be safe to the persons who sent the communications, and it might be injurious in every way.

Mr. CALL. If there be objection I will allow the resolution to lie over, though it seems to me that if any authority in this country ought to have the information upon this subject which is in the State Department, it ought to be the Senate. If it is necessary that it should be sent in confidence, it might be sent in confidence. It is my desire to have immediate action on the part of the Congress of the United States in regard to the recognition of the Cuban Republic and according to it belligerent rights, and I shall ask at an early day for a vote of the Senate, if the Committee on Foreign Relations does not think fit to report the resolution, discharging the committee, and asking that the sense of the Senate be taken upon the question whether the people of Cuba shall have recognition in their resistance to the tyranny that is now imposed upon them.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, I should like to be heard for a single moment upon the question after the remarks made by the Senator from Florida. I have heard a great deal during this session from the Senator to the effect that it was the duty of Congress to take some action with reference to the recognition of the insurgents in Cuba as belligerents, but I had supposed that that was a matter, primarily at least, for the executive branch of the Govern-

ment, and not for Congress. I think in the whole history of the country there has never been an instance in which Congress has passed any resolution whatever upon the subject of declaring neutrality as between contending parties in other countries, but that in every instance where it has been done in the United States it has been done by the proclamation of the President.

I do not know that the President is open to any censure for not having already communicated to Congress the facts with reference to the conflict going on in Cuba. I should suppose, however, that if Congress took any action upon the subject and expressed an opinion upon it, it would be in the nature of a criticism upon the President for having failed to do his duty in this respect. Certainly the whole subject lies primarily with the President.

Recognition of the insurgents as belligerents is not a matter which is due to them, but it is a question which pertains solely to the interests of the United States. If a proclamation of neutrality were issued—which is the only way in which belligerent rights are recognized—for the purpose of moral support or for the purpose of expressing sympathy with the people struggling to throw off a monarchical form of government alone, it would be considered, and justly considered under international law, as an unfriendly act to the parent Government.

I think we had better go a little slowly about this business, Mr. President. We in this country sympathize naturally with every people that is seeking to establish a republican form of government, but I think that we ought not to rush hastily into a matter of according belligerent rights to such a people. We ought to observe the rules which have been laid down by international comity with reference to such matters.

I should be very sorry to see any resolution passed here which in any way would indicate that the President of the United States and the State Department were not doing all that that branch of the Government ought to do with reference to the conflict now pending in a neighboring foreign country.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I do not desire to say more than a word. The proposition of the Senator from Connecticut is a subject which will properly come up for consideration before the Senate when the resolution shall be acted upon, and I will not therefore discuss it, though I differ entirely in opinion with him. But for the purpose of avoiding any further debate on this subject, I will consent that the resolution may lie on the table for future action.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table for the present.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. SEWELL. I submit a resolution and ask that it be read for information, printed, and lie on the table. I give notice that I shall at an early day submit a few remarks upon the resolution.

The resolution was read, and ordered to be printed and lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the Monroe doctrine, as originally propounded, was directed to the special prevention of the threatened action of the allied powers in reference to the revolted colonies of Spain and the occupation, by way of colonization, of any supposed derelict territory on this hemisphere.

2. That the question of resisting any acquisition of territory by conquest was limited, as stated by Mr. Webster, to cases in which, by reason of proximity, such acquisition would be dangerous to our safety and the integrity of our institutions.

3. That the true ground upon which the Monroe announcement was based and upon which any similar position has been taken rests for its justification upon what may be our interests, and our interests only; and that neither by the Monroe doctrine, nor any other official declaration, have we ever come under any pledge to any power or State on this continent that binds us to act merely for their protection against invasion or encroachment by any other power.

4. That when a case arises in which a European power proposes to acquire territory by invasion or conquest, it is then for us to determine whether our safety and the integrity of our institutions demand that we shall resist such action by armed force if necessary.

5. That the Executive has pressed the Monroe doctrine beyond what was contemplated at the time of its announcement, and that the resultant sequence of the positions thus taken seems to be a committal of this Government to a protectorate over Mexico and the Central and South American States; that this would be most unwise and dangerous, and would violate the sound and well-established policy that we should avoid all entangling alliances with foreign powers, whether they be European or American.

6. That this action was premature, looking to the history of the controversy, and inopportune in view of the business and financial condition of the country.

7. That neither Congress nor the country can be, or has been committed by the action or position of the executive department, in reference to the Venezuelan boundary controversy, as to the course to be pursued when the time shall have arrived for a final determination. It will then be our province and our duty to adopt such a line of policy and to take such action as may be then demanded by our sense of duty to the country and by a due regard for its honor and dignity, the welfare and safety of our people, and the integrity of our institutions.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 3018) to amend the act approved March 3, 1891, granting the right of way upon the public lands for reservoir and canal purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AFFAIRS.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, there are lying upon the table several resolutions heretofore offered by me, which, by unanimous consent, were allowed to retain their places, one of them asking for certain information from the District Commissioners desired by the labor organizations of the District. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] some time ago asked to have the resolution lie over until the succeeding day. I suppose he has no objection to its passage at this time.

Mr. HARRIS. The only objection I can urge against the resolution, as it simply asks for information, is that if passed it will involve an immense amount of clerical labor that I hardly think ought to be devoted to the collection and presentation of the information sought. I shall, however, interpose no objection to the resolution.

Mr. CALL. I will only say that the information is desired by labor organizations, as I am informed, and I have presented the resolution at their request. Certainly they ought to be informed as to the taxes and expenditures proposed to be made for public improvements in the District. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the resolution be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. CALL December 24, 1895, as follows:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and are hereby, directed to furnish, as soon as practicable, for the information of the Senate, a statement showing—

First. The names of all streets, avenues, alleys, and reservations in the limits of the cities of Washington and Georgetown which are partially or wholly unpaved, and the total length thereof so unpaved; also the length thereof unsewered; also the length thereof without water mains, together with the estimated cost of fully improving the same.

Second. An estimate of the full amount required to carry out the provisions of the act of March 2, 1893, to provide a permanent system of highways in the District of Columbia outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown; the total number of feet of land in streets, avenues, and reservations required to be condemned in each subdivision or piece of land and the value of the same; the number and estimated value of buildings required to be condemned to carry out the provisions of said act in such districts as are prepared by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; the total number of feet of land in streets, avenues, etc., in each subdivision or piece of land that will be abandoned, and the amount and nature of improvements of such streets, avenues, etc., the amount of said improvements at public and private expense. Also an estimate of the cost of fully improving said streets, avenues, and reservations by grading, paving, sewering, and laying water mains, building bridges, culverts, etc., in such streets, avenues, and reservations as are to be condemned by the provisions of said highway act; an estimate of the value of property held by the United States, and the assessed value of private property held in the county, outside of Washington and Georgetown.

Third. A statement showing the amount of taxes collected in the cities of Washington and Georgetown and the county, respectively, by years, from 1878 to 1894, both inclusive, and in like manner the amount expended in each of said sections by the District of Columbia for the same period.

Fourth. The amount of the revenues of the District of Columbia applied by the Treasurer of the United States to liquidate any undue debt of the District of Columbia to the United States or other parties from 1878 to 1895 and from what fund taken and to what debt applied, and if any of such revenue has been refunded and the amount and time of such refunding; an estimate of the amount of the revenues of the District of Columbia that will remain above the appropriation asked for at the end of the years 1895 and 1896.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

TELEGRAPHIC CABLES IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill No. 1316, which I introduced a few days ago, may be taken from the table and laid before the Senate, as I desire to submit, not at great length, some remarks upon it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill referred to by the Senator from Maine, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 1316) to facilitate the construction and maintenance of telegraphic cables in the Pacific Ocean for the use of the Government in its foreign intercourse.

Mr. HALE. The bill has not been read. I ask that it be read.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does the Senator desire to discuss the bill?

Mr. HALE. I desire to submit some remarks after the reading of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read the bill:

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the bill which is now before the Senate involves not only a question of sentiment touching our relations with a foreign people, but embodies a plain business enterprise which, if undertaken by the United States, increases our communication with the Hawaiian Islands, bringing them and their affairs, by the electric current, close to our doors, and enabling us to act as our constituted authorities may deem wise, on the happening of any significant event in what were formerly known as the Sandwich Islands.

Its consideration raises none of the domestic controversies in Hawaii during the past three years, which so occupied the attention of Congress and of the American people, but looks straight ahead to the accomplishment of a purpose which is much more in the domain of the real and the practical than the sentimental.

The subject of our relations with the Hawaiian people, under whatever form of government they have lived, for the last forty years has never been long absent from the interest and consideration of the people of the United States. Bright, keen, strong, and

accomplished men have gone out from us and made their homes in these islands, and have there lived and prospered and come to be leading figures in the land where they have fixed their new homes. They have acquired land, built up estates, intermarried and reared families, and have, at times, held the highest offices under the Government.

It is safe to say that during these forty years the leading sentiment in the Hawaiian Islands has looked to the United States for interest and friendship, rather than to any other country, and that this, and no other, has been regarded by this people as the mother country. Trade between us and them has largely increased, and the current business between the two countries has been mutually profitable to each.

I give the following comparative statement of the number of American vessels and the amount of tonnage arriving at the principal seaports of the world for the year ended June 30, 1894, compiled from statistics in the Bureau of Navigation:

Port.	Number of vessels.	Tonnage arriving.
Antwerp	19	45,024
Bombay	No report	
Bremen	No report	
Calcutta	None	
Hamburg	2	4,350
Havre	10	16,453
Hongkong	79	137,473
Honolulu	165	146,993
Liverpool	43	*92,932
Manila	10	13,591
Rio Janeiro	64	46,310
Southampton	29	*177,573
Sydney, New South Wales	29	33,568
Valparaiso	10	9,264
Yokohama (Kanagawa)	65	*165,074

*The amount of tonnage is augmented at these three ports by regular lines of American steamers. At Liverpool by the *Ohio* and *Indiana*, running regularly between that port and Philadelphia; at Southampton by the steamships *New York* and *Paris;* at Yokohama by four large steamships of the Pacific Mail Steamship Line.

(See pages 87, 88, Report of Commissioner of Navigation, 1894.)

Statement of the nationality, number, and aggregate tonnage of vessels arriving at the ports of the Hawaiian Islands for the year ended December 31, 1893. (From the Annual Report of the Hawaiian Collector of General Customs.)

Nationality.	Number of vessels.	Aggregate tonnage.
American	238	181,817
Hawaiian	*23	15,759
British	58	†111,655
German	5	5,062
Japanese	4	7,167
Other nationalities	2	2,245

*Owned almost entirely by Americans.

†The greater part of this tonnage represents calling steamships of transpacific lines; those of the Canadian Pacific Company, running between Vancouver and Yokohama; the Occidental and Oriental, between San Francisco and the same port, and a chartered British steamer in the Oceanic Line, from San Francisco to Sydney, New South Wales.

These islands are set, like precious gems, in the middle of the sea, and have been looked upon with greedy eyes by other nations than ours who have, from time to time, sought to establish an influence with the people or the Government of the Hawaiians, which efforts, if successful, would involve nothing but detriment to us.

I propose to give, at no great length, some of the events which touch our relations with the Hawaiian Islands and which bring their history down to the present moment as affecting the objects of the bill before the Senate.

In the last forty years, Mr. President, wherever intercourse and business relations have been maintained between one country and another, the laying of submarine cables as a means of facilitating such business and intercourse has been constantly going on upon the beds of rivers, lakes, bays, gulfs, and oceans in every continent. So marked and beneficent have been the results of these submarine cables that, aside from what has been done by private and corporate enterprise, many of the nations of the world have undertaken the laying of these cable lines, either by assuming governmentally the whole cost and maintenance and ownership of the lines, or by liberal subsidies to companies which but for such aid could not afford the cost of these enterprises.

I have here a list showing the number of cables and the governments by which they are owned or subsidized, and it may be a surprise to Senators, as it was to me, to find how many of these lines, both long and short, have been fostered and aided or absolutely owned by the different nations of the world.

I give here first a list of ocean cables owned and operated by different governments:

Ocean cables owned and operated by governments.

Country.	Number of cables.	Country.	Number of cables.
Austria	31	Great Britain (international)	9
Belgium	2	England and France (jointly)	6
Spain	2	England and Belgium (jointly)	2
Italy	34	British India	93
Germany (internal)	43	Canada	22
Germany (international)	3	Queensland	13
Greece	46	South Australia	5
France	50	New Zealand	3
Denmark	40	Tasmania	1
Norway	255	Victoria	1
Holland	18	Turkey	10
Russia	7	Japan	19
Sweden	7	Netherland Indies	4
Senegal	1		
Cochin China and Tonquin	2	Total number	754
Brazil	15		
Argentina	1		
Great Britain and Ireland (internal)	102		

The number of cables maintained partly by government assistance and which would be impracticable without such assistance is much greater.

I give next a list of subsidies granted by the British Government alone for submarine telegraph cables. They embrace subsidies aggregating £90,100 per annum, about $450,000 in our money, and cover lines to an extent in all nearly 10,000 miles:

Particulars of subsidy granted by the British Government for submarine telegraph cables.

Date.	To whom granted.	Amount of subsidy per annum.	Term.	For what cable.	Length (nautical miles).
			Years.		
1879	Eastern Telegraph Co. and Telegraph Construction Co.	£17,500	20	Natal-Zanzibar	1,943
	do	17,500	20	Zanzibar-Aden	1,908
1886	Eastern Telegraph Co. and Brazilian Submarine Telegraph Co.	19,000	20	St. Vincent and West African ports to the Niger.	2,740
1889	International Cable Co.	8,100	20	Halifax-Bermuda	850
1893	Eastern and South African Telegraph Co.	14,000	20	Zanzibar-Seychelles.	1,119
	do	14,000	20	Seychelles-Mauritius.	1,064

The subsidies granted to the Eastern Extension Australia and China Telegraph Company, Limited, amount to nearly $300,000 per annum, as shown by the following table:

Particulars of subsidy arrangements made with Eastern Extension Australia and China Telegraph Company, Limited.

Government granting subsidy.	Amount of subsidy per annum.	Term.	For what purpose.	Length of cable in question.
		Years.		*Knots.*
Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania.	£32,400	20	For duplicating cables between Penang and Australia.	2,500
New Zealand, New South Wales.	7,500	10	For laying and working cable between New South Wales and New Zealand.	1,283
Tasmania	4,200	40	For connecting Victoria with Tasmania by submarine cable.	182
France	10,600	20	For laying and maintaining submarine cable connecting Cape St. James (Cochin China) with Haiphong (Tonquin).	774
Spain	48,000	10	For laying and working cable from Hongkong to Cape Boliano (Island of Luzon).	555
Portugal	500	10	For connecting Hongkong with Macao.	41

Mr. FRYE. Can my colleague state what that would average a mile?

Mr. HALE. I have not made the figures that my colleague asks for, but Great Britain gives the Eastern Telegraphic Company, which has a cable of 1,943 nautical miles, a subsidy of $85,000 annually; she gives to the Northern Construction Telegraph Company another subsidy of 17,500 pounds sterling, or $85,000, for twenty years for another line of 1,908 miles.

Mr. FRYE. Will my colleague give me the figures for the 10,000 miles?

Mr. HALE. About $450,000.

Mr. FRYE. That would make an average of about $45 per mile.

Mr. HALE. Yes; $45 per mile annually.

Mr. FRYE. I suppose, of course, the calculations are based on nautical miles in all cases.

Mr. HALE. They are all reckoned in nautical miles.

Besides this, Great Britain and her colonies give to a single company, the Eastern Extension Australia and China Telegraph Company, Limited, the amount of nearly $300,000 per annum, lines that aggregate nearly 5,000 miles, to a single company for this method of communication with her colonies. This includes subsidies by outlying provinces of Great Britain, and also two or three lesser items to the same company by France, Spain, and Portugal.

Mr. FRYE. Does my colleague know whether under these subsidies Great Britain has the privilege of sending her messages free?

Mr. HALE. There is an arrangement, but what the terms of it are I do not know. My recollection of my reading upon the subject is that they vary with different companies. The present arrangement provides that the Government messages may be sent free over this line.

With one exception, these lines have been laid in the great waters of the globe, between all its continents. That exception is the great space of ocean water lying between the two hemispheres, and forming that immense, mighty, and majestic sea known as the Northern Pacific Ocean.

The maps and charts, which I have here, and which any Senator may unroll for himself, show where these lines have been laid, and they illustrate, most graphically, their absence from the great ocean lying between the Americas and the great continent of Asia. Therefore, it has happened, Mr. President, that the countries whose shores this great ocean washes have cast their eyes over these waters and have sought a favorable line where a submarine cable could be laid between the continents of North America, Asia, and Australasia, the great requisite for such a line being some midway stopping place where the circuit could be broken, and where the danger of so long an unbroken stretch would be so great as to render the enterprise of laying the interoceanic cable impossible.

The Hawaiian Islands, over and above all other spots in the great Pacific Ocean, furnish this resting place, this division of the great breadth of waters. Whether such a line should be built from some port of the United States or of our southern sister Republic, Mexico, or the vast domain lying at our north, which forms that great English colony, the Dominion of Canada, has been the question, and it is interesting to watch and note what has been done or attempted to be done, by the United States and by Great Britain, to this end.

In the closing session of the Fifty-first Congress the following provision was embodied in the naval appropriation bill, which I had the honor of conducting through the Senate, and which became a law March 2, 1891:

> To enable the President to cause careful soundings to be made between San Francisco, Cal., and Honolulu, in the kingdom of the Hawaiian Islands, for the purpose of determining the practicability of the laying of a telegraphic cable between those points, $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, and the President is hereby authorized to direct the use of any vessel or vessels belonging to the United States in making such survey.

Under this authority the Navy Department proceeded to prosecute the survey, under the direction of accomplished officers of the Navy, with ships and crews and appliances furnished by the Government.

The result of this movement, which laid the foundation for any subsequent action on the part of our Government, is found in the documents which I now present to the Senate, making them a part of my remarks. They consist of the report of Lieut. Commander Richardson Clover, Hydrographer of the United States Navy, giving the general results of the survey, and made to Commodore Ramsay, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, in the Navy Department. This report is transmitted by Commodore Ramsay to Hon. B. F. Tracy, Secretary of the Navy, and by him sent to the President, and by President Harrison sent to Congress in his message which came to the Senate on the 27th day of July, 1892, and was then referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Executive Document No. 153, Fifty-second Congress, first session, contains these messages of transmittal and the detailed report of the course and the result of the survey, which will be interesting to any Senator who desires to follow these events.

Message from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of the results of the survey for the purpose of determining the practicability of laying a telegraphic cable between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands.

July 27, 1892.—Read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, with its accompaniments, a report from the Secretary of the Navy of the results of the survey made pursuant to the act of March 2, 1891, "to enable the President to cause careful soundings to be made between San Francisco, Cal., and Honolulu, in the Kingdom of the Hawaiian Islands, for the purpose of determining the practicability of the laying of a telegraphic cable between those points."

BENJ. HARRISON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 27, 1892.*

—

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, July 25, 1892.*

SIR: Under the act of March 2, 1891, providing for a deep-sea survey to determine the practicability of laying a telegraph cable between California and the Hawaiian Islands, the steamer *Albatross* began to take deep-sea soundings in October, 1891, and by January, 1892, two lines had been run between Monterey Bay, California, and Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands. The *Albatross*, being required for special investigations in Bering Sea, was detached from the work in February, and the steamer *Thetis* was detailed to run a third line between Point Concepcion, California, and Hilo Bay, Hawaii, which was completed in May.

The result of the survey shows that a practicable route can be easily selected. The report, prepared by the Hydrographic Office of the Bureau of Navigation, is herewith transmitted.

Respectfully submitted.

B. F. TRACY,
Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDENT.

—

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION, NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, July 25, 1892.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit the report of the Hydrographer to the Bureau of Navigation concerning the survey of a lane along the bottom of the Pacific Ocean between California and the Hawaiian Islands, for the purpose of determining a practicable route for a submarine telegraph cable between those places.

Very respectfully, F. M. RAMSAY, *Chief of Bureau.*

Hon. B. F. TRACY,
Secretary of the Navy.

—

HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE, UNITED STATES NAVY,
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION, NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1892

SIR: I have the honor to submit a report of the results of the investigations undertaken in connection with the survey made pursuant to the act of March 2, 1891, "to enable the President to cause careful soundings to be made between San Francisco, Cal., and Honolulu, in the Kingdom of the Hawaiian Islands, for the purpose of determining the practicability of the laying of a telegraphic cable between those points."

The survey was prosecuted with all the care and accuracy that the means for modern deep-sea research afford, and it is believed that the accompanying maps and observations present a good knowledge of the route and establish the fact that the laying of a cable on almost any line between California and the Hawaiian Islands is practicable. A lane about 300 miles wide was developed between California and Hawaii, and the results, as shown in the report seem to indicate the most favorable route to be a rhumb line between Monterey Bay, California, and Honolulu.

Very respectfully,

RICHARDSON CLOVER,
Lieutenant-Commander, United States Navy, Hydrographer

Commodore F. M. RAMSAY, U. S. N.,
Chief of Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department.

In the Fifty-second Congress, as the RECORD will show, a provision was incorporated by the Senate on the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill for a subsidy of $250,000 a year for, as my memory recalls, fifteen years' time to enable a private company to construct, lay, and maintain a submarine cable from this country to Honolulu. When that proposition reached the other House it was opposed and defeated there somewhat upon the ground that as the Hawaiian Government had taken no interest in the matter our own Government, if it embarked in the enterprise, would better do the work and pay the bills and own the line than to connect itself by subsidy with a private corporation having no recognition by the Hawaiian Government.

This ended the matter for the time, and the project slept till the stirring events of the last three years forced the subject again upon the attention of Congress and demonstrated the almost absolute necessity of our having quick communication with the Hawaiian Islands if this Government expected to maintain its influence with that people.

I might be led aside, Mr. President, from the strict line of my discussion to refer to the events which led to the subversion of the Hawaiian monarchy and establishment of a republican government, which exists there to-day, but upon this I invoke the memory of Senators who were interested in these events and took part in the rather acrimonious discussion that followed in this body to establish the proposition that had a submarine cable been operating at the time, so that immediate action not only by the President, but by Congress, could have been taken, many of the untoward events of those days would have been averted, and the interest and solicitude upon this side of the water and the agonizing suspense of the people of the Hawaiian Islands might have all been saved.

Growing out of these exciting events came the next proposition

for action on the part of our Government, when, upon the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, which was before the Senate on February 6, 1895, the following amendment, which I had offered in the Committee on Appropriations, and which had been by that committee adopted and made a part of the bill, came before the Senate. Its language was as follows:

The President is hereby authorized to contract for the entire work of laying a telegraph cable between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands, and to direct the prosecution of such work whenever such a contract shall be made, and as a part of the cost of such cable the sum of $500,000 is hereby appropriated.

A somewhat lengthy discussion of this provision, its purpose, scope, and necessity, followed, and the amendment was further amended, at the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. ALLEN, by adding the words:

Said cable to be owned and operated by the United States Government.

Many Senators took part in the discussion, and in its course the following communications were read to the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, January 29, 1891.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th instant, inclosing a copy of House bill No. 13372, present session, "to incorporate the Pacific Cable Company, and for other purposes." You accordingly ask for any views which I may have to offer upon the subject.

This Department feels a deep interest in the prosecution and completion of a submarine cable between the United States and the East, via Hawaii, as shown by the bill under consideration. Recently this subject was presented to this Department by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and I take pleasure in inclosing, for information, a copy of my reply, dated the 22d instant, in the hope that it will suffice for your present needs.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES G. BLAINE.

Hon. MARK H. DUNNELL,
Chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

—

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, January 22, 1891.*

SIR: A letter from you, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under date of December 3, 1890, requested the views of this Department on the subject-matter of the following resolution, adopted by the Senate on the 2d ultimo:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and it is hereby, instructed to inquire into the advisability of the passage of a law authorizing a survey for a transpacific submarine cable route from some suitable point on the Pacific Coast to the Hawaiian Islands, thence via Samoa and New Zealand to Australia, and of legislation encouraging the formation of a company for such purpose, and to report by bill or otherwise."

The general subject-matter of the resolution has for some time been under attentive consideration in this Department, and efforts have been made to obtain trustworthy indications of the disposition of the Hawaiian Government and of other powers interested in the problem of transpacific communication, to promote the cable connection of the East and Australia with the western coast of the United States via Honolulu and the Samoan Islands. It is only very recently that the plan favored by the Hawaiian Government has been authoritatively laid before me.

I have no doubt of the great importance to the United States of possessing cable communication with Hawaii. Besides subserving the close interests which we maintain with those islands, and tending to exert a positive and potential influence on the political autonomy of the Hawaiian group, such a cable would be a necessary factor in a great scheme of direct communication with China and Japan, and with Australasia by way of the Samoan Islands.

There has already been made to this Government a proposition on the part of Germany and Great Britain to consider the feasibility of a concurrent action and aid toward laying a telegraphic cable to Samoa via Honolulu. It is quite certain that the Japanese Government would, in its turn, welcome a direct line to the United States, and would in all probability contribute, by proportionate guaranty or otherwise, toward its realization. The interest of Japan in the subject has been evinced by recent inquiries. A late dispatch from the United States minister at Peking indicates that a transpacific cable company would receive material encouragement from Chinese quarters.

A comprehensive Pacific system of telegraphy would not only of necessity make Honolulu a radial point, but would supply the single line between the United States and Hawaii with a large volume of business.

The terms of the Hawaiian concession are contained in the annexed letter, addressed to me a few days ago by the concessionary, Mr. Alfred S. Hartwell. It is to be observed that the calculations of working cost and revenue therein presented rest on the operation of the proposed Americo-Hawaiian cable alone, without regard to the increased returns which would doubtless flow from an extension of communication westward. As the system expands working expenses may be expected to diminish in proportion to receipts. A single repair ship, for instance, stationed at Honolulu, would probably suffice for the efficient maintenance of all the cables centering there.

In the course of events telegraphic communication throughout the Pacific Ocean and with the shores of America, Asia, and Australasia is indispensable and certain to come. The section joining Hawaii to the American continent, besides being the shortest and least costly link in the general chain, is by far the most important from political points of view; and I deem it of the highest consequence to the United States that it be promptly constructed by American effort, and with the sanction of our Government.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES G. BLAINE.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN,
Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate.

The upshot of it all was that, on the 9th day of February, 1895, the Senate adopted the amendment providing for the laying and maintaining of the cable by the Government, and the whole matter went into conference with the House of Representatives.

Not to take up more time of the Senate, I may say that the whole project failed, owing to the hostility of the other legislative branch of the Government to the project, and, so far as we are concerned, there it has remained till to-day.

In the meantime Great Britain has not been idle, and the history of her efforts to secure a landing place for a British cable, which should traverse the bed of the Pacific Ocean, from some point in her Canadian possessions, probably Vancouver, to a resting point in the middle of the sea, from which two branches would diverge, one to some point in Australasia and the other to the Chinese or Japanese coast, is most interesting.

Colonial conferences of all British dependencies were held, in 1887 in London, in 1888 in Sydney, in 1893 in Auckland, in 1894 in Ottawa, and all urged the Imperial Government to conduct the survey of a route between Canada and Australia for the purpose of laying and maintaining a submarine cable between Canada and Australia. In order to accomplish this such a cable must find a resting place and land on one of the Hawaiian Islands or on Fanning Island; but the British project found a lion in the path in the provisions of the existing treaty between the United States and Hawaii, under which such landing of a foreign company for the purpose of laying its cable could only be permitted by the consent of the United States to a modification of the treaty to that end.

In October, 1894, a commission, consisting of the new British consul, Captain Hawes, Mr. Sanford Fleming, of Ottawa, and Mr. W. Hepworth Mercer, of the British colonial office, London, visited the Hawaiian Islands and sought to obtain permission to acquire property, by lease or purchase, as a landing place and intermediate station for the British Pacific cable.

The Hawaiian Government, acting under the provisions of the treaty, and evidently with no sympathy for the movement or for the lodgment of any European or Canadian cable upon their territory, invoked the provisions of the treaty with the United States, which I have before recited, and, in a communication addressed to our Government, asked that Congress might consider the question of permitting the British company to acquire an interoceanic station upon one of the Hawaiian Islands.

This British commission had gone to Honolulu and, in communication with the Hawaiian Government there, was very pertinacious in seeking for permission to land their cable on one of the lesser islands of the Hawaiian group, and went so far as to claim that under the treaty with us a lease to an individual was not prohibited, and that such instrument might be made to Mr. Mercer for the benefit of such company as he might form.

To this proposition the Hawaiian Government refused to listen, declaring that the concessions asked for are counter to the spirit of the reciprocity treaty, and nothing more could be done under it. The most that the Hawaiian Government undertook to do was to refer the subject to the United States. They did not request the United States to agree to the British arrangement. They reported the fact of such negotiation and asked for an expression of our policy on the subject.

This proposition was submitted by President Cleveland in his message of January 9, 1895, which I read to the Senate, recommending its assent to the proposition of the British company.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I submit herewith certain dispatches from our minister at Hawaii and the documents which accompanied the same.

They disclose the fact that the Hawaiian Government desires to lease to Great Britain one of the uninhabited islands belonging to Hawaii as a station for a submarine telegraph cable to be laid from Canada to Australia, with a connection between the island leased and Honolulu.

Both the Hawaiian Government and the representatives of Great Britain in this negotiation concede that the proposed lease can not be effected without the consent of the United States, for the reason that in our reciprocity treaty with the King of Hawaii he agreed that as long as said treaty remained in force he would not "lease or otherwise dispose of or create any lien upon any port, harbor, or other territory in his dominion, or grant any special privilege or right of use therein to any other power, state, or government."

At the request of the Hawaiian Government this subject is laid before the Congress for its determination upon the question of so modifying the treaty agreement above recited as to permit the proposed lease.

It will be seen that the correspondence which is submitted between the Hawaiian and British negotiators negatives the existence on the part of Hawaii of any suspicion of British unfriendliness or the fear of British aggression.

The attention of the Congress is directed to the following statement contained in a communication addressed to the Hawaiian Government by the representatives of Great Britain:

"We propose to inform the British Government of your inquiry, whether they would accept the sovereignty of Necker Island or some other uninhabited island on condition that no subsidy is required from you. As we explained, we have not felt at liberty to entertain that question ourselves, as we were definitely instructed not to ask for the sovereignty of any island, but only for a lease simply for the purpose of the cable."

Some of the dispatches from our minister, which are submitted, not only refer to the project for leasing an uninhabited island belonging to Hawaii, but contain interesting information concerning recent occurrences in that country, and its political and social condition. This information is valuable because it is based upon the observation and knowledge necessarily within the scope of the diplomatic duties which are intrusted solely to the charge of this intelligent diplomatic officer representing the United States Government at Hawaii.

I hope the Congress will see fit to grant the request of the Hawaiian Government, and that our consent to the proposed lease will be promptly accorded. It seems to me we ought not, by a refusal of this request, to stand in the way of the advantages to be gained by isolated Hawaii through telegraphic communication with the rest of the world, especially in view of the fact that our own communication with that country would thereby be greatly improved without apparent detriment to any legitimate American interest.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *January 9, 1895.*

This recommendation was not received with favor by the Senate, which had more than once committed itself to the proposition that this Government should aid a United States cable, either by building it or by subsidy, and nothing came of it.

The artful project of the British commission had most ignobly failed, and with it, for the present, their hope of securing a concession in the Hawaiian Islands for the benefit of a British cable company.

That great interest had been felt in this commission and great hopes entertained in its action is shown in the reports of the proceedings of the colonial conference at Ottawa in June and July, 1894. I have succeeded in obtaining a copy of these proceedings, and any Senator who hesitates as to the duty of prompt action on our part on this subject will be enlightened as to the objects and hopes of Great Britain upon this matter.

At one of the sessions of the conference Sir Henry Wrixon, a delegate from Victoria, said, speaking of the danger that if England did not take up the cable project, those interested in laying it might secure French assistance:

> The hope we cherish is that we will get France out of New Caledonia, and we are all in favor of England having supreme control of the Pacific. We regard that as essential to our rights and to our existence as a nation. We in Australia dearly cherish the idea that England should control absolutely in the Pacific. That is my argument. The imperial view or national view we regard as important. We want to prevent any other nation from becoming dominant in the Pacific.

The conference, at the time, appears to have been somewhat in fear of interference by the French Government. But its whole proposition was covered by the repeated expressions of the desire that Great Britain should become the mistress of the Pacific Ocean and of the trade on its great waters, and that a submarine cable was the first essential to this control.

Some of the advantages to Great Britain, both from a commercial and military standpoint, were set forth in the conference, as will be found upon pages 301 and 302 of the report by Mr. Fleming, who submitted to the conference certain propositions which had been made touching the importance of the subject to the Imperial Government by General Herbert, then in the service of the Canadian Government.

His first proposition is as follows:

> Such a cable would double the existing means of telegraphic intelligence between Great Britain and Australia, and ultimately between Great Britain, the Cape, and India.

Another proposition was as follows:

> Canada would be provided with an alternative line of intelligence with Great Britain in the improbable, yet possible, event of the general interruption of the transatlantic lines landed in Canada at a time when those landed in the United States might not be available.

This of course refers to the possibility of a conflict between the United States and Great Britain.

Another proposition was as follows:

> A direct line of telegraphic intelligence would be established between the northernmost station of the British Pacific squadron and the stations of the Australian squadron—an incalculable advantage in facilitating the cooperation of these naval forces with one another.

And General Herbert is quoted as winding up his suggestions with the following words:

> In military as in commercial affairs the importance of a rapid and secure interchange of intelligence between distant points can not be overestimated. The proposed transpacific cable will doubtless find many advocates upon purely commercial grounds, but I will venture to report that viewed solely as a military line of intelligence its value is so great that it should secure the unhesitating support of all the governments whose interests and very existence demand the fullest development of an organized system of imperial defense.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to have the Senator from Maine state a little more clearly what the conference was and who attended it.

Mr. HALE. The report is made by Mackenzie Bowell, then minister of trade and commerce, and at present premier to his excellency the Right Honorable Mr. John Campbell Hamilton-Gordon, Earl of Aberdeen, Governor-General of Canada, etc. He says:

> The undersigned has the honor to present to your excellency the report of the proceedings of the colonial conference held in Ottawa from 28th June to 9th July, 1894.

The make-up of the conference consisted of delegates from the Government of Her Majesty, the Earl of Jersey; the Dominion of Canada, represented by Hon. Mackenzie Bowell and other members of the ministry; New South Wales, the Hon. F. B. Suttor, minister of public instruction; Tasmania, by the Hon. Nicholas Fitzgerald; Cape of Good Hope, the Government of South Australia, the Government of New Zealand, the Government of Victoria, the Government of Queensland.

Nothing, Mr. President, could show more clearly the spirit that animates our great commercial rival in dealing with just such questions as the one now before the Senate. All through General Herbert's suggestions or reflections runs the one dominating purpose which controls English administrations in dealing with the whole world, outside of the British Islands, which is to push out and push forward, to gain territory, to gain the control of great seas and waterways, and all to build up the imperial power and imperial authority. It is time that something of this spirit should be interfused with the policy of the United States.

In the meantime an interesting incident had occurred in the Hawaiian Islands, showing the watchfulness of Great Britain and its determination in some way to gain a foothold in some part of the Hawaiian group. At the Ottawa conference, in the early part of the year 1894, the same Mr. Fleming whom I have before quoted took occasion to say that—

> Another island, considerably nearer Vancouver than Fanning Island, was available for a mid-ocean station. On the 23d September I prepared a memorandum which was sent from Honolulu by Mr. Bowell, informing the Canadian Government that this island was unoccupied and unclaimed. I refer to Necker Island. When I reached Australia the same statement was repeated by me in a memorandum dated October 11, which was submitted to the various Australian Governments. And again in January last I had, with the agents-general and the high commissioner for Canada, an opportunity of seeing Lord Ripon, and I placed in his hands a third document, dated January 6, in which I pointed out that this island, 800 miles nearer than Fanning Island, was still unoccupied and unclaimed by any maritime power. That island, however, is not now available. On the 27th May last formal possession was taken of it by the Hawaiian authorities, so that if we want Necker Island we must now apply to those who have so recently laid claim to it.

It will be interesting to Senators to hear the story of the British attempt to get possession of Necker Island and how that attempt was checkmated by the action of the Hawaiian Government. The island lies about 400 miles northwest from Honolulu, and is in a direct line, as are all of the Hawaiian islands, where a cable would naturally be laid from Canada to Australia or to the shores of upper Asia. It had been claimed by the Hawaiian Government as one of the Hawaiian group from 1857, when the Hawaiian Government sent Captain Paty on an expedition to inspect its outlying islands. Captain Paty reported that he had sailed around Necker Island, but found no place where a landing could be made.

From that date to 1894, when the incident of which I am about to speak occurred, the island attracted no attention. The Hawaiian Government seemed to have been conscious of the defect in its title to Necker Island by reason of not ever having taken possession of it. In the month of May the Hawaiian Government became aware that this defect as to possession had been discovered by the Canadian Government or by persons connected with the British Pacific cable enterprise.

A person whose movements were conducted quietly and perhaps furtively landed from one of the Canadian steamers and went at once to the survey department of the Hawaiian Government, where he made minute and pointed inquiries regarding Necker Island. He also sought out and found a son of Captain Paty, of whom he solicited the possession of Captain Paty's log on the voyage of 1857. These facts were brought to the attention of the Hawaiian Government, which at the same time observed that the British cruiser *Champion*, then in port, was prepared to go to sea, ostensibly on a target-practice cruise. The Hawaiian Government determined to act at once in order to save any question about ownership of Necker Island. They chartered one of the inter-island steamers, coaled and provisioned it and dispatched it to Necker Island within six hours from the time they had learned of the danger and of the near departure of the British ship *Champion*.

The Hawaiian vessel and the *Champion* left port at the same time, heading in the same direction. It was commonly believed that both vessels were bound for the same destination. The smaller vessel, however, that employed by the Hawaiian Government, was enabled to make greater speed than her rival on account of her lighter draft and ability to ignore the reefs, the avoidance of which would prolong the voyage. The Hawaiian expedition was successfully accomplished and the Hawaiian flag was raised upon Necker Island, and proclamation was there made that possession was taken in the name of the Hawaiian Government.

The British ship *Champion* did not extend her voyage to Necker Island, having stopped at one of the islands on the way. Further advance by her would have been useless.

For once the wit and enterprise and aggressive force of Great Britain had all been met and outwitted by a smaller Government. This is why Mr. Fleming rather pathetically says in the Ottawa conference that Necker Island is no longer available as a British midway point for the laying of their cable.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator from Maine a question?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to ask whether the *Champion* did not have upon her some British botanist or British geologist whom the war vessel might have landed to make botanic or geographical explorations on the island, notwithstanding the fact that the Hawaiian flag was flying there?

Mr. HALE. I do not know, of course, what prevented any further action upon the part of the *Champion*. I presume that as a British ship she was fitted out with everything that was necessary for any kind of an exploration or lodgment, but the little

vessel got there first and raised the Hawaiian flag, and whether the British ship had botanists or not, it was of no use for the *Champion* to go there. Hawaii in that way maintained her title to the island.

It shows, Mr. President, as many incidents and events show all along the way of the history of this transaction, how determined our rivals are to gain the commercial and military control of the great Pacific Ocean, and that we can afford to lose no time in moving if we determine to move at all.

During the last half dozen years England has been quietly taking possession of group after group of islands in the South Pacific, with the intention of utilizing the most suitable bits of land for telegraph stations on the great transoceanic route. The process has been carried on unobtrusively but systematically. Protectorates were established wherever it was not practicable to assume ownership. In 1888 the British flag was raised on Kingman, Palmyra, Washington, Fanning, Christmas, Dudosa, Bierson, and Penrhyn islands. In the same year Her Majesty the Queen took under her protection Ellice Island and the Phœnix, Union, and Gilbert groups. She already had a protectorate over the Fiji Islands. In 1889 she took Suwaroff Island, and in 1891 Johnston Island, which is about 500 miles west of the south end of the Hawaiian archipelago. In 1892 Gardiner and Danger islands were appropriated. All of these islands and groups have been examined with a view to determining their availability for the purpose mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] is entitled to the floor on the unfinished business.

Mr. PEFFER. Having the floor, I will yield for the purpose of affording the Senator from Maine an opportunity to conclude his remarks, if he desires to do so.

Mr. HALE. I thank the Senator from Kansas. It will not take me very long to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business will be informally laid aside, and the Senator from Maine will proceed.

Mr. HALE. The events which I have recited, showing the purpose of the British Government to establish a Pacific Ocean cable from Canada to Australasia and Asia, with some midway point of rest on or near the Hawaiian Islands, together with the feeling of necessity for close communication with the United States which the occurrences at Honolulu during the past three years had made most intense, had at last brought the Government of the islands to see the necessity of taking steps toward encouraging and aiding some project for telegraphic communication with this country.

It is to the credit of that Government, I can justly say, that whenever it has been confronted with any real emergency it has shown resources adequate to successful action.

On the 12th day of August, 1895, an act to facilitate the construction and maintenance of telegraphic cables in the Pacific, which had been passed by the Legislature of the Republic of Hawaii, was approved and became a law. It is the enabling act under which the concession to which I shall refer later was made. Its provisions are as follows:

An act to facilitate the construction and maintenance of telegraph cables in the Pacific.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Republic of Hawaii:

SECTION 1. The President, with the consent of the Cabinet, is hereby authorized and empowered to negotiate and conclude a contract or contracts with any person or persons, corporation or corporations, government or governments, for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telegraphic cable or cables connecting the several islands of the Republic or connecting the Republic of Hawaii with the countries lying in or bordering upon the Pacific Ocean.

SEC. 2. There may be incorporated in any such contract or contracts provisions to allow the free use of any Government lands necessary for the construction, maintenance, or operation of such cable or cables;

To admit free of duty all material to be used exclusively in the construction, maintenance, or operation of any such cable or cables;

To allow the condemnation and appropriation, according to law, of such land, property, or rights of way as may be necessary for the construction, maintenance, or operation of such cable or cables and the land connections thereof;

To remit for a term of years, therein to be stated, all taxes upon the property located within the Republic belonging to or connected with such cable or cables and necessary or properly appertinent to the construction, maintenance, or operation of such cable or cables;

To remit all harbor and port dues and charges upon any vessel or vessels engaged in laying or maintaining any such cable or cables, or which may be stationed in the waters of the Republic for such purpose; and

To render to such enterprise or enterprises such financial assistance as may seem just and advantageous to the interests of the Republic.

SEC. 3. Such financial assistance may consist of—

1. A fixed semiannual cash payment or subsidy for a stated period; or,

2. A guaranty by the Republic of a payment of the principal or interest or both of a stated amount of the bonds of any person or company controlling or operating such cable or cables; or,

3. A subsidy by issuing to the party or parties indicated in such contract a stated amount of the bonds of the Republic, bearing interest at the rate and payable at the time or times therein stated; or,

4. A subscription to the stock of any corporation or corporations formed for the purpose of constructing and operating any such cable or cables; or,

5. A combination of any two or more of the methods hereinbefore mentioned.

SEC. 4. Such contract or contracts shall also contain such provisions as to the President and Cabinet shall seem necessary or proper for the protection of the interests of the Republic in and concerning the use and maintenance of such cable.

SEC. 5. No contract or contracts concluded under or by authority of this act shall be binding upon the Government of Hawaii until the same shall have been ratified and approved by the Legislature thereof.

SEC. 6. The President is hereby authorized and empowered to employ an agent or agents to assist, either within the Republic or in any foreign country, in negotiating any such contract or contracts.

SEC. 7. For the purpose of defraying the expenses which may be incurred by virtue of this act the sum of $10,000 is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the treasury otherwise unappropriated, which, or so much thereof as may become necessary, shall be expended in such manner as may be directed by the President.

SEC. 8. This act shall take effect and become a law from and after the day of its approval.

Approved August 12, 1895.

It will be seen that it authorizes and empowers the President of the Hawaiian Republic, with the consent of his cabinet, to ne gotiate contracts with persons or corporations or governments for constructing, maintaining, and operating telegraph cable or cables connecting the several islands of the Republic with the countries lying in or bordering on the Pacific Ocean. The sections succeeding section 1 cover all the details necessary to effectuate such concession, and there are ample clauses touching all questions relating to the accession of lands, the subsidy to be given by the Hawaiian Government, the constitution of any corporation to which the concession shall be granted, and, in short, everything authorizing the President and his cabinet to set in motion the machinery necessary to make and put in operation such concession as would be an incentive and aid to the project for telegraphic communication with the United States.

Closely following this act and directly upon its heels is the concession granted by the President of the Republic of Hawaii to Z. S. Spalding "for laying, working, and maintaining submarine telegraph cables from San Francisco to Honolulu and between the several Hawaiian islands, with exclusive landing rights and subsidy for twenty years."

I have here an official copy of this concession, which takes the form of an agreement between "Sanford Ballard Dole, President of the Republic of Hawaii, and Zephaniah Swift Spalding, of Honolulu, party of the second part, hereinafter called the contractor." I have looked at it, and examined it, and it has been examined by other Senators and Members, and it undoubtedly conveys the exclusive right with the subsidy to Mr. Spalding or to any company that he may form or to which he may assign.

Mr. FRYE. My colleague is aware, of course, that there is another bill already pending, and he will excuse me for interrupting him, but I am chairman of the subcommittee having charge of the bill.

Mr. HALE. I am very glad to hear from my colleague.

Mr. FRYE. The bill to which I refer provides for the landing of a cable at Pearl River Harbor. Has the Senator examined the question as to whether or not the grant of Hawaii to the Spalding Company, or whatever it may be called, is so exclusive as to prevent the landing at Pearl River Harbor of a cable built by a corporation and not by the Government of the United States?

Mr. HALE. I have very grave doubts whether under these two instruments, the enabling acts and the concession coming from it, any right can be granted, during the time when Mr. Spalding is allowed to build the cable, to any other person or to any other company whatever. I am inclined to believe, and I think the Senator and his committee—I am glad they are considering the matter, and I hope they will take it up at an early day—will find, that all this right has been parted with to this company, and that it alone during the time which is fixed, the termination of which is November 1, 1898, has the right to occupy Pearl Harbor or any other portion of the territory of the Hawaiian Islands for this purpose.

It is provided in terms that the Spalding Company shall not be entitled to an exclusive franchise or to a subsidy unless the construction of the cable shall begin on or before May 1, 1897, and be completed not later than November 1, 1898.

I may say here that Mr. Spalding is a man well and favorably known, not only in Honolulu, where he has large business interests, but in the United States and upon the other side of the Atlantic. He is a native of the State of Ohio, was a Union soldier in the late war, and went to Hawaii as an agent for the United States Government about the time of the negotiation of the early treaties, and has since served for several years as United States consul-general at Honolulu. He undoubtedly feels that the success of this cable project, while it benefits the people of Hawaii, also will add to the value of his own property, and that with the prosperity of the islands will increase his own prosperity.

I look upon this as fortunate, because it establishes the fact that

the scheme upon which this cable is to be built is not that of an adventurer or a visionary, but that Mr. Spalding and his associates are men of probity, enterprise, and business ability and of sufficient means.

I will not take the time of the Senate by reading the concession or agreement in full, but will, with the leave of the Senate, append it as a supplement to my remarks. I have gone over it with some care and find that it covers all necessary details as to terminal points of the cable, the time which it shall be maintained, the space of time to be devoted to its construction, and I may say here is that "such telegraphic communication shall be established not later than the 1st day of November, 1898"; and the amount of subsidy granted, dependent upon the Government of the United States joining in this undertaking by the granting of substantial assistance to the contractor, his representatives or assigns, is $40,000 per annum.

I can say, in short, of this concession that the intention which evidently animated the Hawaiian Government in making it to connect the enterprise with such aid as the United States might give to it is manifest in all its provisions.

Following this the Pacific Cable Company was organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey, and is the successor and assign of Mr. Spalding's interest, and is the company with which this Government deals, as provided in the bill to which I shall allude later.

I have here a copy of the charter, which, rather than take the time of the Senate in reading in full, I will insert as a supplement to my remarks.

This brings us to the bill which I introduced on January 3, 1896, and which, if it becomes a law, marks the bounds of the obligations of this Government, and all its rights, whether of use or of possession or of ownership, assumed under its provisions.

The bill which has just been read to the Senate has been most carefully drawn. I have examined it thoroughly, as have other Senators and Members of the other branch of the National Legislature, and the Committee on Foreign Relations, which is to carefully consider its provisions, will no doubt examine them in detail and give hearings to all parties from whom information can be gained.

I shall not take up the time of the Senate to comment at length upon each section and clause. It, in short, gives to the Postmaster-General authority to contract with the Pacific Cable Company for transmission by electrical means between San Francisco and Honolulu of all messages on the business of the United States for twenty years from July 1, 1897. The obligation of the United States is to pay in each of the twenty years the actual cost of maintaining, operating, and renewing the cable for that year, and to this is to be added a sum sufficient to pay interest at 4 per cent on the sum expended by the company for constructing and laying the cable and acquiring lands and buildings appurtenant to it for its operation.

From this sum is to be deducted the Hawaiian subsidy of $40,000 per annum, which is thus turned over by the company to this Government. The extent of this obligation is shown by the following computation, which covers the entire cost of the plant, the acquisition of stations, rights of way, and the short interisland connections in Hawaii, the cable repair steamers, and all expense incident to the successful laying and maintaining of the cable, this amount being $3,789,417.45. The annual fixed charges for which this Government will be obligated under the bill amount to $293,324.26, from which is to be deducted the $40,000 annual subsidy given by the Hawaiian Government. So that, in round numbers, the bill commits the United States to the subvention of about $250,000 per annum. I think this is exactly the amount fixed in the bill providing for a subsidy to another company, and to which I have alluded as having, three years ago, in the Fifty-second Congress, passed the Senate. The details are a little more fully given in the paper which I present and make part of my remarks.

Cost of constructing, laying, connecting, and establishing cable lines between the cities of San Francisco and Honolulu, and between points upon the Hawaiian Islands, together with estimate of annual fixed charges, including interest at 4 per cent per annum upon the cost of such cables, ships, stations, land lines, etc.

Cost in cash, based upon estimate of the Compagnie Francaise des Cables Telegraphiques of Paris.

Construction and laying.

	Francs.	Dollars.
San Francisco and Honolulu cable	15,110,000	2,933,980.58
Interisland cables	1,000,000	194,174.75
Cable-repair steamers	2,000,000	388,349.51
Interest on advance payments		
Supervising expenses, etc., at 5 per cent	905,500	175,825.24
Land lines, stations, rights of way, and supplies	500,000	97,087.37
Total	19,515,500	3,789,417.45

Annual fixed charges.

Interest, at 4 per cent on cost, as above, 19,515,500 francs, $3,789,417.45	$151,576.70
Maintenance of cables, renewals, etc., San Francisco and Honolulu line, 600,000 francs	116,504.85
Interisland lines, 130,000 francs	25,242.71
Total	293,324.26

I will here incorporate with my remarks a copy of Senate bill 1316, introduced by me:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized to contract with the Pacific Cable Company, a corporation of New Jersey, for the transmission, by electrical means, between the cities of San Francisco, Cal., and Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, of messages on the business of the United States during a period of twenty years from the 1st of July, A. D. 1897; and to stipulate in the said agreement that the amount paid to said company for such service by the United States shall in each year be a sum to be computed as follows:

First. To the amount actually expended during that year by said company in maintaining, renewing, and operating a line of submarine telegraph from San Francisco, Cal., to Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, there shall be added a sum sufficient to pay interest at 4 per cent on the sum actually expended by said company for constructing and acquiring such telegraph line, together with the lands, buildings, land lines, and other appurtenances fairly requisite to its efficient working; such cost to be certified to and approved by the Postmaster-General or otherwise determined as hereinafter provided.

Second. From such sum to be so computed and paid in each year there shall be deducted in each year the sum of $40,000.

Third. The remainder shall be paid to said company by the United States in four equal quarterly payments: *Provided, however*, That the amount so paid shall not in any one year exceed a maximum sum to be agreed upon in said contract, unless the tolls upon messages transmitted for the United States, computed at the rates charged by said company to the public as hereinafter provided for like service, would be in excess of such sum; in which case the tolls so in excess shall be computed at one-half the current rates; and the deduction of $40,000 hereinbefore provided for shall for that year be diminished to the extent of such excess.

SEC. 2. That said company shall in said agreement stipulate that on or before the 1st day of July, 1897, it will have laid and in operation a line of submarine telegraph extending from the city of San Francisco to the city of Honolulu, capable of transmitting from either of said cities not less than fifteen words per minute; and during said period of twenty years will maintain and renew the same, as may be necessary, to maintain such capacity for electrical transmission between the cities above mentioned.

If from any cause which said company in the judgment of the Postmaster-General could control or avoid, said company shall, at any time within the said term of twenty years, be incompetent to convey the messages of the United States, as aforesaid, for a period of more than one hundred and twenty consecutive days, then, and in that case, the Postmaster-General shall deduct for that year a proportionate part of the sum so named by him as aforesaid: *Provided*, That in the event of a break or damage to such cable at a distance of more than 500 miles from either of its shore ends, the said term shall be extended to one hundred and eighty days before any deduction from the annual payment by the United States shall result from such incapacity: *And provided further*, That in the event such failure or incapacity to transmit said messages shall continue for one year, the Postmaster-General may, at his option, cancel the contract made with said company, and from and after that date the Government shall be under no obligation to pay said amount or any sum whatsoever.

SEC. 3. That said company shall in said agreement further stipulate that the United States may at its option at any time during the said term of twenty years, and without notice, assume and take exclusive possession of all and singular the telegraph line of said company to be constructed as aforesaid, extending from said city of San Francisco to the city of Honolulu, together with all lands, buildings and property of every kind appurtenant thereto, and may exercise absolute and exclusive control of and over the business of said telegraph line between San Francisco, Cal., and Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, for and during such time or times as may be deemed necessary or proper by the President, or the official acting in his behalf, the Government to pay unto the said company, in addition to any sum or sums otherwise agreed upon, such amount as shall and will recompense and make good to the said company any and all loss of subsidy from either Government or receipts from business that may be caused by such taking possession or assumption of control by the United States as aforesaid. The said agreement shall further stipulate that the United States may at its option at any time during the said term of twenty years take over from said company and thereafter own and hold, free of all lien or other incumbrance thereon, the telegraph line of said company to be constructed as aforesaid, extending from said city of San Francisco to the city of Honolulu, together with all lands, buildings, and property of every kind appurtenant thereto, upon payment of said company's just debt then existing and incurred for the acquisition, maintenance, and operation of the property so acquired by the United States, and the payment also to the stockholders of said company, or their assigns, of the sums originally subscribed and paid by them in money to said company, with interest at 5 per cent per annum, less any sum or sums repaid to them by said company, as dividends or otherwise, with interest on every of said sums at 5 per cent per annum from the date of such repayment; such provisions to expressly recite that the intent is that the United States shall have a right, at its option, to acquire said property at the strict cost to such company of its acquisition, maintenance, and operation, less any sum which said property may have earned or in any manner repaid, and shall in addition pay the stockholders of said company or their assigns such sums as will reimburse merely their original and actual outlay, less any sum received back by them from any source, with interest in either case at 5 per cent per annum.

Such provision shall further recite that the amount so to be paid for the purchase of said line of telegraph and appurtenances shall be fixed, exclusive of interest, by a sworn exhibit of any and all contracts for construction, maintenance, and operation, any or all of them, and the amount paid thereon by said company; such exhibit as to the cost of construction to be filed with the Postmaster-General within six months after the completion of said telegraph line or lines between said cities of San Francisco and Honolulu; and as to the cost of operation, maintaining, and renewing, by annual sworn statements to be filed with the Postmaster-General not later than May 1 in each year, showing the cost of operation, maintenance, and renewal during the year preceding; showing also all sums received by said company from any source and what part thereof has in any manner been repaid to the stockholders of said company. Every such annual exhibit shall be the basis upon which shall be made the quarterly payments for operation, maintenance, and renewal during the following year, but the amount so paid shall be subject to readjustment to whatever extent at the end of the year it shall at the end of the year be found more or less than the actual cost to said company during the year in which said quarterly payments were made.

Upon the filing of such statement of cost of construction and upon the

filing of any such annual statement thereafter, the Postmaster-General, in his discretion, may, at any time within one year, refer the same to the Court of Claims for audit, in which case the judgment of said court shall be final and binding upon the United States and upon said company, but every such exhibit not so referred within one year shall be binding upon the United States and said company.

SEC. 4. That during the continuance of said period of twenty years the maximum rates for the transmission of any message other than United States Government messages hereinbefore provided over such cable between Honolulu and San Francisco shall not exceed $1 per word, and the rates for news messages or items of news to any newspaper or association of newspapers of the United States (commonly known as press messages) shall not exceed one-half the rate which shall be charged for ordinary messages: *Provided however*, That it shall not be obligatory upon the said company to transmit any messages for a less sum than $1.

SEC. 5. That the company for itself and its representatives shall, upon the execution of said contract, deposit with the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, Government bonds to the amount of $100,000 to secure to the United States that the said company, its representatives and assigns, will construct, lay, and equip the said cable in accordance with the terms and conditions of this agreement: *Provided*, That upon the completion of the construction, equipment, and laying of the said telegraph line the obligation secured by such bonds shall be deemed to have been fulfilled and performed, and such bonds shall thereupon be returned to the said Pacific Cable Company, its representatives and assigns. But if after the execution of such contract there shall be any failure to complete the construction, laying, and equipment of such telegraph line within the time herein specified, then in such case such bonds shall be forfeited to the United States Government as liquidation damages, and there shall be no further or other claim by way of damages by the Government against the Pacific Cable Company, its representatives or assigns.

Under the provisions of this bill the Pacific Cable Company invest the sum of $1,000,000 and become responsible for the future payment of the balance of the cost of construction and laying of the cables and connecting land lines, repair steamers, fittings and supplies, stations, offices, lands and buildings, and rights of way necessary for the business. To secure them in this investment they are to receive the earnings or receipts of the cable systems from all business outside the messages carried and business transacted for the two Governments free of charge.

Assuming the entire cost of the cables and appurtenant property to be from $3,500,000 to $4,000,000, and that the average receipts from outside business would amount to $100,000 per annum, the company would find themselves still with a debt of $1,500,000 upon their line when the Governments cease to pay at the end of twenty years.

If, on the other hand, the Government makes use of its right to take over the ownership of the cable line at any time before the expiration of the twenty years, the Pacific Cable Company will receive and be paid back their investment of $1,000,000, with interest at 5 per cent per annum, less any sum or sums they may have received by way of dividends or otherwise.

All these considerations, Mr. President, lead unwaveringly to one end—the prompt, immediate cable connection between us and the Hawaiian Islands. Without the light thrown upon the subject by the late events which I have recited, President Cleveland has put the matter more strongly than I can in his message of the 3d of December, 1886, in which he says:

> I express my unhesitating conviction that the intimacy of our relations with Hawaii should be emphasized. As a result of the reciprocity treaty of 1875 those islands, on the highway of Oriental and Australasian traffic, are virtually an outpost of American commerce and a stepping-stone to the growing trade of the Pacific.
>
> The Polynesian Island groups have been so absorbed by other and more powerful Governments that the Hawaiian Islands are left almost alone in the enjoyment of their autonomy, which it is important for us should be preserved.
>
> Our treaty is now terminable on one year's notice, but propositions to abrogate it would be, in my judgment, most ill advised. The paramount influence we have there acquired, once relinquished, could only with difficulty be regained, and a valuable ground of vantage for ourselves might be converted into a stronghold for our commercial competitors.
>
> I earnestly recommend that the existing treaty stipulations be extended for a further term of seven years. A recently signed treaty to this end is now before the Senate.
>
> The importance of telegraphic communication between those islands and the United States should not be overlooked.

And again, in his message of December 3, 1888, from which I quote:

> Proclamation was duly made on the 9th of November, 1887, of the conventional extensions of the treaty of June 3, 1875, with Hawaii under which relations of such special and beneficent intercourse have been created. In the vast field of Oriental commerce now unfolded from our Pacific borders no feature presents stronger recommendations for Congressional action than the establishment of communication by submarine telegraph with Honolulu.
>
> The geographical position of the Hawaiian group in relation to our Pacific States creates a natural interdependency and mutuality of interest which our present treaties were intended to foster, and which make close communication a logical and commercial necessity.

Mr. President, the way to do what President Cleveland has so clearly stated we ought to do has been made clear by the events which I have so imperfectly recited. The path is open to us. If we do not occupy it, if we do not improve the occasion, if we let the project fail, or are laggard in adopting it, Senators may be certain that in some way, by hook or by crook, the British Government will take up this thing which we have left.

The alternative to which they have been driven, by the efficient proceedings of the Hawaiian Government, of laying their Pacific cable by the way of Fanning Island, involves an almost impracticable enterprise. There has been, thus far, no continuous, unbroken line of submarine cable laid longer than about 2,700 miles, and experts in this business, many of them, believe that to lay a line more than 3,000 miles in length, with no resting place, is impossible.

No cable can be laid from the British North American possessions to Fanning Island without involving a length of at least 3,600 miles. If it can be done at all for this long distance, the additional cost, compared to the shorter and more practicable line, is very great, and the fact that the English colonial office is taking no steps now toward the construction of a line from Vancouver to Fanning Island indicates the difficulties under which it is placed.

I may be asked if the project which I am urging involves the accession of these islands by the United States or is a part of some concerted plan to that end. My answer is that I can not tell whether the construction of this line by our aid and subject to our control will or will not greatly shorten the time when annexation will come, nor do I very much care. There is in my mind no doubt that at some not distant day these islands will be ours. I do not care to precipitate that annexation; but I do know this, Mr. President, that with this line established by our aid and substantially in our hands we have taken a step which forbids forever all interference in these islands by any other nation, and that the whole world will then look upon it as a simple question of time when we shall take them into our fold.

It is no great burden; it involves little immediate outlay, and the expenditure from year to year for the twenty years will never be felt by the American people. But I do not, looking into the future, expect that as a business enterprise the matter will stop here. Almost as a business necessity, the projectors of this plan will be compelled to go farther and to lay the line from the Hawaiian Islands to Japan or some point on the Asiatic coast.

We shall not be compelled, and perhaps not called upon, to aid in that work; but when that additional line shall be laid, Mr. President, it will open a new world, with all its business, for the new line, and when it becomes profitable, and this end of the line which we have substantially built also becomes profitable, long before the twenty years have ended, business men who have and will put their money into the enterprise expect that the entire line, over its two parts, on this side and the other side of Honolulu, will be a paying investment.

I do not deem it worth the while to discuss the question whether our Constitution permits the action which is asked for here, or whether there be or not precedents in favor of such action.

The clauses of the Constitution touching the regulation of commerce and the conduct of postal operations are, to me, entirely ample. If we build ships of war and buy foreign lands for naval stations, surely we may expend money for establishing our communications with these stations or ships that frequent them.

APPENDIX A.

This agreement, made this 12th day of August, A. D. 1895, by and between Sanford Ballard Dole, President of the Republic of Hawaii, for himself and his successors in office, and in behalf of the Hawaiian Government, and by and with the consent of the cabinet, party of the first part, hereinafter called "the Government," and Zephaniah Swift Spalding, of Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, party of the second part, hereinafter called "the contractor," witnesseth:

AGREEMENTS BY THE GOVERNMENT.

ARTICLE I.—*Grant of exclusive franchise.*

SECTION 1. In consideration of the covenants, agreements, and undertakings hereinafter contained on the part of the contractor or his representatives or assigns to be kept or performed, the said party of the first part, in the exercise of the power to him granted by the provisions of an act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction and maintenance of telegraphic cables in the Pacific," approved on the 12th day of August, A. D. 1895, and of every other power, if any, him hereunto enabling, doth hereby grant, concede, and confirm unto the contractor and his representatives and assigns, upon the terms and conditions hereinafter contained, the sole and exclusive privilege and franchise for and during the full term of twenty years from the 1st day of November, A. D. 1895, to construct or land upon the shores of the Hawaiian group a submarine electric telegraph cable or cables to or from any point or points on the North American continent or any island or islands contiguous thereto.

SEC. 2. *Cable to terminate at San Francisco and be maintained for twenty years.—Provided, however*, and this agreement is upon these express conditions, viz, that the first cable which shall or may be constructed or laid under this franchise, and for the maintenance of which a subsidy is herein agreed to be paid, shall have its eastern terminus at or near San Francisco, Cal., and its western terminus at or near Honolulu, and shall be maintained in working order in conformity with and subject to the specifications, conditions, and agreements hereinafter contained for the full term of this agreement.

SEC. 3. *Exclusive grant not to conflict with treaty rights of foreign governments.*—And further, that this grant shall not be construed to prevent any foreign government, having existing treaty rights with the Republic of Hawaii allowing any such government so to do, to land a cable upon the Hawaiian group for other than commercial purposes from any point on the North American Continent.

ARTICLE II.—*Grant of subsidy.*

SECTION 1. *Amount and term of subsidy.*—And the Government doth hereby further covenant with the contractor, and his representatives and assigns, that there shall be paid to him, his representatives or assigns, by the Government of the Hawaiian Islands, upon the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, subject to ratification hereof by the Legislature of the Republic of Hawaii, an annual subsidy of $40,000, gold coin of the United States, for and

during the period of twenty years from the date of the establishment by the contractor, or his representatives or assigns, of telegraphic communication between the city of Honolulu, in the Republic of Hawaii, and a point at or near San Francisco, Cal.; and between the said city of Honolulu and the islands of Hawaii, Maui, Molokai, and Kauai.

SEC. 2. *Time and place of payment of subsidy.*—Such subsidy shall be paid to the contractor, his representatives or assigns, at the treasury of the Government in said Honolulu, by the minister of finance of the Government, or his successor in office, in equal quarterly installments of $10,000 each, during each and all of the years of said above-mentioned term of twenty years.

Subject, however, to suspension or cancellation upon the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth.

SEC. 3. *Grant conditioned upon beginning and completion of cable upon specified dates and performance of other agreements.—Provided, however*, and this agreement is upon these further express conditions, viz:

(*a*) That the contractor and his representatives and assigns shall not be entitled to such exclusive franchise, nor to the payment of such subsidy, nor any part thereof, unless the construction of such cables shall begin on or before the 1st day of May, A. D. 1897, and such telegraphic communication be established not later than the 1st day of November, A. D. 1898.

(*b*) And further, that the Government of the United States shall join in this undertaking by the grant of substantial assistance to the contractor, his representatives or assigns,

And provided further, That upon the failure to obtain the assistance of the United States Government, as herein specified, or upon the breach by or failure of the contractor, his representatives or assigns, to perform or observe all or any of the terms, agreements, or conditions herein contained, the party of the first part or his successors in office may cancel and terminate this agreement and all obligations on the part of the Government thereunder, by notifying the contractor, his representatives or assigns, of such cancellation and termination by delivering a written notice thereof at the house of Bishop & Co., in said Honolulu, not less than sixty days before such cancellation and termination shall take place.

But the rights and privileges of the contractor and his representatives and assigns under this agreement shall not be terminated by his or their failure to begin the construction of the cable herein provided for, and establish communication thereon as herein provided for, upon the dates herein specified, or upon or by reason of any other breach of any condition, or any failure to keep or observe any covenant or agreement herein contained on the part of the contractor, or his representatives or assigns, to be kept or performed, unless and until the Government shall in writing notify him or them that it has canceled this agreement by reason of such breach or failure, by delivering such written notice at the said house of Bishop & Co. not less than sixty days before the date upon which such termination and cancellation are to take effect.

SEC. 4. *Suspension of subsidy during temporary failure of cable.*—(*c*) And further that in case of a failure or interruption of efficient electrical connection and communicating power over the said cable or cables between the points hereinafter specified, or any of them, for a period of more than ninety consecutive days, from any cause other than governmental restraint or illegal obstruction, the Government shall not be bound to pay the said subsidy in full, but may deduct therefrom a proportionate amount for the period of such interruption, as follows: For the time of failure or interruption of such communication between San Francisco and the Hawaiian Islands, beyond said term of ninety consecutive days at the rate of $30,000 per annum; for the time of failure or interruption of such communication between the said islands, or any of them, beyond said term of ninety consecutive days, at the rate of $10,000 per annum.

SEC. 5. *Cancellation of contract in case of failure for one year.—And provided further*, That if the said line or lines, or either of them, shall fail to furnish such communication for a period exceeding one year beyond such term of ninety consecutive days, then and in such case the Government may, at its option, cancel this contract as far as it refers to the line or system so interrupted, and it shall thereupon be freed from all obligations to pay any further subsidy on account of the line or system so interrupted.

That is to say, if the line upon which such communication is so interrupted shall be a part of the interisland cable system it shall be relieved from the obligation to pay $10,000 per annum of said subsidy.

And if the interruption of such communication for such period be on the line between San Francisco and Honolulu, it shall be relieved from the obligation to pay $30,000 per annum of such subsidy, and the grant of an exclusive franchise to lay and maintain a cable to or from the North American Continent to the Hawaiian group and of all other rights and privileges referring or relating to such line or system herein contained shall thereupon and thereby become and be null and void.

ARTICLE III.—*Other privileges.*

SECTION 1. *Rights of way and building sites.*—And the Government doth hereby further grant to the contractor, his representatives and assigns, for the said term of twenty years, the free use of a right of way across all Government lands for the landing of any such cable or cables or the construction of any land lines connecting the same, and of suitable sites on any Government lands which may be approved by the Government, for the construction of stations and storehouses for the maintenance or operation of the cable or cables, and doth covenant with the contractor, his representatives and assigns, that during the period of twenty years from the date of the establishment by the contractor, his representatives or assigns, of telegraphic communication between the said city of Honolulu and the other points herein specified, the contractor, his representatives and assigns, shall continue to have the free use of such rights of way and sites.

SEC. 2. *Exemption from duties.*—And also that during the said term of twenty years there shall be admitted into the Republic, free of all duties, all material to be used exclusively in the construction, maintenance, or operation of any such cable or cables.

SEC. 3. *Exemption from taxes.*—And also that for the said term of twenty years no taxes shall be levied upon the property of the contractor, his representatives or assigns, located in the Republic, belonging to or connected with such cable or cables and necessary or properly appurtenant to the construction, maintenance, or operation of such cable or cables.

SEC. 4. *Exemption from port charges.*—And also that during such term of twenty years no harbor or port dues or charges, except pilotage, shall be levied upon or collected from any vessel or vessels exclusively engaged in laying or maintaining any such cable or cables, or which may be stationed in the waters of the Republic for such purposes.

SEC. 5. *Grant of power of eminent domain.*—And also that during such term of twenty years the contractor, his representatives and assigns, shall have the power and privilege to condemn and appropriate, according to law, such property or rights of way as may be necessary for the construction, maintenance, or operation of such cable or cables and the land connections thereof.

AGREEMENTS OF THE CONTRACTOR.

ARTICLE IV.—*Location and equipment of lines.*

SECTION 1. *Specification of location of lines.*—In consideration of the several grants and covenants of the Government hereinbefore contained, the contractor, for himself and his representatives and assigns, doth hereby covenant to and agree with the said party of the first part and his successors in office that he, the said contractor, his representatives or assigns, will, on or before the 1st day of May, A. D. 1897, begin to construct the cables necessary to connect the several points herein specified, and that he, the said contractor, his representatives or assigns, will, on or before the 1st day of November, A. D. 1898, construct, complete, lay, equip, and establish in efficient working condition cables as follows:

From a point on the west coast of California, at or near the city of San Francisco, to a point at or near the said city of Honolulu.

And also from the Island of Hawaii, at or near Kawaihae, to the Island of Maui, at or near Nuu.

And also from the Island of Maui, at or near Napili, to the Island of Molokai, at or near Pukoo.

And also from the Island of Molokai, at or near its west point, to the Island of Oahu, at or near Waikiki.

And also from the Island of Oahu, at or near Waianea, to the Island of Kauai, at or near Nawiliwili.

And also will construct all necessary stations and connections, so as to make such cable and cables available for communication to and from each of such islands.

The landing places at the several termini mentioned shall be at such points on the said respective shores as shall be determined by the engineer in charge of the work.

SEC. 2. *Interisland land lines.*—And the contractor doth further covenant with the Government that he, his representatives or assigns, will, on or before the said 1st day of November, A. D. 1898, construct and equip and connect with such cable and cables all necessary land lines and stations on each of the said enumerated islands, so that efficient telegraphic communication may be maintained between Honolulu and a point at or near said San Francisco, and between Honolulu and each of the said islands, and between each of said islands and any other of said islands.

SEC. 3. *Maintenance of lines.*—And further, that after such cables and land lines are so constructed, laid, and placed in operation the said cables and land lines, and each and every one of them, shall be, during the term of twenty years thereafter, continuously and fully equipped, operated, and maintained, so that the same shall and will constitute and form reliable means of telegraphic communication between the points enumerated.

SEC. 4. *Proviso for delay in certain cases.—Provided, however*, That if any delay in constructing, laying, and completing the said cable or cables shall be caused or arise from any strike, lockout, or any other combination preventing the contractor's works, or any of the trades or occupations upon which the contractor, his representatives or assigns, or manufacturers of cable from which he is or they are obtaining the cable, shall be dependent in carrying out any contract or work necessary to the proper fulfillment of the contract; or shall be caused by any restraints or obstructions occasioned by any governmental authority, or otherwise than by the default of said contractor, his representatives or assigns, then or in any such case the time for completing such cable or cables shall be extended for such period or periods as shall be certified to be reasonable by a competent electrical engineer, who shall be approved by the Government.

SEC. 5. *Exemption of contractor from liability under certain conditions.—And provided further*, That the contractor, his representatives or assigns, shall not be responsible in damages to the Government for any delay or failure in manufacturing or laying the said cable or cables, except such as may be caused by the culpable neglect of the contractor, his representatives, agents, or assigns, in carrying out the terms of this agreement, the true intent and meaning of this agreement being that the contractor, his representatives and assigns, shall take all reasonable precautions and use their best endeavors to construct, lay, and operate the said cable or cables between the said respective points within the time specified, but that he and they shall not be responsible in damages if he and they shall bona fide use his or their best efforts to accomplish such object.

ARTICLE V.—*Ownership of interisland lines.*

SECTION 1. *Government option to assume ownership of interisland lines.*—And the contractor, for himself and his representatives and assigns, doth hereby further covenant with the Government that if so requested in writing by the Government, within one year after the said interisland cable system is completed, he, the contractor, or his representatives or assigns, shall and will sell, transfer, and convey to the Government all of the said interisland cable and cables, and the equipment, stations, and appurtenances, poles and land lines, and everything thereunto appertaining, charging and receiving therefor only the actual cash cost of the said land lines, stations, and equipments, and making no charge for the construction, laying, or furnishing of such submarine cables.

SEC. 2. *Government title to interisland cables to be free from all liens.*—If the Government shall so acquire such interisland cable system it shall acquire and hold it free from any obligation to pay any indebtedness or any bond or bonds or interest thereon, or any part thereof, which may have been incurred, created, or executed in, upon, or concerning the same, and free from any and every other debt, obligation, and lien of any kind whatever.

But nothing herein contained shall be so construed that such acquiring of such interisland cable system shall release the Government from the obligation of continuing to pay the full amount of the subsidy herein before granted.

SEC. 3. *Government acquisition of interisland cable to release contractor from responsibility therefor.*—If the said interisland cable system shall be so acquired by the Government, the maintenance and operation, and all costs, charges, and expenses of maintaining and operating such interisland cable so conveyed shall, from the date of such conveyance, be conducted, borne, and sustained by the Government; and the contractor, his representatives and assigns, shall, from and after such date, be relieved from all responsibility and expense for or concerning such system, and no interruption or failure of communication occurring in such interisland cable system after the same shall have been so acquired by the Government shall work, or be made the cause, directly or indirectly, of the suspension or forfeiture of the subsidy hereby granted, or any part thereof, or be made a ground for the forfeiture of this agreement or any privilege thereby granted.

ARTICLE VI.—*Use of cable ship.*

And the contractor, for himself and his representatives and assigns, doth further convenant with the Government: That if the said interisland cable shall be so conveyed to the Government, the contractor, his representatives and assigns, will at all times allow the cable repairing ship owned by or controlled by him or them to be used by the Government in the repair or replacing of any of the cables in such interisland system, charging therefor only the actual cash outlay of the contractor, his representatives or assigns, in making such repairs or replacement.

ARTICLE VII.—*Specifications of size, weight, materials, and efficiency of cables.*

And the contractor doth hereby further covenant with the Government that the manufacture, size, and weight of the material used in and the method of storing and laying the said cable and cables shall be in accordance with the several specifications hereunto annexed, and made a part of this agreement.

And further, that all of such cable or cables so to be constructed, laid, equipped, operated, and maintained and all instruments and appliances shall and will be manufactured and constructed throughout in a good and workmanlike manner and of the best materials.

And further, that each and every of the said sections of cable shall, during the said term of twenty years, be continuously, except as herein provided, capable of efficiently transmitting not less than fifteen words per minute between the several points herein specified.

And further, that during the said term of twenty years efficient operators shall be maintained at each of the stations on said lines, who shall and will transmit over said cable lines all messages at such stations received for transmission at such rate of speed for the rates of tariff herein provided for.

ARTICLE VIII.—*Schedule of rates.*

SECTION 1. *Interisland rates.*—And the contractor, for himself and his representatives and assigns, doth hereby further covenant with the Government that during the continuance of the terms of this agreement the maximum charge for messages transmitted over the said interisland cable system, from the point of receiving such messages to its point of destination, shall not exceed the following prescribed limit, viz, not to exceed 10 cents for each word so transmitted.

Provided, however, That it shall not be obligatory upon the contractor, his representatives or assigns, to send any message for less than $1.

SEC. 2. *Foreign rates.*—And further, that during such period the maximum rates for the transmission of any message, other than Government messages, to or from the Hawaiian Islands over such cable between Honolulu and San Francisco, shall be such as shall be agreed upon in any contract which shall be made between the contractor, his representatives or assigns, and the United States Government, not exceeding $1 per word, and any contract with such Government shall prescribe a maximum scale of rates.

And further, that if telegraphic communications shall be hereafter established between the Hawaiian Islands and Australasia or Japan, the rate to be charged for any message transmitted from Honolulu to San Francisco, or from San Francisco to Honolulu, shall not exceed a pro rata proportion, based on distance, of the regular rate for transmitting a similar message to or from San Francisco and Australasia or Japan.

And further, that messages from Honolulu to points beyond San Francisco shall not be charged higher rates beyond San Francisco than the rates which the contractor may be charged for the transmission of the same.

SEC. 3. *Press rates.*—And further, that the rates for ordinary messages or items of news to any newspaper or news bureau of the Republic of Hawaii (commonly known as press messages) shall not exceed one-half the rate which shall be charged for other messages, excepting messages to or from the Hawaiian Government, or any officer thereof in his official capacity, or to or from any foreign Government.

Provided, however, That it shall not be obligatory upon the contractor, his representatives, or assigns, to send any press message for less than $1.

SEC. 4. *Hawaiian Government rates.*—And further, that during the said term of twenty years all messages concerning the official business of the Hawaiian Government, to or from the Hawaiian Government or any of its officials, transmitted over said interisland system of cables, or over the said cable from Honolulu to San Francisco, shall be transmitted free up to the amount of the annual subsidy paid by the Government to the contractor, his representatives or assigns, reckoning the charge and scale of rates for such Government messages at the rate herein prescribed or provided for ordinary messages.

ARTICLE IX.—*Security for execution of contract.*

SECTION 1. *Deposit of bonds with minister of finance.*—And the contractor, for himself and his representatives and assigns, doth hereby further covenant with the Government that he will, upon the execution of this agreement, deposit with the minister of finance of the Republic of Hawaii, Hawaiian Government bonds to the amount of $25,000 as security that he and his representatives and assigns will construct, lay, and equip the said cables and land lines in accordance with the terms and conditions of this agreement.

Upon the completion of the construction, equipment, and laying of said systems of cable and land lines in the manner herein provided for, the obligation and obligations secured by such bonds shall be deemed to have been fulfilled and performed, and such bonds shall thereupon be returned to the contractor, his representatives or assigns.

But if after the beginning of the construction of said cables, in manner herein specified, there shall be any failure to complete the construction, laying, and equipment of such systems and such land lines within the time herein specified, then and in such case such bonds shall be forfeited to the Hawaiian Government as liquidated damages, and there shall be no further or other claim by way of damages by the Government against the contractor, his representatives or assigns.

SEC. 2. *Contractor may cancel this contract within a specified time.—Provided, however*, That the contractor, his representatives or assigns, may at any time prior to the 1st day of May, A. D. 1897, notify the Government of his or their desire to cancel this contract, whereupon this contract shall become null and void, and such bonds so deposited as security shall thereupon be forthwith returned to the contractor, his representatives or assigns.

ARTICLE X.—*Definition of "beginning of construction."*

It is hereby mutually agreed that the beginning of the construction of the cables specified in section 1 of Article IV of this agreement shall be construed to mean, and shall mean, the completion and execution of a contract between the contractor and a responsible cable construction company or companies for the construction and laying of such cable and cables within the period limited by the terms of this contract, and the actual beginning of the work of construction under such contract with such construction company or companies, and a written notice to the Government by the contractor, his representatives or assigns, accompanied by proofs of the execution of such contract.

ARTICLE XI.—*Contract binding on and in favor of representatives, assigns, etc.*

It is hereby mutually agreed by and between the parties hereto, on behalf of themselves and their respective successors, representatives, and assigns, that all terms and conditions herein contained upon the part of the Government to be observed, kept, or performed, shall be equally binding and obligatory as well upon the Hawaiian Government and the said party of the first part and his successors; and that all of the agreements and covenants herein contained upon the part of the contractor to be kept or observed or performed, are and shall be as well in favor of and enforceable by the Hawaiian Government and the party of the first part as his successors in office.

And further, that all of the terms and conditions and covenants herein contained upon the part of the contractor to be observed, kept, or performed shall be equally binding and obligatory upon the said party of the second part as upon his representatives and assigns; and that all of the agreements and covenants herein contained on the part of the Government, or of said party of the first part, or his successors, to be kept, observed, or performed, are, and shall be, as well in favor of and enforceable by the party of the second part as his representatives and assigns.

[Specifications of cables hereinbefore referred to. Proposed telegraph cable from San Francisco to Honolulu and Hawaiian interisland cables.]

SAN FRANCISCO-HONOLULU CABLE.

The landing place near San Francisco may be at Monterey Bay, and the landing place near Honolulu at Waikiki.

Lengths of cable required.

	Nautical miles.
Shore end (type A)	2
Intermediate No. 1 (type E)	3
Intermediate No. 2 (type B)	51
Deep sea (type D)	2,444
Total	2,500

SPECIFICATION.

Core.

(*a*) *Conductor.*—The conductor to be a strand of copper wires weighing 400 pounds per nautical mile, or within 5 per cent thereof, and the resistance at 75° Fahrenheit shall not be more than 3.117 ohms.

(*b*) *Insulator.*—The conductor is to be insulated with three coatings of gutta-percha of improved inductive capacity, prepared according to Mr. Willoughby Smith's system, alternating with three coatings of Chatterton's compound, and to weigh 300 pounds per knot, or within 5 per cent thereof. The resistance of the completed core to be not less than 150 megohms per nautical mile after one minute's electrification, when tested at a temperature of 75° Fahrenheit, after twenty-four hours' immersion in water, fourteen days after manufacture, and the average inductive capacity per nautical mile throughout the entire length is not to exceed 0.414 microfarad.

(*c*) *Sheathing.*—The core of types A, E, and B to be covered with Clifford's patent sheathing for protection against the ravages of insects.

(*d*) *Serving.*—The core of all the types to be served with a good and sufficient serving of jute yarn, steeped in cutch or other preservative mixture, and applied wet.

Outer coverings.—Shore end.

(*e*) *Outer coverings.—Type A.*—Type B to be served with tarred jute yarn, and again closed with fourteen galvanized BB iron wires, No. 1 B. W. G. equal to three hundred one-thousandths of an inch when galvanized, or within 2½ per cent thereof.

Intermediate, No. 1.

(*f*) *Type E.*—The served core to be covered with twelve galvanized BB iron wires, No. 4 B. W. G., equal to two hundred and thirty-eight one-thousandths of an inch when galvanized, or within 2½ per cent thereof.

Intermediate, No. 2.

(*g*) *Type B.*—The served core to be covered with twelve galvanized BB iron wires, No. 6 B. W. G., equal to two-hundred one-thousandths of an inch when galvanized, or within 2½ per cent thereof.

Deep-sea.

(*h*) *Type D.*—The served core to be covered with seventeen galvanized steel wires, each wire being taped and compounded. The steel wires to be No. 14 B. W. G., equal to eighty-three one-thousandths of an inch when galvanized, or within 2½ per cent thereof, and to bear a breaking strain of not less than 85 tons per square inch, with an elongation of not less than 4 per cent.

(*i*) Before being used for the sheathing of types A, E, and B, the galvanized iron wire is to be heated in a kiln or oven just sufficiently to drive off all moisture, and while warm is to be dipped into a hot compound or black varnish.

Outside serving.

(*j*) Types A and E, manufactured as above, to be covered with two servings of jute yarn laid on spirally in opposite directions, alternately with two coatings of Clark's compound.

(*k*) Types B and D, manufactured as above, to be covered with two of Johnson & Phillip's patent tapes, laid on spirally in opposite directions, alternately with two coatings of Clark's compound.

HAWAIIAN INTERISLAND CABLES.

Lengths of cable required.

	Nautical miles.
Shore end (Type A)	10
Intermediate (Type B¹)	25
Deep-sea (Type D)	142
Total	177

SPECIFICATION.

Core.

(*a*) *Conductor.*—The conductor to be a strand of copper wires weighing 100 pounds per nautical mile, or within 5 per cent thereof, and the resistance at 75° F. shall not be more than 12.22 ohms.

(*b*) *Insulator.*—The conductor is to be insulated with three coatings of gutta-percha of improved inductive capacity, prepared according to Mr. Willoughby Smith's system, alternating with three coatings of Chatterton's compound, and to weigh 100 pounds per nautical mile, or within 5 per cent thereof. The resistance of the completed core is to be not less than 150 megohms per nautical mile after one minute's electrification when tested at a temperature of 75° Fahrenheit, after twenty-four hours' immersion in water, fourteen days after manufacture.

(*c*) *Sheathing.*—The core of Types A and B¹ to be covered with Clifford's patent sheathing for protection against the ravages of insects.

(*d*) *Serving.*—The core to be covered with a good and sufficient serving of jute yarn, steeped in cutch or other preservative mixture, to be applied wet.

Outer coverings.—Shore end.

(*e*) *Outer coverings.—Type A.*—Type B¹ to be served with tarred jute yarn, and again closed with twelve galvanized BB iron wires, No. 1 B. W. G., equal to three hundred one-thousandths of an inch when galvanized, or within 2½ per cent thereof.

Intermediate.

(*f*) Type B¹.—The served core to be covered with twelve galvanized BB iron wires, No. 9 B. W. G., equal to one hundred and forty-eighth one-thousandths of an inch when galvanized, or within 2½ per cent thereof.

Deep sea.

(*g*) *Type D.*—The served core to be covered with fifteen galvanized homogeneous iron wires. The homogeneous wires to be No. 13 B. W. G., equal to ninety-nine one-thousandths of an inch when galvanized, or within 2½ per cent thereof, and to bear a breaking strain of not less than 52 tons per square inch with an elongation of not less than 3 per cent.

(*h*) *Dipping.*—Before being used for the sheathing the galvanized iron wire is to be heated in a kiln or oven just sufficiently to drive off all moisture, and while warm is to be dipped into a hot compound or black varnish.

Outside serving.

(*i*) *Outside serving.*—Type A to be covered with two servings of jute yarn laid on spirally in opposite directions, and two coatings of Clark's compound.

(*j*) Types B^1 and D to be covered with two of Johnson & Phillips's patent tapes, laid on spirally in opposite directions, alternately with two coatings of Clark's compound.

GENERAL CLAUSES.

(*k*) *Cable to be kept under water.*—The cable when completed to be coiled in suitable water-tight tanks, and kept, as far as practicable, constantly under water.

(*l*) *Tanks on board ship.*—The completed cable to be coiled on board ship in water-tight tanks, and kept, as far as practicable, under water until submerged.

(*m*) *Final electrical condition of cable.*—The electrical condition of the cable when laid to be such as, having regard to its previous condition and making due allowance for the mean actual temperature of the water, as shown by the resistance of the conductor, to give no good grounds for believing that any fault exists in the insulator or conductor.

In witness whereof the said Sanford Ballard Dole, President of the Republic of Hawaii, hath hereunto set his hand and caused the great seal of the Republic of Hawaii to be hereunto attached; and Francis M. Hatch, minister of foreign affairs; Samuel M. Damon, minister of finance; James A. King, minister of interior; and William O. Smith, attorney-general, constituting the cabinet of the Republic of Hawaii, in token of their consent to and approval of this agreement, and the said Zephaniah Swift Spalding have hereunto set their hands and seals, the day and year first above written.

Done in triplicate.

[SEAL.]

SANFORD B. DOLE.
FRANCIS M. HATCH,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.
J. A. KING, *Minister of the Interior.*
S. M. DAMON, *Minister of Finance.*
WILLIAM O. SMITH, *Attorney-General.*
ZEPHANIAH SWIFT SPALDING.

We, William C. Wilder, president of the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii, and J. F. Clay, secretary of the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii, do hereby certify that the foregoing agreement between Sanford Ballard Dole, President of the Republic of Hawaii, and Zephaniah Swift Spalding was submitted by the President to the said Senate on the 12th day of August, A. D. 1895, and was ratified, approved, and confirmed by the said Senate on the 13th day of August, A. D. 1895.

W. C. WILDER,
President of the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii.
J. F. CLAY,
Secretary of the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii.

HONOLULU, *August 14, 1895.*

We, D. L. Naone, speaker, and James N. K. Keola, clerk of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Hawaii, do hereby certify that the foregoing agreement between Sanford Ballard Dole, President of the Republic of Hawaii, and Zephaniah Swift Spalding was submitted by the President to the said House of Representatives on the 12th day of August, A. D. 1895, and was ratified, approved, and confirmed by the said House of Representatives on the 13th day of August, A. D. 1895.

D. L. NAONE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Hawaii.
JAS. N. K. KEOLA,
Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Hawaii.

HONOLULU, *August 14, A. D. 1895.*

APPENDIX B.

CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION OF THE PACIFIC CABLE COMPANY.

This is to certify that we, the undersigned, do hereby associate ourselves into a company under and by virtue of the provisions of the acts of the legislature of the State of New Jersey, entitled "An act concerning corporations" (approved April 7, 1875), and the several supplements thereto and acts amendatory thereof, for the purposes hereinafter mentioned, and to that end we do by this our certificate set forth—

First. That the name which we have assumed to designate such company and to be used in its business and dealings is the "Pacific Cable Company."

Second. That the places in this State where the business of the said company is to be conducted are the city of Jersey City, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey, and in such other townships and cities in this State as the nature and the progress of the business of the corporation shall from time to time render necessary or desirable.

The principal part of the business of said company within the State of New Jersey is to be transacted in the city of Jersey City, county of Hudson aforesaid.

The principal office or place of business of the said company outside the State of New Jersey is San Francisco, in the county of San Francisco and State of California.

The company will carry on a portion of its business without the State of New Jersey, and the places out of the State of New Jersey where the same is to be conducted and where the company proposes to carry on operations are in the State of California and in the Hawaiian Islands, and in such other places in the several States and Territories of the United States and in such foreign countries as shall from time to time be found necessary and convenient for the purposes of the company's business.

Third. That the objects for which this company is formed are to do any or all of the things herein set forth to the same extent as natural persons might or could do, and in any part of the world, as principals, agents, contractors, trustees, or otherwise, and either alone or in company with others, viz:

The construction, laying, operating, and maintaining of electric submarine cables in the Pacific Ocean, with telegraph lines and connections for the transmission of messages by electrical means, including the acquisition, by purchase, by manufacture, or otherwise, of all materials, supplies, machinery, and other articles necessary or convenient for use in connection with and in carrying on the business herein mentioned or any part thereof.

(*a*) To manufacture, purchase, or otherwise acquire, hold, own, mortgage, pledge, sell, assign, and transfer, invest, trade, deal in and deal with goods, wares, and merchandise, and property of every class and description.

(*b*) To the same extent as natural persons might or could do, to purchase or otherwise acquire, to hold, own, to mortgage, sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of, without limit as to amount, within or without the State of New Jersey, real estate and real property of every class and description.

(*c*) To acquire the good will, rights, and property of any kind, and to undertake the whole or any part of the assets and liabilities of any person, firm, association, or corporation, and to pay for the same in cash, stock of this company, bonds, or otherwise.

(*d*) To apply for, obtain, register, purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, and to hold, own, use, operate, introduce, and to sell, assign, or otherwise dispose of, any and all trade-marks, trade names, and distinctive marks, and all inventions, improvements, and processes used in connection with or secured under letters patent of the United States or elsewhere or otherwise; And to use, exercise, develop, grant licenses in respect of, or otherwise turn to account, any such trade-marks, patents, licenses, concessions, processes, and the like, or any such property, rights, and information so acquired, and with a view to the working and development of the same to carry on any business, whether manufacturing or otherwise, which the company may think calculated directly or indirectly to effectuate these objects.

(*e*) To purchase or otherwise acquire, to hold, sell, assign, transfer, mortgage, pledge, exchange, or otherwise dispose of bonds, mortgages, debentures, obligations, or shares of the capital stock of any corporation, and to exercise while the owner thereof all the rights, powers, and privileges, including the right to vote thereon, which natural persons, being the owners of such stock and property, might, could, or would exercise.

(*f*) To draw, make, accept, indorse, discount, execute, and issue promissory notes, bills of exchange, warrants, bonds, debentures, and other negotiable or transferable instruments.

(*g*) To procure the company to be registered or recognized and to carry on its operations and business in any State or Territory of the United States and in any foreign country or place.

To do all and everything necessary, suitable, or proper for the accomplishment of any of the purposes or attainment of any of the objects hereinbefore enumerated or which shall at any time appear conducive or expedient for the protection or benefit of the company as holders of or interested in any such properties mentioned or referred to herein or otherwise, and in general to engage in any and all lawful business whatever, necessary or convenient (excepting always from this charter the business of an insurance company, a banking company, a savings bank, or other corporation intended to derive profit from the loan and use of money, a railroad or other company which shall need to possess the right of taking and condemning lands in the State of New Jersey), with all the powers which are now or may hereafter be granted to corporations under the laws of the State of New Jersey.

It is the intention that the objects specified in the third paragraph shall, except where otherwise expressed in said paragraph, be nowise limited or restricted by reference to or inference from the terms of any other clause or other paragraph in this charter, but that the objects specified in each of the clauses of this paragraph shall be regarded as independent objects.

Fourth. The portion of the business of the said company which is to be carried on without the State of New Jersey is a part of its financial business, any part or all of its purchasing, manufacturing, and selling business, any part or all of its dealings in personal or real property of all kinds and choses in action, any part or all of the negotiation, sale, and delivery of its stocks, bonds, and other securities, any part or all of its business pertaining to patents, patent rights, trade-marks, and any and all other parts of its business described in paragraph 3 herein which may be or become necessary or convenient or deemed profitable for the company.

Fifth. The total amount of the capital stock of this company is to be $1,000,000, and the number of shares into which it is to be divided is 10,000 shares of $100 each.

Sixth. The amount of capital with which said company will commence business is $1,000,000, which is divided into 10,000 shares of $100 each.

Seventh. The names and addresses of the stockholders, and the number of shares of stock held by each, are as follows:

Name.	Residence.	Number of shares.
Abram S. Hewitt	New York City	1,500
D. O. Mills	do	1,000
G. M. Dodge	do	1,000
Fred. D. Grant	do	500
Wager Swayne	do	500
Jas. J. Hill	St. Paul, Minn	1,000
Z. S. Spalding	San Francisco, Cal	2,500
Jno. H. Browning	Tenafly, N. J	1,000
Mason W. Tyler	Plainfield, N. J	1,000

Eighth. The period at which said company shall commence is the 1st day of January, 1896, and the period at which it shall terminate shall be fifty years thereafter.

Ninth. (1.) The board of directors shall have full and unrestricted power without the assent or vote of the stockholders to authorize and cause to be executed mortgages and liens upon the real and personal property of this company, upon such terms and conditions as shall to the board seem proper, and upon like terms and conditions to sell, in the usual course of business, property both real and personal.

With the consent in writing and pursuant to vote of the holders of a majority of the stock issued and outstanding, the stockholders having been formally convened in a meeting, the directors shall have power and authority to sell, assign, transfer, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of the whole property of this corporation, or any part or portion thereof, on such terms and conditions as the directors shall deem fit, right, and just.

(2.) The board of directors, in addition to the powers and authorities by statute and by the by-laws expressly conferred upon them, may exercise all such powers and do all such acts and things as may be exercised or done by the corporation, but subject, nevertheless, to the provisions of the statute, of the charter, and to any regulations that may from time to time be made by the stockholders, provided that no regulations so made shall invalidate any provisions of this charter, or any prior acts of the directors which would have been valid if such regulations had not been made.

(3.) The company may in its by-laws confer powers additional to the foregoing upon the directors, and may prescribe the number necessary to constitute a quorum of its board of directors, which number may be less than a majority of the whole number.

(4.) The board of directors may, by resolution passed by a majority of the whole board, designate two or more of their number to constitute an executive committee, which committee shall for the time being, as provided in said resolution or in the by-laws of said company, have and exercise all the powers of the board of directors in the management of the business and affairs of the company, and have power to authorize the seal of the company to be affixed to all papers which may require it.

(5.) No stockholder holding less than 10 per cent of the total stock issued shall be entitled to an examination of the books of account, or documents, or papers, or vouchers of this company, except by a resolution of the board

of directors giving such privilege, and an examination shall then be had only at the time and place, in the manner, to the extent, and by the person named in such resolution of the board of directors, excepting from this entire restriction only such corporate records as are, by statute, open to the inspection of stockholders.

This restriction shall not be construed to limit the right or power of any director or officer of the corporation to examine the books, papers, or vouchers of the said corporation.

(6.) The company may use and apply its surplus property earnings or accumulated profits, authorized by law to be reserved to the creation and maintenance of a surplus fund, or to the purchase and acquisition of property, and to the purchase and acquisition of its own capital stock, and may take the same in payment or satisfaction of any debt due the company from time to time, and to such extent and in such manner and upon such terms as its board of directors shall determine; and neither the surplus fund, nor the property nor the capital stock so purchased and acquired, nor any of its capital stock taken in payment or satisfaction of any debt due the company, shall be regarded as profits for the purpose of the declaration or payment of dividends unless a majority of the board of directors, or a majority of all the stock then issued and outstanding, shall otherwise determine.

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands and seals this 13th day of December, A. D. 1895.

ABRAM S. HEWITT.	[SEAL.]
D. O. MILLS.	[SEAL.]
G. M. DODGE.	[SEAL.]
FRED. D GRANT.	[SEAL.]
WAGER SWAYNE.	[SEAL.]
JAS. J. HILL.	[SEAL.]
Z. S. SPALDING.	[SEAL.]
MASON W. TYLER.	[SEAL.]
JNO. H. BROWNING.	[SEAL.]

In presence of—
JOSEPH B. BRAMAN.
Swayne & Swayne, counsel, 120 Broadway, New York City.

STATE OF NEW YORK, *City and County of New York, ss:*

Be it remembered that on this 13th day of December, A. D. 1895, before me, Joseph B. Braman, a commissioner of deeds for the State of New Jersey, in and for the State of New York, resident in said city of New York, personally appeared Abram S. Hewitt, D. O. Mills, G. M. Dodge, Frederick D. Grant, Wager Swayne, James J. Hill, Z. S. Spalding, Mason W. Tyler, and Jno. H. Browning, who, I am satisfied, are the persons named in and who executed the foregoing certificate, and I, having first made known to them, and each of them, the contents thereof, they did each acknowledge that they signed, sealed, and delivered the same as their voluntary act and deed.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year last above written.

[SEAL.] JOSEPH B. BRAMAN,
Commissioner of Deeds for the State of New Jersey in and for the State of New York, resident in said City of New York.

Offices: Equitable Building, 120 Broadway, New York City. Branch and residence, 1274 Broadway, New York City.

(Indorsed:) Received in the Hudson County (N. J.) clerk's office, December 14, A. D. 1895, and recorded in clerk's record No. ——, on page —.
JOHN G. FISHER, *Clerk.*

(Indorsed:) Filed December 16, 1895.
HENRY C. KELSEY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, *Department of State:*

I, Henry C. Kelsey, secretary of state of the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the certificate of organization of the Pacific Cable Company and the indorsements thereon, as the same is taken from and compared with the original filed in my office on the 16th day of December, A. D. 1895, and now remaining on file therein.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal, at Trenton, this 16th day of December, A. D. 1895.
HENRY C. KELSEY,
Secretary of State.

Mr. HALE. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALLEN. Before the Senator from Maine takes his seat I should like to ask him what became of the amendment that we put upon the Post-Office appropriation bill last year appropriating $500,000 for the construction of a cable line between the United States and Hawaii.

Mr. HALE. I have stated. That amendment, as the Senator will remember, was amended at his suggestion so as to provide that the Government should own the property.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALE. In that form it passed the Senate. It was voted down in the other House, and the matter went into conference. The Senate insisted upon its proposition for two several conferences; but as the session waned and the bill could not be lost, the Senate at last receded from its own action and the project fell.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not believe that it would now be better policy for us to put such an amendment upon the Post-Office appropriation bill this year to the same effect, and insist upon it, by which the Government would own and control this cable line?

Mr. HALE. The main reason for the change in the manner of acting that has operated in my mind is, that since the time to which the Senator refers the Hawaiian Government has come in with a subsidy of $40,000 a year, to be given to any company that, in connection with the United States, will lay the cable. At that time nobody had shown any interest in the matter. Hawaii had done nothing; there was no indication that it would help pay the bills; and therefore the only thing to do was to build the cable ourselves. But since then, as I have before stated, Hawaii comes in and is ready to assume what I think is her share, one-sixth of the expense of the whole subsidy, and that, therefore, puts the question in a different light.

Mr. ALLEN. I suppose the Senator has no doubt that the Hawaiian Government would cooperate with this Government in the construction of a telegraph line by the Government of the United States?

Mr. HALE. The answer is that the Hawaiian Government has now parted with its rights to do that to Mr. Spalding or to his assigns for the time between now and November 1, 1898.

Mr. ALLEN. Let me make a suggestion to the Senator, if I am not unnecessarily interrupting him.

Mr. HALE. Not at all.

Mr. ALLEN. I suggest that that is such a concession as the Government of Hawaii would have perfect power to cancel. It is not a vested right. It is a grant of sovereignty which may be recalled. Has the Senator any doubt that if the Government of the United States would make a proper appropriation for the construction of a line to be owned and controlled by this Government the Hawaiian Government would properly cooperate with us in that construction?

Mr. HALE. As I have said, I do not know. I have no doubt there is a feeling in Hawaii to cooperate with us in every form possible, but it has chosen this other way of showing its cooperation, and has endowed Mr. Spalding and his company with this gift, so that for two years and more they have a right, if the United States Government will join with them, to lay the cable, and the participation of the United States in the enterprise must be in the form of a subsidy. We, I will say to the Senator, to all intents and purposes own it if we want it. If the Senator will examine the provisions of the bill he will find that on any emergency, of which we are to be the judge, we may take entire possession, control it, operate it, own it, only making the members of the company good their advances.

So we get the cable built. We get the enterprise, with these men enlisted in it. We do not have to do it by governmental means, by the paternal methods. We get the line constructed. Our obligation is not large. It is one that will not be felt by the people; and at any moment we can do what I agree with the Senator is desirable in an emergency, take it and own it; but we do not have to go through the steps and the processes necessary to construct it. As I reflect upon it, in connection with this act of the Hawaiian Government, I think this is, perhaps, the better way to do it. I should not think so if there were not ample provisions for our taking it and owning it on any emergency.

Mr. ALLEN. I observe by the Senator's bill, however, that we guarantee them 4 per cent interest upon their investment. There is no safeguard in the bill, that I can see, against the overcapitalization of the company. They may actually put in one sum of money and capitalize for two or three times that sum, and under the Senator's bill we would be compelled to guarantee them 4 per cent upon their capitalization.

Mr. HALE. Oh, no; the Senator is mistaken. It is all safeguarded in that regard. It is only 4 per cent upon moneys actually expended and shown to be expended in stock of the company.

Mr. ALLEN. How are we to know what has been actually expended?

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly the Government, as a matter of administration, will appoint proper persons, as we would do in any case where we subsidize a line; we have somebody who sees that the men perform the service. We would require a strict system of accounts, and every dollar that was expended would have to be vouched for.

Mr. ALLEN. I understand that the Senator does not doubt the power of the Government of the United States to construct such a cable line?

Mr. HALE. No; I have not any doubt.

Mr. ALLEN. That is conceded. Then it becomes a question of policy whether it would be better for the Government directly to own and operate the line or to subsidize it and assist some private corporation in operating it.

Mr. HALE. That is one of the questions, as I have said, that the committee must consider.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Maine prefers to assist some private corporation in the construction and operation of this line rather than have the Government of the United States construct and operate it itself?

Mr. HALE. I repeat, in the present condition of this enterprise, the Hawaiian Government having selected its method of giving a subsidy to Mr. Spalding or to the company, having given them the exclusive privilege of laying the cable there, I think rather than to go into any doubtful question as to what we could do, aside from that it is better to seize this opportunity and help the company to construct the line under every safeguard we can throw about it. Every dollar of the expenditure will be vouched for. Our obligations will be known as clearly as they are known when we build a ship of war, or when we improve a river and harbor, or any other work in which Government money is expended. Then, above all, at any day, or any hour night or day, we may lay hands upon and take that property and it becomes ours. I do not see any embarrassment about it. I think there

are some advantages in this way over and above our going through the machinery of laying the cable ourselves. I think it will be laid cheaper. I think it will not cost so much by private enterprise aided by us as it would for the Government to do the work. I think the latter course would repeat the history we have made on the construction of war ships, where the most expensive ship, the longest time taken, and the less results shown are when the work has been done by the Government rather than by companies and individuals outside.

I have learned in my experience in that branch of the Government that we get a better ship by far for less money and in less time out of a private than out of a governmental yard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the motion of the Senator from Maine to refer the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations will be considered as agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. Before the question is put on the motion, I desire to say a few words.

At the last session of the last Congress an amendment was placed upon the Post-Office appropriation bill appropriating $500,000 for a survey for a cable line between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands, and also to commence the construction of the line when the survey was completed. On my motion that amendment was so amended as to vest the title of the cable line in the Government of the United States when it was completed, the amendment in fact providing that it should be constructed by the Government and paid for as the work progressed, and that the line should always remain Government property and be operated at actual cost and kept in repair. The honorable Senator from Maine and a former distinguished member of this body from South Carolina, Senator Butler, agreed with me that there was no doubt as to the power of this Government to construct such a line, to own it and operate it, and, if I recollect rightly, they were fully in accord with me at that time as to the desirability of pursuing that course.

I wish to place myself on record as being opposed to this bill, but not as opposed to the construction of a cable line between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands, because I believe that such a line should be constructed. I had the honor in the last Congress to introduce a resolution in the Senate for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the Government of the United States, which I am in favor of. That resolution came within 2 votes of passing, and I have always thought if it had not been a Populistic measure, introduced from a Populistic source, it would have been adopted here and possibly it would be a law at this time.

I am opposed to this bill because I believe it to be not only within the power of the Government to construct such a line, but because I believe it to be the policy of the Government to do so. I do not believe the Government of the United States should be mixed up in the form of a partnership with any private individual or private corporation in this or any like enterprise.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I interrupt the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I sympathize entirely with his idea that the Government of the United States should not guarantee interest on the overcapitalization of any telegraphic company. I take it for granted, according to the statement of the Senator from Maine, that there would be nothing of that kind in the bill; that the guaranties of the Government of Hawaii and the Government of the United States will be upon the actual cost of laying a cable. That being the case, it seems to me, if the Senator will allow me to say so, that this method is preferable to his method. If the Government of the United States or the two Governments build a cable, I ask the Senator may it not be necessary after all to turn about and lease it to some private company? Is it going to be wise for the two Governments to be carrying on the commercial business of running a cable between the Pacific Coast and the Sandwich Islands? I will put my question in this form: Can not a judicious, economical, and wise contract be made by the two Governments with a private company, properly safeguarded, which would be preferable to making it purely a Government enterprise? I venture to ask the question because the Senator is broad in his notions, and patriotic, and very much in favor of the independence of the Sandwich Islands, and I think of their annexation, and very much in favor of a telegraph line, which we need very much, and yet he is opposed to the only method that is proposed for getting the telegraph line.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from New Hampshire misunderstands my position. I am decidedly in favor of the construction of this cable line, but I want the Government of the United States to own it, and to control it and operate it. The Senator asks me if I do not believe that it would be wiser and better for the Government, even if it owned such a line, to lease it to private parties under a properly drawn contract. I do not believe so. I do not believe it would be any wiser to lease a cable line that is used for postal purposes than it would be to lease the post-offices and the post-routes of the United States. Those were private enterprises at one time in the history of this country. I am told by those who are older than I am that they remember distinctly the time when in this country it cost 25 cents to send a letter from one State to another, and in some instances more. The entire postal system of the United States was a private enterprise, exactly as the old stage lines and stage coaches were private enterprises. Yet the Government of the United States saw proper to discontinue the postal service as a private enterprise. Through its sovereign power the Government took control of the postal service throughout the length and breadth of the land, and eventually it assumed control of the postal service emanating from this country and going abroad. Why was that done? Because it made the service more uniform and better, cheaper, and quicker. It was in the interest of the public that that was done.

Now, if we give the money of this Government to the Pacific Cable Company or to any other private enterprise we are simply going into a line of business where we have sunk and are liable to sink in the next twenty years four or five hundred million dollars. The Senator from Maine looks at me with some surprise. I mean to say that the system of subsidizing Pacific railroads, for instance, and the attempt that was made in this Chamber to subsidize the Nicaragua Canal last year will, before they are completed, if they become consummated, cost this Government $500,000,000, if not more. The experience we have had in that line is not such, in my judgment, as to make it satisfactory to our people.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him again?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I sympathize with a great many of the Senator's ideas, but he seems to me to go wild in his differences from all the rest of the world, which seems to be the Populistic function. The Senator criticises the construction of the Pacific roads. A great deal of time might be spent in censuring the method that was adopted, but the fact was that under that method railroad communication across the continent was accomplished in less than seven years. The Senator from Maine will correct me if I am wrong. I say in less than seven years of the ten years that were allowed for that purpose that line was built, while if the Government had undertaken to build the roads for itself the work would have probably dragged for fifteen years.

Does the Senator mean to say, going back to that magnificent enterprise, that because he can find fault with the methods that were adopted for building the Pacific railroads the Government itself ought to have built the roads across the continent and to have continued to operate the roads for all time? Is that the Senator's notion about railroads?

Mr. ALLEN. I have not opposed and do not now oppose or criticise the construction of the Pacific roads per se. I criticise the method by which they were constructed and the means employed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator think the Government ought to have built those roads itself?

Mr. ALLEN. I certainly do.

Mr. FRYE. And run them?

Mr. ALLEN. And run them. Why not? It is paternalism, is it? Yes, that is the only trouble. There is the great bugaboo.

Mr. CHANDLER. Not for me.

Mr. ALLEN. Not for the Senator from New Hampshire. I am glad to hear that. Populism is growing; it is spreading into the Northeastern portion of this country. Mr. President, that is the only objection that any man ever made in public or private, and I am glad to do the Senator from New Hampshire the justice of saying that at all times he has had the courage of his convictions in this Chamber.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am not willing to join the Populistic party quite yet. I am much more ready to take the Senator from Nebraska into my party than to join his. I say the paternalism of those methods would not deter me from adopting them. I do not think that I am in favor of such methods of governmental intervention in public works. It is a question of policy. One method may be adopted in one case and another method may be adopted in another case. It is not the fear that the Government will overstep its functions that would prevent me from adopting the method which the Senator proposes. In this case the speediest way to get a cable, which ought to be built right away, is to take the method that is close at hand. I hope the Senator, who is all right on the main question, will waive his objections to the method and cooperate with the one that is the practical method of accomplishing the result which all agree is desirable.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the Populist party will not take the honorable Senator from New Hampshire into its ranks and into full membership fellowship just yet. I think we prefer to take him, very much as a friend of mine used to say that the Methodist Church took new converts, "for six months on suspicion." [Laughter.] We prefer to have him meet for repentance for a time; and if he proves himself worthy and well qualified, we will at the proper time receive him into full fellowship.

But I am glad to note the fact that light is dawning even in New England, and it is not as bad a thing now as it used to be when I first came here for a man to talk of the doctrine of owner-

ship of railways by the Government. I have never heard a man upon the other side of the Chamber or upon this side, and I never expect to hear one, who can offer a decent reason against those arguments. I understand that gentlemen hold up their hands in holy horror and say, "that is populism;" "that is paternalism;" but you never undertake to define paternalism. You undertake to scare the country with a word, just as you do with the word "parity" and the word "fiat."

No, Mr. President, I am in favor of this Government owning and controlling this cable line for several reasons. In the first place, it would be cheaper, in my judgment, and directly in line with the policy of the Government in owning and controlling the Post-Office Department in all its features; and it would be directly in line with the true policy of this Government never to farm out to private individuals or private corporations any of its sovereign power. We might just as well say that the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States should be farmed out to private enterprise (and I presume they would, in many instances, be as valuable as they are now if they were) as to say that the sovereign power to control the mail service of this Government, or any feature of it, should be farmed out to private corporations. The truth is, we are, every day of our lives here, delegating sovereign powers to private corporations and private enterprises that the Constitution places in this Government to be exercised in the interest of the people. Senators seem to be bent upon having these powers delegated to private corporations. When it comes to the question of the power and policy of this Government to own and operate such lines by itself unaided, and unaiding any private corporation in a like enterprise, I believe it is the true policy and the patriotic policy for the Government to own and operate them.

In the next place, there is another serious objection to the bill. Another great corporation is to be raised up, whose fangs eventually are to enter into the legislative and executive departments of this Government, if not into the judicial department, and one more enemy of free government is to be fed and encouraged by liberal appropriations made by Congress. How long will it be until this Pacific Cable Company will place in this Chamber and in the other House of Congress such servile tools as it wants to do its bidding in the form of legislation, and by that means stifle the cries and wishes of the people and enact legislation in the interests of private enterprise and in such a way as to lay additional burdens upon the masses of our people? I do not believe that we should encourage enterprises of this kind where it is in the interests of the Government to construct the work and where it is conceded that we have ample power to construct it ourselves.

Let me recur briefly to our experience with reference to Pacific railroads, for I do not want to be misunderstood upon that question. I admit that it was good policy to construct the Pacific roads, at least one of them, possibly all of them; it was the proper thing to do; but the originator of that enterprise, Mr. Asa Whitney, never expected it to be a private enterprise. His first petition to Congress, in 1846, I think, possibly in 1844, was to the effect that he was to construct the road out of a land grant to be given to him by Congress, and within a certain time after that he was to turn the road over to the Government, and it was to be a great governmental highway. That was his plan. I believe it would have been better policy, and that it would have been a great deal cheaper for this Government to have made a direct appropriation to construct the Pacific railroads from the Mississippi and Missouri rivers as they have been constructed to the Pacific Slope and to have owned and controlled them to-day.

We have a debt of $120,000,000 due us now. We have guaranteed bonds to the amount of $60,000,000, if not more, 6 per cent bonds, that we must make provision for at this Congress—subsidy bonds that were given to those roads. One of the strange things in the history of such transactions is that when the Government of the United States had the first lien upon the roads for the subsidy bonds through some kind of legerdemain, I know not what, that lien was taken off and certain stockholders and bondholders were given a lien prior to the Government's lien. We voluntarily relinquished the first lien upon those roads; we waived our right to foreclose upon the roads and reduce them to Government ownership, and gave to certain moneyed interests in this country a first lien, who now threaten to take the roads and leave the Government without a penny to pay the subsidy bonds or to recoup for the interest that has been paid upon the debt. Is it not likely that the time will come within fifteen or twenty years when a like policy will be pursued with reference to this Pacific Cable Company if it is subsidized?

I believe if we owned and controlled and operated a great transcontinental line of railway to-day we could squeeze a hundred per cent of water out of watered stock. By fixing the rates of passenger and freight tariff upon that road we could force every competing road in the United States to come to the prices fixed by the Government of the United States. It would go as far as anything we can do, if not further, to bring about an adjustment of this great railroad problem.

Mr. President, a railway is a public corporation; that is, it gets its power to go across your land and mine and to exercise the power of eminent domain because the Government farms out to it the sovereign power. That question first arose in this country in the case of Bloodgood *vs.* The Mohawk River Railroad Company, when the old court of errors of New York was composed of a few judges and the senators. It was a serious question for a great many years whether a private corporation or a corporation in the nature of a railroad company could exercise the sovereign power of eminent domain and force itself across the property of private individuals. Finally that position was sustained; the Supreme Court of the United States followed it, and every court in the Union follows it to-day.

Does any lawyer or any layman doubt that if a railroad company gets a right to construct a road in consequence of the Government farming out to it the right of eminent domain, there goes with that power, as an incident of the grant, the power to control the road that exercises the right of eminent domain? Has not this Government power, whenever necessity may bring about the occasion to exercise its sovereign power of eminent domain, to reduce every corporation of that kind in this country to Government ownership? The same power that the corporation exercises with reference to private property may be exercised by the Government with reference to the property of the corporation itself. It is a supreme power that knows no limit but the limit of necessity and desirability.

Why not, then, own and control those railroads? Out in the State in which I have the honor to live oats are being sold to-day for 11 cents a bushel—oats as fine as were ever grown upon the face of the earth. It costs 16½ cents of freight tariff to put a bushel of oats in market from Nebraska to New York—60 per cent more than the farmer can get for it there. So with corn, wheat, and all other farm products, and with meat products. I believe they are taking from the State of Nebraska and Kansas and other Western States every year $50,000,000 to pay interest upon watered stocks. No restraint is placed upon them by the State government. The State government has no power to place it upon the subsidized roads, in so far as they are doing an interstate traffic business. No restraint is placed upon them by Congress. They are at liberty under our laws to take a road that cost $25,000 a mile of honest money for its construction and to capitalize that road for $140,000 or $150,000 per mile, and by that means take the profits from the grain grower and the meat grower of the States through which they run. It amounts to millions and hundreds of millions of dollars in the course of a year. Is not that a matter of sufficient importance to awake at least some slight interest on the part of Congress?

Mr. HOAR. I desire to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. Do any of the transcontinental roads that run through Nebraska pay dividends on their stock, whether watered or otherwise?

Mr. ALLEN. They have done so until they have been looted.

Mr. HOAR. But they are in the hands of receivers now?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir; and they ought to have been in the hands of receivers years ago.

Mr. HOAR. So the particular hardship which the Senator describes does not exist with the farmers of his State to-day? I put the question for information merely.

Mr. ALLEN. I am willing the Senator should interrupt me and ask a question, but I can not understand the policy of it. The Senator asks me if the stockholders of the railroad companies are drawing dividends to-day. I say some of them are and some of them are not, but throughout their history they have been drawing dividends.

Mr. HOAR. I hope the Senator will not understand that I put the question as differing from him in his comment about the Government's policy in regard to those roads. He can not express himself more strongly than I should wish to express myself if I had occasion to do so.

Mr. PEFFER. I suggest to Senators that all of this discussion is out of order. It is going on by unanimous consent, and I hope they will not protract it unnecessarily.

Mr. ALLEN. I will yield to the Senator from Kansas in a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If a point of order is made the Chair is of opinion that the Senator from Nebraska is not in order, as unanimous consent was simply given that the speech of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] should be concluded, after which the unfinished business would be again laid before the Senate, when the Senator from Kansas would be recognized on the unfinished business.

Mr. PEFFER. I have no doubt the Senator from Nebraska will conclude his remarks soon. I was rather suggesting to other Senators not to interfere with the Senator from Nebraska in order that he might conclude his remarks, if it can be done soon.

Mr. ALLEN. I shall be through in about five minutes.

No, Mr. President, some of those roads are in the hands of receivers, and they ought to go into the hands of receivers. Those roads have been looted from one end to the other. They have been the subject of private plunder in many instances. If they had been managed as they should have been managed they would have yielded a fair compensation upon the actual capital and some compensation upon the entire capitalization. It is a godsend to the people of the United States that they are passing into the hands of receivers and going into liquidation.

Mr. President, I believe it would have been better for the Government to have constructed those roads and to own and operate them to-day. With reference to the construction of the Nicaragua Canal, I favor it. I want to see this Government, by the construction of a canal about 170 miles long, cut off the 10,000 miles of travel around the Horn. But I shall never vote for an interest-bearing obligation of this Government in aid of that or in aid of any other enterprise. It means the expenditure of $300,000,000 upon the part of this Government before that enterprise is finally paid for under such a system. Whenever we can issue the money here and commence the construction of the Nicaragua Canal and pay for it as we go along it will have my vote. But whenever it comes to the question of issuing bonds and subsidizing some private corporation that is to own and construct it and take its profits where we pay the interest and principal of the subsidy bonds, I shall oppose it, not because I do not realize the importance of the enterprise, not because I do not fully approve of it, but because I do not believe that this Government, as a matter of policy, should issue its bonds and incur an endless debt which future generations will be taxed to pay.

Mr. President, for these reasons I am opposed to the bill brought in by the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] will be considered as agreed to, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print, in one volume, all of the acts as they appear in the United States statutes, heretofore passed by Congress, imposing duties on imports.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 628) to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami*.

SILVER COIN AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue, the pending question being on the amendment of Mr. BUTLER to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

[Mr. PEFFER resumed and concluded the speech begun by him yesterday. See Appendix.]

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE COGSWELL.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of William Cogswell, late a member of the House from the State of Massachusetts, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *January 16, 1896.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. William Cogswell, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the House do now adjourn.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the communication of the death of the Hon. William Cogswell, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 20, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 16, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege affecting the proceedings of this House, and ask the Clerk to read from a pamphlet issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York a paragraph which I have marked bearing upon the question.

The Clerk read as follows:

Then came the *Alabama* claims and the fisheries dispute, the first being decided in our favor and the latter against us, each side accepting the decision and paying the award like business men. Then came the seizure of Canadian sealing vessels by the United States in Bering Sea, which was arbitrated, and about $400,000 awarded to the owners of the seized vessels, which has not been paid, owing to the failure of Congress to make an appropriation therefor, and which we are in honor bound to settle without further delay.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this is not a question of privilege. The gentleman from Pennsylvania stated that he rose to a question of privilege. The gentleman has stated no such question, nor does the article read from the desk constitute a privileged matter.

Mr. GROW. It is a privileged matter, for if it be untrue, as I shall demonstrate, it is a direct reflection upon the good faith of this House in the discharge of a national obligation. The alleged failure on the part of the House is not true——

Mr. CRISP. I beg pardon; the gentleman presents no privileged question. My friend would no doubt like to submit remarks upon it; but, nevertheless, it is not a matter of privilege.

I will refer the Chair to the rule in a moment.

Mr. GROW. I did not propose to take more than a minute. I simply desire to correct the statement. It is not true.

Now, does the gentleman from Georgia think that a direct reflection upon the House and its membership such as this does not constitute a question of privilege?

Mr. CRISP. I insist that the gentleman must wait until the Chair decides whether he has presented a privileged question or not. I make the point that the gentleman has not presented a question of privilege, and it is for the Chair to determine.

I am looking for the rule. I desire to call it to the attention of the Chair. The rule of the House is in the following words:

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; second, the rights, reputation, and conduct of its members individually, in their representative capacity only; and shall have precedence of all other questions except motions to adjourn.

Now, I insist, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman has not presented a question of privilege. The Chair heard the reading of the paragraph, and I invoke the judgment of the Speaker upon it.

Mr. GROW. Now, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania can be heard upon the point of order.

Mr. GROW. In response to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Speaker, I claim that any charge made against the good faith of the House with reference to its legislation upon any subject presents a question of privilege for the whole House, being just the same as a misrepresentation of the views and acts of the members themselves.

The arbitration, to which reference is made in this pamphlet, did not award a dollar of damages for the seizure of the fishing vessels; but if so, the representatives of the people on this floor are false to the discharge of their duty and to their country for refusing to assent to what an arbitration had agreed to. Now, I take it that that presents a question of privilege for the whole House. If not, I wish to make a statement which will bring it strictly within the rule, so that the Chair will be fully informed of the question.

Mr. CRISP. I ask a ruling of the Chair——

Mr. GROW (continuing). The joint high commission agreed on between Great Britain and this country, sitting at Paris, refused to consider the question of damages for the seizure of the sealing vessels, hence they made no award, but on the contrary the Secretary of State and the President of the United States agreed with the ambassador of Great Britain on a lump sum if Congress should approve of it.

Mr. CRISP. I call the gentleman to order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman should confine himself to the question of order.

Mr. GROW. My question of order is that whatever affects the vote of a member of the House presents a question of privilege.

But, Mr. Speaker, in order to bring it strictly within the rule I will make it personal to myself. I will raise the question of personal privilege. Before the House, when we voted on it, was the question of raising $400,000 in a lump sum, and we are told that two-thirds of this was claimed by American citizens who made sham sales of their vessels to unnaturalized citizens——

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that any question of privilege has been made out.

Mr. GROW. I am satisfied. [Laughter.]

PRINTING OF TARIFF ACTS.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Printing to favorably report the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PERKINS], chairman of the Committee on Printing, presents the following report, which the Clerk will read to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Printing be, and are hereby, authorized to cause to be printed, indexed, and bound in cloth, in one volume, all of the acts as they appear in the United States Revised Statutes, heretofore passed by Congress, imposing duty on imports, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PERKINS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DUTIES OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR.

Mr. STEELE. I desire to offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read at length. It provides that the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, requested to inform the House whether or not, in his opinion, the duties of the Assistant Secretary of War can not, after March 4, 1897, be more satisfactorily performed by the designation or assignment by the Secretary of War of the commanding officers of the Army or the Adjutant-General of the Army to perform said duties during the illness or temporary absence of the Secretary of War.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman that it seems to me that resolution should be investigated by a committee. The positions of Assistant Secretary of War and Assistant Secretary of the Navy were authorized in order that there might be a little civil blood in those two Departments. I think it would be better to have the resolution go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. STEELE. I will state to the gentleman that there is no purpose in this resolution to try to amend the law. This is only a resolution for information.

Mr. CANNON. I should not mind the recommendation of the Secretary of War, even if he should recommend the change. I think it would be better to have the resolution go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made to the consideration of the resolution.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following Senate bills were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

The bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 941) granting to the Atchison and Nebraska Railroad Company and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, its lessee in perpetuity, the right of way over a part of the Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian Reservation, in the States of Kansas and Nebraska—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

UNCOMPAHGRE INDIAN RESERVATION, UTAH.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Indian Affairs to report back favorably the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Utah submitted the following, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested to inform the House in detail as to the proceedings had and expenditures made by his Department in carrying out the provisions of sections 20, 21, and 22 of an act making appropriations for current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, etc., approved August 15, 1894; with the names and residences of commissioners appointed under the provisions of said sections; with copies of instructions given by his Department to said commissioners, and with a statement, if not incompatible with the public service, of the probable time when that provision of said sections can be executed which provides for a restoration to the public domain of certain lands within the Uncompahgre Indian Reservation in the Territory of Utah."

Mr. SHERMAN. This is simply a resolution of inquiry. The act provided for the appointment of a commission to allot in severalty the lands of the Uncompahgre Indians in Utah, and also that the same commission should negotiate with the Uintah Indians in Utah in reference to allotting their lands in severalty. This resolution simply asks what action the Secretary of the Interior has taken under that act.

Mr. SAYERS. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. Was the appropriation to which the gentleman refers embraced in a special act?

Mr. SHERMAN. No; it was in the Indian appropriation act of 1894.

Mr. SAYERS. Did not the last Congress pass an act in reference to those tribes?

Mr. SHERMAN. No; I think not. I am quite sure no such action was had.

Mr. SAYERS. I may be mistaken as to the tribes, but I am quite confident that the Delegate from Utah was insisting last session on the passage of a special act with reference to two Indian tribes.

Mr. SHERMAN. If that is true, I am not informed of it.

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to ask the gentleman whether these lands include certain valuable asphalt deposits?

Mr. SHERMAN. They do include those lands.

Mr. DOCKERY. This is simply a resolution of inquiry?

Mr. SHERMAN. That is all.

Mr. DOCKERY. It proposes to make no disposition of those lands at this time?

Mr. SHERMAN. No disposition at all.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEASE OF SCHOOL LANDS IN ARIZONA.

Mr. MURPHY of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill No. 2769. It has been reported favorably from the Committee on Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2769) to authorize the leasing of lands for educational purposes in Arizona.

Be it enacted, etc., That the lands reserved for university purposes, and all of the school lands in the Territory of Arizona reserved by law for school purposes, may be leased under such laws and regulations as may be hereafter prescribed by the legislature of said Territory, but until such legislative action the governor, secretary of the Territory, and superintendent of public instruction shall constitute a board for the leasing of said lands under the rules and regulations heretofore prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for the respective purposes for which the said reservations were made, except that it shall not be necessary to submit said leases to the Secretary of the Interior for his approval; and all necessary expenses and costs incurred in the leasing, management, and protection of said lands and leases may be paid out of the proceeds derived from such leases.

Mr. MURPHY of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say in explanation of the bill that it simply makes available——

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona will be allowed to explain the bill.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Arizona. The bill simply makes available the reserved school lands of the Territory for revenue during the Territorial condition. The bill is identical with one passed last session for the Territory of Oklahoma. It confers no title and sells no land, but simply makes the school lands available now while they are idle and doing no good to anybody; and the bill gives authority to the Territory to lease them.

Mr. SAYERS. Is there a report from a committee?

Mr. MURPHY of Arizona. There is a favorable report from the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SAYERS. Is it a unanimous report?

Mr. MURPHY of Arizona. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Arizona as to whether there is any limit to the time of the leases?

Mr. MURPHY of Arizona. It is simply during the time Arizona remains a Territory. When it became a State, the State would own the lands.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Would not the lands be then burdened by existing leases?

Mr. MURPHY of Arizona. Not by any means. I suppose that would all be regulated at the time when Arizona became a State, when it would be the owner of this land and have the fee simple to it.

Mr. FLYNN. I will state that this bill is identical with the Oklahoma bill which was drawn by the Department and passed at the last session. It is a question of allowing the authorities of the Territory to get the proceeds from the vacant lands in the reservation known as school lands in that Territory.

Mr. LACEY. I will state further that it relieves the Interior Department from being compelled to approve all these leases.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Is there any communication from the Interior Department in favor of this bill?

Mr. FLYNN. The same proposition has heretofore been approved by the Department.

Mr. LACEY. They prefer to be relieved from the approval of the leases, and the bill allows them to be made by the Territorial officers, without the approval of the Department.

Mr. McRAE. If my friend from New York will allow me, I will state that I do not think there can be any objection to this bill. It provides, as has already been stated, only a question of authority for the local officers of the Territory to lease the lands

now reserved for school purposes, which will eventually be given for the education of the youth of that country, so as to enable them to receive some rent for a school fund from lands that are now given free, almost, to graziers. This bill itself perhaps has not been referred to the Department, but a bill to the same effect, in relation to Oklahoma, was indorsed by the Department last year, and I can not see why the same principle should not apply to the Territory of Arizona which has already been applied to that of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and, being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HENDERSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

Mr. STEELE. Pending the announcement of that vote, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution I introduced this morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The question was then taken; and the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was agreed to.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. DINGLEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of general appropriation bills, and the Clerk will report the unfinished business.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriation for payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CLARK]; but, Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Iowa begins his remarks, I would like to have the attention of the committee for a moment in reference to the order of debate for to-day.

The committee in charge of this bill has been requested by a great many members that the bill be not taken up by paragraph to-day, but that the committee proceed to consider it under general debate; and the committee is disposed to do so, and to remain in session as long as there are members who are anxious to speak in general debate, without taking up the bill by paragraphs, and unless there shall be some considerable objection to it, the bill will not be taken up by paragraphs under the five-minute rule to-day.

Mr. NORTHWAY. The bill will not be voted on to-day?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. No; there will be no vote taken to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to make any arrangement for closing general debate?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I have no particular desire, as there seems to be no disposition manifested on the other side; but I will simply announce that general debate will be closed to-day, and that the bill will not be taken up under the five-minute rule to-day.

Mr. DOCKERY. Why do you not ask unanimous consent to close general debate to-day?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to ask unanimous consent to close general debate to-day?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is my wish.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that general debate upon the pending appropriation bill be closed to-day, and that the bill be taken up to-morrow under the five-minute rule. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CLARK] is recognized.

Mr. CLARK of Iowa. I have no purpose, Mr. Chairman, to occupy the time of this committee in any general discussion of the measure now pending. I merely desire to call attention to a case or two within my personal knowledge, as contributions to the mass of testimony that is being submitted as constituting reasons why this Congress, representing the American people, making the appropriation of money for payment of pensions, shall define more fully and emphatically the conditions under which the Department or the Bureau of Pensions shall administer its service and distribute those funds. I favor the amendment offered by my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF] because it is in the line of needed legislation. Whether it be held germane to this bill or not, discussion of it will at least be useful as contributing to the proper and complete pension law which Congress should enact.

I will cite first an instance within my personal knowledge. Mr. Francis M. Ross, formerly a private in Company B, Forty-second Indiana Infantry, a resident of my own county, drew a pension under the laws of the United States. He made application for an increase of pension. Dr. John J. Rigg, a townsman of his, a physician of character and repute, a member of the board of examining surgeons in that county, gave a certificate as to his condition, which I will read:

STATE OF IOWA, *Lee County:*

KEOKUK, *June 10, 1892.*

This certifies that I am a resident of Keokuk, Iowa, Lee County; was formerly of Montrose, Iowa; was a practicing physician of Montrose for ten years; have known Francis M. Ross for several years; became his family physician in 1883, and have continued to be such ever since; was called to see him for heart trouble on the 13th day of September, 1885, and have examined him and treated him for said trouble on a number of occasions since. He has a chronic organic lesion of the heart; hypertrophy with valvular insufficiency, also regurgitation (mitral); such disability bringing about a very serious train of symptoms, such as difficulty in breathing, smothering spells when lying down, pain in the region of the heart, and upon the least exertion there occurs a severe attack of palpitation. He is unfit for manual labor and especially labor that would require much walking or lifting. His degree of disability is more than it would be from the loss of leg or arm. I have no interest in the prosecution of this claim.

JOHN J. RIGG, M. D.

The gentleman giving this certificate is, as I have already stated, a physician of high character, and is at present a member of the board of examining surgeons for pension applicants in my county.

Dr. J. M. Anderson, was a resident of my county for fifty years, a gentleman of the very highest character, a gentleman of such standing and repute in his lifetime that when he died last year almost the whole county gathered at his burial, and I felt honored, Mr. Chairman, when, as a personal friend and representative of the district, I was asked to be one of the pallbearers who should bear that honored man, a citizen of my county from the Territorial period, to his grave.

He was a man as honest as Washington and as courageous as Jackson. He would not have borne false testimony for his life. He furnished a certificate to Mr. Ross, which is as follows:

MONTROSE, LEE COUNTY, IOWA, *September 16, 1890.*

In the matter of the claim of F. M. Ross, late private in Company B, Forty-second Regiment of Indiana Volunteer Infantry, for increase of pension.

Personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for said county and State, J. M. Anderson, M. D., whose post-office address is Montrose, Lee County, Iowa, whom I certify to be reputable and entitled to credit, and declares in reference to the above case as follows:

I have been intimately acquainted with said soldier for twenty-five years, and a portion of that time was his family physician. I treated soldier about eighteen years ago for pleuro-pneumonia, and discovered at that time that he had chronic pleurisy with lesion. The exact date of my first treatment I can not give. I have prescribed for him at different times since, and have made a careful physical examination of his condition quite recently, and find cardiac enlargement and mitral insufficiency, also enlargement and induration of liver and spleen, and inability to lie down except upon his abdomen, his face down on his pillow. By reason of these complicated diseases he is incapacitated from manual labor, and the degree of his disability is, in my opinion, equal to the loss of an arm or leg.

I am 70 years old; have practiced medicine forty-eight years, and I have no interest in the prosecution of this claim.

J. M. ANDERSON, M. D.

Dr. A. Weisman, also a member of the board of examining surgeons, gave a certificate to the same effect; which is as follows:

KEOKUK, IOWA, *December 22, 1894.*

A. Weisman, M. D., a citizen of Keokuk, Iowa, whose post-office address is 1123 Main street, well known to me to be reputable and entitled to credit, and who, being duly sworn, declares in relation to aforesaid case as follows: I am a practicing physician and have been acquainted with said soldier for a short time. I never attended claimant professionally, but have made an examination of his physical condition at this date at his own request, and have found the following disabilities:

He has chronic pleurisy, affecting both lungs Some emplysemia of left lung, slight over base of right lung. Pleuritic adhesions of left lung, causing dry, hacking cough, particularly at night. Can't lay on his back, or on either side, for any length of time, causing dyspnœa; bowels tympanitic, spleen enlarged, hypertrophy of heart, and anemia. Disabilities increase in cold and damp weather, and are in such a degree as to disable him from doing any manual labor. The disability did exist, as claimant states, while in the service.

The above affidavit is in my own handwriting, and, in making the same, I did not use and was not aided or prompted by any written or printed statement verified, prepared, or dictated by any other person and not attached as on credit of my testimony.

A. WEISMAN, M. D., *Keokuk, Iowa.*

Dr. J. J. Rigg, of whom I have already spoken, after he became a member of the board of examining surgeons supplemented his first statement by an additional one, which is as follows:

KEOKUK, IOWA, *January 15, 1894.*

In the pension claim No. 204667, of Francis M. Ross, of Montrose, Iowa, I respectfully submit the following in regard to the case: I have known said soldier intimately over ten years and have been his family physician the greater part of this time. He has suffered from chronic pleuritis, with adhesion over the lower lobe of left lung; also hypertrophy of heart, with valvular insufficiency; also fermentative dyspepsia, resulting in a chronic gastritis; has dropsical effusions around the heart and in the abdominal cavity, also of the left leg and foot, and hyperthesia of entire left side. Is now totally disabled so far as earning a support by manual labor is concerned. His disabilities are permanent and progressive and were not caused by vicious habits; and in view of the above facts, and knowing the condition of soldier, both physic-

ally and financially, I would regard his case deserving of more than his present rating, and respectfully recommend the increase asked for.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN J. RIGG, M. D.,
Member Board United States Pension Examiners, Keokuk, Iowa.

Dr. H. Carnes, another reputable physician, examined this pensioner, and gave the following certificate:

MONTROSE, IOWA, *December 18, 1894.*

In regard to the case of F. M. Ross would state that I have this day examined him and found the following conditions in regard to pleurisy, viz:

Adhesions of all the lower lobe of left lung; also emplysemia of lower lobe of left lung; would further state that I have been intimately acquainted with claimant for past six years, have prescribed for him frequently during that time for pleurisy, and, in fact, whenever he contracts a cold he is troubled more or less; it is chronic form, is progressive and permanent. His disability is real without the least shadow of doubt; would state that I have no interest whatever in the prosecution of this claim.

H. CARNES, M. D.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I may remark that these gentlemen, besides being physicians of high repute, are all of them Democrats.

Here, Mr. Chairman, were four physicians of his county, of high personal and professional character, who united in personal knowledge and professional treatment of this man's case, and certifying that the pensioner was entitled to an increase of pension. Now, here is the answer received to the pensioner's application:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1895.

SIR: I have to advise you that your name has this day been dropped from the pension roll, certificate No. 204667, for the reasons set forth in my letter to you under date of December 11, 1894, viz, that the disability for which the pension was allowed has ceased to exist in a pensionable degree.

[Laughter.]

That is signed, "William Lochren, Commissioner."

That soldier, Mr. Chairman, is now laboring through me, and through my distinguished colleague at the other end of this Capitol, Senator GEAR, to be reinstated on the pension roll of the Government, not upon his personal testimony, but upon the testimony of four of the chief physicians of my county, as I personally know. Now, sir, I want to take from that Bureau of Pensions, by whatever party it may be administered, the right to drop a pensioner from the rolls under such conditions without an adjudication of his case by a tribunal where he shall have a right to be heard. [Applause.]

There is another case and phase of Department policy to which I wish to call the attention of this committee. Mr. William Smith, of Company K, Nineteenth Iowa Volunteer Infantry, a resident of Mount Pleasant, in my district, applied for a pension. In the progress of time and in the discretion of the Bureau of Pensions he received a pension. He applied for a rerating under the conditions which I am about to set forth, and he received this notice from the United States pension agency at Des Moines, acting as the representatives of the Pension Bureau. The pension agent wrote to Mr. Smith as follows:

UNITED STATES PENSION AGENCY,
Des Moines, Iowa, September 29, 1892.

DEAR SIR: I hand you herewith blank voucher for pension accrued under your certificate to October 4, 1892. The terms of your certificate are such that former payments erroneously made to you are to be recovered to the amount of $1,007.20, and checks drawn for your quarterly payments will therefore be forwarded to the Assistant Treasurer of the United States until that amount shall have been recovered.

Very respectfully, S. A. MARINE, *Pension Agent.*

WM. L. SMITH,
Mount Pleasant, Henry County, Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, in the case of a private soldier in my own town an application for a rerating led to an equivalent order, and I was informed by the commandant of the Grand Army post of my town that under that order it would take sixteen years to settle the debit and credit account between that pensioner and the Government—that sixteen years must elapse before that pensioner can draw a dollar of pension, and in the meantime he is being maintained by the charity of the people of Keokuk day after day and year after year. I submit, Mr. Chairman and members of this House, that there needs some reversal of policy like this.

I am done, Mr. Chairman, but in closing let me say I can easily find a reason why this policy, unless we check it, may increase. The President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury have had their hearts made sick by the deferred hope of the promise that the Wilson-Gorman tariff would yield an adequate revenue. They have been disappointed on the line of the regular receipts by the operations of that bill. But, Mr. Chairman, if the Pension Department can sit there and by facile and deft bookkeeping of its clerks swop all the pension money between debit and credit, so that it appears merely upon the bookkeeping of the Department and no dollar of it is paid out, probably there will come a surplus to the revenues of this Government by way of the back door of the Pension Department which can be credited hereafter to the operation of the Wilson-Gorman tariff. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, it is not to be denied that the air gun which the gentleman from the Seventh district of New York [Mr. BARTLETT] charged and exploded the other day possessed greater recoil than any piece of ordnance ever used in the gigantic struggle out of which arises the question which is before this committee to-day for determination. Its echoes have been heard in this Chamber for several days, and it is very evident that the greatest point of danger about that gun was its rear and not its front. [Laughter and applause.] These echoes to which we have listened, Mr. Chairman, are but as gentle zephyrs compared with the tornado that will in time come up from the valleys and down from the mountain sides of the regions from which the Union boys came marching in 1861, and from that to 1865—"three hundred thousand" and "five hundred thousand more." These reverberations from distant States in this land will come from the yeomanry, from localities where patriotism is engendered, where it is given birth, where it grows and expands as true patriotism deserves to. You will not find it in the marts of commerce, you will not find it in a part of the Seventh Congressional district of New York represented by the gentleman who has spoken here, for there it is overshadowed by other considerations. You will find it in the rural districts of this land, where love of country is supreme over considerations of business and home comforts—that love of country which actuated every Union soldier who abandoned his home and all that which he held dear, for what? Not for his own protection, not for his own gratification, but for the preservation of a principle which might redound to the benefit of this country and of succeeding generations.

The gentleman from the Seventh Congressional district of New York informs this House that the Democracy of his State and the best Republicans of New York are not in favor of a further extension of pension legislation which shall result in "looting" the Treasury without proper justification. This statement, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say, was refuted by his colleague from the Tenth district of New York; and I believe that the great majority of the constituents of the gentleman from the Seventh district of New York will repudiate his statements.

The great difficulty with the gentleman to whom I refer is that where we on this side of the House find justification he can see none. And I regret exceedingly that such is the fact. The gentleman has called out such a rain of invective upon his head as no member of this House has before, certainly during this session, been so unfortunate as to invite, and were it not for the provocation contained in his remarks I should not now presume to engage the attention of this committee for one moment. But, Mr. Chairman, every man who is a true friend, not a false friend, of the Union soldier should rise here before this debate shall close and in his place denounce the stigma and the reproach which is heaped upon the Union soldiers and their dependents, living and dead, by the unfortunate language made use of by the distinguished gentleman from the distinguished Seventh district of New York, when he charges this kind of legislation as an attempt to "loot the Treasury" of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the term "looting" means pillage; it means plunder; and this is the first time in my brief experience that I have ever heard or known of legalized "looting" and legalized "pillage." I presume very few of those here on this side of the House who advocate this kind of legislation are pensioners. Very few of them are participants in the benefits afforded by pension legislation, and we do not resent the stigma because of its application to us individually, but we refute it, and we hurl it back as false in every particular, in every element, in behalf of those whose voices can not be raised in their own defense in this Chamber. [Applause.] That, Mr. Chairman, is our duty, and it is because I claim the privilege of discharging this duty that I stand here for the moment.

Now, sir, we are in accord with the gentleman in every measure that shall tend to prevent any "looting" of the Treasury, if there be anything of that kind; but the difficulty with the gentleman is that he can not see any necessity for pension legislation such as this amendment proposes. The term "looting" implies in the connection in which it is used by the gentleman that the Union soldiers were a set of rascals, that they were dishonest. In refutation of that I say that patriotism and dishonesty do not go hand in hand. What kind of men, Mr. Chairman, did the country call for in the time of its need? It did not look for bankers; it did not look for preachers; it did not look for statesmen; it did not look for men of the highest integrity in the different communities of our land. It did not seek those who could give the best bonds for their honesty and their good behavior. No; it sought able-bodied, patriotic, brave-hearted heroes, with good teeth to masticate hard-tack, with good eyes so that they could take true aim, with sufficient physical ability to carry a knapsack, forty rounds and a musket, a haversack and a canteen. That is the kind of men that were sought—men not necessarily of the highest repute for probity or integrity; and yet, Mr. Chairman, I assume to say, and I challenge contradiction, that taking the same number of men from the higher and the better walks of life—aye, even from the distinguished Seventh district of New York—the stand-

ard of honesty and integrity which has been exhibited by the Union soldier will surpass the standard of honesty and integrity established by the best class of men from the best walks of life.

This, Mr. Chairman, is proven by the very few convictions, the very few dishonest acts, the very few cases in which perjury has been charged in the dispensing of pensions to the 970,000 pensioners on the part of this Government. So that I say patriotism, valor, honesty, and integrity have traveled hand in hand together. They can not be separated. He who was so self-sacrificing as to say he owed the country his life, if need be, is the last man to-day who ought to be charged with being ready to "loot its Treasury" and "ruin its credit."

Now, what is the justification for the amendment introduced here on this bill, providing that widows may, in case that they have not a fixed income of $500 per year, receive the pittance which the Government is willing to give them in the shape of pensions. We find it, Mr. Chairman, in the fact that when the widow and her little ones may have a few dollars of income, under the strict construction of the law, she is deprived of the bounty of the Government.

Little does the gentleman from the Seventh Congressional district of New York appreciate this state of things. He goes to his club; sits before his grate fire toasting his extremities, with his pedal appendages incased in soft silken slippers, smoking his cigarette [laughter] and sipping his wine with genial friends about him. The winter wind howling outside disturbs not his peace or his drinks. The howling blasts that come from the homes of want and poverty penetrate not to his abode. Everything is lovely; and surrounded with luxury and comfort, what conception, what knowledge, what information can he have to move the liberal hearts of our citizens? But go to the other place, and what do you find? A house with but a single room; nothing but a tallow dip, if it be at night, to cast a lurid glare over the few objects in it; you find huddled about the dying embers of a once perhaps comfortable fire the widow, with emaciated countenance and frame poorly clad, her little ones shivering by her side over the few fragments that remain still unconsumed, their dimpled fingers blue with cold, no food, no fuel, no nothing but want and misery, not even the common comforts, say nothing about luxury—nothing in view but want and suffering.

The few dollars income which the widow may have for herself and her little ones are insufficient, with her efforts, to support and take care of them; and yet there are the two extremes. There is a case, not an isolated one, for they are numerous in this country of ours, rich and plenteous in every other respect. There is a case, Mr. Chairman, which appeals to the favorable action of this House on this amendment. If she could add to the little pittance she has the bounty which the Government—in case this bar shall be removed—would afford her, she may be lifted up from the condition of penury, poverty, and want, and placed where she ought to be placed; and any man who gets up here or elsewhere and announces to the world that he is "the friend of the Union soldier," and yet will not be moved to act with justice by such a recital, by such an instance, by such an example as that, for him the Union soldier has no need, for he does not want any such friends. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, who are the men and what are the elements that oppose liberal pension laws? Why they are a class who live wholly within themselves. They are a class whose hearts do not beat in sympathy with their fellow-men, unless they be of that class whom they number among their "chums." They are those who were opposed to the Union during the struggle for its preservation. They are those who opposed a protective tariff that would give this country prosperity, because that enabled the country to pay the pensions, and would overcome many of the objections made by the gentleman who urges the depleted state of the Treasury as a reason why we should not pass this amendment. They are those who are rich and know not want in any case; those who are members of fashionable clubs; those who ape foreign airs; who send their orders for their wearing apparel abroad; those who wear spike-toed shoes [laughter]; those who want the earth and everything in it without paying anything for it. [Laughter.]

They are those, Mr. Chairman, who, if they see a Union soldier with an empty sleeve, would elevate their olfactory organs as they passed by; those whose hearts are no larger than wooden nutmegs; in short, those who are entirely wanting in the elements of patriotism and valor and the recognition of valorous deeds, those totally lost to the impulses of a humane spirit, and whose ultimate destination will, I trust, be that bottomless pit described by the distinguished gentleman from the distinguished Seventh district of New York [Mr. BARTLETT] where they can revel in the luxury afforded by the money which the gentleman is so fearful will be unnecessarily thrown therein.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has said that we could not monopolize patriotism. Where did he ever hear the sentiments uttered by a man worthy to speak for those on this side of the House who claimed we had a monopoly of all the patriotism in this country? I deny that that claim has ever been made, either by those on this side of the House or those who thought politically as they do, away back from 1861 to 1865. In those days, Mr. Chairman, all parties furnished men for the defense of the Union, and we accord to them, we accord to those who came from the party of the distinguished gentleman from New York, the same credit as we claim for ourselves. But I will say to the gentleman that we have a monopoly of one thing; that a Democratic Administration in 1860 and 1861 confessed the inability of this Government, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, to suppress the rebellion, to compel a State to remain in the Union if it sought, without just cause, to absolve its allegiance to this Government. When the Republican Administration came into power, it stamped that doctrine out of existence, and because of that, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT], with every gentleman who holds a seat in this Chamber to-day, is here under the guise and protection of the law, in a free country, and in a united American Union. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HATCH] is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, in the very few moments that I shall occupy the time of this committee I wish to place myself on record as being in favor of liberal pensions. I also wish to place myself on record in regard to my admiration for the American soldier, for in my estimation marvelous men have these American volunteers proved themselves, on land and on sea. General Grant, our great commander, after the war said to his soldiers:

> Soldiers of the United States, your marches, your battles, your sieges, in endurance, in distance, in brilliancy of results, have dimmed the luster of the world's past military achievements.

And, sir, we can truthfully say that no grander scenes of courage or of devotion have ever been displayed than were displayed by the American volunteers. They have equaled in courage the Spartans at Thermopylæ and the immortal Six Hundred at Balaklava; and, sir, we all know that a large majority, that most of these pensioners, served in a war whose armies were the mightiest hosts ever sent forth by a republic, and in point of magnitude of cost, of blood, and treasure it far outranks any war in the history of this Republic.

And, sir, let me call attention to a few of the battles of that war. There was Cold Harbor, where it was said that in less than twenty minutes after the first gun was fired 10,000 Union men, 10,000 men on one side, lay writhing and bleeding on the sod or calm and still in death. There was Kenesaw Mountain, around whose bloody crest 12,000 men fell in one day. There was that affair at Hampton Roads, when the grand old ship, the *Cumberland*, went down with all on board, her crew firing her guns as she went beneath the water; and her flag, the Stars and Stripes, was never struck, but floating above the water after the vessel went down. There was Shiloh, upon whose bloody field 15,000 men on both sides, 15,000 Americans, were killed or wounded. There were Gettysburg and Vicksburg and the battles around Richmond and Chickamauga, and Mission Ridge, and the battle in the clouds on Lookout Mountain.

These are but a few of the 112 great battles fought during that war, with more than a thousand minor battles and skirmishes, a war whose mighty death roll reached nearly 400,000, with fully as many more maimed and crippled for life. Surely it was no frolic, no pleasant pastime, this sacrifice of home and home comforts, to go forth to such a war, where every inch of ground was contested by a brave and gallant foe. These older men well remember that during that time there were many dark and gloomy days, for some of these great battles were not victories for us, but were terrible and bloody defeats.

Sir, it seemed at times that He who rules over the destiny of nations had forgotten us, and it has been truly said that if time had been counted by events this nation lived a century during those four years. But, thanks to an overruling Providence, and thanks to these old pensioners and their comrades, this Government of the people, for the people, and by the people was not blotted from the face of the earth; and, sir, after four years of terrible and bloody civil war the world understood that the States of this Union were not loosely held together by a bond that could be easily broken, but that they were, in the language of an eminent statesman, many States but one people, having one Government, one flag, and one common destiny.

Yes, we are one people. We are more than that. We are a free people in every sense of the word, and all of our vast territory is, and whatever territory we may acquire in the future will be, dedicated to freedom forever. Abraham Lincoln proclaimed freedom to 4,000,000 slaves, and the Union Army, taking new hope, pressed forward, carrying freedom and victory together, and made them one. And that memorable appeal to arms also decided that the nation was supreme and that no State could leave the Union even by force of arms. No State has ever seceded, but many have been added to it. It is settled beyond controversy that this

Union can not shrink or contract, but it can grow, increase, extend. Growth, extension, greater power, grander destiny are before us, and to-day we rejoice that we are one great, united, harmonious people, stretching from the Gulf to the Lakes and from ocean to ocean, and in the lines of the poet we can truthfully say:

We know no North, nor South, nor West,
One Union binds us all;
Its Stars and Stripes are o'er us flung,
'Neath them we stand or fall.

We also rejoice that this Republic, with its glorious institutions, its grand power, its bright future, its matchless possibilities, still exists, this mother of republics, whose lullaby ought to be heard over every cradle of liberty throughout the world. [Applause.]

Yes, sir; all these things have been made possible, are in fact accomplished facts, through the sacrifices, the sufferings, and the bravery and heroism of those old pensioners and their comrades; and I say to you that, for one, I am opposed to the pension of a single one of these men being taken away from him unless he has had a fair trial, a fair chance given to him for defense, and a fair court to hear him in. [Applause.] Therefore, I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF]. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Chairman, I must confess a great deal of surprise that at his late hour there should be any objection urged against the widows of deceased soldiers receiving the pension due them unless they prove that they are paupers. It seems to me that instead of doing these widows a favor you are punishing them. You make the criterion of their deserts their poverty; you brand them as paupers; you place a placard upon their backs, as it were; you make it a matter of record, and you make that old stooped and gray-headed lady exhibit to the public and her posterity the record, "I, too, am a pauper." It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that the criterion of pensions should not be how many dollars are you worth, but what are your deserts, either as a soldier, or the widow of a soldier, or the mother of a soldier, or the orphan of a soldier.

The question as to whether the soldier himself received injuries during the war and while in service seems to be, also, at this late date, a back number, and especially when you consider that a certain class of our soldiers, to wit, the Mexican soldiers, have for some years received a service pension. There is no reason why there should be this invidious distinction between Mexican soldiers and the soldier of the Union. The pension, the sum of money itself, is not so great, and there is no reason that can be advanced why the Union soldier should not be placed precisely on the same footing as every other soldier that has a pension under our Government. It has been urged that a great many soldiers who never heard a gun fired would probably be pensioned under that system. However, the same objection would lie as well against the Mexican soldier. The fact is, a large majority of the Mexican soldiers pensioned are men who never were near the front, and who never left their homes. The mere fact that they had enlisted entitles them to a pension. While I am finding no fault with that, yet I do find fault with gentlemen who raise objection to the Union soldier being placed on the same footing with the Mexican soldier. You may tell us that a longer time has elapsed. In my judgment time has nothing to do with the matter. A matter of justice is justice one day after the act as well as it is one year, twenty or thirty years after.

It has been urged that this means an extra tax upon the people of the United States. To my friends on the Democratic side of the House I simply want to say that we adhere to the position of a protective tariff which will never make an American citizen pay one penny of tax. Under a revenue tariff it is true you make the American citizen pay the tax. A protective tariff (and at the proper time that shall be illustrated more at large) must be paid at all times by the foreign producer and foreign importer. When it is not paid by them it is of itself a revenue tariff, I mean a tariff for revenue only, a tariff that must be paid by enhancing the price of the article upon which the tariff is laid. A protective tariff means that it lowers the price of the article, and on that I challenge contradiction. I ask any gentleman on that side of the House to show me a single article upon which there has been a protective tariff for ten to twenty years that has not fallen in price, while on the other hand take any article upon which there has been a revenue tariff laid, it has enhanced in price, and the result is that the consumer of this country must pay the additional duty as a tax.

I only speak of this incidentally. I speak of it because it has been thrust in our teeth in the discussion of the revenue bill in the beginning of this session, that we have been endeavoring to burden our people with taxes. But let that be as it may. The point I am most particular about in the consideration of this bill is the infamous system that has been established, I believe, Mr. Chairman, not by the Pension Bureau, but by a power higher than the Pension Bureau itself, a system that I say is infamous because it stands without a precedent, a system that is infamous because it is so unjust that the most tyrannical nation of the world would not have dared to adopt anything of the kind.

One of the fundamental principles of human government is the presumption that every man is innocent until he is proven guilty. Another is that no man shall be declared guilty except by due process of law after a fair and impartial trial, at which he may be present personally or be represented by counsel, where he may have an opportunity to confront his accusers and to examine and cross-examine witnesses, in other words, to make for himself a defense against any charges that may be alleged against him. Why, sir, the veriest vagabond that travels the streets, the worst criminal that has ever been known, is, in the eyes of the law, an innocent man until he is proven guilty. I care not how low in life he may be, I care not what his reputation or his standing is, being charged with an offense, he is still innocent until that offense is proven according to law. No government, no human society, could possibly exist and tolerate a system so infamous as the one that has been adopted by this Administration with reference to our soldiers.

Let us examine it. The applicant for a pension files his application. There are certain forms and processes of law prescribed, and he conforms to them. He introduces his evidence to show that he is entitled to a pension. There is a critical examination of it, and in every case where any doubt exists a special commissioner is appointed who goes to the vicinage, meets the witnesses face to face, carefully and critically investigates the case, and finally the pension is allowed. Years roll on, witnesses die, records are destroyed, evidence is lost, and then, when the pensioner is in that dilemma, an order comes from somewhere in Washington through the Pension Bureau saying to the pensioner: "Unless you show within sixty days that you are not a perjurer, unless you show within sixty days that you have not been guilty of fraud, your pension will be taken from you."

The pensioner stands utterly and absolutely helpless. His witnesses are dead, his evidence, much of it, is destroyed; or, even if some of his witnesses be still alive, owing to the fallibility of human memory, they may perhaps in some small matter contradict some of their former statements, and that is made a pretext for permanently depriving the old veteran of his pension. Instead of holding men innocent until they are proven guilty, this Administration hangs them first and tries them afterwards. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] They put the brand of fraud upon the pensioner. They denounce him and his witnesses as perjurers. They make that record and they hand it down to posterity. His children and his children's children must face that record standing in the archives of this nation, and he has no remedy, because he is forced to prove a negative, which is almost an impossibility. I repeat, sir, that it is the most infamous proceeding that can be found in the history of any government pretending to civilization or justice.

Gentlemen here tell us that something must be done to cut down expenses, resting their opposition to the pensioning of our soldiers entirely on the amount of money involved. That is the only argument that has been used, and it has been put in the most offensive form. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] does not content himself with saying that this is taking money out of the Treasury in a legal way. He speaks of "looting" the Treasury, robbing the Treasury. To "loot" means to rob, to plunder, to take by brute force, and that is the description which the gentleman from New York gives of legislation designed to pay the honest debt which this Government owes to the veterans of the late war.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BRUMM. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman inform us how the Treasury can be looted after it has been emptied by the policy of the party now in power? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRUMM. To be sure, there is very little substance left to loot, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] seems to think that we are "going for" the shadow. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen talk about "looting" the Treasury to pay the soldier, whether he received his wound or other disability in the line of service or not. I do not so regard it. I maintain that the debt which this Government owes to the soldiers of the late war can never be paid. In the shape of a debt it stands beyond the possibility of mathematical calculation. It grows with the growth of our nation. It enlarges with the blessings of this great Republic. Whatever advance we make, whatever blessings we enjoy as a nation, we make and we enjoy because the boys in blue saved them for us. Yet men here halt and quibble about a mere matter of from $8 to $12 a month for the short lives these old veterans still have to live or for the lives of their widows, orphans, or dependent parents, and then call it "looting" the Treasury.

Sir, in considering the great achievements of the soldiers of the Grand Army of the Republic history furnishes no parallel.

Their heroism, loyalty, devotion, self-sacrifice, and success can not be equaled anywhere in the history of the world. They were not hired butchers, but the free citizen soldiers of our land, who held the power of sovereignty as well as the sword and musket. The soldiers of the Union were citizens, as it were, yesterday, soldiers to-day, and citizens to-morrow. The grand spectacle of the aggregation of that Union Army is incomparable. Their heroic work is equal to the best; but in their segregation they loom so far above anything that history has recorded that men should blush with shame when they say, "We will not even give you enough to provide for the ordinary necessaries of life during the remainder of your short existence." When the Army of the United States disbanded, these citizen soldiers by the hundreds of thousands, although paid only 50 per cent of the amount due them, went back to their homes, entered into civil life, and without a murmur became the best citizens of our land. No other people could have done it, no country could have risked it but this glorious Republic of ours.

And here I want to say to my friends on the other side that your "boys" deserve the same credit. History accords them this proud honor as well as us. When your "boys" were done fighting, though beaten, they did not become bands of marauders and robbers. They went back, as did our "boys," and again became citizens of this mighty Republic. Sir, on both sides they were the citizen soldiers that only this Republic can produce.

Mr. Chairman, the cheapest thing that this Government can pay is the price it expends to establish the precedent that it will ever be just to its soldiers and let our posterity know that when soldiers will so loyally make sacrifices as did the boys in blue, this Republic will ever remember them and no future soldiers shall be treated worse than the best of those who served in the last rebellion.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. R. 39) making an appropriation to defray the joint expense of locating the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and the British North American territory; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee again resumed its session, Mr. DINGLEY in the chair.

Mr. DOVENER. Mr. Chairman, it had been my purpose to remain silent and merely listen to the criticisms that were showered upon my friend from the State of New York [Mr. BARTLETT]. But in view of a letter which my mail has brought me this morning from the Pension Department in this city, in answer to a letter of inquiry in regard to the application of a respectable widow of a Union soldier, I should be recreant to my trust and false to my constituents if I did not lay that letter before this House. I intend, after reading this letter, to send it to this widow, a woman whom I know well. This letter is dated "Washington, D. C., January 14, 1896," and I hope my friend from New York is here and will take a memorandum of the case and have it inquired into, so that possibly he may explain that which is inexplicable to me as to the neglectful attitude of the Commissioner of Pensions and his department toward this old soldier, his widow, and his orphans.

MADAM: In response to the personal inquiry of Hon. B. B. DOVENER relative to your claim for pension as widow of the above-named soldier, you are advised that Dr. W. H. McCullom—

A gentleman whom I know well—

testifies that Ira was born December 3, 1879, and you allege that his correct name is Ira Lawson—

Now I want to call the attention of the House, and especially my friends on the other side, to the capricious and unjust manner in which pensions are hung up year after year. This doctor (a gentleman whom I know myself) it appears had stated that this widow's son "Ira" was born December 3, 1879, and the widow stated that her son's name was Ira Lawson. After that it seems some gentleman was sent out to make inquiry as to this apparent discrepancy (and we get such communications frequently) and he had examined the old family Bible. This old lady was unable to write, although she was filled with patriotism and self-sacrificing love for this Union, under the promptings of which she had sent her husband to a soldier's grave in defense of his country. It appears that, some other person having entered the name on the record, it was not spelled Ira Lawson, but Ira Clawson, the difference being merely an additional letter, and this family record also stated that the child was born December 20, 1879, instead of December 3, 1879, as the doctor had stated. The letter continues—

While the certified copy of Bible record shows that Ira Clawson was born December 20, 1879. The correct date of his birth and his correct name should be stated and this discrepancy explained.

Now notice what follows:

Evidence showing that the children are all living should also be furnished, as the last on file only covers November 12, 1892.

So that this pension has been ready for consideration, has been ready to be passed upon, since 1892, and only after an inquiry by me has been made in the year 1896, something like four years later, is this widow informed that some person has come across a Bible record showing a discrepancy of seventeen days as to the birth of her child, and possibly, through a misunderstanding of the name, has misspelled it. So her case is sent back for further information, and not only that, but she must prove over again that her children are living, because more than three years have elapsed while the Department has been waiting to inform her of this technical difficulty. And inclosed in this letter is the famous Order No. 229, which has already been read and its contents commented upon before the House during this discussion, so that I need not read it again. This is the claim of Esther P. Orum—claim No. 534385—and for the benefit of my friend from New York I will say that this is a respectable lady, the widow of a soldier, and residing at the town of Sherrard, W. Va. Here is another letter which I have received to-day, addressed to myself:

McMEEHANS, *January 1, 1896.*

DEAR SIR: I received to-day an answer to your call on the Department of the Interior about the pension for myself. They say the claim was rejected on account of not having proof of my father's marriage. I am very thankful to you for what you have done for me, and hope you will assist me a little further.

There is only one way for me to get proof of the marriage, and that is by finding a family by the name of Jefferson, who lived in Wheeling in 1864, but moved to Washington, D. C. If it is not asking too much, would you please send me a list of the Jeffersons as they appear in the directory of Washington? I will write to them and maybe I can find the one I am looking for.

Respectfully, yours,

H. J. DRUMM.

Hon. B. B. DOVENER, M. C., *First District, West Virginia.*

My friend who opened the debate on the other side of this question used this language, which is found in the RECORD, page 724:

For myself, I can say that I truly believe, had I been of years sufficiently mature when the first cannon boomed across the harbor of Charleston on the morning of April 12, 1861, I should have found my place among the enlisted men in the civil war.

I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is in earnest in the use of that language; and when the extract which I have read from his speech was delivered on the floor of the House he firmly believed that he would have done so. Let us look at the facts. I am of the opinion that my friend from New York need not have been deprived of that privilege if he had chosen to go into the Army. He was born in 1847, and was 14 years of age when the "cannon boomed across the harbor of Charleston." Down in my State, situated differently from the gentleman from New York, born and reared in the State of Virginia, where we were divided in sentiment, when but a few years older than himself, I parted with family and friends and entered into the Union Army in response to that "boom that was sent across Charleston Harbor" of which the gentleman from New York speaks, and in the company which I had the honor to command were men, loyal mountaineers, of what was afterwards the State of West Virginia, who came to the camp, boys of 13 or 14 years of age, and offered their services in defense of the old flag. They were too young, some of them, to be recognized or received into the Army, but they remained with us and underwent the trials as well as the hardships of camp life and finally succeeded in getting their names upon the rolls, and when they did they did it by convincing us by services, entirely voluntary, that they were capable of performing the duties required of them. And, Mr. Chairman, when they enlisted they placed their names upon the rolls as 18 years of age; and after the war was over when some of these men applied for pensions it has come to my personal knowledge that this Commissioner of Pensions has asked to have it explained how it was that they said their age was 18 at that time, while the records of the War Department show very differently, because they seemed to be four years older at that time than they really were, and hence they could have not been in the service, for they were not old enough.

Those are cases of which I have personal knowledge. I say we were differently situated down in West Virginia from the situation in which the gentleman from New York found himself. But let us go a little further. In 1862 the war was still going on, and the gentleman from New York was 15 years of age. In 1863 we were still in that terrible trouble, and the gentleman from New York was 16 years of age. In 1864 he was 17 years of age, and still the war went on and the draft riots of New York went on at the same time in the presence of that gentleman, knowing that the Government was needing forces.

I have already said that in my State we labored under considerable disadvantages. We raised seventeen loyal regiments and sent them into the United States Army, with thirty-six or thirty-seven thousand men from my section, and we did not have any draft either. We raised these regiments, and in 1863, on the 20th day of June, they recognized us as a free, sovereign, and independent State, and placed one of the brightest stars upon the flag of our country in honor of West Virginia. When they did that the General Government said "You have assumed the duties of statehood; you must assume also the responsibilities of it and must furnish your quota of men," and, Mr. Chairman, we did so. Therein we were a little unfortunate no doubt. Possibly if some of us had been less

patriotic and the draft had come on us, there are some no doubt among us who might have had the pleasure of hiring a substitute, and then we would have been in the direct line of promotion and possibly President of the United States some day. [Laughter.]

Now, my friends, I want to say to you this: I recall another instance of patriotic sacrifice, and I commend the history of the man to my friend from New York. At 16 years of age—much younger than my friend was—a youth left the State of Ohio who served honorably in the ranks of the Union army. He returned to his State and has been an honored ornament to it ever since; and on yesterday, recognizing his worth and merit, he was unanimously chosen by his party as Senator from the great State of Ohio to represent that State from the 4th day of March, 1897. I speak of the Hon. Joseph B. Foraker, who at 16 years of age went into the Union army. [Applause.] So that my friend need not have been deprived of the opportunity to serve in the Army if he had desired.

As I said, I think my friend hardly appreciated the situation when he made the remarks which he made the other day. During the war I heard the expression "Lincoln hirelings" applied to us. Since the war, in the newspapers of the country, I have seen the words "pension bummers." I have also heard the pensioners called "Treasury looters," but I never expected to hear a gentleman who regretted that his age prevented him from being in the ranks of the Union Army, and who claimed to be so loyal to this Government, make use of language of the same character, such as "looters and pillagers of the Treasury" and men "indulging in a carnival of pillage"—such language as I heard the gentleman use the other day. As suggested by a friend at my side, that fixes his condition very safely.

Does my friend from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] apprehend—does he for one moment comprehend who it is that he is insulting by calling them "looters of the Treasury" and "organized pillagers of the Treasury"? Aye, although he may not have been disposed to risk his younger days in the Army of the Union, yet he was of age sufficient to have at least read and known the history of his country, to have known something of the men whose surviving comrades he calls, with their widows and orphans, "looters of the Treasury." If he would refer to the books that he was then studying, to the history of the times when he was 16 or 17 years of age, he would recollect who these men were. Does he remember when that grand old vessel of which we all speak with pride, the old ship of state, was out on the sea of dissolution? Does he remember when the clouds hung low? Does he remember when the lightnings flashed, when the thunder rolled, and when the gale bent the masts of that old vessel, when in her distress Abraham Lincoln, of sainted memory, grasped the helm of state and cried for men to man that vessel, and the response came from shore to shore, "We are coming, Father Abraham, 300,000 more"?

The sons and widows of these men and their surviving comrades are the ones who are charged here with being looters of the Treasury. Their comrades, their husbands, and their fathers—many of them lie dead. They are required to prove that death came in the line of service. Many of them sleep in unknown graves in front of Richmond. Many of them sleep in the Wilderness, and at Gettysburg, and along the banks of the Ohio and the great Father of Waters, amid the pine woods of Georgia and the Everglades of Florida. They sleep in honored graves, although unknown. Their sunken graves may be unmarked by any stone or monument, but I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] that in the heart of every loyal American citizen there is erected to their memory a monument around which the flowers of remembrance will bloom in eternal verdure, when the remarks of the gentleman I hope will have been forgotten.

Mr. Chairman, having said this much, I do not wish to detain the committee longer. I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois. I am willing to go further and to support the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Indiana and to pass a law commanding the Commissioner of Pensions not only to cease persecuting and striking from the roll arbitrarily the veterans, their widows and their children, but to place back every soldier and soldier's widow and soldier's orphan who has been stricken from the roll under the arbitrary orders and technical rules of this Department; and then if there are any charges against them let them be informed of that fact; let the man who makes the charge substantiate it. Until that is done, let them remain upon this roll of honor as brave and honorable soldiers of the Union or as the widows and orphans of such. [Applause.]

Mr. LINNEY. Mr. Chairman, it may appear a little odd for a Representative upon this floor from the State of North Carolina, who himself served upon the other side in the late war between the States, to make an argument upon the subject of pensions or to attempt to do so.

The best definition I have ever seen of the word pension is this:

A sum due a soldier, and sometimes poor authors, for services rendered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the consideration moving the heart of any great government to pay this class of meritorious citizenship is public service, and when these services are performed by soldiers they require the exercise of the very highest qualities of the human heart—courage, constancy, patience—and in this country the very highest capacities of American manhood are displayed in the performance of the duties of the soldier.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it was not only so in the late civil war in which the States participated, but it will be an obligation resting upon this great Government of ours in all probability at all times to recognize the right of these meritorious classes.

Let us see. I turn to the report of the Secretary of the Interior, made in 1894, and I find that the Government has not yet entirely discharged its obligation to pay pensioners of the war of the Revolution. You will find that there are names upon the roll to-day from the Revolutionary struggle, from the war of 1812, and from the Mexican war.

Mr. Chairman, in the best essay that I have ever seen by mortal man, that wonderfully strong intellectual document from the pen of the immortal Lord Bacon, the title of which is "The true greatness of nations and states," it is recorded that all republics, all nations, all states, must have motion; that the oceans of the world have been put in a cradle by the direction of the Deity in order that the waters may be rocked and the oceans preserved from impurity. Says this great author:

There must be action, motion, on the part of nations and states, and the true motion of a nation is foreign war. Foreign war in its effect upon the state or nation strengthens, purifies, and preserves. A civil conflict has exactly the opposite effect; like the fever heat upon the human form, it extracts the light of the eye and the life of the heart.

This Republic, Mr. Chairman, is young, and yet in its first century this fever of which the great author tells us came upon the infant Republic. The north of us was engaged in deadly conflict with the south of us, if you will allow the expression. There never has been such a conflict, in many respects, in the history of the nations of the world. It was the dashing, gallant South against the iron resolution of the North; and I was glad to hear the distinguished gentleman who sits over there accord honor this morning to the brave Confederates who fell without success. In my humble judgment, Mr. Chairman, this war was a war of necessity. It must of necessity have fallen upon this young Republic. Why so? Let me see if I can not show it. It was a conflict between the States and the Federal Government. The State courts, therefore, were utterly incompetent to pass upon the great question. Why? Because they were parties to it. The Federal Government was likewise incompetent to pass upon it, because in this conflict of opinion between the States and the Federal power it likewise would be a party to it. The prayers of the good and pious of the land and the expostulations of the great of the land were all unavailing. The courts were incompetent for its adjudication.

This great war of opinion, the bloody chasm, had been dug through this Republic before there ever was a gun fired. How was it to be settled? The courts could not settle it, neither State nor Federal. The prayers of the great could not settle it. No power on God's green earth could settle it, save the arbitrament of the sword. That arbitrament was had. Neither side to-day is ashamed of the part it took in it. I have not seen a single Northern soldier who is ashamed of the side he took in it; and I have not seen a single Southern soldier who is ashamed of the part he took in it. Why, Mr. Chairman? Simply for the reason that this great question could only be settled by the arbitrament of the sword, and when my associates fell into the gulf, when their bones bleach and probably dissolve, in this chasm of public sentiment made by this conflict of opinion before the war, I can claim for them that they have performed at least this office—they have helped to fill up the bloody chasm which seemed to threaten the impairment of this Union, and made it indissoluble. [Applause.]

But while that is so, for one, I recognize the complete decision of the great question by this arbitrament of the sword. My section went under. I recognize the great principle that the Government owes to this class of its public servants, the soldiers who fought to preserve it, the duty now of pensioning them, but at the same time, Mr. Chairman, while that is so, I want to call the attention of the committee to some little matters that have given me some trouble. It is this, and if there can possibly be a remedy all patriots will unite in trying to bring it about: It is the inequality resulting from the operation of our pension system. I want to give you some figures which I prepared hurriedly this morning from documents. The internal revenues collected from this Republic to-day amount to enough to pay the pensions of the Republic, and very little more.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it turns out that North Carolina, the State I in part represent, pays $2,632,779.69 under the operation of the internal-revenue system. I mean, of course, the entire revenue obtained from the internal-revenue system. You never hear me say a word in disparagement of that system of revenues which we collect from customs duties, because in my opinion it is the light and life of this Republic, North and South. [Applause.] But so far as the internal revenues are concerned, if gentlemen will but think for a moment of their operation in the light of the amount of the pensions of this country they must see that it is absolute death to the State of North Carolina. How can we remedy this?

Mr. BRUMM. Repeal them.
Mr. LINNEY. This moment should that be done if I had such power.
Mr. BRUMM. I am in favor of their repeal.
Mr. LINNEY. God bless my friend. Will you help me to do it?
Mr. BRUMM. I will.

Mr. LINNEY. Then I will introduce a bill to-day. Now mark it, we pay $2,632,779, as I have said. We get back in pensions how much? Five hundred and seventy-two thousand dollars. We lose by the arrangement over $2,000,000 every year. Yet we have only $7 per capita circulation, while many of the great States of the North have over $200 per capita circulation.

The great State of Massachusetts pays, under this system of internal revenue, $2,687,178.35 and gets back, under the system of pensions which now exists and will continue to exist of necessity, $5,948,985.49.

The great State of Ohio pays $12,477,148.01 of internal revenue, and she gets back, in the form of pensions, $14,737,191.54.

The great State of Pennsylvania pays $10,981,086.12 internal revenue, and she gets back $13,574,346.36.

The State of Iowa pays $465,105.87 internal revenue, and gets back in pensions $5,760,000.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question in regard to Iowa?

Mr. LINNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LACEY. Are not the gentleman's figures with regard to Iowa rather misleading? For instance, we have no distilleries in Iowa, and consequently only the amount the gentleman has read—$465,000—is paid there in the form of internal revenue, but the people who drink the whisky pay the tax in North Carolina. [Laughter.]

Mr. LINNEY. I am only taking the figures from the reports. If the reports are wrong I am not to blame for that. I am telling you how the figures talk.

Kansas, "bleeding Kansas," pays $277,633.81 internal revenue, and she gets back in the form of pensions $6,084,592.16.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I join heartily with my friends who desire to put a bridle upon the Secretary of the Interior in this matter of pensions. I say there is no sense in permitting him to exercise arbitrary power to exclude men from the pension rolls, and I shall vote for these amendments that are intended to curb him in that respect. But I desire to call attention to an iniquity in the internal-revenue system which demands reform almost as strongly as the cry of the widow. In North Carolina the enterprises of our people connected with the internal-revenue system consist largely in small distilleries. We have been a pretty small people anyway since the war crippled us, except, thank God, in courage, and I hope I may be pardoned for claiming a reasonable share of intelligence for my State. For this reason our financial enterprises have been on a small scale.

Now, it is a common thing for a Government officer to go around, and, by a mere view of the premises of one of these distilleries, to make what he calls a "delinquent assessment" of taxes against the distiller, and thus, by his mere declaration, that tax is almost as effectively levied as it would be after verdict and judgment by a competent court, and the property of the man is sold without a hearing before a jury, or before a justice of the peace, or before any other judicial tribunal known to the law. I hope our friends will help us to abolish that evil, and if the distinguished gentleman who answered me awhile ago so patriotically [Mr. BRUMM] will only get enough members of this House to march at elbow touch with him we will assail this entire iniquity, this accursed internal-revenue system, and blot it from the face of God's green earth, and then we will put a tariff tax upon the goods of foreigners that come into this country large enough to meet the entire demands of the Government. [Applause on the Republican side.] Then indeed North Carolina will have an equal chance in the race of life with Pennsylvania, and will make a showing equal to Kansas, equal to New York, equal to any of the other great States; and then, if in five years after that is done, we are not 100 per cent higher than we are now in all that makes a State great I will never ask another favor of this House. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to address this committee again upon the question of pension legislation, but so much has been said about my attitude and I have been made for so many days the target of attack, the target of abuse, and the object of misrepresentation and invective, that I deem it well to close the debate on this side by answering some of that abuse and some of the alleged arguments that have been advanced against my position.

I think, sir, that I am entitled to a vote of thanks from the Republicans in this Chamber. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I think I am entitled to a vote of thanks for having been the means through which their mouths have been opened, for it must be manifest that we should have been deprived of all the flood of eloquence with which this committee has been inundated for the last three or four days if it had not been for the speech which I made here a few days ago.

Now, the debating school is closed; the daily sessions which have been held for the benefit of the budding orators of every age and every "previous condition" of employment are now at an end. In some of those speeches or addresses the language has been well chosen and the words have been well delivered—although somewhat sophomoric in style and fallacious as a rule in argument. In other cases, instead of oratory and logical argument we have been favored with declamation and rant and invective. I shall only allude to one instance in which I claim the proprieties of parliamentary discussion were grossly violated; I refer to the extraordinary remarks made, I believe, by a gentleman from Michigan yesterday, in which were combined profanity and coarseness—remarks in which the gentleman did not have the courage to avow that the words were his own, but put them in the mouth of a gentleman who, it was alleged, had been sitting on the floor of this House.

Sir, it is the first time since I have had the honor to sit in the Halls of Congress that I have heard a profane word used in debate on this floor, or that I have heard an argument made by a member of Congress, presumed, at least, to have been founded upon his honest convictions, termed "rot." To such words, which I conceive to be an abuse of privilege, and which would have entitled me to summon the member before the bar of this House and to have his words taken down, I deem it only necessary to refer in my remarks to-day. The gentleman who uttered those words was not worthy of being so dignified as to be summoned before the bar of this House. I have had the honor and the pleasure of addressing the members of this House upon many occasions, and heretofore I have been treated with that respect and consideration which I hold that every member of this House, however humble, is entitled to receive.

Yesterday, for the first time, I heard an argument of mine, based at least on honest conviction and following the line of view upheld by some of the leaders of my party, including the Chief Executive of the United States and the leading Senator from Maryland, Mr. GORMAN—I heard that argument characterized by the elegant term "rot." The profane word which preceded that term, though uttered within my hearing, has in the course of revision been wisely expunged from the RECORD, so that it now appears that what I uttered, instead of being some other kind of "rot," was "mere rot." I leave it to the judgment of members of this House whether they have ever heard me make any argument, legal or otherwise, constitutional or founded on moral grounds, which deserved such opprobrium.

There is no other personal incident of this debate which is worthy of notice or answer; for, reviewing whatever was said against me, I can not even say as I look upon my robe, "See what a rent the envious Casca made!"

I have doubted, gentlemen, for the last day or two whether we are free, or bond and slaves—whether a man in the Congress of the United States has a right to raise his voice against lavish expenditure, against unnecessary squandering of the people's money, without being upheld to personal abuse and ridicule. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have not scrupled to conjure up in their fancy or imagination and to picture to this House the circumstances under which I may live in my home. It has been held up as a crime that I should sit at eventide by my fireside or that I should indulge in the use of tobacco; and it has been claimed, because some gentlemen of this House imagined that I am free from want, that my very pecuniary circumstances should form the basis of a charge of lack of sympathy with the widow and the orphan.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. May I ask the gentleman a question?
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, sir.
Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Just one question.
Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] declines to yield.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I should like to accord the members of this House on either side the right to pursue the line of interrogatory and query which was followed upon the day when I first had the honor of addressing this committee. But it is impossible in the limited time which is now left to me (for this debate must be closed to-day) to answer all the interrogatories which I presume are designed as shafts upon my armor and at the same time to conclude this argument within a reasonable length of time.

Now, what is all this debate about? It is well that the country should understand the question. There is, Mr. Chairman, no issue before this committee. In the Committee on Appropriations, of which I have the honor to be a member, I was in favor of the larger appropriation of $140,000,000, rather than the appropriation of $138,000,000. Why? Because I wish it to be within the power of the Commissioner of Pensions to pay the pensions promptly, and to have adequate resources within his reach. That was the view of the whole committee—to give the Commissioner of Pensions the larger sum, to give him the $140,000,000 asked for under the existing provisions of law. The bill itself, dissevered from any im-

proper amendment or rider, received the unanimous support of the Committee on Appropriations, and will pass this House without dispute or division. What, then, is the excuse for all this argument? It is that certain improper amendments have been inserted in this bill, or are to be proposed to-morrow when the bill shall come up for consideration under the five-minute rule.

The first of the amendments coming to this House from the Committee on Appropriations is that which provides that when an application has been rejected and a second application is made, if it appears that at the time of the filing of the original application the disability alleged did in point of fact exist, the pension shall date back to the time of the original filing. To that amendment I accord my support; and I have already given notice that I shall invoke no point of order against it, although as a legislator I believe in the rule laid down by the Committee on Rules of this House, that no change of existing law should ever be incorporated in an appropriation bill. I believe in that broad, sound, general proposition which found favor with the Committee on Rules of this House and which formed a part of the rules of the Fifty-first Congress; which were adopted in their entirety, subject to future amendment, early in this session.

What are the other amendments? The next amendment is that one proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF]. It is that amendment which was found inserted in the pension appropriation bill when it came before the Committee on Appropriations. It is that amendment which did not find favor even with the Republican members of that committee. It was urged against its adoption that it was not right to take away from the Commissioner of Pensions the power which had been imposed on him ever since the creation of his office. It was alleged also against it, and it has been urged also in this committee, that the inconvenience and expense to which the claimant would be subjected in traveling to the various terms of the United States courts would be too onerous, and therefore, for the benefit of the claimant himself, no such amendment should be incorporated even in a general pension bill. And I call the attention of the committee to the fact that you do not find any general agreement on the Republican side of the House with reference to this amendment.

My distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] told us yesterday that that amendment could not have successful practical operation; that he was opposed to it for various reasons, and he gave the reasons why it would operate unjustly and why it was an unwise provision of law. In fact, several gentlemen on that side of the Chamber urged another remedy; they urged a remedy which they hope to see come to pass in the future—that is, the installment of a Republican administration, and the replacing of General Lochren by a Republican Commissioner of Pensions. I believe, gentlemen, that that is a remedy to which you will be entitled if the suffrages of the people of the United States are accorded to you. But to change improvidently an existing provision of law, because you claim that under certain circumstances, and in certain cases, the Commissioner of Pensions has erred, seems to me to be a very unwise mode of effecting a change or providing a remedy.

They say of General Lochren, who, if I mistake not, served honorably in the Union Army, and who is a man with a good record as a soldier, and one which no man on that side of the House or on this side of the Chamber would attempt to impeach, they say that among the enormous number of cases on which his Bureau has been called to pass judgment there have been a certain number of specific cases of error or mistake. That is the claim, and for that reason they urge that General Lochren is opposed to the interests of the Union soldier. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have had the pleasure of meeting the Commissioner of Pensions, and I have always found him, in his attitude to the soldier, to be favorable and considerate; and to be a gentleman who never volunteered to take any view which could by any means be termed detrimental or injurious in the slightest degree to the interest of the Union soldier. I have forwarded many applications and inquiries from my own district to the Commissioner of Pensions, and I believe, with the exception of one or two cases, which had been previously thereto properly rejected, every claim has been passed to a successful determination.

Now, let us see what the condition of business in that office is. In 1891 I believe there were no less than 154,000 inquiries addressed by Senators and Representatives to the Pension Office. The year before last the number was about 95,000, and last year alone 80,000 requests were sent by members of Congress—that is, forwarded by Senators or Representatives—for information. On July 1, 1895, the claims for pensions or increase of pensions amounted to 552,210, represented by 459,475 claimants, and of these there were original claims in number 210,765; and in the last six months alone—that is, until the 4th day of January, I believe, from the 1st of July, 1895—of new claims there were 55,860. Thus you can imagine, thus you can conceive, or form some idea at least, of the magnitude of the work imposed upon the Pension Bureau. What wonder, then, that in the consideration of so many cases, with a party ready to pounce upon every possible mistake or error, ready to claim that any such mistake or error was an absolute dereliction of duty and an effort to encompass a wrong upon the Union soldier who applied for a pension, and with all the shrewdness and all the astuteness and all the time and labor given to the matter by Republican Representatives on this floor, that a few gentlemen in this large body have been able to discover a limited number of cases in which they claim that an error has been committed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, no man, no matter what his position, whether at the head of a bureau or in charge of any Department of the Government, is infallible. Fallibility, alas! is a condition of human existence; and if we were not fallible we should belong to-day, all of us, to that happier sphere to which we may at least hope to attain some day, although one gentleman on the other side of the Chamber has already consigned me to the bottomless pit. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIFFIN. I desire to say to the gentleman from New York that that was his own misfortune in the use of language.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Of course it has been impossible for me to repair to the Pension Office and investigate each specific instance of alleged error. Unfortunately, placed as I am on several important committees of this House, I have other functions to discharge than that of inquiring into every pension case brought up on the floor of this House, whether such case has been brought here by the Delsartian orator from Tennessee or the gentleman from Indiana who furnished me with a single instance yesterday.

Now, let us look into these cases for a moment. There was the case of Alfred Sterrett, referred to by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY]. In that case the record shows that a pension had been paid under the act of June 27, 1890, to Mr. Sterrett for a number of years. An examination of the record of the medical board shows that it is true that they did, by a peculiar system of rating, make out that the man showed a physical incapacity of fourteen-eighteenths. Although the action of his heart was regular, he was reported to be suffering from heart affection to the extent of four-eighteenths, from eczema on his arms to the extent of four-eighteenths, and from lung trouble—it would appear not developed in any way in either lung—to the extent of six-eighteenths; and four-eighteenths, four-eighteenths, and six-eighteenths made up the aggregate of fourteen-eighteenths.

Now suppose the Bureau of Pensions or the Commissioner of Pensions to have been mistaken. Suppose that this man was really physically disabled to the extent that he maintained. At least on the papers it must be conceded that there was enough of doubt to put the Commissioner on his inquiry. But whether there were or not, it matters not. In his judgment, in his discretion, he thought that he was entitled to call for a new examination. This gentleman, Mr. Sterrett, who was, if I mistake not, a member of the One hundred and eighth United States Colored Volunteers, refused to submit to a second examination.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Will the gentleman from New York permit a question?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Yes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Is it not true that this gentleman, in his affidavit, in which he declined to be examined before the board at Tell City, requested an examination before the board at Rockport, Ind., for the reason that they were physicians who did not know him, and that the physicians who formed this board at Tell City were his personal enemies? And upon the other hand, did he not only not refuse to submit to an examination, but did he not request an examination at the hands of the Rockport board?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I believe that this man, Mr. Sterrett, has requested an examination at the hands of another board, but I do not know what action has been taken upon that application by the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Did he not, right at the time he made that affidavit, as a part of the affidavit, request an examination before the Rockport board?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Not that I am aware of. I have not seen any such paper.

Mr. HEMENWAY. If you will examine the papers you will certainly see that.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, the charge made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] the other day was that because the president of the medical board at Tell City wrote a letter—which I admit was a very improper letter, a letter attacking this man—because such a letter had been written, the Commissioner of Pensions must have decided upon that letter. Now, it appears from the papers on file, that the paper which must have been acted upon was the regular report from the secretary of that medical board at Tell City informing the Commissioner of Pensions that the claimant, Mr. Sterrett, refused to submit to an examination.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Will you permit me right here to ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, sir; I can not yield.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman will not yield to me, as I did to him yesterday?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. All right; I will yield.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I will ask you if there is any paper on file in that case from the secretary of the board of examining surgeons at Tell City?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. There is a paper stamped from the secretary of the examining board saying that the claimant refused to appear before him.

Mr. HEMENWAY. And is not that paper this letter from Dr. Hutcheson?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, sir; there is another paper.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Well, it has been placed on file since I examined the papers then, and belongs to that class of secret testimony that the Commissioner does not allow ordinary people to see.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I want to give the gentleman every chance, in fairness, to state his whole case. Of course I am *not, as gentlemen* seem to imagine, in active service in the Department of Pensions. I do not know anything about these cases of my own knowledge.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I concede that the gentleman is correct in that statement.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I merely state what the record shows. I merely state that it would appear by the papers on file that what the Commissioner of Pensions acted upon was this report sent from the secretary of the examining board at Tell City. Now, as the gentleman intimates that that paper has been filed recently, I can only state that my impression is that that paper bears a file mark showing, I think, that about the time had elapsed which would naturally have elapsed before the report was filed.

Mr. HEMENWAY. And does not show any examination by the Tell City board?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] declines to yield.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. What was the other case? The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON] called my attention to the case of Selina Brewer, and he complained that the Commissioner of Pensions had required proof of marriage, or rather of nonmarriage. It appears this man Brewer and his present widow, or alleged widow, were married in 1886 (he died in 1891), and the Bureau of Pensions had required some proof from this lady that she was not married at the time she married him. In reference to these cases, involving the law of evidence as to marriage, I believe that the Bureau of Pensions has only followed the regular rule of law, which makes marriage depend on the lex loci contracts, and the Bureau accepts such proof of marriage as would be required by the courts of the State in which it is alleged that the marriage took place. It is all very well to say that the Commissioner of Pensions should not exact any proof of marriage, but you must bear in mind that there are many cases arising in which two women claim to be the widow of the same decedent, in which two women file applications for the payment of the same pension, and there have been some cases in which the widows were at least three in number.

Let me call the attention of the Committee to the case of an Illinois woman, Rosetta Mulligan, of Pearl, Pike County, Ill., who was pensioned as the widow of Hiram H. Mulligan, of Company D, Third Illinois Cavalry, and Company G, Thirty-third Illinois Infantry, under certificate No. 229249.

It is shown that the soldier married Sarah J. Datsen in January, 1855; that four children were born while these parties lived together as man and wife; that in the fall of 1862 the late pensioner, then a single woman, while visiting a sister living near the soldier, became acquainted with him and his family; that in the summer of 1863 the soldier deserted his wife, and on August 9, 1863, married the late pensioner. The soldier died in 1876 leaving a claim pending.

Here is the point in the case. That woman, who was not entitled to a pension, drew from the Government in all $4,011.13, and that money can never be recovered by the Government. That case only illustrates the necessity for the exercise of due care by the Department as to marriage and as to widowhood.

Mr. QUIGG. Will my colleague allow me to interrupt him a moment for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Yes, sir.

Mr. QUIGG. I want to preface the question by saying that I have not had the same experience with the Pension Department that has been recited by so many gentlemen on the floor, and I admit that somebody ought to ask questions somewhere during the process of getting money out of the Treasury; but does my colleague think it is suitable for the Bureau to require an applicant for a pension as widow to prove a negative proposition by independent witnesses, such as the proposition that the man she claims to have been her husband was never married before she married him. Now, that is the only foolish question, as it seems to me, that I know of having been propounded to applicants for pension as widows, but that question seems to me to be a very unfair one.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. There is no question that my colleague from New York could ask me that would be foolish; but that question, which you say is asked by the Commissioner of Pensions, I do not feel called upon to pronounce judgment upon this afternoon. I am well aware of the good judgment and wisdom of my colleague from New York, for whom I have generally sympathy on all questions of legislation, and there must be something in any proposition that he propounds, but I do not think it is worth while, in the course of this debate, for me to start out with the proposition that no error of judgment, no mistake in decision has ever been committed by the Commissioner of Pensions. If I were a judge on the bench and my view on any question of what the proof of marriage should be were required, or on the weight of evidence, or on the weight of testimony, were asked me, I should feel bound to answer at once; but all I am attempting to do is to explain my position on this pension question, and to defend the Commissioner of Pensions to the extent of showing that he should not be condemned, that he should not be vilified because in some case it may possibly be alleged with some show of reason or plausibility that he has erred.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. I would like to ask the gentleman if he will yield for one question?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for me to allow all the gentlemen who desire to question me to interrupt me, for this reason: Gentlemen on the other side of the House have had an unbridled run for several days. There has been no attempt to put the slightest check upon their oratorical impulses.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. I want to ask one question merely for information.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding my familiarity with addressing courts and juries and my lesser experience in addressing this House, it is impossible for me to make a continuous argument if I am to be subjected to such constant interruption.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Only for information.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I can not yield. Before passing to the consideration of the rider alleged to be in favor of widows, but which I claim is a mere ad captandum piece of legislation by which it is proposed to give to ladies who it is conceded do not need the money a pension from this Government, before passing to the consideration of that second rider, let me say that if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF] be adopted fraud will be the only question that can be raised by the Pension Bureau. That is to say, for any defect in the claimant's case arising from any illegality patent upon the face of the papers, for any collusive action, for any disability which has arisen subsequent to the original grant of the pension, there will be no remedy or recourse.

The amendment will repeal several sections of the Revised Statutes, viz: Section 4707, relative to dependence; section 4708, relative to remarriage; section 4719, relative to failure to claim pension for three years; section 4720, empowering the Commissioner of Pensions to suspend payment in special-act cases during the recess of Congress, and the act of August 7, 1882, terminating the pension on account of adulterous cohabitation of widow pensioners. If this amendment were adopted the Bureau would have no power to suspend a pension in any of the cases which I have indicated, nor would it have power to suspend a pension in cases of complete recovery. In all these classes of cases the Government would be compelled to continue payment of the pension.

Some statement was made in the course of this debate, either yesterday or the day before, as to the cost of pensions in this country, and one gentleman remarked that the cost of the maintenance of the Russian army was greater than the cost of our pension system. It is true that the cost of maintaining the standing army of Russia is greater than our pension appropriation; that is, it is $186,000,000, while our pension appropriation is $140,000,000. But, Mr. Chairman, Russia is the only country in the world in which the cost of maintaining an immense standing army is not less than the amount which we now appropriate for the payment of pensions. For instance, in Austria-Hungary the cost of maintaining the standing army is $55,235,000; in England it is $89,000,000; in France it is $127,900,000; in Germany it is $118,000,000, and in Russia it is $186,000,000. These are the latest official figures which the War Department has been able to obtain.

In reference to the amount of pensions paid in different countries, I desire to call attention to the fact that the pensions paid in France amount to only about twenty-nine or thirty million dollars; in Germany to $19,500,000; in Austria to $12,000,000, and in Russia to $18,000,000. The gentleman who contradicted me in reference to the cost of the standing army of Russia seemed to fear that the argument might be urged that we ought not to pay for

pensions a sum greater than the cost of maintaining the standing army of any great European country, but the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] interrupted him, and said that the greater the amount paid the larger the pension roll, the greater the encomium which should be passed upon the country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not cite these figures showing the cost of maintaining the standing armies of European countries, or the figures showing the amount which is paid in pensions in European countries, as any argument on either side. I merely give these figures as statements of fact tending to show that under our statutes as they stand to-day we make appropriations which may well be considered by the most ardent advocates of an enlarged pension system to be thoroughly adequate to the needs of the widows and the veterans of the civil war.

It has been said by gentlemen in the course of this debate that I have attacked pensions. It has been said that I am unfriendly to the soldier. I denounce each of these statements as an absolute and unqualified falsehood. I, sir, am in favor, as I announced at the beginning of my speech the other day, of the payment of the pensions now provided for by law. I am in favor of the payment of all those pensions which accrue and are due under the general law, of all the pensions which are accorded either to the soldier or the soldier's widow by reason of disease contracted or injury suffered by him in the service and in the line of duty.

I am further in favor of all the sums being paid to soldiers or to their widows which can be justly claimed under any of the provisions of the dependent pension act, so called, of June 27, 1890; and I so stated explicitly on three or four occasions during my speech a day or two since. I avowed that I was in favor of letting the dependent pension act of June 27, 1890, remain unrepealed upon the statute book. I say further that in meritorious cases, in cases which do not come under the provisions of any existing statute, but cases of special or peculiar hardship, where the claim is clearly meritorious, I have always been and always shall be in favor of special pension acts and of special pension legislation.

Why all this abuse; why all this invective which you have hurled upon my devoted head hour after hour and day after day, instead of having been inspired by proper feelings of gratitude to one whom you owe the opportunity to open your maiden mouths? [Laughter.]

I will further state, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, that I have always aided, in so far as it has been within my power, the claim of every soldier and every soldier's widow or orphan within my district which has ever been brought to me. I have given such aid, also, in many cases beyond the limits of my own Congressional district. But notwithstanding the fact that I have voted in favor of pension legislation in the past, that I have voted in favor of special bills that have been meritorious; in spite of the fact that I announced the other day that I was in favor of all the existing pension laws (that is, in favor of the general laws and in favor of letting the act of 1890 remain upon the statute book) I have been assailed in this long debate upon the ground that because I was not in favor of a further enlargement of the pension rolls I was destitute of patriotism. Gentlemen, is he the patriot who believes that for purposes of political advantage the money wrung from the people of this nation by taxation should be paid out to people who do not really need the money? Has it come to such a pass that no Representative in this House dares to rise and say that he is opposed to the unnecessary expenditure of public funds or to the devotion of public moneys to the payment of pensions to people who do not need those pensions?

And let me say right here that in no part of my speech have I intimated that the payment of just pensions, the payment of pensions to such soldiers or widows as are entitled to them under the existing provisions of law, would be in any way an improper depletion of the revenues of this country or of the funds in the public Treasury. I do not think that such use of public moneys would be improper. But I said that if we were to enter upon the passage of an enormous number of new pension bills—if we were to increase the pension rolls enormously by the addition of persons whose income is now adequate and who are not entitled to the payment of pensions, or by the adoption of that which has been proposed and will be proposed again, a general-service pension, which will burden this country with an additional expenditure of from forty to seventy-five million dollars per annum—I said that such enlargement of the pension rolls would inaugurate a pillage of the public Treasury. But my remarks applied to such enlargement of the pension laws, and in no way to existing pensions or to the existing rights of any pensioner.

I will venture to assert that the opposition to an unnecessary and unjust enlargement of the pension rolls has found favor with others in my party than myself, and with many of our party leaders. When I spoke the other day I did not claim to speak for anybody, for any organization. I spoke as a member of the Committee on Appropriations; I spoke because I felt that it would be wrong, through any fear of misrepresentation or attack, to be silent when a proposition came from our committee to enlarge unnecessarily the existing pension laws. I spoke as a Representative in Congress, mindful of what Noah Webster said in the early days of this century, that a Representative in Congress is not only a representative of his district but a representative of the people, a representative of the whole United States. Let me read to you a few words which have come to me showing that even the widows believe that I am right:

Hon. FRANKLIN BARTLETT:

MY DEAR SIR: I had the pleasure of hearing your very able speech upon pensions, and though now a widow asking for increase of pension, I fully indorse many of your sentiments and believe there are to-day many receiving large sums from the Government who have means sufficient to support them in comfort.

One remark of yours struck me very forcibly. You said, show you the man who had fought in twenty battles and you would vote to have him pensioned accordingly. It was rather a singular circumstance that I held in my hand at that time my husband's military record, from which I could have proven to you that he had fought in several more than twenty battles.

I have also, among other letters, received one from a prominent member of the Union League Club of the city of New York—a club which, as you gentlemen are aware, represents one of the great Republican political subdivisions in my city. This gentleman says:

I am most grateful you had the monumental courage to say some words against the additional pensions. Standing up as you did in the center of a half acre of demagogues and saying what you did marks you a man of courage.

[Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Send that to Brother HOWARD for his book.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the gentleman from New York allow me——

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Let me call attention also to the fact that when the act of 1890 was passed one of the great leaders of the Democratic party in the Senate of the United States, the Senator from Maryland, Mr. GORMAN, said:

It is well known that the vote of Indiana controls the election of President of the United States; and I assert here and now, from the rolls of the Pension Office itself, that pensions are being distributed in that State out of all proportion to the number of soldiers furnished by Indiana in the war.

The Senator from Missouri, Senator VEST, after comparing the number of Indiana pensioners with those of Illinois, said:

Why is this enormous disproportion? Read the report of the examining committees and the evidence taken when Dudley was Commissioner of Pensions and you will find the solution. You will find that it was declared and that it was acted upon, "Give pensions freely, liberally; every man that you pension is made or induced to vote the Republican ticket."

* * * * * * *

Sir, I do not care to indulge in speculations as to how much money will be paid upon these pensions. I shall not be here to see the end of it. But I prophesy that the people of this country will revolt against this system as at present carried on. I know that this money is being distributed, not only among the recipients themselves, but it goes to country merchants, to petty dealers, and therefore it percolates and permeates every neighborhood in the country, and is the largest campaign fund that can possibly be used. But there will come an end to it. The American people are long-suffering and patient, but their common sense and their sense of justice will at last revolt against this abuse of the most generous and holy feeling which a people can entertain toward soldiers.

And the distinguished Senator from Maryland, Senator GORMAN, in speaking of the increase of pensions, said:

You are doing it with full knowledge that you have not made provisions to pay them the amounts that are already due since 1879, and you can not do it; you do not dare to do it, because you can not go before an indignant people, as there is in this country, increasing their taxation at the time when you, as well as we, have promised that the burdens shall be taken from them.

Mr. PICKLER. What was the date of that speech.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. That was about the 23d day of June, 1890.

Mr. HARDY. The State of Maryland does not seem to have agreed with him.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I decline to yield.

That was in the speech delivered by the Senator from Maryland when the conference report was brought in on the act of June 27, 1890.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. And he is sorry he made it now. [Laughter.] He would not do it again.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. It is unnecessary for me to discuss the views of the Senator from Maryland further than to state what were the views entertained by him at the date of his speech on this question.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the views entertained by me are adverse to a further and unnecessary enlargement of the pension roll except in special cases of peculiar merit, or in cases where the circumstances alleged show that the pensioner's claim is meritorious; I desire to call the attention of the committee to the further fact that soldiers who have gone through the civil war have also rendered their judgments in favor of this side of the controversy. Read what Lieutenant Foote said in the protest of the loyal volunteers against the degradation of pensions:

I have earned the right to speak. I stood in the ranks, a loyal volunteer in 1861, and heard the hissing balls when the first guns were fired at the skirm-

ish of Blackburn's Ford, three days before the first battle of Bull Run. I marched with my company at the last grand review at Washington, in 1865. I lost not a day from service between those dates, except when disabled by a wound received at the battle of Fair Oaks. No man can say of me that I am not with those who demand pensions for loyal service because I did not serve or did not suffer. I have written my record with my blood.

And here I have a still higher authority. I have the words of a gentleman, of a great officer in the Union Army, whose name is familiar throughout this whole country, but who, alas! to-day is no longer with us. I refer to Gen. Henry W. Slocum, of the State of New York. His article was entitled "Pensions; time to call a halt," and was written, if I mistake not, in 1891:

Congress is besieged at every session so to change the laws as to increase the roll of pensioners and vastly to increase the expenditures of the Government. I believe that the time has come when this agitation should cease. I earnestly hope that it will be checked for two reasons: First, I believe the tendency of these constant demands will be to lessen the esteem and affection which our people have always felt for the veterans of the late war. The liberty of the people and their desire to be generous toward the nation's defenders have been evinced not only by this vast pension roll, but by the establishment by the General Government of national homes in different sections of the country, and by several States of like institutions. In these homes the disabled veteran is as kindly cared for as in any similar institution supported by any government in the world. Laws have also been passed giving the veterans preference in the employment of the Government. In fact, nothing has been left undone by our people to testify their gratitude to the veteran soldiers.

But I have still a stronger reason for opposing the further agitation of this question, and that is the interest I feel in the welfare of the many thousands of honest and deserving people whose names are now on our pension roll. There is great danger, if we allow the pension-claim agent to represent the soldiers as a body of cormorants who are discontented with what they have received, that sooner or later we shall "kill the goose that lays the golden eggs." It is for the interest of the pension-claim agent constantly to change our pension laws, so as to enable him to bring in new claims, each of which brings money to his coffers. At the rate pensions are now being granted the claim agents are in receipt of $3,500,000 per year. It is this class of men, and not the honest pensioner, who is interested in continuing this agitation. I fear that eventually a reaction will take place and honest and deserving pensioners will suffer with the undeserving.

* * * * * * *

The best friend of the old soldier is not he who is pressing these exhorbitant demands upon our Government, but he who by counseling moderation voluntarily takes the risk of incurring the hatred of the pension-claim agent and the unthinking condemnation of his comrades.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PICKLER. May I ask the gentleman from New York a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, it is getting pretty late. We are to close general debate to-day, and my colleague on the committee [Mr. BLUE] desires to make some remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BLUE], a member of the committee.

Mr. BLUE. Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the committee which prepared this bill, it is proper, I think, that the bill should be fully explained before it is submitted to discussion under the five-minute rule.

On the first item of $140,000,000 the committee made no change from the recommendation of the Commissioner of Pensions, giving the full amount that he estimated would be required for the next fiscal year.

In the item of $800,000, submitted by the Commissioner of Pensions as the needed appropriation, the committee thought best to make a reduction of $50,000. The expenditures of last year were but $729,677.78, and from the information the committee received it was believed that the appropriation would be ample to meet the service.

In the section of the bill pertaining to clerk hire there was in the appropriation bill of last year a provision which the committee has left out, which is in this language:

But the appointment of the clerk to sign official checks, who shall receive the same compensation at each agency as was paid during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, shall be made by the pension agent, without other or further approval.

That, it appears, was amended in the bill last year for the purpose of protecting an appointee of the pension agent at Columbus. The pension agent insisted on appointing his daughter as the clerk to sign pension checks. An amendment was placed on the bill in the Senate, which left the approval to the pension agent himself. Before that time it had been subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. This leaves the bill precisely as the law was prior to that interpolation in the last appropriation bill. That the Commissioner advised, and the committee adopted.

In the item of $500 for fuel the expenditure was $165.05. We reduced the amount to $250 in this bill, which is something more than was expended last year. It seems that fuel is used at only two places, Washington and San Francisco. At the other pension agencies the Secretary of the Treasury furnishes the building and fuel.

In the item of light we have made a reduction of $250, the estimated amount being $750, and the actual expenditure $451.85.

In the further item of $35,000, suggested by the Commissioner of Pensions for stationery and other necessary expenses, it was found that the actual expenditure for last year was $31,136.15; but of that actual expenditure about $1,400 was paid out for clerk hire, which should not be in that item, but should be covered by the appropriation made in another place. We have therefore reduced that item to $30,000 instead of $35,000, and put in the words "exclusive of clerical services."

On the question of rent, the actual expenditure of last year was $23,070. The Commissioner recommended on additional item of $3,000 for the rent of a buildinga t the Buffalo agency.

Mr. DANIELS. I desire to say to the gentleman that I propose to bring that up again by way of amendment.

Mr. BLUE. I will explain it now. The committee refused to place that additional item in the bill for the reason that they regarded $23,070 as sufficient to meet all the rents which the Government should pay. We were informed that a building at Detroit, and also another at Milwaukee, are in course of completion, and that before the money is made available by this appropriation, beginning with the 1st day of next July, the expenditures for rent at Detroit and Milwaukee will be no longer necessary. For that reason we made no addition to the amount for rents.

The bill as reported does not reduce the appropriation for pensions, but it has cut down the other estimates as made by the Commissioner $55,750, as I have stated.

In reference to the amendments proposed by the committee, it was believed that the two provisions incorporated into this bill should go there as a just criticism of the inhospitable and unfriendly action of the Pension Department. They were not made more general, nor to extend beyond the time for which this appropriation is made, by reason of the rule of the Fifty-first Congress, which says:

Nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill, or in any amendment thereto.

It is believed by the committee that these amendments do not change existing law, but that they are a legislative interpretation of what the law is and what it should be interpreted to be, in consonance with what was the ruling of the former administration; and that they are not new legislation, but are simply in the interest of a fair and just interpretation of the existing law, for the protection of the pensioner, during the time this money is to be expended.

That, in substance, is the explanation of the bill as reported. It is not my purpose at this time to enter into any general discussion of the subject of pensions, and were it not for the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] has indulged in some expressions which seem to need reply, I should not at this time say anything further.

At some time in the future I hope to claim indulgence for the purpose of speaking upon the question of pensions at some length, when a measure is here upon that subject.

The gentleman from New York seems to be aggrieved at the treatment he has received, and what seems to have troubled his fastidious taste more than anything else is that some gentleman from Michigan, as he recollects the fact, spoke of some of his language as "rot."

Now, Mr. Chairman, that may not have been as elegant as it was expressive, but I think that the committee will bear me out in saying that it was quite as elegant as the language of the cultured gentleman from New York who spoke of "looting the Treasury." It is also quite as elegant as the expression in the anonymous communication which he has just read to this House, speaking of this House as being "an acre of demagogues." The gentleman seems to be fresh from the classics, and prides himself upon the use of the English language; but I apprehend when he consults with other gentlemen around him, who are equally as cultured, he will feel that the gentleman from Michigan, although coming from the Western country, was equally as elegant and tasteful as he in the selection of his phrases.

Now, the gentleman has quoted Noah Webster, as I recollect him, as giving the proper definition of the duties of a Representative upon this floor. I shall not differ with him in regard to the definition, in the main, but, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that a constituency that sends a representative here is responsible for him. [Laughter.] And while I would not disparage the loyalty of the great city of New York, with its splendid patriotism and the heroism of its soldiers, I do say that a constituency that sends a representative here who talks as he does ought to answer for the man who pretends to represent them. [Laughter and applause.] We have been deluged on this floor with circulars and letters and comments of the press criticising the action of the representatives of the people in standing up for the honor of this nation, in asserting the rights of this Republic against the aggressions of Great Britain; and where do they come from? They come from a place so near the gentleman's district that it seemed to me when I heard him that he must properly represent a constituency somewhere there, a constituency boasting of its wealth, but which

would seem to place dollars above patriotism and pelf above that higher duty we all owe to a common country.

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade;
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroy'd can never be supplied.

[Applause.]

It was from the farms and workshops, from the hives of industry, from the homes of this great Republic that the men came who bore the heat and burden of this great conflict. Simple and plain were they, but they represented the great heart of the people of this splendid nation. And in that hour when they were offering their lives that the nation might live, throughout this broad land, everywhere above Mason and Dixon's line, the common sentiment was that the disabled soldier and the widow and orphan of the soldier should be cared for. There were put on the statute books of those times the pension laws of this great Republic, and a very large proportion of the men who are now the care of this nation, the wards of this great Republic, enlisted after very liberal provisions for pensions were put upon the statute books, enlisted after that chosen leader of Republican conviction had annunciated the doctrine that "to care for him who has borne the battle and for his widow and orphan is a sacred obligation of this nation." That has come down to us as from a prophet of old from a man whose fame and great name will last long after this Republic shall have ceased to exist.

And now, my fellow-citizens. [Great laughter.] Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I had gotten out of the presence of the gentleman from New York into the greater presence of the plain people of this country. [Renewed laughter and applause.] If the gentleman from New York had recalled the expressions that he used he certainly could not have found it in his heart to speak of being insulted from this side, and when a member stands in his place and reads encomiums of himself and fails to give names of authors, it seems to me that those encomiums are of doubtful origin and doubtful authority. [Renewed laughter and applause.]

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] says the Republican side owes him a debt of gratitude for his criticism of proposed pension legislation. In that he is correct. No more potent or convincing argument could be offered in support of the policies of the Republican party than the gentleman's assault upon its liberal pension provisions.

The gentleman also wanders off into the classics, and speaks of the rents which the envious Cascas proposed to make in his garment. If the gentleman harbors the idea that any member on this side of the House envies him the reputation he has won in this debate, he is mistaken.

I do not know how true it is, but it is intimated to me that the gentleman from New York is a constituent of his colleague, Mr. CUMMINGS. If that be so, his speech has already been answered. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to interrupt.

Mr. BLUE. I will be more generous than you were in permitting interruptions.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I have the honor to be the constituent of the Hon. JAMES J. WALSH. I have not the pleasure of being the constituent of the Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS.

Mr. BLUE. Of whom did you say you were the constituent?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. WALSH.

Mr. BLUE. You are a constituent of Mr. WALSH. It had been suggested to me that you did not reside in your district, and you seem to be willing to testify in that direction yourself. [Laughter.] That being the case, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to pursue that inquiry any further.

In conclusion, permit me to say that it is my judgment that we ought to put this bill through with very few, if any more, amendments. That rule of the Fifty-first Congress has been to a certain extent the rule of this body, I understand, for many years. It is in the interest of good legislation. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] has intimated clearly and distinctly his purpose and intention to bring into this body some general pension legislation soon. This is a matter of appropriation of money, and under the rules it seems to me that we ought not to waste any great length of time in seeking to amend this bill, but should pass it promptly, so that the Senate may get to it.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DINGLEY, from the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriation for payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, before making the motion to adjourn, I desire to announce that to-morrow we shall take up this bill by paragraphs under the five-minute rule.

ARANSAS PASS.

Mr. HOOKER, by unanimous consent, reported from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors the bill to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, entitled "An act for improving Aransas Pass," etc., with a substitute therefor; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled Senate bill 628, to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami;* when the Speaker signed the same.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have an order made for a reprint of the bill No. 3543, introduced by me, for the purpose of preventing the improper discontinuance of pensions. Many members desire to examine the bill and the supply is exhausted, so that even the committee have not a sufficient number of copies.

There being no objection, the reprint was ordered.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY].

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE COGSWELL OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, as the successor to the seat of Gen. William Cogswell it is my painful office to formally announce the intelligence of his death in this city on the 22d day of May of last year. General Cogswell was a member of the Fiftieth, the Fifty-first, the Fifty-second, and the Fifty-third Congresses, and was elected, by a majority that swept away party lines in his district, to membership in this House. I need not call the attention of those members who served with him to the fidelity with which he always performed every public duty. It is not my purpose at this time to enter into any extended eulogy of his life and services, but at some later day I shall ask the House to set apart a time when its membership may express formally their appreciation of his life, his character, and his services. I content myself now with sending to the desk resolutions which I ask the House to adopt in honor of his memory.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. William Cogswell, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the House do now adjourn.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted; and in pursuance thereof the House (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation for removal of certain furniture and records from the custom-house building in Chicago, etc.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy relating to a deficiency in the "Contingent, Navy," appropriation—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service relating to officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service on detached duty during 1896 with the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of State, submitting an estimate of appropriation for the clerical force in the Bureau of Statistics for the remainder of the current fiscal year, and for the fiscal year 1897—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the finding filed by the court in the case of James P. Layne, administrator of Elizabeth Layne, deceased, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS.

Mr. BARNEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 103) relating to final proof in timber-culture entries, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 56) in writing thereon; which

said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1179) to repeal section 1218 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by chapter 46 of the laws of 1884 relating to appointments of officers in the Army or Navy of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 55) in writing thereon; which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the printing of 1,500 extra copies of the annual report of the Commissioner of Railroads for the year 1895, with appendixes, for the use of the Commissioner of Railroads, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 57) in writing thereon; which said concurrent resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. WOOD: The bill (H. R. 711) to increase the pension of Uzziel B. Church. (Report No. 58.)

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: The bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to Caroline Parker. (Report No. 59.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 1616) to pension Michael E. Bricker, of Edgerton, Ind. (Report No. 60.)

By Mr. MILLS: The bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane Dulany. (Report No. 61.)

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas: The bill (H. R. 2800) granting a pension to Martha Brooks. (Report No. 62.)

By Mr. POOLE: The bill (H. R. 952) granting a pension to Susan D. Wright. (Report No. 63.)

By Mr. KERR: The bill (H. R. 995) granting a pension to Kate A. Pitman. (Report No. 64.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 4141) to reduce the compensation of all persons in public service and thereby to meet the deficiency in the Treasury—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 4142) to protect settlement rights where two or more persons settle upon the same subdivision of agricultural public lands before survey thereof—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4143) to increase the efficiency of the Marine Corps, and to equalize the grades of officers therein—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE: A bill (H. R. 4144) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the times and places to hold terms of the United States courts in the State of Washington"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE: A bill (H. R. 4146) to authorize the First National Bank of Sprague, Wash., to change its location and name—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CULBERSON: A bill (H. R. 4147) to authorize the Chickasaw Nation of Indians to bring suit against the United States in the Court of Claims—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): A bill (H. R. 4148) to license billiard and pool tables in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4149) in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 4150) to separate the duties of professor of ethics, etc., from those of chaplain at the United States Military Academy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 4151) to make Aransas Pass, Tex., a subport of entry—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 4152) for the construction of two steam revenue-cutters for service on the Pacific Coast—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4153) to grant the Fort Smith and Western Coal Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4154) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional judges of the United States court in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 4155) to provide for the completion of the improvements of the Falls of the Ohio River at and near Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 4156) to amend the postal laws providing limited indemnity for loss of registered mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4157) to amend the postal laws relating to use of postal cards—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 4158) to abolish the fee system for the payment of officers of United States courts and pay them salaries instead—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4159) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the transportation and one year's subsistence of 274 Creek Indians, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4160) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvements on the Willamette River above Portland, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4161) providing an appropriation for the improvement of the Nestugga River, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4162) providing for the improvement of navigation of the Alsea River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4163) providing an appropriation for the improvement of the navigation of Coos River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4164) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvements on the Willamette and Columbia rivers below Portland, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4165) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Siuslaw River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4166) providing an appropriation for the improvements at the entrance to Yaquina Bay, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4167) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvements in the navigation of Tillamook Bay, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4168) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvements at the entrance to Coos Bay, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4169) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Nehalem River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4170) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvements at the mouth of the Coquille River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4171) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvements on the upper waters of the Coquille River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4172) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Umpqua River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4173) providing an appropriation for the improvement of the Alsea River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4174) providing an appropriation for the improvement of the harbor of Port Orford, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 4175) to restore the pensions of widows in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 4176) to extend the uses of the mail service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 4177) to enable naval courts-martial and courts of inquiry to secure the attendance and testimony of civilian witnesses—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4178) providing for the use by the United States of devices covered by letters patent—to the Committee on Patents.

Also a bill (H. R. 4179) to amend section 3719 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 4241) for improving Aransas Pass—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MAHANY: A joint resolution (H. Res. 86) directing the Secretary of War to provide and to distribute to the National Guard of New York the medals promised them by General Order No. 195 of the War Department, for services rendered at President Lincoln's call in 1863—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: A resolution (House Res. No. 116) for the relief of the estate of the late Lycurgus Dalton, late Postmaster of the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Acconnts.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A memorial from the legislature of New York State relating to canals—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A memorial from the senate of the State of New York relating to maintenance of canals—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. PAYNE: A memorial from the legislature of the State of New York in reference to canals—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. ELLIS: A memorial from the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, asking the forfeiture of unearned land grants in what is known as the quadrant in Oregon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a memorial from the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, asking that a portion of the Cascade Forest Reserve in Oregon be opened to settlement—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a memorial from the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, asking for the appointment of a guardian for Crater Lake Reserve, in Oregon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a memorial from the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, asking legislation to protect the eggs of wild fowl on their breeding grounds in the Territory of Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the following changes of reference were made:

The bill (H. R. 3384) granting a pension to Mrs. Ann Smith—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1883) for the relief of David Vickers—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1033) for the relief of Mrs. R. C. Jones—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1103) granting a pension to James V. Burch—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1226) granting a pension to John W. Starr—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1330) granting a pension to Mary Jane Debois—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1610) granting a pension to Jane L. Buckingham—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1786) granting an increase of pension to John W. Owens—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2848) for the relief of Archibald P. Cooper—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 3051) for the relief of Lucy A. Branham—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 3155) granting a pension to Annie E. Park—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 138) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hazlip—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 157) restoring Julia L. Roberts, late Julia L. Doty, to the pension rolls—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 158) granting a pension to Mary Collins—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 3759) granting an increase of pension to Edward Geller, of Toronto, Kans.—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 3721) for the relief of Sarah J. Warren—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 3256) for the relief of Alfred T. Morey—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 3310) granting a pension to Patrick Bogan—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2476) granting a pension to George W. Eveleth—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 3059) for the relief of Sarah A. Moore—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2195) to increase the pension of James F. Campbell—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2842) to place the name of Mary A. Fowler upon the pension roll—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1043) granting a pension to Mrs. Hannah Flanders—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1627) to pension Mrs. Elizabeth T. Palmatier—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 967) for the relief of Theodore Huesman—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 1040) granting a pension to Mrs. Nancy T. Eastman—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 494) granting a pension to Christopher Rupp, of Pennsylvania—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 676) for the relief of Newton L. Crow—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 3605) granting a pension to Grotius N. Udell—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 3495) granting a pension to Isabella Clary—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2034) for the relief of Patrick Montgomery—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

Memorial of Ed Hamlin Post, Grand Army of the Republic, as to pensions—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 2241) for the relief of Francis Scala—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC,

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 4180) for the relief of William S. Dugger, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4181) for the relief of William L. Dugger, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 4182) granting increase of pension to Georgianna C. Hall, dependent mother of Maj. John W. Williams, deceased, late surgeon, United States Army—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 4183) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Peter Gehm, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment of Illinois Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4184) granting a pension to Nancy Hollenbank, formerly Nancy Boaz, formerly Nancy Yeley, a hospital nurse during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 4185) for the relief of Warren Hall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 4186) to correct the military record of John G. Riley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4187) to correct the military record of Ebbert Sutton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4188) to correct the military record of Joseph Graham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 4189) for the relief of Capt. James Regan, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 4190) to reimburse Isaac D. Armstrong for stolen bonds—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 4191) granting a pension to George Schamberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 4192) to correct the military record of James K. P. Summers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4193) to correct the military record of William F. Souger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4194) to correct the military record of Frank B. Lamb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4195) for the relief of Charles H. Peirce—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4196) to pension John Hoffman for services in Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4197) to pension Josiah Biggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4198) to pension J. E. Allen, of Company D, Second Regiment California Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4199) to correct the military record of Edward H. Munson, late a private in Company H, Thirty-second New York Regiment Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 4200) to authorize and direct the Auditor for the Post-Office Department to credit the account of George H. Tice, postmaster at Perth Amboy, N. J., for postage stamps and money-order funds stolen from his office—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4201) granting a pension to Nicholas Gardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 4202) directing the Quartermaster-General to certify and transmit to the Court of Claims all papers on file in his office pertaining to the claim of the heirs of Samuel Mitchell, deceased, for the value of a horse taken by the United States troops in the Morgan raid—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4203) to pay Mary Galley $5,503, with interest from the 21st day of March, A. D. 1864, for the destruction of her property by the Seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4204) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to place the name of John P. Biehn on the pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4205) for the relief of Dr. William A. Johnson, late a contract surgeon in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4206) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of William T. Scales for compensation for the loss of his flouring mill and contents, located at California, Ky., on the 10th day of September, 1862, by order of Gen. Lew Wallace—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4207) directing the Quartermaster-General to certify and transmit to the Court of Claims all papers on file in his office pertaining to the claim of Israel Dehass, for the value of a horse taken by the United States troops in the Morgan raid—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEIGHTY: A bill (H. R. 4208) granting pension to William Sible, of Hellers Corners, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 4209) for the relief of Abraham C. Bryan, of Traphill, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4210) for the relief of Abram C. Bryan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTON: A bill (H. R. 4211) granting a pension to William Lagore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4212) to correct the military record of Almon McNinch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4213) granting a pension to Victor M. Cromwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 4214) for the relief of John W. Ferris—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4215) for the relief of James L. Ord, lately acting assistant surgeon in the United States Army—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4216) granting a pension to George Sylvester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 4217) granting a pension to Julia Beauchamp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 4218) for the relief of Richard H. Marshall, heir of Louisa Sommers, deceased, late of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4219) for the relief of the legal representatives of James B. McNair, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 4220) granting a pension to Charles A. Foster, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 4221) for removal of charge of desertion against George M. Totten, late Company G, Fifty-eighth Regiment Illinois Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4222) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4223) for the relief of Curtis P. Wise—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4224) for the relief of Thomas J. Spencer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4225) for the relief of John A. Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4226) for the relief of John J. Vincent—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4227) for the relief of Emeline E. Musgrave—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4228) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Amos B. Howland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNOVER: A bill (H. R. 4229) for the relief of J. Seymour Taylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4230) for the relief of Newell A. Burrows—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4231) for the relief of James E. Morrill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4232) to restore Edward L. Bailey to the United States Army and to place him on the retired list with the rank of captain of infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 4233) granting a pension to Henry M. Hyde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4234) granting a pension to Martha E. Grant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 4235) granting a pension to Adelia A. Eastman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4236) granting a pension to Lorada Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 4237) granting a bounty to Thomas W. Kirby—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 4238) for relief of Sarah McClenachan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 4239) to pension Garrett H. Wilber—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 4240) granting an increase of pension to Dexter B. Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Three petitions, respectively, of 73 citizens of Connellsville, New Haven, and vicinity, Fayette County; 122 citizens of Blair, Camden, Coal Valley, Mendelssohn, and vicinity, Allegheny County, and 163 citizens of McKeesport, Reynoldton, Christy Park, Duquesne, and vicinity, Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of a public meeting held at Claysville, Pa., on the trouble in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: Memorial of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela relative to the boundary of the latter and the intervention of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT of New York: Paper relating to first-mortgage bondholders of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, by H. Livingston Rogers, petitioning that the Government unite its $7,250,000 of its first-mortgage bonds in protecting the first mortgage, etc.—to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. BENNETT: Resolutions passed at a meeting in the Puritan Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., January 10, 1896, protesting against the atrocities in Armenia, and beseeching Congress to use such means as will protect Christian missionaries—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petition of 70 citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., in favor of the William A. Stone immigration bill, to secure a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: Petition of A. E. Chase and 200 other citizens of Oshkosh, Wis., favoring the passage of House bill No. 58, known as the William A. Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALZELL: Memorial of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela relative to the boundary of the latter and the intervention of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON: Twelve petitions, severally, of H. F. Berry and others, J. R. Bartlett and others, B. W. Hall and others, W. B. Jolliffe and others, Elza Shackleford and others, S. C. Reed and others, Ira Moore and others, A. F. Hamilton and others, L. D. Beatty and others, D. W. Huey and others, W. D. Watson and

others, and Lloyd Douglas and others, praying the passage of the William A. Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Joseph Graham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany a bill to correct the military record of John G. Riley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for pension for Garrett H. Wilber—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: Memorial of the J. L. Mott Iron Works, Mott Haven, N. Y., and 702 others, requesting that the Fifty-fourth Congress will authorize the Secretary of War to contract with Charles Stoughton and his associates for the entire work of constructing a canal through the Harlem Kills, New York, 15 feet deep and 300 feet wide, for a sum not exceeding $1,450,000—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FOOTE: Resolution passed at a union meeting of the churches of Malone, N. Y., January 12, 1896, in regard to the protection of Christians in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: Petition of citizens of Tamarac, Pa., praying for a change in the immigration laws, to secure a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGER: Petition of G. C. Wilke and 150 other citizens of Missouri Valley, Iowa, asking for favorable action on bill to secure a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela, relative to the boundary of the latter and the intervention of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Petition of Ellen Bradley, mother of John J. Bradley, Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions adopted at a mass meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, relating to the Cuban struggle—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: Resolutions of the Grand Army of the Republic for the Department of Indiana, asking pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3872, increasing the pension of William S. Dematt to $50 a month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4097, for the relief of James C. Wheat, of Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4098, for the relief of Thomas F. Ryan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HICKS: Eight petitions, severally, of Lyman Sherbine and other citizens of Wilmore; W. L. Hite and other citizens of Belsano; L. B. Fasick and others, of Belsano; J. Lingenfelter and others, of Freedom Township, Beaver County; J. E. Rowland and others, of Pendleton, Cambria County; together with three petitions of citizens of Somerset County, Pa., praying for enactment of laws restricting immigration and for the William A. Stone bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Jacob Acker, George W. Garner, Levi Acker, and 40 other citizens of Drab, Blair County, Pa., praying for an act of Congress to pay fourth-class postmasters' rent—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KNOX: Resolutions of the High Street Church, Lowell, Mass., in reference to the Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEONARD: Petition of citizens of Tioga and Lycoming counties, Pa., praying for the passage of legislation restricting immigration—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of citizens of Mifflinburg, Pa., praying Congress to take some action for the protection of Armenian citizens in Turkey—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, two petitions of citizens of Mercersburg and Fulton County, Pa., praying for the passage of the William A. Stone bill to restrict immigration—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: Two petitions, respectively, of D. W. Rhodes, C. T. McCoy, and 30 others; J. W. Williamson, G. W. Brownell, Monroe Miller, and 45 others, all citizens of West Virginia, praying for the passage of the William A. Stone bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDELL: Petition of W. O. Owen, W. H. Richards, and 158 other citizens of Laramie and Cheyenne, Wyo., in favor of the passage of the William A. Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE: Two petitions, respectively, of Henry E. Standish and 18 others, and Henry W. Sears and 3 other citizens of Middleboro, Mass., praying that Congress pass legislation raising the standard of immigrants admitted to the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OWENS: Petition of James H. Gifford, of Kentucky, praying for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of Charles A. Foster, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, to accompany House bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PITNEY: Petition of William H. Ward and 144 other citizens of Morris County, N. J., in favor of the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Resolutions of the Cincinnati Daily Newspaper Association, asking for change in rate of postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SKINNER: Petition of G. H. Brown, jr., and 19 other citizens of Washington, N. C., asking for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Letter from Prof. Henry S. Williams, Yale College, concerning Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAHLE: Three petitions, respectively, of 136 citizens of West Fairview, 64 citizens of Cumberland County, and 60 citizens of York County, Pa., in favor of the passage of the bill to regulate immigration, known as the William A. Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic of Indiana, through the adjutant-general thereof, R. M. Smock, of Indianapolis, Ind., asking that honorably discharged Union soldiers be placed on the pension roll at $8 per month when they have arrived at the age of 60 years—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Robert M. Snodgrass, commander of John Stewart Post, No. 310, of Reed, Delaware County, Ind., asking that a service pension of $8 per month be granted to the surviving veterans of the war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALBERT: Petition of citizens of Hampton City, S. C., for the passage of bills now pending in Congress for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TRACEY: Papers relating to House bill No. 881, for the relief of persons who made cash entries at double minimum prices—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WANGER: Memorial of representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to the President and Congress of the United States, on the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela relative to the boundary of the latter and the intervention of the United States, favoring arbitration and deprecating the holding out of any menace by the President—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of George E. Hammon, Thomas Pettman, and 141 other citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 17, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct a slight error in the Journal. The report which I made yesterday was from the Committee on Indian Affairs, not from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The correction will be made.

The Journal as corrected was approved.

ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL.

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the desk, and for which I ask present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Library be instructed to ascertain the cause of the delay in completing the chiaro-oscuro (light and shade) by Mr. Costogini, in the Rotunda of the Capitol, and whether or not it would be advisable to remove the scaffolding still remaining for the use of completing the painting, and to report to the House the result of the investigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. SAYERS. Let us have some explanation of it.

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman will be recognized for that purpose.

Mr. HOWE. There is an unsightly scaffolding in the Rotunda of

this Capitol building, which has been there for seven years, unused, defacing the beauty of the Rotunda. The resolution which I have just offered is intended to hasten the completion of the historical decoration of the Rotunda, and thereby to hasten the removal of this scaffolding.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will permit me, I will suggest that we should remove the cause of the scaffolding, namely, the sinecure office under the title of "Architect of the Capitol Extension." Then we shall have the Capitol all right. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution proposes to refer the subject to the Joint Committee on the Library, that they may investigate it and use their own judgment as to the recommendation that they shall make. My object in presenting the resolution is simply to get rid of this unsightly scaffolding, which, as I have already said, has been there for seven years unused.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

DISTRIBUTION OF NAVAL RECORDS.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution, for which I ask present consideration by the House, and, as it concerns the convenience of very many members, I shall ask the privilege, after it is read, of explaining with great brevity its purpose and effect.

The Clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H. Res. 88) authorizing the distribution of copies of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in Congressional districts where distribution has not been made.

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to send the undistributed copies of the Official Records of the War of the Rebellion, both of the Union and of the Confederate navies, to such libraries, organizations, and individuals as may be designated before the meeting of the next Congress by the Representatives in the Fifty-fourth Congress of the districts whose Representatives in the Fifty-third Congress failed to designate the distributees of their quota of said official records or any part thereof, as authorized by the act of Congress approved July 31, 1894, and the joint resolution approved March 2, 1895, to the extent and in the manner and form provided in said act.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has received the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, as will be manifest from a letter which I shall shortly send to the desk. The publication and distribution of these Naval Records were originally authorized by an appropriation act of 1894, which provided that there should be an equal distribution in every Congressional district by the members of the Fifty-third Congress. A resolution passed by Congress on the 2d of March, 1895, provided that the privilege of distributing those records should expire at the beginning of the present Congress. Accordingly those members of the Fifty-third Congress who failed to distribute their quota of these important documents before the opening of the present Congress have lost their right of distribution for their respective districts. There are three districts, including my own, where no distribution has been made, and there are many districts where only a partial distribution has been made.

I send to the desk and ask to have read two letters—one from the superintendent of these Naval War Records and the other from the Secretary of the Navy to the chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, LIBRARY AND NAVAL WAR RECORDS,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1896.

SIR: 1. In reference to our conversation of this morning, in regard to the introduction of the proposed joint resolution, authorizing the distribution of copies of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion in the Congressional districts where the distribution has not yet been made, I have to advise you that I have submitted the proposition to the Secretary of the Navy, and the subject meets his entire approval. He is of the opinion that the draft of the joint resolution you were good enough to prepare and leave for his inspection covers the entire ground, with the exception that there ought to be introduced some limit of time as to when the distribution should be completed.

2. I therefore return the draft to you as prepared, with an official letter upon the subject which the Secretary has addressed to Chairman BOUTELLE, of the Naval Committee. May I ask the favor of you that you will present the letter to Mr. BOUTELLE, as the Secretary directed that I forward it to him through you?

Very respectfully,
RICHARD RUSH,
Superintendent Naval War Records.

Hon. WILLIAM H. MOODY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, January 14, 1896.*

SIR: The act of Congress approved July 31, 1894, authorizing the publication and distribution of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion provides that all sets of these records which were not distributed by the members of the Fifty-third Congress shall be sold by the Secretary of the Navy for the cost of publication, with 10 per cent added thereto, and the proceeds of such sale shall be covered into the Treasury. The joint resolution of March 2, 1895, extended the time of distribution until the assembling of the present Congress.

There are now a number of sets of this publication (as far as published) in this Department, which being the balance of the unassigned Congressional quota, are now subject to sale by the terms of the law. In view of the fact that the Department has received numerous applications from members of the Fifty-fourth Congress for these unexpended quotas, I have not yet placed them upon sale, deeming it best that the present Congress should have an opportunity to express its wishes in the matter, should it so desire.

If, therefore, it is the pleasure of Congress that the distribution of these unexpended copies should be made in the Congressional districts which have not yet received their full quotas, I beg leave to call your attention to the fact that it could easily be accomplished without any additional expense by means of a joint resolution directing this Department to distribute these volumes upon the orders of the members of the Fifty-fourth Congress whose districts have not yet received their full quotas. The Department would be very glad if Congress would make this disposition of the remaining sets.

Very respectfully,
H. A. HERBERT, *Secretary.*

Hon. CHARLES A. BOUTELLE,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say——

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I ask that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee. I object to its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

Some time subsequently,

Mr. MOODY said: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT], having examined the resolution I offered a short time ago, is willing to withdraw his objection, and I now renew my request for the present consideration and the passage of the resolution.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the resolution again reported.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that it should be again read.

The resolution was again reported.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOODY. I beg the indulgence of the House for a few moments to explain again the purpose and effect of the resolution. Gentlemen on both sides of the House apparently apprehended that its purpose was to throw the undistributed Naval Records of the War of the Rebellion into a pool and distribute them among the new members. That is a mistake. It has no such purpose or effect. The only object is to secure the proper and equitable distribution of these volumes. It was submitted to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. BOUTELLE], whose absence at this present moment I regret, and who had himself failed to distribute the whole of his quota of 19 copies. He could not do so because under a resolution passed in March, 1895, the right to do it determined on the assembling of the Fifty-fourth Congress.

Now, there are many gentlemen—the gentleman from New York among others—in the House who have failed to distribute their full quotas, and can not do so now, as indicated by the letter read from the Secretary of the Navy, unless the authority is given by this resolution to the Secretary.

The only purpose is to allow those districts which have failed, either in whole or in part, to receive the 19 copies to which each district is entitled to receive the remaining copies to which they are entitled. In my own district the illness and death of my predecessor, General Cogswell, prevented any distribution at all. Under this resolution I shall have the right to distribute the 19 copies already allotted to the Sixth Massachusetts district and now in the custody of the Secretary of the Navy. It will allow the gentleman from New York to distribute his one copy which remains undistributed. It will allow those gentlemen who have failed to designate the distributees of their quotas to do so. If this resolution does not pass the effect will be that under the law the Secretary of the Navy must take all the copies of these records not already distributed and sell them to the public. I trust that will not be allowed.

Mr. HULL. My understanding was that there was a law passed by both Houses and signed by the President, which provided that in the event these documents were not distributed they should go to the Secretary of the Navy and be sold. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's resolution, and the question I wish to ask him is, will this resolution change that law?

Mr. MOODY. It will change the law. The Secretary of the Navy, who has possession of these copies, holds that it will change the law, and on its passage he will immediately distribute to any district which has not already its full quota the remaining number of these records to which that district is entitled.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It was almost impossible for me to catch the purport of the resolution from listening to the reading of it from the desk. I want to ask the gentleman if there is to be a distribution of any more than the documents which remain undistributed by members of the Fifty-third Congress who failed to make the distribution? Does it authorize the Secretary to go beyond the distribution of those that remain undistributed?

Mr. MOODY. It does not authorize the distribution of a single additional copy, and it does not change the destination from one district to another of a single copy of the records. It only carries out the purpose of the original act, which has failed, owing to the negligence or failure of Representatives to distribute their allotted quota.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Do I understand that the gentle-

man's joint resolution in any way reduces the quota of gentlemen who failed to make the designation in the last Congress?

Mr. MOODY. It does not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

LEASING OF AMERICAN ISLAND, SOUTH DAKOTA.

Mr. STEPHENSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an act entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 21 of an act entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889, be, nd the same is hereby, a mended by adding to said section the following:

"That the said city of Chamberlain, by and through its regular city council, shall have authority to either by itself or under a system of leases, securing a revenue to the city, to use or lease said island for public assemblies of a religious, literary, political, or scientific character; to use or lease the same for fair grounds or driving-park purposes; the right to improve, use, or lease to improve and use, the springs on said island for sanitarium and bathing purposes, together with the right to erect such buildings and make such improvements as may be necessary to provide for the comfort and convenience of those connected therewith or visiting said island for any of the purposes named, the said city council at all times having authority to control and regulate all the fees or charges made by any person or association thereon for any of the purposes herein enumerated, and full authority to construct roadways, and lay out said island into grounds, parks, or lots suitable for the uses herein allowed and provided for, said island always remaining free to the public for the ordinary uses of a public park: *Provided*, That such leases shall not in the aggregate embrace or cover more than one-third the area of said island."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let us have some explanation of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] asks that an explanation be made. With the consent of the House, an explanation may be given.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under section 21 of "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889, there was granted to the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak., American Island, situated in the Missouri River adjacent to said city, in area about 640 acres, and covered with a heavy growth of beautiful and heavy timber.

The act referred to provided that the city should use the island for a public park, and that it at all times should remain open to the public for such purpose. The city has complied with the provisions of the law, and it is contemplated to improve the island in compliance with the original purpose of the act. To do this will necessitate a large outlay, and the city at this time is not in position from its own resources to carry out the extensive improvements proposed. There is located upon the island a warm mineral spring possessing great medicinal properties, and capital is ready to be invested to utilize the waters and to construct a sanitarium for that purpose. It is also contemplated to expend money in the construction of suitable buildings and beautifying the grounds adjacent for Chautauqua assemblies and for literary purposes. It is further proposed to prepare grounds and construct buildings for agricultural fairs and driving-park purposes.

This bill provides that the act of 1889 shall in no way be violated, but that the original purpose, the dedication of this island as a public park, to which the public shall have free access at all times, shall be faithfully carried out.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What advantage will this be to the city?

Mr. GAMBLE. The city has not the means with which to carry out the improvements at present. Capital is ready to be invested in the making of the improvements, and without the authority given by the present bill the parties who are ready to make the proposed improvements will decline to do so.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What franchises will capitalists acquire under this bill?

Mr. GAMBLE. Under the original act there is a question whether the city has any authority to lease the grounds, so that under the present law capital will not be invested; but under the bill now proposed such investments will be made and these improvements carried out to the advantage of the city.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then this bill gives the city the power to lease?

Mr. GAMBLE. That is all; and it applies only to one-third of the original tract.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from South Dakota a question. Has this been referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. GAMBLE. No, sir, it has not; but it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, which has jurisdiction of the subject, and has been favorably reported by that committee in the form of a substitute embodying the same bill as originally introduced by myself, only eliminating from it the preamble, and embodying a further provision that only one-third of it shall be used for this purpose.

Mr. PICKLER. The island in question belongs to the State by a former act of Congress, anyway,

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, and was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GAMBLE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

On motion of Mr. HURLEY, by unanimous consent, the bill (H. R. 2758) entitled "An act to fix the standard of weights and measures," was ordered to be reprinted.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, before moving that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, I desire to have the reference of a bill corrected. It was referred by mistake to the Committee on War Claims, but should have gone to the Committee on Claims. I ask that the bill (H. R. 3715) for the relief of Capt. William J. Kountz be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the change of reference indicated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (S. 30) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," approved March 2, 1893; and

A bill (S. 43) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes,' approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved and signed a joint resolution of the following title:

On January 14, 1896:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 19) for filling vacancy on Board of Regents, Smithsonian Institution.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following joint resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 39) making an appropriation to defray the joint expense of locating the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and the British North American territory—to the Committee on Appropriations.

EULOGIES OF DECEASED MEMBERS.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania; upon the Hon. Marcus C. Lisle, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky, and upon the Hon. George W. Houk, late a Representative from the State of Ohio, be printed, as required by law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I should like to have an explanation as to why these eulogies have not been printed before. This is a very unusual resolution.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I will say that this resolution was introduced by request of the Clerk of the House. He states that the concurrent resolution which passed the House at the last session failed to pass the Senate, and that while the printing law provides for the printing of a certain number of eulogies upon the death of each member, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing requires notice by concurrent resolution of the death of the member. It only refers to the printing of the number of copies required by law.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was absent when this resolution was read, and did not hear it reported.

The SPEAKER. The resolution can be reported again, if the gentleman desires, and if no objection is made.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PERKINS] that it is simply a notice from the two Houses of Congress to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing that these members are deceased.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I hardly understand the necessity for the resolution, if it only calls for the printing in accordance with law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman says it is to give official notice to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing that it is proper to print.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman will allow me a moment, as I understand it now this resolution which the gentleman has introduced is an exact copy of the resolutions which we have heretofore passed providing for the printing of eulogies?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. That is it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The printing law provides how these eulogies shall be printed, and the number that shall be printed, and their distribution. It has been usual, however, since that law was passed, to introduce these concurrent resolutions and have them referred and reported back, with an estimate of the cost. I shall not object to the consideration of this resolution, in view of the fact that these gentlemen were members of the last Congress, and the eulogies should have been ordered to be printed by the last Congress.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. And only failed to do so on account of the concurrent resolution not passing the Senate.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The resolution is proper, in my judgment, and ought to pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

UNAUTHORIZED GRANTS OF PUBLIC LAND.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress:

I desire to invite attention to the necessity for prompt legislation in order to remove the limitation of the time within which suits may be brought by the Government to annul unlawful or unauthorized grants of public lands.

By the act of March 3, 1887 (24 Stats., 556), the Secretary of the Interior is directed to adjust each of the railroad land grants which may be unadjusted, and it is provided, if it shall appear upon the completion of such adjustment, or sooner, that the lands have been from any cause erroneously certified or patented by the United States to or for the use of a company claiming under any of said grants, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to demand a reconveyance of the title to all lands so erroneously certified or patented, and on failure of the company to make such reconveyance within ninety days the Attorney-General is required to institute and prosecute in the proper courts necessary proceedings to restore title to said lands to the United States. The demands made under this act have been numerous, and in some cases have resulted in the reinvestment of title to the lands in the United States upon demand, but in most cases the demand has been refused and suits have been necessary.

The work of adjustment has been unavoidably slow. The said act makes provision for the reinstatement of entries erroneously canceled on account of railroad withdrawals, and, upon certain conditions, provides for the confirmation of titles derived by purchase from the companies of lands shown to be excepted from the grants. It contemplates a disposition of every tract described by the granting act, situated within the primary or granted limits; an inspection of each tract certified or patented to the company within such limit, to determine whether such certification or patenting was proper; the listing of those tracts shown to be erroneously certified, and the determination for what tracts lost to the grant indemnity is to be allowed.

It is necessary, in making such an ajustment, that all questions of conflicting claims, either between settlers and the road, or between two roads the grants for which conflict or overlap, be finally disposed of, so that a proper disposition of the land can be shown in the adjustment. While adjustments have proceeded with the utmost rapidity consistent with a due regard for the rights of the settlers, of the United States, and the railroad companies, and while to this end the force of adjusters has been largely augmented in the General Land Office, many of the grants yet remain unadjusted.

In some of the grants, notably the corporation grants, the lack of surveys up to the present time made the completion of the work impossible.

Decisions rendered by the Interior Department in numerous conflicts have been carried into the courts. The construction of the Interior Department has generally been sustained when final determination has been reached, but many of the cases are still pending in the courts, not yet having been decided. Some of these cases, while involving immediately the title to only one particular tract, will, when decided, furnish a rule of construction to control the disposition of the title to thousands of acres of other lands in the same situation. Until the courts pass upon these questions final adjustments can not be made.

By section 8 of the act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stats., 1099), it is expressly enacted that suits by the United States to vacate and annul any patent theretofore issued "shall only be brought within five years from the passage of this act." This period of five years will expire on the 3d of March, 1896. Of course no suit by the United States to secure the cancellation of a patent in this class of cases after that date would be effective. Indeed, it is now too late to initiate proceedings looking to any such suit, inasmuch as demand has to be first made on the company, and thereafter ninety days must be allowed for compliance or refusal, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887. Before the expiration of this period the statute would bar the right of recovery by the Government, and the benefits of anticipated favorable decisions of the courts would be lost so far as they might determine the character and disposition of grants similar to those directly involved in pending cases.

It will be readily seen that if this act of limitations is to remain on the statute books, the portion of the adjustment act referred to would be rendered nugatory. Indeed, there would be but little use in continuing the adjustment of many of the land grants, inasmuch as ascertained rights of the United States, or of settlers, could not be enforced by law.

Legislation establishing limitations against the right of the Government to sue is an innovation not entirely consistent with the general history of the rights of the Government, for it has uniformly been held that time did not bar the sovereign power from the assertion of a right.

The early adjudications of the Land Department construed the grants with a degree of liberality toward the grantees which later decisions of the courts and of the Department have not sustained. It seems clear that the further progress of adjustments will develop facts and transactions in connection with these land grants which ought to be the subjects of legal examination and scrutiny before they are allowed to become final and conclusive. The Government should not be prevented from going into the courts to right wrongs perpetrated by its agents or any other parties, and by which much of the public domain may be diverted from the people at large to corporate uses.

In these circumstances, it seems to me that the act of 1891 should be so amended as not to apply to suits brought to recover title to lands certified or patented on account of railroad or other grants. And I respectfully urge upon Congress speedy action to the end suggested, so that the adjustment of these grants may proceed without the interposition of a bar, through lapse of time, against the right of recovery by the Government in proper cases.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *January 17, 1896.*

KITCHEN OF HOUSE RESTAURANT.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am requested by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The resolution appropriating $2,000 for the enlargement and improvement of the House restaurant and kitchen was read.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman who presented the resolution if that comes from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds?

Mr. HICKS. Yes, sir; I am requested to ask unanimous consent for its adoption.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, is not a report in writing required, under the rule?

The SPEAKER. The rule requires a report in writing.

Mr. SAYERS. I would like to have that report.

Mr. HOWE. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the adoption of the resolution, and if that is granted it obviates the necessity for submitting a report in writing.

Mr. SAYERS. I would rather have the report, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of bills on the Union Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. DINGLEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills. The Clerk will report the title of the bill which is the unfinished business.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriation for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed to report the bill by paragraphs, for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

During the fiscal year 1897, in expending this appropriation, whenever a claim for pension under the act of June 27, 1890, has been or shall hereafter be rejected, suspended, or dismissed because of any defect or informality in the application, and a new application shall have been or shall hereafter be filed, and a pension has been or shall hereafter be allowed in such claim, such pension shall date from the time of filing the first application, provided the evidence in the case shall show the disability to have existed or to exist at the time of filing such first application, anything in any law or ruling of the Department to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I desire to suggest that the reading of the paragraph has not yet been concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The reading of the paragraph has been concluded.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I think the balance below belongs to that paragraph.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Undoubtedly the gentleman would like it to belong to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph ending with line 21 has been read.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I desire to raise the point of order against the next paragraph that it contravenes the provisions of paragraph 2, Rule XXI, because it is a provision changing existing law. This is an appropriation bill, and therefore it violates the rule of this House; and I raise the point of order on it.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the point of order.

Mr. STEELE. Before the point of order is made, I have an amendment to the section preceding.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's statement?

Mr. STEELE. I have an amendment I desire to offer, to come in at the end of the section which has been read, the paragraph commencing after line 8.

The CHAIRMAN. And ending line 21? That is the paragraph against which the point of order has been made.

Mr. STEELE. I understood the gentleman to say that it was the next paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. That has not been read. The paragraph ending line 21 has been read, and the gentleman makes the point of order that it changes existing law. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The Chair has misunderstood the gentleman from New York. He makes no point of order upon the paragraph ending with line 21.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman to make the point of order upon the paragraph that has just been read?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, sir; it is against the one which is just about to be read.

Mr. STEELE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer my amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, the next portion of the bill belongs to that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a distinct paragraph and a distinct proposition. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment to the paragraph ending line 21.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I have understood that the time to object was when the paragraph was reached by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. After the reading of the paragraph has been completed is the time to make objection.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Very well, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment to come in at the end of the paragraph ending line 21, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That it shall be competent for the Commissioner of Pensions, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to establish such rules and regulations for the presentation and prosecution of pension claims as shall be necessary to facilitate the transaction of business: *Provided*, That all such rules and regulations shall be made public and shall conform to the laws of the United States and the laws and rules of evidence recognized by the courts of justice in the District of Columbia, and shall in no wise abridge the rights of claimants and attorneys as recognized in said courts: *And provided further*, That claimants and their attorneys duly appointed shall have access to all evidence, reports, letters, and papers which in any wise enter into consideration in the adjudication of such claims.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I raise the point of order against the amendment offered that it violates the provision of the second paragraph of Rule XXI in that it incorporates into this provision certain changes in existing law in a general appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Indiana on the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It must be first decided whether the amendment is in order or not. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Indiana on the point of order.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not, in my opinion, change existing law. It only provides that decent and just consideration shall be given to cases pending in the Pension Bureau. It provides against the secret intrigues now employed by that Department. It is intended to make it possible for claimants or for those who prosecute claims before that Bureau to know what evidence is filed against them. The Bureau, by a rule or practice of its own, not only writes to parties who gave sworn testimony four or five years ago, asking whether they told the truth at that time, but also assures them that whatever they may write now in reply to the inquiries of the Bureau shall be treated as confidential.

This amendment simply provides that whatever evidence is filed in any case must be subject to inspection by the claimants or their attorneys, so that they may know what they are called upon to combat. It requires the Pension Bureau to fix some rule of evidence such as is observed in the courts, and to adhere to it. If the present method is to be continued, and letters written in reply to secret inquiries made by the Department, the writers of those letters being assured that their statements will be treated as confidential, are to be taken as evidence against the sworn testimony of eight or ten good men, then of course there will be no possibility of successfully prosecuting any pension claim. Let me say in support of my position that notwithstanding the fact stated by the gentleman from New York yesterday that there are 500,000 pension claims pending, during the last year there were 2,020 fewer names added to the pension roll than were stricken from it. So far as the mention of the courts of the District of Columbia in the amendment is concerned, that is because the Pension Office is within this District, and the amendment provides that if after the rule of evidence, which it will be observed is to be fixed by the Department, shall be made public, then if the Department violates its own rules the claimant or his attorney shall have the right of appeal, as he now has. There is really nothing new in the amendment. Its purpose is to require the Bureau to fix the rule of evidence and to place the evidence which it obtains on file, and not to allow every man in the Bureau to be a lawyer unto himself.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] if he would not be satisfied to strike out the closing paragraph of his amendment?

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, if I can not get all that I desire, I would like to get as much as I can, and therefore I am willing to conform to the suggestion of the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana modify his amendment?

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir; I accept the suggestion of the chairman of the committee [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE].

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I suggest that the gentleman modify the amendment by striking out all after the word "courts," and I ask that the Clerk read the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That it shall be competent for the Commissioner of Pensions, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to establish such rules and regulations for the presentation and prosecution of pension claims as shall be necessary to facilitate the transaction of business: *Provided*, That all such rules and regulations shall be made public and shall conform to the laws of the United States and the laws and rules of evidence recognized by the courts of justice of the District of Columbia, and shall in no wise abridge the rights of claimants and attorneys as recognized in said courts.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I raise a point of order on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I have not concluded what I desire to say, Mr. Chairman. In response to the point of order made by the gentleman from New York, I simply wish to call attention to the fact that the amendment as modified does not change any existing law. The Commissioner of Pensions has already the right to formulate rules for practice in the prosecution of pensions, and he has done so and has made them public, and they do not interfere with the laws of the land in any respect. Therefore, the amendment as now modified does not, I repeat, change any existing law.

Mr. PICKLER. What is the use of it, then?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I claim the right to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, we are either a parliamentary body or we are not, and if we be a parliamentary body it is to be presumed that when certain rules were adopted at the beginning of this session, reported here by the Committee on Rules, consisting of five of the ablest members of the House, three from the dominant party and two from my party, those rules were made to be respected. It was stated the other day by the distinguished Republican gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] that he was in favor of the provision in the rules of the Fifty-first Congress, "nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto," because he believed that it was in the interest of good government and of good, fair, and honest legislation that a change of existing law should not be incorporated in an appropriation bill with the view of coercing either the Senate of the United States or the Chief Executive and obliging the Executive to sign a general appropriation bill containing a change——

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to know if the gentleman is discussing the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that I am confining myself to the point of order. The Chair will recollect——

Mr. STEELE. I should like to know what the point of order is.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is that the pending amendment changes existing law.

Mr. STEELE. Now, I should like to know what existing law this amendment proposes to change.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I object to such interruptions when I am discussing——

Mr. STEELE. I have the right to know what law the gentleman claims that this amendment violates.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] has the floor on the point of order.

Mr. STEELE. I should like to know what law the amendment contravenes.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I ask that the gentleman take his seat.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is on the floor.

Mr. STEELE. Have I not the right to know what law it is claimed the amendment changes?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Indiana to make the inquiry?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. No, sir; I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, these unseemly interruptions during the discussion of a question of law are singularly inappropriate. I have confined myself to the discussion of the point of order and shall do so. When one of the leaders of the Republican party, a member of the Committee on Rules, gives certain reasons for the adoption of the salutary rule which I now invoke, it seems to me I confine myself quite well within the bounds of proper discussion if I refer to what was stated by that gentleman, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. I believe that the leaders of the Republican party in this House are in favor of the proper construction of this rule.

So we come to this question: Are changes of existing law to be tolerated under some plausible or specious excuse? I claim that it appears on the very face of this amendment or substitute as agreed to in the conference just heard on this floor between the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] and the gentleman from some other State—it appears on the very face of this substitute that it provides in the first place that—

It shall be competent for the Commissioner of Pensions, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior—

To do what?—

to establish such rules and regulations for the presentation and prosecution of pension claims as shall be necessary to facilitate the transaction of business.

If this amendment or substitute stopped at the last word just read by me, it would undoubtedly be not subject to the point of order, because up to that point the provision gives or tends to give to the Commissioner of Pensions the power which he already possesses. But the sting of the amendment lies in what follows. The change of existing law lies in this proviso:

That all such rules and regulations shall be made public and shall conform to the laws of the United States and the laws and rules of evidence recognized by the courts of justice in the District of Columbia, and shall in no wise abridge the rights of claimants and attorneys as recognized in said courts.

What a broad, what a monstrous proposition—that is, that the rulings of the courts of the District of Columbia as to pension attorneys and as to the rights of claimants shall control this whole great Department of the Federal Government. The rule now enforced by the Commissioner of Pensions is that the law of evidence of the State in which the particular claimant resides is the law of evidence applicable to the case; in other words, that in reference to marriage the lex loci contractus, or the law of the place where the ceremony was performed, shall govern. Now, is it to be maintained that the law of marriage in the District of Columbia—the Edmunds law, if you please—is to govern marriages contracted outside of this District? The manifest impropriety of such a change of law is too apparent to need discussion.

The only question for the Chair is, is this or is it not a change of existing law? Now, the present occupant of the chair is too good a parliamentarian not to see at a glance that the proposition embraced in the amendment is intended to change the law as it exists to-day, and as it is enforced to-day by the Commissioner of Pensions. So I ask, sir, that the point of order be sustained.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] on the point of order, particularly on the point whether the proposed amendment is a change of the existing law. That is all there is involved.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not understand, Mr. Chairman, that there is any other point made. The amendment which it is proposed to insert after line 21, on page 2, provides simply, as I understand—

That it shall be competent for the Commissioner of Pensions, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to establish such rules and regulations for the presentation and prosecution of pension claims as shall be necessary to facilitate the transaction of business.

As to that part of the amendment there can be no question that it does not change existing law, because under the authority contained in various acts of Congress establishing the Pension Bureau the Commissioner of Pensions, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, has from time to time adopted rules and regulations. I hold in my hand a book in which those rules and regulations have been collected and set forth for public distribution and use. Then the amendment continues—

Provided, That all such rules and regulations shall be made public and shall conform to the laws of the United States.

Certainly an amendment which directs that the rules and regulations adopted by the Commissioner of Pensions shall conform to the laws of the United States does not change existing law. It directly reaffirms the existing law by providing that these rules and regulations shall conform to that law, "the rules of evidence recognized by courts of justice in the District of Columbia."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is new.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I think the gentleman from Indiana perhaps would not insist upon that part of it. Would the gentleman from Indiana insist on that?

Mr. STEELE. I am going to insist on everything that I can secure that will make the practice better than it is now.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. But if the gentleman would strike out all after the word "States" it will relieve the amendment from the point of order.

Mr. STEELE. I will say to the gentleman that the power of appeal now rests in the United States district courts.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes; but it confines the Commissioner of Pensions to the rules of evidence in the district court of the District of Columbia, and these rules go back to the old law of Maryland.

Mr. STEELE. This relates to the practice in the United States district court for the District of Columbia.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They are under the same rules.

Mr. STEELE. In order to relieve the amendment from the objection, I will strike that out. My object is the transaction of business, and to provide for the prosecution of pension claims before the office.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Then I confine my remarks to the amendment as modified.

There is nothing now left in the amendment except that the Commissioner of Pensions shall establish rules and regulations, and shall make them public, and that they shall conform to the laws of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana modify his amendment?

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The modified amendment will be read for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That it shall be competent for the Commissioner of Pensions under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to establish such rules and regulations for the presentation and prosecution of pension claims as shall be necessary to facilitate the transaction of business: *Provided*, That all such rules and regulations shall be made public and shall conform to the laws of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he understands that to be new legislation?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not think so.

Mr. CANNON. Is that the law now?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It is.

Mr. CANNON. Then, what is the good of it?

Mr. PICKLER. That is what I would like to know.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Everything in it that was new has been knocked out.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York make the point of order against the modified amendment?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I make the point of order against the modified amendment or new bantling in this present form.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I make the point of order that it is in contravention of the same provision of the twenty-first rule, second paragraph, which provides that no provision changing existing law shall be in order on a general appropriation bill.

As has been well said by one of the leaders of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], if this be no change of existing law, why insert it in a general appropriation bill? It is because there lurks underneath it some insidious purpose or provision to change existing law by the insertion of the amendment. It gives what? It gives the Commissioner of Pensions power to make certain rules and regulations, limiting the power to make rules and regulations to only such as will facilitate the transaction of business; but it does not say to make any rules or regulations which will tend to prevent fraud, or which tend to prevent collusion. It is the insidious design to take from the Commissioner of Pensions that general power to make rules and regulations that the proper administration of his Department—the power which has been reposed in him ever since the year 1833—requires.

Then there is another provision that no rule or regulation can be made by the Commissioner of Pensions which shall not be made public. It shows that there must be some intention or design to take advantage of some rule or regulation properly made, but against which it might be alleged that sufficient publicity had not been given.

So I submit that this provision is a change of existing law, and therefore that it should not and can not be incorporated upon a general appropriation bill in the face of the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman think that the law which now authorizes the Commissioner of Pensions to make rules and regulations for the transaction of business in his office is not substantially the same as this proposition; and that the

general design is to facilitate business, notwithstanding such rules and regulations may cover the prevention of fraud?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. In answer to the Chairman's interrogatory, I will say this: That if this simply gave the Commissioner of Pensions power to establish such rules and regulations for the presentation and determination of pension claims, I should be satisfied. But it goes further. It is to make rules and regulations for the presentation and prosecution of claims, such rules as shall be necessary to facilitate business, and which might be construed to limit the power now existing in the Commissioner of Pensions.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman think it would impose a limitation if it should become a law?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. That is my opinion.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I should like to ask the gentleman who offered this amendment a question. The amendment directs the establishment of such rules and regulations for the presentation and prosecution of pension claims as shall be necessary to facilitate the transaction of business, provided that such rules and regulations shall be made public and shall conform to the laws of the United States. Does the gentleman mean that all rules pertaining to the introduction of evidence in the prosecution of claims shall conform to the laws of the United States? If so, suppose the laws of the United States forbid ex parte affidavits or evidence. How are you going to prove a claim? Do you not see there may be danger here?

Mr. MAHON. A claimant would never get a pension through.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I am afraid a claimant would never get his pension through.

Mr. MAHON. Or if he did, it would cost ten times as much as it does now.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I submit that it would mean that the introduction of evidence should conform to the laws of the United States, and if the laws of the United States do not permit ex parte evidence, then how would you ever get your pension claim through?

Mr. STEELE. I do not think it has that effect at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] anything further to say on the point of order?

Mr. STEELE. No; I think not. I think the Chair is thoroughly advised, and that this does not change existing law at all. The intention of the amendment is that some rules of practice shall be laid down by which claimants can be guided.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I suppose we might as well have a ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DINGLEY). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair has examined the proposed amendment, and it appears that one provision of it will work not only as a change of existing law, but will work somewhat disastrously to applicants for pensions, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask consideration of the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask gentlemen who have amendments if they would wait. I ask unanimous consent that we pass to the next portion of the bill which is reported by the committee, and pass upon that before any of these individual amendments are offered.

Mr. HERMANN. I have no objection as to the others which shall follow this amendment of mine.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] desires to raise a point of order on the next paragraph.

Mr. HERMANN. I desire to leave the Hall of the House in a few moments, and should like to have this amendment considered for that reason.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HERMANN] offer his amendment to the parapraph under consideration?

Mr. HERMANN. I do, and desire to have it read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HERMANN] offers an amendment to the paragraph, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend after the word "notwithstanding," on line 21, page 2:

"*Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, upon application therefor, the names of the surviving honorably discharged officers and enlisted men of the military and naval services of the United States who actually served ninety days, or more, subsequent to the 4th day of March, 1861, and prior to the 20th day of August, 1866.

"SEC. 2. That pensions under section 1 of this act shall be at the rate per month of 1 cent for each day's service rendered, and payable only from and after the approval of this act, for and during the natural lives of the persons entitled thereto: *Provided, however*, That in each and every case where the services so rendered was less than eight hundred days, the pension shall be at the rate herein established for a service of eight hundred days, to wit, $8: *Provided further*, That all invalid pensioners now on the pension roll, or who may hereafter be placed on the pension roll by reason of a disability or disabilities which originated in the line of duty in the military or naval service of the United States since the 4th day of March, 1861, shall be entitled to receive such increase of pension as may be found due them under this act.

"SEC. 3. That all honorably discharged invalid pensioners who rendered service specified in section 1 of this act and who are now receiving pensions under existing laws, or whose claims are pending in the Pension Bureau or before Congress, may, by application to the Commissioner of Pensions, in such form as he may prescribe, receive the benefits of this act; and nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to prevent any pensioner thereunder from prosecuting his claim and receiving his pension under any other general or special act, at his election, at any time.

"SEC. 4. That rank in the service of any officer or enlisted man shall not be considered in applications under this act.

"SEC. 5. That section 4716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby repealed so far as the same relates to this act or to pensions under this act: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to those persons under the political disabilities imposed by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States: *Provided further*, That the benefits of this act shall not be extended to any person who did not serve ninety days, or more, in the military or naval service of the United States between the 4th day of March, 1861, and the 20th day of August, 1866, and who did not receive an honorable discharge for such service.

"SEC. 6. That all laws or parts of laws which conflict with the provisions of this act shall be and the same are hereby, repealed."

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order against this amendment that it contravenes Rule XXI, in that it incorporates a change of existing law.

Mr. HERMANN. I desire to be heard for one moment. I desire to express my profound surprise that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] should have seen fit at this stage to offer the objection which he offers, or to make the point of order. I am especially surprised, since he has shown himself in these debates to be so true and loyal a friend of the old soldiers of the Union——

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman be directed to confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. HERMANN. I shall now confine myself to the point of order. [Laughter.]

The Chair will observe upon a reading of the bill reported from the Committee on Appropriations that two very liberal amendments have been incorporated for the purpose of protecting the just and equitable rights of the old soldiers of the Union. The first is as to the allowance of a pension for the time intervening between the first and second or third application, the pension to commence from the first application.

Another amendment, very liberal in its character, is that which refers to widows' pensions, and which defines what shall be the net income of a widow. Beyond this, we find nothing of relief for the old pensioners of the Union; and it occurred to me that it would have been but generous on the part of the Committee on Appropriations, when they saw fit to amend the law so liberally as they have, to have gone still further.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I object, Mr. Chairman. I ask that the gentleman be confined to the discussion of the point of order.

Mr. HERMANN. I think they should have made this just amendment to the pension laws.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. And not engage in violations of the English language.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. HERMANN. Now I shall particularly confine myself to the point of order. [Laughter.]

This is generally known, Mr. Chairman, to the old soldiers as the per diem service pension proposition; a proposition which met the unanimous approval of the Grand Army posts throughout this country, and as to which there is not a surviving old soldier of the Union who would have any objection. It has also met public approval; and therefore it occurs to me that the gentleman from New York could now very graciously afford to withdraw the point of order and permit this to be incorporated as a part of the laws of the land, for it really meets the approval of everybody but the gentleman from New York himself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the point of order, it will be apparent to the Chair, who is one of the best parliamentarians in the United States, and I will not occupy the time of the House further by a lengthy argument as to whether the point should be sustained or not, but will submit it to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MAHON. I offer an amendment, which I would like to have read and have it pending; but I will not discuss it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

That any pension heretofore or that may hereafter be granted or allowed under any law of the United States authorizing the granting and payment of pensions shall be considered a vested right, and shall be so treated by all the courts and officers of the United States.

That no pension, once allowed or granted, shall be withheld, suspended, diminished, or annulled unless the same was obtained by fraud, accident, or mistake. Where a pension has been allowed by accident or mistake, the same may be suspended until the case is investigated and a decision thereon had. In every case where fraud is alleged the person or officer of the United States making the charge of fraud shall file his or her statement, setting forth fully all the facts in the case, said statement or charge to be sworn to by the person or officer making the same. When said statement is filed in the Pension

Department the Commissioner may then suspend, and not before, the payment of the pension until said charge is proven or dismissed. Within thirty days from the time of filing said notice with the Commissioner of Pensions, notice of not less than thirty days shall be given to the pensioner, together with a full and complete statement of all allegations of fraud against his or her pension, and of the time and place a hearing will be had in the case. The pensioner or his duly authorized attorney, or both, shall have the right to be present at said hearing and to cross-examine all witnesses produced by the Government. The pensioner or his attorney shall have the right to produce witnesses in denial of the charge.

The hearing to be held by an examiner appointed by the Commissioner of Pensions. The hearing to be held and testimony taken at the county seat of the county wherein the pensioner lives, and if said pensioner lives within the District of Columbia the hearing to be held and testimony taken in the city of Washington. All evidence offered by either side, as well as the cross-examination, shall be reduced to writing by the examiner, and the same, with his finding of facts, shall be filed with the Commissioner of Pensions within thirty days from the time the taking of the evidence has been closed. The pensioner or his attorney shall be permitted to examine all the papers in the case.

If the charge of fraud is sustained, then said pension shall be annulled and vacated. If the charge is dismissed, the suspension shall be removed and payment of pension be made from date of last payment. The right of appeal to remain as now allowed by the Pension and Interior Departments.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order against the provision offered that it contravenes Rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the proposed amendment changes existing law, and is therefore in contravention to Rule XXI.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I ask that it be passed over. I was going to ask unanimous consent that we pass over this offered amendment until the next paragraph, and that permission be given to return to it. I think the gentleman will consent to that.

Mr. MAHON. I agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the pending paragraph be passed over, with permission to return to it after the succeeding paragraph shall have been completed. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the next paragraph be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

During the fiscal year 1897, in expending this appropriation, it shall not be necessary for a widow, in establishing her claim to a pension under the provisions of the act of June 27, 1890, to prove that she is without other means of support than her daily labor: *Provided*, That before she shall be entitled to a pension under the provisions of said law she shall prove that her net income does not exceed $500 per annum.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that that provision in a general appropriation bill, just read, contravenes Rule XXI, and is therefore improperly inserted in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order against the paragraph which has just been read that it changes existing law, and is therefore in contravention of Rule XXI. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Yes, sir; I would like to be heard for a moment.

Mr. Chairman, I have argued this question of pension legislation to a considerable extent within the last week, and do not care to discuss the general question of pension legislation to any further extent; but I shall address myself entirely to the question of law—that is, is this provision a change of existing law or not? If it be a change of existing law, then it is out of order and must be stricken from the bill. Now, what is the test under existing law? The test under the dependent pension act, so called, of June 27, 1890, is the dependence of the widow upon her daily labor for support; and this amendment shows on its face that it proposes to change that existing provision of law, because it says that during this year it shall not be necessary for the widow to do what? To prove that she is without other means of support than her daily labor. Now, it is conceded on both sides of the House that in the statute as it stands to-day, without this general appropriation bill in aid of its interpretation, the widow must, as a condition precedent, show that she is dependent for her support on her daily labor. Then the next provision clearly sustains my position. The provision is that before she shall be entitled to a pension she must prove one thing—not that she is dependent upon her daily labor for support, but that her net income does not exceed $500. Now, that needs no argument. It is manifest that a large class of widows who are comparatively affluent would be admitted to the pension rolls under this new provision of law.

I do not know whether the Chairman heard my argument in the course of one of my previous speeches as to the proper construction of the words "net income." No one can say exactly what is the meaning of that expression, and probably it is because of that doubt that those words were used by the gentleman who drew up this amendment. But if we turn back to the tariff act of August 28, 1894, if we turn for guidance as to the true meaning of the words "net income" to the last provision of statutory law passed by the Congress of the United States, we find that before the net income can be determined there must be deducted from the gross income three different classes of disbursements: First, the expenses of carrying on the business, occupation, or profession of the person—in this instance of the widow; second, the taxes paid on all realty and personalty, and in the third place, the interest on existing indebtedness. As an illustration, I may state that when I made out my income-tax return I felt conscientiously compelled to deduct many thousand dollars from my gross income before I reached that which was subject to the tax. So, Mr. Chairman, I submit that on the face of this amendment it clearly appears that it contravenes Rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I do not concede that this provision in the bill changes existing law. The law as it now is provides "that if any officer or enlisted man who served ninety days or more in the Army or Navy of the United States during the late war of the rebellion, and was honorably discharged, has died or hereafter dies, leaving a widow without other means of support than her daily labor," and so on. This amendment provides that during the fiscal year 1896–97, in expending this appropriation, it shall not be necessary for a widow, in establishing her claim to a pension under the provisions of the act of June 27, 1890, to prove that she is without other means of support than her daily labor. The second part of the paragraph, as reported in the bill, is, of course, a limitation on the first; so that if the first part of the paragraph is to remain in the bill the point of order against the second part falls. Therefore I shall not address my remarks at all to the point of order raised against the second paragraph.

I find that this provision in our rules to which the gentleman refers has been for some time a part of the rules of the House of Representatives, the only change being that the proviso in the old rule with reference to reducing expenditures is left out, and we now have the bare, bald provision, "nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto."

The simple question here is: Does this bill, as reported by the committee in this particular paragraph, change existing law?

The provision of existing law which I have read speaks of a widow "without other means of support than her daily labor." The proviso in the bill is that a widow seeking a pension shall not be required during the current fiscal year to prove that she has no other means of support than her daily labor. This proviso does not repeal or change the existing law, but simply provides that during this fiscal year while the expenditure of this money is going on the widow seeking a pension need not make proof that she has no other means of support than her daily labor. We come, then, to the first question: Is an act of Congress appropriating money and providing how that money shall be expended, which only limits the operation of a provision of a law on the statute book during the period for which the money is appropriated—is that necessarily a change of existing law? I hold that it is not. It is, at the most, only a suspension of the law for a brief period. It does not change the law; it does not repeal it; it simply provides that for a brief, well-defined period the law shall be suspended. Now, I do not wish to take much time upon that point, because I desire to read some authorities and precedents to the Chair; but, technically speaking, I say that legislation which for a brief space of time merely suspends an existing law does not necessarily change that law. I refer the Chair to that period which followed 1873 when nearly every State in this Union by its legislative action enlarged the exemption or suspended the right of execution on real estate—suspended it for a definite period. As soon as that period expired the old law was in full force, and, in fact, it was in force all the time, except that, to use a rather vulgar expression, it was "bottled up" during that period. It was suspended, but it was not changed, repealed, or modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania any authority to sustain the position he has just taken, that an act suspending a law for a definite period is not, pro tanto, a change of the existing law for that period?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I have no authority to sustain that particular proposition, but I have authorities which justify me in claiming that the paragraph in the bill is not a change of existing law in the proper sense of the word, and I will read them to the Chair.

Another proposition is that the language in a bill, which is simply directory during the period indicated, although it may lay down a different line of action from that which the existing law is understood to prescribe, is not necessarily a change of existing law. I call the attention of the Chair to the Digest of the Fifty-third Congress, page 268, and I read:

An amendment providing that no money appropriated in the pending bill shall be applied in a certain lawful way, namely, the transportation of troops on certain railroads, was held in order as being merely a limitation of expenditures, and, indeed, not a change of existing law.

Here was an existing law providing that money appropriated

should be applied in a certain lawful way; and there was inserted in an appropriation bill a provision that it should not be applied in that lawful way. That was held not to be a change of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will pardon an inquiry of the Chair. Suppose that an amendment, instead of providing that no money appropriated in the pending bill should be applied in a certain lawful way, had said that the money appropriated in the bill might be expended in a certain way not now the law; would that be regarded as a limitation?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. In the case which I have just cited it was held that a proviso was in order which provided that the money should not be applied in a way provided for by existing law. That was the decision, as the Chair will observe.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of the inquiry is this: The act of June 27, 1890, provides that a widow without other means of support than her daily labor may be pensioned under certain circumstances. The provision now under consideration declares that she need not prove that she is without other means of support than her daily labor. It thus enlarges rather than limits the appropriation of money. In other words, it devotes the money appropriated in the bill to a purpose not now lawful, but which is to be made lawful by this provision. What does the gentleman say on that point?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The fact that the provision enlarges the appropriation does not affect the question under the present rule. The question is simply whether or not, technically speaking, the language does change existing law. Under the old rule a provision on an appropriation bill might change existing law if it cut down expenditures. The Chair will observe that we do not really suspend the existing law; we merely change the manner of getting the pension. We direct that for the period covered by this bill the widow need not prove that she has no means of support except her daily labor.

Now, in all these cases affecting the decision of points of order under this rule, there must be a technical construction in order to enforce the point; so I claim that a technical construction may and ought to be resorted to in order to sustain a liberal view of a proposition which may be submitted to the House. Technically speaking—and we have no right to treat the question in any other way—this provision does not change existing law.

Now, on page 273 of the Manual to which I have already referred, I read:

The Post-Office appropriation act for the current fiscal year containing an appropriation for necessary and special facilities on trunk lines, a provision in the pending appropriation bill adding to the words quoted a designated route to which the appropriation should be applied was held not to be a change of law, but merely a limitation of the discretion of the Postmaster-General; also held that it was in order as being a continuation of a public object already in progress.

The proviso in this bill is a limitation, practically and technically speaking, on the discretion and rulings of the Commissioner of Pensions. It directs that during the coming fiscal year widows in prosecuting their claims for pensions need not prove that they have no other means of support than their daily labor.

On page 274 of the same edition of the Digest it is stated:

A provision in the Indian appropriation bill providing a mode of disposal of lands acquired under a proposed treaty authorized by the bill was held to be in order, although the proposed disposition was different from that applicable to lands already owned by the Government.

I ask the attention of the Chair also to the next paragraph:

An amendment declaratory of the effect of a provision of law and giving an interpretation different from that held by the Department charged with its execution was held not to be a change of law.

Now, if the Chair will pardon me for continuing the discussion further, I will conclude this recital of authorities by referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 80 (Forty-ninth Congress), pages 5986, 5987. In this case an amendment was offered to the sundry civil bill in these words:

Provided, That no portion of this sum shall be expended for printing United States notes of large denominations in lieu of notes of a small denomination canceled or retired.

On that proposition offered as an amendment by Mr. Weaver of Iowa a point of order was raised by Mr. Randall; and the Chair held that the proposition was not a change of existing law, and therefore admitted the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is scarcely possible to bring in here a bill or to suggest an amendment that does not in some narrow sense change existing law. We may say that an appropriation bill itself changes existing law, because the law as it exists before the money is appropriated is certainly different from what it is after the appropriation is made. If a narrow, technical construction is to be adopted, it might be held that every paragraph and line of an appropriation bill changes existing law. Now, then, does this proviso change the existing law? The Chairman will observe that the act of Congress is peculiar in its language. It says:

Or shall hereafter die, leaving a widow without other means of support than her daily labor.

I call the attention of the Chair particularly to that language—

Without other means of support than her daily labor.

The Commissioner of Pensions has seen fit, on that language, to compel widows applying for pensions to prove, every one of them, that they were not property holders to the extent of even 5 cents. That woman who had an extra suit of clothes could not acquire a pension; one who had a cow, a sheep, a little lot, anything that contributed to her support, was excluded under that ruling, and in the case of a soldier's widow who lived with her husband, perhaps boarding at some hotel, she was compelled to go out and engage in service as a domestic to prove that she had no other means of support than her daily labor. It gives a chance for the Commissioner of Pensions to hold the rule most rigidly in the construction of that act of Congress. Now, what do we do? We put a different construction upon it. In other words, we direct that during this fiscal year—during the period of the expenditure of the money herein appropriated—the widow making an application for a pension need not prove that she has no other means of support excepting her daily labor. We do not attempt to repeal, to change, or modify. In appropriating this money, and in the expenditure of it, we say that the Commissioner of Pensions is directed that she should not be compelled to prove, in making her application, what the office has heretofore required.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. DOCKERY. Suppose this proposition, instead of carrying the limitation, "for the ensuing fiscal year," had used the language that "hereafter" applications for pensions shall be considered in the manner he suggests. What would be the effect, in his judgment, of the use of the word "hereafter," instead of during the fiscal year 1897? In the one case you make a permanent law; and I ask if, in the judgment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that would have been obnoxious to the rule?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I think it would.

Mr. DOCKERY. Then, as I understand the analysis of the position held by the gentleman, it is that it is not obnoxious to the rule to change the existing law for a period of twelve months, but that the same proposition, in the form of a permanent law, would be obnoxious to the rule.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Let me answer the gentleman from Missouri. Any attempt to change a law, to evade a law, or to evade a rule where the intention is obvious—that is, any attempt which in its execution would have that result or effect—would be undoubtedly a change of existing law.

I admit that; and that intent would be evidenced by the direction that "hereafter" and for all time to come the widow should not necessarily be compelled to prove in her application for a pension that she had no other means of support than her daily labor.

But it must be remembered that in this case we are not going beyond the limits of the money we appropriate. We appropriate a certain specific sum for a certain specific purpose that shall run for a certain specific period of time, and we have the right to limit it. We have the right to condition it. Why, the very fact that it is conceded that we have the right to appropriate for this purpose is a concession that we may limit the expenditure. If Congress has no power under the rule to stipulate how the money shall be expended which it appropriates, then we are at the mercy of an official, armed with discretion, who may decide this or that as he pleases. If we have the right to appropriate money for a specific purpose, we have also the right to say how that money shall be expended in the execution of that purpose. That is all we do here. We simply put a limitation upon the expenditure.

I do not understand, sir, that this question has been raised in any place so fully as in the last reference I read. It was then fully discussed, and the Chairman, in ruling upon it, took particular pains to give his reasons. He says:

The CHAIRMAN. In relation to the Civil Service Commission it was held it was not competent to place an amendment on the bill which compelled that Commission to change two of its rules. The present case has this for its basis: The law prescribes the Secretary of the Treasury may issue notes of various denominations, but does not advise the proportion of the denominations in which they shall be issued. Now, it is proposed by the amendment to say in issuing these notes the Secretary of the Treasury shall not issue large notes in lieu of small notes.

Mr. WEAVER of Iowa. No; it merely provides that no part of the appropriation shall be used to change the denomination of the bills.

The CHAIRMAN. Shall not issue in that proportion in payment. That he shall not issue larger notes in lieu of small notes. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is not well taken, and rules the amendment to be in order.

Now, if in appropriating this money we should say that these pensioners should be paid in any particular denomination of money, Treasury notes, greenbacks, or silver certificates, would there be any question of our right to do so? Would there be a question as to our power to determine in what manner the money shall be expended; and if the proposition here was how we should pay it, would it be a question subject to a point of order?

Is it possible we have nothing more or less to do than to appropriate money blindly, leaving the discretion entirely in the hands

of the officer who disburses it? This is not an attempt to change existing law. We do not pretend to change existing law.

Mr. MILES. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes.

Mr. MILES. Does not this proposed amendment make a different test of title to the pension?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Not at all.

Mr. MILES. The test of title in the one case, as I understand it, was the state or condition of being entirely without means of support other than daily labor. In this case the widow may have a pension although she may have $500 of income. Now, is not that an entirely different test of title to the pension?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Well, I think not. It depends on the construction of this act of Congress. It does not make any difference whether our bill changes the rule or differs with the construction put upon it by the Commissioner of Pensions. That has nothing to do with the case. The question is, does it change existing law? And we have got to look at the law to see what it is:

Widow without other means of support than her daily labor.

Mr. MILES. That is one test.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is the law.

Mr. MILES. Do you not propose another test in lieu of that, to wit, that she shall not have over $500 income?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. No; we say that during the expenditure of this money she need not do what the Commissioner of Pensions has heretofore required her to do, namely, to prove that she is a pauper.

Mr. MILES. If the gentleman will allow me, then, it is a change of test during the expenditure of this appropriation, is it?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. No; we say that the Commissioner of Pensions has always erred in the construction of this law; that he had no business to require that a widow should prove herself to be a pauper in order to get a pension.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Your contention is that this is only construction.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. This is only construction. It only declares how Congress has defined existing law. It does not change it, or modify it, or suspend it, or anything of the kind:

Widow without other means of support than her daily labor.

If that was to be technically construed, if the Chairman believes that the construction which the Commissioner of Pensions has put upon that phrase is correct, then I undertake to say that it is utterly impossible for any widow on earth to get a pension, technically speaking:

Other means of support than her daily labor.

She might be paralyzed, utterly incapable of performing daily labor. That is not the test, and the Commissioner of Pensions in construing that law has erred, and we propose to construe it in this bill, that is all; and although our construction will differ with the construction of the Commissioner of Pensions, that does not make it a change of existing law; unless the Chairman thinks that it changes existing law—that is, that it is different from the act of Congress, and not a change from the construction put upon it by the Commissioner of Pensions, and that we undertake to say that this law is repealed, modified, or changed. That would be different. That we would be estopped from doing, but we do not. We say that for this period, in expending this money, the widow need not prove what the Commissioner of Pensions has heretofore required her to prove.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, the question before the committee is not, as I understand it, whether existing law is right or wrong—is not whether the proposed legislation is right or wrong. The distinct question is, does the proposed amendment violate the rule by the incorporation of new legislation? That is the precise question, as I understand it. Now, I do not quite agree with my friend who has just concluded his remarks [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE], for it seems to me that he has taken altogether a too narrow view of the existing law. He has narrowed it down to too limited a compass. It means more than he gives to it, and I do not agree with his answer to my friend from Missouri, that if the word "hereafter" had been inserted in the clause which reads "during the expenditure of this appropriation" it would have been any change in existing law.

To determine whether this be a change in existing law, it becomes necessary for the committee to construe the existing law. No man can say that it has been changed unless he can say precisely what it is now, and that it would be different as proposed by this legislation.

The existing law is:

That if any officer or enlisted man who served ninety days or more in the Army or Navy of the United States during the late war of the rebellion, and who was honorably discharged, has died, or shall hereafter die, leaving a widow without other means of support than her daily labor.

What is the purport of that language? It is nothing more or less, Mr. Chairman, I insist, than a mere description of the widow. He must leave a widow who is without means of support other than her daily labor.

Now, then, a widow, when the soldier died, may have had no other means of support; she may have had no other income; she may have her hands and been able to labor and earn a livelihood. During some years she may have been able to accumulate a fund, and at the end of one year of her labor she may have laid aside $50, and placed it in the savings bank. At the end of another year she may have laid aside another $50, and thus placed $100 in the savings bank; and at the end of ten years she may have $3,000 on deposit in the savings bank. Does that cut her off from her pension? Not at all. We must read the whole act together in order to see what is meant by the language. It says: "Leaving a widow without other means of support than her daily labor;" then, after speaking of minor children, says, "she," the widow, "shall be placed on the pension roll of the date of the application thereof under this act at the rate of $8 per month during her widowhood." So that the very law itself contemplates that if, after the death of the husband, that particular condition this widow is left in, namely, without means of support—if all that is changed in the future and she become a millionaire, it does not defeat her right to a pension. The whole thing dates from the death of the husband. If at this moment she is without means of support she is a pensioner, and once on the roll she is there during her widowhood, no matter what subsequent change of circumstances may occur in her behalf.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, that being so, the Pension Office and this committee are called upon to construe that language, "without other means of support." What does it mean? Why, my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee is in error when he says the Pension Office has given it the construction of nothing more than daily labor. As I understand the ruling of the Pension Office, and as I was told by the Commissioner of Pensions, by their regulations they allow a pension in all cases where a widow has some small fund other than that earned by her daily labor, provided that that fund is not as great as the pension itself would be. So that the Pension Office in the construction of this language, "without other means of support," has given it a meaning.

Now, what is proposed by this legislation? Is it to change that law in the least? Not at all. Mr. Chairman, you would not hold that a mere construction of the clause of a statute, giving its true construction, was any change of that law. The law is what its language implies when properly construed, and not what A, B, or C might say it means. But what does it mean when properly construed? Now, the Pension Office, and we in legislation here, must construe that language, "other means of support." That is precisely what this committee has undertaken to do. They have said that you may incorporate what the gentleman from Missouri interpolated, "hereafter," if you please. "Hereafter," a widow in establishing her claim for a pension under the provisions of the act of June 27, 1890, shall not be obliged to prove that she has no other means of support than her daily labor. She may have an income of a dollar a month from some other source, and still not have means of support, means sufficient for support outside of her daily labor. She may have that. This is to prevent any possible mistake as to the meaning of that language. The bill goes forward and says that it shall be an inexorable law that in the construction of this statute what we mean by "other means of support" is that it shall not exceed $500 net income.

Now, this statute does not mean that it applies simply to those widows who go out and scrub doorsteps and minister at the sick bed or anything of that kind. The expression, "daily labor," does not have that narrow construction. It means support other than what she can earn; and whether she can earn more than enough for her daily support, that does not deprive her of a pension if she has less than a support. Her daily labor may bring in an income of $150 and her support may require $200 a year, and if she has $50 from some other source she is within the language of this statute.

So that it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly plain. When you read the original statute itself you can see what the meaning of this language in this proposition of the committee is. It is simply the language as we construe it. It does not mean that it shall be the same construction that has been given to it at the Pension Office; but we mean by this language that the limit as to what "means of support" is shall be $500, and in that you add more certainty to the law. You make certain that which is now in a state of uncertainty; you define that which has never heretofore been defined. You do not change anything; you simply give to the original language its very palpable, legal, and common-sense meaning. [Loud applause.]

Mr. NORTHWAY. I quite agree with the able gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS]. In some remarks which I made the other day upon this bill—the present Chairman of this Committee of the

Whole was by my side and may remember it—I, in a less direct and less explicit manner, called attention to the fact that I thought the law was all right, but that it was the construction of the law that was wrong. We must not forget, in passing upon this matter, that we may be passing upon the law as construed by the Commissioner of Pensions and not upon the law itself. I took occasion to say the other day, and I repeat it now, that the Commissioner has, in an arbitrary manner, interpreted the words "other means of support" in the act of 1890 to mean $96 a year. That is, he holds that if a widow is in receipt of an income of $96 a year she has other means of support. I called attention then, as I do now, to the fact that that is a misconstruction of the law. The law in speaking of "other means of support" intended such support as was necessary for the widow's proper personal care and sustenance. Why the Commissioner should limit the amount to $96 a year I know not. He had just the same power under the law to limit it to $500 a year, and if he had fixed that amount, he would have come much nearer to carrying out the spirit of the law than he has in fixing it at $96. Now Congress steps in, by the proviso in this bill, and says to the Commissioner: "You shall not limit the amount to $96 a year, but if you undertake to fix any limit it shall be a reasonable one"; in other words, we say that the law of 1890, in using the words "means of support," contemplates a reasonable sum, and that the Commissioner has construed it to mean an unreasonable sum. I claim, therefore, that this provision in the pending bill does not change existing law, but simply interprets the law, construes the law, because the Commissioner has undertaken to misconstrue it. This provision gives a correct interpretation to the terms of the law of 1890, where the Commissioner has given an incorrect interpretation. So, I say, this provision does not change existing legislation, but simply places our construction upon our own language, "other means of support," and says that it shall mean $500 a year, instead of $96 a year, the limit incorrectly fixed by the Commissioner.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending appropriation bill has in it a provision which declares that a widow whose net income does not exceed $500 a year shall be held to be entitled to a pension under the act of 1890. Does the gentleman from Ohio think that this would be a change of the law as it actually exists on the statute book?

Mr. NORTHWAY. I think it is not a change of the terms of the law. I think it is simply giving an interpretation to the language of the act of 1890—"other means of support." In other words, it interprets that language for the Commissioner and tells him as to the amount that if any limit is to be fixed it shall be understood as meaning at least $500 under the terms of the existing law. The Commissioner has misinterpreted the words "other means of support" in that law and we interpret them correctly for him.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not new legislation?

Mr. NORTHWAY. I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. What is it then?

Mr. NORTHWAY. It is an interpretation of the existing law. Suppose the Commissioner of Pensions had established a rule that a widow who was in receipt of an income of $500 a year should not be entitled to a pension, I think he would have had just as much right to do that under the existing law as he had to say that a widow who is in receipt of an income of $96 a year shall not be entitled to a pension, and inasmuch as he has placed the construction upon the law of 1890 that a widow who is in receipt of an income of $96 a year shall not have a pension, we step in by this provision in the pending bill, and say that that is not correct, that the Commissioner has misinterpreted the words in the act of 1890, "without other means of support," and that if any limit is to be fixed it shall be $500. I think we have just as much right to place our construction upon the act of 1890 as he has to place his construction upon it, and I hold that neither construction would be violative of the terms of the act. Therefore I hold that this is not a change of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The act of 1890, describing widows who shall be entitled to pensions, speaks of "a widow without other means of support than her daily labor." Now, the pending paragraph provides that it shall not be necessary for a widow, in establishing her claim to a pension under the act of 1890, to prove that she is without other means of support than her daily labor. Would not this provision repeal the words in the act of 1890 which the Chair has cited?

Mr. NORTHWAY. This provision in the pending bill simply takes from the Commissioner of Pensions that which he has arrogated to himself—the right to declare that that language in the act of 1890 means that a widow who is in receipt of an income of $96 a year shall not be entitled to a pension, and tells him that the law means that the widow who is in receipt of an annual income of not less than $500 shall not be entitled to a pension. It goes wholly to the question of proof, and not to the right to a pension. It simply takes from the language of the act of 1890 the construction which the Commissioner gives it, and places upon that language the construction which we say it ought to bear, not because the terms of the law are limited, but because they are liable to a construction. "Means of support." The Commissioner says that these words in the act of 1890 mean $96 a year; we say that he shall not construe them to mean anything less than $500 a year. This provision in the pending bill is not a change of law, but is simply a construction of the words "means of support," and it provides that a widow applying for a pension shall not be called upon to prove anything relative to her means of support so long as her income is under $500 a year.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I would like to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY].

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, if the rules of the House are invoked by any gentleman on the floor they should be maintained in their integrity, and this committee ought not to attempt under the guise of "construction" to pass upon or change our rules. I am not authorized to speak for the distinguished gentleman [Mr. DINGLEY] who occupies the chair; but I believe he is in thorough and hearty sympathy with the pending proposition. Believing the Chairman to be in sympathy with the proposition, but necessarily putting a different construction upon Rule XXI from that given it by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Vermont, I do not think, therefore, the Chair ought to be embarrassed by insisting upon what would at best be a very doubtful decision.

The existing law clearly requires that the soldier's widow applying for a pension shall be without other means of support than her "daily labor." This provision changes the existing law. The gentleman from Vermont says that the provision is merely a "construction" of the existing law; but how can Congress construe a law except by the enactment of law? In order to effect a construction you must enact a law differing from the one already on the statute book.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Do the words "without other means of support" mean anything outside of daily labor?

Mr. DOCKERY. Why, that is a matter for construction by the administrative department.

Mr. NORTHWAY. No; but have not we——

Mr. DOCKERY. If we hold a different view from that adopted by the administrative officer who construes the law, we can only make effective our construction by the enactment of a law. There can be no other way for Congress to construe an existing statute.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Is it necessary to enact a new law where the Commissioner is giving a wrong construction of the existing law? May we not wipe out that wrong construction without changing the existing law?

Mr. DOCKERY. I frankly confess that I am utterly unable to understand how Congress can put any sort of "construction" upon an existing statute different from the one prevailing in the executive department except by the enactment of a law; that is a measure which must pass the House and the Senate and be approved by the Executive. That is the only way in which we can make our construction of the law effective.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the appeal on this occasion should be addressed to the Chairman of this Committee of the Whole, because in my judgment he has already intimated the proper construction—that is, that this proposition does not operate to change the existing law. I think our appeal should be addressed to my good friend from New York [Mr. BARTLETT], and I desire his attention. I appeal to him now, in view of the fact that the widows of soldiers of all the other wars are, as I understand, allowed $12 a month under existing statutes (if I am not correct in that statement I should like to be corrected); in view of that fact, I appeal to the gentleman from New York, out of the abundance of his generosity, to withdraw the point of order and allow a vote upon the proposition, especially as this proposition comes to the House supported by substantially the unanimous vote of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I think the position taken by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. NORTHWAY] is impregnable and unassailable. This is not new legislation. Here is a statute passed by Congress which has received a construction by a ruling of the Pension Office. We come here now and propose to say that that construction is not a proper construction. We do not undertake to change the law; and I call the attention of the gentleman from New York, who makes the point of order, to this proposition: It is entirely competent for the legislative branch of the Government to declare the true intent and meaning of an existing statute. Statutes are sometimes confused in their provisions; they are sometimes drawn in such a way that even the courts of last resort differ in construing their meaning.

Legislative intent can be inferred from the incidents of the legislation. Legislative intent is always competent to construe a statute. Legislative intent can never be invoked to construe a constitutional provision. But in the construction of the purpose

of a statute, legislative intent can always be inferred from the surrounding circumstances of the legislation itself. Thus the title of an act not infrequently can be considered in giving construction to the act where the language of the enactment itself is confused or uncertain. Thus the title of an act declares it to be an act "to do so and so;" but it is found in the body of the statute that the person who drafted it has not made the purpose clear. In such a case, according to one of the rules of construction, it is competent to ascertain the meaning from what the title of the act declares. It is also competent to look to the surrounding circumstances. You may look to the debate which took place in the legislative body at the time the act was passed. You may ascertain what was understood at the time to be its purport. This may always be done with reference to legislation; never in constitutional construction, and never to override the plain words of a statute—only in cases of doubt.

Now, then, what is the meaning of the words "without means of support"? Suppose we had simply said in this amendment, "It is the true intent and meaning of the statute of 1890 to provide" so and so. Will my friend from New York, who is a technical lawyer at all events, say that that would be new legislation? I deny it. It is a declaration on the part of the legislative body that the original statute was intended to be thus and so. That is competent; that is binding. I call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the proposition I make as a matter of law: A legislative declaration of the intent and purpose of a statute carries back the rights under the statute to its original passage. Here is a doubtful statute; rights are sought to be enforced under it; the legislature makes a declaration of the true meaning and intent of the statute; and that declaration reacts upon the statute back to its original passage.

Does this do anything more than that? Is this anything beyond that? Is not this a mere declaration in fact as to what was the true intent and meaning of the statute of 1890? I submit that the Chair will look to the position in which this question presents itself, and will also look back to the conditions that surround the question to ascertain what is the operation and effect of this amendment upon the statute of 1890.

There is another proposition which I desire to press upon the attention of the Chair. This now becomes a declaration of a rule of evidence. I have not entered into these criticisms of the Pension Office and the general execution of the statutes, nor shall I do so at this time. I shall have something to say upon the question when the general legislation from the Committee on Invalid Pensions shall come up. I have not been indifferent to these great questions which have been so ably argued here upon this floor, but I have deemed it better, so far as action in my legislative capacity is concerned to wait until there is no question of the competency of the legislation proposed.

Upon this question, Mr. Chairman, I present this view: What is the rule in the Pension Office now? It is after all but a rule of evidence. The office says, in construing that statute of 1890, that the rule of evidence shall mean that the widow shall show, by satisfactory proof, that the maximum limit of her means of support, outside of the Pension Office, was $96 per annum; and this is a rule of evidence by construction of that statute. That is all there is of it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I desire to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Under the law as it stands the discretion as to fixing the amount to be considered as determining the means of support of the applicant in a case for pension under that bill is left with the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. GROSVENOR. In terms?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Under the construction of the law.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is, under the construction of the office.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, you propose to take away all the right the Commissioner has to interpret the law. Is that not a change of law?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, that is the strongest point that has yet been made against the amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does it not necessarily follow, if that be true, that it is a change of existing law?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Let me continue for one moment. The point the gentleman makes, I think, is not well taken, for we claim that the exercise of that discretion by the Commissioner of Pensions has been a usurpation in violation of the law of 1890, and not in harmony with the law. We must stand upon that ground or we can not stand upon any.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, allow me to proceed with my question. The present law fixes no maximum or minimum amount which shall be construed as determining whether the widow applicant for a pension has means of livelihood or not, or is dependent solely upon her daily labor.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is true.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, there being no maximum or minimum limit fixed by the law, this amendment proposes to fix it, and does it not to that extent change the existing law?

Mr. GROSVENOR. It may not change existing law; but the argument here is that this is new legislation upon an appropriation bill. Now, the question for our consideration is to determine whether or not it is new legislation. It undertakes to declare the purpose of the original law, and that purpose of the original law was something greater and better than the construction of the Pension Office.

In conclusion I have but this to say, Mr. Chairman. I differ with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] in asking that this question shall go over to some future legislation and that the Chair should be relieved of the duty of ruling upon it. I shall be content with the ruling of the Chair, whatever it may be; but if this presents, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] says it does present, a question of doubt, then the spirit of this law appeals to the Chair and to the House to construe the statute for the benefit and not to the injury of the beneficiaries under that statute. Every doubtful question, in construing a statute of this character, ought to be construed in favor of the beneficiaries. It ought not be construed—and there, in my humble judgment, is the mistake of the current administration of the Pension Office—doubtful questions of this character, it has been claimed here, and with great force, have been construed by the office against the applicant. Here is the most worthy of all, in my opinion, of the beneficiaries under the pension law—the widows. I appeal to the Chair, if he has any doubt about it and does not understand clearly that it is a violation of the rules of the House, to give the benefit of the doubt in favor of these beneficiaries. I do not want to vote upon an appeal, for I would feel bound to recognize the ruling of the Chair on this question; and I regret that a gentleman of so high a character for benevolence and kindness of heart as the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] should have made this point of order, so fatal, if it shall be sustained, to the best interests of a great class of beneficiaries under this beneficent law.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say a word on this bill or about this point of order. In the Committee of Appropriations, in common with most of the personnel of that committee, this provision received, upon the merits, my hearty approval. It received that approval for the reason that the law as it is construed by the authority that has the power to construe it is unfair. I believe that it works a hardship, and I believe this provision would cure that hardship.

Now, if the point of order had not been invoked, I think it would have been enacted because I am inclined to think that the Committee of the Whole House is in favor of the law. But the point of order has been invoked. The rule is direct and imperative that no legislation shall be in order upon a general appropriation bill. Now, I am for this provision, because it is legislation. "Ah," says somebody, "it is limitation."

Mr. GROSVENOR. Declaration.

Mr. CANNON. The limitations that have been placed on appropriations, and under which the precedents were made or supposed to have been made that have been referred to, to justify this, were upon the principle that a law is one thing, but that Congress is not compelled to appropriate to carry out a law; that the discretion rests with us, and therefore that we may limit an appropriation and thereby leave all or a part of a law without any money to carry it out. This has the form of limitation, but it has the substance of legislation and enlargement; and, after all, it is the spirit, the substance, that maketh alive and that determines, and not the mere form.

Now, I say again I am heartily in favor of this legislation, if it comes up in the proper way; but when the point of order is invoked, if it should be overruled, we should make a precedent, and upon the appropriation bills that are to follow after in this Congress this precedent would nullify the rule when invoked. Much as I should like to see the legislation enacted, I do not believe that we can afford to nullify that rule.

Mr. MAHON. It can be put into law through another committee.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says it can be put into law through another committee which has plenary jurisdiction. I hope so, and I believe the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] has notified us that he will promptly report a bill covering this and other points.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I only wish to say one word in conclusion. Certain appeals have been made to the Chair, and certain appeals have been made to me. I am surprised to hear gentlemen of this committee, on a question of parliamentary ruling on what is in reality a question of law, appeal to the Chair to decide improperly, because the doubtful question should be construed in favor of the widow. On the other hand, gladly as I should listen to the suggestions urged plausibly in behalf of the widow, I must decline to withdraw my point of order, because I do not think we have any right, as representatives of the people of

the United States, to take money wrung from the people by taxation and give it to ladies who do not need or require the money. As to this question of the change of existing law, let me say one word, Mr. Chairman. The suspension for one year of any existing statute is a change of existing law. As the poet says:

> The present moment is our own,
> The next we never know.

So, in so far as existing law goes, it is the law of the current year which affects us. There might be more force in the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] if the word "existing" were omitted. If it were merely "no change of law," there might be some plausibility in his suggestion. But when we find here an inhibition against any change of "existing" law, what does that mean? It means the law which exists to-day; and the suspension of any statute existing in the year 1896 is the change of law for that year. Let us see how it would be with other laws. The suspension of the laws of inheritance would be a change of existing law. The suspension of a law providing for capital punishment during the current year would certainly be a change of existing law, and a change which would find favor with a certain class in the community.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules upon this point I want to suggest briefly another view, or perhaps the same view which I did not succeed in making clear when I addressed the Chair before. I am willing to strike out the second proviso in this paragraph if the Chair should hold it to be objectionable under the point of order. The proposition then will be—and I ask particular attention of the Chair, because I shall only occupy a few minutes:

> During the fiscal year 1897, in expending this appropriation, it shall not be necessary for a widow in establishing her claim to a pension under the provisions of the act of June 27, 1890, to prove that she is without other means of support than her daily labor.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I shall object to that.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I have not made the motion yet. If the Chair will observe, this is a declaration that it shall not be necessary for the widow to prove this. It does not say that it shall not be proven by somebody. The Government may still prove it if they think it advisable. If the Chair will look at the present law, he will observe that this is not a change of that law at all:

> Leaving a widow without other means of support than her daily labor.

Where is the provision in that law that the widow must prove that fact? The Commissioner of Pensions has said that she must do it before she can obtain a pension. The law does not say so at all. The law does not impose on her the burden of making that proof. This provision in this bill says that it shall not be necessary for the widow to establish that fact; and I stand here as a lawyer, and I declare upon my judgment as such, that it does not change existing law in any particular, because that law does not exist that says that the widow shall make this proof at all.

It exists in this form, which says:

> Shall hereafter die leaving a widow without other means of support than her daily labor.

The law does not put that burden upon the widow at all. We may change that ruling of the Commissioner of Pensions without changing the law. The trouble is that he has erred in the law in the construction of this statute, and he has held that the widow must make this proof, that the law does not require the widow to do at all, and never did. We say that she need not do it. He may still do it if he thinks it advisable after this bill is passed, and undo the law. By striking out the second proviso leaves it unobjectionable and not covered by this point of order at all. I challenge every lawyer and every jurist in this House to say whether that is not a correct and proper legal construction of the status before this commitee at the present time.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I accept the challenge, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I challenge the lawyers. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make the parliamentary inquiry: Are we discussing the amendment as it appears on the bill reported, or are we discussing the modified amendment now suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I think, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of the gentleman from New York, that I would leave out the proviso in the paragraph, if I have understood the intimations of the Chair correctly. I do not want to force the Chair to an unwilling ruling, because I know the sympathy of the Chair is strongly in favor of sustaining this portion of the bill; but I suggest that if the Chair should sustain the point of order that I would then renew the amendment leaving out the proviso of the paragraph. If the Chair should not sustain the point of order that will be unnecessary. I will ask unanimous consent to strike out the proviso in the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The proviso can be stricken out by unanimous consent. Does the gentleman from New York object to that?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. The gentleman means striking out the proviso with reference to $500 in the paragraph? I do not object, provided that it is not to be considered as binding as to what remains.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Certainly not.

Mr. POWERS. I shall have to object. That proviso, in my judgment, is what places the whole thing out of the reach of the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Very well; I will wait until after the Chair has ruled.

The CHAIRMAN. The question of order which has been raised assumes special importance because of the fact that if there should be any variation from the construction of the rule as it has always governed in Committee of the Whole on account of the sympathy that we may have for the particular legislation proposed, it would be a precedent that would rise to trouble us in all subsequent propositions looking to legislation in appropriation bills. The Chair will endeavor, therefore, to consider the question from the parliamentary point of view, and endeavor to follow what he believes to be the almost uniform practice of the House.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] raises the point of order that the pending paragraph is in violation of clause 2 of Rule XXI, the last paragraph of which—that bearing on the point of order that has been raised—reads as follows:

> Nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order on any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

That has been the rule in the consideration of a general appropriation bill in the Committee of the Whole for many years. The rule has been modified several times with a view to reducing expenditures, but never so far as this particular point is concerned. The grounds of public policy on which this rule rests are—

First. That inasmuch as general appropriation bills carry the appropriations necessary to maintain the Government, and only appropriations already authorized by existing law, it is of the highest importance that they should not be impeded or jeopardized by differences in the House, or differences between the House and Senate, or differences between the two Houses and the Executive over any legislative propositions that may be proposed as amendments to such bills, each of which should be tried out on its own merits in separate bills.

Secondly. That in view of the fact that the Committee on Appropriations can only consider the question of appropriations—the subject committed to them by the rules—and that each particular subject of legislation is required to be considered by a standing committee which has jurisdiction of that subject, each committee should be held to attend to its particular work. If general legislation on the subject of pensions is proposed, the rule requires that such proposition of legislation shall go to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and that committee having the right to report at any time may, on any day bring in any amendment of the pension laws and present it for the consideration of the House, after due consideration as to the effect of such legislation. It is supposed that a special committee having in charge that particular subject has given special attention to such legislation, has looked into all its parts, and is able to bring in a bill of a comprehensive character, which when brought into the House may then be subject to amendments in the ordinary way. It has been found by experience that legislation on appropriation bills is usually exceedingly narrow and unsatisfactory, because of the fact that it had not been considered by the committee having the special subject in charge.

Thirdly, another ground of objection to legislation on an appropriation bill lies in the fact that even if an amendment should be admitted here which is in the nature of general legislation, changing existing law, our rules would so restrict amendments to it that it would be almost impossible to perfect it.

For these three reasons this rule, controlling the action of the Committee of the Whole with reference to proposed new legislation, has been found necessary not only to prevent the delay or failure of general appropriation bills, but also to secure good legislation, and only legislation in which there was general concurrence has, as a rule, been included in such bills. Having stated the grounds on which this rule rests, the question arises whether the pending provision is, as matter of fact, a change of existing law.

There has been more or less discussion of that point, but there is one vital fact to which the Chair desires to call the attention of the committee, because it presents in a nut shell the whole question at issue. The pension act of 1890, which this paragraph proposes to either amend or construe—whichever view is adopted—does not provide that the widow of an enlisted man who served ninety days in the Army or Navy shall receive a pension simply upon proof of her husband's death, without proving his death to have been the result of his service. That act requires something more. That something more is the occasion of the legislation proposed by this paragraph, and the occasion of the deserved complaint which has

been made against the administration of the Pension Office with reference to its construction of the law. This additional condition or fact, which must be shown by competent proof in order to entitle such a widow to a pension, is expressed in the law of 1890 in these words: "Leaving a widow without other means of support than her daily labor."

Now, that provision means something. It was intended to mean something when the act of 1890 was passed. I think the Commissioner of Pensions has not given that language the construction which the Congress that enacted the law intended it should bear; but nevertheless it means something. It is certainly a limitation of law to some extent, and a restriction or condition of law which must be met by some proof. And as the Pension Office can not be expected to furnish proof to show that any applicant is entitled to a pension, it necessarily follows that the law of 1890 contemplates that the widow should present the proof required by law.

Now, what does the paragraph under consideration propose? It proposes to give a pension to any widow of a soldier who has died from a cause not originating in his service without requiring any kind of proof with respect to her having other means of support than her daily labor, and by a proviso to establish a new rule, namely, that when a widow shall have shown that her net annual income does not exceed $500 she shall be entitled to a pension.

While I have great sympathy with that amendment, it does seem to me to be clearly a change of existing law. It is a change in the right direction, but nevertheless it is a change of existing law.

It has been contended that the pending paragraph is merely a construction of existing law, and that a construction of the meaning and intent of a law which has been heretofore enacted is not the "new legislation" prohibited by the rule. Everyone knows that no legislative construction can be given to a law that is upon the statute book without a legislative enactment. A construction of an existing law by an act of Congress must be itself a piece of legislation that has been passed by the two Houses of Congress and received the approval of the President. In fact, it is new legislation in every sense, because if it should be held that any act of legislation could be put upon an appropriation bill simply because it professed to construe anterior law, any gentleman could propose an amendment giving any kind of construction to an anterior law, whether right or wrong, thus opening up in the consideration of an appropriation bill in Committee of the Whole any proposition for new legislation under the guise of construing the law.

It does not seem to me that there can be any distinction made in this respect between different legislative acts. If an act is in fact new legislation, it seems to the Chair that it is subject to the point of order under the rule that it is new legislation or (what is the same thing) a change of existing law as construed by the authority that can alone construe it, subject to appeal to the courts, unless Congress shall step in and construe it by a new law.

Another point has been raised—and it is a point of importance—that this legislation is only a limitation or restriction on the expenditure of the money appropriated by the pending bill during the fiscal year in which it will be operative.

Before considering this point the Chair desires to say that the fact that this legislation is limited in operation to one year does not change its character at all. It is still new legislation for one year, a change of existing law for one year, or, if you please to style it an act suspending existing legislation for one year, the fact still remains that it is, pro tanto, a change of existing law.

There can be no doubt about that. Otherwise the tariff law which passed the House the other day might be proposed as an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill, to the paragraph providing for customs, on the ground that it did not propose to change permanently the existing law—only to suspend it—and was limited in its operation to two and a half years. If an act of the legislative power changes a law upon the statute book for a single year or a single month, or for any period, longer or shorter, it seems to the Chair that it must be a change of existing law.

The argument so strongly urged that this paragraph proposes merely a limitation or restriction on the use of the appropriation for pensions, and that it comes, therefore, under a well-settled practice of the House in Committee of the Whole, seems to the Chair to not be well founded. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] has cited what may, perhaps, be said to be a precedent which practically establishes the principle of limitation; that is the proviso which was ruled to be in order on an appropriation bill, and which was in this language:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall not use any of the money appropriated by this paragraph for the printing of greenbacks of a larger denomination than those that are canceled.

Now, look for a moment at the principle of limitation or restriction as established by that proviso. In that case the law authorized the printing of greenbacks of any denomination in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. The proviso limited the use of the money which was appropriated for that single year to the printing of denominations which should not be larger than those that were canceled. Now, observe that the limitation was simply this: The appropriation could not be used for one purpose authorized by law; that is all the limitation there was to it. The proviso did not undertake to say that the appropriation could be used for printing or doing something not already authorized by law. In order to be considered as a limitation or restriction, a provision must prohibit the use of the appropriation for some purpose already authorized by law.

The reason for that rule of limitation is simply this: The House in Committee of the Whole has the right to refuse to appropriate for any object which it may deem improper, although that object may be authorized by law; and it has been contended, and on various occasions sustained by the Committee of the Whole, that if the committee has the right to refuse to appropriate anything for a particular purpose authorized by law, it can appropriate for only a part of that purpose and prohibit the use of the money for the rest of the purpose authorized by law. That principle of limitation has been sustained so repeatedly that it may be regarded as a part of the parliamentary law of the Committee of the Whole.

But observe that the provision now under consideration is not a limitation or restriction; it is an extension. It provides not that the money herein appropriated shall not be used for a purpose authorized by law, but that it may be used for a purpose not already authorized by law. It is an extension, not a limitation. If it should be held that propositions of this character could be presented and entertained as in order on the ground that they are limitations, there is no possible legislation that might not be presented on an appropriation bill and be held to be in order, thus obstructing the passage of appropriation bills.

The Chair is aware that in a few exceptional cases this principle of limitation has been improperly construed to include an enlargement of the objects for which an appropriation may be used; but the exceptions have so clearly disregarded the theory on which limitations rest that they only serve to prove the correct rule.

So, from every point of view, it seems to the Chair, if this question is to be decided on sound principles of parliamentary law, if a practice that will be safe in the handling of appropriation bills hereafter is to be established, it is exceedingly important that we should start at the beginning of this Congress by laying down correctly the rule with reference to new legislation on appropriation bills.

The Chair confesses that he might have been somewhat embarrassed from the fact that he is in favor of substantially the legislation proposed, but in view of the fact that the Committee on Invalid Pensions can report at any time legislation broadening the operation of the existing laws—legislation going to the extent that legislation ought to go—all embarrassment is removed; for, without violating the rules of this House and still maintaining correct principles with reference to the conduct of business in the Committee of the Whole and without obstructing the passage of general appropriation bills, it is possible to accomplish in other ways much more than what is proposed to be accomplisned here.

The Chair is therefore constrained to sustain the point of order against this provision.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After end of line 21, page 2, insert:
"During the fiscal year 1897, in expending this appropriation it shall not be necessary for a widow, in establishing her claim to a pension under the provisions of the act of June 27, 1890, to prove that she is without other means of support than her daily labor."

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I raise the point of order that the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania violates the provisions of the second clause of Rule XXI and is therefore out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] desire to make any remarks on the point of order?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I simply desire to call the attention of the Chair to the remarks which I made when last on the floor in support of the amendment then pending. I do not think that this amendment changes the law at all. While it proposes to relieve the widow from proving that she has no means of support except her daily labor, the existing law does not require her to make such proof; it is only the Commissioner of Pensions who has required that she shall make such proof.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow me a question?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. PICKLER. Is this a committee amendment?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Entirely so; every word of it has the approval of the committee.

Mr. PICKLER. Has the committee authorized this amendment?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Oh, yes; they authorized this amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I should like to say a few words in support of the point of order. [Cries of "Rule!" "Rule!"]

I submit the point for the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not seem to the Chair that the principles laid down in the ruling made a few moments ago are at all obviated by the modification of the amendment. Precisely the same objection applies to it—that it is unquestionably a change of existing law, or at least an attempt to declare what the law is by new legislation. In the opinion of the Chair, therefore, the point of order must be sustained.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] was pending on a point of order when general consent was given to pass over the paragraph with the right to recur to it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I listened very attentively to the ruling of the distinguished occupant of the chair, and fully concur in what he has said. I agree that it is correct in every particular, and the point of order having been sustained on the former amendment, I recognize that it would be useless to press my amendment before the present occupant of the chair. I propose to withdraw it now and will present it again when the chair is occupied by some other gentleman. I will try it on then. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. STEELE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment that I offered some time ago in a somewhat modified form.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That it shall be competent for the Commissioner of Pensions, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to establish such rules and regulations for the presentation and prosecution of pension claims as shall be necessary to facilitate the transaction of business: *Provided*, That all such rules and regulations shall be made public.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I think that is the law now.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I do not want to go into a discussion of the matter, but I reserve my objection.

Mr. STEELE. What is the gentleman's objection?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I make the point of order upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order that the amendment changes existing law.

Mr. STEELE. I do not believe that I will discuss the point of order further than to say that this is now the existing law and is therefore no change. It requires no additional expense; it is only the indication of how the committee would have the Commissioner or Secretary of the Interior observe the rules and regulations that they have promulgated and made public. It is only an indication of what we would have done when we make the appropriation. It does not change the law, it does not involve the expenditure of any additional money, it is not an increase of the expenditures in any manner, and is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, if it is really no change of existing law it seems to me that it is a very foolish proposition.

Mr. STEELE. There are a great many things that seem to the gentleman from New York to be foolish, but upon which many other people are not likely to agree with him. We can not agree upon anything.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. And it seems to me that there must be some motive underlying the presentation of such a proposition. For that reason I feel compelled to reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman claim that it does change existing law?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I so claim.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman be kind enough to point out the law which is changed by this proposition?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. What I apprehend is this, Mr. Chairman, that whereas the Commissioner of Pensions has the general authority now to make such rules and regulations as he deems fit, this provides for a certain class of rules; so that it may be regarded, possibly, as a limitation upon the existing powers of the Commissioner—that is, it gives him power to make such rules and regulations as he sees proper, for what? For the presentation and prosecution of pension claims, as shall be necessary to facilitate the transaction of business. If not, what is the necessity for the amendment? Now, the Commissioner has that power. It may be claimed under the amendment that he had not power to make such rules and regulations as might be necessary in cases of fraud, or for the detection of collusion, or detection of any illegality in the papers. That is the reason why I can see that this construction would make practically a change in existing law.

Mr. STEELE. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, it leaves it entirely with the Secretary of the Interior. Not a single word of coercion is in the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is under the impression, unless some one can cite a law to the contrary, that it is simply a reaffirmation of the existing law. If so, it is doubtful if a point of order would lie against it, although it might be an argument against the adoption of the amendment that it is only a reaffirmation of what is the law, and therefore an unnecessary addition to an appropriation bill. Unless some one can point out a change of law the Chair is not inclined to sustain the point of order.

There being no such suggestion, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the amendment a minute or two. I am one of the friends of the soldiers of this country who would not favor any legislation whatever to enable a man to go upon the pension rolls who is not entitled to a pension, and I am in favor of every regulation to prevent fraud. So I am with the widows of soldiers. Unless the widow who applies for a pension can establish her widowship of a soldier who performed honest and honorable service I would not have her name upon the pension roll.

The gentleman who spoke yesterday referred to a Commissioner of Pensions who was appointed in 1881, and charged that pensions were allowed during that period for political purposes. I desire to assert, without fear of contradiction, that the appointment of the gentleman who served from 1881 to 1885 was the wisest that has been made by any President of the United States since we have had a Commissioner of Pensions; that there was more real good, kind judgment in the mind and heart of that gentleman than there has been in any man who has been appointed since.

While I would prevent those who should not be upon the pension rolls from getting there, I do not favor the present system, as in its mysterious and crooked ways it prevents an honest soldier from being placed upon the roll. In this respect it has about reached perfection. I do not charge that it has grown up entirely under the present Commissioner of Pensions, and I want to do myself the honor of saying more than the gentleman who spoke for him yesterday, who said that the present Commissioner of Pensions is "said to have a good record." I say that he has a good record as a soldier, that he was a brave soldier, and that I believe his heart is better than it seems to be. On the one hand he is governed by a man whom I do not think has the kind and good feeling for the soldiers of the country that he ought to have, and on the other hand he is at the mercy of men who are in place, who would make the Pension Department a life institution. Their regret is that the soldiers can not live as long as some of these young fellows will live, so that they may not lose their jobs. A majority of the men in the Pension Office, it seems to me, are a law unto themselves, and the more impediments they can throw in the way of a claimant the better service they seem to think they perform. It will be so under the present law regulating appointment to office, and unless the Commissioner of Pensions can discharge employees because of their incompetence or because they know too little or too much, and then be allowed something to say in the selection of his help to do the work of the Pension Department, matters will grow worse than they now are, if possible. I believe if the Commissioner of Pensions was allowed to select his employees because of their integrity, competency, and sympathy the work might be carried on with one-half the present force, and business greatly facilitated. I do not care to talk about what the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] has said. He has a right to his opinion. He has a right in a flippant or obstinate way to object to proper questions. That is his privilege. I will not speak of the harmless shafts that have been shivered on a coat of mail or a devoted head; nor about the income tax; I was not subject to it, I am sorry to say.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Your salary was.

Mr. STEELE. I was not drawing much salary at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEELE. I should like to have a minute or two more.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] takes the floor and yields to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE].

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to see a gentleman who professes friendship for the soldiers rise in his seat and make a speech against them. I was sorry to have objection made yesterday when I offered a resolution asking the present Secretary of War, who is not a soldier, who was too young to be a soldier, if in his opinion the duties now performed by the Assistant Secretary of War might not be better performed after the 4th of March, 1897, by the selection by him, the Secretary of War, of the General of the Army or the Adjutant-General of the Army to perform the duties of Secretary of War during his sickness or temporary absence.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Was the gentleman a member of the Fifty-first Congress, a Republican Congress, which created that ornamental office, and did he vote for the bill?

Mr. STEELE. I was not a member of the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am glad that the gentleman escaped voting for that bill.

Mr. STEELE. I did not vote for the bill. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that the heroes of the war ought to be kindergarten instructors. I do not believe that a stripling should be selected as Assistant Secretary of War, who may order about the heroes of the rebellion. Why, in eight years at most the General of the Army will go out of active service, and as he is the youngest man, or about so, of the general officers or staff who served during the war, and who must retire within the time named on account of age, the Department and Army will be in the hands of civilians or officers appointed since the war.

Now, I know my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] did not mean to say yesterday that he wanted a little more civilian blood in it. Why, the Secretary of War is a civilian, and the duties of the Assistant Secretary of War, under the old régime, were limited to such as he directed during his absence. No trouble ever came on account of it. There is not much military about it; yet, if I am not misinformed, the present Assistant Secretary of War, so far from being a civilian in his notions, visits from post to post in the Army and is not at all satisfied unless the troops are turned out and a salute is fired in his honor, being more military display than Secretaries of War ask or expect. If this be correct, and I think it is from what I have heard and seen of the young gentleman, there is too much civilian for him.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to live in a country and in an age when people, without regard to party, generally are proud to care for their soldiers. They are proud to give them good homes, where they have not homes of their own. The best soldiers' homes ever erected have been provided for them by the liberality of Congress, and they are now so crowded that men are sleeping on the floors and hundreds are waiting their turn for admission.

I am glad that I live in an age when the people feel like granting liberal pensions to their soldiers, and am sorry that we even have one man who objects to the harmless legislation, if you please to so call it, that is proposed in this bill, such as will induce or compel the Department to carry out the spirit of the laws enacted rather than grade them, and that will at the same time prevent the improper expenditure of the money appropriated.

Something must be done during the present session of Congress, and more especially for those soldiers who, on account of false modesty, deferred filing their applications until it is now about impossible for them to make the technical proof required.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if he insists on this amendment? It does not seem to do anything more than to authorize the Commissioner.

Mr. STEELE. I do not think it will do any harm, and I would like it to go in.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It might do this—let me call the attention of the gentleman. It might make legal and perhaps ratify similar orders to Order 229, which has been very obnoxious to the whole country. This amendment as it is drawn states—

That it shall be competent for the Commissioner of Pensions, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to establish such rules and regulations for the presentation and prosecution of pension claims as shall be necessary to facilitate the transaction of business.

Now, here is a rule or regulation established by the Commissioner of Pensions, which is very obnoxious, in reference to the taking of affidavits, which makes it impossible for anybody to prepare affidavits unless he has been properly drilled.

Mr. STEELE. If there is even a suspicion that it will indorse Rule 229, I certainly will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana withdraws his amendment.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois desires to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the bill by inserting after the word "dollars," in line 4, page 2, these words "to be paid quarterly to all pensioners now borne on the rolls, or which may be hereafter placed thereon, at the rates now allowed such pensioners, or at such increased rates as may be hereafter allowed them by law."

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, that part of the bill has been passed over, and I will have to make the point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is made that that part of the bill has been passed over, and that no amendment to it would be in order.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania to state that this portion of the bill should be informally passed over, and that we should return to it and have opportunity to offer amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. It was the paragraph commencing with line 9 and ending with line 21 that was passed over.

Mr. WOOD. I did not so understand the gentleman. There was no opportunity offered, Mr. Chairman, of presenting an amendment to the first section. Some amendment will have to be offered there, I think, because the bill as it is now before the committee provides—

For Army and Navy pensions, as follows: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, army nurses, survivors and widows of the war of 1812 and with Mexico, and the survivors and widows of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, $140,000,000.

There is not a syllable in it that provides for the pensioners of the late war—the war of the rebellion. I care not what the committee meant by this language, as it is it does not apply to those pensioners.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Let me say, in reply to the gentleman, that this bill is in the identical language of all pension bills that have passed since 1862.

Mr. WOOD. I am aware of that fact, but there have been some very strict constructions of appropriation bills made in the past year. I submit to the members of the committee and to the Chair that the bill as it is absolutely makes no provision for the payment of pensions growing out of the late war—the war of the rebellion. If the gentleman will look at it he will see the point I am making.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I desire to reserve my point of order, and wait until this debate is closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania makes another point of order. I desire to make the point of order that it changes existing law, and will wait until this point of order has been determined.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves the point of order that this amendment, if admitted, even if it is conceded that the paragraph is now amendable, is in violation of Rule XXI. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania insist upon the point of order that the committee can not go back to the paragraph?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not make that point of order. Clearly he can not afford to suggest——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, there is so much noise that I can not hear what gentlemen are saying.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What possible objection can the gentleman from Pennsylvania have to the introduction of these words in this bill, which alone in my judgment make the appropriation applicable to the pensioners of the civil war?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Then, Mr. Chairman, there is another thing——

Mr. GROSVENOR. Let me ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania this. I do not care what former bills have had, following the words "for Army and Navy pensions," following the colon—

For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, army nurses, survivors, and widows of the war of 1812 and with Mexico——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The gentleman overlooks the first section of the bill, which provides for the payment of pensions authorized by law. Such pensions as the law authorizes—should not that include pensions growing out of the late war?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. NORTHWAY. The gentleman on my right clearly understood that he might go back and ask you a question in reference to this paragraph, and I think it would be right to let him go back. That was the understanding here on the right.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I did not so understand, but if the gentleman understood that he had the right to offer an amendment I will withdraw the point. I would like to have the amendment reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his objection to going back, and the Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment of Mr. WOOD was again reported.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I shall object to that, as changing existing law.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It seems to me that the gentleman offering this amendment has misunderstood the meaning of the first two paragraphs of the bill. The language is:

For Army and Navy pensions, as follows: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, army nurses, survivors and widows of the war of 1812, etc.

Each class is designated. The bill does not mention specifically the survivors of the late war of the rebellion, but they are clearly intended, and the law could not be understood otherwise. This language has been used in every act since the first pension act was passed.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Analyzing that language now, with nothnig there but a comma to indicate the meaning, how can the gentleman say that it is not limited to the war of 1812 by a strict con-

struction, which the distinguished Comptroller of the Treasury would be only too glad to make?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The present administration of the Department of the Interior has already construed the same language in previous pension bills.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether this is not substantially the same as an amendment that has been stricken out?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. No; it is not the same.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. How have pensions been paid to soldiers of the late war heretofore—under what laws?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Under acts having the same language that is contained in this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then, what is the necessity for this amendment?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not think there is any necessity whatever for it; but at the same time the amendment is properly before the committee. It is the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] that has raised the point of order upon it, not I. I simply want to relieve the minds of members of the impression that it is necessary to have any more specific mention of the pensioners of the late war.

Mr. CANNON. Let us have the amendment read again, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment was again read, as above.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that that amendment violates Rule XXI by changing existing law. It allows no decrease in pension rates. It makes the rates permanent, and that is not the law.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order I wish to say that it is unjust to the pensioners to pass such an amendment as this, as no increase of pension can be allowed under it; and if our friends on the other side want to have increased pensions allowed, they had better vote down this amendment.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few remarks on the point of order. We are now considering an appropriation bill which will cause the expenditure of over $141,000,000. We have a right in this bill to prescribe the purposes for which the money is to be paid. In the first place, the language of the bill so far, to say the least, is subject to the construction that the appropriation does not apply to pensioners who have been placed on the rolls from causes arising out of the late civil war. The amendment which I have offered proposes that the money that we are appropriating shall be paid quarterly to all pensioners now borne on the rolls or who may hereafter be placed thereon. It also provides that it shall be paid to them at such rates as they are now allowed by law, or at such increased rates as may hereafter be allowed by law.

What objection is there to it? If we have the right to appropriate the money, have we not the right to say where that money shall go? Does this amendment interfere with any existing law? Does it even prevent the Commissioner of Pensions from engaging in the work of cutting off pensioners? The fact that a man may not be on the pension rolls to-day does not prevent the Congress of the United States from appropriating money for him. This amendment does not change existing law. It does not add to expenditures under this bill. It makes not a penny of difference in the amount of appropriation made by the bill. And, in conclusion, let me say it is absolutely necessary that this amendment, or some amendment of this kind, shall be adopted to determine with certainty where the money which we are appropriating shall go, for I do insist that upon a construction no more strict than those which have been made in the past year by disbursing officers of this Government not one dollar of the $141,000,000 appropriated by this bill need be paid to a man or the widow of a man who earned his pension by service in the war of the rebellion.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the language of the act of 1894:

> For Army and Navy pensions, as follows: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, army nurses, survivors and widows of the war of 1812 and with Mexico, and the survivors and widows of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive.

Then comes the amount appropriated. That is the exact language of the present bill.

Mr. CANNON. Let me ask the gentleman from Iowa a question. The language of this bill being in punctuation and everything else precisely that which has been employed for many years and which has received the construction of the accounting officers, does not the gentleman think, from his observation as a lawyer and as a legislator, that under such circumstances it might be dangerous, or at least inexpedient, in view of possible danger, to adopt a change of language which might result in a difference of construction?

Mr. LACEY. That is a very long question, but I will answer it in this way: If this language did not cover the soldiers of the late war I think there is somebody in the present Administration that would have been able to find it out. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa a question? I hold in my hand the pending appropriation bill. It does refer specifically to the war of 1812; it does refer specifically to the Indian wars; but there is not one line of reference in the whole bill to the war of the rebellion.

Mr. LACEY. Well, it will be construed that from the words "invalid" down to the comma preceding the words "survivors and widows of the war of 1812" the language applies generally. I do not think that this is the best language in the world, but it is the exact language which has been used in these bills for some years past.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Are we afraid to mention the late war of the rebellion?

Mr. LACEY. I think not. I think I have heard some gentlemen mention it boldly and defiantly on this floor during the last day or two. [Laughter.]

Mr. WOOD. Are there not invalid pensioners of the war with Mexico now borne on the roll?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly; and they are covered by this bill in terms.

Mr. WOOD. Is not the enumeration of certain classes generally held to be the exclusion of other classes?

Mr. LACEY. There are invalid pensions payable now to soldiers of the Mexican war. Some such soldiers have been drawing pensions during forty years past for wounds received in that war.

Mr. WOOD. Do we not by enumerating certain classes of persons to whom this appropriation shall be distributed exclude other classes? Is not that a well-settled rule of law?

Mr. LACEY. I do not think that rule will be applied in the construction of the language of this bill. I think these words have been found ample heretofore.

Mr. WOOD. It will not do any harm, will it, to complete the enumeration?

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I have procured a copy of the last pension appropriation act for the purpose of reading from it, but the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] has already read the language of the act of the preceding year. The language in both acts, namely, that of 1894 and that of 1895, is identical with that used in this bill; and more than this, it is the same language always heretofore used in this bill.

Mr. LACEY. Might we not cast a doubt on the provisions of the acts of 1894 and 1895 by the insertion of additional words?

Mr. GROUT. Precisely so. The suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] as to the danger of adopting new language when the language heretofore used has received a settled construction at the Department should have great weight. Not only is this bill in the language of former laws, under which the present Administration has readily paid out the money heretofore appropriated, although we have been told, and perhaps not with exaggeration, that this Administration is not friendly to the soldier—not only this, but the language of this bill is that of the estimates from the Department. I hold those estimates in my hand; I need not take the time of the House to read from them, but the language is identical.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then we had better let well enough alone.

Mr. GROUT. As the gentleman from Georgia suggests, it seems to me we had better not undertake to reconstruct or reform this bill in any particular. It is understood by everyone as appropriating pensions to the invalids and widows of all wars in the language used heretofore, although it seems perhaps somewhat inadequate to the casual observer——

Mr. GROSVENOR. Why not, then, use adequate language?

Mr. GROUT. But this is held to be adequate language.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Held by whom?

Mr. GROUT. If the gentleman will wait until I complete my sentence he will understand. I was saying that it seemed somewhat inadequate to the casual observer, but has been held to be adequate by the Department and by the two Houses of Congress over and over again. This being the case, what occasion is there to change it? I think we had better let it alone.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Who has ever raised a question?

Mr. GROUT. I hope that the gentleman will not insist on the proposed change. I was not present when it was presented and am not able to say whether it is subject to the point of order. But if it is insisted upon and not ruled out I hope it will be voted down. It is entirely unnecessary and might get us into trouble. Leave it where it is; where everybody understands it as being correct and sufficient; where there has, in fact, no question ever been raised in reference to it at the Department or elsewhere till now.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry: What is the status of the pending question? Has the Chair ruled on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is pending and has not yet been decided.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. It seems to me that we had better have a ruling and proceed with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] who makes the point of order to point out the change made by the amendment in the existing law.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that this money shall be paid quarterly to all pensioners now borne upon the roll. That is, now, at the present time. I claim if that provision be enacted into law that no man can be dropped from the pension rolls or suspended for any cause, no matter how just, hereafter, and that the list must remain inviolate throughout the whole period of this fiscal year.

It not only affects those who are now on the pension roll, but it will affect all those who may be placed thereon hereafter at the rate now fixed by law. That would fix all of those now on the rolls permanently there, no matter how wrongfully their names were put upon the rolls. It provides that their payment shall continue, and does not under any circumstances allow a change to be made. The only change that would be possible under this amendment would be an increase of pension. So it would seem that this is a change in the existing law in several important particulars, and for that reason I make the point of order upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois who offers the amendment desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the amendment to prevent the Commissioner of Pensions from proceeding to pass upon any claim on the report of his examiners, or his deputies, or his postmasters, and proceed to drop a pensioner from the rolls wherever just cause is shown. There is nothing to prevent him from cutting anybody off under the amendment. It is not a permanent provision of law, as the gentleman from New York has maintained, for the reason that this appropriation only lasts until the 30th day of June, 1897. Therefore, it can not be claimed in any sense to be a permanent provision.

Does the gentleman from New York or anyone else pretend that this Congress has not the right to make an appropriation for a man now upon the pension rolls at his present allowance and to continue it up to a certain date? Is that changing existing law? If so, do not all appropriation bills change existing law? Can it be contended for a moment that this Congress is disbursing $141,000,000 of the public money and is absolutely shorn of its power from providing that the pensioner who may be dropped from the rolls shall be paid to the end of the quarter when he gets his notice?

Mr. CANNON. Will my colleague allow me a question?

Mr. WOOD. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Does the amendment of my colleague do that?

Mr. WOOD. It is a good amendment, I will say to my colleague from Illinois. [Laughter.]

The effect of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, is to clear up and make plain some language which has been criticised by those who think the bill is well enough already. It is said that there has been a construction of a statute of a similar character. Has the point ever been raised before? There has been money paid out for sugar bounties, for instance—paid out right along for years, and yet under a precisely similar statute there came along an officer and decided that he was greater than the Congress of the United States, and that payment was held up. So when we provide that this money shall be paid to the pensioners at the rate they are now given by law, or such increased rates as may hereafter be allowed them, we are providing where the money shall go. If, when the bill is passed, or at the proper time, there is any trouble about the title of it, we can amend that without debate, as I understand, under the rules of the House.

Now, why is not this proper in this bill? It is germane and is entirely pertinent to the bill itself. Will the chairman of this committee pretend that we might not appropriate money in this bill, for instance, to a pensioner who had been dropped under the thirty days' notice of the law of a year or so ago? If it specified the old rate the effect of it would be to continue the pension for thirty days. If for thirty days, why not for a quarter?

Can we not then say in this appropriation that if a pensioner is cut off his pension shall be continued up to the time of the expiration of this appropriation? I believe that the amendment is right, that it is not subject to any point of order, that it will do no harm to this bill. It will do good, and be a measure of safety, and make every man and every widow and every child on that pension roll feel easier. They will sleep better at night. This is distributing the bounty of the Government, and merely designating where that bounty shall go; and if that is not the principal office of an appropriation bill, pure and simple, I have yet to learn what it is.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I should like to have a ruling on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that under the statement of the effect of this amendment, made by the gentleman who proposes it, that it is clearly subject to the point of order, and the Chair sustains it.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I wish to make an announcement to the committee, that if we can get through with this bill to-night, I intend to move that when the House adjourn it adjourn until Monday. I should like to dispose of this bill to-night. I do not like to have it go over until next week.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion can not be made in committee. Does the gentleman desire to make that motion, or simply to give notice?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I simply desire to give notice that unless we can get through with these amendments reasonably soon, I shall have to move that the committee rise, and then get some order to limit debate.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the words "under the act of June 27, 1890," in lines 11 and 12, and also inserting after the word "defect," in line 13, the words "omission to allege the true disability."

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. On what page is that?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Page 2.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I object. I raise the point of order that we have passed that provision of the bill.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement that was made, it is still under consideration.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Before the gentleman proceeds, let the amendment be reported again.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that this is in contravention of the provisions of clause 2 of Rule XXI, being a change of existing law.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I make the point that the point of order comes too late.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Then the amendment comes too late.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The making of any point of order has been waived on this paragraph, and therefore any amendment to perfect the paragraph is clearly in order.

Mr. PICKLER. That is certainly right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. The offering of this amendment would be a monstrous violation of good faith.

Mr. PICKLER. It is altogether otherwise. The gentleman did not reserve any point of order against this paragraph, and it certainly is subject to amendment. Although this amendment might be out of order in the first instance, yet after this paragraph is before the committee for debate, then it is certainly amendable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it would be subject to amendment only so far as necessary to perfect the propositions contained in the bill.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I concede that. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed briefly to explain the object of this amendment, I think even my mercurial friend from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] will waive his objection. If I may have his kind attention, I will be very much obliged.

Mr. Chairman, the evident object of this paragraph is to allow pensions to be granted upon the true disability which exists at the time of making the application. With the general purpose of this paragraph, I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] has no quarrel, and, in fact, has expressed his approval of the general provision. Now, my amendment makes two additions to this paragraph. The first addition is by way of subtraction. It eliminates the limitation of the act of June 27, 1890, and makes the same provision applicable to all applications for pensions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to suggest to the gentleman from Nebraska that such an amendment, referring to another act, would practically change the whole subject. The Chair desires to ask whether this is not introducing another subject?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. No; I think not. I think the general provision of the paragraph was to allow pensions to be granted on the actual disability existing at the time of making the application. Now, it seems to me that the reference to the act of 1890 was merely an incident, and does not go to the heart of the proposition. Since that is the purpose of the paragraph, I have also thought best to include, after the word "defect," the words "omission to allege the true disability," because the words used in this paragraph go simply to a defective allegation of disability, or to an irregularity relating simply to form; for instance, failure to verify as provided by law, and do not include what was the evident purpose and intention of the paragraph, to grant the pension on the actual disability existing at the time of the application.

Now, it seems with this explanation the gentleman will certainly withdraw his objection, although I believe it to be not well taken.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, notwithstand-

ing the qualification or adjective applied to me as "mercurial" by the gentleman——

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I withdraw the adjective if it is offensive to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York (continuing). I shall endeavor to give his proposition due consideration. I always assume in any agreement made between gentlemen of this House that a man is pretty safe, and I am therefore surprised that when I had stated to a number of gentlemen who are anxious to get this amendment through with this appropriation bill, that I would not raise the point of order against this first amendment or rider as it stood, provided no effort should be made to amend it thereafter, and an agreement was virtually entered into, that a gentleman on the same committee should have proposed to take advantage of my silence and introduce another amendment.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will allow me, the gentleman does not mean to state that he had an agreement with me that no amendment should be made to that paragraph.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I say that there was a tacit understanding that there should be none.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The gentleman certainly has no foundation for any such statement.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. It may not have been with you; but it is my impression that I so stated to you. Still, if you disclaim it, I accept your statement.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. You have absolutely no foundation for any such intimation, and it is entirely uncalled for.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. That may be your view.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. That is the absolute fact.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I will not discuss that with the gentleman. I do, however, press my point of order, Mr. Chairman. I claim that the effort now to amend this amendment by striking out the words "the act of June 27, 1890," makes a radical change. In other words, it would make this amendment of existing law or change of an existing law apply not only to the dependent pension act, so called, of June 27, 1890, but to all other pension laws, to the general pension law, the law which was passed in 1862, and which we ingrafted in the Revised Statutes. I claim also that the insertion of these other words—what are the words?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. "Omission to allege the true disability."

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, as the amendment now stands the applicant can date back to the time of the original filing. In what case? In case of any defect or informality—that is, any slight error—any informality can be corrected just as a court may order one to be corrected; but here we have a change—"omission to allege the true disability." That is a very different matter. That opens the door wide, or would open the door wide, to fraud. A man could come in and by fabrication of testimony make out that he suffered under one disability when in point of fact the disability did not even exist. So I press my point of order.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Mr. Chairman, if the committee will give me their attention a moment I will explain why the committee limited it to the law of 1890. You will find by examination that a statement made by Commissioner Lochren before the subcommittee having this bill in charge shows this fact, that under the old law if an applicant has a case rejected an application can be made to reopen it, and then the pension is made to date from the original application or from the time that the disability is shown to exist. Under the law of 1890, by a peculiar construction of the law, the Commissioner holds that when an application is rejected that cuts off all claim, and if another application is made he can only make payment from the date of filing the last claim. You will find that in the statement of the Commissioner before the subcommittee, so that the same rule is not applied to claims under the old law as under the law of 1890.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, as the time is growing very late and we wish to have a vote on this bill, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fees and expenses of examining surgeons for services rendered within the fiscal year 1897, $750,000.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the Chair as to the matter pending before the committee. Is it not the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has been withdrawn, so that the point of order drops.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a motion that all debate——

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my colleague on the committee, as he evidently wants to finish the bill to-night, as the main parts of the bill have been passed, and as he has asked the House to sit until the bill is finished, that he might as well let the reading proceed and the bill be read through.

The paragraph was again read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the next paragraph of the bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph we are about passing.

The CHAIRMAN. To the paragraph which is now being read?

Mr. CONNOLLY. No, sir; to the one which we have just been considering.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. If that is to be done, Mr. Chairman, I think I shall have to move——

Mr. CONNOLLY. I do not think that this will take much time.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. We have already passed that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CONNOLLY] was endeavoring to obtain the floor to offer this amendment, so the Chair will recognize him for that purpose.

The amendment of Mr. CONNOLLY was read, as follows:

Amend by striking out of lines 13 and 14, page 2, the words "because of any defect or informality in the application."

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, if there be good reasons——

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point comes rather late, as the gentleman from Illinois has begun his argument, but it will be considered as reserved by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, it will be observed, leaves the clause applying to the act of 1890 just as the committee have reported it to the House. The committee in their bill report a provision that whenever a claim for pension under the act of June 27, 1890, has been, or shall hereafter be, rejected, suspended, or dismissed because of any defect or informality in the application, and a new application shall have been, or shall hereafter be, filed, and a pension has been, or shall hereafter be, allowed in such claim, such pension shall date from the time of filing the first application, provided, etc.

That I understand to be the rule adopted by the Pension Bureau under all the pension acts except that of 1890. My amendment would have the effect of applying to the act of 1890, and to pensions allowed under that act the same rule of construction that is applied to all the other pension acts. The committee have limited that construction to cases where the pension has not been allowed because of defect or informality in the application; but why stop there? There may be reasons, arising, if you please, from the ignorance of the applicant, or from other causes——

Mr. NORTHWAY. If the gentleman will permit a suggestion, there is a difference between rejecting a claim and disallowing or dismissing a claim. The Pension Office sometimes rejects a claim for imperfection in the application on the ground that the application is not a proper one, but if a proper application is made and the office disallows the claim, the applicant can put in other evidence, and then the pension, if allowed, dates back to the original filing of the claim. In the other case, where the application is defective under the law and where the office holds that it is not a proper application, the applicant has to go back and file another application, and in that case the pension does not date back. In all other cases it does. That is why the committee used the words "because of any defect or informality in the application."

Mr. CONNOLLY. But I understand that there may be cases where a pension claim is disallowed or rejected because of the absolute failure of proof that the applicant is entitled to a pension.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Yes; but in that case the Commissioner rules that the applicant may put in evidence to reinstate his claim, and if he succeeds the pension goes back to the date of the original application.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Under the other pension acts.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Under the act of 1890 also.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I think not.

Mr. NORTHWAY. An examination of the statement of the Commissioner before the committee will show that I am correct.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Well, Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that it would be safer for the House to say now that in case of an application for pension under the act of 1890 made while this appropriation bill is in force no claim shall be rejected or disallowed on the ground——

Mr. NORTHWAY. I wish to say to the gentleman that I do not see any objection to the language of his amendment, because if it does not apply to anything more than what he states it can not do any harm.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois what would be the practical advantage to the pensioners of adopting his amendment?

Mr. CONNOLLY. It would be this: If an application is dismissed or rejected because of the absolute failure of proof to show

that the claimant is entitled to a pension, under the bill as we have it here if the claimant makes another application he will be entitled only to receive a pension from the date of the second application.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It distinctly states the contrary.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I beg the gentleman's pardon, it does not, if I can read it. It provides that if a pension is allowed on the second application, and the evidence in the case shall show the disability to have existed at the time of the filing of the first application, then the pension shall be allowed to date back to the time of the first application. But that can only be done in a case where the application has been rejected on account of informality. I want the provision to apply to a rejection for any cause. Such a provision can do no harm. Let me state a case. An applicant for pension may have his application on file under the act of 1890——

Mr. NORTHWAY. What is the language of the amendment which the gentleman proposes?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I do not propose to insert any language, but to strike out in lines 13 and 14 the words "because of any defect or informality in the application." The clause will then provide that if an application for pension has been rejected under this law and it turns out on the hearing of a new application that the cause for granting the pension existed when the first application was made the pension shall in that case be allowed to date back to the time of the first application.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I can see no harm in that amendment.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Nor can I; on the contrary, it may in some cases do much good.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I maintain that the amendment under the admission of the gentleman who offers it changes the existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the change proposed to be made by this amendment is in the amendment already admitted and now pending subject to perfection; and any modification of language which is within the subject, which does not go outside to other subjects, must inevitably be in order, because it is the right of the Committee of the Whole to perfect an admitted amendment within the subject which it embraces. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CONNOLLY].

Mr. PICKLER. I move pro forma to strike out the last word, for the purpose of making a statement. A good many gentlemen have inquired whether there would be a session this evening. Until the last five minutes it was the intention of the Committee on Invalid Pensions that a session should be held, but in view of the request of the gentleman in charge of the pending bill and upon the representation that members have been hard at work during the present week, and that there are only a few pension bills pending on the Calendar, I am disposed, if it meets the wish of the House, to let the session of to-night go over in order that when this afternoon session closes we may adjourn until Monday.

Several MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. We want to finish this bill this evening.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. CONNOLLY, it was agreed to.

Mr. AVERY. I move to amend by striking out the word "the" before the word "disability," in line 18, page 2, and inserting the words "a pensionable"; so as to read, "shall show a pensionable disability to have existed."

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I raise the point of order that this is a change of existing law and is in violation of Rule XXI.

Mr. AVERY. Oh, no; it does not change the law.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I think the Committee on Appropriations are willing to accept the amendment, if they can.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the point of order pressed?

Mr. AVERY. This amendment does not change the existing law, and I think the gentleman from New York, upon reading it, will recognize the propriety of the proposition.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I press my point of order, because I find that this would be a material change in the existing law. The section as it now stands provides substantially that if at the time of the second application it is found that the disability then complained of existed at the time of the original filing the pension, if granted, shall date back to the time of the filing of the original application. Now, suppose that at the time the second application is filed the disability complained of is of a very serious nature, such as to entitle the applicant to a very large pension, but that so serious a disability did not exist at the time of the first application. Under this amendment the pension which might be allowed in view of this severe grade of disability would date back to the time of the filing of the original application, provided that at the time of such application the slightest pensionable degree of disability existed. That would certainly be a change in the law, besides being manifestly unfair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order, and will submit the amendment to the committee.

Mr. AVERY. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE] has stated the willingness of the Committee on Appropriations to accept the amendment, I hope there will be no objection to it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I move that all further debate on the pending paragraph be closed in one minute.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. I move the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting after the words "to the contrary notwithstanding," in lines 20 and 21, of page 2, the following:

"*Provided further*, That whenever the medical testimony and examination shows that the claimant is not able to earn his support by manual labor the claimant shall be granted a pension, notwithstanding the disability or disabilities shown to exist by said medical testimony and examination are other or different from those set forth in claimant's declaration."

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I raise the point of order that this is a change of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The next paragraph of the bill was read.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I move that all debate on this paragraph be closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to say, in justice to the large number of members of this House who have spoken favorably to the amendment which I offered, to give the pensioner a vested right after the pension was adjudicated, that, in view of the ruling of the Chairman of the committee to-day, which I consider entirely right and proper, I propose to present the same measure to the Committee on Invalid Pensions at the proper time and endeavor to secure action by that committee. I do this with the more confidence from the fact that I have been assured by the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER], while there may be some differences of opinion as to the remedy, that the Republican membership of that committee unanimously, so far as he knows, recognize the right of a soldier to have his pension secured to him by law as a vested right after adjudication, and that a bill will be reported from that committee at an early date which will remedy the evil to which the amendment calls attention.

I believe that the debate brought up by the introduction of that amendment has had its good uses in the House. I am proud of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment has succeeded in unanimously crystallizing the sentiment on this side of the House in favor of a pensioner having a vested right on adjudication of a pension in his favor.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks that a proposition would not also find favor that would place those upon the pension roll who have been thrown out without just cause?

Mr. GRAFF. I am in favor of that also.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I hope that that will be done.

Mr. GRAFF. I am glad that I can place the blame for the prevention of the adoption of that amendment upon a gentleman on the other side of the House rather than upon this.

The amendment which I proposed to offer, had it not been announced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] that he would object to its consideration under Rule XXI, section 2, of this House, with some slight modifications is the same as I announced in this House on January 13.

In its form as I would desire it now it is as follows:

Add to the conclusion of the present bill the following:

"*Provided further*, That during the fiscal year of 1897 in expending all the foregoing appropriations no pension shall be reduced, suspended, or dropped except for fraud upon the part of the pensioner in obtaining the pension, which fraud must be established by the verdict of a jury of the United States circuit or district court of the circuit or district in which the pensioner resides, either by indictment or issue framed in the civil branch of the court, on the relation of the Attorney-General of the United States, of which the pensioner shall have due and reasonable notice, and appear and plead as in other cases: *Provided, however*, That the foregoing provision shall not apply where, since the granting of the pension, the title to said pension has ceased to exist under provisions of law. A certified copy of the indictment or issue and the proceedings, verdict, and judgment had thereon shall in all such cases be forwarded by the court to the Commissioner of Pensions free of cost to the pensioner."

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this bill has now been completed, and I move that the committee rise and report the bill with favorable recommendation as amended.

Mr. DANIELS. I desire to present an amendment first, if the gentleman will allow me an opportunity.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I think it due to Judge DANIELS

that I should withdraw the motion for a few moments, in order to permit him to offer an amendment. I feel under obligation to do so.

Mr. DANIELS. I offer this amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 15, page 4, add the following:

"The Commissioner of Pensions is also hereby authorized and empowered, at a rent not exceeding $3,000 per annum, to lease or hire for the use of the pension agency in the city of Buffalo suitable rooms in a new fireproof building in the said city of Buffalo; and a sum not exceeding $3,000 is appropriated to pay said rent."

Mr. MILES. I raise the point of order upon the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend from New York permit a suggestion?

Mr. DANIELS. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. If you want $3,000 at Buffalo, as there is an item for rent of $23,000 in the bill, why not move to strike out "three thousand" and insert "six thousand?"

Mr. DANIELS. I thought it would be more satisfactory to the members of the committee and to the House to present it in this shape, where the explanation would appear on the face of the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I hope the gentleman from New York will not consume more than his five minutes.

Mr. DANIELS. I shall not do so.

I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that there is an absolute necessity for this additional appropriation in the city of Buffalo.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. But the point of order has been made upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland will please state his point of order.

Mr. MILES. The point of order I make is that this amendment changes existing law, and also that it provides for an expenditure not authorized by law.

Mr. DANIELS. The Chair will observe that this is simply to increase the appropriation mentioned in the fifteenth line of the bill in section 4.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Does the amendment apply to that line?

A MEMBER. That is the effect of the amendment, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. But the point of order has been made against the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Let us have a ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is compelled to sustain the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I now move that the committee rise and report the bill as amended to the House.

Before that motion is submitted, I wish to ask unanimous consent that all members who have not spoken upon this question may have permission to print their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I object. I think we have had enough of this.

The motion of Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE was then agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DINGLEY reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the pension appropriation bill, had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I move the previous question on the bill and amendments.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments. Unless objection is made, the vote will be taken on the amendments together. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

WITHDRAWAL OF A REPORT.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to withdraw a report, No. 53, accompanying House bill No. 147, and to substitute another report.

The SPEAKER. Is it by direction of the committee?

Mr. POOLE. I have the consent of the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York to withdraw a report and to substitute another?

There was no objection.

IMPROVEMENTS IN HOUSE RESTAURANT.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a report from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, with a resolution, for the present consideration of which I ask unanimous consent.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of $2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be appropriated from the contingent fund of the House for the purpose of enlarging and improving the House restaurant and the kitchen attached thereto, the said sum to be expended under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman if that is the report of a subcommittee?

Mr. HICKS. It is the report of the entire committee.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, in what form does that resolution come up?

The SPEAKER. As a report from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HICKS. It is reported by the entire committee.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman in what position will that leave the present keeper of the House restaurant with reference to betterments and improvements?

Mr. HICKS. It will not change his condition at all. He and Mr. Lewis, the new keeper, are arranging that to the entire satisfaction of both.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. He will be deprived of no existing rights?

Mr. HICKS. None whatever.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I understand that that committee has no right to report this as a privileged matter, and I want to suggest that there is no money in the contingent fund with which to pay that amount.

Mr. HICKS. The Committee on Accounts have agreed to the matter, and also the Committee on Appropriations. It is necessary that some improvements should be made.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman is mistaken about the consent of the Committee on Appropriations. We have that matter under consideration, and there is no money in the contingent fund with which to pay this.

Mr. HICKS. I am informed that there is a fund, and I trust the gentleman will not interpose any objection to this needed improvement. We will find the fund.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I want to ask if it is designed also to improve the cooking?

Mr. HICKS. This is intended for the benefit of all of you.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I suggest that there ought to be some means devised by which a member can get a good meal without paying three or four days' salary for it.

Mr. HICKS. If you will permit the improvements to be made you will all be benefited.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. I should like to ask the gentleman why the new keeper of the restaurant should not pay these expenses himself. Why should we be obliged to appropriate the public money for such a purpose?

Mr. HICKS. It is a permanent improvement, and belongs to the House. Similar improvements on the Senate side cost $15,000.

Mr. BARTLETT of New York. In the absence of the other members of the Committee on Appropriations I shall object.

Subsequently,

Mr. BARTLETT of New York withdrew his objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York withdraws his objection. Is there further objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HICKS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I move that when the House adjourn it adjourn to meet on Monday next. If that motion shall prevail it will do away with the meeting to-night, as I understand it.

The SPEAKER. That motion alone will not accomplish that object. Under the rules the evening session would take place, and after that the House would adjourn until Monday.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I understand that if this motion prevails, and then if the House adjourns before 5 o'clock, that does accomplish an adjournment until Monday and does away with the evening session.

The SPEAKER. That would do it; yes.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I move that when the House adjourn it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. PICKLER. Pending that, I desire to say it was the intention of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to have a session this evening, but a large number of members have said that they are very weary, having been here so long, and that there is a desire to adjourn over until Monday. Further, we have only a few private pension bills on the Calendar, and therefore we have concluded to ask a vacation of the order for an evening session to-night.

The motion of Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE was agreed to.

EXTENDING TIME FOR MAKING ASSESSMENT OF REAL ESTATE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled the joint resolution (H. Res. 25) to extend the time for making an assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia; when the Speaker signed the same.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, in moving to adjourn, I simply wish to state that which no doubt many members know, that the pension bill just passed is fifty days ahead of the passage of any pension appropriation bill in the last three Congresses. [Applause.] I now move that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for armament of fortifications, rapid-fire guns, etc.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for repairs to the War Department branch of the Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a letter from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of deficiency for the pay of regular assistant attorneys for the current fiscal year—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Anacostia and Potomac River Railroad Company, transmitting the annual report of the said company for the year ended December 31, 1895—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1895—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PENDLETON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred House bill No. 54, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 4254) granting to the Duluth and North Dakota Railroad Company right of way through certain Indian reservations in the State of Minnesota, accompanied by a report (No. 71) in writing thereon; which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2300) to incorporate the Supreme Council of the Thirty-third Degree of Scottish Rite Masonry for the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 70) in writing thereon; which said bill, amendment, and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 189) to repeal an act entitled "An act to exclude the public lands in Alabama from the operation of the laws relating to mineral lands," approved March 3, 1883, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 73) in writing thereon; which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1244) to confirm certain cash entries of offered lands, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 75) in writing thereon; which said bill, amendment, and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 128) for the relief of Henry H. Schrawder. (Report No. 67.)

By Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 2048) for the relief of Rufus Betz. (Report No. 68.)

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 356) extending provisions of an act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors, approved June 27, 1890, to the Eighteenth and Nineteenth regiments of Kansas Cavalry Volunteers. (Report No. 72.)

ADVERSE REPORT

Under clause 2, Rule XIII, the following adverse report was delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table:

By Mr. BISHOP, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 2047) for the relief of Charles Fletcher, alias James H. Mitchell. (Report No. 69.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4242) to amend section 4426, Title LII, Revised Statutes, requiring ferryboats, canal boats, yachts, and other small craft of like character, propelled by gasoline, gas, fluid, naphtha, or motor power to be inspected under the provisions of this title—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 4243) to pay for improving the streets in front of the post-office site in the city of Sacramento, State of California—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CATRON: A bill (H. R. 4244) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sale of public lands to the New Mexico School of Mines, located at Socorro, N. Mex.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 4245) in reference to pensions and their payment—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNE: A bill (H. R. 4246) declaring that bicycles, for the purpose of transportation by common carriers in interstate commerce, shall be deemed baggage, and regulating said transportation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEM: A bill (H. R. 4247) directing the foreclosure of the Government lien on the Pacific railroads, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 4248) granting to certain successful contestants of timber-culture entries the privilege of now exercising their right of entry under the timber-culture act of June 14, 1878—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4249) donating the abandoned military reservation in the State of Washington, Jefferson County, to school district No. 1—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 4250) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to exchange with the National Guard of the respective States Springfield rifles of the pattern of the year 1884 for Springfield rifles of the pattern of the year 1873—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4251) to amend section 619 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the appointment of circuit court clerks—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4252) to declare the jurisdiction of circuit courts of the United States in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE (by request): A bill (H. R. 4253) granting arrears of pension to certain widows whose husbands served sixty days or more in the war of 1812—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Florida: A bill (H. R. 4255) to provide for settlement of titles and disposition of public lands in the Arredondo grant in Columbia County, Fla.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McMILLIN: A bill (H. R. 4256) granting to the Washington Cooling Company the right to lay pipes for the distribution of materials for refrigerating purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STALLINGS: A bill (H. R. 4318) granting increase of pension to survivors of the Mexican and Indian wars and to their widows—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 4319) to amend the Articles for the Government of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 4320) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war," approved July 27, 1892—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSK: A joint resolution (H. Res. 87) extending time

for completion of Washington and Maryland Railway Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A concurrent resolution (House Con. Res. No. 16) for distribution of monographs and bulletins of the United States Geological Survey—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HOWE: A concurrent resolution (House Con. Res. No. 15) relative to completing the "chiaro-oscuro" by Mr. Costogini in the Rotunda of the Capitol—to the Committee on the Library.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the following changes of reference were made:

The memorial of the One Hundred Thousand Club of Fresno, Cal., urging that immediate action be taken on the part of our Government for a speedy completion of the Nicaragua Canal—Committee on Foreign Relations discharged, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The bill (H. R. 3112) granting a pension to Josephine Foote Fairfax—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 4257) to correct the military record of John Blue, of Uniontown, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4258) to correct the military record of William F. Magee, of Uniontown, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 4259) for the relief of E. W. and A. Cross, of Wakefield, R. I.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4260) for the relief of Thomas F. Tobey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 4261) to pension Mrs. Susan M. Sessford—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULBERSON: A bill (H. R. 4262) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 4263) for the relief of John Millan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 4264) granting a pension to Mary Pelham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4265) granting a pension to Eliza Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 4266) granting a pension to Herman Caples, late of Company L, Twentieth New York Heavy Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMP: A bill (H. R. 4267) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel Widmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COWEN: A bill (H. R. 4268) granting a pension to Mrs. Christina Graham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4269) for the relief of George Arnal—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4270) granting a pension to Kattie Lambert, of Osage City, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4271) granting an increase of pension to Ralph Mulvane, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4272) for the relief of James H. Covert, of Eldorado, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNING: A bill (H. R. 4273) for the relief of Richard S. Taylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 4274) granting an increase of pension to John Matlock, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 4275) to increase the pension of Mrs. Annis H. Enochs, widow of Gen. William H. Enochs, from $20 to $50 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 4276) for the relief of William Craig, to cancel order dismissing him from United States naval service March 14, 1863—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 4277) for the relief of Marie Damainville—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4278) to grant an honorable discharge and remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Terence Lynch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT (by request): A bill (H. R. 4279) to cure the title to certain real estate in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HENRY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4280) restoring the widow of William T. Tout to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 4281) granting a pension to George Johnson, of Lenox, Iowa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 4282) granting a pension to Louise Friday, Edwardsville, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 4283) granting a pension to Delia A. Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 4284) to increase the pension of Samuel Masters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4285) to increase the pension of E. H. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 4286) for the relief of Jacob Walker, son and assignee of Thornton Ralls—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 4287) granting a pension to Edward Stanley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4288) granting a pension to John Hoke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4289) granting a pension to George W. Wiant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4290) to place on the pension roll the name of Isaac Bloss—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: A bill (H. R. 4291) granting an increase of pension to John C. Knapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 4292) for the relief of Thomas Lee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOSES: A bill (H. R. 4293) for the relief of the heirs of S. H. Hill, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4294) for the relief of the estates of Daniel Woodson and of Ely Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 4295) for the relief of Alfred T. Morey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 4296) to increase the pension of Charles Parshall, Company B, Thirty-sixth Regiment of Wisconsin Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4297) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Carman, widow of Augustus Carman, who was a private in Company F, One hundredth Regiment of New York Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 4298) granting an increase of pension to Annie Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 4299) for the relief of Joseph H. Watson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 4300) for relief of Regina Ernst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4301) for the relief of the Merchants and Miners' Transportation Company of Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRAIT: A bill (H. R. 4302) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Jane Secrest—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A bill (H. R. 4303) for the relief of Dr. H. C. Farrand—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A bill (H. R. 4304) to pension Luman Bell for services rendered in the war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLER: A bill (H. R. 4305) for the relief of Rev. M. M. Travis—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TALBERT: A bill (H. R. 4306) to correct the records and roll of Capt. Allen G. Johnson's company, First Regiment Florida Mounted Volunteers, by inserting the name of Robert H. Hunter in place of Silas Hunter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 4307) to make Commodore William P. McCann, of the Navy, a rear-admiral on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 4308) for the relief of William C. Hughes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4309) granting a pension to Henry W. Rupright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 4310) for the relief of Mathias Pedersen—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WALKER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4311) for the relief of Eliza D. Ricketts—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 4312) for relief of C. Phetzing, of Holmes County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 4313) to increase the pension of Mrs. Charlotte B. Cozzens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 4314) for the relief of Dr. John N. Groves—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. QUIGG: A bill (H. R. 4315) for the relief of Clara A. Graves and others, heirs of Lewis Smith, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 4316) granting a pension to Margaret Meyer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 4317) to place on the muster roll the names of Claiborn Evans and others—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: Resolution of the Chicago Board of Trade, asking for legislation which will retire the greenbacks and Treasury notes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BULL: Circular of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association of Providence, R. I., relative to licensed officers of steam vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: Petition of Hon. T. O. Torrison, chairman, and G. G. Sedgwick, secretary, of Manitowoc Improvement Company, together with memorials containing the names of 527 citizens of Oshkosh, Fond du Lac, Appleton, Menasha, Neenah, Ripon, El Dorado, Osceola, Hancock, and Packwaukee, in favor of an adequate appropriation to establish and maintain a 21-foot channel in the harbor at Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of 200 citizens of Iowa, and inmates of the Iowa Soldiers' Home, at Marshalltown, favoring the enactment of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: Petition of Iowa members of the National Guard, praying for the passage of House bill No. 2294—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition of Jacob Hurley, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Petition of E. H. Martin, J. M. Jones, and others, of Webster City, Iowa, for an appropriation to carry on litigation against the Bell Telephone Company—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of citizens of Whatcom County, Wash., favoring the passage of the immigration bill introduced by Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce, asking Congress to provide for the establishment of a Weather Bureau service at Tacoma, Wash.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce, urging the passage of Senate bill No. 334—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Pastors' Union of Snohomish, Wash., relative to Armenian sufferers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of John S. Lamb and others, asking to be allowed the benefit of the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Resolutions of relief committee of Springfield, Mass., in favor of the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: Memorial from the Central Labor Union of Lafayette, Ind., in favor of a bill to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HICKS: Two petitions, respectively, of Rev. W. L. Spanogle, John K. Strayer, Robert Delozier, and others, and J. K. Templeton, J. D. Cox, and 55 other citizens of Tyrone, Pa., for the enactment of laws restricting immigration and the passage of the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of John A. Snowberger, David Dougherty, A. F. Earnest, and others, of East Freedom, Pa., favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Chicago January 13, 1896, requesting the retirement of the greenbacks and Sherman notes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a minute on the state of affairs in Armenia adopted by the Congregational Ministerial Union of Chicago January 13, 1896—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOOKER: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of Delia A. Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: Petition of M. M. Murphy and others to accompany a bill for the relief of Jacob Walker, son and assignee of Thornton Ralls—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, two petitions of citizens of Norwalk and vicinity, together with 87 citizens of Shelby, Ohio, and vicinity, favoring the passage of the immigration bill introduced by Hon. WILLIAM A. STONE—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LACEY: Paper to accompany House bill No. 3247, for the relief of Charles Blitz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Petition of the heirs of Nancy Hutcheson, deceased, late of Fulton County, Ga., praying reference of her war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the estate of Henry Banks, deceased, late of Fulton County, Ga., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition and resolution of mass meeting of citizens of Haddonfield, N. J., concerning the Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDEARMON: Petition of Hon. P. T. Glass, Hon. George W. Young, mayor, and 28 other citizens, of Ripley, Tenn., praying for the passage of an act for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McEWAN: Petition of 500 citizens of Hudson County, N. J., asking the passage of the immigration bill of Hon. WILLIAM A. STONE, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Thomas Lee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: Petition of F. G. Leach and 78 other citizens of Burton and other parts of Geauga County, Ohio, in support of an act to secure a better grade of immigrants to this country—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ODELL: Petition and papers of the United States Military Academy detachment of army service men, favoring a bill for the retirement of enlisted men after having served twenty-five years in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States, who were physically disqualified in the line of duty for active service, at 75 per cent of the pay, etc., of the rank upon which they were retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PITNEY: Two petitions, respectively, of George Albertson and 28 others, H. O. Cahart and 16 others, citizens of Warren County, N. J., praying the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. QUIGG: Petition of William H. Ballou, asking that the bulls bred for fighting be interdicted, and bull fighters be subject to the exclusion clause of the contract-labor law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: Petition of the New Orleans clearing house, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Sugar Planters' Association of Louisiana, urging an increased duty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSK: Petition of Johanna Eckle, for arrearages of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Petition of Residenz Lodge, No. 513, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Scranton, Pa., for the passage of House bill No. 1360, for the relief of Odd Fellows' Hall Association of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: Petition of Rev. Albert Donnell, pastor of the Congregational Church of Wellfleet, Mass., in regard to the suffering Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAHLE: Petition of 66 citizens of York County, Pa., praying for the passage of the William A. Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TERRY: Petition of the Little Rock Typographical Union, No. 92, in relation to the Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TRACEY: Two papers relating to House bill No. 2480, for the relief of D. C. Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TYLER: Petition of John T. West, administrator of Naharai Foreman, deceased, late of Norfolk County, Va., praying that his war claim be referred to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *January 20, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The VICE-PRESIDENT announced his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 628) to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami*, which had previously received the signature of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

WESTERN CHEROKEE INDIANS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, in response to a resolution of March 2, 1895, directing the Secretary of the Interior to withhold any further distribution and payment out of the money derived from 35 per cent of the judgment in favor of the Old Settler or Western Cherokee Indians against the United States in the sum of $800,386.31, set apart for the payment of expenses and for legal services justly and equitably payable on account of the prosecu-

tion of this claim, until otherwise authorized by law, except allowances already made for legal services, transmitting certain information as to any and all payments and distributions from this fund already made, together with copies of all payments in any manner connected with said payments and distributions filed in the Interior Department and the office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

DEDUCTIONS FROM SALARIES OF CLERKS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 20, 1895, information as to whether there is a practice in the Post-Office Department, or any branch or line of its service, of deducting from a clerk's salary, at the end of a month, pay for such offenses as missending a registered package, carrying mail past its destination, or failing to sign a register at terminal points, and also the extent to which this practice has been carried on and the aggregate sum of money in the Post-Office Department arising from this practice; which was read.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask, in addition to the printing of the communication which has just been read, that it may lie on the table for a few days, when I shall call it up.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The communication will lie on the table and be printed.

ANACOSTIA AND POTOMAC RIVER RAILROAD COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Anacostia and Potomac River Railroad Company, transmitting the annual report of the Anacostia and Potomac River Railroad Company for the year ended December 31, 1895; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 2769) to authorize the leasing of lands for educational purposes in Arizona;

A bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an act entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 88) authorizing the distribution of copies of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in Congressional districts where distribution has not been made.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, upon the Hon. Marcus C. Lisle, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky, and upon the Hon. George W. Houk, late a Representative from the State of Ohio, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (S. 30) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," approved March 2, 1893;

A bill (S. 43) to amend an act entitled "An act to forfeit certian lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes," approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 25) to extend the time for making an assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Produce Exchange of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to cancel every note once redeemed in gold by the Treasury and to issue long-term bonds in sums of $50 and less at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 per cent, to be offered to the people of this country and no other; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to permanently retire and cancel all United States notes, called greenbacks, and Treasury notes, called Sherman notes, in order to prevent disaster to business and preserve the honor of our country; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of members of the Kentucky Equal Rights Association, praying Congress to protect women equally with black men against State denial of the right of suffrage; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VEST presented the petition of Clay B. Bording and sundry other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the so-called William A. Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I present resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of New Orleans, Limited, asking favorable consideration of what is known as the Squire bill, making appropriations for the protection of the United States coasts everywhere from foreign attack. I move that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I also present a memorial concerning the importance, condition, and needs of the harbor of New Orleans, with a petition praying that an adequate appropriation be made for the improvement of that harbor.

The memorial shows that the exports from the port of New Orleans in 1891 were $81,529,453. The imports in the same year were $18,087,944, or nearly 66 per cent of the entire imports of all the Gulf ports. It further shows that New Orleans is the second port in the United States in regard to its exports, and in regard to imports it is the fourth; while, in regard to its total foreign commerce, it is only exceeded by New York, Boston, and Philadelphia.

The memorialists show that this harbor is of national and international importance. They ask that Congress appropriate for the improvement of the harbor at New Orleans the sum of $500,000, and they further urge that this be made part of a continuing appropriation of $2,000,000, extending over four years, similar to appropriations for other important works, as made by the Fifty-third Congress.

The memorial is signed by the mayor and city council of the city of New Orleans, by the president of the New Orleans Levee Board, by the presidents of the Cotton Exchange, Board of Trade, Sugar Exchange, Mechanics Dealers, and Lumbermen's Exchange, the Maritime Exchange, and the Chamber of Commerce; also, by the president of the Associated Banks in Clearing House, and by the president of the Board of Underwriters, and the president of the Association of Railroads.

I move that the memorial and petition be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I present resolutions of the Chicago Board of Trade, recommending the retirement of the greenback circulation. I move that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I present resolutions of the Victoria Club of Chicago, in relation to the action in the Transvaal Republic. I move that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I also present a petition of the National Live Stock Exchange of Chicago, in relation to the condition of the live-stock trade, praying that Congress, by the aid of the diplomatic representatives of our Government, who have larger experience and more intimate knowledge of the means necessary to be employed, enact such legislation as Congress in its wisdom may deem expedient in the interests of that trade with foreign countries.

In this connection I have a letter which states that when reciprocity was inaugurated, Germany, France, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, and Belgium freely bought our cattle, sheep, hog products, and canned meat, and when it was repealed the trade was in a large degree cut off.

I call the especial attention of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to this petition and to the subject therein discussed. I move that it be referred to that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Portland, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation abolishing compulsory pilotage on coasting and sailing vessels when the captain has a United States license, or a vessel in tow of a tug in charge of a man holding such license; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CAMERON presented sundry petitions of citizens of Kingwood, New Lexington, Middletown, Royalton, Voltair, Sunbury Gap, East Freedom, Pindleton, West Fairview, Berwick, Lewisberry, Penns Park, Wrightstown, Lingohocken, Churchville, and Bellsano, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called William A. Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. GEAR presented the petition of George W. McGibbin and 66 other citizens of Sioux City, Iowa, praying for the passage of the so-called William A. Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LODGE presented the petition of H. A. Brown, of Westport Point, Mass., praying that an increased duty be placed on sugar; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Massachusetts Wholesale Lumber Association of Boston, Mass., praying that an appropriation be made providing additional improvements for Boston Harbor; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented the petition of M. A. Chandley and other citizens of North Carolina, praying that the sum of $45 be paid to G. C. Haynie, administrator of Hannah McDowell, deceased, late of Marshall, N. C., for accrued pension at the date of her death; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Matilda Haynie, of Marshall, N. C., praying that compensation be granted her for services rendered the Government as a guide during the late war; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of 543 members and friends of the Saturday Morning Club, of Boston, Mass., praying for the passage of House bill No. 119 to protect public forest reservations; which was referred to the Select Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of Amethyst Council, No. 40, of Amethyst, Colo., and a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Denver, Colo., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Burnside Post, No. 15, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Colorado and Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation granting a pension of $8 per month to all honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the late war of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VILAS presented a petition of the common council of Superior, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for raising and controlling the levels of the Great Lakes in order to deepen their harbors and connecting shallows without further dredging, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SHERMAN presented sundry petitions of citizens of Norwalk, Shelby, Belle Center, Attica, Brookfield, Melmore, and Rapids, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bellaire, Ohio, praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions, adopted by the Toledo (Ohio) Produce Exchange, praying for the issuance of long-term bonds in sums of $50 and less at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 per cent, and for the cancellation of every note once redeemed in gold by the Treasury; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of New Philadelphia and Canal Dover, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation in the interest of morality; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of the Saginaw (Mich.) Lumber Dealers' Association, and a petition of the Board of Trade of Saginaw, Mich., praying for the improvement of the harbors of Ludington, Mich., and Manitowoc, Wis.; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GORMAN presented the petition of Harry E. Price and sundry other citizens of Cumberland, the petition of J. D. Warfield and sundry other citizens of Damascus, and a petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a petition, numerously signed by citizens of Aurora, Mo., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill.

I also present a petition, numerously signed, by the leading citizens of Maryville, Mo., praying for the passage of the same bill.

I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Immigration, and hope they will be there given full consideration.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL presented petitions of sundry citizens of Missouri praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the United States Military Telegraph Corps, praying that they be granted compensation for efficient and important service rendered the Government during the late war; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, No. 35, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 735 to reorganize the personnel of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HILL presented a petition of sundry citizens of Utica, N. Y., and a petition of members of sundry churches of Malone, N. Y., praying that the President and the Congress of the United States use their influence with the great powers of Europe in persuading them to arrest the awful persecutions now in progress in Turkey and Armenia; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of La Crosse, Wis., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., praying that an appropriation be made for improving the harbor facilities at St. Joseph and Benton Harbor in the State of Michigan; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GORDON presented a petition of sundry letter carriers, of Atlanta, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation to pay the claims of the letter carriers for overtime, judgments for which have been rendered by the Court of Claims; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BRICE presented sundry petitions of citizens of Long Bottom, Meigs County, and Magadore, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called William A. Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Albert F. Remy Company, of Mansfield, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Cincinnati (Ohio) Bicycle Club, praying for an increase in the appropriation for the office of road inquiry of the Department of Agriculture; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation in the interest of morality; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Akron, Ohio, praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WHITE presented a petition of the board of supervisors of Napa County, Cal., and of the city council of Napa, Cal., praying for the control and construction by the Government of the Nicaragua Canal; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CUBAN CONSTITUTION.

Mr. CALL. I present a translation of the constitution of the new republic of Cuba, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a miscellaneous document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HOAR, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1415) relating to the liability of employers in the District of Columbia to make compensation for personal injuries suffered by employees in their service, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1416) providing for the preferment of wages of employees in cases of assignment, execution, in payment by receivers, etc., asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia; which was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I am also directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1483) to repeal an act entitled "An act for the punishment of certain crimes therein specified," approved January 30, 1799, being section 5335 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to ask to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I call the attention of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] to this report.

Mr. GRAY. The Committee on the Judiciary, then, does not take cognizance of the bill?

Mr. HOAR. It is the bill introduced by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] in regard to correspondence of American citizens with foreign Governments.

Mr. GRAY. It is the opinion of the Judiciary Committee that the bill belongs rather to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. HOAR. The Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the Senator is himself a member.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be agreed to, in the absence of objection.

Mr. HOAR, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1560) to regulate the procedure in pension cases, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and

that it be referred to the Committee on Pensions; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 991) for the relief of Frederick Carlisle, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1398) for the relief of Maj. Samuel T. Cushing, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 38) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage; which was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1498) to punish the carnal and unlawful knowing of any female under the age of 18 years, to ask to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

This is a bill to raise the age of consent in the District of Columbia, the Territories, and all other places within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. The committee were of opinion that in regard to the Territories the matter would be more properly dealt with by the several Territorial legislatures, and in regard to all places within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States except the District of Columbia the likelihood of such offenses there is so small that it is not worth while to make any legislation in addition to what now exists. Therefore, the matter being reduced to the District of Columbia, the committee were of opinion that the Committee on the District of Columbia is the proper place for a consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Committee on the Judiciary will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and it will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOAR. I am also instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1582) to pay to the widow of the late Samuel F. Miller, a justice of the Supreme Court, a sum equal to the balance of his salary for the year in which he died, to report it without amendment.

I give notice that to-morrow, or at some early day, I shall call up this bill for action.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 677) to provide American registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig*, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 100) for the relief of the estate of John R. Bigelow, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BRICE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (R. 1100) granting a pension to Russel N. Reynolds, reported it without amendment and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1017) granting a pension to Robert Kiracofe, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 680) for the relief of James Linskey from the operation of the act restricting the ownership of real estate in the Territories and the District of Columbia to American citizens, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

PITMAN PULSIFER'S CENSUS TABLE.

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Printing I report a resolution, with the accompanying table, and ask immediate action.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That 1,000 copies of "Table showing the publications and cost of each census of the United States," prepared by Pitman Pulsifer, formerly clerk of Committee on the Census, United States Senate, be printed for the use of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the request in regard to the resolution?

Mr. HALE. I ask immediate consideration for it. I will state to the Senator——

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read again, and then I will hear the explanation.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. HALE. This matter has been called to the attention of the Committee on Printing by the Commissioner of Labor, who has charge of the census. I have sent to the Printing Office and find it will cost only $17.50, and therefore the committee recommend its passage. It is a valuable table.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is to be printed as a separate document?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. DAVIS. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom were referred the joint resolution (S. R. 1) relative to the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine; the joint resolution (S. R. 12) to enforce the Monroe doctrine; the joint resolution (S. R. 49) to enforce the Monroe doctrine; the resolution of the board of supervisors of Sangamon County, Ill., in favor of the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine; resolutions adopted by Washington Council, No. 1, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Butte City, Mont., indorsing President Cleveland's message upon the Monroe doctrine; and a memorial of the Eighth Ward Republican Club of the city of Detroit, Mich., relative to the Monroe doctrine, to ask to be discharged from their further consideration, and to report a concurrent resolution, which I ask may be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The committee will be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution and memorials, if there be no objection. The concurrent resolution will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

Concurrent resolution relative to the assertion and enforcement of the Monroe doctrine.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That whereas President Monroe, in his message to Congress of December 2, A. D. 1823, deemed it proper to assert as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, were thenceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power; and

Whereas President Monroe further declared in that message that the United States would consider any attempt by the allied powers of Europe to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety; that with the existing colonies and dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and should not interfere, but that with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States; and further reiterated in that message that it is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; and

Whereas the doctrine and policy so proclaimed by President Monroe have since been repeatedly asserted by the United States by Executive declaration and action upon occasions and exigencies similar to the particular occasion and exigency which caused them to be first announced, and have been ever since their promulgation, and now are, the rightful policy of the United States: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the United States of America reaffirms and confirms the doctrine and principles promulgated by President Monroe in his message of December 2, A. D. 1823, and declares that it will assert and maintain that doctrine and those principles, and will regard any infringement thereof, and particularly any attempt by any European power to take or acquire any new or additional territory on the American continents, or any island adjacent thereto, or any right of sovereignty or dominion in the same in any case or instance as to which the United States shall deem such attempt to be dangerous to its peace or safety by or through force, purchase, cession, occupation, pledge, colonization, protectorate, or by control of the easement in any canal or any other means of transit across the American Isthmus, whether under unfounded pretension of right in cases of alleged boundary disputes or under any other unfounded pretensions, as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States and as an interposition which it would be impossible in any form for the United States to regard with indifference.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask that the concurrent resolution be placed upon the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I desire to give notice, having reference to the filing of the resolution, and having reference also to the resolution which was introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], that I shall on Wednesday, at the close of the routine morning business, ask leave to address the Senate upon the Venezuelan question.

Mr. GRAY. I desire to say, in reference to the report from the Committee on Foreign Relations just made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], that that report was not from a unanimous committee.

SUITS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. PLATT. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1547) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory; and as there is immediate necessity for the passage of the bill, I am instructed to ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. PLATT. Perhaps a single word of explanation may be necessary.

The United States court in the Indian Territory embraced the whole Territory prior to the passage of an act last March, and appeals and writs of error were taken from that court to the court of appeals of the eighth circuit. Last March we divided the Territory into three judicial districts, and provided for the appointment of three judges, whom we constituted an appellate court, from which cases should go from the separate courts, and from that appellate court we gave an appeal or writ of error to the court

of appeals in the eighth circuit. However, we failed to provide that the cases already pending in that circuit should be proceeded with the same as if the act had not been passed. The object of this bill is to allow the courts to proceed with the cases then pending. Judge Caldwell has written a letter stating that this bill ought to be passed.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is reported from the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. PLATT. It is reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF NAPHTHA LAUNCHES, ETC.

Mr. FRYE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 291) to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to vessels propelled by steam, gas, fluid, naphtha, or motor, to report a substitute therefor. I ask that the substitute may be treated as an original bill and placed on the Calendar, and that Senate bill 291 be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That bill will be indefinitely postponed, and the bill now reported will be read twice by title.

The bill (S. 1646) providing for certain requirements for vessels propelled by gas, fluid, naphtha, or electric motors, was read twice by its title.

Mr. FRYE. For the information of Senators, all of whom have been receiving letters about the naphtha launches, I wish to state that the bill which has been reported as a substitute for the original bill provides that all naphtha launches of less than 15 tons burden shall not require inspection, or an engineer, or a licensed pilot, but that naphtha launches exceeding 15 tons burden, carrying passengers for hire or carrying freight for hire, shall be subject to inspection.

The bill further provides that none of these launches shall hereafter be utterly lawless; that they shall be subject to all the requirements as to the laws of the road, as to safety appliances to be kept on board, as to signals in fogs, as to signals when meeting and passing other steamers, that now apply to the steam craft of various kinds. Such a provision is an absolute necessity.

The president of the company manufacturing these gas engines, John J. Amory, who, no doubt, was largely instrumental in inspiring the letters that have been showered upon us within the last fortnight, called at the room of the Committee on Commerce Saturday and examined this bill, and declared that it was entirely satisfactory to him. He said that these launches should be subject to the laws of the road, etc.; that he knew of but one pleasure launch over 15 tons burden, and that those over 15 tons burden carrying freight and passengers for hire ought to be subject to inspection. So I presume that all the launch people will be entirely satisfied with the bill that has been reported.

Mr. VEST. Do I understand the chairman of the committee to state that this Mr. Amory made no objection to that provision of the bill which subjects launches of all sizes, even of 2 or 5 tons, to the rules of the road, as the Senator expressed it, in regard to signals and lights?

Mr. FRYE. He expressed himself as entirely satisfied with that provision. He said that, in his opinion, it ought to be required of them, and that, in his opinion, they all to-day comply with the rule, because he said the rules of the road and for the safety of passengers, etc., were posted in every naphtha launch that he has had anything to do with.

Mr. VEST. I am a member of the Commerce Committee, and I agreed to the reporting of this bill, with the reservation that that portion of it to which I have just alluded does not meet my approval. I think it is simply absurd to require a launch of 2 tons or 1 ton or less (for some of them are made even less than a ton burden) to have apparatus on board for lights, signals, pilotage, and all the rules that applied to that class of vessels which are not operated by naphtha.

I do not propose to go into a discussion of the bill, but it refers to very extensive provisions that are found in the general statutes in regard to signals, lights, etc. Before we enact it, these provisions should be scrutinized, because we might make it simply impossible for anybody to own for pleasure one of these very small launches if we apply all these regulations to it.

Mr. FRYE. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that after the chairman of the committee was authorized to report the bill he amended the last section. The chairman examined it with a great deal of care. There are some regulations contained in the laws on the statute book which ought not to apply and could not apply to the naphtha launches. The change which was made is as follows:

Relating to lights, fog signals, steering, and sailing rules, as the Board of Supervising Inspectors shall, by their regulations, deem applicable and practicable for their safe navigation.

Mr. VEST. That is a very great improvement. I am very glad the chairman has put that clause in.

Mr. FRYE. It was of very great importance, as I thought.

Mr. VEST. When I agreed to the reporting of the bill it did not contain that provision.

Mr. PASCO. I do not understand that the bill is now up for action.

Mr. FRYE. It is not.

Mr. PASCO. I hope the bill will be allowed to remain on the Calendar for some little time. A great many people in my State are interested in naphtha vessels, and I wish to submit it to some of them in order that if there are any other objections to the bill than those which have been removed, they may have an opportunity to communicate the objections to me and I may have an opportunity to present them to the Senate. I find that the bill has been shorn of its most serious objections, perhaps of all the objections that have been called to my attention, and I hope to be able to assist in its passage, unless I find there are other objections that may be presented to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 1608) for the correction of the military record of Capt. Joseph H. Richards; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1609) for the erection of a statue of Commodore John D. Sloat, in the city of Monterey, Cal.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 1610) granting a pension to Nathan Kimball, of Ogden, Utah; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1611) granting a pension to Clarissa E. Hobbs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1612) for the relief of the heirs of John W. West; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1613) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph A. Mower; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Lydia A. Tibbits; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1615) for the relief of James B. Boyd; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1616) to amend an act approved March 1, 1895, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional judges of the United States court in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1617) to grant the Fort Smith and Western Coal Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1618) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional judges of the United States court in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1619) to enlarge the jurisdiction of United States commissioners; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 1620) granting a pension to Amelia M. Grobe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 1621) granting a pension to Josephine I. Offley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 1622) for the relief of Martha M. Welsh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 1623) for the relief of Cumberland Female College, of McMinnville, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1624) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain unconfirmed and located private land claims in the State of Louisiana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1625) to permit the Home Telephone Company of Washington, D. C., to install, maintain, and operate a telephone and telegraph plant and exchange in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1626) for the relief of the estate of Turner Merritt, late of the parish of East Baton Rouge, La.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VEST (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1627) to amend sections 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 11 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the registration of trade-marks, and protect the same," approved March 3, 1881; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1628) confirming the title of mixed-blood Indians to their lands and allowing the same to be alienated under certain circumstances; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1629) to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to certify certain additional homestead claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1630) granting an increase of pension to Mary Penfield; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1631) granting a pension to Emeline Filgate; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 1632) to permit owners of claims to iron and coal mines on forest reservations of the United States to perfect their title thereto, and to procure a patent therefor, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1633) for the relief of Capt. George W. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1634) to remove the charge of desertion against Charles L. Thompson, late lieutenant, Seventh Kansas Cavalry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1635) granting a pension to James Byrne; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1636) granting a pension to John G. B. Masters; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1637) for the relief of David A. McKnight; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1638) for the relief of John A. Sibbald; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1639) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1640) granting a pension to Catherine L. Nixon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1641) granting a pension to James H. Preston; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 1642) for the relief of Rinaldo Johnson and Ann E. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1643) for the relief of Cyrus Martin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1644) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah A. Aspold; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 1645) donating the abandoned military reservation in the State of Washington, Jefferson County, to school district No. 1; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1647) to increase the pension of Clark W. Harrington, late sergeant of Company I, Ninety-third New York Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 1648) for the relief of Stewart College (now the Southwestern Presbyterian University), located at Clarksville, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VILAS introduced a bill (S. 1649) to extend the period of limitation of suits to annul patents, certifications, and other evidences of title erroneously issued for lands granted to aid railroads; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (S. 1650) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 56) extending time for completion of Washington and Maryland Railway Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 57) directing the Secretary of War to appoint a board of engineers with a view of establishing a harbor of refuge at Cape Lookout, on the Atlantic Coast, or at some point south of or near Cape Hatteras; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CALL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 58) appropriating $5,000 to open Jupiter Inlet, Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Committee on Commerce to give immediate attention to this joint resolution. It carries an appropriation of $5,000 to open Jupiter Inlet, in the State of Florida. That inlet has become closed by recent storms, and all access to the lighthouse and to the interior is cut off by the dangerous shoals and reefs which have accumulated there.

ECKINGTON AND SOLDIERS' HOME RAILWAY.

Mr. GORMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 721) to amend the charter of the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. PASCO. I ask to have an order made in reference to some papers presented by the former Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Butler. It is at his request that I ask for the order.

The order was agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the petition filed by and in behalf of the heirs of Jesse Fish, jr., regarding the title to Anastasia Island, Florida, and other papers filed by and in behalf of said heirs in said case be allowed to be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, there having been no adverse report thereon.

On motion of Mr. GALLINGER, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the pension claim of John C. Secrest, under Senate bill 1485, Fifty-third Congress, second session, be, and the same are hereby, withdrawn from the files in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, there being no adverse report thereon.

PAPERS WITHDRAWN AND REFERRED.

On motion of Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, it was

Ordered, That the petition of Mrs. E. L. Eblen and also the petition of Francis E. Yale and J. S. Blackford be taken from the files and referred to the Committee on Claims.

On motion of Mr. BAKER, it was

Ordered, That the papers relating to the claims of Rufus Betz and of Charles Fletcher be withdrawn from the files of the Senate and transmitted to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, there having been no adverse report in the Senate in either case.

PRESERVATION OF HERDS AND FLOCKS.

Mr. WARREN. I send a resolution to the desk, and ask that it be printed and lie over. It is my intention to call it up on Thursday next immediately after the morning business, and then to make some remarks upon it.

The resolution was read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That in view of the late unprecedented shrinkage in numbers and values of farm animals throughout the United States, as shown by the last published reports of the Department of Agriculture, the attention of the Committee on Agriculture is hereby especially directed to this subject, with the request to consider and report to the Senate, or to invite the Finance Committee to consider and report, by bill or otherwise, what legislation, if any, is necessary to preserve our herds and flocks.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 2769) to authorize the leasing of lands for educational purposes in Arizona was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The bill (H. R. 3537) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an act entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 88) authorizing the distribution of copies of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in Congressional districts where distribution has not been made was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

EULOGIES ON DECEASED REPRESENTATIVES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Repre-

sentative from the State of Pennsylvania; upon the Hon. Marcus C. Lisle, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky, and upon the Hon. George W. Houk, late a Representative from the State of Ohio, be printed as required by law.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH], coming over from a previous day, which will be read:

The Secretary read the following resolution, submitted by Mr. PUGH January 15, 1896:

Whereas by the act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," approved March 18, 1869, it was provided and declared that the faith of the United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment, in coin or its equivalent, of all interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had expressly provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver; and

Whereas all the bonds of the United States authorized to be issued by the act entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, by the terms of said act were declared to be redeemable in coin of the then present standard value, bearing interest payable semi-annually in such coin; and

Whereas all bonds of the United States authorized to be issued under the act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, are required to be of the description of bonds of the United States described in the said act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt"; and

Whereas at the date of the passage of said act of Congress last aforesaid, to wit, the 14th day of July, 1870, the coin of the United States of standard value of that date included silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains each, declared by the act approved January 18, 1837, entitled "An act supplementary to the act entitled 'An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,'" to be a legal tender of payment, according to the nominal value, for any sums whatever: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in violation of the public faith nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor.

Mr. PUGH. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution, and I hope we may be able to secure a vote upon it without debate.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator will allow me, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] gave notice a few days ago that he desired to occupy the attention of the Senate for a while this morning, and he has been seeking the floor for that purpose. If it be agreeable to the Senator from Alabama to let his resolution lie over until the Senator from New Jersey can make his speech, I think it would be pleasant to that Senator.

Mr. SEWELL. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that it will probably not take me over fifteen minutes to make the remarks which I propose to submit.

Mr. PUGH. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution which has just been read was laid before the Senate as the business next in order in the morning hour. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. PUGH. Certainly.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. SEWELL. I ask that the resolution heretofore submitted by me be now taken from the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution heretofore submitted by the Senator from New Jersey, which will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution, submitted by Mr. SEWELL January 16, 1896:

Resolved, That the Monroe doctrine, as originally propounded, was directed to the special prevention of the threatened action of the allied powers in reference to the revolted colonies of Spain and the occupation, by way of colonization, of any supposed derelict territory on this hemisphere.

2. That the question of resisting any acquisition of territory by conquest was limited, as stated by Mr. Webster, to cases in which, by reason of proximity, such acquisition would be dangerous to our safety and the integrity of our institutions.

3. That the true ground upon which the Monroe announcement was based and upon which any similar position has been taken rests for its justification upon what may be our interests, and our interests only; and that neither by the Monroe doctrine, nor any other official declaration, have we ever come under any pledge to any power or State on this continent that binds us to act merely for their protection against invasion or encroachment by any other power.

4. That when a case arises in which a European power proposes to acquire territory by invasion or conquest, it is then for us to determine whether our safety and the integrity of our institutions demand that we shall resist such action by armed force if necessary.

5. That the Executive has pressed the Monroe doctrine beyond what was contemplated at the time of its announcement, and that the resultant sequence of the positions thus taken seems to be a committal of this Government to a protectorate over Mexico and the Central and South American States; that this would be most unwise and dangerous, and would violate the sound and well-established policy that we should avoid all entangling alliances with foreign powers, whether they be European or American.

6. That this action was premature, looking to the history of the controversy, and inopportune in view of the business and financial condition of the country.

7. That neither Congress nor the country can be, or has been, committed by the action or position of the Executive Department, in reference to the Venezuelan boundary controversy, as to the course to be pursued when the time shall have arrived for a final determination. It will then be our province and our duty to adopt such a line of policy and to take such action as may be then demanded by our sense of duty to the country and by a due regard for its honor and dignity, the welfare and safety of our people, and the integrity of our institutions.

Mr. SEWELL Mr. President, the message sent by the President to Congress on the 17th of December last presents a condition of affairs in our relations with Great Britain of most serious import. After a brief reference to the boundary question between Great Britain and the Republic of Venezuela, and to the correspondence between the respective officers of the two Governments upon this subject, he refers to the Monroe doctrine, and proceeds to apply it in this way:

If a European power, by an extension of its boundaries, takes possession of the territory of one of our neighboring Republics against its will and in derogation of its rights, it is difficult to see why to that extent such European power does not thereby attempt to extend its system of government to that portion of this continent which is thus taken. This is the precise action which President Monroe declared to be "dangerous to our peace and safety," and it can make no difference whether the European system is extended by an advance of frontier or otherwise.

After further discussing the subject, he proceeds:

Assuming, however, that the attitude of Venezuela will remain unchanged, the dispute has reached such a stage as to make it now incumbent upon the United States to take measures to determine with sufficient certainty for its justification what is the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana. * * * In order that such an examination should be prosecuted in a thorough and satisfactory manner, I suggest that the Congress make an adequate appropriation for the expenses of a commission to be appointed by the Executive, who shall make the necessary investigation and report upon the matter with the least possible delay. When such report is made and accepted, it will, in my opinion, be the duty of the United States to resist, by every means in its power as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests, the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands, or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which, after investigation, we have determined of right belongs to Venezuela.

In making this recommendation I am fully alive to the responsibility incurred, and keenly realize all the consequences that may follow.

Taking the text of this message, it appears to be quite clear that the President intended to present to Congress the contingency of war with Great Britain, if that power should insist upon encroaching upon the territory of Venezuela beyond the line which the suggested commission should find to be the true boundary between British Guiana and Venezuela. Whether it was wise in the President, at this time, to present that as a contemplated issue or not is a matter about which there may be a serious difference of opinion. Throughout this message, as well as the accompanying correspondence upon the part of the Secretary of State, the ground upon which the position of the President is taken is that the United States has announced the Monroe doctrine as the one which must govern its action in the relations between European powers and all the States in this hemisphere.

It may be well to recur to the circumstances under which the Monroe doctrine was put forward, and what was intended at the time to be its purpose and its scope. This announcement was made in the year 1823. Shortly prior to that time, Russia, Prussia, France, and Austria had entered into what was known as the Holy Alliance, the purpose being to protect and sustain the monarchs of Europe in their authority and power. In pursuance of this purpose, they proposed to overturn the Cortes in Spain and restore Ferdinand to power. Upon making this proposition, however, to England, that power declined to cooperate. It was then determined that France should send an army into Spain for this purpose. This was done, the Cortes was overthrown, and Ferdinand installed as King of Spain.

Following these events the courts of St. Petersburg, Vienna, Berlin, and Paris were addressed by the Spanish Government in the month of December, 1823, proposing a conference at Paris for the purpose of inducing the allied powers to assist Spain in regaining her sovereignty over the revolted American colonies.

In a speech made by Mr. Webster upon the 14th of April, 1826, he discussed the history of the Monroe doctrine, its correct definition and limitations, and what it was properly intended to mean as a rule of action on the part of the United States. After giving a statement of this request, he says:

The King of Spain, in making this request to the members of the Holy Alliance, argued as it has been seen he might argue. He quoted their own doctrines of Laybach; he pointed out the pernicious example of America, and he reminded them that their success in Spain itself had paved the way for successful operations against the spirit of liberty on this side of the Atlantic.

The proposed meeting, however, did not take place. England had already taken a decided course; for as early as October (two months prior to Monroe's declaration) Mr. Canning, in a conference with the French minister in London, informed him distinctly and expressly that England would consider any foreign interference, by force or by menace, in the dispute between Spain and the colonies as a motive for recognizing the latter without delay.

It is probable that this determination of the English Government was known here at the commencement of the session of Congress; and it was under these circumstances, it was in this crisis, that Mr. Monroe's declaration was made.

The Spanish provinces on this continent had previously thrown off the yoke of Spain and erected themselves into independent, so-called republican forms of government. There was an apprehension in this country that the Holy Alliance might undertake to reestablish the power of Spain throughout her revolted colonies.

A feeling prevailed that such a policy as this, if carried out successfully, might endanger the safety of our people and the integrity of our institutions, and it was as against this that the Monroe doctrine was chiefly pointed. Another object of what is known as the Monroe doctrine was to settle the question that there could be no occupation of unoccupied territory by way of colonization upon the part of any European power. In other words, that there was no portion of either North or South America which, at that time, could be considered as derelict or unoccupied, and that the policy previously pursued by European powers of appropriating such territory could no longer be permitted within this hemisphere. The Monroe doctrine served its purposes. No attempt was made upon the part of the Holy Alliance to reestablish the power of Spain within her revolted colonies, and no territory was sought to be colonized as being unoccupied or derelict.

That the limitations which I have thus put upon what is known as the Monroe doctrine are correct, I think I can safely rely upon the words used in the announcement of the doctrine, upon the correspondence of the then Secretary of State, and the declarations of the men who were in public life at and shortly after that period.

Again, the doctrine, even as proposed at that time, limited as I have suggested, met with very great opposition upon the part of men whose opinions are certainly entitled to respect. Unquestionably there was the thought upon the part of many persons that the Monroe doctrine would, if adopted as a part of our fundamental law, more or less commit this country to interference and intermeddling in the affairs of other American States, where they were involved in hostile relations with European powers. A declaration upon this subject is to be found in a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives in 1825 in the following words:

That the United States ought not to become a party with the Spanish American Republics, or either of them, to any joint declaration for the purpose of preventing interference by any European powers with their independence or form of Government, or to any compact for the purpose of preventing colonization upon the continents of America, but that the people of the United States should be left free to act in any crisis in such manner as their feelings and friendship toward these Republics and as their own honor and policy may at the time dictate.

The same thought was enforced by Mr. Webster in the speech to which I have referred. In the course of his speech he said:

It is doubtless true, as I took occasion to observe the other day, that this declaration must be considered as founded on our rights, and to spring mainly from a regard to their preservation. It did not commit us, at all events, to take up arms on any occasion of hostile feeling by the powers of Europe to South America. If, for example, all the States of Europe had refused to trade with South America until her States should return to their former allegiance, that would have furnished no cause of interference to us. Or if an armament has been furnished by the allies to act against provinces the most remote from us, as Chile or Buenos Ayres, the distance of the scene of action diminishing our apprehension of danger, and diminishing also our means of effectual interposition, might still have left us to content ourselves with remonstrance. If an army equipped and maintained by these powers had been landed on the shore of the Gulf of Mexico and commenced the war in our own immediate neighborhood, such an event might justly be regarded as dangerous to ourselves, and on that ground call for decided and immediate interference by us. The sentiments and policy announced by the declaration thus understood were, therefore, in strict conformity to our duties and our interests.

In a speech delivered in the Senate on the 8th of March, 1853, by the Hon. John M. Clayton, of Delaware, he said:

This celebrated declaration, which is often quoted as a pledge to go to war with any European nation which shall attempt to colonize any part of this hemisphere, is not a declaration by the President to a foreign country, but a mere recommendation to Congress to declare, first, that we think any attempt to extend the European system, that is, to make a European colony in this hemisphere, would be dangerous to our peace and safety; and, secondly, that any European interposition to control the destiny of an established American Government would be viewed by us as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. Congress utterly refused to adopt the recommendation at the time, and has ever since refused to make any such declaration. Mr. Monroe made no declaration himself. But, in pursuance of the power given him by the Constitution to recommend to Congress such measures as he should deem expedient, he said in his message to the two Houses: "We owe it to ourselves to declare," etc.; that is, he recommended to Congress (in virtue of the right to recommend given him by the Constitution) to make this declaration in some resolution or other proper form, and he was pledged by it to nothing more than this: That, if Congress shaped such a resolution or made such a declaration, he would approve it. There was no pledge in it to any power on earth but his own countrymen in Congress assembled. The American Government could be committed only by the vote of both Houses of Congress, approved by the President.

The proposition recommended by Mr. Monroe was warmly opposed by the very Congress to which it was submitted. No such declaration was made, or attempted to be made, by Congress, but Mr. Clay, who was an ardent supporter of Mr. Monroe's administration, did at the time propose a resolution to the House of Representatives which was intended to approach the declaration, but even that failed. His resolution was "that the people of these States would not see, without serious inquietude, any forcible interposition by the allied powers of Europe, in the behalf of Spain, to reduce to their former subjection those parts of the continent of America which have proclaimed and established for themselves, respectively, independent governments, and which have been solemnly recognized by the United States." Even had this passed, it was but a poor response to the recommendation. It did not adopt Mr. Monroe's language or its equivalent, and it restricted the "serious inquietude" we should feel to the case of a forcible interposition by the allied powers to aid Spain! But Mr. Clay's resolution, even when thus diluted, backed by all the influence which he and Mr. Webster exerted on the occasion, never passed the House of Representatives.

* * * * * * *

It has been often said and there is much reason to believe that Mr. Adams, who was Secretary of State at the time Mr. Monroe proposed the doctrine, was entitled to the paternity of it. Mr. Calhoun once intimated so much in the Senate. It was the principal topic of discussion in Congress during the Administration of Mr. Adams, and it was generally believed at the time that the reassertion of the Monroe principle in Mr. Poinsett's instructions, and in the course adopted by the advocates of Mr. Adams in favor of the Panama mission, drove Mr. Adams from power and secured the election of President Jackson, whose party, shortly after his election, assumed the name of the Democratic party. Among his most ardent advocates was Mr. Van Buren, the great Coryphæus of that party, who, in a speech in the Senate, opposing the Panama mission and the Monroe doctrine, said:

"I will venture to affirm that there is not a member on this floor who will avow his willingness to enter into a stipulation to resist attempts by the European powers to colonize any portion of this continent. If mistaken," said Mr. Van Buren, "I desire to be corrected. No; I am not. No; thank heaven, a policy so opposite to all the feelings of the American people, so adverse, as I firmly believe it to be, to its true interests, has no friend, at least no advocate, on this floor."

* * * * * * *

The Senator from Michigan, Mr. Cass, was perfectly correct when he said that this declaration of Mr. Monroe had lain ever since its origin a dead letter on our records. His recent attempt to revive it by his resolution at the last session closes the history of the Monroe doctrine. That resolution met with such violent opposition from his own party as to give us the assurance that no President who should undertake to act upon it could be sustained. With all similar resolutions, recommendations, and declarations, it was consigned to "that same ancient vault where all the kindred of the Capulets lie."

Looking back to the condition of this country at the time the Monroe doctrine was announced, and looking to the then threatening position of the European powers and the feeble condition of Mexico and the South American States, it might well have been our duty to ourselves and our own interest would have demanded that we should have intervened to prevent the reconquest of the revolted colonies by the Spanish Government. It may have been well also to give notice to all the world that we could not abide the appropriation of any portion of either North or South America by a European power by way of colonization as unoccupied territory, but I can not see any ground for maintaining that this Government gave any pledge to other American States that in controversies with European powers we would and must necessarily intervene and assist them by our military power to resist assaults by a European power. As Mr. Webster states it, that, as it appears to me, would raise a contingency in which we should then have to decide whether our interests and our safety were involved or not.

That also appears to me to be the true rule which should be applicable in the present instance. Is our safety involved? Is the integrity of our institutions endangered by reason of this controversy between Great Britain and Venezuela? It appears to me that the doctrine which has been put forth by the President, and upon which the Administration bases the extreme position it has taken, is far in advance of anything which was contemplated by the Monroe doctrine or which has ever yet been acted upon as a part of our national policy.

The controlling reason as presented by the President is not the acquisition or extension of territory merely, whereby we are to be endangered. But it is the taking "possession of the territory of one of our neighboring republics against its will, and in derogation of its rights." That the mere acquisition or extension of territory is not the gravamen of the offense is shown by the following language taken from the President's message:

Great Britain's present proposition has never thus far been regarded as admissible by Venezuela, though any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage and may enter into of her own free will can not, of course, be objected to by the United States.

Venezuela might thus cede by treaty the half of her territory and yet we would not have a right to object. But if any part of it is taken by force, we are then bound to intervene and resist the attempt by force. Great Britain may get the whole disputed territory by treaty or purchase, and neither our safety nor the integrity of our institutions is involved. But if there is a quarrel, then we are to make the cause of Venezuela our own and resist by armed intervention the attempt of Great Britain to take forcible possession of the disputed lands.

This appears to be inconsistent with the previous position taken in the message that "it can make no difference whether the European system is extended by an advance of frontier or otherwise." But, whether it be inconsistent or not, the deduction to be drawn from the spirit and the letter of the message is that the mere acquisition of territory is not the cause of offense, but the real cause is the attempt of a European power to impose upon and oppress a weaker American State or nation.

I can but think that this is a new departure; that it practically means that this Government must assume a protectorate over Mexico, Central America, and all the South American States, and that, no matter whether these States may be right or wrong, in any case of a conflict with a European power we pledge ourselves as an ally to furnish men and munitions of war and force enough to protect the weaker American power against the stronger European power. This seems to me to be the plain inference to be deduced from the attitude assumed by the President and his Secretary of State in the correspondence with Great Britain.

Again, conceding that the message does not go so far as I have endeavored to show, it may be that our safety and the integrity of our institutions would not be in the least degree affected or endangered by the acquisition of territory by a European power under such circumstances, and yet the position of the President and of his Secretary of State leaves no room for inquiry as to whether we would suffer any damage under those circumstances. With them it seems that the mere enforcement of a claim by a stronger European power which may result in the acquisition of more or less territory is, in itself, the injury and damage to us; that it endangers our safety and the integrity of our institutions.

For one, I can not assent to that doctrine. It is to be borne in mind that Venezuela is 3,000 miles distant. According to estimates which have been made of its population it has about 2,200,000 inhabitants. Of these, 1 per cent, or about 22,000, are said to be whites, while the rest of the population consists of Indians, negroes, and mixed breeds. It is well known that these South American States, and Venezuela especially, have been in a state of revolution, more or less, ever since they threw off the Spanish yoke. The Secretary of State says in his correspondence, which accompanies the President's message:

> In 1848 Venezuela entered upon a period of civil commotions, which lasted for more than a quarter of a century, and the negotiations thus interrupted in 1844 were not resumed until 1876.

Certainly a nation which was so recently in a state of practical revolution for a period of twenty-five years can hardly commend itself to us as a proper ward over whom we should be willing to assume guardianship, and we know that the same condition of things has been more or less true of all the South American States. I can but think that it behooves us to pause and consider well before we agree to an extension and development of the Monroe doctrine to a point which involves our taking charge of all these States and undertaking to protect them as against European powers. It can not be that a population so given over to turmoil and revolution, so unstable in their forms of government and systems of policy as they are, can fail to embroil themselves with foreign powers, sometimes when they are right and perhaps more frequently when they are wrong. If we lead them once to understand that we will stand between them and foreign powers, they will be reckless, hasty, and violent, and we shall find ourselves in interminable trouble in consequence. Besides, it may be fairly supposed that foreign powers would say to us that our interposition as now proposed would lay upon us the duty of making good all undertakings on the part of these Governments and being responsible for the wrongs they might commit. That would be the effect of a protectorate, and I do not myself very well see how a position of that kind could be successfully contested if we do undertake to interfere as is now proposed.

I do not wish to be understood as affirming that there are no cases in which it is not our right, and our duty to ourselves, to interfere; but the test is not whether a stronger power is imposing upon a feeble one or not. It is not that we owe any duty to the weaker power or to any other power on the face of the earth except ourselves. If we are to interfere, it must be simply and solely because our duty to ourselves and our own rights and interests absolutely require it.

I am fully aware of the fact that the commonly received interpretation of the Monroe doctrine is much broader and the understanding of its binding force much stronger than I have adopted. But it has not yet been so engrafted upon or incorporated with our system, with the latitude to which I refer, as that, when a proper case arises, we may not review its history, its past application, and its adaptation to the conditions now existing.

I can but think that the public mind, as well as many of our public men, has been led away from a true understanding of the grounds upon which we can properly and legitimately intervene in matters such as are now under consideration. The thought seems to prevail that by reason of the declaration of the Monroe doctrine we are pledged to resist by force any and all aggressions of a European power upon the States lying south of us, and that the Monroe doctrine as thus interpreted is to be the measure and rule of our conduct in all such cases. As I have endeavored to show, the Monroe doctrine was much narrower and more limited in its scope than the interpretation to which I have referred as being put upon it. Our right and duty to intervene rests upon a broader basis. We have a right to intervene in the affairs of other nations in any case in which our safety is involved or the integrity of our institutions is endangered. This principle is bound up in and is of the essence of our organization and existence as a nation. It underlies the Monroe doctrine. That was but one form of proposed application or expression of that cardinal principle and was most useful and valuable in the conditions then existing. The Monroe doctrine was but an outgrowth from that broad, underlying principle. To rest our right to interfere upon the Monroe doctrine is calculated to mislead and confuse.

It may be entitled to respect. But if it should appear that a blind adherence to its supposed obligations is likely to lead us into entangling and dangerous alliances, then the sooner we halt and ponder and deliberate upon its true meaning, upon the consequences to ensue from too latitudinarian a construction of its terms, and upon the full import of its application in the present or existing contingency, the more probable it is that we will discharge the duties we owe the country in a wise and patriotic manner.

The Executive has no power to commit Congress or the country to the positions he has assumed, nor do I regard that by providing for a boundary commission we have made any committals as to the action which may appear to be wise and expedient, when the commission shall have made its report. It is to be hoped that with that report, or in some other manner, an amicable solution of the controversy may be obtained. If not, then, and not until then, will the emergency arise in which we shall have to determine upon the course of action we should adopt.

And when the time for action comes it should not be unduly influenced by impulsive sympathy on the one hand, or by passionate antipathy on the other. The human mind is prone to excitement when international controversies arise. The first ebullitions of public sentiment are not always sustained by the sober second thought. Besides there are persons who seek a cheap popularity by the affectation of patriotic zeal. Such, as a rule, are not of the stuff of which the solid and substantial citizens are made. While public sentiment is entitled to respect at our hands, we should not be misled by the intemperate expressions of those who at the first intimation of war are ready to boil over with heated passion, no matter what nation may be the contemplated antagonist or what the cause of controversy.

Such influences should not find lodgment in this body. We are intrusted with the conservation of the interest and the welfare of over 60,000,000 people. The interests involved are vitally important. The subject is grave, and our action may be fraught with momentous consequences. Such is my sense of the situation, and I submit to you that it demands at our hands the most careful, the most deliberate, and most thoughtful consideration of which we are capable.

Again, it does appear to me that the present was not an opportune time for the precipitation of such an issue upon the country. I can but think that a matter which has been slumbering so many years in a state of diplomatic repose might have been delayed at least a few months longer. If we address ourselves to the proper ordering of our domestic economies we have quite enough now to engage our full time and upon which to exert our best mental energies. It seems hardly wise, just at this time, to have thrown into the political arena this further cause for disorder and disturbance.

A proper and zealous regard for the upholding of the honor of the nation on the part of the Executive is to be commended. It is right that he should be watchful as to any proposed innovations on the part of foreign powers which may involve our interests, our safety, or the integrity of our institutions. But we have a right to expect that discretion and good judgment will be exercised in bringing to a culmination an issue so grave and serious as that now presented. It appears to me that in this respect the action of the Executive has been alike unseasonable and premature.

Whatever may be the true construction of the Monroe doctrine; whatever may be its binding force; whatever may be the eventual danger of the apprehended encroachment by Great Britain upon Venezuelan territory; whatever course our honor and dignity and interests may require us to pursue, I can but think that the action to which I have referred has not been well timed. The country is in a state of recovery or convalescence from the financial malady of 1893. But the still unsettled and troublous condition of its business and money affairs are too strongly in evidence to warrant the putting of any further unnecessary strain upon it. In this view it appears to me that the action of the Executive has been most unseasonable.

I ask that the resolution remain on the table for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VILAS in the chair). It will be so ordered, unless there be objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to state that I desire to submit some remarks upon the resolution of the Senator from New Jersey on Thursday next.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CHAPELL, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution to print 5,000 copies of the paper entitled "Geological and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado," with an amendment; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 50) authorizing the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect

of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for the public building at Chicago, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I do not propose to object to a vote being had upon the joint resolution if the Senate desires to vote upon it at this time.

When the consideration of the joint resolution was asked for a few mornings ago by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], as I am informed, it had not been referred to a committee, but was then introduced by him and its passage by the Senate asked for. I objected to its passage at that time because I believed that it provided for an extravagant appropriation, which was not authorized under the circumstances.

The facts in regard to this matter, as I understand—and if I am misinformed the Senator from Illinois will correct me—are that it is the duty of the Supervising Architect, regularly appointed and receiving a salary of four or five thousand dollars—I do not know the exact amount—to prepare plans and specifications of all public buildings provided for by Congress throughout the United States.

Congress, in the regular appropriation act, appropriated the sum of $200,000 for the office of the Supervising Architect for the employment of draftsmen and skilled workmen to assist him in the preparation of these plans. Two hundred thousand dollars, I understand, is the regular appropriation for that office to aid the Supervising Architect, whose business it is by law to make all of these plans and specifications, with the assistance he is authorized to employ by this additional appropriation.

In addition to that, Mr. President, in the sundry civil appropriation act of last year the sum of $30,000 was specifically provided for assistants to the Supervising Architect in preparing plans and specifications for the public building at Chicago, Ill. Now, it is proposed by this joint resolution, without sending it to a committee, to consider and pass upon it in any way whatever, to appropriate $25,000 to employ an assistant architect to make the plans and specifications for the public building at Chicago, in the State of Illinois. I believe this to be extravagant. I do not think that such a sum should be so recklessly appropriated.

I know how difficult it is to defeat any appropriation that is asked for by one of our large cities, but it seems to me that it is the duty of the Supervising Architect to make the plans and specifications for all public buildings. If he is not competent to do it, then the Secretary of the Treasury ought to appoint some one who is competent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will please suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, in order that the joint resolution may be disposed of.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I presume there will be no objection to that course.

Mr. CULLOM. It will take but a very few minutes to dispose of the joint resolution at any rate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside and the consideration of the joint resolution will be proceeded with. The Senator from Arkansas will proceed.

Mr. BERRY. If the Supervising Architect is not competent to discharge the duties which the law imposes upon him, then the Secretary should secure some one who is. If it be stated that the money given to the Department is not sufficient to enable it to employ first-class talent, then it should be increased and first-class talent should be employed. But the Secretary of the Treasury has already had $200,000 for assistants for all the public buildings throughout the United States, $30,000 more to employ assistants for this particular building, and then to ask the Senate to pass a joint resolution, without consideration by any committee of this body, appropriating $25,000 more to employ another assistant architect to make the plans of the building is recklessly extravagant. It seems to me, I confess, that there have been few things in a small way that show such reckless extravagance.

Now, if we make this precedent, if we provide for the appointment of an assistant architect at Chicago, where are we to stop? We have already had notice from the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE] that he wishes an appropriation for an assistant architect at Los Angeles, Cal., with a salary, I presume, of twelve or fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, if it is made in proportion to the proposed appropriation. The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has given notice that he desires two assistant architects for two buildings in the State of New Jersey. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], I think, has another proposition for the public building at Portland, Oreg., where he will want one or more assistant architects to prepare the plans. If we begin in this reckless way, where is it to stop? How much will it cost to make the plans for the various public buildings throughout the United States? How much assistance does the Architect want, when Congress thought $200,000 was sufficient for him to employ all the necessary assistants?

As I said a while ago, I know full well the influences that will be brought to bear from the great city of Chicago to beat down a man who dares to stand here and oppose any proposition they want; but, Mr. President, I believe that this extravagance in this particular is unjustified and inexcusable.

Much has been said recently about the tariff act not providing sufficient revenue to run the Government. I think the difficulty is not in the insufficiency of revenue, but that it comes from the extravagant appropriations which are made here, almost recklessly, in so many cases. It is true that $25,000 is not a great deal, but it sets a precedent for the extravagance which prevails in many of the departments of this Government. Such extravagance ought to be stopped and it will have to be stopped if we are to get revenue enough from any source to meet the demands that are made upon the Government.

I am unwilling to sit by and let the joint resolution pass without objection. If the Senate thinks proper, however, to vote upon it now without reference to a committee, I shall simply call for the yeas and nays upon the passage of the joint resolution, and vote against it.

Mr. BATE. Has not the joint resolution been referred to a committee?

Mr. BERRY. No, sir; it has never been referred to any committee.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I shall not take much time in discussing the merits of the joint resolution, as I think the Senate already pretty well understands it. I do not propose to debate with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] the question whether the present policy, which has been in vogue for so many years in the Treasury Department with reference to the Supervising Architect, is a good one, or whether the salary paid to the man who occupies that place is a sufficient amount. But I will simply state what the facts are.

The appropriation for the building at Chicago was made some time ago. The Illinois delegation, for the time being representing that State in the two Houses of Congress, have frequently called upon the Secretary, hoping thereby to secure the preparation of plans for the building and to begin its construction. Up to this time nothing at all has been done. The reason why nothing has been done, as alleged by the Secretary of the Treasury, is that it is impossible for him or for the Architect of the Treasury to proceed any faster than they are going in the preparation of plans for the construction of public buildings.

Mr. PLATT. When was the act authorizing the building passed?

Mr. CULLOM. A year and a half ago. The fact is, as the Secretary stated, that there are hundreds of buildings the construction of which has been authorized. Work has been begun on a number of them, while the plans for many of them have not been prepared at all. The reason for it, as alleged by the Secretary, is that they did not have appropriations sufficient to carry on the work as rapidly as it ought to be carried on.

It is very important to the city of Chicago that the building should be constructed as soon as possible; and when I say the city of Chicago, it means in a large sense the whole country, because the mails of the entire country—East and West and North and South—largely go through that city and have to be handled there.

Therefore, after consulting with several of our delegation and after consulting with the Treasury officials, I asked the Secretary to put on paper exactly what he thought ought to be done; what amendment to the law ought to be made. He did so, and I introduced it, as I told him I would, and I supposed when I did it that there would be no opposition whatever to the passage of the little amendment.

The joint resolution simply provides for taking $25,000, or so much as may be necessary, but not to exceed that amount, of the appropriation already made for that building and using it for this purpose. There is no increase.

Mr. DAVIS. Is there no increase?

Mr. CULLOM. There is no increase at all. The sum of $25,000 is simply to be taken from the appropriation for the purpose of enabling the Secretary to employ an architect or architects for the preparation of plans for the building. It is to be a great edifice, a building which perhaps will cost not less than $4,000,000, covering a whole block of ground. It is very important that it should be a great building in size, so as to accommodate the Department and the Government with reference to its mails, courts, etc. It is very important, therefore, that this authority should be given,

and I am surprised, I confess, that there should be any objection to it.

I do not sympathize with any attacks which have been made upon the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], if any have been made, for having a different opinion. I certainly make no criticism of him. But I do trust, notwithstanding the fact that he holds a different opinion and believes that there is extravagance in the Department and there will be extravagance in this matter if we pass the joint resolution, that the Senate will pass it. I assume that the Secretary of the Treasury will not spend a dollar beyond what is necessary in order to get the plans and specifications prepared for the beginning of the construction of the building.

I am inclined to think that the Government may be justly criticised for the manner in which we conduct that Department, because I believe that if there were a law which authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to send an agent to Chicago, or New York, or Oregon, or wherever a great public building is to be constructed, and let the contract and employ an architect on the ground where the building is to be erected to make the plans, we would get along with the work a good deal faster than we have been getting along heretofore and save money to the Government. But that is not the policy of the Government. What I desire now is to get the building at Chicago started. When the present building is vacated, which will be done within a period of a little less than two months, the Government will have to pay not less than $60,000 a year as rent for rooms scattered all over town, to be used for public offices occupied by Government officers outside of the post-office force itself.

It seems to me that the most important feature at present is to get the building started so as to stop the extraordinary rent that the Government will have to pay in order to conduct the business of the Government in that city. I hope there will be no further discussion about the joint resolution and no further objection to it. I understand from my friend, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. WHITE], that he does not propose to make any further opposition to it, and so I understood from the honorable Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I hope the joint resolution will be passed without further delay.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the views of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] as to economy have always been eminently sound, but a condition of things is now presented which will create the necessity of extravagant appropriations or there will be no money for the people. There is already in the Treasury a cash balance of about $180,000,000, and it is proposed to sell bonds and buy $200,000,000 more of money—$100,000,000 immediately, and another $100,000,000 at the convenience of those who wish to obtain Government bonds. If that is done, pretty much all the circulating medium will be in the Treasury.

It is something more than a temptation to extravagant appropriations—before Congress adjourns it may become its duty—to get this money out of the Treasury by any means, so that the people may have something with which to do business. A contraction in the currency of $200,000,000 more and piling up the cash balance in the Treasury would utterly destroy business. It would be a greater calamity than to appropriate money and tax the people. If you take the money out of circulation at this time, unless there can be some way invented to stop the bond sales, there will be no refuge for the people except extravagance. That appears to be the only alternative.

Congress will not do anything else. It will not stop the bond deals going on, and it can not afford to have the entire circulation tied up in the Treasury. A peculiar state of affairs is presented. Therefore, if money is wanted at this time to build public buildings, Congress had better appropriate it now when it is necessary to get the money out of the Treasury. The people can not get it in any other way that I can see.

Mr. BERRY. I do not entirely agree with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] that it is best to issue bonds and then to indulge in extravagant appropriations in order to get the money in circulation throughout the country. I think it would be better to stop issuing bonds.

Mr. STEWART. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas in that respect. That is what I am trying to do, but it can not be done, and it leaves the alternative which I have presented.

Mr. BERRY. If that can not be done I do not think it wise that the Senate should indulge in extravagant appropriations even because wrongs may be done in other directions.

Now, in answer to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], I wish to state, in the first place, that when he says the joint resolution does not increase the appropriation, because the sum comes from the appropriation already made, it is not a fair argument, because the Senator from Illinois well knows that when the building has once been begun it will be completed. He knows that if by reason of this sum being taken from the present appropriation there shall be an insufficient amount left to complete the building Congress will have to appropriate what is needed. He knows that it is not fair to say that this does not increase the amount of money that the building will cost, because if we take from the present appropriation $25,000 or $50,000 to pay for the plans, the Senator well knows that when the proper time comes that amount will be replaced in order to complete the building. So there is nothing whatever in that argument.

The point I am making is clear. It may be that I know nothing about it, but here it is made an officer's duty under the law to make the plans; he is there for that purpose; those who made the law thought that a man with a salary of $5,000, if that be the sum, was sufficient for the purpose, and they made it his duty to make the plans. They gave him a general appropriation of $200,000 for assistants in making the various plans. But the Chicago building being somewhat out of the ordinary and larger than those usually built, Congress thought it might be necessary to require more assistance than that ordinarily used and it went further. It also appropriated $30,000 for assistants to this man whose duty it is to make the plans. Congress has already appropriated $30,000 for somebody to help him in making the plans.

The joint resolution proposes to appropriate $25,000 in addition. It seems to me that is reckless extravagance. It seems to me that when it is the duty of this officer to make the plans, to pay $25,000 for a man unnamed to assist him is an extravagant appropriation. The joint resolution does not come from any committee whatever, and it seems to me it ought not to pass the Senate in this way.

The senior Senator from Illinois says the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] have agreed not to oppose the joint resolution further. Why? Because the moment we make this precedent and give $25,000 for an assistant at Chicago, that moment the Senator from California, the Senator from New Jersey, and the Senator from Oregon will say, "The same reasons prevail at Portland, Los Angeles, and Newark that exist at Chicago; and the Senate having already given the authority in the Chicago case, why not give it in these cases?"

I think, Mr. President; that money should not be appropriated in this way. I repeat that which I have already said. Complaint has been made and is being made that under the present tariff law there is an insufficiency of revenue. I say that the laws of this country raise ample revenue to run the Government if it were run in an economical way; but extravagance after extravagance has grown up, and every man who has dared to stand and raise his voice here because he believed it was his duty to the people he represented has been denounced as a demagogue and even worse by the parties whose interests were affected by the appropriation to which he objected. But believing it to be my duty to object to the joint resolution, I did object to it. I do not think it ought to be passed in this manner. I think the whole matter ought to go to a committee, and the committee ought to report not only on the Chicago building, but on the California, the New Jersey, and the Oregon cases, and any other building that may be similarly situated. If the present laws or the present architects are insufficient to meet the situation, then a general bill ought to be brought in to meet it, instead of seeking to take money out of the public Treasury without consideration by a committee of this body.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not care to take up the time of the Senate in replying to the Senator from Arkansas. I have stated what are the facts about the Chicago case. If there is any fault to be found, it is in the fact that there is not enough money for the Architect of the Treasury to make the plans and designs as rapidly as they are required.

That is the whole story. The Secretary insists that there is not money enough to enable him to do it. He desires to employ an architect to help prepare the plans for the Chicago public building and to take the money, if we will allow him to do so, out of the appropriation already made. I hope that permission will be granted.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe the joint resolution ought to be referred to the appropriate committee, and, therefore, I move that it be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator from Mississippi bear with me for one moment? I hope that that reference will not be made. It would simply result in longer delay, which would cause greater expense to the Government of the United States. If the joint resolution is passed, as it ought to be in my judgment, and the plans and specifications are provided, we will get a public building in Chicago some time or other, and shut off the extraordinary amount of rent that the Government is now paying. I may say that it will have to pay rent at a much greater rate within a short time.

I hope that the reference will not be made, and that the joint resolution will be passed by the Senate.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President, I shall vote against the motion to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, but I do it in the hope and with the expectation that either the Committee on Appropriations, of

which the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] is a member, or the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or both together, will, at a very early day, and without waiting for the regular appropriation bill, formulate a bill that will furnish money enough to enable the Secretary of the Treasury and the Supervising Architect of the Treasury to go on with the plans and specifications of the various public buildings in this country for which appropriations were made years ago.

I for one think it is a burning shame that the public business should have been delayed as it has been delayed, and if, as stated by the recent communication of the Secretary of the Treasury, it is because of the lack of appropriations to enable the work to proceed, it seems to me we ought to know it and we ought to meet the demand at once without further delay.

Mr. CULLOM. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that it is a shame that the hundreds of public buildings all over the country are delayed for want of sufficient appropriations to enable the Government to prepare the plans and specifications as rapidly as they ought to be prepared. So far as I am concerned, I am ready at any minute to do my part on the Committee on Appropriations, of which I have the honor to be a member, if the matter comes before the committee, looking toward the reformation of this condition of affairs.

Mr. BERRY. I wish to repeat that $230,000 has already been appropriated for assistants to the Supervising Architect in making the plans.

Mr. GEORGE. For assistants to him?

Mr. BERRY. For assistants to the man whose duty it is to make the plans, whom the law contemplates will make them, and who is getting a salary to make them. Congress has already given him $200,000 generally, and $30,000 for this particular building at Chicago.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a few days ago, when the same matter was under consideration, I mentioned the peculiarity of a similar case at San Francisco. I do not intend to oppose the joint resolution, because I know that a building in Chicago is a great necessity, and I think it ought to be proceeded with before the plans which have been adopted for it become so antique as to be considered disreputable. As it is now in various places in this country, including, as I stated, the city of San Francisco, the Department has prepared plans and they are still hanging upon the wall, in most cases, I believe, looking outward. They will soon be turned the other way. They will soon be obsolete, and we shall have to prepare new plans in accordance with the progress of the age, not the progress made by Congress in the matter of public buildings.

I do not think the Treasury Department is at all to blame. I do not believe that money enough has been appropriated. I think the whole system is wrong. Certainly a system which brings about the result that confronts us here must be wrong. Congress makes an appropriation for a public building and then five or six years hence nothing is done looking to its completion. Here is an opportunity for Chicago to get a public building. Although I am anxious to succeed in the case of San Francisco, I shall do my best to help Chicago out. I think it is the duty of Congress to provide for all these buildings, but if we can extricate one from the slough of despond let us do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to be indulged in making one or two remarks as furnishing the reason why I made the motion.

The joint resolution proposes to appropriate $25,000 out of the Treasury. The rules of the Senate require or suppose without contrary action on the part of the Senate, that all measures shall be referred to its committees for the purpose of deliberation, for the purpose of informing the Senate as to the particular necessity for them, and as to the particular form in which a bill or joint resolution ought to be passed by the Senate.

When the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] states that $200,000 has already been appropriated for the purpose in a general appropriation act, that $30,000 more has been added, making the very large sum of $230,000, nearly a quarter of a million dollars, and then that another $25,000 is asked for, I think it is rather pressing the liberality of the Senate. In other words, when Congress has got to that point in the way of giving out money—and I understand there is not very much money in the Treasury, except what we have borrowed—I think it is rather pressing the matter; that we ought at least, when that point is reached, to have a committee look into the matter and see what is right and proper. I do not see any reason, and no reason has been given, why the usual course of reference to a committee—which ought not to delay the passage of the joint resolution more than a week, if it ought to be passed at all, because every committee meets once a week—should not be pursued.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GEORGE. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not see why the usual course of referring the matter to a committee ought not to be adopted on this occasion. If the Senator from Illinois desires to interrupt me I will hear him now.

Mr. CULLOM. I merely wish to state that a portion of the Illinois delegation, as I have said, although I do not know whether the honorable Senator from Mississippi heard me, called upon the Secretary of the Treasury two or three times within the last year, asking him to commence the work of preparing the plans and specifications for the building. Without a very definite answer, he put us off by the statement that the Department had not got to it, and so on. Finally he made the statement that it would be impossible for him to take action very soon with reference to the Chicago building, in view of the other buildings which were being crowded upon him, unless Congress would give him an additional appropriation and authority to employ an additional architect to assist in making the plans, etc. The Chicago delegation never asked him to recommend any additional appropriation or any specific amount, but they were governed entirely by his judgment as to the best thing to do with reference to getting started.

I thought, and I think my colleague agreed with me, that as it is a matter which does not concern, except indirectly, the question of extravagance or of any other appropriation, but simply asks that so much of the appropriation already made as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary, not to exceed $25,000, may be used for this purpose, it would not be necessary to have the joint resolution referred to any committee, but that the Senate could pass it, and thereby save a little time and in the end save money, which would be paid for rent.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not going to do anything against the interests of Chicago. The fact is, I am in love with that city. I have a right as a Democrat to be in love with that city. It happens to be the only city in the United States which has succeeded in having a Democratic nominee nominated there elected to the Presidency of the United States. I understand that Chicago is to be also the seat of the next national Democratic convention; and dim as the prospect may appear now for the election of the next Democratic nominee, I confess that my hopes are brightened and cheered by the fact that the good luck which has attended the Democratic party by holding its conventions in Chicago twice and electing its nominee twice may attend it the third time. So I want the Senator from Illinois to understand particularly that I have nothing against Chicago. It is a great city, and I would not lay as small a thing as a straw in the way of the progress of that great city having anything in the world it wants.

But still, Mr. President, notwithstanding the predilections which I have as a Democrat in favor of the city of Chicago, and notwithstanding all the pride I may have as an American citizen in its rapid and phenomenal growth—for never was there anything like it before in all the history of the world—notwithstanding all that, I believe I ought to insist, when money is to be taken out of the Treasury, that a committee shall consider that question beforehand. What will the delay of a week amount to? In the lap of the ages which that city is to last—because I suppose it is to be eternal—what is just one week? I believe the Senator from Illinois is on that committee, is he not?

Mr. CULLOM. I am not upon the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. GEORGE. Well, there will be a meeting of the committee one day this week, and by next Monday we can have all this matter before us. So I think, out of respect to the rights and the feelings of the overtaxed people, even where the little sum of $25,000 is involved, the joint resolution should go through the ordinary routine by which bills are acted upon in the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The motion was not agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. BERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the joint resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. I do not know how he would vote if present, and therefore I will withhold my vote.

Mr. DANIEL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE].

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

Mr. PUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am paired with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON].

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 6; as follows:

YEAS—49.

Bacon,	Faulkner,	Mantle,	Shoup,
Baker,	Frye,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Smith,
Brice,	Gallinger,	Murphy,	Stewart,
Burrows,	Gear,	Nelson,	Teller,
Caffery,	Gordon,	Palmer,	Turpie,
Call,	Hale,	Pasco,	Vest,
Cameron,	Hansbrough,	Peffer,	Warren,
Carter,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Wetmore,
Chandler,	Irby,	Platt,	White,
Chilton,	Jones, Nev.	Pritchard,	Wilson.
Davis,	Lindsay,	Roach.	
Dubois,	Lodge,	Sewell,	
Elkins,	McBride,	Sherman,	

NAYS—6.

Bate,	Blanchard,	Jones, Ark.	Walthall.
Berry,	George,		

NOT VOTING—32.

Aldrich,	Daniel,	McMillan,	Pugh,
Allen,	Gibson,	Martin,	Quay,
Allison,	Gorman,	Mills,	Squire,
Blackburn,	Gray,	Mitchell, Wis.	Thurston,
Butler,	Harris,	Morgan,	Tillman,
Clark,	Hill,	Morrill,	Vilas,
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Pettigrew,	Voorhees,
Cullom,	Kyle,	Proctor,	Wolcott.

So the joint resolution was passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DUBOIS. I desire to call up for consideration the bill (S. 790) to aid the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, and South Dakota to support schools of mines. It will take but a few minutes to pass it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There are a number of Senators who desire to be heard on the regular order, and none are ready to proceed to-day, I understand. Under the circumstances, I think it is proper I should state that I shall not ask the regular order to be proceeded with to-day, but am willing that it shall be informally laid aside to consider anything that the Senate chooses to take up during the remainder of to-day's session.

Mr. PLATT. May I ask the Senator from Arkansas when he thinks we shall be able to reach a vote on the pending measure, the bond bill?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I can not undertake to set a time. There are a number of Senators who desire to be heard. They are not ready. I presumed some of them would be ready to proceed to-day, but I understand no one is ready. I suppose they will be ready to go ahead in the course of a few days, and that there will not be very much delay.

Mr. PLATT. The bond bill has been pending here since the 7th of January. It is nearly two weeks now, and there have been no speeches made in opposition to the amendment proposed by the majority of the Finance Committee. It is not a case where the minority is obstructing business, but where the majority seems to be preventing us from getting to a vote. I think that the measure ought to be pressed to a vote in some way without what seems to me to be an unreasonable delay. It is a measure which was adopted in the other House because the President of the United States had asked Congress not to take a recess for the holidays until it did something to assist the Treasury Department. There is the bond call, which expires on the 5th of February, and if this bill is to be passed at all, either as it came from the other House or according to the amendment which has been suggested here in the Senate, it ought to be acted upon, it seems to me. The Secretary of the Treasury in giving his notice requiring bids for the bonds, as I remember it, said that if there should be authority to issue a 3 per cent bond on long time the bids would be received for such a bond.

There is a great deal said about being unable to get a vote upon measures in the Senate, about unlimited debate, about obstruction on the part of minorities to prevent votes, and very many Senators think the rules ought to be changed so that there should be some limitation upon debate, among whom I am one. But this is a very peculiar debate. We do not arrive at a vote because Senators in favor of the proposition have not gotten ready to make speeches. We have occasional speeches here; I suppose they are speeches; and I suppose it is debate which has been going on upon the bill. I should call it the reading of essays, or, adopting the language of our old school days, the reading of compositions. A debate upon the bond bill seems to signify a written composition and reading it to four or five members of the Senate.

It seems to me the measure, which is the unfinished business, is important enough, whatever the action of the Senate may be, to have it pressed to a vote. The Senator says that in a few days somebody will be ready, as I understood him, to make a speech on it, and then we will take it up again. I submit that we ought to have some time fixed within which it is possible that we may reach a vote on the subject,

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, the anxiety of the Senator from Connecticut to have a free-silver bill passed at this time is in striking contrast with that Senator's conduct about twelve months ago, when a similar measure was pending in this body, which the friends were anxious to have passed at once and without debate. At that time we had but one day within which we could hope to consider such a bill, and the Senate and the country owed it to the filibustering tactics of the Senator from Connecticut that no vote was then had on that measure. He himself took the responsibility by dilatory tactics to delay and prevent a vote because of the pressing necessity to pass appropriation bills.

Now that Senator is particularly anxious to have the bill passed at once and become a law. The friends of the measure understood at that time the reason why he opposed it, and the friends of the measure understand now that perhaps his anxiety to force a vote at this time is to avoid a debate upon this question, for the reason probably that he does not feel he will be able to answer the reasons presented in favor of the bill, either here or to the country. The friends of the measure will present the reasons why they believe the bill ought to be passed. We shall not ask for a vote until we shall have had an opportunity to present those reasons clearly and distinctly, that they may be understood not only here, but elsewhere.

I imagine that there will be no difficulty about the action whenever it is to the best interest of the country that action should be had. There never has been a time, so far as I know, where a Senator in good faith desired time to prepare to discuss a great question such as this is, when there was any disposition to cut off such debate. I do not believe the Senator from Connecticut himself ever undertook anything of the kind or ever advocated it anywhere; and this is the first time, so far as I know, when any such measure was ever resorted to.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, if I am justly chargeable with inconsistency—I do not think I am—the Senator from Arkansas is certainly much more open to that charge than I am. At a time when the appropriation bills were pressing upon the Senate and it was doubtful whether the Senate could consider the appropriation bills and adjourn on the 4th of March without leaving some of them unacted upon, the Senator insisted upon bringing forward a bill for free coinage which had no relation to anything which was being transacted in the Senate, which was a purely independent measure, and insisted that the Senate should vote upon it in one day. Some of us did desire to discuss that bill. I remember that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] made some remarks upon the bill——

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. You have the opportunity now.

Mr. PLATT. And I made some remarks upon the bill. I think I spoke about two hours, and then there arose after my speech was concluded some little disagreement between the two sides of the Chamber, which ended in an agreement on this side that the Senate might vote the next day at 11 o'clock upon a resolution which was offered by one of the Senators in favor of the bill, and the next day the Senator from Arkansas came in and said he did not want a vote at all. Now, that is the inconsistency; that is the charge which is laid to me.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President——

Mr. PLATT. One moment, please. But the Senator then, and without any reason for it, apparently, except a desire that the Senate should express its opinion upon that great subject, as he considered it, insisted that it should vote within one day after the report was brought in. Now, he is not willing the Senate shall vote. If I have changed, if I wanted to prevent a vote then, he certainly has got on my ground now. He wants to prevent a vote now.

I do not know what reason there can be for the delay of this bill. I do not know why this amendment is brought here, unless it be to embarrass the Treasury Department. The Senator knows perfectly well there is not any free-coinage measure going to pass this Congress. And yet we take up two weeks, and three weeks, and four weeks, while this bond call is pending, in an academic discussion of the question of the standards and the coinage of this country. What other object is there except to embarrass the Treasury? I should be glad to know. We who do not believe in causing embarrassment to the Treasury have not added to the delay by discussion. For my part I do not intend to do so. I want to see a vote upon the bill. I think that I might be able to answer some of the arguments which have been addressed to the Senate in favor of the measure, satisfactorily at least to myself, but I do not wish to delay a vote upon it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to have the Senator repeat his statement as to a proposition for a vote on that bill before. If I understood him, he said there was a proposition submitted from the other side of the Chamber at the time that bill was pending that there should be a vote had the next day at 11 o'clock, and I declined.

Mr. PLATT. No; submitted by the friends of the Senator from Arkansas and those who were acting with him.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I myself asked for hour after hour to be agreed upon the next day, and all the propositions were rejected by the gentlemen who were filibustering on the other side. Any statement or information on the part of the Senator that I was in any sense responsible for there being no vote the next day is absolutely without foundation, and the record does not sustain it.

Mr. PLATT. This matter has been called up without having had an opportunity to refresh my recollection, but I think I am not mistaken about it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The Senator ought to refresh his memory now and state the facts.

Mr. PLATT. Some disagreement arose between the friends of the measure and those who were opposed to it. It was at 11 or 12 o'clock at night. The Senator from Arkansas was insisting upon a vote, and he could not find any quorum here. Then there was a compromise reached by the introduction of a resolution by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], and it was assented to by the Senator from Arkansas, that there should be a vote upon that resolution, expressive of the sentiment of the Senate on the subject of free coinage, the next day at 11 o'clock. That was agreed to before an adjournment that night, and without a vote upon the bill itself.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I wish to repeat that I stood hour after hour and through the whole of the next day asking that a vote might be had on the bill, and it was rejected all the time. There was a proposition made on a different matter altogether, which was submitted from the other side. I do not remember whether it was voted on or not, but it had nothing to do with a vote on the bill; and the intimation, as I understood it, by the Senator from Connecticut that I had failed to ask for a vote on the bill when I could have gotten it is absolutely without foundation, if he made the statement, although, from his present statement, he did not, and I accept his disclaimer.

Mr. CHANDLER. There can not be any mistake about the substantial accuracy, I think, of what has been said by the Senator from Connecticut. I distinctly recollect the occasion. There was objection made to the bill or resolution which the Senator from Arkansas was pressing. It continued during the evening. The controversy was allayed and an adjournment was brought about by an agreement of the opponents of the measure which the Senator was pressing that the next day there should be a vote upon that subject-matter. I do not know that it was an agreement that the vote should be taken upon the exact proposition of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I know it was not.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think it was a part of the arrangement that evening that the vote should be taken upon a different proposition on the same subject-matter, which, as the Senator from Connecticut has said, was drawn up by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT]. I know, however, the proposition was made that the next day, by agreement, there should be a vote. The proposition was stated to me. I assented to it for one, and came here the next day with a distinct understanding that without debate the subject-matter which the Senator from Arkansas had been pressing upon the Senate and insisting that we should vote upon in less than twenty-four hours should be disposed of, and neither the junior Senator from Colorado nor the Senator from Arkansas insisted that the understanding should be carried out, but the Senator from Arkansas, as I understand and as I understood at the time, incontinently retreated from the agreement that the sense of the Senate might be taken upon his measure.

Mr. PUGH. Mr. President, a few days since I introduced a resolution which is kindred in its character with the bill which is now the unfinished business, and it is specially associated with the question of the new issue of bonds. That resolution is known to history as the resolution of Stanley Matthews, then a Senator from Ohio. The resolution recited facts in its preamble that were fresh in the recollection of the country and of the Senate by which it was passed. The resolution passed both Houses of Congress by over a two-thirds vote in January, 1878. A few days afterwards the measure known as the Bland-Allison Act for the remonetization of silver was sent to the President of the United States, Mr. Hayes, and it encountered his veto. It was returned and passed over his veto and became the law. That law and the contract which it recited have been in undisturbed operation since February, 1878. Notwithstanding it had the sanction that it did when it became a law, notwithstanding the persistent effort to have that law repealed and that contract disregarded, it has remained the law of Congress since that day, and no one has attempted to introduce any bill in either House to repeal that law or to gainsay the facts recited in it.

The Treasury Department under the administration of both parties since that time has persisted in disregarding that law and violating the contract recited on its face and recited on the face of the bonds that are now held to be payable in gold. They have changed that express law by treatment and by custom of the Treasury Department; they have violated an express law, an express contract, without any respect or consideration, and repudiated it, and to-day are insisting that their repudiation, their nullification of a law and their disregard of a contract, has changed the legal effect of that law recited in the Stanley Matthews resolution, and converted those bonds into gold bonds. There has also been an effort since the present Administration came into power to commit this Congress to the policy of issuing gold bonds—bonds payable on their face in gold instead of coin. The persistent effort and practice and policy of the Treasury Department has been under this Administration to commit the Government to an obligation to pay all these bonds in gold, and very tempting propositions have been made to Congress to induce it to take that action. We were told when the veto message of the seigniorage bill was sent to Congress that possibly a place could be found for all the silver to be coined out of the seigniorage if Congress would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue gold bonds without limit to obtain gold to prevent the evil effects of attempting to coin the seigniorage.

When the last bonds were sold, the sixty-two-million-dollar issue, another message was sent to us that a contract had been made with the bond syndicate by which they would give up the 4 per cent bonds and accept the 3 per cent bonds upon condition that the new bonds should be expressly payable in gold, and that by this committal of the Government to gold bonds and the repudiation of the law and the contract recited in the Stanley Matthews resolution the people of the country could save $16,000,000 in interest. These were very tempting offers to Congress, but they did not have the effect to influence any action favorable to the demands in those messages.

I simply rose to remind the Senate that this resolution has been laid before it by the Vice-President, that it is the next thing in order, and I can gratify the desire of the Senator from Connecticut and the desire of those who are anxious for a vote by calling up the resolution and asking that the Senate give it immediate consideration for the purpose only of demanding a yea-and-nay vote, to see what progress the money power has made in revolutionizing the sentiment of these two bodies since 1878, from a two-thirds vote, a vote that wiped out the veto power upon which the bond syndicate to-day depends to carry out its purpose.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of making an inquiry, in the first place, as to the parliamentary situation. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH] called up his resolution during the morning hour. He then gave way, after it was read by the Secretary, to allow the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] to have considered the joint resolution relating to the public building at Chicago. That was continued until the morning hour expired. Then the unfinished business proper, which was the bond bill or the free-coinage bill, was laid aside temporarily to enable the Chicago building joint resolution to be completed. Therefore, the business now properly before the Senate is the bond or free-coinage bill. I ask whether I am not right and whether that is not the only business now before the Senate? The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] stated that he would not press that bill this morning for debate, but nevertheless that is the business before the Senate now, is it not?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. That bill is the unfinished business. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH], as the Chair understood, asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of his resolution.

Mr. PUGH. I did so to gratify the wishes of those Senators who wanted to vote upon something relating to this great question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is the status, and the unfinished business is the free-coinage bill, so called.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire to make some remarks upon this revolutionary resolution, as the Senator from Alabama calls it. I should prefer to do so to-morrow, and I would ask him not to press it this afternoon. If the Senator from Idado [Mr. DUBOIS] wishes to have his bill considered this afternoon, I desire to accommodate him if I can; and the resolution of the Senator from Alabama may go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. An objection will carry the resolution over.

Mr. HILL. I simply asked the Senator the question. I do not wish to object, unless I am compelled to do so.

Mr. PUGH. I understand that an objection will carry the resolution over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from New York does not object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be the first resolution laid before the Senate to-morrow. That is the parliamentary status.

Mr. PUGH. Can I get unanimous consent to take a vote on the resolution to-morrow?

Mr. HILL. Hardly, Mr. President. Not to-morrow; some other day. [Laughter.]

Mr. PUGH. Will the Senator name a day when he will be ready to stop this filibustering?

Mr. HILL. I am not informed as to the precise time of the election of Senators in Utah, and therefore I can not. I do not wish

to displace the bill of the Senator from Arkansas. I care nothing about it. The Senator from Arkansas can take his own time.

Mr. PUGH. I am anxious to have a vote on the resolution, as it involves a great public question and excites so much public attention and interest. Notwithstanding my very great desire to yield to any request of the Senator from New York—and if it were his personal request I could not resist it—as this is a request relating to a great public matter, I must insist upon my motion.

Mr. HILL. What is the effect of that motion?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion is to take up the resolution, as the Chair understands.

Mr. HILL. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry as to the effect of the motion. Would it displace the free-coinage bill, if agreed to?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would like the Senator from Alabama to again state his motion, so that there will be no misunderstanding as to just what it is. Is the motion of the Senator from Alabama to take from the Calendar the resolution and proceed to its consideration?

Mr. PUGH. I ask unanimous consent to do so. I do not wish to displace the pending measure.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That would be the effect of agreeing to the Senator's motion.

Mr. PUGH. It is not my intention to affect the standing of the unfinished business. I can put my request in the shape of unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution during the morning hour before the unfinished business is reached.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be then considered.

Mr. HILL. What is the request?

Mr. SHERMAN. The proposition is not understood.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair said the Senator from Alabama could make the request. That is all the Chair has decided.

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will decide any other question when it is presented.

Mr. DUBOIS. I rose a few moments ago to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Senate bill No. 790, and my understanding was that unanimous consent was granted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill the title of which will be read for information.

Mr. HILL. I suggest that the request of the Senator from Idaho, that by unanimous consent the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, would not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. HALE. It was part of the request of the Senator from Idaho that the unfinished business be not displaced.

Mr. HILL. I did not understand that. I have no objection to that course being pursued, the unfinished business not being displaced.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, before the subject of considering the unfinished business passes from the attention of the Senate, I want to make an appeal to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] who is in charge of that bill.

The Senator gained in the last Congress a deserved reputation for good sense and skill and good temper in the management of important bills, and I appeal to him, now that he is in charge of the bill which is the unfinished business, the bond bill, so called, substituted by a free coinage of silver amendment, whether in the course of the business of the Senate it is not desirable for him to push that bill so far as is practicable to a vote.

I do not make this appeal because I am anxious for a vote, but I want to call the Senator's attention to the condition of the business of the Senate. It is known to every Senator of experience that the best time to get any important bill considered and passed is in the early part of the session. The months of December and January, and especially January, are the months when other business does not interpose.

The House of Representatives has already matured and passed one appropriation bill, is considering another to-day, and the third one has been reported this morning; and these bills will be here within a day or two. There is a disposition on the part of both bodies to attend to the business of the session, to wind it up as speedily as possible, and to secure an early adjournment of Congress. The appropriation bills have the right of way, and will inevitably be brought before the Senate within the next week. One of them is a very important bill, one of the most important of all the appropriation bills, having upon it many subjects that will need discussion, and long discussion. The Senator will then find that his measure, which I know he wants to pass, and I know he wants to pass it speedily, will be taken out of its track and other business will be substituted. Without manifesting any anxiety for a vote on this bill—for I do not feel it and I do not want to hurry the Senate—yet I do want him to take into account the other business that will be here, and to try to push the bill in his charge to as early a result, whatever that result may be, as it is possible for him to do.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Maine, I desire to say that the friends of the measure in my charge are anxious to have it disposed of at the earliest practicable moment; but at this time, early in the session, with very little business on the Calendar, with nothing of material importance now pressing, with appeals made to me by Senators who say that they in good faith are making as rapid preparation as they can in order to submit arguments on the question, I can not refuse to allow them reasonable time to make this preparation. Therefore, as there is no occasion for any great hurry at this moment, it seems to me that a delay of a few days will not interfere with the disposition of this measure. Anxious as I am to have a vote, and willing as I am to have it disposed of at the earliest possible moment, I have not pressed it because Senators are preparing to address the Senate and have not had time as yet to do so.

Mr. HALE. I suppose that is undoubtedly so; but I ask the Senator whether now, when other business is not being pushed, is not the time when, if he can, he should try to induce Senators who want to speak in favor of the measure in the Senator's charge, and who are not opposing it, to hurry up their mental processes and to try to give to the Senate the benefit of their speeches upon the subject at as early a date as possible? The truth is, we have been considering it at odd hours, as the Senator from Connecticut says, nearly a fortnight; and the Senator has been very good-natured, as is his way, and allowed it to go along rather in a dragging fashion; nobody has found fault, and I find none, because I know the condition the Senator describes, but when the speeches to which he refers are made, say in a week longer, he will find other business here that he can not get rid of, and I can not get rid of, and the Senate can not get rid of, and then the measure in his charge will be side tracked, which he does not want. I am interfering here only as a friend in the conduct of this matter, not that the Senator needs that, but to show him that he will not have the clear track that he has now.

PUBLIC LAND SUITS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress:

I desire to invite attention to the necessity for prompt legislation in order to remove the limitation of the time within which suits may be brought by the Government to annul unlawful or unauthorized grants of public lands.

By the act of March 3, 1887 (24 Stats., 556), the Secretary of the Interior is directed to adjust each of the railroad land grants which may be unadjusted, and it is provided, if it shall appear upon the completion of such adjustment, or sooner, that the lands have been from any cause erroneously certified or patented by the United States to or for the use of a company claiming under any of said grants, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to demand a reconveyance of the title to all lands so erroneously certified or patented, and on failure of the company to make such reconveyance within ninety days the Attorney-General is required to institute and prosecute in the proper courts necessary proceedings to restore title to said lands to the United States. The demands made under this act have been numerous, and in some cases have resulted in the reinvestment of title to the lands in the United States upon demand, but in most cases the demand has been refused and suits have been necessary.

The work of adjustment has been unavoidably slow. The said act makes provision for the reinstatement of entries erroneously canceled on account of railroad withdrawals, and, upon certain conditions, provides for the confirmation of titles derived by purchase from the companies of lands shown to be excepted from the grants. It contemplates a disposition of every tract described by the granting act, situated within the primary or granted limits; an inspection of each tract certified or patented to the company within such limit, to determine whether such certification or patenting was proper; the listing of those tracts shown to be erroneously certified, and the determination for what tracts lost to the grant indemnity is to be allowed.

It is necessary, in making such an adjustment, that all questions of conflicting claims, either between settlers and the road, or between two roads the grants for which conflict or overlap, be finally disposed of, so that a proper disposition of the land can be shown in the adjustment. While adjustments have proceeded with the utmost rapidity consistent with a due regard for the rights of the settlers, of the United States, and the railroad companies, and while to this end the force of adjusters has been largely augmented in the General Land Office, many of the grants yet remain unadjusted.

In some of the grants, notably the corporation grants, the lack of surveys up to the present time made the completion of the work impossible.

Decisions rendered by the Interior Department in numerous conflicts have been carried into the courts. The construction of the Interior Department has generally been sustained when final determination has been reached, but many of the cases are still pending in the courts, not yet having been decided. Some of these cases, while involving immediately the title to only one particular tract, will, when decided, furnish a rule of construction to control the disposition of the title to thousands of acres of other lands in the same situation. Until the courts pass upon these questions final adjustments can not be made.

By section 8 of the act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stats., 1099), it is expressly enacted that suits by the United States to vacate and annul any patent theretofore issued "shall only be brought within five years from the passage of this act." This period of five years will expire on the 3d of March, 1896. Of course no suit by the United States to secure the cancellation of a patent in this class of cases after that date would be effective. Indeed, it is now too late to initiate proceedings looking to any such suit, inasmuch as demand has to be first made on the company, and thereafter ninety days must be allowed for compliance or refusal, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887. Before the expiration of this period the statute would bar the right of recovery by the Government, and the benefits of anticipated favorable decisions of the courts would be lost so far as they might determine the character and disposition of grants similar to those directly involved in pending cases.

It will be readily seen that if this act of limitations is to remain on the statute books, the portion of the adjustment act referred to would be ren-

dered nugatory. Indeed, there would be but little use in continuing the adjustment of many of the land grants, inasmuch as ascertained rights of the United States, or of settlers, could not be enforced by law.

Legislation establishing limitations against the right of the Government to sue is an innovation not entirely consistent with the general history of the rights of the Government, for it has uniformly been held that time did not bar the sovereign power from the assertion of a right.

The early adjudications of the Land Department construed the grants with a degree of liberality toward the grantees which later decisions of the courts and of the Department have not sustained. It seems clear that the further progress of adjustments will develop facts and transactions in connection with these land grants which ought to be the subjects of legal examination and scrutiny before they are allowed to become final and conclusive. The Government should not be prevented from going into the courts to right wrongs perpetrated by its agents or any other parties, and by which much of the public domain may be diverted from the people at large to corporate uses.

In these circumstances, it seems to me that the act of 1891 should be or amended as not to apply to suits brought to recover title to lands certified os patented on account of railroad or other grants. And I respectfully urge upon Congress speedy action to the end suggested, so that the adjustment of these grants may proceed without the interposition of a bar, through lapse of time, against the right of recovery by the Government in proper cases.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *January 17, 1896.*

SCHOOLS OF MINES.

Mr. DUBOIS. I now ask for the consideration of Senate bill 790.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 790) to aid the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, and South Dakota to support schools of mines.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, in section 1, line 6, after "United States," to strike out "by each of the said States"; in line 7, after the word "within," to strike out "the"; and in the same line, after the word "States," to insert "respectively"; so as to read:

That each of the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, and South Dakota shall annually receive 25 per cent of all moneys paid to the United States for mineral lands within said States, respectively, for the maintenance of a school of mines in each of the said States.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to have the Senator make some explanation of the general nature and character of the bill.

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator will excuse me for a moment. I am instructed by the Committee on Public Lands to move in section 1, lines 3, 4, and 5, to strike out "States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, and South Dakota," and to insert in lieu thereof "public-land States"; so as to read:

That each of the public-land States shall annually receive 25 per cent of all moneys paid to the United States, etc.

Mr. HALE. What States would that include?

Mr. DUBOIS. All the public-land States. I will say that I do that in deference to the House of Representatives. The public-land States will not secure any of this appropriation unless they have mineral lands; but some of the members of the House of Representatives wish those States included.

Mr. HALE. Is that a phrase in the nomenclature of the General Land Office which is recognized as defining and including certain States?

Mr. DUBOIS. That is the term which is used by the General Land Office in defining States which have had public lands.

Mr. HALE. So that it is well understood and is in accordance with the present practice?

Mr. DUBOIS. It is well understood and simply in accordance with their definition.

I will say, in answer to the question of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], that this bill has heretofore passed the Senate several times, that it has been unanimously reported from the Committee on Public Lands each time, and also has been reported at the present session. It provides that the Government shall appropriate from revenues derived from the sale of mineral lands the sum of $12,500 each year, provided that each of those States appropriates a like amount in order to support a school of mines. The money comes from the sale of the mineral lands in the mineral States, and the States put up an equal amount for the support of these schools.

Mr. NELSON. I should like to have the bill read as amended.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] will first be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 3, after the words "States of," it is proposed to strike out "California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, and South Dakota," and insert "public-land States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will now be read as amended, in accordance with the request of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON].

The bill as amended was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each of the public land States shall annually receive 25 per cent of all moneys paid to the United States for mineral lands within said States, respectively, for the maintenance of a school of mines in each of the said States: *Provided*, That said sum so to be paid shall not exceed the sum of $12,000 per annum to each State, nor shall it exceed the amount annually expended by each of the said States for said school of mines.

SEC. 2. That before any money shall be paid to each of the said States under the provisions of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that each of the said States is maintaining a school of mines within its borders, in which students in attendance are given instruction in chemistry, metallurgy, mineralogy, geology, mining, mining engineering, mathematics, mechanics, and drawing, and that the students in attendance from other States are received into said school of mines on the same terms and conditions that the students from the said State are received.

SEC. 3. That the board of trustees of each of the said schools of mines shall make a report each year to the Secretary of the Interior of the number of students in attendance at such school of mines, the State of which they are inhabitants, and the general course of studies pursued in said school, and the amount expended in the support of said school.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to aid the public-land States to support schools of mines."

JOHN FINN.

Mr. VEST. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate for the present consideration of the bill (S. 227) to permit the withdrawal of certain papers and the signing of certain receipts by John Finn or his attorney. The bill will excite no debate, and has heretofore passed the Senate in the same form. Of course, I do not wish it to displace the regular order.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Auditor for the War Department be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to permit John Finn of St. Louis, Mo., claimant of 371 quartermaster's vouchers, aggregating $6,363.95, more or less, to sign the receipts upon the said vouchers, which said vouchers, it is alleged, were presented by the said Finn to the Quartermaster-General, and are now alleged to be in the office of the Third Auditor of the Treasury; and the receipts so signed shall be accepted as a sufficient compliance with the laws and rules regulating such cases: *Provided*, That it shall be found, upon examination, that the said vouchers were duly issued by the legally constituted authorities and came rightfully and for value into the hands of said Finn and that they have not heretofore been audited and paid: *Provided further*, That all original payees who do not present claims for payment on said vouchers within thirty days from the date of approval of this act shall be forever barred from presenting such claim, and said John Finn shall after said thirty days be entitled to receive the amounts found to be due thereon upon the conditions aforesaid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Auditor for the War Department to audit certain quartermaster's vouchers alleged to belong to John Finn, of St. Louis, Mo."

CONGRESSIONAL FUNERALS.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during sessions of Congress.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill has heretofore been read.

Mr. PLATT. The bill has been read, but manifestly there are some amendments which ought to be made to it if it is to be passed. I wish that it may be read again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will again be read.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Kansas to one feature in his bill. I do not know that it is open to the criticism which I am now going to make, but as the bill reads it seems to enact by public law that the body of a Senator or of a Member of the other House shall, the moment the breath leaves it, be put into the absolute care and custody and delivered over to a committee of the Senate or of the House to prepare it for burial, without any reference whatever to the wishes of the family of the deceased. In other words, if I fall in my place here, no matter how many of my family may be here, no matter what their desires may be in reference to the final disposition of my body, it is placed absolutely within the custody of a committee of the Senate or of the House.

Now, I am not very particular what becomes of my body after the final hour, but I confess that so far as I am concerned, I should prefer that my friends should have charge of my body and make preparations for the funeral rather than that it should be done of necessity, by law, by a committee of the House or of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Let the first section of the bill be again read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read section 1 of the bill, as follows:

That whenever, during a session of the Congress of the United States, a member of the Senate or House of Representatives shall die at any place within the District of Columbia, the House of which he was a member shall appoint a special committee of its members to properly prepare and incase the body of the deceased and forward it, in charge of a sergeant-at-arms specially

appointed, to the home of the deceased, and deliver it to his family, or to his relatives or friends in case he had no family.

Mr. HILL. I desire to inquire of the author of the bill what is the precise reform the bill proposes to make. Those around me suggest that it simply prevents a committee of either House of Congress from accompanying the remains to the place of burial. Is that the case? What is the precise reform which the bill will make in existing law?

Mr. PEFFER. There is no existing law, but there is a very expensive and useless custom which has grown up by long usage. The Senator from New York probably was not present some four weeks ago, when I had the honor to present to the Senate a large number of very interesting facts relating to this matter. That presentation showed, among other things, that within the last ten years the expenditures for the funeral services and obsequies alone undertaken by both Houses of Congress have averaged upward of $4,000 in each particular case.

While I do not know, and of course can not do more than approximately estimate, what the expense would be, I think the average under the bill would probably be not to exceed three or four hundred dollars at most, whereas now the average is upward of $4,000. In addition to that, the measure relieves the two bodies of Congress combined of all the gossip and talk of newspapers and others in relation to what does or does not occur during the trip from the capital to the home of the deceased member and upon the return. In other words, I think it is a very substantial reform.

Mr. HALE. Before the Senator from Kansas takes his seat, will he allow me to make a suggestion to him?

Mr. PEFFER. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I think we all see what the Senator is trying to accomplish, but I do not think that on reflection he will want to have the bill passed as it has been framed. One sees on its being read from the desk that it really does provide, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] has said, that the moment the breath leaves the body of a Senator or a Representative a committee of either House shall take charge of the body. It goes upon the theory that a Senator or a Representative is a waif, an estray, and that when he dies his body is to be taken charge of at once by the House of which he was a member, which is to go through with the last sad offices and prepare the body for burial, as if there were no family.

Now, the Senator from Kansas does not want to do that. He does not want to create any law which has in it that really objectionable proceeding. I suggest that unless he can now prepare an amendment which will cover his purpose, that there shall not be large committees to go off on trips, but that there shall be limitations as to what shall be done by either House incidental to the funeral ceremonials of a Representative or a Senator, he ought to let the bill go over for a day and call it up to-morrow, in the meantime preparing something that will be unobjectionable to everybody here.

Mr. PEFFER. I think that upon a moment's reflection and consideration Senators will see that everything has been provided for except the objection made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], which can be disposed of very readily by adding, after the word "member," in line 6, if I have the right place, the words "unless otherwise requested by the family or the friends of the deceased."

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator desire in a case of this kind to put upon the family, the near representatives, the mourners of a deceased Senator or Representative, as a part of the law, the burden of requesting that the Senate or House of Representatives shall not interfere? I do not think the Senator wants to do that. Let nature take its course, and then let the Senator come in and provide for what he wants as to any incidental participation of the House of Representatives or of the Senate in the funeral ceremonial. If he will put the bill in that form nobody will object.

Mr. PEFFER. If the Senator from Maine will pardon me, I will state that I have been a member of this body for something over four years, and several deaths have occurred during that time. Immediately after the announcement of the death the Sergeant-at-Arms and a number of persons in his employ, without any request from the friends of the deceased anywhere, assume that it is proper, and everyone will concede that it is, to see that the remains are properly cared for; that the friends are properly notified; that all proper things are done. Then in addition to that—and it is this addition which I wish to avoid—the presiding officer of the Senate and the presiding officer of the House of Representatives, in pursuance of resolutions offered to that effect, appoint a committee of five or seven members of this body and a number of members of the other body, forming together a joint committee, to accompany the remains of the deceased to his late home. It is all of this expense, which occurs after the preliminary work of taking care of the body has been done, that I desire to avoid by the bill now pending.

In case none of the friends of a deceased member is present to look after the proper care of the body, it seems to me it is the duty of this body or of the other body, of whichever the deceased person happened to have been a member, to take some appropriate action in the premises. My home is between 1,200 and 1,300 miles from the capital. The home of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] is not so far. The homes of the Senators from California are much farther, as are those of the Senators from the Dakotas. I think the average distance of the homes of Senators from the capital is not less than a thousand miles.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator from Kansas allow me?

Mr. PEFFER. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to call the Senator's attention to an omission in the bill and to ask him whether or not it is intentional. It is also customary with the two Houses of Congress to spend large sums at the funerals of deceased members of the Supreme Court. Does the Senator desire that custom to continue or does he desire to include it in his bill?

Mr. PEFFER. The bill merely applies to members of the Senate and the other House.

Mr. GEORGE. It relates only to those?

Mr. PEFFER. Only to those.

I think the objection made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] can be obviated by the amendment which I suggested a moment ago. After the word "member," in line 6—I do not care about having the amendment stated until Senators have thought about it—I suggest that we insert "unless otherwise requested by the family or the friends of the deceased"; so that it would read:

That whenever, during a session of the Congress of the United States, a member of the Senate or House of Representatives shall die at any place within the District of Columbia, the House of which he was a member, unless otherwise requested by the family or the friends of the deceased, shall appoint special committee, etc.

Mr. FAULKNER. I suggest to the Senator from Kansas that at present there exists no law whatever authorizing these expenditures. They are always made by authority of a resolution of the Senate or of the other House, from whichever body the member dies, and they are paid out of the contingent funds of the respective Houses. The matter is absolutely within the control of each body.

With respect to the average expense within the last ten years, to which the Senator from Kansas has referred, I will state that I think the average is enlarged very considerably by the expense of the funeral of a Senator from California, which came within that period and which caused a very large expenditure.

I am satisfied that it is better to determine this question, if we are to determine it by the action of the two bodies, by a concurrent resolution of instruction in reference to the subject to the officers having charge of such funerals. As well stated by the Senator from Kansas, the amount of expenditure on account of funeral services in the city of Washington is very limited, and could not in any way be regarded as extravagant or beyond what Congress should spend. The other expenditures result from the method of transportation of the body to the place of burial and the transportation thereto and return of the Congressional committee. That can be limited and controlled by either House at any time upon the death of a Senator or a Representative, or it can be controlled by a concurrent resolution passed by the two bodies. But I do not think we ought to put this in the form of a statute of the country. I suggest that the plan I have outlined would be a more feasible way of reaching the question, and framed in such way it would give instructions to the officers of this body and the other House as to the expenditures which would limit them to an economical sum for that purpose.

I do not like another portion of the bill, I am frank to say, and that is in reference to not permitting a committee of the Senate, for example, where a member of the Senate departs this life, to accompany his remains to the place of interment. I think that is a courtesy, a respect and an honor due to a deceased member which ought to be carried out by this body. I know of no organization in the United States, I care not what it may be, in which that custom is not observed. I do not think it is well for the Senate or for Congress to set an example to all the organizations of the country by prohibiting a reasonable, economical expenditure on account of railroad fare of a committee from Washington to the home of the deceased, if he is to be buried there. For that reason I should object very seriously to that portion of the bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, my first feeling on reading the bill was that it was a very cold and cruel measure. I do not see what title a committee of the House of Representatives should have to the body of any one of our brother Senators who may die within the District of Columbia. The bill provides that the committee shall immediately take possession of the remains, and, as the object is economy, get as cheap a coffin as it can bargain for, I suppose—perhaps what they call in the army a pine overcoat—and deliver it at the home of the lately deceased member.

I do not at all like the reading of the bill. I dislike the extravagance aimed at, but I think the evil could be cured by two lines in an appropriation bill, when we come to the paragraph that gives the contingent expense fund to the Senate, by providing that no expense shall be incurred in the case of the funeral of a Senator without the previous approval of the Committee on Con-

tingent Expenses. I am sure they would reasonably govern the whole matter. I shall vote to postpone the bill, or to take any other courteous action on it, but I can not vote for it.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Kansas will not press the consideration of the pending bill. There are a great many Senators and Members of the House, elected here to represent the people, who have very limited means and who are very poor. That when one dies the expense of sending his body to his home shall be paid by the legislative body of which he was a member is eminently proper. There can be no reason why a legislative body should not see that at least the mileage which would be paid for sending the body to his home is paid. The verdict and judgment of the people who have honored him by sending him to a place of public trust and importance should be treated with some consideration. We lower the standard of public duty and of public men when we confine them to the narrowest and closest and plainest economy. The people have admiration and honor for a government whose representatives, elected by the people, are surrounded by some degree of public respect and public attention. Therefore, in my judgment, the money is not thrown away when expended in this manner.

As was said by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], it is the province of the Senate and of the House to provide for the expense and to determine the manner in which it shall be done, and I do not think it is competent for the two Houses of Congress and the President of the United States to limit the method of procedure which is inherent in the two Houses, and in them alone, in their separate organization.

In my opinion, therefore, if any change shall be made it is the duty of the Senate as a distinct legislative body to provide the manner in which its dead members shall be transported and the respect that shall be paid to them. This has been the custom, and if there be objection to any expense it is competent for the Senator from Kansas or any other Senator to provide by a resolution of the Senate the manner in which the ceremonies shall be conducted.

But if the consideration of this bill is to be pressed, I shall propose an amendment that the wishes of the family shall be consulted, and that if they so prefer, the expense of the funeral service and the transportation shall be paid to them, leaving to the Senate and the other House to say what degree of respect and what degree of expense shall be incurred.

I hope the bill will not pass.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, just a word or two more. I see there is some objection on the part of Senators to the enactment of a law authorizing or directing the expenditure of money upon these funeral occasions. It is the use that has been made of money on such occasions that I am trying to avoid. If Senators are really in sympathy with the objects and purposes of this bill (and I think they are, because I have talked with a number of them individually, and all of them seem to think that something ought to be done), I hope that they will suggest something. I would have no sort of objection to striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the few words mentioned by the Senator from Connecticut a few moments ago providing that hereafter there shall be no money expended upon the occasion of the death of any member of either of the Houses of Congress, or something of that kind.

Mr. HAWLEY. No——

Mr. PEFFER. My object is to get rid of these expenditures, and yet, at the same time, if the Senator will pardon me just a moment, I appreciate very well, as all other Senators do, that there is a propriety in taking some notice of the decease of members of either branch of Congress. In any other great body, no matter where it is or under what circumstances, where a member dies, some attention ought to be paid on the occasion. I am trying to get some appropriate action taken that will not be expensive, where the people of the country have to pay the expense.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator allow me? If he referred to me he was mistaken in his reference.

Mr. PEFFER. I thought the Senator spoke about the propriety of such a provision.

Mr. HAWLEY. I did not advocate the entire prohibition of any expenditure. I suggested merely, by way of illustration, that to the clause in the appropriation act setting aside money for contingent expenses there should be added a provision that no obligation shall be incurred in conducting the funerals of Senators except after the previous approval of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I think that would prevent these very extravagant things and answer every purpose in the world.

Mr. PEFFER. Now, continuing my line of remarks, unless some action of this character is taken, when the first instance arises in this body or in the other House the usual course will be pursued, and it will go along; the next will be treated in the same way, and the next one. Every dollar of these expenses comes out of the public Treasury. If it were the rule that Senators and members of the other House who are personal friends of the deceased should as individuals have charge of the funeral obsequies and bear all the expenses personally, there would be no need of anything of this kind, but as it is now it is constantly growing to be more and more extravagant, and there are more and more useless ceremonies, and the people of the country have to foot the bills.

I wish to call the attention of Senators to the fact that I have received a very large number (I do not know how many, for I have not kept account) of newspaper comments, not only the comments of gossiping reporters, but solid, deliberate, temperate discussions from editorial pens in all sections of the country. I have one here from the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, a paper with whose history every Senator is familiar. It is a long argument in which the subject is discussed.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Kansas allow me a moment?

Mr. PEFFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from West Virginia expressed the idea that he thought it would be appropriate that a committee of each House should accompany the remains of a Representative or Senator. The Senator from Kansas has been investigating this subject. I desire to ask him whether in his investigation he has ascertained what is the custom in the Parliament of Great Britain? What is the custom in other legislative bodies of the world? What is the custom of the legislatures of the respective States of the Union? Can the Senator inform me?

Mr. PEFFER. I will say to the Senator from New York that I have not gone to the extent of investigating the practice of other nations, nor do I know anything about the custom of the States separately. All I do know is with respect to my own State, and I have never heard of an instance of that kind there. Indeed, I do not know that I have ever heard of an instance in any of the State legislatures, when a member of either branch died during a session, where the State was charged with his funeral expenses beyond a certain very small matter of preparing the body and having it sent in charge of a committee or something of that kind to the home of the deceased, and that is what I want to get at here.

Mr. HILL. As I understand this bill it does not affect judges of the Supreme Court, it does not affect any Cabinet official.

Mr. PEFFER. No, no.

Mr. HILL. It would not affect either the President or the Vice-President of the United States?

Mr. PEFFER. No; only a Senator or Representative. It is particularly expressed.

Mr. HILL. Are not the reforms as necessary in regard to other funerals as those which will pertain to Senators and Representatives?

Mr. PEFFER. I do not hear the Senator.

Mr. HILL. I ask if the reforms are not as necessary and desirable in regard to funerals of those other officials as in regard to Senators and Representatives? In other words, would it still be left to the discretion of Congress as to what should be done upon the occasion of the death of a justice of the Supreme Court, the death of a President, or the other high officials of the Government, or the General of the Army of the United States? Does the Senator think it would be inappropriate to appoint a committee of the civil branch of the Government to accompany the remains of the Lieutenant-General of the Army of the United States?

Mr. PEFFER. I do not.

Mr. HILL. At the public expense?

Mr. PEFFER. I do not.

Mr. HILL. Then he draws the line simply on Senators and Representatives.

Mr. PEFFER. That is not the proper way to mark the line that I have drawn.

Mr. HILL. I ask the question for information merely.

Mr. PEFFER. That is not the way to put it exactly. The General of the Army is only one man, and a Senator of the United States is only one man, but he is a member of a body that now consists of 87 and will soon consist of 90 members. It has grown up to be a custom that without distinction as to men these proceedings are to be had. Custom has the force of law in these cases. The General of the Army is one case in a hundred thousand. He is at the head of an army of 25,000 men. He represents the military arm of a mighty people. In his case, and especially if he were a man like Grant, or Sherman, or Sheridan, or Schofield, the people would unanimously expect some proper demonstration on the part of the Congress of the United States. It has always been that way, and there would be no objection in the case of great Senators. We can go back through the departed past and our memory will drop here and there upon one great character that was national and rose up above the average public man.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas will suspend while the Senate receives a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CHAPELL, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4241) for improving Aransas Pass; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ARANSAS PASS IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to ask my friend from Kansas if he will not yield to me to ask unanimous consent to call up and pass the little measure that has just come from the other House. We want to relieve the company. The law expires day after to-morrow and the bill must be passed within the next few days. It will take but a moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. PEFFER. I will yield for that purpose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 4241) for improving Aransas Pass was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time within which the Aransas Pass Harbor Company was required, by an act entitled "An act to amend an act of Congress, approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass," to obtain the navigable depth of 20 feet over the outer bar therein mentioned is hereby extended until January 22, 1899.

Mr. MILLS. The bill is simply for the completion of the work. I will state that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], who is chairman of the Committee on Commerce, is familiar with the bill, and finds no objection to it at all.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas whether the War Department, conducting the work, desires to have this extension given to the company?

Mr. MILLS. I so understand. I do not know personally.

Mr. FRYE. The War Department has nothing to do with the work.

Mr. CHANDLER. Who conducts it?

Mr. FRYE. It is the work of a private corporation.

Mr. VEST. It is a special contract.

Mr. FRYE. A special contract.

Mr. CHANDLER. What I desire to know is whether the executive officers of the Government, whoever may be supervising the work of this company, think this extension ought to be allowed.

Mr. FRYE. They have nothing to do with it. Authority was given by Congress to a corporation to improve the Aransas Pass, and a certain length of time was allowed by the law enacted by Congress in which the work should be completed. They have not been able to complete it within that time, and therefore they come in and ask that the time may be extended. The matter was before the committee two years ago, and there was an extension of a year given at that time. I see myself not the slightest objection to further extending it to 1899.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Maine further inform me whether it is a question of any payment of money to this company?

Mr. FRYE. It is not. The Government has nothing to do with it at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is simply a permission to this company, at their own expense, to improve the pass?

Mr. FRYE. That is all.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONGRESSIONAL FUNERALS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 236) to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the capital during sessions of Congress.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President——

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Will the Senator from Kansas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. PEFFER. For the purpose of this bill?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Yes, sir; on this bill.

Mr. PEFFER. I will hear the Senator.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I rose to make a suggestion to the Senator from Kansas. It does not seem that there is any prospect of reaching a vote this evening. There is some executive business to be transacted. It is getting rather late. Will the Senator yield to me that I may move an executive session?

Mr. PEFFER. I think it is likely that we shall have this matter disposed of inside of fifteen minutes. I do not think it will be long.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Very well; we will try it.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, before leaving the subject, I think it is due to the friends of the bill and to the subject-matter of it as well that I should place on record a few of the criticisms made by the newspaper press. Here is one from the Springfield (Mass.) Republican. The reading clerk is a better reader than I am, and if he is not too tired he will oblige me by reading it. I ask that it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

PEFFER ON FUNERAL JUNKETS.

Senator PEFFER exercised self-restraint in his attack on the Congressional funeral abuse in the Senate the other day. The most that he did was to prove that these affairs are recklessly and extravagantly managed, and that everybody who has a chance to get in a big bill for any sort of services rendered does so and gets what is asked for. Congressional coffins cost considerably more than those in which ordinary corpses are buried, and so with carriages, flowers, clerical services, and all the incidentals of the funeral. A Congressional funeral seems to be regarded as a grand plucking time by everybody who can find a pretext for grabbing some of the public money. It cost $21,000 for a Senatorial committee to bury the body of Senator Hearst in California, and while this funeral was probably the worst junket of the sort for years, there is plenty of evidence that it differed only in degree from the usual expression of respect and regard paid to a dead member of Congress by his bereaved colleagues.

The custom is for the public Treasury to pay for everything connected with Congressional funerals—casket, undertaker's services, carriages, flowers, grave digging, and so down to the last detail, including the fees of musicians and clergymen at the funeral services. In addition the expenses of a committee of the Senate or House, with such invited guests as the members of the committee may take with them, the Sergeant-at-Arms and his assistants, and often of relations and friends of the deceased, are also paid, to say nothing of refreshments of various sorts which the contingent fund of one body or the other supplies. PEFFER does not say very much about this item of refreshments, nor does he emphasize the junketing features of these funeral parties, but he hints plainly at them, and they appear in the itemized account he gives of the expenses of the Plumb funeral at Emporia, Kans., and of two or three others. There were at least 21 persons whose expenses were paid to the Plumb funeral, and probably more, and it cost between $350 and $400 for food and commissary supplies for them en route, not including hotel bills at Emporia and St. Louis. As several members of the committee returned to Washington by themselves, most of these supplies must have been consumed on the outward trip. The bill of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, which carried the party from Washington to Emporia, was $153 for "commissary supplies en route," while the remainder of the $350 was expended by the Sergeant-at-Arms. PEFFER says that the Plumb funeral was as economically managed as was possible, and if this is the case his figures throw considerable light on the probable cost of "commissary supplies" on less carefully watched junkets.

Senator Kenna, of West Virginia, whose home was only 300 miles from Washington, was buried a couple of years ago at a cost to the country of over $3,000, of which $432 went for "commissary supplies, meals and lunches furnished in cars." There is another item of more than $100 for meals and hotel bills in the account of the Sergeant-at-Arms. This Kenna funeral seems to have been a wholesale picnic, for the country paid for the use of three Pullman cars and a combination car, and, first and last, of eighty-five carriages. It cost $1,800 to bury the body of Representative Houk at Dayton, Ohio, and $2,350 to go to Michigan with the remains of Representative Chipman, and the commissary plays a prominent part among the items in both these accounts. It is not much of a Senatorial funeral that does not cost $3,000 or more nowadays, while the outlay in burying Representatives average a little more than half that amount.

The charge of gross junketing in connection with these funerals is thus established, and is in itself sufficient argument for the passage of the bill which PEFFER has introduced and had placed on the Senate Calendar. His bill provides for the showing of proper respect and regard to deceased members of either House, including the appointment of committees to arrange for the preparation of the body for burial and for services over it at Washington, but it forbids the sending of committees to the home of the deceased, leaving the transportation of the body to the Sergeant-at-Arms. PEFFER is right in regarding this as the proper extent to which expressions of Congressional respect for deceased colleagues should go, but there is not the slightest probability that either House will abandon these chances for junkets at public expense, any more than that the Senators will give up their bay rum, apollinaris, brandy, expensive pocketbooks, penknives, and other luxuries to which they treat themselves frequently at the expense of the public Treasury.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, if there is any more of that sort of matter let us bury that at any rate. [Laughter.] The man who wrote that article, especially the last part of it, is wholly ignorant of the way matters are conducted here, wholly ignorant of this matter of stationery and all that sort of thing. The fact is that my neighbor of the Springfield Republican talks sometimes as if he would be glad to bury the whole of us alive at his own expense. [Laughter.]

Mr. FAULKNER. I think there is a general sentiment in the Senate, so far as I have observed, looking to retrenchment in expenditures here in the matters referred to, and especially on the question of transportation, which is really the expensive item in all Congressional funerals. I submit a motion, which I believe the Senator from Kansas will not object to, which will carry out to a great extent his views in this matter. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Rules, with instructions to report an amendment to the rules to regulate and control the expenditure of public funds in the burial of a Senator, thereby making it a rule of the Senate. This matter will come up for discussion when the Committee on Rules make their report.

Mr. PLATT. Before that motion is acted upon, I should like to suggest an amendment to the bill, to strike out all after the word "committee," in line 7 of section 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

To confer with the family or friends of the deceased and take such order, consistent with their wishes, as may be required for forwarding his remains, in charge of a sergeant-at-arms specially appointed, to the home of the deceased and the delivery thereof to his family or friends.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER].

The motion was agreed to.

PORT OF ENTRY OF NEW ORLEANS.

Mr. CAFFERY. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1230) to extend the limits of the port of entry of New Orleans.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to extend the limits of the port of entry of New Orleans so as to include that portion of the parish of Jefferson on the west bank of the Mississippi River lying between the upper line of the parish of Orleans, west bank, the west bank of the river to a point opposite the upper boundary line of the parish of Orleans, east bank, a line drawn thence back 4,000 feet, perpendicular to the river, and a line drawn thence parallel to the Mississippi River until it intersects the upper parish boundary line, west bank; and so as further to include that portion of the parish of St. Bernard lying between the lower boundary line of the parish of Orleans, east bank, the east bank of the Mississippi River to a point 3 miles below the lower boundary, a line drawn thence back 4,000 feet parallel to the lower boundary line, and a line drawn thence parallel to the Mississippi River, until it intersects the lower boundary line of the parish of Orleans.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GAINESVILLE, M'ALESTER AND ST. LOUIS RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory."

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, to insert, as section 2, the following:

SEC. 2. That section 1 of said act be so amended as to make the City of Fort Smith the terminus of said road on the western border of the State of Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SILVER COIN AND COIN REDEMPTION.

Mr. BAKER. I desire to offer an amendment to the first section of the silver bill, so called, which I ask to have read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 1 it is proposed to add:

Provided, however, That this section shall apply to the coinage of the silver mined in the United States of America only.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie over.

Mr. BAKER. I give notice that I shall ask leave to submit some remarks upon the subject to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will then recognize the Senator for that purpose.

NEWBERRY COLLEGE.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 271) for the relief of the Newberry College, Newberry, S. C., which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Claims.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to say to the Senator from South Carolina that it will be impossible for him to have that bill debated and passed this afternoon.

Mr. TILLMAN. I had hoped the bill would go through without any debate, as it passed the Senate at the last session.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will say to the Senator that I have letters with reference to this claim, which make it necessary for me to object to it until I have examined those letters. After I have done so, I shall cooperate with the Senator in getting the bill before the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. Of course, if the Senator objects to the consideration of the bill, I do not want to precipitate any debate this evening.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do object; but I want to state to the Senator from South Carolina why I do so. If he calls the bill up at some other time I shall be ready to speak upon it, if I conclude to speak upon it at all.

Mr. PASCO. I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire before he enters his objection that I hope he will not urge it. The bill was called up during the last Congress by the then Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Butler, who preceded the present Senator, was discussed here for some time, and finally passed by the unanimous vote of the Senate. It was then recommended by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Claims, and it has received a like indorsement during the present session. I should be very glad if the Senator from New Hampshire would take that into consideration before he insists upon his objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall be obliged to make the statements which have come to me in reference to this claim if the bill is taken up for action at the present time. It is possible that when I examine the papers and confer with the Senator from Florida I may not object to the passage of the bill. I shall do so if it is taken up to-day. While I wish to extend every courtesy to the Senator from South Carolina, I must object to its consideration at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection, and the bill will be passed over.

CRIPPLE CREEK DISTRICT, COLORADO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print 5,000 copies, in separate form, with paper covers, of the paper entitled "Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado"; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. GORMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 21, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 20, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

POSTAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS OF 1893.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of three brief reports from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the accompanying House concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of the Postal Laws and Regulations of 1893 for the use of the Post-Office Department, have considered the same and recommend that it do pass.

The Public Printer estimates that the cost of printing and binding will be $1,800.

In support of the recommendation the committee submits the following letter from the Postmaster-General:

OFFICE OF POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1896.

SIR: I have the honor to request that you will kindly cause a concurrent resolution to be introduced in the House for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of the Postal Laws and Regulations of 1893 from the plates now in the Government Printing Office. The entire edition of this publication was exhausted early in the year 1895. In that fiscal year the Department procured 1,000 additional copies and at the beginning of the fiscal year 1896 another 1,000 copies, all of which have been distributed.

Under the provisions of section 89 of the act of January 12, 1895, the Department can not procure an additional supply until the beginning of the fiscal year 1897, at which time only 1,000 more may be procured.

It is presumed that it was not the intention of the Congress to restrict the Department in procuring an adequate supply with which to meet the demands of the service of so necessary a publication as the Postal Laws and Regulations, and I trust you will urge the adoption of the proper legislation.

Very respectfully,

WM. L. WILSON,
Postmaster-General.

Hon. GEORGE D. PERKINS,
Chairman Committee on Printing,
House of Representatives.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. One moment. The resolution will be reported to the House first.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of the Postal Laws and Regulations of 1893 for the use of the Post-Office Department.

The SPEAKER. The question is on granting unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that I did not hear the reading of the report, and I would like the gentleman to make some explanation why he asks unanimous consent for the passage of this resolution.

Mr. PERKINS. The resolution, Mr. Speaker, provides for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of the Postal Laws and Regulations, the edition having been exhausted; and the Postmaster-General, in that letter which has been read as a part of the report, makes the best explanation that the committee is able to present.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I would like to ask the gentleman, before unanimous consent is given, what is the estimated cost?

Mr. PERKINS. Eighteen hundred dollars.

Mr. CANNON. Why should this item of deficiency be referred

to the Committee on Printing rather than to take the usual course along with the other deficiencies for the public service for the remainder of this fiscal year? In other words, why should we have practically the carrying of deficiencies for the remainder of the fiscal year divided up rather than kept track of along with other deficiency appropriations?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the law provides for the printing of so many copies of these reports annually.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely.

Mr. PERKINS. That the number has been exhausted, and the Postmaster-General asks the authority of Congress to print an additional number.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Is this a unanimous report from the Committee on Printing?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. In other words, if I understand it, the Postmaster-General, instead of submitting his deficiency estimate through the Secretary of the Treasury, along with other deficiencies for the fiscal year, proposes, without reference to the rules of the House, to have this appropriation made in the shape of a first, second, or third urgent deficiency.

Mr. PERKINS. Why, then, can not every request for printing here be accounted a deficiency?

Mr. CANNON. Ah! The printing touching the House and its business is a matter that goes to the Committee on Printing, and touching the propriety of the authorization of printing, etc.; but this is where printing is authorized, and the law calls for so much printing. It does not need any enactment; it does not need authorization of the Committee on Printing; but it should go to the Committee on Appropriations, in charge of the urgent deficiency bill. It seems to me that the best way is to allow the estimate to come in the formal way.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not understand the objection of the gentleman.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Certainly.

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to say, in addition to what has been so well said by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that the subcommittee in charge of the legislative appropriation bill in the last Congress considered this question, as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] will remember, and gave exactly the amount of the Postmaster-General's estimate for this service.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the two gentlemen, members of the Committee on Appropriations, do not exactly understand this resolution. This is simply a resolution to print additional copies of a document.

Mr. CANNON. Wherein does it differ from a resolution to provide for carrying on the Government Printing Office?

Mr. RICHARDSON. This resolution simply provides for printing additional copies of a document out of money already appropriated. It is not a self-appropriating resolution. It simply proposes to use money already appropriated for printing—to print additional copies of a document, and it is in the exact form that has been followed always heretofore when we have provided for printing additional copies of documents.

Mr. SAYERS. If the money which is covered by this resolution is used for this purpose it may cause a deficiency in the annual appropriation for the Public Printing Office. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this resolution ought to have gone in the first place to the Committee on Appropriations, because that committee has exclusive jurisdiction of appropriations, and that jurisdiction has been uniformly recognized by the Committee on Printing.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If my friend will permit me, this resolution makes no appropriation. As I have already said, it is in the same form as every resolution for printing for the last ten years, to my knowledge. I have been a member of the Printing Committee for nine years, and during that time every resolution to print additional copies of a document has been in the exact language of this one. I repeat, this does not make any appropriation; it simply uses money which has been already appropriated for public printing, but the Public Printer will not use that money for this purpose until there is a concurrent resolution directing him to print these additional copies.

Mr. SAYERS. But this resolution ought first to have gone to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If this resolution should have gone to that committee, then every resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of a document ought to have gone there; but no such resolution ever did go there, to my knowledge.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the documents to which this resolution refers are for the use of the Post-Office Department. Now, the resolutions to which the gentleman refers as heretofore reported from the Committee on Printing for the printing of additional copies have generally been for documents for the use of members of the Senate and of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Not at all. My friend is mistaken in that. The Post-Office Department has no power to do this printing. The law expressly limits them to 1,000 copies, and now they want additional copies of this document.

Mr. CANNON. The correctness of the position of the gentleman from Tennessee is to be tested and determined by the powers of his committee under the rules of the House. If this be a matter of privilege reported from the Committee on Printing an objection will have no effect.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I concede that this is not privileged.

Mr. CANNON. Therefore the gentleman comes here and asks unanimous consent. Now, that request would come with just as much force, so far as the rules of the House are concerned, from any other gentleman who should rise in his place and ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution. It seems to me that the test of the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee in this matter lies in its privilege.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If that be so no resolution could be reported from the Committee on Printing unless it were privileged. That position certainly can not be maintained for a moment. The rule says that the Committee on Printing is privileged to report resolutions for printing where the printing is to be provided for the House or for the two Houses of Congress, but if they add to that printing for the House or the two Houses a provision for the reprinting of documents for any of the Departments or bureaus, it has been held that that addition takes away the privileged character of the resolution. It will not do, however, to say that the Committee on Printing has not jurisdiction of such a resolution because it was not privileged, as the gentleman from Illinois seems to contend.

Mr. CANNON. So far as I am concerned, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PERKINS] makes his report and seemingly, and I have no doubt actually, reports a condition of affairs that calls for this printing. Having called attention to the matter, I shall not make objection in this instance, but I want to say, in all courtesy and kindness, that it seems to me that the best way is to keep the deficiencies for the public service together, and in the future, in case I have the power, I shall insist upon the strict observance of the rule.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's premises are right, but I confess that I do not see how they affect this resolution. This resolution simply provides for printing additional copies of a document the supply of which has been exhausted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

There was no objection; and the resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. PERKINS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

PUBLIC LANDS AND THEIR WATER SUPPLY.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the second resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, under the direction of the Department of the Interior, 6,000 copies of a paper contained in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Director of the United States Geological Survey, entitled "The public lands and their water supply," together with the accompanying maps and illustrations; of which number 1,500 copies shall be for the use of members of the Senate, 3,000 for the use of members of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 for the Geological Survey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the chairman of the committee make some explanation as to the necessity for the adoption of this resolution.

This resolution, as I understand, requires 6,000 copies of some report to be printed. I have not been able to catch the reading of the resolution, and I should like to have the chairman of the committee explain the necessity for its adoption.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, which comes from the Senate, proposes to print a part of the report which the resolution describes. It has been represented to our committee by the Director of the Geological Survey and by others interested in the matter that there is a great demand for this portion of the report for circulation among the people. Prompted by the suggestions made to it, the committee has secured from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of the proposed printing, and on due consideration has recommended the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. What is the important part of the report which the gentleman refers to?

Mr. PERKINS. It is set forth in the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again read the resolution for the information of the House. The Chair hopes that quiet may be preserved so that the Clerk may be heard.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. SAYERS. To cut this matter short, I object to the consideration of the resolution.

GEOLOGY, ETC., OF CRIPPLE CREEK DISTRICT, COLORADO.

Mr. PERKINS. I have another resolution from the Committee on Printing which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed at the earliest day practicable 5,000 copies in separate form, with paper covers, of the paper entitled, "Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado," constituting pages 1 to 209 of Part II of the Sixteenth Annual Report of the United States Geological Survey, with the accompanying illustrations, of which 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies for distribution by the Geological Survey.

Mr. DOCKERY. Let us have the report read, the right to object being reserved.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report, if there be no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the accompanying Senate concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 5,000 copies in separate form, with paper covers, of the paper entitled, "Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado," constituting pages 1 to 209 of Part II of the Sixteenth Annual Report of the United States Geological Survey, with accompanying illustrations, have had the same under consideration, and recommend its passage with the following amendment:

Strike out "2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,500 copies for the use of the House of Representatives" and insert: "1,500 copies for the use of the Senate, 3,000 for the use of the House of Representatives;" so that it will read:

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed at the earliest day practicable, 5,000 copies in separate form, with paper covers, of the paper entitled 'Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado,' constituting pages 1 to 209, of Part II of the Sixteenth Annual Report of the United States Geological Survey, with the accompanying illustrations, of which 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies for distribution by the Geological Survey."

The Public Printer estimates the cost at $1,260.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. MILES. I object.

Subsequently,

Mr. MILES said: I withdraw my objection to the consideration of the resolution last reported from the Committee on Printing.

Mr. PERKINS. As the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILES] has withdrawn his objection, I would like to have the question on that resolution resubmitted. If an opportunity can be given, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] would like to make a brief explanation.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MILES. It was because I did not understand the purport of the resolution as read that I made the objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that if gentlemen will resume their seats and cease conversation there may be an opportunity for gentlemen making explanations to be heard.

Mr. MILES. I think the House ought to have the benefit of an explanation on this subject; and the gentleman to whom I stated that I would withdraw my objection informed me that he would make such an explanation to the House.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for the present consideration of this resolution arises from the fact that the annual report of the Geological Survey is now being printed. The part relating to Cripple Creek constitutes one part of the report. The surveys have been made, and the Government has gone to the expense of having the plates prepared and everything ready for printing the extra copies of the report. By authorizing the printing of it at this time it will save a large amount of money by using the plates and type that are now set up.

This report relating to the Cripple Creek mining region is one that is in great demand, not only from the State of Colorado, but from all parts of the Union. The recent gold discoveries made there are attracting a great deal of attention, and demands, to me, at least, come in from all parts of the Union for copies of this report. The Government, as I have already said, has gone to an enormous expense in making the surveys. These surveys are now in the annual report, the plates are all prepared, and all that is asked at this time is to permit the additional number of copies to be printed while the work is being done on the annual report.

Mr. SAYERS. What is the amount of the cost?

Mr. SHAFROTH. One thousand two hundred and sixty dollars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SAYERS. I shall not object, Mr. Speaker, to the consideration of this resolution. But I wish to say to the gentleman from Colorado and to the House that I shall hereafter object to all resolutions of this character which look to the use of the general appropriation for the support of the Printing Office. For the first time in a great many years no deficiency has been asked for by the Public Printer for the current year, and for one I do not like to see that fund (appropriated by the last Congress) exhausted by using it in this manner under special resolutions.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if it is not also true that while there is no deficiency, the Public Printer has actually turned back $150,000—covered it back into the Treasury, as funds not used?

Mr. SAYERS. I suppose so. I do not know the fact, but suppose it to be true.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, the amendment recommended by the Committee on Printing was adopted, and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. PAYNE. The bill (H. R. 2705) constituting Green Bay, in Wisconsin, a port of delivery, was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. That committee has directed me to report it back and to ask its reference to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which, according to the practice of the House, bills of this character have uniformly been referred.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the reference will be changed.

IMPROVEMENT OF ARANSAS PASS.

Mr. CRAIN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4241) for improving Aransas Pass. This bill has been presented as a substitute for House bill No. 3548, which should be laid on the table if this substitute be passed.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time within which the Aransas Pass Harbor Company was required, by an act entitled "An act to amend an act of Congress, approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass," to obtain the navigable depth of 20 feet over the outer bar therein mentioned is hereby extended until January 22, 1899.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. CANNON. I wish to put a question to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN]. If I understand this matter aright, there is a company now engaged in improving Aransas Pass.

Mr. CRAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. What is the necessity for the passage of this bill?

Mr. CRAIN. Its passage is made necessary by reason of the fact that on the 22d day of this month the time heretofore fixed by law for the completion of the work by this company will have elapsed. The company has been working in good faith, but owing to unforeseen obstacles has been unable to comply with the provisions of the original act. That company has expended over $150,000, and has abundant means to go on with the work. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which the original bill was referred, have unanimously recommended the adoption of the substitute which has just been read.

Mr. CANNON. My understanding is that a private company is doing this work with its own funds, and that neither by the original bill nor by the bill now proposed to be passed is the Government in any way committed to any expense in connection with the construction or maintenance of this work.

Mr. CRAIN. Not to the extent of one dollar.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CRAIN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PACIFIC RAILROADS.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Pacific Railroads to ask that that committee shall have leave to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC BUILDING, BLOOMINGTON, ILL.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The joint resolution will be read, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 89) concerning the erection and completion (except heating apparatus) of the United States post-office building at Bloomington, Ill.

Whereas a clause in the sundry civil appropriation act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat., 395) relating to public buildings, provides: "No change in said plan involving an increase of expense exceeding 10 per cent of the amount to which said building was limited shall be allowed or paid by any officer of the Government without the special authority of Congress;" and

Whereas during the last recess of Congress the contract for the erection and completion (except heating apparatus) of the United States post-office building at Bloomington, Ill., was let for an amount less than the estimated cost, and it became advisable for the Secretary of the Treasury to so modify the drawings and specifications for said building as to provide fireproof construction and improved design: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to construct and complete the above-named building as may be shown and called for by modified drawings and specifications: *Provided*, That the present appropriation for said building and its site shall not be exceeded.

Mr. SAYERS. I understand from the reading of this resolution that it is not proposed to exceed the limit of cost?

Mr. WARNER. Not to exceed the appropriation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, and ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WARNER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SCOTTISH RITE MASONRY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2300) to incorporate the Supreme Council of the Thirty-third Degree of Scottish Rite Masonry for the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Thomas Hubbard Caswell, of the city of San Francisco, State of California; Odell Squier Long, of the city of Charleston, State of West Virginia; Erasmus Theodore Carr, of Miles City, State of Montana; Frederick Webber, of the city of Washington, D. C.; Gilmor Meredith, of the city of Baltimore, State of Maryland, and Samuel Emery Adams, of the city of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, officers and members of the supreme council mentioned in the caption hereof, and their successors, be, and they are hereby, incorporated and made a body politic and corporate in the District of Columbia by the name of "The Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the Thirty-third Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America"; and by that name it may sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded in any court of law or equity, and may have and use a common seal and change the same at pleasure, and be entitled to use and exercise all the powers, rights, and privileges incidental to fraternal and benevolent corporations within the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. That the said corporation shall have the power to take and hold real and personal estate, which shall not be divided among the members of the corporation, but shall descend to their successors for the promotion of the fraternal and benevolent purposes of said corporation.

SEC. 3. That all claims, accounts, debts, things in action, or other matters of business of whatever nature now existing for or against the present supreme council mentioned in section 1 of this act shall survive and succeed to and against the body corporate and politic hereby created: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall be construed to extend the operation of any law which provides for the extinguishing of claims or contracts by limitations of time.

SEC. 4. That said corporation shall have a constitution and statutes, and shall have power to amend the same at pleasure: *Provided*, That such constitution and statutes or amendments thereof do not conflict with the laws of the United States or of any State.

SEC. 5. That said corporation shall not engage in any business for gain, the purposes of said corporation being fraternal and benevolent.

The following amendments recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary were read:

In lines 10 and 11 of the bill strike out the words "mentioned in the caption hereof," and insert in lieu thereof the words "of the Supreme Council of the Thirty-third Degree of Scottish Rite Masonry for the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States."

Strike out section 2 of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following as section 2:

"That the said corporation shall have the power to take and hold personal estate and such real estate as shall be necessary and proper for the promotion of the fraternal and benevolent purposes of said corporation, which shall not be divided among the members of the corporation, but shall descend to their successors for the promotion of the objects aforesaid."

In section 4, line 2, after the word "statutes," insert the words "or by-laws," and in line 3 of same section, after the word "statutes," insert the same words, "or by-laws."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. NORTHWAY. I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee why he applies to Congress for incorporation?

Mr. RICHARDSON. There is no other way by which this Masonic order can be chartered in the District of Columbia. They own some property here and have a valuable free library.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Does it only apply to the District of Columbia?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is all.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not like to appear overcritical, but this bill uses the word "statutes," meaning by-laws. I believe I am safe in saying that never before in any law or statute of Congress has the word "statute" been applied to anything except an enactment of Congress or of some State legislature, and I should like to have that word stricken out and some such word as "regulations" substituted. I desire to say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] that I perfectly understand that this order designates its by-laws as statutes, but he will understand that if this law should call them "by-laws" or "regulations," then in any court in which they might become a matter of controversy the court would construe the words "by-laws" or "regulations" to cover what the order calls "statutes."

Mr. RICHARDSON. I defer entirely to my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] in that matter. The only reason why I used the word "statutes" in drawing the charter was that from time immemorial that order has used the word "statutes" as applicable to its regulations or by-laws; but I agree with the gentleman fully that if the word "regulations" is used instead of "statutes" it will answer the purpose, and I will accept his suggestion.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Ought not this bill to be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It has been considered by the Judiciary Committee, and this is their unanimous report, submitted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], and I will state, moreover, Mr. Speaker, that a similar charter was passed in the last Congress for the benefit of the Knights of Pythias.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I did not know that the bill had been considered by the committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It has. This order is purely benevolent and charitable, and the object of this bill is to enable them to own and have title to their property here and to carry on their library and other similar purposes.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Does this bill confine it to the District of Columbia, or does it simply confer all the powers, rights, and privileges incidental to fraternal and benevolent corporations in the District?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will read the language. After naming the gentlemen and giving the title, it says:

Be, and they are hereby, incorporated and made a body politic and corporate in the District of Columbia by the name of "The Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the Thirty-third Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America."

Then at the conclusion of the paragraph are the words which the gentleman has quoted:

And be entitled to use and exercise all the powers, rights, and privileges incidental to fraternal and benevolent corporations within the District of Columbia.

It is limited particularly to the District of Columbia.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the gentleman reported the amendments recommended by the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The Clerk reported the amendments, and they are embraced in the report. I shall ask that they be adopted. In addition to that, I will further ask to substitute the word "regulations" in two places where the word "statutes" occurs in the bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the bill passed for the benefit of the Knights of Pythias the word "statutes" was not used.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, because they do not so denominate their regulations or by-laws, while in this order they denominate them statutes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it essential to use the term "statutes"?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is not. The word "regulations" will answer every purpose. I ask first for the adoption of the amendment which I have suggested.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] asks unanimous consent to amend by substituting the word "regulations" where the word "statutes" now appears.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is right—in section 4.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PRINTING AND BINDING FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents, for the use of the said committee, as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by the said committee during the Fifty-fourth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

CONDEMNED CANNON.

Mr. HILBORN. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Naval Affairs to report back House bill No. 1712 with a request for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1712) granting to the First Regiment of North Carolina State Guard two condemned cannon.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to deliver to the First Regiment North Carolina State Guard two pieces of condemned cannon: *Provided*, That the same can be spared without detriment to the service, and that no expense is thereby incurred by the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and, being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HILBORN. Mr. Speaker, there are six bills of a similar nature, coming from military organizations, Grand Army posts, and municipalities, requesting the donation of condemned cannon, and in some cases of condemned cannon balls, for monumental and other purposes. These were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The committee communicated with the Secretary of the Navy to ascertain whether it was practicable to comply with these requests. In reply the Secretary says, in case the discretion is given to the Secretary of the Navy to furnish such articles as in his judgment may be spared without injury to the service, and with the further provision that the Government of the United States shall not be put to any expense by reason of the donation, there is no objection to the passage of the bills. The bills have all been amended so as to conform to the suggestion of the Secretary. These condemned cannon of the Navy are old iron guns of obsolete patterns, and of no use to the Government. They have no commercial value, as the cost of breaking them up would be greater than the value of the metal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of these bills?

Mr. CANNON. I would be glad if the gentleman would submit his report and let it be printed in the RECORD, because there are other places that would be very glad to have these condemned cannon for ornament in the same way; and that would give us a little time to look into it and let others have an opportunity.

Mr. HILBORN. Let these bills pass, and let the others then come in.

Mr. THOMAS. Let these bills pass, and let others then come in.

Mr. CANNON. You can have it printed in the RECORD, and you can call it up in the morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. How many cases are there in this?

Mr. HILBORN. It covers seven cases, and fourteen guns.

Mr. CANNON. How many pieces of condemned cannon are there altogether?

Mr. HILBORN. I can not tell you. The Secretary of the Navy says there is no objection to the passage of these bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. I want to move an amendment, if you do go on with them.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 248) empowering and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish four pieces of condemned cannon to the city of Hastings, Mich.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to furnish to the city of Hastings, Mich., for use in completing the soldiers' monument, four pieces of condemned cannon, if in his judgment it may be consistent with the interests of the public service.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Provided, That the United States shall not be subjected to any expense on account of such donation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. CANNON. This is an omnibus bill, I understand, covering seven cases.

The SPEAKER. It is not an omnibus. There are seven cases.

Mr. THOMAS. This is a bill granting cannon to the city of Hastings, Mich., for the soldiers' monument.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I will advance backward. [Laughter.]

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1785) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to W. H. Wallace Post, No. 66, Grand Army of the Republic, of Eldorado, Kans., and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to donate one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to W. H. Wallace Post, No. 66, Grand Army of the Republic, of Eldorado, Kans., for the soldiers' monument to be erected in said town.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Provided, That in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy such articles can be spared without detriment to the public interests; *And provided further*, That the United States shall not be subjected to any expense on account of such donation.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2777)) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate condemned cannon and condemned cannon balls to certain posts of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to donate one condemned cannon and condemned cannon balls for four pyramids to Shaw Post, Grand Army of the Republic, at Leavenworth, Kans., and also one condemned cannon and condemned cannon balls for four pyramids to McLouth Post, No. 279, Grand Army of the Republic, at McLouth, Kans., for soldiers' monuments to be erected at said cities.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Provided, That in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy such articles can be spared without detriment to the public interests; *And provided further*, That the United States shall not be subjected to any expense on account of such donation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3265) donating one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to Stone River Post, No. 74, Grand Army of the Republic, Sedan, Kans.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to donate to Stone River Post, No. 74, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, Sedan, Kans., one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls, for the monument to be erected in the cemetery in said town.

The Committee on Naval Affairs, reporting the bill, recommended an amendment, as follows:

After the word "town," in the eighth line, add: *Provided*, "That, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, such articles can be spared without detriment to the public interest: *And provided further*, That the United States shall not be subjected to any expense on account of such donation."

The amendment was adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The question being on the passage of the bill as amended,

Mr. BLUE said: Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by adding: "And also to Charles A. Clark Post, No. 184, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ridge Farm, Ill., four pieces of condemned light cast-iron cannon, and twenty cannon balls for use of said post for decorative purposes."

The amendment was adopted; and the bill as amended was passed.

The title was amended by adding the following: "And authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to deliver four condemned cannon to Charles A. Clark Post, No. 184, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ridge Farm, Ill."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill H. R. 3544) empowering and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish not more than four pieces of condemned cannon to the village of New Rochelle, N. Y.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to furnish to the village of New Rochelle, N. Y., for use in completing the soldiers' monuments in that place, not more than four pieces of condemned cannon, if, in his judgment, it may be consistent with the public service.

The committee recommended an amendment, as follows:

After the word "service," line 7, add: "*Provided*, That the United States shall not be subjected to any expense on account of such donation."

The amendment was adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3982) granting to Lincoln Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Valley Hope, R. I., one condemned cannon.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to deliver to Lincoln Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Valley Hope, R. I., one condemned cannon: *Provided*, That the same can be spared without detriment to the service, and that no expense is thereby incurred by the Government.

Mr. PITNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Add to the bill the following:
"And also to the town of Newton, in the State of New Jersey, four pieces of condemned cannon and twenty cannon balls, for the decoration of the new soldiers and sailors' monument in that town."

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by inserting:
"And also to the Women's Relief Corps, of Taylorsville, Ill., four condemned cannon, for the purpose of decorating the soldiers' monument erected by said corps."

The amendment was adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended by adding the following:

Also to the Women's Relief Corps, of Taylorsville, Ill., four condemned cannon and four condemned cannon balls; also to the town of Newton, in the State of New Jersey, four pieces of condemned cannon and twenty cannon balls.

On motion of Mr. BRODERICK, a motion to reconsider the several votes by which the above bills donating cannon, etc., were passed was laid on the table.

THOMAS L. YOUNG.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask present consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of the widow, heirs, or legal representatives of the late Thomas L. Young, who served as captain of Benton Cadets, Missouri Voiunteers, and as major, lieutenant-colonel, and colonel of the One hundred and eighteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, in the late war of the rebellion, for a balance or balances of wages earned by him as said officer in the suppression of said rebellion and not yet paid to him or to his widow, heirs, or legal representatives, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims for due investigation according to law; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon said court to render a judgment for the amount, if any, found due from the United States upon the said claim.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I desire to make a brief explanation. This is a bill which passed the Fifty-third Congress, and is no more than a bill to remove the statute of limitations so as to enable the representatives of Col. Thomas M. Young, formerly lieutenant-governor of the State of Ohio, and a member of this House, to recover the longevity pay to which he would have been entitled had his claim been filed with the Court of Claims in time. It is similar to many other bills that have passed both Houses, and it was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives in the third session of the Fifty-third Congress. The bill simply allows the claim to be filed with the Court of Claims under the longevity pay act, which allows an additional ration for every five years of service prior to entering the war of the rebellion.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman state the amount involved?

Mr. BROMWELL. The report shows that, and I will ask to have it read.

Mr. DOCKERY. Before the report is read, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to the fact that the bill, as I understood it from the reading, does a little more than what the gentleman states. It not only refers the case to the Court of Claims for a finding of facts, but it also authorizes the entering of a judgment against the United States.

Mr. BROMWELL. That provision was inserted at the suggestion of my colleague [Mr. WILSON of Ohio], who is a member of the Committee on War Claims, in order to prevent the necessity of coming back to this House after the court shall have ascertained the amount to which the representatives of Colonel Young are entitled.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object in this case, but I wish to remind the other side of the House of the rule which we adopted here the other day after some discussion, requiring all these claims to have their first consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BROMWELL. I ask for the reading of the report.

The SPEAKER. The report may be read.

The report (by Mr. WILSON of Ohio) was read, as follows:

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1743) for the relief of the legal representatives of Thomas L. Young, submit the following report:

This claim was presented in the Fifty-third Congress and was favorably reported upon by the Committee on War Claims, to whom it was referred.

After a careful investigation of the facts involved, your committee adopt the report of the Fifty-third Congress, a copy thereof being hereto attached and made a part of this report.

Your committee attach hereto the acts of Congress and the decisions of the courts relating to longevity pay, and ask that they be printed as an appendix of this report.

Your committee report back the bill, and recommend its passage with the following amendment:

In line 7, after "Infantry," insert "and an officer in the Regular Army of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. CANNON. I should like to ask a question of the gentleman in charge of the bill. How does this controversy arise?

Mr. BROMWELL. This bill is merely for the purpose of removing the statutory limitation, this claim not having been filed within six years, as required by statute.

Mr. CANNON. Has there been a ruling of the Court of Claims covering this case in principle, so that, but for the statute, this case would come within the principle?

Mr. BROMWELL. I understand that a number of bills similar in purport to this have been passed. I get this information from the report of the Senate committee on a similar bill. This bill went through this House unanimously last winter. The language of the Senate committee is:

The principle upon which this bill is based has been repeatedly established in cases to which this one pertains, particularly in the case of Captain Pullman, and in an omnibus bill now on the Calendar for the relief of officers designated by name.

That was the language of the report of the Senate committee in connection with a similar bill passed at the last session of the Fifty-third Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, without being entirely familiar with the ruling in the cases referred to, I know that there have been a large number of cases of officers in the Navy where they have come in after great lapse of time—possibly a generation or possibly almost two—and sought relief, upon findings of the Court of Claims, affirmed, perhaps, by the Supreme Court. There have been cases, possibly, similar to this of parties entitled to longevity pay under the ruling, they never having dreamed of such a construction of the law during their term of service or during their lifetime. I think Congress has, in the main, refused to remove the bar of the statute of limitations in that class of cases.

But we all recollect Mr. Young, a late member of this House from the State of Ohio; and if the committee is right in holding that his legal representatives are entitled to $478 I would greatly prefer that the bill be amended so as to make an appropriation of that amount for the widow, if there be one, or for the children.

Mr. GROSVENOR. There is a widow, and she is very poor.

Mr. CANNON. I would rather make an appropriation of that kind at once without establishing a precedent by sending this case to the Court of Claims. I think the action I now suggest would be less embarrassing to the House. The passage of this bill in the form proposed might prove somewhat mischievous as a matter of precedent.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that this is a new proposition at all. My understanding is that in a great many cases of this kind longevity pay has been allowed by private bills passed through Congress, each case being in the first instance adjudicated by the Court of Claims, and an appropriation subsequently made by Congress for the payment of the longevity pay.

Mr. CANNON. But this case goes beyond that. This bill does not propose to refer this claim under the Bowman Act to the Court of Claims, allowing the facts to be found by that court and the case then to be brought back to Congress for its action. This bill makes a new precedent. It proposes to send this matter outright to the Court of Claims, giving that court authority to deliver judgment, which judgment would, as a matter of course, be reported for appropriation. Now, I do not want that done.

Mr. BROMWELL. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that the provision to which he refers was not originally contained in this bill, but was inserted by a subcommittee of the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will amend his bill by striking out that provision, or if he sees proper to amend the bill so as to allow this sum of $478 outright to the widow of Mr. Young, I shall not object; otherwise I shall be obliged to do so.

Mr. BROMWELL. Upon that statement of the case by the gentleman from Illinois, I will consent that the provision requiring the Court of Claims to enter judgment be struck out, and that the court be merely authorized to investigate and make a finding of the facts in the case.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill with the proposed amendment? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me that if there be no objection it may be well to adopt the course indicated by the gentleman from Illinois and pass the bill in such a form as to make at once a direct appropriation of the $478, which the committee reports to be due. Of course this would be preferable to having the case go to the Court of Claims, where it might be tied

up for a long time, and then come back here for further appropriation. If there be no objection to such a modification of the bill, I hope it will be passed in that form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must state the amendment which he proposes, so that the House may understand it.

Mr. SAYERS. I suggest to the gentleman that he allow this bill to lie over until to-morrow morning, retaining its present privilege, and in the meantime he can prepare the modified proposition.

Mr. BROMWELL. Very well; I will agree to that.

The SPEAKER. The bill is temporarily withdrawn.

DULUTH AND NORTH DAKOTA RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254) granting the right of way to the Duluth and North Dakota Railroad Company through certain Indian reservations in the State of Minnesota.

Before the request for unanimous consent is submitted, I wish to state that this bill was reported by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PENDLETON], and meets the approval of the entire committee.

This road has been built the entire length of the route, with the exception of that part of the line through the reservation. The bill has been submitted to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, and has been amended according to their suggestion. I do not think that there can be any serious objection to the bill, which, as I have said, has received a favorable report from the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the Duluth and North Dakota Railroad Company, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of North Dakota, and its successors and assigns, the right of way for the extension of its railroad through the Winnibagoshish, Chippewa, White Oak Point, and Red Lake Indian reservations, in the State of Minnesota, such right of way to be 50 feet in width on each side of the center line of said railroad; and said company may also take land adjacent to such right of way for station buildings, depots, machine shops, side-tracks, turn-outs, and water stations, not to exceed in amount 200 feet in width and 3,000 feet in length for each station, to the extent of one station for every 10 miles of road constructed within the limits of said reservations.

SEC. 2. That before said railroad shall be constructed through any land, claim, or improvement held by an individual occupant according to any agreement, treaty, or law of the United States, full compensation shall be paid such occupant or claimant for all property taken and damage done by reason of the construction of said railroad. And it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to fix, in such manner as he shall designate, the amount of compensation to be paid individual occupants and claimants; and the amount of damage resulting to the tribe or tribes of Indians, in their tribal capacity, pertaining to said reservations, by reason of the construction of the road through such lands of the reservations as are not occupied in severalty, shall also be ascertained and determined in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may direct, and be subject to his final approval. But no right of any kind shall vest in said railroad company in or to any part of the right of way and station grounds herein provided for until plats thereof, made upon actual survey for the definite location of the road, including the grounds for station houses, machine shops, side-tracks, turn-outs, and water stations, shall have been filed with and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and until the compensation aforesaid shall be fixed and paid. And said railroad company is hereby authorized, immediately after the passage of this act, to enter upon said reservations for the purpose of surveying and locating its line of road: *Provided*, That said line of railroad shall be located, constructed, and operated with due regard to the rights of the Indians, and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe.

SEC. 3. That the rights herein granted shall be forfeited by said company unless said road is constructed through said reservations within three years from the passage and approval of this act.

SEC. 4. That Congress may at any time amend, add to, alter, or repeal this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Has this bill been reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; unanimously. It meets also the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. I would like to hear the report read, if it is not too long.

Several MEMBERS. The bill is all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JENKINS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a resolution and have it read, after which I will ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read at length. It provides that the President be requested to transmit to the House of Representatives the report of the board of engineers who have investigated the route and other subjects connected with the Nicaragua Canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CANNON. Before consent is given I would like to ask the gentleman a question. What is the object of this resolution?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. It is to secure the transmission to the House of the report of the board of engineers who have investigated the route and other matters connected with the Nicaragua Canal.

Mr. CANNON. Has there been a report made on the subject?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. There has been, as I am informed, and I understand that it was transmitted to the President before the opening of Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Well, let us have it read.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. This is simply a resolution asking that the report be transmitted.

Mr. HITT. Let me suggest to the gentleman that this ought to have in it the usual provision "if not incompatible with the public interests."

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Very well; let that be incorporated. I am willing to have the amendment inserted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution as proposed to be modified?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I know no reason why this resolution should not take the usual course, and go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky objects.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Well, then, I ask to have it referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where it properly belongs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that reference will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

HON. THOMAS F. BAYARD.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

In response to the resolution of the House of Representatives of December 28, 1895, I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, and accompanying papers, relating to certain speeches made by Thomas F. Bayard, ambassador of the United States to Great Britain.

In response to that part of said resolution which requests information as to the action taken by the President concerning the speeches therein referred to, I reply that no action has been taken thereon by the President except such as is indicated in the report and correspondence herewith submitted.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 20, 1896.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I believe under the rules that message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and printed.

The SPEAKER. It will be so referred, according to the rule of the House, and printed.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and prior years, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that this bill and report are already in print, and can be found in the document room. I desire to give notice to the House that on conclusion of the Military Academy appropriation bill, if it shall be speedily concluded, or at a convenient opportunity in the near future, I will call up this bill.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. HULL, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the consideration of appropriation bills, with Mr. PAYNE in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first bill on the Calendar.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897.

Mr. HULL. If there be no objection, I will move that all general debate be considered as closed, and that we proceed to the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, this bill was largely prepared by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS]. He will probably desire an opportunity to explain the bill before proceeding to its consideration by paragraphs.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Has the first reading of the bill been dispensed with?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I suggest that that is the first thing in order.

Mr. HULL. I intended to ask that the first formal reading be dispensed with. I now ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the first formal reading of the bill be considered as dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I will detain the House but a few moments——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to proceed by unanimous consent, as there is nothing before the House until the first paragraph of the bill is read.

Mr. HULL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed now, and that he have such time as he may need for his explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from New York be heard for the purpose of explaining the bill.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. For what length of time?

The CHAIRMAN. No length of time has been suggested.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. We are operating under the five-minute rule, are we not?

The CHAIRMAN. The request is that the gentleman be allowed such time as he may desire. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been prepared so as to state the several items under different heads, and in the order of arrangement it differs from bills which have been heretofore presented to the House. The subdivisions of the appropriations are as follows: For permanent establishment; for extra pay of army officers at Military Academy; for pay Military Academy band, field music, enlisted men on detached service, and extra pay of enlisted men on special duty at Military Academy; for pay of civilians employed at Military Academy; for current and ordinary expenses; for miscellaneous and incidental expenses, and for buildings and grounds.

In the appendix will be found the sum appropriated annually for the regular pay of officers on duty at the Military Academy.

It is well, also, to inform the House that previous to the last Congress the pay of enlisted men on duty at West Point was appropriated for in the army appropriation bill, but in the last Congress it was contemplated, on the advice of the Secretary of War, to increase the Army by the number of men then on duty at West Point. That failed, however, so that the appropriation for West Point last year, for the first time—and that system follows in this bill—was made in the Military Academy bill; and it should be considered as not only an appropriation for the Military Academy proper, but for the military post at West Point.

It is $58,154 this year; and when we consider the amount annually appropriated in the past, which is about the amount recommended to the House in this bill, it shows a large saving and is a large deduction from the amount asked for, and is believed by many to be too small for an efficient management of the Military Academy.

When the Clerk reads this bill you will see the amount appropriated—how much less it is than the estimates, and how much less than in the appropriation bill of last year. In the report will be found a list of the appropriations for the last six years, and the amount of the recommendations for the Academy this year. At the end of the report will be found a reference to every item submitted by the Secretary of War that has not been, in some part at least, recommended to the House for an appropriation. Should any member of the House desire to ascertain what has been the action of the committee upon any one of the estimates made by the Secretary of War, he can find it recommended in the bill or a written statement in the report, giving the reason why the particular item is not included in the bill.

This bill contains no provision of general legislation which will render any part of it obnoxious to a point of order, in my opinion.

If any gentleman desires to ask any question, I will gladly answer him.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I notice from examining hurriedly the bill as reported by the committee, it seems to be, as compared with former enactments of appropriations for the Military Academy, almost entirely recast and rearranged.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Now, I am not prepared to say, from the slight examination I have given it, that the arrangement of the committee as reported is not wise, but I am prepared to say that there should be very grave reasons for entirely recasting an appropriation bill. Whether the sins, the errors, the hardships of the former arrangement were such as to justify throwing aside the form of the other bills and adopting this as reported now I do not know; but I have no doubt it will breed very much of extra work to the accounting officers of the Government. Well, the gentleman shakes his head. I have not consulted the accounting officers; but I take it that it amounts to an entire closing, substantially, of the accounts and the opening of a new set of accounts, and for that reason it seems to me not desirable. However, I throw that out more by way of suggestion than anything else.

The truth is, if the gentleman will allow me, that the Government of the United States has so increased in its public service, the appropriations, permanent and annual, amounting away up to almost $500,000,000 a year, that where the appropriations have proceeded from year to year in certain forms and under certain headings, and been followed by the opening of an account by the accounting officers, so that the people who enforce or execute the law are thoroughly familiar with the ordinary system of appropriation, that when that is changed, it must necessarily breed much of doubt and trouble. Gentlemen are aware that even in the matter of punctuation touching appropriations (as well as in the matter touching legislation) that frequently becomes very important. Now, I must confess, so far as I can see, I doubt the wisdom of this departure, and having said this much, I desire to say nothing further.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the criticism of the gentleman from Illinois, I want to say that the uniform custom of officers of the various branches of the Government charged with the preparation of estimates is to take up the last appropriation bill and make their estimates on the items as they appear in that bill, and without some authority such as the House of Representatives, which is the source of all authority for appropriations, to change that system, it never will be changed. This bill in the past has had items for pay, items for repairs of bookcases, items for improving the public grounds, items for current expenses and incidental expenses, for the compensation of civilians, and for extra pay to officers. These items have been distributed throughout the bill, and it was absolutely impossible to give a prompt answer to an inquiry as to what each special subdivision amounted to.

In preparing this bill the estimates relating to pay of officers belonging to the permanent establishment were put down first. The extra pay to officers on detached service followed; pay of enlisted men; then that of civilians; and there will be found no modification in the estimates except in the order of their presentation. It will not affect the system of bookkeeping except to facilitate it and lessen the labor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is well known to everybody conversant with public affairs that there is no business concern in the United States that could afford to maintain the system of bookkeeping which is practiced by the Federal Government. There is seemingly an effort made in every Department to so manage the bookkeeping that it shall require a constant increase of the force instead of a reduction. The last Congress made some modifications in the Treasury Department.

The last visit to this city by the man for whom it was named was in the month of December, 1799. He came on horseback to Alexandria, by rowboat from there to the new city of Washington, and returned during the night to his home, which he never left. Were Washington to come back this day he would find the steamboat, the railroad car, the electric car—now running almost to the door of his old residence—and every modern improvement of the past one hundred years; but were he to come into Congress he would find the same old system and regulations for conducting affairs which existed when he was President, and in the Departments the same old system of bookkeeping. We have gone on a hundred years with almost no advance in the direction of abandoning cumbersome methods or adopting the improvements which civilization and intelligence have brought, and while it may be satisfactory to my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to go on in this listless, idle, careless manner, I think it is rather to be commended than criticised that we should stop and make some little reform at least once in one hundred years. John Locke said that there were no laws enacted that ought not to contain within themselves a provision for their repeal at the end of a century. I will read from the estimates the exact items as they appear in this bill. Every single estimate as submitted by the Secretary of War has been taken note of. The committee approved as they saw fit a large number of those estimates. We have disapproved others and have stated to the House those approved and those we have disapproved.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that we proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS] to the third paragraph on page 13 of this bill, and to ask him to explain it for my own information and for the information of the House and of the country. I suggest that that paragraph as it stands may excite alarm among the temperance people of the country. As I understand that, the effect of alcohol and narcotics on the human system shall be one of the studies in these military schools. I regard this law as of supreme importance. A Massachusetts lady, Mrs. Mary Hunt, is the author of this legislation, and this provision is now a law in every State and Territory but three, as well as in the military schools at Annapolis and West Point. Now, I see that the paragraph in the bill to which I have called attention, and which reads as follows——

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts accept a suggestion?

Mr. MORSE. I certainly will, if it is satisfactory.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I suggest that when that paragraph in the bill is reached will be the best time to discuss it. Unless the gentleman will be satisfied with a very brief explanation now, I think it better to wait until we reach that item in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I think the gentleman can make a sufficient explanation now, and I prefer to hear it, as possibly I may not be in my seat just at the time when that paragraph is reached. I want the gentleman to explain to the House and to the country just what the scope of this paragraph is. I have no doubt that his explanation will be satisfactory, but I should like to hear it for my own information as well as for that of the temperance people of the country. As I said a moment ago, the existing law requires the teaching in the Military Academy as to the effect of alcohol and narcotics upon the human system, and I believe that the existing law is construed to mean and specify a certain text-book on this important subject.

Mr. TARSNEY. I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARSNEY. The gentleman from Massachusetts asked leave to propound an inquiry to the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from New York responded that it would be in order to answer that question when the paragraph to which it related was reached in the regular order. My point of order is that the gentleman from New York having declined to yield, the gentleman from Massachusetts is not in order in proceeding with his discussion of this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS] to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I only desire to say that I think it is due to the House and to the country that some explanation should be made of the scope and effect of the paragraph to which I have called attention.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I can assure my friend from Massachusetts that the paragraph to which he directs attention in no way lessens the authority or the obligation of the officers of the Military Academy to give instruction as to the effect of alcohol and tobacco upon the human body, but it does allow them to give such instruction in their discretion, and does not require them, as the present law does, to use a particular text-book, the publishers of which seem to have derived great benefit from the peculiar phraseology of the law. This paragraph leaves the obligation to give such instruction as the gentleman from Massachusetts desires, and as I and many others desire to have it given, but it does not require the use of a particular text-book.

Mr. MORSE. That explanation is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the gentleman in charge of this bill to some inconsistencies in the figures. The gentleman's report states that the amount here appropriated by this bill is $14,714.05 less than was appropriated last year. The appropriation for that year was $464,261.66. Now, on page 25 of this bill, I find that the total amount appropriated here is $562,447.61, so that the amount appropriated in this bill appears to be nearly $100,000 more than last year, instead of less.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I believe I neglected to say, Mr. Chairman, that some of the figures in the printed report are erroneous, but the errors have been corrected by the assistant clerk of the committee, and will be read from the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon the pending bill is closed, and it will now be considered by paragraph under the pending rule.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The following paragraph was read:

For extra pay of twenty-eight enlisted men of cavalry detachment employed on additional duty with the instruction battery of field artillery, United States Military Academy, at 30 cents per day when employed, $840.

Mr. HULICK. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee whether the extra pay provided in this paragraph is a peculiar provision of this appropriation bill applying only to the present year, or whether it is in accordance with a uniform policy?

Mr. CURTIS of New York. This is the appropriation uniformly made for detached men employed on special duty.

Mr. HULL. I will say to my friend from Ohio [Mr. HULICK] that not only has it been universally customary in the past to provide this extra pay, but the employment of these enlisted men instead of civilian experts on this special duty is a great saving to the Government.

Mr. HULICK. Then these extra men are employed by officers of the Academy every year——

Mr. HULL. Every year.

Mr. HULICK. Just as their services are demanded?

Mr. HULL. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. They are employed in giving instructions to the cadets.

Mr. HULL. They are enlisted men who have special skill in certain lines; and although they receive extra pay the expense to the Government is considerably less than if civilians were employed for this sort of duty.

Mr. HULICK. Then this is a permanent provision?

Mr. HULL. Yes, sir.

The Clerk read as follows:

For clerk to the disbursing officer and quartermaster, $1,350.

Mr. ODELL. I move to amend the paragraph just read by striking out "$1,350" and inserting "$1,500." I desire to state that in 1872 the officer here appropriated for was paid $1,650 per annum. Somewhere about 1893 the salaries of the three civilian clerks, of whom this is one, were reduced to $1,200 each. In 1894 the salaries were raised to $1,350; and the following year the salaries of the clerk to the adjutant and the clerk to the treasurer were raised to $1,500 each. But the salary of this clerk to the disbursing officer and quartermaster was left at $1,350. In the Book of Estimates the quartermaster and the commandant at the Military Academy have recommended that the salary of this officer be placed on an equality with those of the other two clerks whom I have named; but for two Congresses this recommendation has been ignored. I ask that the amendment I have offered may be adopted, as a matter of justice, because this clerk performs an equal amount of work to that performed by the other two, who are each receiving $1,500.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. The amendment of my associate [Mr. ODELL] proposes to add $150 to the salary of an old clerk whose salary was cut down some time ago. It has been thought desirable to increase his salary to equal that paid to others doing similar duty. This matter was brought to the attention of the committee, and the amendment has their approval.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for civilians employed at the Military Academy, $25,770.

Mr. HULL. The aggregate of appropriation in the paragraph just read should be increased by the sum of $150, in view of the addition which has been made to the salary of one of the clerks appropriated for.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of objection, that amendment will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I wish to strike out lines 17, 18, 19, and 20, on page 9, as they reappear on page 17.

The CHAIRMAN. Those lines have not yet been read.

Mr. WHEELER. On that question of the contingent fund I wish to say a word.

The CHAIRMAN. It appears that some corrections have been made in the printed bill which the Clerk is reading. The Chair thinks the Clerk should read the bill as reported from the committee.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. He is reading the bill as reported; there are no modifications in it. There are merely references placed on the margin of the pages.

The CHAIRMAN. The printed bill which the Clerk is reading appears to carry various corrections.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Those are simply memoranda.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. The Clerk will now proceed to read the paragraph which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURTIS] desires to strike out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent fund, to be expended under the direction of the academic board: For instruments, books, repairs of apparatus, and other incidental expenses not otherwise provided for, $1,000.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. I move to strike out the paragraph just read, as it reappears on page 17.

Mr. WHEELER. Then I will postpone what I wish to say until the paragraph on page 17 is reached.

The amendment of Mr. CURTIS of New York was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for current and ordinary expenses, $68,379.

Mr. HULL. It will be seen, Mr. Chairman, at this point, lines

13 and 14, on page 16, that the amount has been reduced from the printed bill to $68,379, which is the correct amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingent funds, to be expended under the direction of the academic board; for instruments, books, repairs to apparatus, and other incidental expenses not otherwise provided for, $1,000: *Provided*, That all technical and scientific supplies for the departments of instruction of the Military Academy shall be purchased by contract or otherwise, as the Secretary of War may deem best.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word expenses, in line 20, on page 17:
"Including the expenses incurred by ministers of the gospel who may be invited by the academic board to preach in the cadet chapel."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering that amendment is to call the attention of the House to a matter that I think is important to the Academy. The late most excellent and distinguished gentleman, Professor Postlethwaite, died a few days ago. He occupied most creditably the chair of professor of history, geography, and ethics, and under the law was also the chaplain of the Military Academy, and before the appointment of a successor I think it is generally conceded by the friends of the Academy that some provision of this character should be made.

Several bills have been introduced and have been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for the purpose of separating the chaplaincy of the Academy from the professorship of ethics, his-history, and geography, and I think it would be well to consider the advantages which would result from having a fund provided, not a very large one, but a fund out of which the academic board could from time to time pay the expenses of eminent divines from all parts of the country who would be invited to preach to the cadets. Everyone will realize that for the same minister to preach Sunday after Sunday to the same audience is doing himself an injustice, and the history of a hundred years shows that such a course has not been well calculated to attain the very best purposes or results in connection with such ministrations.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, his amendment is to pay the expenses of the chaplains from time to time who may be invited. Is it large enough, in his judgment, to cover the payment to the evangelists who may be called in for revival purposes?

Mr. WHEELER. I think it might become necessary to make some increase in the contingent fund. It would not require a large sum. I think the academic board can be trusted to use their best discretion in the invitations they extend, and it would benefit the cadets in many ways to have the opportunity of listening to the preaching of the eminent divines who could be called to hold service for the young men in the Academy. The academic board, by correspondence with the eminent divines throughout the country, can learn at what time they would probably be in New York or Philadelphia or in the vicinity of the Academy and could probably make advantageous arrangements with them, inviting them to come to the Academy and preach to the cadets. It is well known to all that the eminent divines of the country like to have this privilege of preaching to young men like the Corps of Cadets at the Military Academy, and there is no doubt that these invitations would be accepted, in many instances to the great advantage of the young men there.

I simply make this suggestion, so that when the bills should come up to be considered I hope a sufficient sum for this purpose will be set apart.

Mr. TALBERT. Let me ask the gentleman from Alabama if his amendment would include the Salvation Army?

Mr. WHEELER. It makes no limitation whatever; it leaves it entirely within the discretion of the academic board, and, Mr. Chairman, as we trust that board entirely and wholly in the administration of the Academy, in the course of instruction of cadets, in the making of the men who are to lead our armies, and in whom the honor, safety, and integrity of this great Government is to be reposed, we can certainly trust them in the matter of selecting or inviting the eminent divines of the country to come to the Academy and preach to them. I think it would have the effect of improving the tenor of religious sentiment of the Army; it would be of unquestioned advantage to the young men at the Academy, and involves a very insignificant expense.

Young men from 17 to 20 years of age leave their homes and parental care and go to the Academy from every part of the United States, and these men are trained to hold high positions in our Government. It seems to me that a plan similar to the one proposed by the amendment is worthy of the most painstaking consideration of Congress. The years spent by the young men at the Academy are the forming years of a young man's character. That is all I desired to say upon the subject.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, without undertaking to answer the reasons that have been suggested by the gentleman from Alabama for the amendment, I would simply say that there is now before the Committee on Military Affairs one or more bills providing for the separation of the duties of the chaplain at the Academy from those of professor of history, geography, and ethics, and that one at least of these bills will probably be brought before the House during the present week. If at that time the House shall deem it advisable, merely at the cost of their traveling expenses, to secure the services of the eminent divines who will be asked to preach at the Academy, that will be the proper bill in which to insert such a provision. I hope, therefore, the gentleman from Alabama will not insist upon his amendment at this point.

Mr. WHEELER. I withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, in the several footings of the bill there were some errors, and those have been corrected. They really form no part of the bill, but I ask that the modifications in the footings be made as they appear in the copy of the bill at the Clerk's desk. I think they have all been adopted except the last one, and I ask that that one be adopted.

Mr. HULL. The total should be corrected by adding $150 to the amount reported by the gentleman from New York. The committee has added $150 to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state the correct figures?

Mr. HULL. The correct amount would be $448,967.61, with the addition of $150. The Clerk can make the addition.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. The bill foots up $448,967.61, to which an addition was made, on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ODELL], of $150. I ask that that sum be added and the total corrected accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "four hundred and forty-nine thousand five hundred and forty-seven dollars and sixty-one cents," in the printed bill, and insert in lieu thereof the words "four hundred and forty-nine thousand one hundred and seventeen dollars and sixty-one cents."

Mr. HULL. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, this amendment will be considered as adopted.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I desire to submit the report on this bill, which contains the facts in reference to it in concise form.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred the estimates for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, submit the accompanying bill therefor, and recommend the passage of the same.

The total amount appropriated by the bill is $448,967.61, which is $172,002 less than the estimates, and $15,294.05 less than appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896. A detailed statement of the appropriations for the Military Academy during the last six years is subjoined.

Appropriations Military Academy for the fiscal years 1891 to 1896, inclusive.

Year.	Pay.	Current and ordinary expenses.	Miscellaneous items and incidental expenses.	Buildings and grounds.	Total.
1891	$229,518.96	$61,431.15	$21,020.00	$123,326.00	$435,296.11
1892	231,436.09	62,576.60	18,770.00	65,672.70	378,455.39
1893	230,890.08	70,981.25	22,020.00	114,646.00	438,537.35
1894	233,627.08	79,935.90	25,737.50	90,065.69	429,366.17
1895	233,223.78	73,698.60	27,540.00	101,993.00	436,455.38
1896	232,712.01	79,867.10	29,310.00	50,451.25	464,261.66

Recommended for 1897.

Permanent establishment	$199,000.00
Extra pay of army officers at Military Academy	22,000.51
Pay of band, field musicians, enlisted men, and extra pay on special duty	58,154.10
Pay of civilians at Military Academy	25,770.00
Current and ordinary expenses	68,379.00
Miscellaneous and incidental expenses	15,894.00
Buildings and grounds	59,770.00
Total	448,967.61

Pay for the professors, the extra pay of officers on detached service, the pay for the Military Academy band, the field musicians, and enlisted men on detached service, and extra pay of enlisted men on special duty is fixed by law, and any change in the appropriation on that account is required by the difference in the length of service of those so detailed.

The expenditures recommended for new works and improvement of the grounds seem to be required, and vary slightly in amount from those heretofore annually made for buildings and grounds.

The most expensive improvements are for new guardhouse at the south entrance, the removal of peat from the new reservoir, and the reconstructing of the cable coal railway. Two estimates for the reconstruction of this work were furnished the War Department, one to be made of wood, at a cost of $10,000. The present trestles were constructed of wood six years ago, and are now practically worn out. The second estimate was to construct it with iron and steel trestles, at the cost of $20,000. The War Department submitted the first estimate, but the committee on investigation of the subject concluded that iron should be used instead of wood, and have recommended the appropriation, $20,000, therefor. The Superintendent of the Academy stated that the

saving in the last six years by carrying the heavy freight on this road to storehouse, over its transportation by teams, was $16,000, and as it will be required for all time, the committee were unanimously of the opinion that it should be constructed of the most enduring material.

The following items in the estimates the committee believe to be desirable, but not essential, to the preservation of the property or the actual needs of the institution, and have not, on account of the depleted condition of the Treasury, recommended them to the House.

For1 senior assistant inspector, ordnance	$400
For 1 senior assistant instructor of military engineering	400
For 12 civilian janitors	7,200
For reimbursing contractor for extra labor and material not specified in the contract	298
For cases and materials for new ordnance museum	1,000
For fitting up operating room, cadet hospital	2,629
For building iron stairway in halls of engineer barracks	2,800
For completion and repairs of barracks, army service men, quartermaster's department	2,000
For repairs and improvements of cavalry barracks	1,000
For repairs to soldiers' chapel	800
For 168-foot iron porch, and tin roof for new cavalry barracks	4,200
For enlarging coal house at boiler house	4,100
For beginning work reconstructing sidewalks	1,000
For leading water mains for connecting new reservoir with present system of water distribution	20,000
For rebuilding superstructure of engineer boathouse	1,200
To build addition in rear of wing to quarters No. 35	1,900
For enlarging dining room to quarters No. 41	1,200
For renovation of library building	70,000
For granolithic pavement	2,600
For building one set of hospital steward's quarters	3,050
For pay as assistant plumber	600
For pay as keeper post cemetery	1,000
For repairs and improvement of quartermaster's stables	1,500

On motion of Mr. HULL, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. PAYNE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, and with the recommendation that as amended the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendments of the Committee of the Whole. If there is no objection, they will be considered together.

There was no objection.

The amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CURTIS of New York, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DESTRUCTION OF INCOME-TAX RETURNS.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have a privileged report from the Committee on Ways and Means upon which I ask immediate action. It will take but a moment.

The SPEAKER. Is the motion to adjourn withdrawn?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, I withdraw it temporarily.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution reported by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 24) providing for immediate destruction of income-tax returns, etc.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to cause the immediate destruction of all income-tax returns and any copies thereof, with all statements and records relative thereto, now in possession of the Treasury Department, by reason of "An act to reduce taxation," etc., in effect August 28, 1894.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue recommends the passage of this joint resolution, and it is unanimously reported.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I should like to ask my colleague on the committee whether his resolution does not cover rather too much ground? I call his attention to the fact that it directs the destruction of any records kept of those income taxes. My friend knows that some taxes were voluntarily paid under the act, and there ought to be some record kept of those payments in order that they may be refunded.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I understand that there is an independent record of all the payments, and the audit has been made upon those accounts. This relates only to the returns of income taxes.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. As I understood the reading of the resolution, it provided for the destruction of all records.

Mr. GROSVENOR. This resolution was drawn, as I understand it, by the Internal Revenue Department, and I presume that abundant precautions have been taken about the matter referred to by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I only wanted to call the gentleman's attention to it. I accept his statement.

Mr. GROSVENOR. This resolution will have to go to the Senate, and if there is anything wrong about it, it can be corrected. A letter was received only this morning from the Department approving of the passage of the resolution, and my understanding is that it is in the proper form.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GROSVENOR, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the report which accompanies this joint resolution, a bill on the same subject, but different in its terms from the joint resolution just passed, should lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill H. R. 3560 will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ANDERSON, for two days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BELL of Texas, for ten days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. BROMWELL, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. COLSON, for ten days, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. CANNON (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Attorney-General of the United States, transmitting a list of judgments rendered against the Government by the circuit and district courts of the United States, in which the records have been received since February 27, 1895—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the cases of Maria J. Fowler, executrix of Edward Fowler, deceased; James S. Hamilton, administrator of Turner Patterson, deceased; James W. Myers and Sarah E. Nichols, administratrix of William P. Hackney, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from Jacob P. Clark, president of the Washington and Great Falls Electric Railway Company, transmitting a report of the operations of the said company for the year ended December 31, 1895—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, inclosing a copy of a communication from the Treasurer of the United States recommending additional clerical assistance for his office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the assistant treasurer at New York setting forth the need of increased clerical force in his office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting certain reports of the details of the business relating to the carrying of the mails, including particulars of all contracts, with names of contractors, allowances, fines, curtailments, etc.—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred the concurrent resolution of the Senate (No. 6) to print, under the direction of the Department of the Interior, 6,000 copies of a paper entitled "The public lands and their water supply," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 87); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3455) to establish a classification division in the United States Patent Office, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 88); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A bill (H. R. 4322) relating to the compensation of United States attorneys, clerks, marshals, and other court officials, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 4323) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 4324) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to deliver one condemned cannon to the city of Elmwood, Peoria County, Ill.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4325) providing for the preferment of wages of employees in cases of assignment, execution, in payment by receivers, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4326) relating to the liability of employers in the District of Columbia to make compensation for personal injuries suffered by employees in their service—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 4327) relative to immigration and naturalization—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCORMICK: A bill (H. R. 4328) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals, and to define and regulate, in certain cases, the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER (by request): A bill (H. R. 4329) to amend section 3282 of Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWERS (by request): A bill (H. R. 4330) relating to the forfeiture of lands granted in aid of the construction of the Union Pacific Railway and the Union Pacific Railway, Eastern Division—to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A bill (H. R. 4331) to regulate the manning of vessels on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 4332) to enlarge the jurisdiction of United States commissioners—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOKES: A bill (H. R. 4333) to provide a district attorney and a marshal for the western judicial district of the State of South Carolina—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWERS (by request): A bill (H. R. 4334) to provide for the representation of the United States as a first-mortgage bondholder of the Union Pacific Railroad Company—to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 4335) to coin gold and silver money, establish a parity between gold and silver coin, and provide a means of maintaining the same with legal-tender money and to equalize the utility of the national banks with State banks—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4336) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to lands embraced within reservations created by Presidential proclamation, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4337) to extend the mining laws of the United States, making them applicable to reservations, etc.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRUMM (by request): A bill (H. R. 4338) providing for the mobilization of the regular soldiers and marines and State militia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 4339) to establish a national military park to commemorate the campaign, siege, and defense of Vicksburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 4340) establishing additional regulations concerning common carriers engaged in interstate commerce and to extend the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission under an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, with amendments thereto—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 4341) empowering and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish not more than four pieces of condemned cannon to the city of Mount Vernon, N. Y.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 4342) awarding a medal of honor to Jefferson Dye, of Jollytown, Greene County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 4343) to grant certain lands to the city of Colorado Springs, Colo.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4344) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1887—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 4345) to continue the navigable inland waterway along the Atlantic coast and Florida as a coast defense in time of war and a safe and convenient channel for our domestic commerce at all times—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4346) making the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri (by request): A bill (H. R. 4347) to reimburse prisoners of war who were in the military and naval service of the United States during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 4348) providing an appropriation for continuing the improvement of the Mississippi River between Minneapolis and St. Paul by construction of Lock and Dam No. 2—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SAUERHERING: A bill (H. R. 4349) to create State trade-marks and to protect and promote foreign and interstate commerce—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4350) for the benefit of the Chickasaw freedmen—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McLAURIN: A bill (H. R. 4351) to provide for the erection of a public building at Florence, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 4352) to allow the bottling of distilled spirits in bond—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDY: A joint resolution (H. Res. 90) to revive the grade of Lieutenant-General in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A joint resolution (H. Res. 91) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A joint resolution (H. Res. 92) providing for the printing of certain agricultural publications—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A resolution (House Res. No. 119) requesting the President to furnish to the House of Representatives the report of the board of engineers appointed by him to investigate and report upon the route and other subjects connected with the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DANFORD: A resolution (House Res. No. 120) to place J. Y. Jamieson on the pay roll of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. THOMAS: A resolution (House Res. No. 121) directing the Committee on Ways and Means to prepare a report which shall show in what countries restrictions or discriminations are made against our agricultural and manufactured products exported to foreign countries, of what they consist, the causes alleged therefor, and their effect on our foreign commerce—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBSON: A resolution (House Res. No. 122) favoring the recognition of belligerent rights of the Cuban revolutionists—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: A memorial of the general assembly of Rhode Island concerning the construction of a channel through the island of Conanicut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bill; which was referred, as follows:

The bill (H. R. 1033) for the relief of Mrs. R. C. Jones—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 4353) to correct the military record of John Stevenson, of Bentleysville, Washington County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 4354) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Gould Carr, widow of the late Brig. and Bvt. Maj. Gen. Joseph B. Carr, United States Volunteers, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 4355) to increase the pension of Theresa Peebles, of Jefferson County, Ga.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMM: A bill (H. R. 4356) to confirm title to lots 13 and 14, in square 959, in Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 4357) for the relief of W. R. Miller, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCK: A bill (H. R. 4358) for the relief of George Baldey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 4359) to increase the pension of Calvin Gunn—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4360) for the relief of Jacob Scott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4361) to pension William H. Nesbitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4362) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Benjamin A. Woods—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 4363) to increase the pension of Joseph J. Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLUE: A bill (H. R. 4364) for placing the name of Marcus D. Watson, of Girard, Kans., on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4365) to place the name of Mary E. Trimble, of Paola, Kans., on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 4366) for relief of Lewis W. Merriman, late of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4367) for the relief of Jacob Hambright, of Polk County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4368) for the relief of Hugh Scarbrough, of Polk County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 4369) for the relief of Charles Brewster and to place him upon the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 4370) for the relief of Fred E. Ernst—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4371) for the relief of William H. Self—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMP: A bill (H. R. 4372) for the relief of Albert F. Wakefield—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 4373) for the relief of Frederick S. Perkins—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4374) to increase the pension of Sidney B. Tullar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4375) for the relief of John Maley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): A bill (H. R. 4376) for the relief of Christina Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4377) to increase the pension of Mark S. Clay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANFORD: A bill (H. R. 4378) for the relief of David A. McCrum—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4379) for the relief of John H. Willis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4380) granting a pension to Margaret Hawthorne—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 4381) for the relief of Mary Jane Baynard, of Adams County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FISCHER: A bill (H. R. 4382) to correct the military record of Abram Louis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 4383) granting a pension to Gen. William H. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 4384) granting a pension to Helen Carrothers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 4385) granting an increase of pension to William Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH: A bill (H. R. 4386) increasing the pension of James Eskridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HURLEY: A bill (H. R. 4387) granting a pension to William Henry Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HYDE: A bill (H. R. 4388) for the increase of pension of Farnham J. Eastman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4389) for the relief of Henry Bateman—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4390) to pension Ezilda A. Magors, widow of John P. Magors, of Company D, Second Kansas State Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILBORN: A bill (H. R. 4391) granting relief to Alexander W. Chambers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 4392) for the relief of Edward C. Parsons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 4393) for the relief of Hugh F. McNary, executor of A. C. Thomson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4394) for the relief of Nathan Fralick—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 4395) for the relief of Miss Juliette Betts—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 4396) correcting the military record of Herby B. Hyde—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4397) for the relief of James M. Clowers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4398) for the relief of Abijah B. Gilbert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4399) for the relief of James Dozier—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4400) for the relief of Mike S. Elkin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4401) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Stone, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4402) for the relief of B. F. Bryant—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 4403) for the relief of Mrs. Anna R. Widmayer, for the killing of her husband on or about the 3d day of September, 1872—to the Committee of the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4404) for payment to the heirs of the late Michael Treiber for the use of property taken during the late civil war by the United States authorities—to the Committe on War Claims.

By Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 4405) granting a pension to Augustus G. Cary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 4406) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Ferdinand Pessica—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOZLEY: A bill (H. R. 4407) to correct the military record of Christopher C. Owens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4408) granting a pension to George B. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4409) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Point Pleasant, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NOONAN: A bill (H. R. 4410) to increase the pension of Elise Blenker from $30 to $50—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 4411) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas B. Pope—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4412) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Wood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 4413) for the relief of Gratus B. Stearns—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 4414) to increase the pension of Cassie A. Davis, widow of James P. Davis, late of Company E, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 4415) for the relief of William Allen, a sailor in the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANEY: A bill (H. R. 4416) to relieve William Moore of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROYSE: A bill (H. R. 4417) for the relief of Augustin Riffel, late private Company E, One hundred and seventy-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4418) for the relief of Josiah C. Miller, late private Company K, Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4419) for the relief of Amanda Parnall, widow of Nicholas Lemler, late private Company D, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4420) for the relief of Robert McAlexander, late private Company F, Eighty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4421) for the relief of James C. Wattleworth, late private Company I, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4422) for the relief of William T. Kimsey, late private Company K, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4423) for the relief of William Shulmire, late private Company E, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STAHLE: A bill (H. R. 4424) to correct the military record of George I. Spangler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4425) for the relief of Jacob Johnson, of York, Pa.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 4426) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Dent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4427) for the relief of William H. Tibbits—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4428) for the relief of Joseph F. Bryant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4429) for the relief of Alfred McNeely—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4430) for the relief of John R. Nelson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT (by request): A bill (H. R. 4431) to place on the pension rolls the name of Minerva Sample—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 4432) for the relief of John Reed, alias Michael Flanagan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4433) for the relief of Arulus C. Parkhurst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 4434) for the relief of P. M. M. Alexander, of Holmes County, Miss.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 4435) for the relief of Stewart College (now the Southwestern Presbyterian University), located at Clarksville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 4436) to grant a pension to Catharine Van Sickle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CRUMP: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Michigan, for the relief of Michael Sheehy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: Petition of D. E. Elliott and others, of Callensburg, Pa., for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ATWOOD: Petition of Margaret J. Kibble, widow of Joseph A. Kibble, late of Company N, Twenty-fourth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, asking for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Rebecca Ober, widow of Albert G. Ober, late of Company I, Thirty-fifth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, asking for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELKNAP: Memorial of the National Live Stock Exchange, Chicago, Ill., relative to restrictions by certain foreign countries in the exportation of the products they represent, and praying Congress for remedial legislation, together with letter from president and secretary of said exchange, transmitting the same—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY: Petition of H. C. Applegate, Philip Hosner, and others, of Newport, Ky., and vicinity, favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRUMM: Four petitions, severally, of John W. Hagner and 50 others; H. H. Minnick and 10 others; A. S. Minnick and others, and John B. Ditzler and 10 others, in support of the William A. Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BULL: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Providence, R. I., concerning the construction of a channel through the island of Conanicut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of the Muscatine Commercial Club, of Muscatine, Iowa, asking an appropriation for the improvement of the Upper Mississippi River, and for the speedy completion of the Hennepin Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of property holders of the town of Winthrop, Buchanan County, Mo., praying for reimbursement for the destruction of their property by reason of the ravages of the Missouri River—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of 300 citizens of Nodaway County, Mo., praying for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CRUMP: Petition of the Saginaw Lumber Dealers' Association, for the perfecting of certain lake docks in the State of Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DANFORD: Two petitions, respectively, of N. P. Buskirk and 75 others, of Round Bottom and vicinity, and Samuel Braumlick and 92 others, of Hannibal and vicinity, Ohio, asking for change in the immigration laws, and the passage of the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Presbytery of Steubenville, Ohio, consisting of 44 ministers and 61 churches, asking prompt action in behalf of Armenian Christians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition of W. G. Vincenheller, James A. Anderson, John L. Buchanan, and others, for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: Ten petitions, respectively as follows: Henry Greek and 66 other citizens of Chester, Hancock County; William Miller and 13 others, of Marshall County; Porter T. Fitzhugh and 14 others, of Bridgeport, Harrison County; M. D. Teter and 29 others, of Oral; W. H. Bennett and 24 others, of Rock Cove, Upshur County; Emory J. Nutter and 15 others, of Clarksburg; W. R. Ayers and 20 others; and John C. Wolfe and 19 others, of Graysville; C. C. Stutler and 67 others, of Johnstown; C. W. Wilson and 5 others, of Stillman, all of West Virginia, in behalf of the bill to secure a better class of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of officers and citizens of Blount County, Tenn., for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Resolution of the Commercial Club of Muscatine, Iowa, asking for liberal appropriation for the improvement of the Mississippi River and the speedy completion of the Hennepin Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, letter from C. H. Wilson, Washington, D. C., urging the passage of a bill in behalf of F. E. Hoover, of Indiana—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILBORN: Petition of citizens of California asking for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, four petitions, respectively, as follows: From the board of supervisors of San Francisco County, the board of supervisors of Nevada County, the board of supervisors of Contra Costa County, and the Board of Trade of Oakland, all in California, asking for measures of relief for the mining industry—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. HITT: Memorial of the Daughters of the Revolution of New Jersey, and petition for a pension for Eliza Sandford—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, that Congress give expression to its abhorrence of the atrocities perpetrated on the Armenians, and make an appropriation for their relief—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of 200 citizens of Suterville, Lash, Yohoghany, and West Newton, Westmoreland County, Pa., urging the enactment of laws restricting immigration, and favoring the passage of the bill with reference thereto introduced by Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolutions of the Muscatine Commercial Club, of Muscatine, Iowa, favoring appropriation for the Mississippi River and Hennepin Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEONARD: Petition of citizens of Clinton County, Pa., praying for the passage of legislation restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Petition of the Boston Merchants' Association, asking that the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to keep the gold reserve transaction separate from the receipts and outgoes, and favoring the appointment of a commission to investigate the banking systems of the world—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDEARMON: Petition of Rev. J. H. Evans, Rev. W. G. Hefley, R. M. Hall, S. R. Latta, and 17 other citizens of Dyersburg, Tenn., urging the passage of an act for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEYER: Resolutions of the New Orleans Board of Trade, Limited, indorsing a reduction of letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the New Orleans Board of Trade, Limited, indorsing the Squire bill for coast defense—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association, asking that sugar should receive the same increase of duty in the tariff bill as is accorded to other articles contained in said bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin: Petition of 90 citizens of Stevens Point, Wis., asking for amendments to the immigration laws, so as to secure a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: Two petitions, respectively, of R. J. McCallum and 28 other citizens of Brookfield, Trumbull County, and Willis Ryder and 13 others, of Rapids and Hiram, Portage County, Ohio, in behalf of a bill to secure a better class of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OGDEN: Resolutions of the New Orleans Board of Trade, urging the passage of the Squire bill for coast defense—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of 66 citizens of Sioux City, Iowa, in behalf of legislation to secure a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Three petitions, respectively, of 99 citizens of Lawrence County, 74 citizens of Beaver County, and 39 citizens of Butler County, Pa., in favor of the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PITNEY: Four petitions, as follows: James Howell and 77 other citizens of Warren County; W. H. Savacool and 28 others; J. H. Pinsman and 9 others; David Vancampen and 45 others, of

Sussex County, N. J., in favor of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. POWERS: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Rutland, Vt., favoring the giving of belligerent rights to Cuban insurgents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REYBURN: Resolution of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the purchase by the United States Government of the Delaware and Chesapeake Canal—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of J. C. Martin, sheriff; W. J. Morris, county court clerk; R. B. Parks, attorney, and 20 other citizens of Moore County, Tenn., for payment of claim of book agents of Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROYSE: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3601, in support of claim of Charles H. McCord—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALBERT: Petition of citizens of Aiken City, S. C., praying for the passage of bills now before Congress for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, for damages done in Nashville during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of A. E. Kinston, H. G. Hayes, and 37 others, of Hastings, Mich., favoring the bill to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WADSWORTH (by request): Petition and papers of Truman A. Morton for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 21, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. HOAR. I observe that the clerks in making up the Journal state that several bills "on motion of Mr. HOAR" were referred to committees. The Journal should state that I reported the bills from the Judiciary Committee; that the committee desired to be discharged from their further consideration, and recommended their reference to other committees severally, instead of having it appear simply as the motion of a Senator. It was not a motion; it was the recommendation of the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The correction suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts will be made. The Journal stands approved as corrected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CHAPELL, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of the Postal Laws and Regulations of 1893 for the use of the Post-Office Department; in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

TELEPHONE SERVICE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 30, 1895, calling for information as to the number of telephone companies now doing business in the District of Columbia and the city of Washington, the name of each of said companies, when and where they were incorporated, etc., a report of the superintendent of the telegraph and telephone service of the District of Columbia on the subject; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of the Historical Society of Jefferson County, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation modifying or repealing the present homestead entry and preemption laws relating to Indian reservations; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of sundry citizens of Anderson, S. C., praying that Congress empower the President to send aid and relief to the suffering people in Armenia; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Boston Merchants' Association, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation directing the Secretary of the Treasury to keep his gold reserve and note redemption transactions separate from other receipts, and not to use notes which have come into the Treasury for redemption, except in accordance with the bill introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], and also that a commission of experts be appointed to study the banking systems of the world; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PEFFER. I present a petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, through a number of their officers, setting forth, among other things, that they represent not fewer than a million people, not limiting them to this country. They believe that the protection of the home is the supreme duty of statesmen, and they therefore earnestly and solemnly beseech the Congress of the United States to take such action as shall put our home-loving Republic on record as having used the moral and material influence of the country for the relief of the Armenians. They therefore beg the Congress as the legally constituted representatives of the wives and mothers of the nation to give heed to their devout prayer and aspiration that America, through her highest legislative authorities, may give expression to all the world of her abhorrence of the atrocities in Armenia, and may make an appropriation from the people's money for the relief of our brethren and sisters who have been driven to the last extremity by the fatal fanaticism of the Sultan and his soldiers.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented petitions of the Board of Trade and of the Lumber Dealers' Association of Saginaw, Mich., praying for the improvement of the harbors at Ludington, Mich., and Manitowoc, Wis.; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of representatives of sundry women's associations of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to make parents the natural guardians of their children, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented the petition of James W. Dunn, of Elizabeth City, N. C., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Thomas Green, of Bakersville, N. C., praying that he be granted arrears of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Pawtucket, R. I., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I present the petition of Mrs. Helen Carrothers, of Hennepin County, Minn., praying relief for injuries received by her at the hands of the Sioux Indians while she was held a captive by them in August, 1862. I move that the petition and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. I present sundry petitions in favor of a bill introduced by me some days ago to amend the charter of the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Salladasburg, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WARREN presented the petition of E. U. Snider and 44 other citizens of Buffalo, Wyo., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committtee on Immigration.

Mr. IRBY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Anderson, S. C., praying that Congress empower the President to send aid and relief to the suffering people in Armenia; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BAKER presented a petition signed by Charles Charles, president of the National Protective Labor Association of Washington, D. C., and George Charles, president of the African Emigration Association of Topeka, Kans., praying that ex-slaves of the United States be granted a reasonable pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GORMAN presented the petition of Mrs. Zachariah L. Windsor, widow of Zachariah L. Windsor, deceased, of Montgomery County, Md., praying that her claim for supplies and stores be referred to the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883, known as the Bowman Act; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas presented a petition of sundry citizens of Brinkley, Ark., representing various church denominations, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

WINNEBAGO AND OMAHA INDIAN AGENCY.

Mr. ALLEN. Before introducing certain evidence in the nature of a petition and asking its reference, I wish to make a brief statement regarding it, and then I shall ask for its publication as a document.

Last summer there was widespread discontent in the State of Nebraska as to the management of the Indian agency known as the Winnebago and Omaha Agency, on the reservation in Thurston County, Nebr. Public charges were made in the press of Nebraska, and possibly some of the adjoining States, that the administration of this agency was not upon correct principles, and that possibly its management involved somewhat the integrity of some of the employees at the agency. This charge was so notorious and so general that it was necessary that the Nebraska delegation in Congress should take some notice of it. While we had no authority to act in the sense of reaching a finding as a committee of either branch of Congress, or a joint committee, we did act as a committee, and sat two days, the 24th and 25th of July, taking testimony and investigating the charges as far as we could do so within that time. We employed the official court stenographer of that district to take the evidence.

I have the evidence before me, properly transcribed, being evidence taken ore tenus, affidavits, petitions, and letters. In the light of the fact that there is to be an investigation of all the Western Indian agencies this year by the Committee on Indian Affairs, I ask that the testimony and the reports which I now present be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 997) granting a pension to Ella D. Cross, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1505) granting an increase of pension to Rufus H. Paine, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 146) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Towne, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 558) for the relief of Mary H. Noonan, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 757) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Adelaide Morris, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER subsequently said: This morning I reported from the Committee on Pensions the bill (S. 757) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Adelaide Morris. I move that the bill be recommitted to the committee for further consideration.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1296) to commission passed assistant surgeons in the United States Navy, and to provide for their examination preliminary to their promotion to the grade of surgeon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an act entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands; which was agreed to.

Mr. PEFFER. I report back from the Committee on Pensions the bill (S. 241) to grant service pensions to surviving soldiers of the war of the rebellion, with additional amounts to prisoners of war, and to repeal section 2 of the pension act of June 27, 1890. I am instructed to report the bill without recommendation. I ask that it be placed on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 626) providing for disposal of lands on abandoned portions of the Fort Assinniboine Military Reservation in Montana, and for the relief of certain settlers thereon, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 120) for the relief of Jean Louis Legare, of the Dominion of Canada, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1297) to provide for the purchase of lands adjoining the United States naval station, Port Royal, S. C., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 878) granting a pension to Jared S. Chamberlain, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 625) granting a pension to Nellie L. Groshon, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. GIBSON introduced a bill (S. 1651) for the relief of Theophilus Fisk Mills; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1652) for the relief of the estate of Charles M. Roberts, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1653) for the relief of John Murphy & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 1654) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect the birds and animals in the Yellowstone National Park, and to punish crimes in said park, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1655) granting a pension to Elizabeth W. Walker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1656) for the relief of Stout, Hall & Bangs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1657) making a further appropriation for the construction and equipment, and providing for the completion thereof by placing the work under contract, of a boat railway from the foot of The Dalles Rapids to the head of Celilo Falls, in the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1658) for the relief of Mrs. Helen Carrothers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1659) to amend the laws of the District of Columbia as to married women, to make parents the natural guardians of their minor children, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1660) to provide for the adjustment and payment of certain claims against the District of Columbia by drawback certificates, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1661) to grant an honorable discharge to Caleb Woolpert; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1662) granting a pension to Henry Clemmens; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 1663) to place William T. Dodge on the retired list of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1664) restoring a pension to Mills T. Redmon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1665) granting a pension to Rita Stine, amounting to $20 per month; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BATE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1666) for the relief of the Overton Hotel Company, of Memphis, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BRICE introduced a bill (S. 1667) for the relief of Nancy Rose, light-house keeper; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1668) granting a pension to Henry Wagner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1669) granting a pension to Andrew J. McWade; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1670) granting an honorable discharge to James Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1671) authorizing the President to place the name of Julius R. Frederick on the retired list of the Army, with the rank, pay, and perquisites of second lieutenant; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1672) granting a pension to Lue R. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAFFERY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1673) granting a pension to Jane M. Anderson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 1674) granting a pension to Martha Custis Carter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VILAS introduced a bill (S. 1675) to prevent the carrying of obscene literature and articles designed for indecent and immoral use from one State or Territory into another State or Territory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 59) extending the provisions of section 79 of "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, so as to include monographs, bulletins, and reports of the Geological Survey published in 1894 and succeeding years; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. CALL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 60) for the relief of employees in the Government mail repair workshop; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Census, and ordered to be printed.

PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. PUGH on the 15th instant; which were ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. GIBSON, it was

Ordered, That James S. Crawford be permitted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers pertaining to the bill for his relief in the Fifty-third Congress, there having been no adverse report thereon.

WESTERN CHEROKEE INDIAN CLAIM.

Mr. PRITCHARD submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Whereas the following resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Fifty-third Congress, third session, on March 2, 1895:

"*Resolved, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to withhold any further distribution and payment of the money derived from the 35 per cent of the judgment in favor of the "Old Settler" or Western Cherokee Indians against the United States in the sum of $800,386.31, set apart for the payment of expenses and for legal services justly and equitably payable on account of the prosecution of said claim, until otherwise authorized by law, except allowances already made for legal services, and to report to the Senate any and all payments and distributions from said fund already made, with copies of all papers in any manner connected with said payments and distributions filed in the Interior Department and the office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the action had thereon."

And whereas it is not the intent nor the purpose of said resolution to prevent payment out of said 35 per cent of said judgment of the amounts that shall be found by the Secretary of the Interior to be justly due and payable to attorneys or to their representatives, if deceased, for legal services rendered by them in the prosecution of said claim of the "Old Settler" or Western Cherokee Indians: Therefore

Be it resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that no part of said resolution shall operate to prevent payment of whatever sum or sums, if any, that may be found by the Secretary of the Interior, after investigation, to be due to the estate of C. M. McLoud, deceased, and Marcus Erwin, deceased, both of Asheville, N. C., and T. H. N. McPherson, of Shippensburg, Pa., for legal services rendered by them under contract, in the prosecution of the claim of the "Old Settler" or Western Cherokee Indians, against the United States: *Provided*, That the total amount that shall be allowed and paid under this resolution shall not exceed ——.

ADALINE V. BASSETT.

Mr. GORMAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Adaline V. Bassett, widow of Isaac Bassett, deceased, late assistant doorkeeper of the Senate, a sum equal to one year's salary at the rate allowed by law to said assistant doorkeeper, out of the "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate; said payment to be considered as in lieu of all funeral expenses or other allowances.

REPRINT OF THE NAPHTHA LAUNCH BILL.

Mr. FRYE. I ask an order for the reprinting of what is known as the naphtha launch bill. The edition is entirely exhausted, I understand.

The order was agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 1,000 copies of Senate bill 1646, providing for certain requirements for vessels propelled by gas, fluid, naphtha, or electric motors.

REPORT ON IRRIGATION.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed under the direction of the Department of the Interior 10,000 copies of a report on irrigation in the Western part of the United States, prepared for the Eleventh Census, together with accompanying maps and illustrations; also an appendix bringing the water supply information up to date, and an index. Of this number 3,000 copies shall be for the use of members of the Senate, 5,000 copies for the use of members of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies for the use of the Department of the Interior.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD FOR SENATE LIBRARY.

Mr. GRAY submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Whereas the number of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD provided for the Senate library by section 73 of the act in regard to public printing approved January 12, 1895, has proved insufficient to supply the needs of the Senate:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Government Printer be, and he is hereby, directed to supply the Senaet library, for the use of the Senate, in addition to the 10 copies provided in the new printing law, 10 copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for each and every session of Congress hereafter, beginning with the third session of the Fifty-third Congress.

DAMS AT OUTLETS OF THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate, That 500 copies of a report by the Interstate Commerce Committee, to whom was referred Senate bill 1339 and Senate resolution No. 42, be printed for the use of the Senate.

ARREST OF AMERICAN CITIZENS IN CUBA.

Mr. CALL. I submit a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to inquire into the arrest and forcible removal of Mark E. Rodriguez, a citizen of the United States, on board the United States mail steamer *Olivette* in the harbor of Habana on Wednesday, the 15th instant; also into the arrest of Luis Someillan and his son, citizens of the United States, in the city of Habana; and, if no just cause for such arrest exists, to demand their immediate release.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HOAR. It seems to me that if the Senate is to take any action on the subject at all the better form of resolution would be, in the first place, to ask the President for such information as the Department of State may have, or as he has. Will the Chair direct the resolution to be read again?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be again read.

Mr. CALL. Before the resolution is read, I will read for the information of the Senator from Massachusetts a telegram which I received last night.

Mr. HOAR. Will not the Senator have the telegram read at the desk?

Mr. CALL. I send the telegram to the desk to be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The telegram will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Telegram.]

KEY WEST, FLA., *January 20, 1896.*

To Senator WILKINSON CALL, *Washington, D. C.:*

Mark E. Rodriguez has been taken from steamer *Olivette*. Last Wednesday Luis Someillan and his son also arrested in Habana. All American citizens. Use your influence with Secretary of State to get them out of the Spanish grasp.

CARLOS RECIO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for information.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. It seems to me the proper mode of resolve should be, in the first place, to inquire of the President what information he has. Directing him to make an inquiry may imply certainly that he has not made any himself. There seems to be a notion in some quarters that the Senate of the United States is a constantly loaded cannon which any single member of the Senate can touch off at his discretion. I think it would be better to go a little more slowly in all these cases. I trust the Senator from Florida will modify his resolution into a mere resolution of inquiry of the President, which would undoubtedly have the same effect.

Mr. CALL. I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, although it is quite obvious that the State Department can have no information upon an occurrence so recent. I had thought, as this matter of the unlawful and unreasonable arrest of citizens of the United States as contradistinguished from subjects of Great Britain and other countries has become so frequent, and the protection of the flag and the fact of citizenship of the United States really amounts to so little, that it were well that this instance should receive immediate consideration on the part of the Senate, to the end that foreign Governments should understand that all departments of the Government of the United States are vigilant to protest and prompt to demand proper treatment and complete immunity from wrongful treatment of citizens of the United States. I have introduced the resolution, but I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution as modified?

Mr. HALE. What is the resolution as modified?

Mr. GORMAN. Let it be read as modified.

Mr. HOAR. Let the resolution as modified be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from Florida to modify the resolution.

Mr. CALL. The modification suggested is simply that the President of the United States be requested to communicate the information.

Mr. HOAR. The information he has in regard to the arrest of those persons.

Mr. HALE. Strike out all that part of the resolution that makes

an imperative demand for release. That should be stricken out.

Mr. CALL. There is no such part of the resolution. There is a part of the resolution that directs that if no just cause be found the immediate release be demanded. But to avoid any question about it I will consent to strike out that part, although I can not understand why any Senator should object to an unconditional demand for the release of a citizen of the United States after it has been ascertained that he has been unlawfully arrested and is innocent of offense against the foreign Government.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read as modified.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think this is setting an example that may give us a great deal of trouble in many cases that will arise. I hope the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, which meets to-morrow, and it will no doubt be promptly reported back. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CALL. If there be any desire on the part of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to refer the question whether the Senate of the United States shall act upon this information given to it of the arbitrary and unjust arrest of citizens of the United States in foreign countries, and that a committee, a small part of the Senate, shall decide what it is the business of the whole Senate to decide, I shall not object. I wanted to show the people of the United States, and of my own State in particular, that I am prepared as a Senator to demand their protection in foreign countries without reference to the action of any other department of the Government.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to state that a resolution has already been introduced and passed by the Senate which I think substantially covers the question the Senator is seeking to get light upon.

Mr. PLATT. I guess not.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know exactly, as I was not present when the resolution was read. At any rate, I desire to state for the information of the Senator from Florida that perhaps to-day a report will be received from the Secretary of State giving information as to the arrest of American citizens who are naturalized in this country and upon other questions pertaining to the general subject. I hope the Senator will consent to the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Illinois allow me to make a suggestion before he sits down?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I am informed by a member of this body that several communications have come to him in the past in regard to the arrest of American citizens in foreign countries, not by the Spanish Government, but by other Governments, and that on taking them to the Secretary of State the Secretary of State instantly sent a cable dispatch abroad inquiring into the facts and had the proper means of redress set in motion. Why this one case which has come to the notice of the Senator from Florida should be singled out and made a means of applying a spur to the President or the Secretary of State or to the Senate I can not see.

It seems to me that when the Senator from Florida received the dispatch he should have instantly communicated it to the Secretary of State, who is the proper officer of the Government to take cognizance of the matter; and he would have found, I presume, that in ten minutes inquiry would be made by cable. If the Secretary of State had refused, then the Senator would have exercised his discretion as to calling upon the Senate to interpose.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, one word further. I understand that the resolution does not pertain to the country to which I supposed it did; but I still think it pertains to the general question involved in an inquiry already made of the Secretary of State by this body. Whether that is the case or not, I hope the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as suggested by the chairman of that committee.

Mr. CALL. I desire to say for the information of the Senator from Massachusetts that I did send this telegram immediately to the Secretary of State; but I think the Senate of the United States owes a duty to the people of the United States, irrespective of what the President or his Secretaries may do. I think that to this body belongs the protection of the honor of the American flag and American citizens in a higher degree than is devolved upon the executive officers of the Government. Therefore I thought that it was well for the Senate to show its care and consideration upon this subject.

I do not accept the theory that there is any department of this Government in which so large powers are vested and so great a responsibility as the Senate and House of Representatives, in whom is vested the power of removal by impeachment of the officers of all other departments.

I have no censure to imply upon the President of the United States or upon the Secretary of State; but the idea that we can not act, but must ask information of the President of the United States before we strengthen his hands by resolving that he should take especial care and immediate action in an instance of great enormity, where the flag of the United States has been violated, and in a state of war, an atrocious war, citizens of the United States are taken from on board an American mail steamer, and that attention should not be called at the instance of the Senate to that particular case of outrage seems to me to have no justification in the reasons which have been given by the Senator from Massachusetts.

But I have no objection, if it be desired by Senators here to refer so plain a question of duty to a committee, that it shall be done, and therefore, if the Senator from Ohio, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, desires this reference, I will consent to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF VALUABLE SEEDS, ETC.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to give notice that to-morrow morning, after the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall ask the Senate to take up and consider the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins.

WAR IN CUBA.

Mr. CALL. I will ask the Senate, if the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] has no objection, that the resolution which was introduced by me a few days ago, asking the Secretary of State to communicate to the Senate the reports of the consuls of the United States to the Island of Cuba, be taken up and passed. If it be desired to modify it by providing that the communications be made in confidence to the Senate, I have no objection to that modification. I ask the Senator from Ohio, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, if he has any objection to the consideration of that resolution and its passage by the Senate?

Mr. SHERMAN. What is the resolution? I ask that it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

Mr. CALL. I will state further, before the resolution is read, that it is particularly desirable that the Senate should have, either in confidence or in open session, full information in regard to the condition of affairs in the Island of Cuba and the arrest of American citizens there without just cause. I am informed that the difference in the protection and respect shown to citizens of the United States and subjects of Great Britain and other foreign countries is marked in favor of the subjects of those Governments and in detriment and disparagement of American citizens and the American flag. I hope, if that fact be true, as I am advised it is, that the information contained in those reports may be communicated to the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator from Florida will prepare a resolution requesting the Committee on Foreign Relations to give a statement of the condition of affairs in Cuba, that committee will do so. If he will send such a resolution as that to the committee, they will no doubt promptly respond.

The objection I had to the resolution offered a while ago was to taking any individual case of arrest and endeavoring to investigate that, when other subjects of much greater importance, involving many thousands of people, were also pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have no doubt that in a short time the committee will report the subject to the Senate, when there will be ample time to discuss the whole matter.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the Senator misunderstands the resolution. The resolution to which I refer is a resolution which was considered very briefly a few days ago, to which objection was made, asking the Secretary of State to send to the Senate the reports of consuls of the United States in regard to the condition of affairs in Cuba, not an individual case, but referring generally to all reports which touched upon that question. I have no objection to that resolution being referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, if that be the only method to get action upon it; but I am very desirous, as I am informed that these reports contain information which we can not otherwise get, that they shall be communicated to the Senate either in confidence or in open session. That is the resolution to which I refer. It relates to no particular case.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no doubt the matter will be reported to the Senate very soon by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CALL. The resolution to which I refer has not yet been referred to that committee. It lies upon the table, and I am asking that it may be taken up in order that some disposal may be made of it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. What is the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CALL. That the Senate proceed to consider the resolution calling for the reports of the consuls of the United States touching the condition of affairs in Cuba.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the following resolution, submitted by Mr. CALL January 16, 1896:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed, if not incompatible with the public interest, to send to the Senate the dispatches of the consuls of the United States relating to the war now carried on in Cuba.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, it seems to me that as a matter of common safety to our consuls abroad we ought not to do this. Those consuls are scattered through the Island of Cuba. If the communications of those consuls to the State Department should be sent to the Senate, they would undoubtedly be subject to exposure, and the lives of many people might be involved by the betrayal of the correspondence of those consuls. It does seem to me that the Senate of the United States ought not to seek to explore the mysteries, if there be mysteries, in the State Department, and that the State Department ought not, under any circumstances, to communicate what is reported by consuls in time of war, which might attract attention to them and probably endanger their lives. I think, therefore, that we ought not to call for this information, unless there is some allegation that the Secretary of State is not doing his duty in protecting American citizens. The ordinary correspondence going on between the State Department and the various consuls of this country ought not to be disclosed while a war is raging.

There is another thing I wish to say in respect to the resolution. The resolution is not in the usual form. When the Senate of the United States directs a thing to be done by the head of a Department, it directs it positively, without any condition. It is only when we address the President as a separate department of the Government that we leave the question of propriety and expediency to be determined by him.

Mr. CALL. I introduced the resolution originally in conformity with the present suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, but I changed it upon suggestions from some Senators on the other side of the Chamber. I am indifferent as to the form in which it is put, and I am entirely willing that it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; but I think that the Government of the United States ought to be able to protect its consuls and foreign ministers in the discharge of their official duties in all countries, and that such timely respect and consideration of the determination of this Government to protect its citizens and the honor of its flag abroad should exist as would be a sufficient protection to them when their official acts were considered.

I will consent, therefore, inasmuch as it seems to excite so much objection, to the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, in the absence of objection.

POSTAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS OF 1893.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution received from the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *January 20, 1896.*

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of the Postal Laws and Regulations of 1893 for the use of the Post-Office Department.

JOHN FINN.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Yesterday the Senate passed the bill (S. 227) to permit the withdrawal of certain papers and the signing of certain receipts by John Finn, or his attorney. It has not yet gone to the House of Representatives, and I notice that there is a misrecital in the body of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed may be reconsidered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the votes are reconsidered. The bill is before the Senate.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I move, in lines 10 and 11, to strike out the words "Third Auditor of the Treasury" and to insert in lieu thereof "Auditor for the War Department."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH], coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PUGH January 15, 1896, as follows:

Whereas by the act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," approved March 18, 1869, it was provided and declared that the faith of the United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment in coin or its equivalent of all interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had expressly provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver; and

Whereas all the bonds of the United States authorized to be issued by the act entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, by the terms of said act were declared to be redeemable in coin of the then present standard value, bearing interest payable semi-annually in such coin; and

Whereas all bonds of the United States authorized to be issued under the act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, are required to be of the description of bonds of the United States described in the said act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt"; and

Whereas at the date of the passage of said act of Congress last aforesaid, to wit, the 14th day of July, 1870, the coin of the United States of standard value of that date included silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains each, declared by the act approved January 18, 1837, entitled "An act supplementary to the act entitled 'An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,'" to be a legal tender of payment, according to the nominal value, for any sums whatever: Therefore

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in violation of the public faith nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor.

Mr. HILL. Before I proceed, I ask the Senator from Alabama what disposition he proposes to make of that resolution this morning?

Mr. PUGH. I propose to have it considered by the Senate with a view of having a vote taken upon it.

Mr. HILL. I was going to suggest whether it would not be wise at this time to refer the resolution to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PUGH. They have already considered all the matters involved in this resolution, and have substantially made a report covering every question that arises on the resolution.

Mr. HILL. A written report?

Mr. PUGH. I mean they have reported a bill, which is now the unfinished business.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator from New York desire to address the Senate?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HOAR. I thought the question put by the Senator from New York implied that he did not desire to go on with a speech this morning. I do not, of course, wish to interfere with him if he does, but I was going to suggest, if nobody was prepared to address the Senate at this time, that the resolution go over informally, and that the hour between now and 2 o'clock be devoted to unobjected cases on the Calendar; but I shall not interpose if the Senator from New York desires to proceed.

Mr. HILL. That will be far more profitable if the Senator from Alabama will consent.

Mr. HOAR. What does the Senator want to do?

Mr. HILL. I want to oppose the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Senator from Alabama to let the resolution stand in its place and that we proceed to consider the unobjected cases on the Calendar for an hour. Of course there can be no considerable debate on them.

Mr. PLATT. There appears to be a colloquy going on on the other side which none of the rest of the Senators here, except those engaged in it, can hear. We on this side of the Chamber would be glad to know what is taking place.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Senator from Alabama, without displacing it, be set aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected cases on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. PUGH. Several Senators who are friends of the resolution that I offered suggest to me that it would be well not to object to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HILL. I also concur in that proposition.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the resolution will be laid over without prejudice. The first case on the Calendar will be stated.

PAYMENT OF PENSION MONEY.

The bill (S. 242) to require payment of pension money to wives in cases where male pensioners desert or abandon their families, or are habitual drunkards, or for any reason fail and neglect to support their families, was announced as first in order on the Calendar, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed its consideration.

Mr. PEFFER. That bill needs to be amended slightly, and the report of the committee points out the amendments. In line 5 after the word "drunkenness," I move to strike out "or where, for any reason or cause, such pensioners," and insert the word "and."

Mr. PALMER. I ask to have the section read as it will appear if the amendment be agreed to.

The Secretary read the section as proposed to be amended, as follows:

That in any and all cases where male pensioners of the United States desert or abandon their families, or where such pensioners are addicted to habitual drunkenness and do not use their pension money for the support of their families and do not support them, and when they have no other sufficient means of support, the Commissioner of Pensions, on such facts being made

to appear by competent testimony and on application of the wife of any such pensioner, shall pay the money due such pensioner from time to time to his said wife so long as such conditions of failure or neglect to support continue.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEFFER. In line 11, after the word "pensioner," I move to insert the words "she being a woman of good character."

Mr. SHERMAN. Who is to examine and determine such a question as that? I hope that such a provision will not be inserted in a pension law which would require every woman who applied for a pension to have her character examined.

Mr. HOAR. I enter an objection to the present consideration of the bill. Let the amendments be printed, and this will be the first bill to come up the next time the Calendar of unobjected cases is considered. The Senator by that time can then have his amendments printed.

Mr. PEFFER. Does the Senator suggest that the bill be printed with the amendments proposed?

Mr. HOAR. Yes.

Mr. PEFFER. I am very well satisfied with that, Mr. President. Let the bill be printed with the amendments as they appear in the report.

Mr. PLATT. If the Senator from Massachusetts will withdraw his objection for a moment, it seems to me that perhaps it would be better if the Senator from Kansas would consent to have the bill recommitted to the committee in order that it may be recast.

Mr. PEFFER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. PLATT. I wish, while on my feet, to make a single suggestion about the bill as it would stand if these amendments were all adopted. It would pay, as I understand, the pension money to a wife whenever the husband was not properly applying it for the support of the children, and it would do so whether the wife was living with the husband or was separated from him, and it would do it also whether the wife were applying, or would apply, the money for the support of the children. I think all these things should be taken into consideration, and the language of the bill should be so framed by the committee as to carry out the idea which is involved, which is a good one.

Mr. PEFFER. Let the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to make a single observation before the bill is recommitted. I am satisfied that some legislation ought to be had on this subject.

Mr. PLATT. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. GALLINGER. But I confess that I have not myself given the attention to this bill that I think, as chairman of the Committee on Pensions, I ought to have given, and I promise to give it careful consideration if it shall be recommitted, as I trust it may be.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions, in the absence of objection. The next business on the Calendar will be stated.

EXCHANGE BETWEEN GOLD AND SILVER STANDARD COUNTRIES.

The next business on the Calendar was the resolution submitted by Mr. STEWART December 12, 1895, directing the Committee on Finance to inquire what effect the difference of exchange between gold-standard countries and silver-standard countries has upon the agricultural and manufacturing industries of the United States, etc.

Mr. HILL. I suppose that resolution was offered by the Senator from Nevada for the purpose of making some remarks upon it, which have already been made, and the resolution may as well be taken off the Calendar.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Nevada, who introduced the resolution, is absent, but may desire to address the Senate upon it when it comes up. I object to its present consideration.

Mr. VILAS. Let it go over without prejudice.

Mr. HOAR. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

CORPORATE INFLUENCE IN POLITICAL AFFAIRS.

The resolution submitted by Mr. CALL December 17, 1895, providing for the investigation of organized efforts of corporations to control the election of members of Congress was announced as next in order.

Mr. CALL. By unanimous consent, it was agreed that that resolution should lie upon the table, without losing its place, to be called up at any time. Objection was made that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] was not in the Chamber and desired to be here. As he is not now here, I ask that that order may be continued and that the resolution may be passed over without prejudice in the order of resolutions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

CONGRESSIONAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The bill (S. 238) to prohibit officers of the Government from refusing to pay moneys appropriated by act of Congress was announced as next in order.

Mr. HALE. That is a very important bill. I think it had better go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being interposed, the bill will go over.

PORTRAIT OF MRS. DOLLY MADISON.

The bill (S. 420) for the purchase of the oil portrait of Mrs. Dolly Madison by E. F. Andrews was announced as next in order.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I should like to have that bill go over until I am able to examine it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

ISSUANCE OF INTEREST-BEARING BONDS.

The bill (S. 1341) to prohibit the further issuance of interest-bearing bonds without the consent of Congress was announced as next in order.

Mr. HALE. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will go over.

MAP OF THE UNITED STATES.

The joint resolution (S. R. 29) to print, with certain additions, the last map of the United States published by the Interior Department was announced as next in order.

Mr. CALL. I think there can be no objection to that joint resolution, and I desire at the proper time to insist on its passage, if I may do so. It exhibits a condition of things in the State of Florida which I think will justify the publication of this map.

Mr. HALE. Let the joint resolution go over, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being interposed, the joint resolution will go over.

LANDS WITHIN FORT PEMBINA MILITARY RESERVATION, N. DAK.

The bill (S. 1344) providing for the selection of the lands within Fort Pembina Military Reservation, N. Dak., by the State of North Dakota was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL MEN FOR THE NAVY.

The bill (S. 1404) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to enlist additional men for service in the United States Navy, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HALE. That bill is one upon which some Senators who are not present desire to be heard. I shall not ask that it be taken up now, but I give notice that at some early day I shall move to go to the Calendar for the purpose of having it considered, and, I hope, passed.

ELIZABETH MOORE ENGLISH.

The bill (S. 1271) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore English was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elizabeth Moore English, widow of Rear-Admiral Earl English, at $50 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES E. JONES.

The bill (S. 249) granting a pension to Charles E. Jones was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty," and in the same line, after the word "month," to strike out "said Jones having become practically blind, the result of a gunshot wound received while in the line of duty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles E. Jones, late photographer for the Eleventh Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers, said pension to be at the rate of $30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. GALLINGER January 8, 1896:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 249) granting a pension to C. E. Jones, have examined the same, and report:

The bill passed the Senate during the Fifty-third Congress.

Claimant was not an enlisted man, and hence not pensionable under the general law. He was employed as a photographer, and in that capacity rendered valuable service to the Union cause. Not only did he faithfully perform his duties as a photographer, but the evidence clearly shows that he performed actual military service, and that while thus engaged he received a gunshot wound which has resulted in almost total blindness.

There seems to be no question as to the incurrence of the disability, the affidavit of Capt. R. B. Ward, herewith appended, being conclusive on that point. Many other affidavits are on file which tend to confirm Captain Ward's statement. Had claimant been an enlisted man, there can be no reasonable doubt of his right to pension, and having performed actual military service, and being wounded while thus engaged, the duty of Congress to come to his relief is clear and imperative.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

AFFIDAVIT OF CAPT. R. B. WARD.

STATE OF MISSOURI, *County of Jackson, ss:*

In the matter of Charles E. Jones, claimant.

On this 5th day of September, A. D. 1890, personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for said county, duly authorized to administer oaths,

Robert B. Ward, aged 61 years, a resident of Kansas City, in the county of Jackson and State of Missouri, whose post-office address is Kansas City, Mo., well known to me to be reputable and entitled to credit, and who, being duly sworn, declared in relation to aforesaid case as follows:

"I have known above claimant, Charles E. Jones, since the spring of 1862, when he came to and joined the Eleventh Pennsylvania Cavalry as photographer, I being captain of Company D of said regiment. Said claimant was not an enlisted man, but I know of him being in several engagements under military orders, and in April, 1863, I know of my personal knowledge that the said Charles E. Jones was ordered to take photographic view of Longstreet's fortifications at the siege of Suffolk, in the State of Virginia, and while performing his duty, acting under orders of Gen. John Peck, commanding officer, said claimant, Charles E. Jones, received gunshot wound from Longstreet's sharpshooters in the small of back, across the spine, which affected his eyesight and has caused blindness of both eyes to such an extent that said claimant has to be accompanied with a guide at all times to walk around, rendering him as good as totally blind.

"R. B. WARD."

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 5th day of September, 1890.
[SEAL.] ROBERT S. RODGERS, *Notary Public.*

AFFIDAVIT OF W. D. HOOVER, M. D.

STATE OF KANSAS, *County of Miami, ss:*

In the matter of appeal for pension through special act of Congress by Charles E. Jones, regimental photographer, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers.

On this 29th day of October, A. D. 1894, personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for the said county, duly authorized to administer oaths, W. D. Hoover, aged 60 years, a resident of Paola City, in the county of Miami and State of Kansas, well known to me to be reputable and entitled to credit, and who, being duly affirmed, declares in relation to aforesaid case as follows: "That I have been acquainted with the said Chas. E. Jones since 1867, when he first came to Paola, Kans., and that his eyes were diseased then, and that they continued to grow worse until he became totally blind, or nearly so. He can just barely grope his way with the use of his cane. He received a gunshot wound across the small of his back while in the line of duty in the Army during the late war. The ball passed across the back just over the second lumbar vertebræ, and has left a scar over one-half an inch across and more than an inch in length. It is a wonder it did not cause paraplegia. His eyes became affected before he recovered from the wound in the back, and I am of the opinion, taking the prostrated condition of his system, especially the nervous system, into consideration, if the wound in the back was not a primary cause of the disease of the eye it certainly was a secondary cause. Said Jones has been a good citizen during his residence here.

"The above is from my personal observation of the case, and is written by myself."

His post-office address is Paola, Kans., and further declares that he has no interest in said case, and is not concerned in its prosecution.

W. D. HOOVER, M. D.

STATE OF KANSAS, *County of Miami, ss:*

Sworn to and subscribed before me this day by the above-named affiant, and I certify that I read said affidavit to said affiant, including the words erased and the words added, and acquainted him with its contents before he executed the same. I further certify that I am in no wise interested in said case, nor am I concerned in the prosecution; and that said affiant is personally known to me, and that he is a credible person.

[L. S.] WARD J. CARPENTER, *Notary Public.*

(My term expires March 27, 1895.)

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EZRA S. HAVENS.

The bill (S. 54) for the relief of Ezra S. Havens was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to Ezra S. Havens, late captain of Company G, Eighteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, the pay and allowances of a captain of infantry in the late volunteer service from the 11th day of March, 1862, to the 2d day of February, 1863.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN M. DAVIS.

The bill (S. 56) for the relief of John M. Davis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of War to set aside the general order issued by Major-General McPherson approving and confirming the sentence of the court-martial dismissing John M. Davis, captain of Company H of the Sixty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to issue to him an honorable discharge.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NAPOLEON B. GIDDINGS.

The bill (S. 57) for the relief of Napoleon B. Giddings was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated the circumstances of the alleged taking from Napoleon B. Giddings, in January, 1847, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., and deposit with A. B. Dyer, lieutenant of ordnance, United States Army, by order of Sterling Price, colonel commanding the army in New Mexico at that time, of 140 kegs of gunpowder, and to ascertain the reasonable market value of such powder at that time and place, and whether the same, or any part thereof, was ever returned or delivered back to Giddings, and the final disposition of such powder; and if the same, or any part thereof, was never returned to or delivered back to said Giddings, then to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of the reasonable market value at that time and place of the powder so never returned or delivered back to Giddings. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to cause to be paid to Napoleon B. Giddings the amount so certified by the Secretary of War to be the reasonable market value of such powder as aforesaid.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN S. NEET, JR.

The bill (S. 58) for the relief of John S. Neet, jr., was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to John S. Neet, jr., late a private in Company C, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, afterwards Company L, Sixth Missouri State Militia Cavalry, $100 in full payment of the sum allowed him in October, 1878, by the Third Auditor of the Treasury Department.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH W. CARMACK.

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Joseph W. Carmack was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Joseph W. Carmack, late of Company A, Sixth Missouri Cavalry, the pay and allowances of a first sergeant of cavalry from the 1st day of May, 1862, to the 30th day of September, 1862, less any pay received by him during such period.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREDERICK GRAMM.

The bill (S. 61) for the relief of Frederick Gramm was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to amend the military record of Frederick Gramm, late a private soldier in Company B of the Fifty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteers, so as to remove the charges of desertion, and to show that Gramm was captured by the enemy on June 25, 1862; paroled on June 28, 1862; permitted by Major-General Grant, commanding the district, to pass from Memphis, Tenn., to his home in Ohio to remain until notified of his exchange or otherwise ordered; duly exchanged and ordered to return to his command, and absent without leave until March 5, 1863, when he enlisted in the Navy of the United States for two years, served faithfully, and was honorably discharged at the expiration of his service. No pay or allowances are to become due by reason of the proposed act.

Mr. HILL. What will be the effect of the bill?

Mr. COCKRELL. The effect of it is to remove the charge of desertion which was entered against the soldier as in the military service and substitute for it the facts in the case, that he was captured, went home by permission of General Grant, was exchanged and required to report, and was absent without leave. Then he enlisted in the Navy, served faithfully, and was honorably discharged.

Mr. HILL. I merely wish to ask for information whether all those recitals exist and the record still shows that the man deserted?

Mr. COCKRELL. The record shows he deserted on a certain day, and that is all it does show. It does not show that he was captured or paroled, or anything else. The object of the bill is to make the record correspond with the facts.

Mr. HILL. I thought I understood from the reading of the bill that a discharge from the Army was given.

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, no.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE A. ORR.

The bill (S. 60) for the relief of George A. Orr was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay the claim of George A. Orr as acting assistant provost-marshal at Mount Vernon, Mo., from May 28, 1863, to January 30, 1864, at the rate of $100 per month for his services and such sum for legitimate expenses during the period as may be shown and found to have been actually expended by him in the lawful discharge of his duties and necessary for the public service.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NORTHRUP & CHICK.

The bill (S. 360) for the relief of Northrup & Chick was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to examine and adjudicate the claim of Northrup & Chick, late licensed Indian traders with the Pottawatomie Indians in Kansas, for supplies furnished those Indians for their subsistence; to determine the amount thereof justly due Northrup & Chick, and whether there is any fund belonging to those Indians which can be applied to the payment of such claim, and, if so determined, to report and certify the amount found due to North-

rup & Chick, without interest, to be paid from the funds of those Indians to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be so paid by him.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SILAS P. KELLER.

The bill (S. 361) for the relief of Silas P. Keller was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to examine and adjudicate the claim of Silas P. Keller, late licensed Indian trader with the Pottawatomie Indians in Kansas, for supplies furnished those Indians for their subsistence; to determine the amount thereof justly due, and whether there is any fund belonging to the Indians which can be applied to the payment of such claim.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RULES FOR CANAL NAVIGATION.

The bill (S. 565) providing for the establishment and enforcement of rules and regulations for the use and navigation of United States canals and similar works of navigation, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CALL. I should like to hear from the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], who reported the bill, a statement of it.

Mr. FRYE. It is a bill the draft of which was sent to the Senate by the War Department, and is regarded as absolutely essential for the protection of canals. There is one canal governed by law, but since then the Government has assumed charge of several other canals and there are no laws protecting them.

Mr. COCKRELL. Three canals, the Des Moines Rapids Canal, the St. Marys Falls Canal, and the Louisville and Portland Canal, and the Mississippi jetties will be affected by the bill. The bill proposes to apply the same law to all canals.

Mr. FRYE. Yes, to all canals.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FEES FOR CERTIFICATES OF TITLE TO VESSELS.

The bill (S. 564) providing for the collection of fees for furnishing certificates of title to vessels was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes that collectors of customs shall collect $1 for each certificate provided for in section 4194 of the Revised Statutes of the United States from persons or corporations requiring the same; and repeals section 1 of the act of June 19, 1886, entitled "An act abolishing certain fees for official services," so far as it authorizes the payment by the United States of any fee for furnishing such certificate.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DECORATIONS FROM LATE HAWAIIAN GOVERNMENT.

The bill (S. 153) authorizing the persons herein named to accept of certain decorations and testimonials from the late Hawaiian Government was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest that the word "of" in the title, which is probably a misprint, be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). That correction will be made.

UNLADING OF VESSELS.

The bill (S. 661) to amend section 2880 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, fixing time for vessels to unlade, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 2880 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 2880. Whenever any merchandise shall be imported into any port of the United States from any foreign port, in any vessel, at the expiration of ten working days if the vessel is less than 500 tons register, and within fifteen working days if it is of 500 tons register and less than 1,000, and within twenty working days if it is of 1,000 tons register and less than 1,500, and within twenty-five working days if it is of 1,500 tons register and upward, not including legal holidays and days when the condition of the weather prevents the unlading of the vessel with safety to its cargo, after the time within which the report of the master of any vessel is required to be made to the collector of the district, if there is found any merchandise other than has been reported for some other district or some foreign port, the collector shall take possession thereof; but with the consent of the owner or consignee of any merchandise, or with the consent of the owner or master of the vessel in which the same may be imported, the merchandise may be taken possession of by the collector after one day's notice to the collector of the district. All merchandise so taken shall be delivered pursuant to the order of the collector of the district, for which a certificate or receipt shall be granted."

Mr. FRYE. The bill is rendered necessary on account of the largely increased size of vessels. When the original law was passed, nearly a hundred years ago, the largest vessels were only 800 tons, but now the largest are from three to five thousand tons, and sufficient time is not given to unlade.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

S. W. MARSTON.

The bill (S. 69) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle the claims of the legal representatives of S. W. Marston, late United States Indian agent at Union Agency, Ind. T., for services and expenses, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF BONDS.

The resolution submitted by Mr. ELKINS, December 31, 1895, providing that hereafter no bonds of the United States shall be sold at private sale or under private contract, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELKINS. Let the resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

STATUE OF MAJ. GEN. JOHN STARK.

The bill (S. 130) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H., was considered by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the Library with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 3, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty"; so as to read:

That the sum of $40,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and is hereby, appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 16, after the word "until," to insert "a design for said statue shall be accepted by the Secretary of War and the Joint Committee on the Library, and until"; so as to make the additional proviso read:

And provided further, That no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be so expended until a design for said statue shall be accepted by the Secretary of War and the Joint Committee on the Library, and until a suitable lot of land in said Manchester for the erection of said statue shall be conveyed, with all the right, title, and interest therein of the owner thereof, to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Shall the bill pass?

Mr. COCKRELL. I simply wish to say upon the bill that a similar measure has been up in past Congresses and I voted against it and opposed it. I merely desire to enter on record the fact that I do not approve of the appropriation made in the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will state that a similar bill has passed the Senate three different times.

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand, and that is the reason why I simply make my record without consuming the time of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is all right.

The bill was passed.

COLUMBIA AND RED MOUNTAIN RAILWAY COMPANY.

The bill (S. 259) granting to the Columbia and Red Mountain Railway Company a right of way through the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all of the bill after line 20, in the following words:

There is also hereby granted to said company the same right to locate, appropriate, acquire, and use, for all the purposes for which said company is organized, so much of the waters of any streams in said reservation, and not navigable, as may be necessary for such purposes, and the right of way for all necessary ditches, flumes, and pipes to be connected therewith, to the same extent and as fully as said company might or could acquire the same under the laws of the United States if the lands in said reservation were open to settlement and sale, together with the right to locate and select a mill site not to exceed 10 acres, upon which to erect shops or other works; and upon the erection of such shops or other works a patent to such mill site may be acquired in the same manner as mill sites on the public lands.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and is hereby, granted to the Columbia Red Mountain and Railway Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Washington, a right of way to the extent of 100 feet on each side of the center line of said railway across the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, commencing at a point at or near the Little Dalles on the Columbia River, in Stevens County, in said State, and running thence in a northerly direction by the most feasible route to the international boundary line between the United States and British Columbia, together with all the rights granted to railroads by the act of Congress entitled "An act granting to railroads a right of way through the public lands of the United States," approved March 3, 1875; and for the purposes of this grant and the construction of said railway all the provisions of said act are hereby declared to be applicable thereto to the same extent as though the lands in said reservation were open to settlement and sale.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELVIRA BACHELDER.

The bill (S. 147) granting a pension to Elvira Bachelder was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll, at the rate of $12 per month, the name of Elvira Bachelder, dependent mother of J. K. P. Bachelder, late a private in Company D, Seventh New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HORACE TOWNSEND.

The bill (S. 136) granting an increase of pension to Horace Townsend was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Horace Townsend, late of Company A, Tenth New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM W. FRENCH.

The bill (S. 137) granting an increase of pension to William W. French was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William W. French, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY A. WISE.

The bill (S. 140) granting a pension to Mary A. Wise was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary A. Wise, widow of Capt. Peter Wise, late of Company I, Eighteenth Pennsylvania Cavalry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM J. MURRAY.

The bill (S. 836) for the relief of William J. Murray was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William J. Murray, who served in the Department of the Gulf in the telegraph department in the year 1862, and in the Red River campaign in 1864, the pension to be at the rate of $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT GAMBLE.

The bill (S. 944) granting a pension to Robert Gamble was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Robert Gamble, a soldier in the Florida Seminole war of 1836.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORENCE W. BUSKIRK.

The bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to Florence W. Buskirk was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Florence W. Buskirk, widow of John W. Buskirk, late a corporal in Company G, Forty-ninth Regiment of Indiana Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of $20 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELEN M. JACOB.

The bill (S. 149) granting a pension to Helen M. Jacob was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Helen M. Jacob, of Rochester, Ind., widow of Benjamin Oden West, deceased, late private in Company C of Mounted Riflemen, in the war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of $16 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. HELEN MORRELL CARROLL.

The bill (S. 730) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Helen Morrell Carroll was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mrs. Helen Morrell Carroll, widow of Samuel Sprigg Carroll, late a major-general in the United States Army, at the rate of $75 per month, in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH NEW.

The bill (S. 1051) granting a pension to Elizabeth New, widow of Jethrow New, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elizabeth New, widow of Jethrow New, late captain of Company D, Twenty-ninth Indiana Volunteer Infantry, of the war of 1861.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADA J. SCHWATKA.

The bill (S. 710) granting a pension to Ada J. Schwatka, widow of the late Frederick Schwatka, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ada J. Schwatka, widow of the late Frederick Schwatka, late first lieutenant, Third Cavalry, United States Army, at the rate of $30 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAUD ARDELLE BLISS.

The bill (S. 145) granting an increase of pension to Maud Ardelle Bliss was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, after the word "month," at the end of the bill, to insert "payable to her legally constituted guardian"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Maud Ardelle Bliss, dependent and invalid daughter of John W. Bliss, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, payable to her legally constituted guardian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Maud Ardelle Bliss."

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand that the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] is to address the Senate on the unfinished business. He has very kindly suggested to me that if I ask permission to lay it aside informally until the remaining pension bills on the Calendar are disposed of that course will be agreeable to him. I make that request.

Mr. TELLER. I suppose it will not take very long.

Mr. GALLINGER. It will take a very short time.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask whether the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] prefers to go on to-day after the pension bills are disposed of or at a later day?

Mr. TELLER. It is perfectly immaterial to me whether I shall go on to-day. If anyone desires to proceed with the Calendar that course is entirely satisfactory to me and I shall go on to-morrow.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest, then, that we go on with the Calendar after the pension bills are disposed of. The whole Calendar is very short, and I suggest that we go on with it to-day.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator who has the unfinished business in charge does not object, I certainly do not; and I shall seek an occasion to take the floor to-morrow.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have no objection to the arrangement suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire accept the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOAR. Which is, to go on with the Calendar for the rest of to-day's session.

Mr. GALLINGER. That course will be agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire, as modified by the Senator from Massachusetts, that the unfinished business be informally laid aside, without being displaced, and that the Senate proceed with the Calendar under Rule VIII? The Chair hears none. The next bill on the Calendar will be proceeded with.

ELIZABETH E. DONOHOE.

The bill (S. 746) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Donahue was announced as next in order on the Calendar, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, to strike out the word "Donahue" and insert "Donohoe"; and, in line 7, to strike out the word "Donahue" and insert the word "Donohoe"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions

and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Elizabeth E. Donohoe, widow of the late Col. Michael T. Donohoe, of the Tenth New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry and brevet brigadier-general of volunteers, at the rate of $30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. In drafting this bill I made an unfortunate mistake in the amount named. General Donohoe was a very distinguished officer. He was very severely wounded. He never applied for a pension. He might have drawn a great many thousands of dollars from the Treasury. He was a very distinguished member of the Democratic party, a candidate for office, both in New Hampshire and Massachusetts. He died in poverty, leaving a widow. I meant to draft the bill so that she would receive a pension of $50 per month, which is the minimum amount for widows of that class. I move to amend the bill, in line 9, by striking out the word "thirty," before "dollars," and inserting the word "fifty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth E. Donohoe."

DUDLEY F. BROWN.

The bill (S. 1311) granting an increase of pension to Dudley F. Brown was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twenty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Dudley F. Brown, late private of Company A, Sixth New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month, in lieu of that he is now receiving, payable to his legally constituted guardian.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the report.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. GALLINGER January 14, 1896, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1311) granting an increase of pension to Dudley F. Brown, have examined the same and report:

Claimant under this bill had an honorable military record, and was wounded while in the line of duty. He applied for pension under the general law, but pending the consideration of his claim became so necessitous that he sought relief under the act of June 27, 1890, and was pensioned at the rate of $12 per month, which amount he now draws. Shortly after being pensioned he showed signs of insanity, and is now confined in the New Hampshire Asylum for the Insane, at Concord, N. H., a hopeless lunatic. The affidavit of Dr. Charles P. Bancroft, superintendent of said asylum, is as follows:

"NEW HAMPSHIRE ASYLUM,
"*Concord, N. H., January 7, 1896.*

"DEAR SIR: At the request of Weare N. Shaw, the guardian of Dudley F. Brown, I hereby depose and say that Dudley F. Brown is in a state of chronic delusional insanity. He has been here twice. The first time he was committed here on the 11th of August, 1892. He had a history then of having been insane about three years. His case apparently was one of organic disease of the brain.

"He had hallucinations of hearing and the persistent delusions that are characteristic of long-continued insanity.

"After his commitment at the asylum he continued very nicely for a while, and so far improved that his wife thought it was reasonably safe to try him out again. He was discharged from the asylum after this first commitment on the 5th of May, 1893.

"Two months after he left the asylum he appeared quite rational, and then he began to make unusual remarks. He complained of the heat of the sun, and was unable to work out of doors except in the cool of the day. He endeavored to make shoes, his trade being that of a shoemaker, but he could not apply his mind continuously. He complained of his head quite constantly, and it was not long before he began to manifest delusions that batteries were at work on his head and that somebody was discharging electricity through his body.

"He could not sleep nights because of these morbid ideas and sensations. He finally grew more confused and dazed, remaining out in the woods all night without any covering, and was recommitted at the asylum on the 9th of February, 1894.

"His condition is evidently one of structural brain disease, and there is no probability that he will ever regain his natural state of mind, and it is also quite certain that he can never be self-supporting and must always depend upon the charity of others for his maintenance.

"CHARLES P. BANCROFT, M. D.,
"*Superintendent New Hampshire Asylum for Insane.*

"Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER."

"Personally appeared before me the above-named Charles P. Bancroft and took oath that the above statements made by him concerning the mental condition of Dudley F. Brown are true.

"J. H. CASE, *Justice of Peace.*

"JANUARY 7, 1896."

This case is one that strongly and properly appeals to Congress for relief. Your committee recommend that the bill be amended by striking out, in line 8, the word "twenty-four" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty," and that as amended the bill do pass.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTHA R. HITCHCOCK.

The bill (S. 585) granting an increase of pension to Martha R. Hitchcock was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Martha R. Hitchcock, widow of Maj. Gen. Ethan Allen Hitchcock, for forty-three years a soldier in the Army of the United States, at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NAPOLEON B. BREEDLOVE.

The bill (S. 341) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon B. Breedlove was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll as entitled to increase of pension, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Napoleon B. Breedlove, late of Company G, Fourth Louisiana Volunteers, Mexican war, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. GALLINGER January 14, 1896, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 341) granting a pension to Napoleon B. Breedlove, have examined the same, and report:

A similar bill was introduced in the Fifty-third Congress, referred to the Committee on Pensions, examined, reported favorably, and passed the Senate.

The facts are as follows:

The petitioner, Napoleon B. Breedlove, was a private in Company G of the Fourth Regiment of Louisiana Volunteers. He enlisted on the 13th day of May, 1846, and was discharged the 8th of August, 1846, having served two months and twenty-seven days, and has been receiving a pension of $8 per month from January 29, 1887, and subsequently increased to $12, which he is now receiving on account of his services in the Mexican war of 1846; is 68 years of age and totally blind, and in such destitute circumstances that $12 a month is insufficient to provide him with the necessaries of life. It is alleged that he is suffering with a lame back and wholly unable to do any manual labor of any kind, and has no property, either real or personal, and no income except his pension as furnished by the Government.

Mr. F. G. Audran testifies by affidavit that he has been acquainted with the petitioner for the past twenty years; that he knows him to be a constant sufferer from sore eyes ever since he knew him, both eyes being affected all the time, which has incapacitated him for any and all kinds of work, and for the last ten years his eyes have been very decidedly growing weak, and now he is in a pitiful and helpless condition, not being able to see his way, and is also a sufferer from pain in back or lumbago and disease of the kidneys, which has troubled him constantly for the past fifteen years. Whatever income he had, he spent all his means for remedies for relief for his troubles during his family's destitute circumstances, and is now suffering with all the disabilities mentioned, and with no means of having himself treated. He is very old and quite feeble, is totally unable to do any kind of work, and he has no property, either personal or real, which brings him any income. His only means of subsistence is the $12 pension he gets from the Government.

William Wilson, aged 82, of Fansland, Ind. T., testifies that he has been acquainted with the petitioner for the last forty years and intimately for the last twenty years, and he knows that he has suffered with the eyes and has become so blind that he can not make his way anywhere without assistance, and also suffered from a lame back caused by an affliction of the kidneys, and for years has been unable to do any manual labor of any kind; has no property, either real or personal, and only the income which he receives from the Government of $12 per month. A petition is also signed by a number of reputable citizens, certified by the president of the First National Bank of Muscogee, Ind. T., which citizens state that he is so blind that he has to use a staff to be guided, and is not able to make a living for himself or for his family; that he is entirely helpless, and was compelled to cease all active pursuits some years ago on account of his failing—blindness.

The mayor of Seneca and other citizens testify that they knew him to be an honest and upright man; that he is unable to do anything toward the support of his family on account of feebleness. A number of other citizens of Prairie City, Ind. T., certify to the same effect.

The fact of his poverty and blindness and present condition in life, that he is unable to maintain his family by reason of his disabilities, is abundantly supported by a mass of evidence indisputable, and it is therefore unnecessary to make it cumulative by setting forth, specifically, affidavits. It also appears that all his business has to be transacted by other persons, and that he was postmaster at Prairie City for nearly four years, and his affliction was the prime cause of his discontinuing the service as postmaster, and his efficiency as a business man, before he became totally disabled by the loss of his sight, added materially toward the support of his family, which is also certified to by the president of the bank of Seneca and other reputable citizens.

Your committee, therefore, in view of the fact of his total blindness and inability to provide either for himself or for his family at his advanced age, and the abundant and high character of the citizens who testify in his behalf as to his condition, therefore recommend the passage of the bill with an amendment.

Strike out the word "fifty" and insert the word "thirty."

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATHARINE DILLON.

The bill (S. 148) granting a pension to Catharine Dillon was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twelve"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Catharine Dillon, of Logansport, Ind., widow of Patrick Dillon, deceased, late a private of Company E, Ninth Regiment of Illinois Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. GALLINGER January 14, 1896, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 148) granting a pension to Catharine Dillon, have examined the same, and report:

A similar bill was introduced in the Fifty-third Congress, referred to the Committee on Pensions, reported favorably, and passed the Senate.

The facts are as follows:

She is the widow of Patrick Dillon, deceased, who served in Company E, Ninth Regiment Illinois Cavalry, from 1861 to 1863. The husband, from the evidence, was a good and faithful soldier up to the time of his death, in 1863, while he was yet in the service.

The pension claim of the widow has been rejected by the Bureau on the ground that the death of the soldier did not occur by reason of the service, although it occurred while he was in the service, but we are strongly inclined to the opinion, as shown by the circumstances in evidence, that the death of the soldier was actually due to his military service, though the precise manner of his death is not known.

The claimant is 66 years of age. She is very poor, having no property or income, and has been supported by the charity of her friends for some time past. She is broken in health and unable to do manual labor of any kind.

Your committee, therefore, recommend the passage of the bill with the following amendment:

Strike out the word "twenty," in line 9 of the bill, and insert the word "twelve" instead thereof, so that the petitioner shall be pensioned at the rate of $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH W. FISHER.

The bill (S. 640) to increase the pension of Joseph W. Fisher was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "one hundred"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph W. Fisher, late colonel of the One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteers, at the rate of $72 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. GALLINGER January 14, 1896, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 640) granting a pension to Joseph W. Fisher, have examined the same and report:

A similar bill was introduced in the Fifty-third Congress, referred to the Committee on Pensions, examined, reported favorably, and passed the Senate.

The facts are as follows:

The object of the bill is to increase the pension of Gen. Joseph W. Fisher, late colonel of the One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteers, from $30 per month to $72 per month.

General Fisher, at the breaking out of the civil war, entered the service as a lieutenant-colonel of the Fifth Pennsylvania Reserves, and in July, 1862, he was promoted to the colonency of the regiment. He served as such for a full term of three years, the time of enlistment. Being mustered out, he raised the One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, and at the expiration of their term of enlistment he again raised a regiment known as the One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers. He continued in the service until January 31, 1866, when he was finally mustered out.

He was engaged in all the battles in which his regiments participated, frequently received the compliments of his superior officers, was recommended for the position of brigadier-general, and was appointed brigadier-general by brevet in 1865. He performed conspicuous service at the famous Little Round Top at the battle of Gettysburg.

At the time General Fisher first enlisted he was past the military age, but he served during the entire war and came out of the war broken down in health, and has suffered from the exposures and hardships of the war ever since. He has had four different strokes of paralysis; he is 80 years old, and is well-nigh helpless. He is by profession a lawyer. He held the office of associate justice and the office of chief justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Wyoming for a number of years. He has no means of support, and is totally disabled for mental and physical work.

A petition signed by several hundred representative citizens of his town (which is hereto annexed with the omission of the signatures) gives a statement of his condition mentally and physically, while the affidavits of two representative physicians, who are members of the pension board of examiners (hereto annexed and made a part of this report), confirm the statements contained in the petition.

The committee recommend that the bill be amended by striking out in line 7 of the bill the words "one hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "seventy-two," as this will grant to General Fisher a pension equivalent to that provided for privates in the volunteer service who are totally disabled.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN CLYDE SULLIVAN.

The bill (S. 1037) for the relief of John Clyde Sullivan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the President to nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to reappoint John Clyde Sullivan a paymaster in the Navy with the relative rank of lieutenant-commander at the foot of the list of paymasters having the relative rank of lieutenant-commander.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let a part of the report be read. I do not call for the reading of the entire report, as it is very voluminous, but some reason ought to appear on the record for the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Secretary read from the report submitted by Mr. PERKINS January 14, 1896, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1037) for the relief of John Clyde Sullivan, after careful consideration, make the following report:

This bill was favorably reported by this committee at the last session of Congress and passed the Senate, but failed to receive action in the House.

Mr. Sullivan was a paymaster in the Navy. He was tried before a court-martial at the navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal., July 26, 1893, on charges of rendering false and fraudulent returns and making a false and fraudulent official report, in violation of article 14 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; of disobeying the lawful order of the Secretary of the Navy, and of embezzling the public moneys. The court, in August, 1893, found him guilty of these charges and sentenced him to be dismissed from the service, and the President, on January 31, 1894, approved the sentence.

The bill authorizes the President to reappoint Mr. Sullivan as a paymaster at the foot of the grade which he occupied at the time of his dismissal.

The committee are well aware that in no ordinary case of this character would they be warranted in making a favorable report. Such report is now made upon the conviction that a serious wrong has been done to an upright and worthy officer. In saying this it is not intended to charge that any injustice was intended either by the court, Secretary, or the President. The committee do not believe there was. But upon a careful examination of the evidence adduced before the court-martial and such additional evidence as has been brought to their attention they are satisfied the sentenee was an error that should, so far as possible, be rectified.

A paymaster in the Navy is required by the regulations to make two kinds of reports, or periodical statements, to the Navy and Treasury Departments. The first is to be rendered at the close of each calendar month, and is known as a monthly summary statement. Copies of this are sent to both the Navy and Treasury Departments. The name indicates, to some extent, its character. While it purports to give expenditures and receipts, and the disbursements of clothing and small stores, it is not accompanied by vouchers, and is not the report upon which the accounts of the paymaster with the Government are settled.

The other report required is called the quarterly account current. Upon this report the Treasury Department settles the paymaster's accounts every three months. The regulations require it to show all receipts and expenditures, with vouchers for open purchases and all contingent bills, properly approved by the captain and receipted, and a complete statement of the small stores and clothing account, with the receipts of other disbursing officers; also a full statement of all moneys received for provisions. The original of this report, with its accompanying papers, goes to the Fourth Auditor of the Treasury for official action, and a duplicate is also forwarded by the paymaster to the Navy Department. Upon this report only is predicated the financial relation of the paymaster to the Government.

The monthly summary statement has its use in informing the Navy and Treasury Departments at more frequent intervals of the condition of the paymaster's accounts, whether he is or is not in need of stores or funds, and serves as a check upon undue requisitions for either. But in the instructions printed upon the blanks furnished for this kind of report, the amounts which the paymaster credits to the hospital fund during the quarter on account of pay, and on account of rations for sick in hospital, are only required to be entered in the reports for March, June, September, and December. Thus there are two months in each quarter that the monthly statement is not required to set forth all the paymaster's expenditures. It is in evidence from the officers of the Treasury Department that these monthly statements are not used in any way in making the quarterly settlement. They seem to have no function ordinarily other than as here stated.

The distinction between these two kinds of reports which are required of the paymasters is important, as the material charges before the court-martial rest upon the monthly statements made by Mr. Sullivan, and do not rest at all upon his quarterly accounts current.

The committee find that the gravamen of all the charges is embezzlement. If the accused is innocent of having appropriated the funds of the United States to his own use, then the most that can be deduced from all the other accusations would be want of accuracy and carelessness in signing his monthly statements. The committee are fully convinced there was no embezzlement.

Mr. Sullivan kept a paymaster's account with the subtreasury in San Francisco, and one with the subtreasury in New York. A portion of the public funds was always kept in a safe on board for daily current use. If he embezzled any money it would have to be taken from one of the depositories by check, or taken from the funds he kept on hand. It is now perfectly evident that all checks made on the subtreasury accounts were proper and legitimate. Those accounts have been closed and the vouchers examined by the proper officers and found correct. It is true that a list of checks drawn on New York was submitted by the Navy Department to the President with the findings of the court-martial, with the allegation that part of them must have been drawn by the accused for his own illegal use. All these are now duly accounted for, and the committee allude to this point in another part of their report.

If, then, Mr. Sullivan embezzled, he must have taken the money from the amount which he kept aboard. Let us see if that was possible. The summary statements upon which the charges of embezzlement were based begin with the one rendered for July, 1891. The court found that during that month the accused appropriated to his own use the sum of $6,279.09. A copy of this report is before the committee; also a copy of the report for the month previous. The June report shows that Sullivan had on board in cash

at the close of that month $17,223. Hence he commenced July with that much money. During July the deposits in his money chest aggregated $555, making total cash receipts aboard for the month of $17,778. The summary shows that he disbursed, all told, during the month $4,650.95. Of this amount he paid by checks, which were cashed at the subtreasury the following month, $699, leaving a balance to be paid in coin of $3,951.95, which, being deducted from the cash on hand, left in the ship's chest, according to this calculation, at the end of July, the sum of $13,826.05. The commander of the ship, who counted the money on the 31st day of July, duly certifies on the summary statement that he found there on hand $13,970.05, being an excess of $44.

Owing to the difficulty of determining exactly what portion of the disbursements was made by check on the subtreasury, we do not claim absolute accuracy for the above deduction. Yet it is sufficiently accurate to utterly disprove any allegation of embezzlement to the extent of $6,279.09, as found by the court-martial.

Another analysis of the various returns made by the paymaster during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1892 also completely meets the allegations of embezzlements made during the first two months. The summary statement for the last month of the preceding quarter showed the paymaster to have on hand in the depositories and in the ship's chest $43,669. This was taken up on the July summary statement. The three statements for July, August, and September show receipts as follows:

In July, taken up from June		$43,699.00
In July, current receipts		555.00
In August, current receipts		1,005.00
In September, current receipts		5,510.00
Total receipts for the quarter		50,739.00
The expenditures, as per the monthly statements, were:		
For July	$4,650.95	
For August	4,035.79	
For September	12,057.09	
		20,743.83
Balance due United States September 30		29,995.17
The accounts from the two depositories show, on September 30, as follows:		
Balance in New York	$7,633.33	
Outstanding checks	628.00	
Actual balance		$7,005.33
Balance in San Francisco	13,468.78	
Outstanding checks	2,510.10	
Actual balance		10,938.68
Total to his credit in depositories		17,964.01
He had on hand, as counted by the commander		12,490.92
Grand total to his credit		30,454.93

The amount due the United States at the end of this quarter, as shown by his three summary statements given above, was $29,995.17. This leaves a balance in his favor of $459.75.

Again, in the charges made before the court, based on the summary statements for July and August, 1891, it is alleged that Sullivan embezzled during July $6,279.09, and during the month of August, $5,309.99. There is no charge made against the accuracy or honesty of his summary for the month of September. If the quarterly return made to the Fourth Auditor for the quarter composed of these three months was found accurate, and fully accounted for the funds which he had on hand at the beginning of the quarter and such additional amounts as were placed to his credit during the three months in question, then he either did not embezzle and appropriate to his own use the $11,589.08 of which the court found him guilty during July and August, or else he returned the amount by depositing it at the subtreasury, or adding it to the "balance due the United States in hand." But the subtreasury accounts show that there were no deposits, great or small, to his credit during either month of the quarter. Did he then add the large amount to his cash on hand during the month of September, and previous to the count for that month? This is not conceivable.

At the end of July the cash in the chest was $13,970.05; at the end of August, $12,336.26, and at the end of September, $12,490.92. Either these sums were on hand at these several dates, or the commander of the ship (Commander C. S. Cotton) was in a conspiracy with the paymaster to rob the United States. He certifies at the bottom of each return:

"I have examined all the above money items of receipts and expenditure, as well as the balance of cash on hand, and find the same correctly stated."

Commander Cotton also testified at the court-martial that he always counted this cash with great care, having it brought from the safes and placed on his table, and counted by himself, and counted in his presence by the paymaster and his clerk.

Having in mind the three items of "Cash on hand" at the end of each month, can it be possible that the paymaster brought from some private source and placed in his safe, to be counted on the last day of September, the large sum of $11,589.08? It is not probable that he would have restored in August any of the money alleged to have been embezzled in July. According to the finds, he was still embezzling.

On the 31st day of August (September 1) there was on hand, as counted by the commander, $12,336.26. If to this be added the alleged embezzlements for the two preceding months ($11,589.08) we have $23,925.34. The deposits that month in the ship's chest aggregated $5,510, making all told to be counted as cash $29,435.34. The returns and vouchers show the expenditures for September to have been $12,057.09. Of this amount about $7,560.75 was paid by check on the subtreasury. This would leave but $4,496.34 to be paid from the money chest. Deducting this from the money which must have been on hand under the circumstances as above stated, to wit, $29,435.34, we have a remainder, ostensibly, in the paymaster's safe of $24,939. Yet the commander certifies that he found only $12,490.92.

By an inspection of the various charges and specifications presented to the court-martial it will be seen that most of the allegations of fraud are predicated on entries in the summary statements, showing larger sums to the credit of the paymaster in the subtreasuries than really existed. And upon these alleged shortages are based the charge of embezzlement. There are two ways apparent upon the record, as it is now before us, that these discrepancies are subject to explanation,

1. It seems to have been a custom of the paymaster, while the ship was on a cruise, to make purchase of supplies, such as coal, from time to time during the current quarter, paying for such purchases when made by checks and taking receipts. These receipts he did not enter on his summary statements for the first or second months of the quarter, but reported his balances in the subtreasuries as if such checks had not been given. During the third month of the quarter these receipts were frequently consolidated into a new receipt, which the parties furnishing the supplies would sign. The accumulated receipts were at the end of the quarter forwarded to the Fourth Auditor as vouchers to the quarterly current statement. They had not appeared upon either of the summary statements for the first two months.

This is illustrated in the three summaries for the first quarter of the fiscal year of 1892 (July, August, and September, 1891), of which we have already had occasion to speak. Neither the July nor the August summary shows any purchases of coal, but the September summary shows disbursements for coal to the amount of $5,832, and the itemized statement attached shows that 131 tons were purchased July 11, 120 tons August 4, 91 tons August 24, and 95 tons September 15. All of this coal was paid for on the days when purchased. The *Mohican* was then cruising in the Bering Sea. The coal was bought of Rudolph Neumann, as general agent of the Alaska Commercial Company, at Unalaska, in Alaska. Thus the Navy Department was apprised, by the summary for the third month in the quarter and its accompanying abstract of "public bills," of what had been expended during the whole quarter in this class of purchase.

Of the wisdom or propriety of this course the committee express no opinion. But it was a custom that must have been known to the Navy Department if these summary statements received any inspection, and it readily explains certain apparent misstatements in the entries on the summaries for the first two months of the quarter. For instance, Mr. Sullivan purchased 131 tons of coal, at $13.50 per ton, in July, and gave his check for the amount. This would amount to $1,768.50. The receipt for this amount was in his safe on the last day of the month, when the summary for that month was made up. He was not sure the outstanding check had reached the depository and been paid. Then, instead of charging his summary account with an expenditure of that amount, he simply made the entry against the subtreasury, as if the check had not been issued.

When the Navy Department came to make up the case against Mr. Sullivan they had the itemized accounts from the subtreasuries, and found that, at the end of a given month, where he had reported certain sums to his credit, there was a less sum, as checks issued during the month in question had been paid, and, further, what was found to his credit was subject to further diminution by reason of outstanding checks.

2. Another way in which the differences between what Sullivan alleged in his statements to be in the subtreasury at the end of the month and what was actually found to be there when the subtreasury account came to be stated can frequently be accounted for, in this: It often occurred that on the last day of the month, or the last day but one, he would make a check for cash to be used on board. This check would be placed in the hands of an express company to collect at the subtreasury and return the proceeds to the ship. When the summary was made up this check was outstanding. It may have been in transit to San Francisco, or the proceeds may have been on the way to the vessel. In any event the coin was not on board, and the amount of the check was not deducted from his balance at the subtreasury. Such checks, of course, were dated within the month for which the summary was made, and, in some cases, may have been actually paid within that month. If not so paid they were "outstanding checks," as set out in the specifications, chargeable to the account.

An examination of the account of the San Francisco subtreasury shows the entry of such checks, as follows:

Made.	Paid.	Amount.
November 30, 1891	December	$1,800
December 30, 1891	January	1,500
January 30, 1892	February	3,000
February 29, 1892	March	4,000
April 28, 1892	May	2,500
July 26, 1892	August	1,580
November 30, 1892	December	1,000
December 30, 1892	January	3,000
February 27, 1893	March	1,000

The paymaster evidently considered the summary reports as an approximate statement from month to month of a continuous open account. There was no attempt to make them absolutely accurate. His obvious thought was that such apparent inaccuracies as grew out of his retaining vouchers for coal and other supplies during the first two months of the quarter, and reporting the several amounts as in the subtreasury, and of reporting in the subtreasury the amount of checks drawn the last days of the month for cash to be used on board, would be set right in the quarterly current statement.

That he did render the required quarterly statements with regularity, and duly transmit with them the necessary vouchers, throughout his entire connection with the *Mohican* and the *Independence*, the time within which he was charged and convicted of embezzling, in the aggregate, the enormous sum of $52,151.99, is apparent from the following letters addressed to a member of the committee from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury and the Fourth Auditor:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *March 24, 1894.*

SIR: In reply to your communication of the 19th instant, asking for information in regard to the accounts of John Clyde Sullivan, late a paymaster in the United States Navy, for use of the Committee on Naval Affairs in connection with Senate bill No. 1655, I have the honor to transmit herewith a report of the Fourth Auditor of the 22d instant, covering the information desired.

Respectfully, yours, W. E. CURTIS, *Acting Secretary.*

Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS, *United States Senate.*

—

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE FOURTH AUDITOR,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1894.

SIR: Your letter of the 19th instant to the honorable Secretary of the Treasury relative to the accounts of John Clyde Sullivan, late a paymaster in the United States Navy, has been referred to this office.

"In reply thereto you are informed that the accounts of Paymaster John Clyde Sullivan, of the *Mohican* and *Independence*, were rendered to this office for settlement with but little delay, which delay was satisfactorily explained, and he has accounted to the Treasury for all moneys intrusted to him for disbursements, and has deposited all balances due the United States except the sum of $150.88, due by his final account current of the *Independence*, which amount was offset by pay due him at the date of rendering his final accounts of that ship.

"He has never been called upon to make any deposits of Government funds in consequence of the proceedings and finding of a naval court-martial.

"Respectfully,

"C. B. MORTON, *Auditor.*

"Hon. GEO. C. PERKINS,
"*United States Senate.*"

There will also be found attached, as an exhibit to this report, a copy of a certified statement made by the Fourth Auditor of the Treasury, in which is set out the total expenditures and total receipts of John Clyde Sullivan, paymaster, United States Navy, from March 31, 1891, to May 5, 1893, covering the time he served on board the two steamers, *Mohican* and *Independence*. The summary found at the foot of this statement is as follows:

Total receipts as shown by account current	$234,211.19
Total expenditures	220,117.83
Balance deposited	14,093.36

Attached to this statement, and as a part of it, is a further statement entitled: "Expenditures, as shown by summary statements, from December 16, 1890, to May 5, 1893."

In this latter statement the expenditures are put down for each month, but the months are grouped into quarters and the footings for each quarter given. An examination shows that the aggregate expenditures for each quarter thus made up by months from the summary statements rendered the Paymaster-General by Mr. Sullivan tallies exactly with the expenditures set forth on the quarterly returns on which the Treasury Department settled his accounts, with the exception of a single quarter. The "Quarterly" for December 31, 1892, showed total expenditures of $34,034.93, while the sum of expenditures on the three monthly statements for that same quarter showed $34,176.95—a discrepancy of $142.02. This is remarkable. Here are summary statements running through more than two years, most of them being made while the paymaster was on board his vessel cruising in the Bering Sea. But the vouchers which accompany the quarterly statements, when all rounded up, tally with the disbursements set down in the summaries, with only a difference in a single quarter of the small item of $142.02.

It will be seen that the committee have thus far confined their report largely to the question of whether or not the paymaster could have been guilty of embezzlement. As was said at the outset, this is the material matter in the charges upon which he was tried. If he was not guilty of this crime he should not have been dismissed. It is evident from a statement in the files of the case, made by the Secretary to the President, that the Navy Department takes the same view. In a long letter reviewing the case the Secretary deals principally with the question of embezzlement. It is not the purpose of the committee to follow and discuss all the topics he touches upon. But it is apparent that the Secretary felt that the case of embezzlement was not strong if it rested simply upon the discrepancies between the statements made by Sullivan in the summaries as to the amounts to his credit in the subtreasuries on a fixed date and the amounts actually found there on that date. It was necessary to find where and when he had drawn money from those accounts to appropriate to his own use. Accordingly, on pages 16 and 17 the Secretary makes the following statement:

"By reference to Exhibit Z-20 of the record it will be seen upon the credit side of the account that after Paymaster Sullivan left the *Mohican* he paid, on account of that ship, bills amounting to $118.50 only, and deducted for pay of himself and clerk $1,127.52, or a total of $1,246.02. Turning to Exhibit Z-29-30 of the record, Paymaster Sullivan's account with the subtreasurer at New York, it will be seen that he checked out—

March 11	$45
March 11	251
March 14	100
March 13	50
March 13	264
March 13	274
April 12	100
April 22	500
April 21	21
April 3	133
April 24	25
May 3	1,000
Making a total of	2,763

"If we deduct the amount, $1,246.02, with which he credited himself in his monthly summary statement for March and April, 1893, which included the pay of himself and clerk and all other moneys he had a right to draw for, we find that Paymaster Sullivan must have used the sum of $1,516.98 for his own purposes. There is no escaping this conclusion. The two exhibits named above are both in evidence, and Mr. Sullivan has never attempted, either by testimony or argument, to make any explanation of this fact. Remembering that he drew during the months of March and April and up to the 3d of May from the *Mohican* deposits in the subtreasury this large sum, drawing it from day to day as he seemed to have use for it, and as he would naturally do if using it for his own purposes, the proof that he was converting Government funds to his own use is conclusive beyond the possibility of a doubt."

Now, whatever may have been the omissions of the accused or his counsel at the trial before the court-martial to explain the items appearing to have been checked from the subtreasuries, it is now in proof before us that each check set out above, making up the aggregate of $2,763, was drawn for a proper and legitimate purpose and duly paid. The committee had the canceled checks brought from the Treasury Department to the committee room. It will be seen that the Secretary admits that of the whole amount the sum of $1,246.02 might have been properly drawn. The latter sum was due to meet the paymaster's salary and that of his clerk, and pay $118.50 of bills for the ship.

The evidence of the checks themselves show that the following ones appearing in the Secretary's list were drawn against the paymaster's own salary:

March 11	$45
March 14	100
April 12	100
April 22	500
April 21	21
April 3	133
April 24	25
Making in all	924

Then the check drawn March 13 for $50 was to pay the clerk (Norbey). Deducting these amounts from the whole sum given leaves $1,789. This amount is accounted for by the following four checks, the first three being given in payment of bills due merchants, and to their respective orders, for provisions furnished the messes of the U. S. S. *Mohican*, and the one for $1,000, drawn May 3, for the transfer of funds from the subtreasury in New York, for disbursements while on duty, as follows:

March 11, to James Brownlie	$251
March 13, to James McCudden	264
March 12, to Corcoran & Collins	274
May 3, to John Clyde Sullivan	1,000
In all	1,787

The receipts for the above amounts paid for provisions are in the possession of the committee. Thus every item that the Secretary has given, and on which he founds the allegation that they furnished "the proof that the accused was converting Government funds to his own use is conclusive beyond the possibility of a doubt," is proven to have been quite legitimate.

There is one item of $1,552.20 received from the sale of provisions to officers and their messes on board the *Mohican*, which Mr. Sullivan charged against himself, but it is not accounted for on his cash returns. This item deserves separate and special attention. When the *Mohican* started for an extended cruise in Bering Sea an unusual supply of provisions was taken aboard. These were stored in all parts of the vessel where room could be found, and outside of the usual storerooms provided, thus preventing the ordinary supervision and care of such stores. Throughout the cruise the quarterly statements of Paymaster Sullivan were duly made and verified by the commanding officer of the ship. It was at the end of the cruise, extending through more than two years, when the final inventory was taken for transfer to his relief that a shortage of $1,520.62 was discovered.

This amount is equal to at least three times the amount of provisions which could have been sold on any ship of the Navy of that class during one quarter. In the confusion resulting from a summary removal an inventory was hurriedly made and the shortage developed. Knowing that in this alleged shortage there must be an error which would be straightened when the accounts came to be settled finally, Mr. Sullivan very properly charged himself with the entire amount for which he was liable, leaving an open question between himself and his bondsmen and the Treasury Department, which question was to be settled when his affairs were finally adjusted. The committee can not find in this transaction anything other than an honorable course on Mr. Sullivan's part, and the settlement effected at the Treasury Department in regard to this item sustains the committee in its opinion.

In closing this report the committee unhesitatingly state that they give some weight in determining the probabilities of the innocence of the accused to his long and honorable career in the service of his country. He entered the Army during the late war of the rebellion as a drummer boy at the age of 12 years. He served throughout the war, and upon the recommendation of a number of eminent soldiers, who knew of his most creditable services in the Army, he was appointed by President Grant an assistant paymaster in the Navy, and served in that office for more than twenty-three years. During that time he disbursed more than $1,000,000 of money, and the Treasury Department passed all his accounts without question. Up to the time of the court-martial in question no breath of defamation had touched his high character for honor and honesty. It will be a sad day for the Republic when such a reputation counts for nothing in meeting charges of crime.

The committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MOUNTAIN VIEW CEMETERY ASSOCIATION.

The joint resolution (S. R. 15) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the Mountain View Cemetery Association, at Oakland, Cal., certain cannon, etc., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to add the following:

Provided further, That the United States shall not be subjected to any expense in connection with the donation of the articles referred to.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to donate and deliver, under such conditions as he may deem necessary in order to insure the proper fulfillment of the purposes of this resolution, to the Mount View Cemetery Association, at Oakland, Cal., such old and unused cannon, muskets, swords, and other implements of war, of copper, tin, bronze, iron, and steel, as are not now and will not hereafter be required for naval uses, for the purpose of being used for parades, anniversary celebrations, and salutes: *Provided*, That such articles only be donated, under the authority herein contained, as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy may be spared without detriment to the public interests: *Provided further*, That the United States shall not be subjected to any expense in connection with the donation of the articles referred to.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, January 14, 1896.

The committee recommend the passage of this bill, with the provision suggested in the letter of the Secretary of the Navy, which is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 11, 1896.

SIR: In reply to the letter of the committee, dated the 7th instant, referring to joint resolution No. 15, "authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the Mountain View Cemetery Association, at Oakland, Cal., certain cannon, etc.," and requesting to be advised as to the views of the Department in regard to said resolution, I have the honor to inform you that, the matter having been referred to the Bureau of Ordnance for report, that Bureau has submitted the following expression of opinion:

As this resolution donates only such articles as, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy, can be spared without detriment to the public interests, the Bureau sees no objection to its passage.'

The Department concurs in the views expressed by the Bureau of Ordnance, but would suggest that a further provision be inserted in this resolution to the effect that the United States shall not be subjected to any expense in connection with the donation of the articles referred to.

Very respectfully,

H. A. HERBERT, *Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
United States Senate.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM BROWN.

The bill (S. 466) granting a pension to William Brown, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Brown, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Michigan Cavalry, at $20 a month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to William Brown."

MOLLIE CRANDALL.

The bill (S. 507) to pension Mollie Crandall was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mollie Crandall, widow of Clark P. Crandall, deceased, and late captain of Company C, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, and pay her $20 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES F. HOLLY.

The bill (S. 1303) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Holly was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the words "rate of," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "fifty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles F. Holly, late captain of Company H, of the Second Colorado Cavalry, at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of the pension now received by him.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELEN L. DENT.

The bill (S. 748) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Dent was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the words "rate of," to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "fifty"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Helen L. Dent, widow of the late Frederick T. Dent, colonel, retired, United States Army, at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of the sum of $30 per month now received.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY DOUBLEDAY.

The bill (S. 1203) granting an increase of pension to Mary Doubleday, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Abner Doubleday, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary Doubleday, widow of Maj. Gen. Abner Doubleday, and to pay her a pension of $100 per month, in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE.

The bill (S. 1176) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Oregon and Washington Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Columbia River, between the State of Oregon and the State of Washington, and to establish it as a post road," was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT ST. LOUIS.

The bill (S. 214) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, from some suitable point between the north line of St. Clair County, Ill., and the southwest line of said county, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in section 9, line 1, after the first word, "That," to strike out "all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act are repealed, and"; so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CHAPELL, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the bill (H. R. 4241) for improving Aransas Pass, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE NEAR CHAMBERLAIN, S. DAK.

The bill (S. 636) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Chamberlain, in Brule County and Lyman County, in the State of South Dakota, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That it shall be lawful for the Dakota Pacific Bridge Company, a corporation now being organized for that purpose under the general corporation laws of the State of South Dakota, or its assigns, to construct under and subject to the conditions and limitations hereinafter provided, a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, within 5 miles above or below the city of Chamberlin, S. Dak., and lay on and over said bridge railway tracks for the more perfect connection of any and all railroads that are now or which may hereafter be constructed to the Missouri River at or within 5 miles above or below the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak., or to the river on the opposite side of the same, near the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak., and build, erect, and lay on and over said bridge ways for wagons, vehicles of all kinds, and for the transit of animals, and to provide ways for foot passengers, and to maintain and operate said bridge for the purposes aforesaid; and that when said bridge is constructed all trains of railroads terminating at said river and on the opposite side thereof, at or within 5 miles above or below the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak., shall be allowed to cross said bridge and its approaches for reasonable compensation to be made to the owners of the same; and if the amount of said compensation can not be agreed upon by the parties, the same shall be fixed by the Secretary of War. The owners of said bridge may also charge and receive reasonable compensation or tolls for the transit over said bridge of all wagons, carriages, vehicles, animals, and foot passengers: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may at any time prescribe such rules, regulations, and rates of toll for transit and transportation over said bridge as may be deemed proper and reasonable.

SEC. 2. That any bridge built under the provisions of this act may, at the option of the corporation building the same, be built as a drawbridge, or with unbroken or continuous spans: *Provided*, That if the same shall be made of unbroken or continuous spans, it shall not be in any case of less elevation than 50 feet above extreme high-water mark as understood at the point of location to the lowest part of the superstructure, with straight girders, nor shall the spans of said bridge be less than 300 feet in the clear at low-water mark; and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with the current of the river at high water, and the main spans shall be over the main channels of the river: *And provided also*, That if a bridge shall be built under this act as a drawbridge, the same shall be constructed as a pivot drawbridge, with one or more draws, as the Secretary of War may prescribe, and with spans of not less than 200 feet in length in the clear on each side of the central or pivot piers of the draws, and the next adjoining spans over the river to the draw shall not be less than 250 feet in the clear, measured at low water; and said span shall not be less than 10 feet above extreme high-water mark, measuring to the lowest part of the superstructure of the bridge; and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with the current of the river at high water: *And provided also*, That said draw shall be opened promptly, upon reasonable signal, without unnecessary delay, for the passage of boats and rafts; and said company or corporation shall maintain, at its own expense, from sunset till sunrise, such lights or other signals on said bridge as the Light-House Board shall prescribe, and such sheer booms or other structures as may be necessary to safely guide vessels, rafts, or other water craft safely through said channel spans or draw openings, and as shall be designated and required by the Secretary of War: *And provided further*, That the corporation building said bridge may, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, enter upon the banks of said river, either above or below the point of location of said bridge, and confine the flow of the water to a permanent channel, and to do whatever may be necessary to accomplish said object, but shall not impede or obstruct the navigation of said river, and shall be liable in damages for all injuries to private property, and all plans for such works or erections upon the banks of the river shall first be submitted to the Secretary of War for his approval: *And provided further*, That any bridge built under the provisions of this act shall be at right angles to the current of the river at high water.

SEC. 3. That no bridge shall be erected or maintained under the authority of this act which shall at any time substantially or materially obstruct the free navigation of said river; and the said company shall submit to the Secretary of War for his approval drawings showing the plan and location of said bridge, and until the said plan and location of the bridge are decided by the Secretary of War to be such as will not materially affect the interests of navigation and are approved by him the bridge shall not be commenced or built; and any change in the plan of such construction or any alteration in the bridge after its construction shall be subject to the like approval; and whenever said bridge shall, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, substantially obstruct the free navigation of said river, he is hereby authorized to cause such change or alteration of said bridge to be made as will effectually obviate such obstruction; and all such alterations shall be made and all such obstructions be removed at the expense of the owner or owners of said bridge, or the persons operating or controlling the same; and in case of any litigation arising from any obstruction or alleged obstruction to the free navigation of the Missouri River, at or near the crossing of said bridge, caused or alleged to be caused thereby, the cause shall be commenced and tried in the

circuit courts of the United States of either judicial district of South Dakota in which the said bridge or any portion of such obstruction touches.

SEC. 4. That any bridge built under this act and according to its limitations shall be a lawful structure, and shall be recognized and known as a post route, upon which also no higher charge shall be made for the transportation over the same of the mails, the troops, and the munitions of war of the United States than the rate per mile paid for the transportation over the railroad or public highways leading to such bridge. The United States shall also have the right to construct, without charge therefor, telegraph or telephone lines across said bridge.

SEC. 5. That Congress may at any time alter, amend, or repeal this act.

SEC. 6. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Chamberlain, S. Dak."

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 4043) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

BRIDGE OVER OBION RIVER, TENNESSEE.

The bill (S. 25) authorizing the Dyersburg and Mississippi River Railway and Improvement Company to bridge the Obion River in the State of Tennessee was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in section 1, line 22, after the word "piers," to insert "at the low-water line," and in line 30, after the word "clear," to insert "at the low-water line"; so as to read:

Said span shall have a clear opening of at least 150 feet between the piers at the low-water line, measured at right angles to the current, and shall be over the main channel of the river; and the bridge shall be at right angles to and the piers parallel with the current of the river. And if the bridge over the said river shall be constructed as a draw or pivot bridge, the draw or pivot pier shall be over the main channel of the river at an accessible navigable point and the openings on each side of the pivot pier shall not be less than 100 feet in the clear at the low-water line unless otherwise expressly directed by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM P. BUCKMASTER.

The bill (S. 90) for the relief of William P. Buckmaster was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to William P. Buckmaster, surviving partner of James Murphy & Co., $22,386.61, the balance due for labor and material furnished by James Murphy & Co. in the construction of the machinery for the double-ender vessel *Otsego* in 1862.

Mr. PLATT. I should like to have the report in this case read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The report will be read.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Connecticut permit me?

Mr. PLATT. I should like to have the report read.

Mr. ALLEN. It may consume an hour or two to read the report.

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps the Senator from Nebraska can state briefly the substance of the report.

Mr. ALLEN. I think a similar bill has been reported favorably several times.

Mr. COCKRELL. Such a bill was passed at the last session.

Mr. ALLEN. It was passed at the last session of Congress. The bill proposes to allow the surviving partner of James Murphy & Co., who built this vessel during the days of the war, under a guaranty from the Navy Department that they should not lose money in its construction, the balance due for labor and machinery. They did not seek to make any money, but the rise in the price of materials and labor was so rapid and constant at that time that a guaranty was exacted from the Navy Department. The matter was considered by the Selfridge Board several years ago, and a similar bill has been reported favorably heretofore and passed.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF JOHN C. HOWE.

The bill (S. 32) for the relief of the legal representatives of John C. Howe, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to the legal representatives of John C. Howe, deceased, $66,907, compensation in full for the use by the United States in cup-anvil cartridges of the invention secured to John C. Howe by letters patent of the United States.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to have the Senator who reported the bill make a short explanation of it, or let the first part of the report be read.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. I can make a statement as to the bill.

Mr. PLATT. I think perhaps the Senator from Massachusetts can state even better than I can the object of the bill. The parties for whom the bill is to be passed were the owners of a patent for the manufacture of cartridges, and the parties interested in it are the people who bought it from the original inventor upon an understanding that they were to manufacture the cartridges, and with an understanding as to the amount they were to pay to the inventor from any profits which they might derive from it. The inventor is now dead and his daughter takes his place.

There was a suit upon this invention brought in the State of Connecticut against the superintendent of the Springfield Armory, and the patent was adjudged to be valid. There was no accounting at the time of the suit, but this is one of the first cases which was referred to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act. The court went into the matter fully, and it found that the parties who were plaintiffs in the suit were entitled to $69,000, which is the sum proposed to be paid by the bill, without interest. One-third of it is to be paid to the daughter of the inventor. I believe that is a fair statement of the case. The Government was represented by the Attorney-General before the Court of Claims. A similar bill passed the Senate at the last session of Congress, I believe.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CHAPELL, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 1712) granting to the First Regiment North Carolina State Guard two condemned cannon;

A bill (H. R. 3265) donating one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to Stone River Post, No. 74, Grand Army of the Republic, Sedan, Kans.;

A bill (H. R. 3544) empowering and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish not more than four pieces of condemned cannon to the village of New Rochelle, N. Y.;

A bill (H. R. 3982) granting to Lincoln Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hope Valley, R. I., one condemned cannon; also, to the Woman's Relief Corps of Taylorsville, Ill., four condemned cannon and four condemned cannon balls for the purpose of decorating a soldiers' monument lately erected there by said corps; and, also, to the town of Newton, in the State of New Jersey, four pieces of condemned cannon and twenty cannon balls, for the decoration of the new soldiers and sailors' monument in that town; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 24) providing for immediate destruction of income-tax returns, etc.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 1712) granting to the First Regiment, North Carolina State Guard, two condemned cannon;

A bill (H. R. 3265) donating one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to Stone River Post, No. 74, Grand Army of the Republic, Sedan, Kans.;

A bill (H. R. 3544) empowering and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish not more than four pieces of condemned cannon to the village of New Rochelle, N. Y.; and

A bill (H. R. 3982) granting to Lincoln Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hope Valley, R. I., one condemned cannon; also to the Woman's Relief Corps of Taylorsville, Ill., four condemned cannon and four condemned cannon balls, for the purpose of decorating a soldiers' monument lately erected there by said corps; and also to the town of Newton, in the State of New Jersey, four pieces of condemned cannon and twenty cannon balls, for the decoration of a new soldiers' and sailors' monument in that town.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 24) providing for immediate destruction of income-tax returns, etc., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PALMER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Illinois give way for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois withdraw his motion so as to enable the Senator from New York to be heard?

Mr. PALMER. I am willing to hear a suggestion from any quarter, but I am very anxious that there shall be an executive session this afternoon.

Mr. HILL. I simply wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that here are three or four bills just passed by the House of Representatives and duly referred to the appropriate committee, relating to the giving away of condemned cannon or allowing various posts of the Grand Army of the Republic to receive condemned cannon. A year or two ago I had a bill of that character passed. Senators will find such bills upon the Calendars of each House very frequently.

Now, I suggest to the committee to whom those bills are referred whether there can not be a general bill passed authorizing some executive officer of the Government, the Secretary of War, for instance, to allow those various people or organizations to have condemned cannon. Why should it require a special bill every time we dispose of a single cannon throughout the country?

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. Hearing the captions of the bills read I remarked to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] who sits on my right, that when they came to the Naval Committee I thought it would be a fitting thing to have a general statute reported prescribing that whenever any of those cannons or when munitions of war have become useless the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War should be allowed, in their discretion, to distribute them. Thus our Calendar would be rid of these numerous cases. I am glad the Senator from New York has called attention to the matter, because I propose when the bills reach the Naval Committee to submit a proposition for a general statute on the subject.

Mr. HILL. I have said all I care to say. The Senator from Illinois can now have a vote on his motion.

Mr. HOAR. The suggestion made by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Maine has come after I had made a like suggestion in regard to bridge bills. I should like to have the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, consider the matter. At the end of nearly every session of Congress, when we are very much pressed for time, when every minute is precious, when measures of great importance are going over, there come in long bridge bills of several pages of our printed documents, setting forth in detail the precautions for the safety of commerce and the public convenience which the Secretary must take before allowing a bridge to be built.

It seems to me it might be possible for the Committee on Commerce to devise a general bill providing that all bridges should comply with certain conditions, and then, when we pass a bill, say that the corporation is authorized to construct its bridge subject to the provisions of such a statute, or, if the provisions are not uniform in all cases, have some items or articles numbered in the general statute to which the subsequent legislation could refer. I presume we could save hours of very valuable time if that could be accomplished.

Mr. VEST. I wish to state, in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts, that the matter of which he has spoken has been before the Commerce Committee for the past four years. We have twice reported a bill, which I had the honor in a large measure to draft, with a view to emancipating the Senate from the nuisance of which he speaks. After debate in the Senate on each occasion something intervened under our rules, which we all know to be perfect, so that the bill was not considered to its final determination.

Such a bill is now before the Committee on Commerce, and it will be reported again. It emancipates the Senate from all bridge bills, so far as the Western rivers are concerned, and that is the source from which legislation of this character comes, there being very little from other parts of the country.

Mr. HOAR. I will pledge to the Senator from Missouri one vote in favor of the bill when it comes into the Senate.

Mr. VILAS. I merely wish to suggest, in the same line, that it would be well for the Committee on Indian Affairs to prepare the draft of a general law giving to railroad companies the privilege of passing through Indian reservations, another class of bills somewhat lengthy. It would be far better, and in the interest of the Government, if the Secretary of the Interior were to dispose of the subject under such general regulations as Congress might provide.

Mr. HALE. What has become of the motion of the Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Illinois to have withdrawn the motion.

Mr. VILAS. I will renew it, if there is nothing to be brought before the Senate.

Mr. FRYE. There are two bills that I should like to have passed to-day. It will not take five minutes. The Senator is absent who has charge of the next bill on the Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that No. 79 and No. 80 on the Order of Business be taken up. They are very short bills.

Mr. COCKRELL. We shall reach them in a moment.

Mr. FRYE. If some one does not move an executive session.

Mr. COCKRELL. That will not be done for a little while.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill on the Calendar will be stated.

NEWBERRY COLLEGE, SOUTH CAROLINA.

The bill (S. 271) for the relief of Newberry College, Newberry, S. C., was announced as next in order on the Calendar, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to pay to the trustees of the Newberry College of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of South Carolina, in Newberry, in said State, $15,000 for injuries to the buildings of the college, resulting in its destruction, and caused by the troops of the United States while in possession of it and occupying it as a barrack, after the close of the war, in 1865, in South Carolina, this sum to be in full payment of all claims by the college on account of the use, occupation, and loss of the buildings.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAILROAD LAND GRANTS.

The bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants, made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that bill be passed over for the present, without losing its place.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I hope the Senator from Missouri will allow the bill to be passed. It is a very short bill and has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Public Lands. I do not think there is any objection to it at all. It is wholly in the interest of the settlers.

Mr. COCKRELL. Very well. I see that the Senator who reported the bill is present. I thought he was out of the Chamber at the moment.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill; which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1887, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That where such purchasers, their heirs or assigns, have paid only a portion of the purchase price to the company, which is less than the Government price of similar lands, they shall be required, before the delivery of patent for their lands, to pay to the Government a sum equal to the difference between the portion of the purchase price so paid and the Government price, and in such case the amount demanded from the company shall be the amount paid to it by such purchaser."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FINANCIAL POLICY.

The resolution introduced by Mr. MILLS on the 14th instant relative to United States legal-tender notes outstanding, coinage of the silver bullion now in the Treasury, etc., was announced as the next business on the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. Let that go over.

Mr. FRYE. That will lead to debate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over without losing its place.

TITLES OF NOBILITY.

The bill (S. 654) to prevent citizens of the United States from soliciting or receiving and accepting titles, patents of nobility, or degrees of honor from foreign nations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. FRYE. There is an adverse report in that case, which operates as an objection to the consideration of a bill under Rule VIII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over without losing its place.

ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS.

The bill (S. 502) to approve a compromise and settlement between the United States and the State of Arkansas was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over without losing its place.

INTERNATIONAL MARINE CONFERENCE.

The bill (S. 1450) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889 was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Commerce whether he has reason to believe that the reconvening of the conference will be followed by a successful attempt to adopt international regulations.

Mr. FRYE. I have myself no idea that there will be any necessity to reconvene the delegates, but Great Britain has not yet consented to the rules which the Maritime Congress unanimously reported. We enacted them into a law, to become law when the President of the United States should issue a proclamation to that effect. Great Britain then entered an objection to one of the rules and no action has been had since. The Commissioner of Navigation saw the English Board of Trade and they informed him that at the opening of Parliament they should submit these questions to the Parliament and undoubtedly there would be an agreement; but Parliament might seek to amend. If they desired to amend, we thought it very proper indeed that the Secretary of State should be in a condition to call our delegates together to act upon the amendments proposed by Great Britain; that is all.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION OF WAGES OF SEAMEN.

The bill (S. 1423) to protect the wages of seamen was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments: In line 18, to strike out the words "It is hereby further enacted that" and insert "and"; in line 19, to strike out the word "paper" and insert "order or decree"; and after the word "void," in line 21, to strike out the remainder of the bill, in the following words:

And any officer executing the same shall be punished, upon conviction thereof before any State or United States court, by fine not to exceed $300 or imprisonment not to exceed three months, at the discretion of the court, for each and every offense.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4536 of the Revised Statutes be, and it is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4536. No wages due or accruing to any seaman or apprentice shall be subject to attachment or arrestment from any court; and every payment of wages to a seaman or apprentice shall be valid in law, notwithstanding any previous sale or assignment of wages, or any attachment, incumbrance, or arrestment thereon; and no assignment or sale of wages or salvage, made prior to the accruing thereof, shall bind the party making the same, except such advance securities as are authorized by this title; and the provisions of this section shall extend to and embrace seamen and apprentices in the domestic or coasting trade and the trade between the United States and ports in the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland and the West India Islands and Mexico, and to seamen in the whale or other fishing business. And any writ or attachment or other order or decree for the enforced collection of a seaman's wages, in contravention of this section, shall be void."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTHA ALLEN.

The bill (S. 248) granting a pension to Martha Allen was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Martha Allen, of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kans., widow of Robert Allen, deceased, late a private in Company I, Second Regiment Kansas State Militia Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE FEDERAL CENSUS.

The joint resolution (S. R. 47) relating to the Federal census was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported from the Committee on Census with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Commissioner of Labor, now in charge of the Eleventh Census, is hereby authorized and directed to correspond with the census officers of other Governments for the purpose of securing uniformity in the inquiries relating to the people to be used in future censuses; and that said Commissioner is also hereby directed to report to Congress for its consideration, as soon as practicable, a plan for a permanent census service.

Mr. HALE. In line 5, after the word "correspond," I move to insert the words "and confer," so as to read:

That the Commissioner of Labor, now in charge of the Eleventh Census, is hereby authorized and directed to correspond and confer with the census officers of other Governments, etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

HEIRS OF JAMES BRIDGER.

The bill (S. 82) for the relief of the heirs of James Bridger, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to the heirs of James Bridger, deceased, $6,000, in full satisfaction for his improvements made at Fort Bridger, Utah Territory, which were appropriated by the United States Army, in the fall of 1857, under command of Brig. Gen. Albert S. Johnston.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM A. STARKWEATHER.

The bill (S. 535) for the relief of William A. Starkweather, of Oregon, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to William A. Starkweather, of Oregon, $2,170, being the amount paid out by him to Owen Wade for clerk hire in the United States land office at Oregon City while Starkweather was register of the land office.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETER GRANT STEWART.

The bill (S. 529) for the relief of Peter Grant Stewart, of Oregon, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to Peter Grant Stewart, of Gervais, Oreg., $7,500, in full for property owned by him and taken by the United States, and included within the military reservation near the mouth of the Columbia River, in Pacific County, now State, then Territory, of Washington, taken under and by virtue of an executive order dated Washington, D. C., February 26, 1852.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. L. ADAMS.

The bill (S. 709) for the relief of W. L. Adams, of Oregon, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to W. L. Adams, late collector of customs at Astoria, Oreg., $461.02, found to be due him as such collector on the settlement of his accounts in the Treasury Department.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KANSAS CITY, PITTSBURG AND GULF RAILROAD.

Mr. HALE. I suggest that we have an executive session.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator from Maine will permit me, there is a bill on the Calendar which will be reached the next in order. I understand the joint resolution which intervenes will go over. It is necessary to pass that bill now if at all. I hope the Senator will not object. It is a mere formal matter.

Mr. HALE. What is the bill?

Mr. VEST. It is the bill (S. 1046) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893.

Mr. COCKRELL. I suggest to my colleague to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. VEST. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered now. The joint resolution that intervenes will not be considered to-day, as the Senator who reported it has given notice that he will call it up to-morrow. The bill to which I refer is simply a bill in regard to a right of way through the Indian Territory, and it is necessary to have action upon it immediately.

The joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. VEST. That goes over until to-morrow, I understand, by notice from the Senator who reported it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over without losing its place on the Calendar.

The bill (S. 1046) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, to strike out section 2, in the following words:

SEC. 2. That said act be further amended by adding thereto the following, which shall be known as section 13 of said act; that is to say:

"SEC. 13. That the said railroad company shall have, and is hereby given, the right to sell and convey its bridges across the Arkansas River and the Poteau River in the Indian Territory, or either of them, together with their approaches and supports, to any bridge company or companies which may be organized for the purpose of purchasing them, or either of them; and any company which may purchase either of said bridges shall have the power to own and maintain and operate the same, and to charge and collect toll for the use thereof by railroad companies or others, and may from time to time issue bonds and secure the same by giving one or more mortgages on said bridge

and its appurtenances and franchises; and that all mortgages executed by any such bridge company conveying either of said bridges, with its appurtenances, supports, and franchises, shall be filed for record in the Department of the Interior, and such filing shall be evidence and notice of their execution, and such mortgages shall have the effect of conveying all rights and property of such bridge company as therein expressed."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. After the word "war," in line 19, I move to insert:

And with the right to locate, construct, maintain, and operate a spur of this railroad from a point on said branch about 4 miles northeast of Scullyville, by the most practicable route, to a point on the west line of the State of Arkansas about 10 miles south of Fort Smith, and with the right to build in the line of said spur a bridge over the Poteau River, whose plan of construction shall first be approved by the Secretary of War.

Mr. PLATT. Is it proposed to provide for two bridges over the Poteau River, or does the amendment relate only to the bridge which is spoken of in the bill?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If the Senator from Missouri will permit me, I will state that it is for a second bridge. The original bridge provides for a spur running out from the main line of the road 14 miles west of Fort Smith to the city of Fort Smith. This is a proposition to add an additional spur to the spur, turning out at the town of Scullyville, in the Indian Territory, and running to a point on the Arkansas line south of Fort Smith, intending to reach certain coal fields in the county of Sebastian south of Fort Smith.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. The same amendment must be made elsewhere in the bill. It must come in in two places or it will not be right. My colleague's amendment is inserted in line 19, which is the right place; but then the whole section is reconstructed, and it must go in at line 41 as well.

Mr. VEST. It can be put in there.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the same words my colleague has offered be inserted in the bill which gives the section as it will read when amended. That will be over on page 3, line 41.

Mr. VEST. Simply repeating the provision.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is necessary to repeat it.

Mr. VEST. It will not do any harm at any rate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "war," in line 41, on page 3, insert:

And with the right to locate, construct, maintain, and operate a spur of this railroad from a point on said branch about 4 miles northeast of Scullyville, by the most practicable route, to a point on the west line of the State of Arkansas about 10 miles south of Fort Smith, and with the right to build in the line of said spur a bridge over the Poteau River, whose plan of construction shall first be approved by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then insert the word "and" so as to continue after the words just inserted, "and with the right to construct, use, and maintain such tracks, turn-outs, sidings," etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment will be agreed to, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. PALMER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive business the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 22, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 21, 1896.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF STEAM ENGINEERING.

Chief Engineer George W. Melville, United States Navy, to be Engineer in Chief and Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering.

POSTMASTERS.

John Riley, jr., to be postmaster at North Amherst, in the county of Lorain and State of Ohio.

George T. Roof, to be postmaster at Corning, in the county of Perry and State of Ohio.

Frank P. Furlong, to be postmaster at Hartford, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Charles E. Boehme, to be postmaster at Germantown, in the county of Montgomery and State of Ohio.

Andrew J. Ewing, to be postmaster at McComb, in the county of Hancock and State of Ohio.

John Nesbitt, to be postmaster at Chicago, in the county of Huron and State of Ohio.

James Ramage, to be postmaster at Gibsonburg, in the county of Sandusky and State of Ohio.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 21, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DOCUMENTS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report the following joint resolution, and to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Printing, asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution which the Clerk will report to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H. Res. 66) to supply the Department of State with documents.

Resolved, etc., That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to print, in addition to the usual number, and furnish the Department of State with 20 copies of each Senate and House of Representatives document and report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution reported to the House? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I did not object; but I will be glad to know why this resolution is necessary. It is a concurrent resolution, is it not?

The SPEAKER. It is a joint resolution.

Mr. PERKINS. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is rendered necessary by the printing act of the last Congress. Heretofore 20 copies of each document and report have been sent to the Department of State. No provision for that was made in the printing act. Accompanying the report is a letter of the Secretary of State making the request for the additional number of documents to be filed in his office.

Mr. DOCKERY. What number?

Mr. PERKINS. Twenty of each document and report. If the gentleman requires it, I will have the letter of the Secretary of State read.

Mr. CANNON. I take the gentleman's word for it; but I want to give notice now to the House——

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is utterly impossible to hear what gentlemen are saying.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken. Gentlemen will take their seats, and the gentleman will suspend until order is obtained.

Mr. CANNON. Last Congress the so-called printing act was passed under the leadership of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON]. Doubt was expressed at the time as to the propriety of its enactment, but from the gentleman's long experience upon that committee the House took his judgment, and the legislation was enacted. Since that time organization has been had. Perhaps the Printing Committee and God know what the organization is under this law, how many new offices, how much additional expense is covered up as against the offices that were abolished. I do not know; but from day to day somebody from that committee or some member of the House rises and asks unanimous consent that there be so many copies of such and such a document printed, and asks for the passage of a concurrent or a joint resolution. Now, then, it seems to me one of two things is to happen: Either a large portion of the time of this House from time to time is to be taken up by the enactment of concurrent or joint resolutions that will nullify or piece that printing act, or the Committee on Printing will have to mend its hold and give us such an amendment of that act as will enable it to operate so as to transact the business of the country and the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is about the fourth, fifth, or sixth time that the gentleman from Illinois has found it necessary in his judgment and wisdom to arraign the Printing Committee.

Mr. CANNON. No; the act, not the committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. To arraign the committee and the act which was passed, an act coming from the Printing Committee of the last Congress and also the Printing Committee of the Fifty-second Congress. I had supposed that his remarks heretofore were made in a humorous vein, and have treated his criticism in that way; but evidently from the earnest tone of my distinguished friend this morning he has lost something of what I supposed to be his equanimity or good nature in his criticism and gives vent to feeling in the matter.

Mr. CANNON. I have no feeling about it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Evidently, then, the gentleman's manner does not indicate his feelings. I thought the gentleman's manner betrayed feeling. He proceeds in an insinuating way to arraign gentlemen who were instrumental in having this printing bill passed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that these resolutions which the gentleman refers to will of necessity arise. They have always arisen. This resolution simply provides that there shall be printed and delivered to the Secretary of State some additional copies of documents. The reason for it is that the printing law did what gentlemen who framed it and those who supported it in the last Congress thought and contended it would do; that is, economize or reduce the number of documents printed. As an evidence of the fact that we succeeded in accomplishing that purpose, the Secretary of State comes and says he wants 20 copies more. I am very glad to know that we did succeed in reducing the number at least in that Department. The Secretary of State comes in and says with respect to that Department, "You have economized a little too far; you have cut down this Department until we have not quite enough, and we want 20 copies more." This resolution simply gives him 20 additional copies of these documents; and that is all there is of it. I see nothing in it to provoke the animadversions of my friend, and I would not say to him and to the House what I am going to say but for the fact, as I have already said, this is the fifth or sixth time he has taken occasion since this Congress began to animadvert upon this law.

Now, what is this printing law? It is a law which was framed by a joint committee of Congress, consisting of five members. On the part of the Senate the members were Senator Manderson, who had been for many years chairman of the Senate Committee on Printing and of the Joint Committee on Printing, Senator HAWLEY of Connecticut, also very familiar with the subject of printing, and Senator GORMAN, who, however, took absolutely no part in framing the bill; so that, so far as the Senate was concerned, the work was done by Senator Manderson and Senator HAWLEY. Under the joint resolution passed in the last session of the Fifty-first Congress providing for this joint committee to consider the subject of printing, two members of the House, who were also members-elect of the Fifty-second Congress, were named by the Speaker of the Fifty-first Congress, the distinguished gentleman who now sits in the Speaker's chair. One of those members was the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. RUSSELL, who, however, took no part in framing the bill; in fact, so far as I now recollect, he did not attend a single meeting of the committee. I was the other member appointed on the part of the House. The result was that the bill was framed by three members of the joint committee, Senator Manderson, Senator HAWLEY, and myself.

In gathering information upon which to base it, we visited every Bureau and every Department of the Government. We spent three months in this city when Congress was not in session endeavoring to collect data which would enable us to frame a judicious printing bill. We found the laws in relation to printing in an utterly chaotic state, and we put them all into this one act, which is the result of the labors of the three gentlemen I have named, but principally the work of Senator Manderson. The law is a good law, and it does not deserve the adverse criticism of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] or of any other gentleman. I repeat, that in preparing the bill we visited every Department of the Government for which printing was done or which has to have printing done. We took and considered the testimony and the suggestions of a large number of gentlemen familiar with the subject of printing, and, as the result of it all, we framed this act. It may not have been wisely framed, it may not be a perfect law, but I wished to show the House how carefully it was framed. I desire to call attention to the opinions of gentlemen in respect to this act who for years have had much to do with printing for this Government. One gentleman, not a member of the committee, but who assisted us in our labors, attending nearly every meeting of the joint committee while the work was being done—he is a man who had had more to do with the work of public printing for this Government for five or six years than any other man, a Republican, a man who had honored a seat in this House for, I think, three terms, and best of all, perhaps, a gentleman coming from the State of my distinguished friend, Mr. CANNON—he knows to whom I refer——

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Who is the gentleman?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refer to Mr. Palmer, than whom, in my opinion, there has not been a better or more efficient Public Printer in the history of this Government. As I have stated, Mr. Palmer was present during the labors of the joint committee in framing this bill, and in order that the House may know what his opinion of it was, I ask to have read from the Clerk's desk a letter addressed by him to Senator Manderson, the chairman of the joint committee which framed the act.

The letter was read, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1892.

SIR: Your favor of the 30th ultimo, sending me a complete set of sheets containing the sections of the proposed printing bill, and asking me to give you an estimate of the probable saving to the Government that would accrue under the operations of the bill, should it become a law, came duly to hand.

In reply I have the honor to state that I have caused those sections of the proposed bill relating to the number of copies of documents to be printed to be compared with the present law and various concurrent and joint resolutions of Congress ordering extra copies of the same documents, and from this comparison it is estimated that, should the proposed bill become a law, the annual saving under its operations would be between $175,000 and $200,000.

It is impossible to arrive at even an approximate estimate of the saving which would be effected by having documents distributed from a building within a block of the Government Printing Office, instead of from the Capitol. In order to haul the documents this one square they will have to be loaded into wagons, and the only saving which would be effected would be the difference in hauling those documents which are to be distributed upon orders of Senators and Representatives, say, one square instead of six squares. Wagons would have to be used then, as now, to deliver work to the Capitol which is required for the daily use of Congress.

Very respectfully,

F. W. PALMER, *Public Printer.*

Hon. CHARLES F. MANDERSON,
Chairman Committee on Printing, United States Senate.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, that is the testimony of this experienced gentleman to the merits of the bill submitted to him, which was substantially the bill afterwards enacted into law. With all his knowledge and all his experience of the business of public printing, he gave that testimony as to the bill. He held office for four years as Public Printer under President Harrison, a Republican President, and was continued in that office for sixteen or seventeen months under the present Administration. He gave that testimony with regard to the merits of the law which my friend from Illinois criticises so seriously. Dr. John G. Ames, the former very efficient superintendent of documents, gave testimony similar to that given by Public Printer Palmer in a letter which I hold in my hand.

I desire now to call attention to the testimony of the present efficient and highly competent Public Printer, after he has served nearly two years. In his annual report he says:

All the details called for by this public printing act it is possible to present in an intelligent form are included herein. The office has experienced no difficulty in carrying out the provisions of the new law.

So, Mr. Speaker, the present Public Printer recognizes this printing law as a wise law, and I undertake to say that every gentleman who examines it will be impressed with the idea that it is a wise and economical law. I am not vain in saying that, because I claim no credit for its enactment. I do admit I made an earnest and strenuous effort to put it through the House of Representatives. The act was framed by Senator Manderson, assisted by the other gentlemen. I am not going into any further defense of that law now. It speaks for itself. Mr. Palmer said that it would only save about $200,000 a year in public printing, and I, after an experience of eight or nine years on the Committee on Printing, am quite satisfied that it will save much more than that in money, and also a great deal of trouble in the modes and methods of disposing of matters connected with printing.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is a mistake to suppose that any law can be passed which will prevent the Committee on Printing from coming here from time to time to ask for the printing of extra copies of documents. Occasions for such resolutions as the one now pending will continually arise. This case simply confirms what I have said heretofore, that in our efforts to cut down we perhaps cut the State Department a little too deep, and they now ask for 20 additional copies of this document. That is all that this resolution amounts to.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, because of my being on the Committee on Appropriations for several years past I have had some experience in the matter of making appropriations for the support of the Public Printing Office.

Now, I take no part in the contest between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] further than to say this: That it remains to be seen whether the present printing law will stand the strain of a session of Congress, no matter whether the House of Representatives be in the control of the one party or the other. I wish to call attention to the appropriations which have been made, so that it may be seen that so far we have been unable to determine whether the present printing law is an economic measure or not as compared with previous laws. In 1893 the appropriations for the support of the Printing Office were $3,270,000; in 1894, $3,481,000; in 1895, $3,124,320. At this session, for the first time since 1886, the Public Printer did not submit to Congress, prior to the Christmas holidays, a deficiency estimate; but I take it that this results from the fact that at the last session of Congress we appropriated $3,110,000 for the support of the Printing Office, as against $2,504,320 which appeared in the sundry civil bill of the preceding session, and which was supplemented by an appropriation of $620,000 in the deficiency bill.

Now, this is a point to which I wish to call the special attention of the House: Notwithstanding the letter of the Public Printer and the several communications of his predecessors, and that we have appropriated for this year only $3,110,000, and that the Public Printer has not thus far asked for a deficiency appropriation, I notice that his estimates for 1897 amount to $3,560,659.40, which

is more than $300,000 in excess of any estimate heretofore submitted.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SAYERS. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee to explain to the House why it is that there come from the Public Printer at this session of Congress estimates $300,000 in excess of any estimates heretofore submitted.

Mr. RICHARDSON. In the first place, I answer by saying, in reference to the comparison which the gentleman makes with the appropriations for last year, that those appropriations were some $200,000 or $300,000 less than those of the preceding year. Thus it will be seen that last year was not a normal year in reference to the expenditures; the amount of appropriation was not the usual amount, but was considerably less. I ask the gentleman from Texas whether I am not correct in saying that last year the appropriations were less than those of the year before?

Mr. SAYERS. But take other preceding years.

Mr. RICHARDSON. For some of the preceding years the appropriations were undoubtedly more than $3,100,000.

Mr. SAYERS. But the point I wished to make was this: That it remains to be seen whether the new printing act would bear the strain of a session of Congress and still preserve the economical features which were claimed for it during its passage through the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand that point of the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. RICHARDSON. In a moment; let us get through with this matter. The gentleman from Texas has made a statement which I wish to discuss. As I understand, he states that the appropriations for the past year amounted to $3,100,000, in round numbers. But it is to be remembered that the amount would be swelled to $3,400,000 or $3,500,000, if we should take into consideration the deficiency appropriations, because large deficiencies were asked for by Mr. Palmer, as the gentleman very well knows.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing which this printing law does to which I ask the attention of my friend from Illinois, because he and his committee will have much to do with this matter. It will necessarily come before them. The printing law puts upon the Public Printer the duty of printing, out of funds appropriated in the annual appropriation bill for public printing, the Agricultural Report, which of itself takes about $300,000. Prior to the passage of this printing law the amount necessary for the printing of that report was always carried in a separate joint resolution, which was self-appropriating, and therefore was not included in the amount annually appropriated in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for public printing.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman means the sundry civil bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; I beg pardon; I mean the sundry civil bill.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman is correct in his statement.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am not only correct in that, but my friend from Texas will bear me witness to another thing. Before the passage of this printing law large sales of waste paper, gold-leaf shavings, and other articles of waste that I can not now enumerate were made by the Public Printer, amounting possibly to $300,000 a year. What did he do with the proceeds? I presume my friend from Illinois knows that the money thus realized was again used by the Public Printer for carrying on the public printing. Under the new printing law this can not be done. The Public Printer is required to cover into the Treasury every dollar realized from such sales. Before any of that money can be used by him for purposes of public printing it must be again appropriated by Congress. Is not that wise? My friend knows too much about public expenditures to say that it is not a wise measure. If there is any one feature of the printing law which should commend it to the favorable consideration of prudent legislators it is that one provision which does away with a "slush fund," as it has been called, in the hands of the Public Printer, to be used at his discretion.

Now, inasmuch as my friend from Illinois has not answered me, and declines to do so, I will ask my friend from Texas whether I am not correct in that statement?

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman is.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then there is $300,000 or thereabouts—of course I am not undertaking to speak accurately as to the amount—which was formerly at the disposal of the Public Printer as proceeds of these sales; money which he could twice use, but which he can not now use; which must be turned into the Treasury and remain there subject to appropriation by Congress. There is the sum of $300,000, or about that, that we might by "juggling the figures" say was an increase in funds for the public printing. It will be seen at once it is not an increase, but is a wise and eminently proper provision which should, and which I know will, commend itself to the gentleman from Illinois.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], who wishes to ask a question.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Well, Mr. Speaker, my question has somewhat cooled, but has not entirely congealed. [Laughter.]

I wish to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if it is not a fact that the kind of printing—the documents and other things printed—varies very materially from Congress to Congress; so that the estimate given upon certain indications of how much the saving might be, or would be, is not a very accurate test? And furthermore if the estimate of $200,000 saving was not made on the basis of the same identical printing; and so the facts do not show whether the statement of the gentleman from Texas was correct or not.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I am for the public printing act as I understand it; and I merely wanted to bring out the fact that these estimates are on the same identical printing, but that the total cost of printing necessarily varies from Congress to Congress by very large sums.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman is correct; and not only that, but he will find that the printing is increasing year by year; but under the operation of this bill there will be a material saving, as has already been indicated.

Mr. SAYERS. Before the gentleman from Tennessee takes his seat, let me ask if he knows why the estimate for the coming year is so much larger than for the preceding one?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know, I will be frank to say to my friend from Texas; I have not examined the subject. The Public Printer no doubt has found it necessary, for reasons satisfactory to himself, to ask for a larger amount. I take it that the object is to take care of the very class of subjects to which I have referred. First, the $300,000 for reprinting the Agricultural Report——

Mr. SAYERS. But we have that for this year.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And the other in respect to the waste and sales of waste materials.

Mr. SAYERS. But the gentleman will remember that, as far as the Agricultural Report is concerned, we have that for this year.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; I understand that; and, as I have said to the gentleman, I am frank to say that I do not understand the reason. But I know it is the policy of the present Public Printer to ask for the amount or sum he thinks will be necessary for the annual public printing, and that this necessary sum may be carried in the regular appropriation bill, and not asked for at the close of the year as a deficiency.

Mr. CANNON. Well, Mr. Speaker, in reference to this matter of saving, "the proof of the pudding is the eating of it."

A MEMBER. No; "chewing the bag."

Mr. CANNON. Very well; have your own way; I'll accept the amendment.

The gentleman from Tennessee claimed that this printing bill was and is a great economical measure—and that it is going to save a vast amount of money for the Government. Why, he flapped his wings when it was under consideration, as the record will show——

A MEMBER. "Vote!"

Mr. CANNON. Well, you will not vote just this minute.

When that bill was being considered he talked of the abolition of the Clerk's document room——

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. And yet, almost the first day of this session, the whole force of the Clerk's document room, with the blessing of the gentleman from Tennessee, was transferred bodily over to the other document room.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I beg pardon; not with my blessing.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, the RECORD shows.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Well, the best evidence of the operation of the law is the effect of it that we witness here from day to day. We have seen on yesterday the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PERKINS], the chairman of the Committee on Printing, rise upon this floor and pass three resolutions for additional printing by unanimous consent.

Mr. PERKINS. No; one of them I fell down on. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Well, you passed two out of the three, and you hope to get another one through to-day. To-morrow, perhaps, you will have four. Whether more will follow I do not know; but I take it that on the average from this on to the close of the session we are to have one or more resolutions a day for printing not provided for by this most economical bill to which the gentleman from Tennessee refers.

Mr. CHICKERING. Do you object, if it is all right?

Mr. CANNON. I am talking of the law and the necessity for its amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman from Illinois complains

because the Committee on Printing, in making up the printing act, could not anticipate the discovery of gold in the Cripple Creek region in Colorado, and that we did not provide for the printing of the geological report incident thereto. Had we known that fact we might probably have been able to provide for it in advance in the printing bill. But unfortunately that knowledge was denied to us.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this resolution has taken a very wide range. I think I can say for the Printing Committee of the House that it dislikes very much to be held responsible for whatever sins were committed in the last Congress under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Tennessee.

I dare say it is true, as the RECORD will show, that resolutions of this character have been acted upon by every Congress. I doubt if any provision of law could guard against them, or obviate the necessity of offering such resolutions. These questions will naturally arise from time to time in the House of Representatives as its business progresses; and we must, by resolution, provide for the printing as these matters develop in the Departments.

When we seek to make provision to supply the wants of the House, we are privileged; but when we undertake to supply the requests of the Department, we are subject to objection.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply calls for the printing of 20 additional copies of documents and reports for the convenience of the Department of State. It is a simple proposition. The Secretary of State, in the letter which has been sent to the Clerk's desk, represents the necessity for it. If every time the Committee on Printing have occasion to report here there is to be such a debate sprung here as the one which we have had this morning, I think I can promise for the Committee on Printing that it will make as few reports as possible. So far there has been no extravagance, at least, in the reports made from this committee, and I think it will be the policy of the committee, in the reports hereafter to be made, to guard that point. If it be true that we must first seek the approval of the Committee on Appropriations, it would be well to have that instruction now, so that we may avoid these collisions on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we may have a vote on the resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise to a question of privilege for a moment. It ought to be attended to, I think. It has reference to a publication in the RECORD this morning. I do not at present see the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. HITT] in the House, and I will postpone it for a moment until he comes in. I yield now, and will call it up when the gentleman comes in, because it relates to a matter in which he is concerned.

ISSUE OF BONDS, NEW MEXICO TERRITORY.

Mr. CATRON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Territories have unanimously directed me to report back House bill No. 4052 with a request for its present consideration. The report states fully the provisions of the bill and the objects of it, and I will ask that the report be read, and then I shall ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4052) approving certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, authorizing the issue of certain bonds of said Territory.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the coupon bonds and indebtedness of the Territory of New Mexico, amounting to $75,000, authorized by section 7 of an act of the Thirty-first legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, entitled "An act authorizing the rebuilding of the Territorial capitol at Santa Fe, which was destroyed by fire May 12, 1892, and to provide the necessary means therefor and a board with authority to rebuild the same," approved February 5, 1895, and designated as capitol rebuilding bonds of the Territory of New Mexico;

Also, the bonds and indebtedness, amounting to $15,000, authorized by section 1 of an act of the said legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, entitled "An act to provide for the maintenance of the military institute at Roswell, N. Mex.," approved February 13, 1895;

Also, the bonds and indebtedness, amounting to the sum of $30,000, authorized by section 1 of an act of the said legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, entitled "An act to provide an addition to the insane asylum of New Mexico for the accommodation of all the insane persons of the Territory, and for other purposes," approved May 13, 1895; and

Also, the bonds and indebtedness, amounting to the sum of $35,000, authorized by section 1 of an act of the said legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, entitled "An act to provide for the completion of the buildings for the normal schools of New Mexico at Las Vegas and Silver City, and to provide for the necessary furnishings therefor; and for additions to the New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, at Las Cruces," approved February 27, 1895, be, and the same are hereby, approved, confirmed, and made valid: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to make the Government of the United States liable or responsible for the payment of any of said bonds by this act approved, confirmed, and made valid.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, let the report be read, pending objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the report will be read.

The report (by Mr. CATRON) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4052), approving certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, authorizing the issue of certain bonds of said Territory, report the same to the House and recommend that it pass.

The committee find that this action is made necessary by reason of the provisions of a statute of the Congress of the United States, enacted in the year 1887, sometimes called the Harrison Act, by which the Territories were prohibited from creating any indebtedness in excess of 1 per cent of the assessed taxable value of the property of the Territory.

The assessed value of the property of the Territory of New Mexico amounts to about $41,000,000.

At the time of the passage of the act of 1887 by the Congress of the United States, the Territory of New Mexico had already an indebtedness in excess of 1 per cent of the assessed value of the taxable property therein, which had been created principally by the erection of a Territorial capitol building and of a Territorial penitentiary, at an expense of something in excess of $400,000 and by other outstanding indebtedness existing at the time. The present Territorial indebtedness, exclusive of the bonds in question, is near $900,000. The total amount of the bonds which it is sought by this act to validate is $155,000, making a total indebtedness by these bonds and the previous indebtedness of a little more than $1,000,000, or about 2½ per cent of the assessed value of the property in the Territory.

The capitol building, which had been constructed by the Territory at an expense exceeding $250,000, was destroyed by fire on the 12th day of May, 1892, a large amount of the material of which was saved and preserved, so that it can be made use of in the rebuilding of the capitol building. The legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, at its last session, unanimously enacted a law providing for the issue and sale of $75,000 bonds, bearing interest at the rate of 5 per cent, to be made redeemable in twenty years, and to become absolutely due and payable in thirty years, which bonds, it is asserted and believed, can be sold for a premium, and according to estimates furnished by architects will produce money enough to completely rebuild the capitol building. The said capitol building is now being worked upon by the authorities of the Territory, by aid of certain other means which have been furnished by the Territory and by private subscription by the citizens of Santa Fe, but the amount so subscribed is about exhausted, and the work on the said building will have to be discontinued unless the appropriation made by the legislature can be made available at an early day, so that much valuable material on hand may not go to waste and be lost.

The legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, previous to its last session, had also provided for the erection of an insane asylum at Las Vegas, in the Territory of New Mexico, at an expense of about $50,000, which institution has been erected and is now being operated for the care of the insane in said Territory, but said building was not erected with sufficient capacity to care for all the insane, and in order to save great expense to the various counties of the Territory in taking care of the additional insane, it is necessary that the capacity of the said institution be enlarged, for which purpose the legislative assembly at its last session, by a law approved May 13, 1895, authorized the issue and sale of the bonds of the Territory to the amount of $30,000, bearing the same rate of interest and payable in the same time as the bonds first mentioned.

Also a previous legislative assembly of that Territory had provided for the erection of a building for an agricultural college at an expense of about $40,000, which building has been erected, and that college is now in successful operation at Las Cruces, in the Territory of New Mexico. For the employment of teachers and instruction in that college ample means are furnished by the Government of the United States, but none of the moneys furnished by the United States can be used for the purpose of erecting buildings or repairing or enlarging the same. Since the erection of the building and the opening of the institution the attendance at the college has so increased that there is not sufficient room for the convenience of all the students and for rooms for instruction and laboratory purposes, and it has become necessary to make large additions to the same.

The Territory has also established heretofore two normal schools, one at Silver City and the other at Las Vegas, one being in the northeastern part of the Territory and the other being in the southwestern part, about 300 miles or more apart from each other. The building for one of the schools has been erected and the other has been partially erected. The first was erected by a levy of a tax, the second, which is partly completed, as far as it has gone has been built in anticipation of the sale of the bonds which are authorized by the last legislative assembly. The attendance at the first of these institutions has become so great that it has become necessary to enlarge it.

In order, therefore, to enlarge the said agricultural college, the first of said normal schools to a capacity to meet the wants of those attending, and to pay for the second of said normal schools, the said legislative assembly, by an act approved February 28, 1895, authorized the issue and sale of $35,000 of bonds of the Territory, bearing interest and payable on the same terms as the bonds first mentioned.

The last session of said legislative assembly, also, by an act aproved February 13, 1895, authorized the issue and the sale of the bonds of the Territory of New Mexico, bearing interest and payable the same as the other bonds before mentioned, to provide for the maintenance of the military institute at Roswell, N. Mex. This institution is in full operation, is a Territorial institution, under the control of the Territory, and is well attended by students, but there are not suitable or sufficient buildings for their accommodation and instruction. It is provided that the proceeds of these last-mentioned bonds shall be used for the erection of suitable buildings and other improvements at that institution, under the direction of the board of regents.

The indebtedness created by the various acts mentioned in the bill is entirely a debt of the Territory of New Mexico, created by the unanimous action of the Territorial legislature for the purpose of rebuilding the capitol building, enlarging the asylum for the insane, and erecting and enlarging educational institutions, all of which it is believed will be for the benefit of the Territory. Should the capitol building be erected as contemplated it will be a saving of about $3,000 to the United States, which will otherwise have to be appropriated to provide assembly rooms and committee rooms for the next legislative assembly. If this appropriation can be made available at once the building will be completed before the meeting of the next legislative assembly and much valuable material which would otherwise go to waste would be saved. The bill in question contains a proviso that the United States shall not be liable or responsible for the payment of the bonds by this act validated or conformed.

The committee, believing that the bill is a meritorious one and that the moneys appropriated will be expended for the benefit of the people of the Territory, recommend the enactment of the same into a law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COOPER of Texas, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LIFEBOAT EQUIPMENT OF OCEAN STEAMERS.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the unanimous action of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to report the resolution which I send to the desk, and to request its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it has been repeatedly charged by the Buffalo Evening News and other leading papers that ocean steamers are permitted to sail from American ports with lifeboat equipment utterly inadequate to accommodate the crew and passengers in case of accident; and

Whereas it is further alleged in these same journals that lifeboats are frequently without the detaching hooks of the disengaging apparatus required by law: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to inform the House of Representatives whether the present provisions for the safety of the public in ocean travel are adequate; and if so whether such provisions are strictly carried out.

The SPEAKER. This is a privileged motion. The joint resolution is reported from the committee. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the preamble read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the preamble, without objection.

The preamble was again read.

Mr. DINGLEY. I have no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the preamble will also be agreed to.

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF RECORD FOR MEMBERS AND SENATORS.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution providing 10 additional copies of the RECORD for Members and Senators was read.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether this resolution is intended to cover one of the faults of the printing act or not, but I think it had better be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. Does the gentleman from South Dakota desire the resolution referred?

Mr. PICKLER. I will ask that the resolution be referred to the committee.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. PICKLER. I hope the committee will give it prompt consideration, as it is of interest to every member of the House.

CORRECTION OF REFERENCE.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads to report back the bill (H. R. 573) for the relief of Frances R. Jack, Elizabeth I. Jack, and Matilda W. Jack, and recommend that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

DOCUMENTS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask the gentleman to withhold that matter for a moment, for a matter of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, the matter I think is a privileged matter, inasmuch as it relates to the conduct of the business of the House and publication of the daily RECORD. I find in the RECORD this morning that on yesterday, when the President's message was laid before the House by the Chair, a message which relates to the speeches of Mr. Bayard, that the Chair, as was right and proper, referred the message and ordered it to be printed, with the accompanying documents. Of course, Mr. Speaker, that meant that the message and the accompanying documents would be printed as a document—an executive document. I find that not only is the message, of eight or ten lines, printed in the RECORD, but it is followed by twenty-three columns of closely printed matter. The message, of course, should be printed; but it was followed by twenty-three columns of closely printed matter, which purports to be, and I suppose are, the accompanying documents. Among these documents I find the speeches of the American minister at the British court. The effect of it is to put in the RECORD these speeches of Mr. Bayard, give them the circulation which the RECORD has, and enable members to frank that matter to their constituents if they see fit to do so. This is a palpable violation, Mr. Speaker, of the rules of printing in the RECORD. I simply call attention to it, because it is a perversion of the columns of the RECORD and this twenty-three columns of matter should not have been published.

I have no motion to make. Of course, there would be just as much propriety in printing in the RECORD the documents accompanying the President's annual message, such as the reports of heads of Departments, etc. I ask that this matter be printed as a document, as ordered on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that this was put in the RECORD by mistake of the printer.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know how the mistake arose.

The SPEAKER. Certainly, the criticism of the gentleman is entirely just. The matter ought not to have been printed as a part of the RECORD. It should have been printed as a document. And the Chair will direct that it be kept out of the permanent RECORD.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I trust that that order will not be made. The expense has already been incurred. These speeches have been made the subject of much criticism here and elsewhere; and inasmuch as the expense of printing has already been incurred, I hope that they will not be expunged from the permanent RECORD. I think they should go along with the criticisms as a matter of justice.

The SPEAKER. It had no business to be printed in the RECORD. The RECORD is rather voluminous in a natural way.

Mr. McRAE. Perhaps it ought not to have been printed in the daily RECORD, but it has been printed, so that we shall save nothing now by striking it out.

The SPEAKER. But by leaving it in the RECORD you establish a precedent which may be troublesome in the future according as you like the matter printed or do not. [Laughter.]

Mr. McRAE. I trust that the Speaker will not make the order to expunge this from the permanent RECORD, inasmuch as it has already been printed in the daily RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Unless the House otherwise orders, the Speaker will have to make the RECORD conform to the rules of the House.

Mr. McRAE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter be permitted to go into the permanent RECORD.

A MEMBER. Regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is called for.

Mr. McRAE. Then I understand that the Chair does not entertain my motion that this matter be allowed to stand in the permanent RECORD?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see how he can entertain the gentleman's motion when the regular order is called for. The rules of the House can not be suspended except by unanimous consent. The Chair would be quite willing to have the gentleman's motion put to the House if it could be done under the rules.

Mr. McRAE. The suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] was entertained by the Chair far enough to declare that he would make an order to have this matter stricken from the RECORD unless the House orders otherwise, but now, when I make that motion, the regular order is called for and no opportunity given for the House to pass upon the question, and the Chair is left to do as it chooses about the matter. I think this unjust.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is only following the rules of the House unless he is mistaken, and if the gentleman thinks he is, the Chair will listen to argument on that point.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, is a motion in order to allow this matter to remain in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think such a motion can be at this time entertained under the rules of the House. It might be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] asks unanimous consent that the documents printed in the RECORD of this morning in connection with the President's message laid before the House yesterday be continued in the permanent RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. PERKINS. I very much dislike to object, Mr. Speaker, but I think it would be unfortunate to set this precedent, and therefore I think we had better follow the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

POST-OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

Mr. HILBORN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, submitted the following report, and asked for its immediate consideration:

JANUARY 11, 1896.

Mr. LOUD submitted the following, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is requested to inform the House what progress has been made under the act approved March 3, 1893, in the erection of a building at San Francisco, Cal., for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office, and the reason for delay in the prosecution and completion of said building."

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. LOUD calling upon the Secretary of the

Treasury for information in regard to the progress made in the erection of a public building at San Francisco, Cal., and asking the reasons for delay in the completion of said building, beg leave to report the same back with the recommendation that the said resolution be adopted.

The report was adopted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union——

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Illinois completes his motion I would like to inquire of the Chair what has become of the unfinished business, the report from the Committee on Rules. That has never been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. It has not been disposed of. The Chair understands that it will be brought up as soon as the pending appropriation bill is out of the way.

Mr. CRISP. But I understand there are some of those amendments that have not yet been acted upon.

The SPEAKER. The amendments have been acted upon.

Mr. CRISP. But not as a whole. I propose to offer a substitute for the whole of them whenever we get to the point where that can be done.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was not aware of the intention of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. But it certainly is not proper, pending a report from the Committee on Rules, when part only of the report has been adopted, to go on acting as if the whole of it had been adopted. It does not follow, from any action yet taken, that the whole of the report may not be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that if the gentleman from Georgia will examine the RECORD he will see that the amendments which were offered were offered to each article separately; that the proceeding was not a revision of the whole system of rules. The Chair was not aware that the gentleman proposed to offer a substitute.

Mr. CRISP. It was understood that each rule was amendable, and we have acted on that idea.

The SPEAKER. We have acted on every part of the report except one section.

Mr. CRISP. But the report has not been disposed of as a whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that each provision acted upon has been disposed of.

Mr. CRISP. I do not so understand it. Pending the completion of the matter, the report of the committee is undoubtedly unfinished business, and how we can go on and enforce some part of that report before the whole of it has been disposed of by the House I do not understand. This report is like a bill pending for amendment. Amendment after amendment may be adopted, but until the whole matter is disposed of there is no vital force in any of them.

Mr. DALZELL. My understanding is that all the propositions respecting the rules have been disposed of with the exception of one.

Mr. CRISP. That is to say, we have arrived at the point where all the matters proposed have been passed over except one; but we are yet to dispose of the matter as a whole.

Mr. DALZELL. Each rule was disposed of by itself as it was laid before the House. Amendments were invited. Wherever amendments were suggested they were disposed of; where there was no suggestion of any amendment the rule stands just as it was in the Fifty-first Congress. I repeat that, as I understand, the whole matter has been disposed of with the exception of one proposed amendment. With respect to that amendment as it came from the committee a number of suggestions were made on this side of the House and on the other, so that the Committee on Rules, or a majority of that committee, thought it desirable that we should further consider that proposed amendment with the view to adopting perhaps some of the suggestions made in the House. It is the purpose of the Committee on Rules, as I understand, to have an early meeting, and after disposing of that amendment in the committee to make further report to the House.

Mr. CRISP. My only desire in the matter is that there may be an opportunity to offer a substitute for the whole report when we get to that point in the consideration of the matter where it may be done. But with this report pending in its present position we do not know when it may be called up. The committee may call it up at any moment. A demand for the regular order, as I understand, would bring it up, unless some gentleman having an appropriation bill in charge should claim precedence for such a measure, which I admit would, under the rules, have priority over the unfinished business. Subject to that qualification, a mere demand for the regular order would bring up this report at any time. Now, this matter ought to be disposed of in some way.

Mr. DALZELL. I suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that the House is not suffering at all by reason of the delay. If it is proper that he should have an opportunity to make a motion or to offer a substitute, that opportunity will be afforded him when the amendment is suggested by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CRISP. If I should happen to be here, or if I should happen to be informed when the matter would be called up, I probably would have that right.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, I think I can say to the gentleman that nothing will be done, or attempted to be done, on this matter in his absence.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. CANNON. I now renew my motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. PAYNE in the chair) and proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection; and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. CANNON. I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] whether he desires any general debate on this bill?

Mr. SAYERS. I take it that no general debate is desired on this side of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Then I ask that general debate may be closed in ten minutes.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask the gentleman to reserve me two minutes of that time.

Mr. CANNON. Very good; I will give the gentleman five.

Mr. SAYERS. I may not want any time at all.

There being no objection, the motion to limit general debate to ten minutes was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HEPBURN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 4241) for improving Aransas Pass.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Joint resolution (S. R. 50) authorizing the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for the public building at Chicago, Ill.;

A bill (S. 790) to aid the public-land States to support schools of mines;

A bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory";

A bill (S. 1230) to extend the limits of the port of entry of New Orleans; and

A bill (S. 1547) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 4241) for improving Aransas Pass; when the Speaker signed the same.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

The committee again resumed its session, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this urgent deficiency bill recommends an appropriation in the aggregate of $4,415,922.61. The largest item of deficiency is that for United States courts, aggregating $3,242,582.19. It is proper I should state that for some years the practice has obtained of making short appropriations for the Department of Justice.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman might say that such has been the practice for eight or ten years past.

Mr. CANNON. That explains a part of this deficiency in the appropriations for United States courts; the growth of business in those courts explains the rest.

It is proper I should state also that the appropriations contained in this bill exhaust upon the subjects to which they relate the appropriations for the remainder of this fiscal year. This departure from the custom heretofore with reference to urgent deficiency bills has been made for the reason that the committee intends to present only this one urgent deficiency bill for the consideration of the House; the other deficiency items will take their places in the general deficiency bill, which is ordinarily passed near the close

of the session or the close of the fiscal year. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the committee for a few moments to the report accompanying the bill. I will read from the report, and hope I will have the attention not only of the Committee of the Whole, but especially of the Committee on the Judiciary, whose honorable chairman I see now before me.

The committee desire to call attention to the very large sum, $3,242,582.19, appropriated in the bill for expenses of United States courts, $3,006,000 of which sum is on account of the current fiscal year. They append herewith a statement showing the regular appropriations and the deficiencies made for the expenses of United States courts for the fiscal years 1885 to 1896, inclusive.

This exhibit shows, for the period named, a growth in the expenses of this branch of the public service of more than 100 per cent. The expenses for fees of United States commissioners have grown from $127,150 for the fiscal year 1889 to $340,000 for the current year; and the fees of witnesses have increased from $900,000 in 1889 to $1,500,000 for the current year.

Mr. HENDERSON. During what time were these expenditures incurred?

Mr. CANNON. From 1889, in these two items, to the present time; and from 1885 to the present time, covering all of the items.

The report goes on:

That these expenditures are abnormal, and that some reform in the law should be instituted, the committee are well satisfied; but under the rules of the House they have no power in the premises other than to recommend the appropriations which are necessary to meet the demands of this branch of the public service as they arise under existing law, and to express the earnest hope and recommendation that the proper committee or committees of the House will take up the matter without delay during this session, with a view to the enactment of proper legislation.

A word more and I will yield the floor to the gentleman from Texas. This matter of the increase of the expenses of the Federal courts has been going on all of these years, as shown by the report, and attention to it has been called by various members on the floor from time to time. Some of the increase arises from the natural increase in population; the increase in the number of courts and the increase of business being legitimate increases. Much of it, in my judgment and in the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations, from what examination it has been able to give to the matter, comes from the fee system.

Now, just what the remedy is I do not know. I suspect it lies along the line of placing the United States district attorneys upon a fixed salary—possibly other officials as well. It may be the marshals ought to be salaried officers, and the United States commissioners, also; but when the maximum of a salary of a United States attorney is $6,000, as a general rule they are apt to agonize until that maximum is reached, and I have thought sometimes, from information I have received, that the fee system in this respect occasionally causes practical oppression in office against the citizen.

That is all I can say about it.

Mr. SETTLE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. SETTLE. Has the gentleman any information that will enable him to state to the House in what districts these abnormal increases of expenditures, of which he speaks, have occurred? Is that information contained in the report of the Attorney-General?

Mr. CANNON. I will say, in response to the gentleman from North Carolina, that if I recollect aright the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] introduced a resolution recently in the House asking for that information under the Department of Justice, and I am informed that the work there approaches completion, and that the House will soon have the response to it—the complete information covered by the resolution.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, I will state that I called at the Attorney-General's Office on yesterday, and examined the preliminary draft of the reports of the House. It is almost completed, and they thought it would be ready probably to-morrow or the next day for transmission. I think it will give a full answer to the inquiry propounded by my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. CANNON. I now yield the floor to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say in reference to the pending bill that it meets my hearty concurrence. I do not believe that there is an item in the bill that will not commend itself, after ample discussion, to the members of the committee.

There is only one thing that I wish to say in addition to the explanation given by the gentleman from Illinois in reference to the deficiencies for the Department of Justice. As stated by him, it has been the practice of the Committee on Appropriations for very many years—and that practice has been approved by the House—of appropriating only for a portion of the fiscal year, say about one-half, and that accounts for the large deficiency which appears on the bill for the Department of Justice. This practice has obtained for eight or ten years, and no matter which party may have been in power in the House it has never varied from that practice.

Now, it would not be just to hold the Attorney-General or the Department of Justice responsible for any excess of expenditures made either by the courts themselves or by the commissioners under the appropriations made by Congress. The Department of Justice has practically no control over such an expenditure; and so, where expenses are allowed by the judge presiding, they are considered as absolutely approved, and nothing remains for the Department of Justice and the proper Auditor of the Treasury to do but to allow and pay them.

I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that there is necessity for a reform in the matter of expenditures for commissioners, and also for United States marshals and their deputies. Whether or not the salary system will result in this reform it is impossible to say; but I wish to state that unless something be done you will certainly see these expenditures enormously increasing year by year, it makes no difference what Administration may have control of the Government. They will increase from year to year, until they become so large as to awaken the attention of the people and such an earnest demand for reform is made that Congress will respond to it.

Mr. NORTHWAY. There is no way, is there, of estimating anywhere near what the expense will be during the coming year?

Mr. SAYERS. There is none.

Mr. NORTHWAY. You have just got to cover it by a deficiency appropriation?

Mr. SAYERS. Yes. To illustrate: At the last session of the last Congress, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and as a member of the subcommittee on deficiencies, I can state that it was our intention to gather up every possible deficiency for prior years, and we went as far back as the years 1888 and 1889. We appropriated for every deficiency that was estimated for by the Department of Justice. We went so far that after the bill had passed the House a representative of the Department went to the Senate and stated that our bill in this respect was $80,000 too much, and it was accordingly cut down. But you will find in this bill deficiencies amounting to several hundred thousand dollars for the period for which we were endeavoring to appropriate, although we thought we had appropriated a sufficient amount under the estimates of the Department of Justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for general debate has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have general debate extended ten minutes, so that I may yield a little time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTHWAY] and such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be extended ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] five minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am very glad that the Committee on Appropriations have brought up this question. We have had it up often before. It is a troublesome one. The growth of the expenses of the Federal courts we are all familiar with, and as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has stated, much of it can be legitimately accounted for. The growth of the country, the admission of new States, the creation of new courts, and the large growth of corporations, which in most cases have the power of transferring litigation affecting them to the Federal courts, have all tended to swell the business of those courts. In the last Congress the Judiciary Committee took hold of this question, and they had under consideration what was known as the Stone bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE], who is now a member of the Committee on Appropriations, having charge of it; but I am informed by those who were familiar with the provisions of that bill that it fell of its own weight; that while it sought to put officials upon salaries instead of upon fees, when the committee came to figure upon the results of the bill it was found that the expense would be greater than it is under the fee system, and the bill died in the committee.

There are a number of bills now before the Committee on the Judiciary bearing upon this question, and the matter is being looked after and studied with the view to see if some remedy can be found. I know of no suggestion of any bill or legislation in detail coming from the Department of Justice. We have had able Attorneys-General who have admitted the difficulties, but still we are without the suggestion from them of a remedy. It will be impossible to run the Federal courts without heavy expenditures, because we have a big and growing country; but I believe that there are serious difficulties in connection with the administration of the offices of United States commissioners, and possibly of deputy marshals and assistant district attorneys, whose interests lie in the filing of informations before the committing magistrates, and continuing from day to day, after sessions of an hour or two, in order that they may get the per diem allowed by law, and it may be that we shall be able to find some remedy for these difficulties.

I yield for a question to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HAINER].

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I simply desire to correct an error

into which the gentleman from Iowa has evidently fallen. The Stone bill, to which he refers, did not fall of its own weight; neither has it fallen at all. As a matter of fact it makes a very considerable reduction in expenditures. The experts of the Department of Justice all substantially agree upon it. The facts are very fully set forth in the report which accompanied that bill, and, as I understand it, the bill has been reintroduced, and will be urged before the committee of which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] is chairman.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am very glad to have the gentleman make his statement. My statement is based upon information received from a member of the committee in the last Congress who is familiar with the details of the bill, and who told me what I have stated. I do not speak from my own information, as I did not have occasion to study the provisions of the bill in the last session. I intend to do so now. The gentleman from whom I derived my information was then and is now a member of the committee, and he worked hard upon the bill. That is all I desire to say, and if I have any time remaining I will yield it back to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. NORTHWAY. Mr. Chairman, of course it will do no good, and I have not time to-day, to discuss the imperfections of the fee system in the United States courts. I do not propose to enter upon any such discussion, but to respond to one idea that may suggest itself. The large deficiency carried in this bill will surprise members, as it surprised the members of the committee when we had it under consideration; and the question may arise in your minds in this way: Can not we cut down these enormous fees and do something to reform them by declining to make this deficiency appropriation? Let me say that that was one matter under serious consideration. There are upon this committee two or three gentlemen who have served for years, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], to whom the younger members of the committee deferred. The investigation showed that the Department of Justice is not responsible for this at all, and ought not to be held responsible. The fees are all created in the United States courts throughout the various States, and whether we appropriate for them or not will make but little difference. The marshals or commissioners, whoever they may be, can go into the court, the court will certify their fees, and they will obtain judgments, and thus we would have judgments coming up to us for payment. We can not, therefore, do anything but make the appropriation. After a most thorough investigation we were entirely satisfied that the Committee on Appropriations must make this appropriation and that the House ought to pass it, as there is no help for it. The remedy is in another direction, not here. We can not help anything either by cutting down the appropriation or declining to make it here; and there is no way in which to reform this abuse as to marshals' fees except by passing a general law.

Mr. SWANSON. I would like to have about five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. CANNON. If I have any time, I will; and if not, I will ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has three minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from New York wants some time also.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia for three minutes.

Mr. SWANSON. I want eight minutes. I will take three minutes, and five minutes under the five-minute rule.

Mr. CANNON. I ask that the time for general debate may be extended fifteen minutes.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Now I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

[Mr. SWANSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SWANSON. I wish the gentleman from Illinois would give me two minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. I have promised to yield my remaining time, seven minutes, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DANIELS], but we shall reach this question again when we are considering the bill under the five-minute rule, when the gentleman from Virginia will have an opportunity to further discuss it.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, while I agree very fully with the gentleman who has last addressed the committee [Mr. SWANSON] as to the necessity of revising the present system and providing for the remuneration of these United States court officers by salaries, yet at the same time this bill, in my judgment, is a step in the right direction. It provides in a measure for putting the United States courts upon a basis of respectability, by furnishing them with the means of properly exercising their jurisdiction, means which they have not heretofore possessed. The district in which I reside extends from the Hudson River to the western bounds of the State of New York. It is probably one of the largest and most populous districts in the United States, but under the parsimonious appropriations that have been made heretofore for defraying the expenses the means at the disposal of the United States court in that district have been so meager that the court has been obliged to adjourn on some occasions without doing any business whatever for want of money to defray its legitimate expenses.

During the last year two courts were convened in the district, one in the city of Buffalo, having a large number of criminal cases before it, indictments already preferred; but it was without means of defraying the expense of bringing witnesses to testify in those cases so as to try the indictments. The consequence was that the court was compelled to adjourn without doing any business, and the persons who were indicted—some of them, it is true, for insignificant offenses, but others for high crimes, the court being without the power to retain them longer in custody—were discharged without any trial. Another court was convened in another part of the district during the same year and was subjected to the same disability, so that persons indicted, as well as those who had cases to be tried before the court, were dismissed for want of means of paying the ordinary expenses.

Mr. SAYERS. What year was that?

Mr. DANIELS. Last year.

Mr. SAYERS. At what time?

Mr. DANIELS. One case was in the latter part of the spring and the other in the summer season. I have before me here the charge of Judge Coxe, showing how that court felt the necessity for increased appropriations.

Mr. SAYERS. If the gentleman will allow me a moment, when the deficiency bill which went into effect on March 4 last was being prepared by the Committee on Appropriations, the Department of Justice was asked to estimate for the amount which would be necessary to pay every deficiency during the fiscal year 1895. The estimated deficiencies, as well as those which had actually accrued, were provided for by the committee, and I say to the gentleman now, as I have said before, that the committee allowed every estimate. When the bill went to the Senate a representative of the Department of Justice went before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and stated that we had appropriated $80,000 too much, and so the amount was cut down in the Senate to that extent. The gentleman will see, therefore, that it was not the fault either of the Committee on Appropriations of the last House, or of the House itself, if there was any failure to appropriate a sufficient amount of money to pay every legitimate expense of the courts up to the 1st of July, 1895.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I think the statement of the gentleman corroborates and sustains the position I have been endeavoring to maintain here—that the appropriation was grossly insufficient, and that on that account these failures on the part of the courts to exercise their jurisdiction took place.

Mr. SAYERS. But it was not because of any fault on the part of either the Committee on Appropriations or the last House.

Mr. DANIELS. I am not attributing fault in any particular quarter, Mr. Chairman, but simply stating the fact that this deficiency has existed, and that because of it the court failed to exercise the jurisdiction which it was called upon to exercise under the laws of the land.

Mr. SAYERS. Further, Mr. Chairman, I will say that it is almost impossible for the Department of Justice to anticipate, with any degree of accuracy, the amount which will be required by the courts throughout the country, and I think, therefore, that a reform in this matter becomes necessary. If we were paying salaries we should then know the amount due each officer, and could appropriate accordingly. But inasmuch as they do not receive salaries, I repeat it is impossible for either the Department of Justice or Congress to anticipate what will be the expenditures of the courts and of their commissioners, marshals, deputy marshals, clerks, juries, and witnesses during any fiscal year.

Mr. DANIELS. Congress nevertheless must take the responsibility of making adequate appropriations for meeting these expenses and providing the officers that are necessary for the purpose of carrying on the business of the courts.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman will allow me to ask him this question: How can Congress make its appropriations except upon estimates from the Department of Justice; and how can the Department of Justice make even approximately accurately estimates when it is impossible to tell how much these courts are going to expend? There is no way of even approximating the amount.

Mr. DANIELS. The court of which I am now speaking has made no extraordinary expenditures in any direction; it has kept its expenses within the closest possible limits. It has not, however, had the means of employing a sufficient number of officers to take care of two juries when they have been out considering their verdicts upon two different cases. This court has not been furnished even with the means of paying for the meals which should be furnished jurors when they are kept out a number of hours deliberating upon their verdicts.

In reference to this deficiency of funds Judge Coxe, the United States judge of that district, says:

Several prisoners have escaped for lack of sufficient officers to guard them. At a recent term of the court one of the prisoners left the prisoners' dock, came upon the platform behind the bench, and commenced conversation with the judge during the trial of a case. There was no officer in the court room to see the impropriety, not to say indecency, of such conduct and prevent it.

More than that, these courts have not been supplied even with the means of employing stenographers, so that the course of business in the trial of cases has been greatly retarded and these courts have not been able to proceed with the expedition which characterizes business in the State courts. A State court is supplied with all these facilities. It can employ a stenographer; it can facilitate the taking of testimony; it can dispose of its business certainly one-third more rapidly than the United States courts have been able to do.

All these circumstances tend to indicate the necessity of increased appropriations for these courts. I am not advocating extravagant appropriations, but such as will be liberal enough to meet the actual necessities, such appropriations as have not been made heretofore and the want of which has interfered materially with the administration of justice. It is certainly a reproach to the public authorities, to Congress, and to the people of the United States that men are indicted for crimes for which they would probably upon trial be convicted, and yet the courts are without funds to institute trials on the indictments and to determine whether the accused are guilty or innocent.

I consider, therefore, that this bill is a step in the right direction. It does not go so far as the circumstances would justify; but certainly it opens an avenue by which the obstructions heretofore existing in the discharge of the business of these courts may be removed and the courts be thus relieved from the reproach of being unable to execute the laws of the United States for want of proper appropriations to meet their necessities.

The Clerk, proceeding to read the bill, read the following:

That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year 1896, and for other objects hereinafter stated, namely.

Mr. SETTLE. I move pro forma to amend by striking out the last word. It is not my purpose, Mr. Chairman, to oppose any of the appropriations carried by this bill, but I rise for the purpose of submitting a few remarks in the line of those submitted by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], with reference to the increase of business in the Federal courts in the State of North Carolina. On some other occasion, I hope to submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and to this House certain facts connected with the administration of the laws in the Federal courts in that State, with the view of securing some legislation for the removal of the evils which now exist. On this occasion I desire merely to have printed as part of my remarks a letter which I have received from the United States district judge of the western district of North Carolina, suggesting certain amendments of the existing law. To these suggestions I wish to invite the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary. If I can have permission to have this letter incorporated in my remarks without being read, I desire to say nothing further at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to printing the letter in connection with the gentleman's remarks? The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

GREENSBORO, N. C., *January 14, 1896.*

MY DEAR SIR: My brief conversation with you a few days ago induced me to hope that there was a possibility of having some judicious and needful amendments made to the internal-revenue laws in regard to the prosecution and punishment of retail dealers of liquors. Under the present law any person who sells or offers for sale spirituous liquors in less quantities than 5 gallons at the same time is regarded as a retail dealer in liquor.

Under a strict construction of this law, I am satisfied that there are more than ten thousand violations each year in this district.

By the activity and vigilance of officers the prosecutions became so numerous, were so expensive, and caused such delay in the courts in disposing of more important business, that the circuit and district judges, after careful consideration, adopted a rule of court that commissioners of the circuit court should not issue warrants unless the informing affidavits showed that the persons accused "carried on the business of retailing by frequent sales."

In my charge to grand juries I instruct them not to return a bill as true unless the evidence before them brings the case clearly within the rule of court. I am very anxious to reduce the enormous expenses of the courts incurred in these prosecutions.

The defendants generally are very poor and ignorant and have large families dependent upon them for the necessaries of life.

If judgment is prayed, I am now compelled by law to imprison them at least thirty days and impose a fine of $100, and they have to remain in prison another thirty days before they can take the oath of insolvency and be discharged.

The strict and rigid enforcement of this law does not and never will stop the petty neighborhood retailing of whisky, and I can see no public good that can result from the prosecution of every person who sells or offers for sale without payment of the special tax.

The law certainly does not advance the "cause of temperance," but rather increases insobriety. It operates somewhat as a monopoly in favor of saloon keepers in towns and cities, who realize large profits and greatly demoralize communities. Men who live in remote and sparsely inhabited sections of country want whisky. They can not conveniently procure it from regular saloons, they have not capital to "carry on the business," and this want and inconvenience give rise to illicit neighborhood traffic, where profits and business are not sufficient to sustain a regular grogshop. The prosecution of these petty country neighborhood transactions causes enormous expense, they in no way tend to increase the revenue of the Government, they produce much suffering in the families of offenders, and result in numerous neighborhood strifes and almost countless perjuries.

A remedy for these evils can not be effected by a law empowering commissioners to hear and dispose of these little cases. It would open the door to much oppression, wrong, and general disturbance in communities, and not reduce the expenses of enforcing the law.

The best remedy which I can suggest is to so amend the law so as to clearly provide that for the purpose of assessment for taxation every person who sells or offers for sale spirituous liquors less than 5 gallons shall be regarded as a retail dealer, and be liable for special tax and penalty to be collected by distraint; and that prosecutions by indictment shall only be instituted against offenders who carry on the business of retailing spirituous liquors by frequent sales, or who make such preparation for sale as indicates a purpose to engage in the traffic as a business, and that such offenders upon conviction shall be imprisoned not more than one year, or fined not more than $1,000, or both, at the discretion of the court. Minimum punishments should be intrusted to the discretion of the court familiar with the facts and circumstances of each case.

The object of restricting the maximum punishment to one year is to take such cases out of the class of infamous crimes as defined by the Supreme Court in Mackins's Case, 117 United States, 348.

In all cases where the punishment may exceed one year the prosecution must be by indictment. If retail cases could be prosecuted by "information," a large amount of expenses would be avoided and offenders would be more certainly convicted and punished. Many professional witnesses, for the purpose of obtaining fees, swear enough to have a defendant bound over to court, and then so shape their evidence before a grand jury as to defeat a bill. This could not be done in a trial in open court on information before the judge and upon the skillful examination of the district attorney.

The object of "fine or imprisonment" is to enable the court to make judicious discrimination in punishment according to the facts and circumstances of each case. A fine could often be secured from an insolvent defendant or his friends to prevent imprisonment, and it would be as effectual preventive punishment as imprisonment. When defendants are both fined and imprisoned they will pay costs and fine by taking oath of insolvency, and the cost of imprisonment will be considerable.

From long experience I find that criminal and penal laws are difficult in enforcement unless the policy of such laws is approved and sustained by the public sentiment of the good citizens of the country. I think this public sentiment is now very decidedly against illicit distilling and the illicit traffic in whisky as a regular business; but a very large number of good citizens do not approve of the rigid prosecution of petty transactions of sale in remote country sections, in small neighborhood dealings where whisky can not be conveniently obtained from regular saloons and grogshops. The revenue officers are very active and vigilant in hunting up such cases. The evidence generally makes out a clear case of violation of law, and honest juries convict, while they do not approve of such prosecutions and regard the law as too stringent and "iron clad."

If the law can be amended as I suggest, I feel confident that such amendments would be approved and appreciated by the best public sentiment, and the internal-revenue laws would cease to be such a prominent and disturbing factor in politics in this State.

My dear SETTLE, don't ask too much by way of amendment, as I fear you would fail if you ask too great a change.

Congress may well limit maximum punishment to guard the constitutional provision against "excessive fines and cruel and unusual punishment"; but surely United States judges can be safely intrusted with the discretion of minimum punishment in retail cases, and to fine or imprison. Such judges are independent and uninfluenced by political considerations. They have much experience in the enforcement of law, and they know the peculiar facts and circumstances in each case, and should be allowed to act wisely, expediently, and mercifully in the administration of justice.

Yours, sincerely, ROBT. P. DICK.

Hon. THOMAS SETTLE.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase, subject to a ground rent of not exceeding $200 per annum, from the Imperial Japanese Government of the present building and site occupied by the United States legation at Tokyo, $16,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill [Mr. CANNON] whether he is informed as to the price which will probably be asked for the building and site at Tokyo, the purchase of which is contemplated by this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. The item speaks for itself:

For the purchase, subject to a ground rent of not exceeding $200 per annum, from the Imperial Japanese Government, of the present building and site occupied by the United States legation at Tokyo, $16,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. MERCER. I understand that the Government is now paying $4,000 a year rent.

Mr. CANNON. So we are informed by the Secretary of State.

Mr. MERCER. The building is a two-story frame building, rather old and not in the best condition. At the present rate of exchange an American dollar is worth in Japan about two Japanese dollars or Japanese yen, so that $16,000 American money, and I am glad to add that our money is always as good as gold, would be equal in Japan to about $32,000. I do not think the house and site are worth to exceed the sum of $12,000 in gold, and I would suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that that paragraph be amended to read $12,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. SAYERS. Has the gentleman seen this building and grounds?

Mr. MERCER. Yes; I have seen them.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will state that this item is recommended by the Committee on Appropriations under the estimate set forth in the Book of Estimates and for the reason con-

tained in Executive Document No. 124, which I hold in my hand. The Secretary of State gives the reasons, but I will save the time of reading the document, unless the gentleman desires it, by stating briefly that this purchase is based on the recommendation of our representative at Tokyo, from which it appears that the committee found in substance as follows: These premises have been occupied for this purpose, if I recollect aright, for about six years; that they belong to the Japanese Government; that the annual rental we pay there is $4,000; that we have an option to buy up to, if I recollect aright—the document states it—the 1st of May next, or possibly some time in April, but at all events during the coming spring, when the lease and option will expire. Now, our representative there states that this is an exceedingly low price for the property.

Mr. MERCER. Does the option fix the price?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; it fixes it at 30,000 yen, the equivalent of the amount recommended here, $16,000 in our currency.

It has been urged strongly by our representative there and indorsed by the Secretary of State. Speaking of the great difficulty that our representative labors under in getting proper accommodations there, we are informed that the Japanese Government itself is crowded out into leased buildings, not so well located as this one; and there is no prospect of renewing the lease or option unless we avail ourselves of it now. This appropriation, it seemed to the committee, on all grounds was the best thing to be done, in view of the statements made, provided, of course, that our representative there tells the truth, and I suppose he does; at least, he is indorsed by the present Secretary of State.

Mr. MERCER. I understand the Japanese Government is desirous that the United States Government should own a legation—house and site—in Tokyo, and have expressed to the American minister a desire that such a purchase be made by our Government. If the purchase of this property is a necessity, then I think we should make the best bargain possible.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me just there? If we buy this property for $16,000, we will own it, whereas the rent for four years would equal that amount.

Mr. MERCER. That is true enough; but I think we are paying an exorbitant rent for the property. This is an old building; it has been improved and repaired two or three times and will demand repairs continually; either that or we must erect a new building in a few years. The location, it is true, is a splendid one; and if the United States should own a legation there, I do not know of a better locality than this. There are plenty of sites to be had, however, for Tokyo extends over a very great area. Washington is spoken of as a "city of magnificent distances," but it can not hold a candle to Tokyo. There is a distance of 7 or 8 miles between different railroad stations in the city, while the main thoroughfare is broader and longer than Pennsylvania avenue, and all within the city limits. This location, as I have said, is a good one, but I think the sum of $16,000 in gold is entirely too much to pay for it, and I believe that if our minister was instructed to purchase it for less he could do so.

I suggest, therefore, that the bill be amended by making it read "$12,000," instead of "$16,000," because if we appropriate $16,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, I am quite sure that the whole amount will be expended.

Mr. CANNON. It will unquestionably be expended, because the appropriation is made with the idea of accepting the option from the Japanese Government, which is to pay 30,000 yen—the equivalent of $16,000 of our currency—for the property.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, the Japanese Government will present this property to the Government of the United States for nothing, if it will accept it, and they have so intimated heretofore. The Committee on Foreign Affairs gave attention to the matter and determined that the United States Government could not submit to such humiliation. Besides, if we accept it in that way, we will be compelled, in a spirit of reciprocity, to at once present to the Japanese Government a site in this city for a Japanese legation, and perhaps for an embassy, which will have to be in keeping with the others here, and there is not one in this city of less value than $16,000 to $60,000.

The French Government accepted a present, centuries ago, from the Turkish Government, of a residence on the Bosphorus, and they were compelled in reciprocity to present to the Turkish Government that magnificent palace in Paris which is now inhabited by the Turkish ambassador, who is so reduced in revenues that he can only keep three servants in a palace which has a dining room that seats 82 guests. At the time that the bargain was made for the renting of this residence in Japan we paid $4,000 rent because the minister said it was the best he could do, and, as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has just said, it is good business to get rid of the payment of $4,000 a year by the purchase for $16,000. If you attempt any chaffering with the Japanese Government, it is very probable that the answer will be: "Eight thousand dollars? No; but take it for nothing."

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing before the committee. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

For purchase of horses and wagons for office and mail service, to be used only for official purposes, care and subsistence of horses, including shoeing, and of wagons, harness, and repairs of the same, $1,000.

Mr. CANNON. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, after line 5, insert:

"The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to cause such furniture and records, used by the Government officials in the custom-house building in Chicago, Ill., as may be necessary, to be removed to rented quarters; and for necessary expenses of such removal, for altering and fitting old counters, screens, and cases so that they may be utilized in the rooms to which they are to be transferred, and for any additional furniture that may be necessary he is authorized to expend not exceeding $3,500 of the appropriation for furniture and repairs of furniture for public buildings, made in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1896."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

State and Territorial homes: For continuing aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled volunteer soldiers, in conformity with the act approved August 27, 1888: *Provided*, That one-half of any sum or sums retained by State homes on account of pensions received by the inmates shall be deducted from the aid herein provided for, being a deficiency for the fiscal year 1895, $18,799.74.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to inquire whether that is the language used in the former bill?

Mr. CANNON. It is.

Mr. SAYERS. This deficiency was not anticipated when this item was before the Committee on Appropriations in the last Congress. We gave the entire estimate, but it has been found that the estimate was not large enough, and this appropriation becomes necessary.

Mr. PICKLER. This is the language of the former bill, as I understand?

Mr. SAYERS. Exactly so.

Mr. PICKLER. I withdraw my formal amendment.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Classification of certain mineral lands in Montana and Idaho: For compensation of the twelve commissioners appointed under the act of February 26 1895, to examine and classify certain lands within the land grant and indemnity land grant limits of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, in the States of Montana and Idaho, with special reference to the mineral or non-mineral character of such lands, $13,500: *Provided*, That said commissioners shall be paid at the rate of $10 a day each while actually engaged in the performance of their duties, which amount shall include their transportation and subsistence expenses, and that the total amount of compensation to be paid to each commissioner annually shall in no case exceed the sum of $2,500.

Mr. HARTMAN. I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 14, page 10, strike out the word "ten" and insert the word "thirteen."

Mr. CANNON. I reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. HARTMAN. I only ask the attention of the committee for a moment upon this amendment. The facts surrounding the services of the commissioners appointed under this act are probably not known to the Committee on Appropriations, or to the members of the House. These commissioners, under the bill, are required to examine and classify mineral lands within the grant of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company. In order to do so they are compelled to outfit and equip themselves for camp life in the mountains.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. HARTMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SAYERS. The members of this commission have been appointed, have they not?

Mr. HARTMAN. They have.

Mr. SAYERS. They have been in service?

Mr. HARTMAN. They have been in service since last May.

Mr. SAYERS. And receiving $10 a day?

Mr. HARTMAN. They have been getting $10 a day.

Mr. SAYERS. And they wish to continue their duties?

Mr. HARTMAN. They wish to continue their duties, and they wish to receive adequate compensation for it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Texas will give me his attention for a moment. From the very fact that these commissioners are compelled to hire horses and mules for the purpose of conveying them into the mountains to actually perform these services, the very fact that they must employ men to take charge of these animals when they are out examining these lands, the very fact that they must employ a cook for the purpose of keeping their provender in shape and enabling them to perform this work properly, it does seem to me that they ought to have more than $10 a day, because of the fact that they are compelled to pay their expenses, they are compelled to pay for the support

even of the men they employ and the wages of the men, and for the forage of their horses and mules. I undertake to say it is inadequate compensation. Again, they are compelled to go away from the railroad 60, 75, and 100 miles, and they can not possibly return to their homes on Sundays. They get no compensation for staying out that time, and it seems to me, taking into consideration the hardships and the unusual expenses which they are compelled to go to, this amendment ought to be allowed. I do not care to consume any further time.

Mr. CANNON. I desire to state, Mr. Chairman, that this point of order is made because the pay of these commissioners is fixed by law at $10 a day while actually employed, not exceeding $2,500 a year. It changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I will have to do that.

Mr. McRAE. Before the gentleman asks a ruling, I desire to say a few words in behalf of these men.

Mr. CANNON. I will reserve the point of order, if the gentleman desires.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I indorse the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Montana. The compensation allowed these commissioners, under the strict construction of the Interior Department, is not adequate for the character of service they perform. They have to make these examinations in the field, and in doing so are required to provide their own camp equipage, to employ cooks, to hire horses, to pay their own traveling expenses, and are not allowed pay for Sundays. Their total compensation is so limited by the original law that they do not receive compensation commensurate with the difficult and important service they perform. These are exceedingly important commissions, and at present are composed of men of high character and first-class ability. They are doing an important work for the Government by segregating from the land grant of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company the excepted mineral lands, and it seems to me they ought to have for expenses what an ordinary inspector from the Land Office gets. Inspectors and special agents are allowed $3 a day for subsistence when on duty. No officer representing the Department of the Interior goes out into the field without having his expenses paid or an allowance made for such expense, except these gentlemen, who are required to do such work as makes it necessary for them to go into camp and endure the hardships of such life, while the other class of men, for whom expense money is allowed, are permitted to stop at first-class hotels and travel in sleeping cars. This amendment only provides what is usual for men in the field, as they of necessity have to be.

The circumstances under which the original bill was passed during last Congress are familiar to old members who had anything to do with it; and they will remember that it was insisted then that this compensation was not sufficient. No one, however, supposed that such a strict construction would be placed upon the law as to deny them compensation for one-seventh of the time they were actually engaged. I do not believe such a construction to be just or legal, but there is no remedy for them. So I hope that the gentleman from Illinois will not insist upon his point of order, but will allow to these gentlemen what is allowed to others who go out from the Department to do field work. I am satisfied that if he knew how important is the work required, and the high order of ability represented in the commissions, he would not insist, but would allow the committee to vote upon it.

Mr. CANNON. I ask a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to move to strike out the language commencing with the word "provided," in line 13, down to and including line 19, on page 10, because that is merely repeating the provisions of the law and performs no useful purpose there.

Mr. SAYERS. I would ask the gentleman from Illinois if he is quite sure now, unless this provision is retained in the bill, that it may not be held that these commissioners can receive more pay?

Mr. CANNON. My recollection is that this is substantially the language of the law.

Mr. McRAE. I think you are correct about that.

Mr. CANNON. And my recollection is reenforced by that of the clerk of the committee.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask the gentleman to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. HARTMAN. That is the language of the law.

Mr. CANNON. It does not help anything, but is a standing invitation for somebody to increase it first, and second——

Mr. SAYERS. They have already endeavored to get an increase.

Mr. CANNON. And it lumbers up the statute without serving any useful purpose.

Mr. SAYERS. All I wish to be done in the matter is to hold these commissioners to $10 a day, and to not more than $2,500 per annum. They have accepted these offices at that salary. They have been at work for months at that compensation. They do not show any disposition to resign. They have been at work during this fall, they will be at work during the spring, and I do not wish the Interior Department to be furnished with an opportunity to increase the pay of these commissioners.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me, there is no objection to the limitation of $2,500. There is no danger of exceeding that sum, either at $13 a day or $10 a day, because they can not work near all of the year. They are called off in the winter months.

Mr. SAYERS. Let me state to my friend that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. HARTMAN] was before the Committee on Appropriations and asked for the appropriation because these men could work during the winter season.

Mr. McRAE. I have not said that they can not work in some of the districts during the winter season; but I know as a matter of fact that they are not at work now, and I know that in some of the districts they can not work in winter.

Mr. HARTMAN. The statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] is correct, with this limitation. What I stated before the committee I repeat here, and it is absolutely correct, that in some of the districts, notably the Bozeman district, work can be done during the winter season.

Mr. McRAE. In some districts they can work and in some they can not work during the winter season. It depends on which side of the mountains they are working.

Mr. SAYERS. The statement of the gentleman from Montana as to what he told the committee is correct.

Mr. McRAE. My information is that in the Missoula district, which I had in mind, they can not work during the winter season.

Mr. HARTMAN. That is the Missoula district?

Mr. McRAE. Yes.

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Add after line 13 the following: "And that the Secretary of the Interior may allow each commission a surveying outfit when they are examining unsurveyed lands."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that amendment that it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Arkansas upon the point of order.

Mr. McRAE. Does the gentleman from Illinois decline to hear the reasons why this is necessary?

Mr. CANNON. I do not object to the gentleman making a speech, but I give notice now that I shall insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order will be considered reserved.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, the reasons for that amendment are that these commissioners, in one district at least, will soon complete the examination of the surveyed lands, and when they go to examine the unsurveyed lands, embracing the larger part of the district, they will necessarily need some assistance in running lines, in order to do the work with any accuracy or with advantage to the Government. They will be in the midst of the Rocky Mountains, where it is almost impossible to get through. There are no roads and but few trails, and it will be necessary to have such an outfit.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I had so much confidence in the judgment of my friend from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] in the last Congress, when these limitations were placed upon these officials, that out of my regard for his judgment as it was last winter, I must insist upon the point of order. [Laughter.]

Mr. McRAE. But the gentleman has not heard me on this proposition.

Mr. CANNON. I listened to the gentleman last winter. [Laughter.]

Mr. McRAE. You did not hear me on this proposition last winter, for I had no information as to these difficulties. I have always endeavored to have the public-land surveys extended over this country wherever they are necessary, but I have hardly ever failed to meet the stubborn objection and resistance of the Committee on Appropriations when I have asked for this.

Mr. SAYERS. For an increase of appropriations, you mean.

Mr. McRAE. Now, if the gentlemen in charge of this bill will not authorize these surveys in the regular way, and we must send out commissioners to segregate the mineral from the nonmineral land, they ought at least to give the surveyors to help them in making the lines. Do they merely want the commissioners to go out and look at the lands without being able to mark the corners and describe the land? It seems to me that such an examination would be of but little value to the Government.

Mr. CANNON. I want them to run and glorify according to the law under which they were created with the support of the gentleman from Arkansas and his friends.

Mr. McRAE. They will glorify their work, but the gentleman must not understand that that bill was proposed by the gentleman from Arkansas; it was proposed and advocated by the Representatives of the two States affected by it. However, I will tell the gentleman that I supported that bill, believing it to be right. Now, then, we do not want to nullify all the good effects of that law by sending out commissioners to examine these lands imperfectly. Let us give them surveying outfits to run the lines, so that we can always know them. As a matter of economy this provision ought to be adopted, for this will be perhaps the only survey ever needed for much of this land.

Mr. SAYERS. I wish to say a word, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Arkansas. A person reading the RECORD to-morrow morning would infer that these commissioners could not perform their duties unless this amendment was adopted, and also that the Committee on Appropriations was opposed to the survey of the public lands. I want to say in this connection that the bill providing for these commissioners was supported by the gentleman from Arkansas in the last Congress, when he was chairman of the Committee on Public Lands; the salaries of these officials were fixed in that bill; these commissioners were appointed under that law; they have been working under that law; and if they now feel that in justice to themselves they can not work any longer under that law, if the salary prescribed by it is not sufficient in their opinion, let them resign and we will find others who can and will work under that law.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Texas, permit me to say that this amendment is not an attempt on the part of the existing commissioners to have their compensation increased. The act to which the gentleman refers was a piece of experimental legislation. What it undertook to provide for had never been attempted before in the United States, and so far it has operated very advantageously to the people and to the Government. It was the most valuable piece of legislation for the State of Montana that has ever been enacted by the Congress of the United States. We presumed when the bill was passed that it was as near perfect as it was possible for it to be and get through the Fifty-third Congress. It was passed. We could not help the fact that certain limitations were placed upon it by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] and others; we could not have passed it without acceding to those requests.

Mr. SAYERS. Let me interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. HARTMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SAYERS. I have just been informed by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] that these limitations were put upon the bill by the Senate. "The gentleman from Texas" has never been a Senator.

Mr. HARTMAN. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that at the time I was making my argument or alleged argument in support of this bill the distinguished gentleman from Texas himself proposed the amendment whereby the compensation of these commissioners was reduced.

Mr. SAYERS. And that was a good day's work.

Mr. HARTMAN. It was a good day's work for the gentleman, but it was pretty rough on the commissioners.

Now, another thing; we have discovered under the operation of this law that there is one provision which could be added to it which would secure the accomplishment of much better work. The act being an experiment, it is no wonder that it is found to be in some particulars imperfect. Now, under the provisions of the existing law, when the commissioners go upon the unsurveyed lands to determine what are mineral and what are nonmineral, they are compelled to make a report in which they are supposed to designate what lands are mineral and what are nonmineral.

Mr. SAYERS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HARTMAN. In one moment; let me finish my statement, and then I will yield.

Now, in making that report the commissioners must have some kind of intelligent description or designation of the land which they return as mineral lands, contradistinguished from that which they define as nonmineral lands. In order to have any definite line or boundary between these two classes of lands they must have the services of a surveyor to establish the lines. Every man knows that. Now, as the matter stands to-day, if the commissioners are to have the benefit of a surveyor's services they have to employ him and pay him out of their own miserable pittance of $10 a day. After they have done this, after they have hired their horses and their mules and paid the expenses necessary for their support and their traveling expenses between the railroad and the various places where they make their examinations, how much of that $10 a day does the gentleman from Texas suppose any one of these commissioners is going to have left? Nothing at all. Thus the result is one of two things: Either you compel these men to pay out all they receive and more than they receive in order to secure good service, or else you compel them to go on without the aid of a surveyor, the consequence being inefficient and bad work. It seems to me that the chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON] ought, out of his proverbial generosity, to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. McRAE. We do not ask any increase of pay for these commissioners.

Mr. CANNON. Let me say that on this question I will take the chairman's advice. The Committee on Public Lands is a beautiful committee and a jealous committee, individually and collectively.

Mr. LACEY. It is neither beautiful nor jealous; but——

Mr. CANNON. It is both beautiful and jealous. [Laughter.] Now, under the rules of this House that committee has exclusive jurisdiction to report legislation changing this law. Yet gentlemen come in here and agonize over this bill, upon which the rules of the House make any legislative amendment out of order. In their thirst for legislation on this subject I send them to the place where the water is to be found; it is not to be found, under the rules, in this bill.

Mr. McRAE. Will you help us on a bill which we may report?

Mr. CANNON. I will make up my mind about that. [Laughter]. Mr. Chairman, I must insist upon the point of order.

Mr. PICKLER. Allow me to say that the Interior Department has, I think, quite a number of these outfits. I know that Department has been doing a large amount of surveying under the appropriations of the last Congress in the Indian Territory, and it is possible that these outfits can be furnished without any new expenditure of money.

Mr. CANNON. That is another argument to be addressed to the Committee on Public Lands, which has plenary jurisdiction of this subject.

Mr. HEPBURN. But if the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] is true, then the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois will not lie. If the Department has these outfits on hand the furnishing of them does not change existing law.

Mr. SAYERS. That appropriation was made under another law; it has no reference to this particular case.

Mr. PICKLER. It is under the Interior Department, is it not?

Mr. SAYERS. It is.

Mr. CANNON. I ask for a ruling on the point of order.

Mr. McRAE. In view of the suggestion made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], I am inclined to think that perhaps the amendment is in order. It will be observed that we are not asking any increase of the appropriation; so that there is no objection to the amendment on that score. The Department, I feel quite confident, has some surveying parties now under employment that it can detail to this work without any increase of expense; so, as the amendment makes no change of law, but merely seeks to control the discretion of the Department on this particular point, I submit the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, a moment only in reply to the gentleman on the point of order.

The service which has been rendered under the Interior Department in the Indian Territory is quite a different service from that referred to here. That was authorized by an appropriation and by legislation on the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. McRAE. But by the general law surveys, as you know, are provided for by the sundry civil bill——

Mr. SAYERS (continuing). And it would be without authority of law for the Secretary of the Interior to divert the expenditure of the appropriation from the particular surveys provided for in the Indian Territory to the surveys mentioned in this bill.

Mr. McRAE. But the general appropriation in the sundry civil act for surveys would cover it.

Mr. SAYERS. No; it would not authorize it.

Mr. McRAE. I mean the provision of the sundry civil appropriation bill providing for the general surveys, which leaves it all in his discretion, and this allows him to authorize some of his force to assist in the work in the manner suggested without a change of law.

Mr. SAYERS. This is a service under a special law; and the Secretary of the Interior has no right to divert funds appropriated for another purpose to this particular purpose.

Mr. CANNON. If he has a right to do it now there is no necessity for this provision, and I think I must insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule upon the point of order, and sustains the point.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my friend from Montana [Mr. HARTMAN] a question. He has almost convinced me that the Committee on Appropriations has made a mistake in recommending a deficiency appropriation for these commissioners. I do not want to do a vain thing, and have the

money thrown away, or recommend an appropriation unless it is to be used, and can be used, for the good of the public service; and so I will ask the gentleman whether or not it can be so used——

Mr. SAYERS. And will be.

Mr. CANNON (continuing). And will be, in his judgment, for such purpose?

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Chairman, up to the extent of the examination of the surveyed lands the commissioners can do efficient service. Until the surveyed lands are entirely exhausted there is no reason why the appropriation should not be made.

But in all sincerity, and I am satisfied from the twinkling I see in the eye of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that there is some suggestion on his part or intention to overturn the "gentleman from Montana"——

Mr. CANNON. Not at all. On the contrary, I put the provision in on account of the industry and insistence of the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. HARTMAN. And the "gentleman from Montana" is very grateful.

Mr. CANNON. We thought he wanted it for a public service, but he has almost convinced me the other way. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this money can be appropriated with a certainty that it will be used to great advantage in the examination and classification of the surveyed lands. That will be the case until by law, either by general bill or by some appropriation bill, it is provided that surveying outfits can accompany these commissioners in the examination of the unsurveyed lands; and I frankly admit that to expend money on the unsurveyed lands unaccompanied by a surveying gang would be of no possible value.

Mr. CANNON. Are there enough of the surveyed lands to keep these gentlemen busy until the 1st of July?

Mr. HARTMAN. Yes; and probably until the 1st day of December.

Mr. CANNON. Very well. Let the Clerk proceed with the reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the payment of stenographers employed by said commissioners when authorized by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, for the purpose of reducing testimony to writing in cases where it is found necessary to examine witnesses in order to establish the character of lands examined by said commissioners, $500; in all, $20,000.

Mr. TOWNE. Mr Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to an amendment which I propose to offer at the end of line 9, the paragraph at the top of page 11.

Mr. CANNON. Very well; let the gentleman offer his amendment.

Mr. TOWNE. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, after line 9, insert:

"FOR SURVEYING AND ALLOTTING FOR CHIPPEWAS IN MINNESOTA.

"For completing the necessary surveys within the Chippewa Reservation in Minnesota, including expenses of examining and appraising pine lands, under the provisions of the act approved January 14, 1889, to be reimbursed to the United States out of the proceeds of their lands, $5,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, having heard read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNE], I will say that my attention has been called to it, and I am satisfied that the appropriation should be made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

For additional salary of chief of accounting division, $600.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to that item. If he will examine the official register of some twenty years ago he will find that chiefs of division were then practically unknown, and that that grade in the public service in the Departments has grown up since then, and that it costs the Government a great deal of additional money. Now, here is a provision for additional salary for one of those officers in this urgent deficiency bill, and I should like to ask for some explanation as to the necessity for it.

Mr. CANNON. I will state to the gentleman that the Joint Commission, which the gentleman recollects about——

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I recollect it very well.

Mr. CANNON (continuing). Wisely or unwisely, as the case may be, brought about a complete change in the accounting system of the Departments. In the organization of the accounting division of the Department of Justice there was an increase of force, while there was a decrease in the Treasury Department proper. Without reference to the wisdom or unwisdom of that law, it is necessary to have the proper employees under it, and from all I can ascertain the accounting division in the Department of Justice is doing good work. I do not recall the name of the gentleman to whom this appropriation will go, nor do I know where he is from, but he is a gentleman who, I believe, is really at the head of this division, receiving, I believe, $1,800 a year, along with other clerks. I will state further that he seemed to have so much merit, coming, as he did, before the committee, not in reference to this item, for he never referred to it, but in the presentation of the estimates of the Department of Justice, he seemed to have so much information touching the expenditures of the same that it seemed to the committee proper to make this recommendation.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have the explanation given by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I wish here to call attention to this as one of the very many additions that have been made, not only to force but to salaries, under the so-called reorganization of the Departments. It was claimed during the debate on that measure that there would be a saving of some $200,000 annually; but if the whole roster of officers and salaries could be completed and brought before this House at this time it would be shown that there has not been any practical saving, while the business of the several Departments has been performed in a less accurate manner and no more rapidly than before; in fact, that the accounting divisions of the Treasury Department are in such condition that they are practically unable to tell what they have done or what they will do, and that no man knows what the condition of his account may be under this so-called revised system, and that all the records and files of the Departments have been torn up and twisted here and scattered there until it is impossible to find the papers which ought to be on file in the Treasury Department. I hope that the time will speedily come when all this will be righted, and that the accounting system of the Government will be put back into the condition in which it was from the days of Hamilton down until the last Congress.

That bill authorized a number of new officers, law clerks of this bureau and that bureau, and some of the heads of those bureaus have had the good sense and honesty to say that they have no use for the law clerks, and in most of the bureaus the law clerks have been put upon other work than legal business.

Now, in relation to these chiefs of the accounting divisions, twenty-five years ago the most important bureaus of the Treasury and other Departments transacted their business without the intervention of chiefs of divisions. It is a serious question in my mind whether that grade should ever have been established, and whether it should now be maintained. It certainly has resulted in an increased cost of several thousand dollars in addition to what the expense would have been if transacted by the regular clerks of the Treasury and other Departments, simply detailed to be at the head of their several branches of work. I do not know the chief of this accounting division either by name or reputation, and it is appropriate probably that he should have this increase of salary if such salary is to go to all others; but I wish to call the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to the propriety of cutting down the salaries and destroying the grade of all those known as chiefs of division in all the Departments.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUDICIAL.

To pay the salaries and expenses of the judges, district attorneys, marshals, clerks, commissioners, and constables of the United States courts in the Indian Territory, being a deficiency to the appropriation for the service of the fiscal years 1895 and 1896, $210,000.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "Territory," in line 25, on page 12, insert: "To include the salary due James V. Walker, resigned, as district attorney of the central district of the Indian Territory, from April 1, 1895, to July 8, 1895, inclusive, at the rate of $4,000 per annum, and the salary due Lucius L. Stowe, now deceased, as marshal of the southern district of the Indian Territory, from April 3, 1895, to July 27, 1895, inclusive, at the rate of $4,000 per annum."

Mr. CANNON. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. DINSMORE. I will state, Mr. Chairman, that I do not think, when the chairman of the committee hears my statement, he will find that this amendment is subject to the point of order, because——

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, we can not hear the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. DINSMORE. I will speak so that the gentleman shall hear. I will state, Mr. Chairman, that this asks no increase whatever in the appropriation as offered by the committee in this bill. As a matter of fact, the bill was intended to cover the items referred to in my amendment, and the bill was based upon estimates submitted by the Department of Justice, which included these items; and the amendment was offered for this purpose solely. The district attorney was appointed after the adjournment of last Congress for the central district of the Indian Territory, and he served from April 1 until the 8th day of July, when he resigned.

The marshal was appointed for the southern district of the Territory. He served from the 3d day of April until July 28, I believe, when he died. The Department have sent up items, as I have already stated, including the salaries of both of these officers, to meet the objection, the captious objection many think, of Mr. Bowler, Comptroller of the Treasury, as to paying out money for

salaries. He has held, and I suppose if he is consistent would hold again, that unless an officer has been confirmed by the Senate he is not entitled to his pay. That he did in one or two instances, as suggested to me already by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, wherein there was no money available, but he has also done it in the case of the ambassador to Mexico, Mr. Ransom, where the money was available. This does not change the bill except to name the parties, so that the Comptroller will find them provided for in this appropriation bill.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. DINSMORE. Certainly.

Mr. SAYERS. Has the gentleman any communication from the Department of Justice on the subject?

Mr. DINSMORE. I have. I have a letter from the Acting Attorney-General upon the subject, which I will ask to have read. I will ask the Clerk to read the letter first and then the statement.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1896.

SIR: In complicance with your personal request, I inclose herewith a memorandum showing the date of appointment, qualification, and termination of term in the cases of L. L. Stowe, United States marshal for the southern district of Indian Territory, and James V. Walker, United States attorney for the central district of Indian Territory, with the amount of salary earned by them, respectively, during the said terms.

Very respectfully,

HOLMES CONRAD,
Acting Attorney-General.

Hon. J. H. BERRY, *United States Senate.*

Lucius L. Stowe, of Indian Territory, appointed marshal of the United States court for the southern district of the Indian Territory, as provided for by act of Congress approved March 1, 1895, by the President during recess of the Senate, March 20, 1895. Oath of office, April 3, 1895. Salary from April 3, 1895, to July 27, 1895 (time of his death), $1.271.47.

James V. Walker, of Arkansas, appointed attorney of the United States court for the central district of the Indian Territory, as provided for by act of Congress approved March 1, 1895, by the President during recess of the Senate, March 20, 1895. Oath of office, April 1, 1895.

Resignation accepted to take effect upon the appointment and qualification of his successor.

(William J. Horton, of Indian Territory, appointed attorney of the United States for the central district of the Indian Territory, vice J. V. Walker, resigned on July 2, 1895. Oath, July 8, 1895.)

Salary of Walker from April 1, 1895, to July 8, 1895, $1,086.96.

Mr. DINSMORE. Now, Mr. Chairman, it will be observed, as I stated, that these two officers were appointed to their respective offices in the beginning of the month of April—Mr. Walker on April 1 and Mr. Stowe on April 3; that they served a portion of the time; that Walker resigned on the 8th day of July and Stowe died a little later in the month. As I have stated before, the estimates were given to the Committee on Appropriations by the Department of Justice covering these two items; and the appropriation bill is based upon them. I wish to impress upon the House that that is the single object of the amendment; that it does not change the result, except as it may include the conduct or judgment of the Comptroller of the Treasury as to the money, by specifically providing in this bill that these two officers are entitled to the payment of their salaries, and therefore I hope that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will not object to the amendment being adopted.

Mr. CANNON. I read from the bill, on pages 12 and 13, and I will ask the attention of the Chair:

To pay the salaries and expenses of the judges, district attorneys, marshals, clerks, commissioners, and constables of the United States courts in the Indian Territory, being a deficiency to the appropriation for the service of the fiscal years 1895 and 1896, $210,000.

Now, if this man was an officer, or attorney, or other official mentioned in this appropriation, he will get his money, because he is covered generally along with the other officials by the terms of the appropriation. If he was not an official, then he ought not to have the money.

Mr. DINSMORE. But, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me——

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman from Arkansas allow me?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. DINSMORE. Yes.

Mr. SAYERS. I have no doubt that the men who are mentioned were officials, and that they received their appointments according to law.

Mr. DINSMORE. That has been stated by the Department of Justice.

Mr. SAYERS. But what I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to first is the fact that this amendment does not increase the sum total of the appropriation——

Mr. DINSMORE. Not one cent.

Mr. SAYERS. Second, to the further fact that the law itself is analogous to the appropriation for ambassador to the Republic of Mexico. I will read:

Schedule A: Salaries of ambassadors and ministers, envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Russia and Mexico at $17,500 each, $35,000.

Now, the point I desire to make in this connection is this: That if under this appropriation the Comptroller of the Treasury refused to pay the salary of the gentleman appointed as minister to Mexico during the vacation, there is no reason why he should not refuse to pay the salary of these parties, who were appointed during vacation and were never confirmed by the Senate, one of them having died and the other having resigned.

Mr. DINSMORE. That is the point.

Mr. SAYERS. And I understand the object of the gentleman is simply to meet the objection raised by the Comptroller of the Treasury in the case of the payment of the salary of the ambassador to Mexico.

Mr. DINSMORE. Certainly; that is it exactly.

Mr. CANNON. The general language covers every official who is performing service in that territory under the law. I do not know what the Comptroller has held about the salary of the Mexican minister, and I do not care. I do not know what the Comptroller may hold touching this matter. If he should hold as the gentleman claims that he possibly may, that will be a legitimate subject for argument to be addressed to the great and good President who sits at the other end of the Avenue and makes Comptrollers; but if we are to undertake to anticipate what the action of the Comptroller may be in the future touching all our legislation and appropriations, we shall never get through. There is no more reason why these two gentlemen should be singled out and put into this act than there is why any of the fifty or sixty others to whom the act relates should be put into it by name. As I said before, this proposition is to do away with auditing in these cases, and I do not think we care to do that. If it were necessary I would be inclined to give way, but I do not think there is any necessity for it.

Mr. SAYERS. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that this provision can be so amended as to protect the Treasury and at the same time require the Comptroller to pass these accounts, provided they are right.

Mr. CANNON. In other words, you propose to abolish your Comptroller to this extent?

Mr. SAYERS. We have done it already. One of the first things we did in this Congress was to pass a resolution to meet his objections touching another matter of appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. Has the gentleman from Arkansas asked the Comptroller what construction he will put upon this law?

Mr. DINSMORE. I have not, but we have precedents. We know what the Comptroller held before in a similar case, and we must assume that he will be consistent and will so hold again, because this case comes under the principle of his former ruling. These officers were appointed in vacation and never were confirmed by the Senate. One of them died before he could be confirmed, and the other resigned before the Senate met, so that there never was any opportunity to confirm them. I can not understand why the distinguished gentleman from Illinois should make objection to this proposition, because it will not be contended by anybody that these officials were not appointed, that they did not serve, or that they are not entitled to their pay. But the Comptroller construes the law to mean that there must be a confirmation in every case before an officer can be entitled to receive compensation.

The gentleman from Illinois says that we are proposing to abolish the office of Auditor. Not at all. This matter would still go before the Auditor to determine the amount due. We have not undertaken to determine the amount that is due. We have simply set forth the terms during which these men served, as shown in a statement furnished to me or to one of the Senators from my State. That statement shows the time during which they served and for which they should be entitled to their pay. This amendment does not add one single cent to the appropriation necessary for this purpose; it only makes the appropriation specific in order to prevent any confusion about the payment. Mr. Stowe, the marshal, died, and in case the Comptroller should insist on his objection, the same objection which he has made heretofore in a parallel case, if the personal representatives of Mr. Stowe should come to apply for his compensation, they would be involved in interminable trouble and expense, perhaps necessitating an application for a mandamus to make an officer of the Government perform his duty. I am sure that the distinguished gentleman in charge of this bill does not desire that, and I think that when the case is fully understood every gentleman here ought to be willing to make this appropriation specific, so that it may certainly reach the persons for whom it is intended.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will follow out that rule we shall require to have an analytical statement in each case, setting forth each man for whom each dollar and each cent is appropriated; every deputy marshal, every judge, every employee in the United States will have to be specified, and all in order to head off a Comptroller who can not at all times distinguish the difference between a fly speck and a period. [Laughter.]

Mr. SAYERS. But would the gentleman from Illinois, in a case like this, expect these men, who are fairly entitled to their pay, to go without it simply because the Comptroller of the Treasury makes a technical ruling?

Mr. CANNON. I do not know what the Comptroller's ruling may be in this case. He has never yet had a chance to rule upon it.

Mr. SAYERS. No; because no money has ever been appropriated to pay them.

Mr. DINSMORE. But the Comptroller has made a ruling in similar cases.

Mr. CANNON. It is quite enough, Mr. Chairman, to have to correct this man's rulings after he has made them, but if we undertake to anticipate the mistakes he will make in the future we shall never get through. [Laughter.]

Mr. DINSMORE. We are not assuming—at least I am not—to correct his errors.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, are we not bound to presume that the Comptroller will rule correctly?

Mr. DINSMORE. Very well; that being so, so much greater is the importance of having this amendment adopted; because here is an officer who, as nobody will deny, has served the Government. He was appointed in pursuance of law, and entered upon the discharge of his duties in pursuance of law. It is admitted by everybody—and information to that effect has come to the House from the Department of Justice—that he did perform service, and for such service is entitled to a certain amount of salary.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The money to pay these officers has already been appropriated, has it not?

Mr. DINSMORE. I will state to my friend from Pennsylvania what perhaps he did not hear stated before, that the appropriation for the payment of these men is included in this bill, which has been made up upon the estimates furnished by the Department of Justice.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I understand that; and now what you want is a specific direction in this bill to the Comptroller to do what you apprehend he will not do or has not done.

Mr. DINSMORE. Well, I suppose it amounts to that, practically. I should like to have it specified in the bill——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. In other words, you want this House to strike at the Comptroller in reference to the performance of his duties in a particular matter.

Mr. DINSMORE. No; my position is not susceptible, I humbly submit, of that construction. But I want this House to specify that the appropriation here made shall be in part applied, in accordance with the judgment of every man on the committee and of every man in this House who is familiar with the purpose for which the appropriation is designed, to the payment of these two items which are intended to be included, and which we have reason to believe (the Comptroller having taken the same position with reference to similar matters) he will not otherwise permit to be paid, he holding the provision not available for such purpose because these officers have never been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I submit that the House, in adopting the course which the gentleman urges, would take upon itself duties which do not belong to it. If we have a Comptroller whose rulings are unsatisfactory or unjust, it is the duty of the Administration to remove him. We can not undertake to lay down a line of conduct for him. We are to presume that he will follow the precedents and the law. While I think he has not done so in all cases, especially in the case of the sugar bounty, yet we can not presume to instruct him by a special direction in a bill of this kind.

Mr. DINSMORE. Is it out of deference to the views of the Comptroller that the gentleman says "we can not presume to instruct him"?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I know that Comptrollers are generally obstructionists; they are generally striving to find some excuse for withholding payments of money, especially when the Treasury is very much depleted. The present Comptroller has been a useful officer for this Administration, though an unfortunate one for some of the persons who have had dealings with him. I prefer that he shall continue to administer his office without any positive directions from this House. I think that will be better all around. If we have to put into our appropriation bills peremptory directions for the guidance of the Comptroller, there will be a larger deficit in the Treasury than there is now.

Mr. DINSMORE. Well, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend allow me a suggestion?

Mr. DINSMORE. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. As a matter of current history we know that this appropriation is designed to cover in part the pay of two gentlemen, lately members of this House, now on the bench—Mr. Springer and Mr. Kilgore—who, as a matter of current history, we know served for months before they were confirmed. I do not know whether they have yet been confirmed.

Mr. SAYERS. They have.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Texas says they have been. Now, if we pick out two of these people whose cases are "on all fours" with cases of other gentlemen and appropriate for these two men by name, thereby tacitly admitting that without our special legislation nothing is due to them until they have been confirmed, do we not "turn down" every other official who occupies the same situation; and is not this a bad method of legislation? If anything is due these gentlemen, will they not get it? And if we pass this amendment, is it not legislation?

Mr. TERRY. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] a question. He speaks of "singling out men by name and providing for them in this bill." I wish to ask him whether in this bill the Committee on Appropriations has not, in at least three different places, "singled out men" and directed that specific sums be paid them?

Mr. CANNON. Not in connection with Mr. Bowler.

Mr. TERRY. Now, let me ask the gentleman another question. As a matter of right and justice, does he feel that it is proper to wrong one living man and the legal representatives of another who is dead in order to make a point against Bowler?

Mr. CANNON. I am not seeking to make any point against Bowler. In my judgment this appropriation will pay everybody who was an officer of the United States during the fiscal year 1895 or the fiscal year 1896; and when you commence to pick out men by name as the beneficiaries of this appropriation you may, while thus mentioning a few, be discriminating against others.

I think we had better do business in the ordinary way, Mr. Chairman; and having said that much, having stated my view of this matter, I leave the question with the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, may I ask to have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment, if there be no objection, will be reported.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is there a point of order pending, or is the question now on the merits?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was made and reserved against the amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois for a moment, for the purpose of asking him a question for information. I understand that there has been a ruling of the Department that these Presidential offices (not others) must be confirmed by the Senate before there is acquired a title to receive the pay designated by law, or, in other words, before they become officers.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. That is it; and the first ruling of the kind ever made.

Mr. SWANSON. That is the ruling of the Comptroller of the Treasury Department. Now, I understand that these people, who held the offices in question and performed the duties, or one at least of them, died when they were serving, and hence there is no possible way for the Senate ever to confirm the appointment. Is that not so?

Mr. CANNON. I do not know.

Mr. SWANSON. So the gentleman from Arkansas states, as I understand it.

Mr. DINSMORE. That is correct.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, there are but few Presidential offices; and if this ruling is to hold and these officials can not get their money by the process of law, that is, out of the money appropriated, as it has been appropriated, how is it to be expected that they will ever get their compensation unless some such provision as this is inserted?

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Oh, well, the successor of the present Comptroller of the Treasury will rectify that error. [Laughter.]

Mr. SAYERS. I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be as powerful in the Treasury Department as he is in this House. He can not speak there.

Mr. SWANSON. I am confident that the House is desirous of doing what is right in this matter——

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Oh, yes.

Mr. SWANSON. Do you propose to delay people with just claims against the Government until some political battle is fought out and won or lost? It seems to be very poor politics, as well as very poor justice, to do such a thing as that. If the work was done, and a comptroller, as he construes the law, claims that these parties must have been confirmed by the Senate before they become officers of the Government and entitled to their pay, although they performed the work, surely it is our duty to see that justice is done to them. Now, until that ruling is reversed, or a change is made by Congress, there is no way by which they can possibly get their compensation.

Mr. HEMENWAY. If there is no law now by which these gentlemen can have their pay, would it not be new legislation injected upon this bill to adopt the amendment?

Mr. SWANSON. But it is not new legislation. This is simply an interpretation by Congress as to what the law is.

Mr. HEMENWAY. You reverse the Comptroller——

Mr. DINSMORE. Let me say to the gentlemen that this is not

new legislation, but simply making an appropriation bill clear and explicit in its terms.

Mr. HEMENWAY. If the gentlemen will permit me, if it is now the law that these gentlemen should be paid, why are you asking to insert it here?

Mr. DINSMORE. The law gave authority in the first instance for their appointment. They were appointed and served in pursuance of the law. That service has passed, has been rendered, and it is proposed in this bill to pay them the salaries they earned.

This is an urgent deficiency bill, carrying deficiencies for the service for the year 1895, when that service was rendered. But, as has been repeatedly stated, in order that the payment may not be deferred, and thereby compelling these parties to go to the expense and trouble of bringing their claim before the courts, I only ask that this appropriation bill shall make it specific. I ask the House only to make the appropriation definite in terms.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Let me ask the gentleman this question: If it is now the law——

Mr. DINSMORE. We propose to make it the law.

Mr. HEMENWAY (continuing). If it is the law now, why does the Comptroller refuse to pay?

A MEMBER. Why assume that he will refuse?

Mr. DINSMORE. I do not suppose it; I do not assume it——

Mr. HEMENWAY. Let me conclude what I was about to ask. The Comptroller has decided that under the law he can not pay them their salaries. Now you ask us to change the law so that they can be paid notwithstanding that decision.

Mr. DINSMORE. The gentleman is mistaken in regard to the decision of the Comptroller.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Let me ask how much money has been held up by the present Comptroller under this Administration?

Mr. DINSMORE. Now, if my friend from Pennsylvania will pardon me, that is an entirely irrelevant question. My purpose in coming before the House on this matter was to obtain a simple act of justice to two persons who are entitled to an appropriation, and I thought when I proposed it that I certainly should meet with no objection from anybody.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Let me ask this one question: How much would the present deficit in the Treasury be increased if this Comptroller had followed the precedents of previous Comptrollers?

Mr. DINSMORE. I must decline to answer such questions.

Mr. SWANSON. Let me answer the question.

Mr. DINSMORE. No; I decline to yield. The matter is perfectly plain.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] has the floor.

Mr. CANNON. I will say that so far as I am concerned I will not press the point of order.

Mr. DINSMORE. Then I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order having been withdrawn, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

UNITED STATES COURTS.

For payment of the fees and expenses of the United States marshals and deputies, $960,000: *Provided*, That not exceeding $500,000 of this appropriation may be advanced to marshals, to be accounted for in the usual way, the residue to remain in the Treasury, to be used, if at all, only in the payment of the accounts of marshals in the manner provided in section 856, Revised Statutes.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 13, at the end of line 12, insert:

"*Provided, further*, That hereafter all fees for United States attorneys, marshals, clerks of courts, and special counsel necessarily employed in prosecuting civil suits instituted by the Auditor for the Post-Office Department through the solicitor of the Treasury against the sureties on the official bonds of late postmasters, as provided for by section 292, Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be paid from the appropriations for expenses of the United States Courts."

Mr. SAYERS. The object of the amendment is to cure an existing evil. Suppose that an officer of the United States court—a marshal, for instance—presents his account to the Department of Justice for the purpose of having it audited. The account may contain items for different kinds of services. Under the present law, if there should be an item for service in a suit upon a postmaster's bond, then after the account has been passed upon by the Department of Justice it must go to the Post-Office Department and be examined and passed upon by that Department also. The intention of this amendment is, not to increase the appropriation, but simply to facilitate the examination and allowance or rejection of accounts, so that when a United States marshal's or a district attorney's account, or a clerk's account, shall go to the Department of Justice, no matter for what Department the particular services may have been rendered, the Department of Justice may, under the law, examine the account and pass upon it.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is right; it ought to be done.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. There is no objection to that.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask that a letter from the Attorney-General upon the subject, which I send to the Clerk's desk, may be incorporated in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1896.

SIR: Referring to your suggestions in a recent personal interview, relative to a proposed amendment to the present provision governing the payment of fees in post-office cases (page 8, Attorney-General's Report, 1895) I beg to say that you will find on page 265 of the Digest of Appropriations for 1896 the provision that requires accounts in civil post-office cases to be paid from the appropriation under the Post-Office Department styled "For mail depredations and post-office inspectors." If the amendment suggested is added to the urgent deficiency bill and hereafter the proviso is omitted from the Post-Office bill, accounts of this character will be forwarded by this Department hereafter to the Auditor for the State and other Departments.

The amendment might be in the language following:

"*Provided*, That hereafter all fees for United States attorneys, marshals, clerks of courts, and special counsel necessarily employed in prosecuting civil suits instituted by the Auditor for the Post-Office Department through the Solicitor of the Treasury, against the sureties on the official bonds of late postmasters, as provided for by section 292, Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be paid from the appropriations for expenses of the United States courts."

Respectfully,

JUDSON HARMON,
Attorney-General.

Hon. A. M. DOCKERY,
House of Representatives.

The amendment of Mr. SAYERS was agreed to.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Provided, That none of the sum appropriated by this act shall be paid to United States marshals or deputies for mileage or expenses in excess of the amount they are entitled to by law for carrying or taking prisoners arrested before the nearest United States commissioner or other proper officer.

Mr. CANNON. I will reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. STEELE. That is not the amendment which I showed to the gentleman a while ago.

Mr. CANNON. I think it is substantially the law now.

Mr. STEELE. I think it is substantially the law. The only point is that marshals will arrest a prisoner, say, in the southern part of Texas, and although there may be a United States commissioner within 10 miles of the point where the prisoner is arrested, instead of taking him before that commissioner, the marshal will take him 600 miles away, to another commissioner, and he will not only take him, but he will employ three or four men to go with the man, although the man when cited might go of his own accord. The marshal will employ these men to help him take the prisoner before the commissioner 600 miles away, and as soon as they arrive there the commissioner will let the man go on his own recognizance. Then these excessive fees are charged up, notwithstanding the law.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend that I will send to the Clerk's desk and have read the law as it stands now.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That it shall be the duty of the marshal, his deputy, or other officer, who may arrest a person charged with any crime or offense, to take the defendant before the nearest circuit court commissioner or the nearest judicial officer having jurisdiction under existing laws for a hearing, commitment, or taking bail for trial, and the officer or magistrate issuing the warrant shall attach thereto a certified copy of the complaint, and upon the arrest of the accused, the return of the warrant, with a copy of the complaint attached, shall confer jurisdiction upon such officer as fully as if the complaint had originally been made before him, and no mileage shall be allowed any officer violating the provisions hereof.

Mr. CANNON. I trust that after hearing the law read the gentleman will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. STEELE. Notwithstanding the fact that the law treats the matter in that way, yet as we are appropriating this money, we may say that it shall not be paid out in cases where the law has been violated.

Mr. CANNON. By implication, would not the gentleman's amendment nullify or repeal the statute which I have just had read?

Mr. STEELE. Not at all.

Mr. CANNON. I am not so clear about that.

Mr. STEELE. It only makes it obligatory upon the accounting officer to say that the money shall not be paid out where the law has been violated.

Mr. CANNON. The safest way, I think, is to insist upon my point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I move to strike out the last word. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, in reply——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Illinois to raise the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I want to say in reply to the gentleman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has sustained the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Then I move to strike out the last word. The abuses which the gentleman complains of are not confined to that particular part of the practice of the Federal courts, but they extend to the whole machinery of the courts. The law is violated every day, and the cost of running those courts is accumulating every day. This committee had that matter in full consideration, but could not change the law without violating our own rules; but it does sincerely hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will do its duty and make some changes in the law, and change this system of paying Federal officers by fees to salaries; and there is no other way of relief from this abuse.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what the point of order was that the gentleman made that the Chair has sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. That it changes existing law.

Mr. STEELE. What law does it change? I would like to ascertain.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman comes rather late with his inquiry.

Mr. STEELE. If the Chair does not care to give the reason, I will not insist.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana will please give his attention. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was recognized on an amendment to strike out the last word, and that amendment is still pending.

Mr. STEELE. The gentleman from Indiana, as I understood, got up to address himself to the amendment. The Chair asked the gentleman from Illinois if he made the point of order, which he stated he did, and then the Chair sustained the point of order while the gentleman from Pennsylvania was endeavoring to address the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana did not give his full attention to the Chair. The Chair inquired of the gentleman from Illinois if he insisted upon the point of order. The gentleman said that he did, and the Chair sustained the point of order. Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania arose to discuss the point of order, and the Chair suggested to him that the Chair had already ruled on the point of order, and sustained it; and then the gentleman from Pennsylvania was recognized on a motion to strike out the last word.

Mr. STEELE. I only asked, as a matter of information, what the point of order was that the Chair had sustained. No point of order was stated.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Illinois to reserve the point of order from the commencement.

Mr. STEELE. That, too, might be; but he did not state what the point of order was that was sustained. But that is all right to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has already risen to address the Chair, and the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has already stated and give the committee the benefit of some facts and figures that will perhaps be useful in the further examination of this question. I realize, and the committee of course realizes, the fact that we can not remedy the evils in our Federal courts by any amendment to the present bill. I will call attention, however, to the fact that the original appropriation bill for the year 1896 only carries $3,455,600, while this deficiency carries $3,240,582.19. In other words, we come within $212,000 of as much deficiency as in the original bill for the Federal courts.

The reason for this is largely due to the methods which have been perpetuated for a generation, and because the courts themselves are beyond the reach practically of legislation. Men holding a life office do not feel that sense of responsibility to the people that members of this House do, or even members of the Senate. Many of the evils that are complained of here could be cured by the judges themselves, and are cured, or partly so, in some States by the judges, by the prompt removal of offending officers. A judge has power to remove a deputy marshal who institutes or a commissioner who sends up a frivolous charge, and the courts do remove them in some instances. But such men are often retained, because they are very useful to two officers of the court, the marshal and attorney. The district attorney's fees, under existing law, depend entirely upon the amount of business that is done. I remember more than twenty years ago, perhaps twenty-five years ago, I remonstrated with the assistant district attorney in a case in which I was engaged for bringing a clearly frivolous charge. He said to me, "My friend, you do not understand the situation. The chief under whom I serve is entitled to $6,000 a year providing there is business enough to make $6,000 a year. I have to make the business, and I am bringing suits in order to create business enough so that he may earn his salary."

So with the marshal. The deputy must do business enough to bring the salary of his chief up to $6,000 a year. It is this inherent defect in the system that causes the trouble. Let me give you a few figures taken from the unfinished manuscript report in the Attorney-General's Office. The report of court expenses was called for by resolution of this House, but of necessity some delay has arisen in preparing it, and in the meantime I will give a few figures which will be embraced in that report. Take, first, the State of Arkansas, the western district of that State. It will be interesting to the House to learn that in that district the same man performs the duties of clerk of the district court, clerk of the circuit court, and United States commissioner, for which he receives the following emoluments: As clerk of the circuit court he earned last year $3,241.65; as clerk of the district court he earned $3,791.65; as United States commissioner he earned $6,032.70, making a total of $12,372.80 earned by this one man, or $7,372.10 more than the judge of that court received for the performance of his duties. Such inequalities make manifest the necessity of a revision of the laws under which such things are possible. This is not an exceptional case by any means. Take the court commissioners of the Territory of Oklahoma. Their fees last year amounted to $32,738.

Mr. SAYERS. How many United States commissioners are there?

Mr. LACEY. There is a large number. This instance is perhaps exceptional, because these officials perform all the duties performed by State courts. The total expenditure there for deputy marshals for last year in that Territory was $212,665.73.

Turning now to the commissioners in the State of Iowa, and including both districts, north and south, I find that they earned $7,781.13; while in the State of Ohio the commissioners earned only $3,890.43, and in the State of Pennsylvania only $3,144.70. It will be seen, therefore, that the commissioners in my own State earned more than all the commissioners in the great States of Ohio and Pennsylvania put together. Now, Mr. Chairman, when you find such discrepancies there must be some evil or fault underlying the system, which ought to be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, having such matters in charge. That committee is an able one, and no doubt will give the matter the fullest consideration and report some adequate remedy.

I have introduced a bill making these officials salaried officers, so as to dig up this whole fee system by the roots. The "pernicious activity" of the deputy marshals and commissioners has done much to increase the expenditures in connection with the United States courts. Self-interest is involved.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LACEY. I should like some additional time.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa be allowed time sufficient to conclude his remarks.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. LACEY. I thank the committee for their courtesy, and I shall not abuse it nor occupy any time beyond what is absolutely necessary to present a few additional figures. I know that this House is deeply interested in this general question. It is one that has come to the front in every Congress for many years, but, like all other evils, there are men whose interests are affected by any attack upon the present system, and who have friends here. It is an unpleasant duty, as we all know, to turn down one's friends in one's own district, and therefore it is difficult to work many necessary reforms. Abuses like these become strongly intrenched by long use. So it has happened that although propositions for the reform of these abuses have been presented to the House year after year, nothing has come of them, not even of those which have been favorably reported to the House. The Stone bill in the last Congress was reported by the committee with a favorable report, but no action was ever had upon it. Now that the present officials are soon to go out it would be a good time to make the change. When the new Administration comes into power new court officials should find fixed salaries, and be relieved from the temptation that has been so potent with their predecessors.

Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a list of the deputies and of the fees which they received in each State and Territory of the Union for the last year. I will call attention to a few items taken from that statement, and will ask the privilege of printing the whole in connection with my remarks, so that members may have an opportunity to see these figures in anticipation of the report from the Attorney-General's Office. In the middle district of Alabama I find that the deputy marshal's fees last year amounted to $37,780.30.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Can the evils of which the gentleman is complaining be corrected in the present bill?

Mr. LACEY. No, sir.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Can they be corrected in any bill?

Mr. LACEY. Yes, sir; very easily.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Have not bills for the reform of these abuses been presented in this House for ten years past right along? What committee ought to bring in a bill to make these reforms?

Mr. LACEY. The Committee on the Judiciary. These same evils have been often hinted at before, but I find it is a very good plan for the House to talk earnestly about such things. Discussion leads to correction.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. But they have been "talked about" for ten years. Who are the committee having the bill in charge, and why do they not bring it in?

Mr. LACEY. The Committee on the Judiciary has charge of this subject.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Are they living or dead? [Laughter.]

Mr. LACEY. I hope and have no doubt that they will be found, before the present session of Congress adjourns, a very active committee. The last Committee on the Judiciary did report a bill, but, unfortunately, it slept the sleep of death in the latter part of the session. By bringing this matter prominently before the House at an early period in the present Congress it will be all the more likely that the legislation necessary to bring a remedy will be enacted.

The Attorney-General in his report has called the attention of Congress to these abuses and has urged that they be cured by legislation. We are all substantially agreed that legislation is needed. The only question to be determined is the question of detail, and that must be worked out through the proper committee. The members of this body must take the matter into consideration and use their influence upon those having the bill in charge in order to secure an early report.

Now, in a single district of Texas—the eastern district—the fees of these deputy marshals were $67,199.46. Delaware—economical and virtuous little Delaware—spent for deputy marshals' fees last year only $20. On the other hand, in the western district of Virginia—on the other shore of the bay—the amount spent was $30,403.45. West Virginia spent $35,096.89. New Jersey spent only $1,784.91, while on the other hand, the western district of North Carolina spent $29,679.20. The eastern district of Michigan spent $4,739.76, and the western district of the same State $2,533.97, while Minnesota's deputy marshals drew $14,056.28—about double the amount expended in both districts in Michigan.

Mr. BAILEY. In justice to the marshal of the eastern district of Texas, I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that to that district is attached a large part of the Indian Territory.

Mr. LACEY. So I understand; and that fact excuses that part of Texas from some of the charges that might seem to be implied by these figures. In the northern district of Texas the expenditures amounted to $7,611.58, and in the western district, $12,700.07. The State of Vermont seems to have spent nothing in this direction, not a single dollar, while South Dakota spent $19,759.74.

Mr. STEELE. Has the gentleman any information on the subject of excessive charges for fees?

Mr. LACEY. These matters are undoubtedly honeycombed with fraud in many localities. For instance, a single man will be arrested in a certain neighborhood and brought before a commissioner; the next day the officer will go back to the same locality, arrest another man, and bring him before the commissioner; and on the third day perhaps go back and arrest a third. Then there are fee-earning adjournments after adjournments in the trial of cases before the commissioners. In fact, in some places these commissioners' courts might be called factories for the manufacture of claims for fees against the United States, and that is why we have here a deficiency appropriation in one year coming within $212,000 of the amount of the original appropriation. The original appropriation was made small so as to keep these people in check, but they know that claims against the Government are good, and they have gone on with their business in the sure expectation of being cared for in a deficiency bill.

Mr. STEELE. But the point I wished to make was this: Has the gentleman any information as to prisoners being taken, not to the nearest commissioner, but carted off five or six hundred miles to another commissioner, in order that the charges for mileage may be swelled?

Mr. LACEY. That is a universal complaint from almost every part of the country where these large charges for fees of deputy marshals and commissioners appear on the record.

Mr. STEELE. Does the gentleman know about what percentage of prisoners arrested are discharged without trial after fees have been collected for taking them these long distances?

Mr. LACEY. There is no way of getting at the percentage without very careful investigation; but the number of such cases is very large. In addition to that, there are a very large number of men who are tried, convicted, and their sentences suspended. In other words, the dockets are merely ornamented with these cases without any punishment being finally inflicted upon defendants, the only utility of these trials being to furnish fees to the men who institute the proceedings and bring the cases before the courts.

Without detaining the committee further, I will print, in connection with my remarks, a full statement of the figures to which I have partially referred.

The statement is as follows:

Deputy marshals' emoluments and expenses for the last fiscal year.

Alabama, northern	$26,049.94	Montana	$14,731.40
Alabama, middle	37,780.30	Nebraska	10,283.74
Alabama, southern	18,389.92	Nevada	2,378.41
Arizona	18,341.25	New Hampshire	0.00
Arkansas, eastern	8,443.58	New Jersey	1,784.91
Arkansas, western	33,427.87	New Mexico	22,622.23
California, northern	5,940.60	New York, northern	9,962.98
California, southern	7,787.49	New York, eastern	0.00
Colorado	8,120.39	New York, southern	12,138.96
Connecticut	751.07	North Carolina, eastern	10,440.58
Delaware	20.00	North Carolina, western	29,679.20
District of Columbia	5,791.20	North Dakota	25,943.54
Florida, northern	6,386.94	Ohio, northern	4,612.09
Florida, southern	1,431.30	Ohio, southern	7,041.16
Georgia, northern	41,020.42	Oklahoma	212,665.71
Georgia, southern	7,787.20	Oregon	10,917.80
Idaho	5,329.54	Pennsylvania, eastern	2,486.03
Illinois, northern	14,703.71	Pennsylvania, western	1,397.42
Illinois, southern	13,537.15	Rhode Island	59.77
Indiana	10,294.57	South Carolina	25,945.89
Iowa, northern	6,938.47	South Dakota	19,759.74
Iowa, southern	19,665.98	Tennessee, eastern	25,052.88
Kansas	7,080.88	Tennessee, middle	20,165.20
Kentucky	25,051.60	Tennessee, western	5,475.23
Louisiana, eastern	2,546.88	Texas, northern	7,611.58
Louisiana, western	269.10	Texas, eastern	67,199.46
Maine	4,943.35	Texas, western	12,700.07
Maryland	2,422.94	Utah	10,692.64
Massachusetts	5,758.54	Vermont	0.00
Michigan, eastern	4,739.76	Virginia, eastern	1,267.21
Michigan, western	2,533.97	Virginia, western	31,403.45
Minnesota	14,056.28	Washington	30,557.78
Mississippi, northern	12,505.74	West Virginia	35,096.89
Mississippi, southern	11,139.57	Wisconsin, northern	7,696.04
Missouri, eastern	10,231.56	Wisconsin, western	4,466.26
Missouri, western	15,825.01	Wyoming	62.50

Mr. SWANSON. If the gentleman from Iowa will allow me, I have the information at hand.

Mr. LACEY. I have concluded my remarks.

Mr. SWANSON. I will state to the gentleman from Indiana who makes the inquiry, that there were 25,949 cases of indictment found in the United States courts during the last year. Of these, 10,521 were nolle prosequied—discontinued, on the ground that there was no evidence to sustain them. Forty per cent of the jury charges, witness charges, and deputy marshals' charges were on suits discontinued by district attorneys as being petty, frivolous, and incapable of being sustained.

A MEMBER. That is about the amount of the deficiency asked here, is it not?

Mr. SWANSON. Just about. Last year they spent $5,300,000 for the United States courts, and this is 40 per cent of the total expenditures. This 40 per cent represents only those cases where indictments were found by juries, but does not include those cases where the grand jury refused to find the indictments or where commissioners refused to send them on to the grand jury. If you include these, over one-half the expenses of the United States courts were incurred by petty and frivolous suits which did not amount to anything and only harassed or annoyed the people. Of the $5,300,000, if we could save one-half, there would be near two and three-quarter millions of dollars each year to be saved of this expenditure. This saving to the Treasury would be largely in the shape of fees paid to these officers.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we may proceed with the bill. Whereabout are we now?

The CHAIRMAN. On line 12, page 13.

Mr. CANNON. What is the motion?

The CHAIRMAN. To strike out the last word.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman succeeds in his amendment, or after he has addressed the committee, I will then ask the Clerk to proceed with the reading. I have no right or disposition to do so now. But after the gentleman concludes his remarks I will ask to proceed with the bill.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to make a few remarks at this time relating to the pending subject, and also with reference to certain suggestions which have been made concerning the duties of the Judiciary Committee.

There seems to have been considerable criticism indulged in during this debate upon the Judiciary Committee for not reporting a bill to correct the evils claimed to exist in the judicial system of the United States. On that point I desire to be heard briefly.

I for one do not believe that the officers connected with the judiciary of the United States are one-half as corrupt as has been pictured here to-day. I do not believe that the courts of the United States are "fee factories." We are all familiar with the evils that have grown out of the fee system. No one disputes the fact that evils have resulted from that system. But in the last Congress the Judiciary Committee of this House reported a bill doing away with the fee system and substituting the salary system; but we could not get a hearing before this body. In this Congress we hope to report a bill proposing to do away with the fee system, as far as possible, and substituting the salary system instead, and I trust the gentlemen holding places on the Committee on Appropriations—who are so zealous and active to-day in denouncing other committees of the House——

Mr. SAYERS. We did not denounce anybody.

Mr. RAY (continuing). And in denouncing and criticising the judiciary system of the United States will, when the bill is reported, show the same zeal and the same activity in support of that bill. I trust the bill will not be smothered, but that the Committee on Rules will give us time for its consideration and the House an opportunity to act on the subject by amending the law.

I for one believe that these evils ought to be corrected, and that they may be corrected by Congressional legislation. I believe that when that bill comes before this House the proper time to criticise the present system of fees and the present administration of the courts of this country will have come. That will be the time for gentlemen to exercise their oratory in denunciation of the officers connected with the judicial system of the United States and of the present system, out of which, as they claim, all of these evils have grown.

Until that time it will be useless to discuss the subject. It avails nothing to indulge in a general tirade against laws and the abuse of laws at a time when reform is not proposed or action in that direction is not possible. The way to be good is in conduct, not criticism; practice, not preaching alone. The Judiciary Committee, however, hail with delight these expressions of a desire to do away with a pernicious system and establish one in the conduct of which frauds, unjust arrests, and false or stuffed accounts will be without reward in the law and therefore unprofitable, and, we trust, unknown. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, in view of all that has been said, I hope the gentleman from Illinois will withdraw the point of order he did not make, and let a vote be taken upon the amendment. It will not do any harm.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I am not so sure. I rather think that by implication it repeals a better provision.

Mr. STEELE. Well, the word "implication" is a great thing in legislation in the House, as used by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. It is a great thing sometimes in the construction by the courts, too.

Mr. STEELE. Very well; let the evils continue.

Mr. CANNON. I ask that the Clerk proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

To pay to Charles H. Evans, for services to the Ways and Means Committee in preparing estimates of revenue from proposed tariff legislation, $100.

To pay to Joel Grayson, for services in the document room from January 1 to June 30, 1896, inclusive, at $125 per month, $750.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer.

The amendment was read, as follows:

After line 2, page 17, amend by inserting the following:

"To pay to the mother of Lucien Davidson, deceased, late a page in the office of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House, a sum equal to his salary as such page for six months; also, the expenses attending his last illness and funeral, not to exceed $100, and in all $460.

Mr. CANNON. I will reserve the point of order until I hear what the gentleman has to say about this.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. This amendment introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] refers to a boy who was a page in the office of the Sergeant-at-Arms during the last two years. He was taken sick about the 10th of December with typhoid fever, and while sick and practically dying he was dropped by the Sergeant-at-Arms and another boy put in his place. He died a few days afterwards. He was the only son of a widowed mother and her entire support. He was dropped from the roll a few days before he died. He was not able to get home, and after his death his mother was unable to take his remains home, and he was buried in the Congressional Cemetery in this city. He left his mother without a dollar in the world. Perhaps no other case similar to this has ever been before the House. Others who have been dropped from the rolls have asked for compensation, but they were well and could go home. This boy was on his deathbed when dropped, and could not get away from here. His mother could not pay his funeral expenses and di not pay them. She has nothing now to live on, and has not money enough to buy a railroad ticket with which to get home. The gentleman from Texas has offered the amendment, and I hope no gentleman on the floor will oppose it.

Mr. DINGLEY. What is the amount?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Only $460 all told, and I hope the gentleman who has charge of the bill, the chairman of the committee, will not make any point of order on a matter like this.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the Sergeant-at-Arms informs me that the boy was taken sick while on duty in his office. Under the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] I am not inclined to insist upon the point of order. Of course we have to be a little particular—it stands the House in hand to be particular—not to extend the payment of compensation or funeral expenses to others than its employees. Even that class of expenditure does not dwell in the law except as it dwells in precedent, but it does obtain where an employee dies while in the service of the House. It is customary to pay his funeral expenses and a sum equal to six months' salary. Under the conditions stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON], however, it is not in my heart or judgment to insist upon the point of order, and I have said what I did about it in order that it might not constitute a precedent for any other than a similar case.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the gentleman.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to amend by inserting, after the amendment which has just been adopted, the words:

"To pay R. C. Peacock for services performed as a page, $20.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay R. C. Peacock for services performed as a page, $20.

Mr. CANNON. I will reserve the point of order until the gentleman makes his statement.

Mr. HEPBURN. This boy was a page, and while performing the services of a page was notified that his services were no longer needed. He then discovered that his successor had been appointed some eight or ten days previously, and had taken the oath. So when he came to draw his pay he failed to receive the pay to which he was entitled for services actually rendered by the sum of $20. It is entirely equitable, just, and decent that this House should pay him.

Mr. CANNON. As I understand, he performed services for which this item is offered as an amendment, and it is the pay between the time he was discharged in fact and the time when he was notified of his discharge?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. And in the meantime he performed the service.

Mr. HEPBURN. Right along.

Mr. CANNON. And the gentleman is satisfied that that is the correct statement?

Mr. HEPBURN. I am satisfied.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be concurred in and that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was asked, and that as amended the bill do pass.

The amendments of the Committee of the Whole were agreed to in gross.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CANNON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed in the cases of William Taylor,

administrator of Polly Blackwell, deceased, James C. Hodges, and Thomas J. West, administrator of Thomas West, deceased, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of War submitting estimate of appropriation for repairs to Aqueduct Bridge, District of Columbia—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting a reply to the resolution of the House asking for information as to the progress made in erecting a mint building at Philadelphia—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting an appropriation for the repair of a Government wharf at Sitka, Alaska, and making certain recommendations with regard to said wharf—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a request for authority to use unexpended balance of an appropriation to reimburse R. E. Ashley for services—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. McRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1199) designating the officers before whom preliminary affidavits in entries of public lands may be executed, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 99); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOWNING, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2642) granting leave of absence for one year to homestead settlers upon the Yankton Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 100); which said bill, amendment, and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completon of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 101); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 325) to provide that United States railroad corporations shall, for purposes of jurisdiction, be deemed citizens of the respective States into which their line of railway may extend, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 102); which said bill, amendment, and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House No. 218, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 4554) to amend the act approved February 18, 1895, entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1891," accompanied by a report (No. 104); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution of the House, No. 84, reported in lieu thereof the resolution (No. 125) directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire as to the rights of executive officers of the Government to refuse to indorse acts of Congress, accompanied by a report (No. 105); which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from the Committee on War Claims, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. HURLEY: The bill (H. R. 3313) for the relief of James Bigler. (Report No. 90.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 3294) for the relief of officers and crews of the U. S. gunboats *Kineo* and *Chocura*. (Report No. 91.)

By Mr. MAHON: The bill (H. R. 1524) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of William B. Isaacs & Co. (Report No. 92.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 1353) for the relief of George McAlpin, to repay to him moneys unlawfully collected from him by the United States. (Report No. 93.)

By Mr. AVERY: The bill (H. R. 4438) for the relief of Eugene Oscar Fichet. (Report No. 94.)

By Mr. OTJEN: The bill (H. R. 4310) for the relief of Mathias Pedersen. (Report No. 95.)

By Mr. HATCH: The bill (H. R. 2058) for the relief of James E. Southard. (Report No. 96.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 4437) to amend "An act to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenues," approved June 10, 1890—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COFFIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 4439) to authorize purchase of lot for dispensary and hospital in District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAHANY: A bill (H. R. 4440) for the necessary and better protection of American labor and the enforcement of the law of domicile and the restriction of immigration to such a degree as will serve that end—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 4441) to provide for terms of the circuit and district courts for the southern district of California at San Diego—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 4442) to amend the act of June 3, 1878, entitled "An act for the sale of timber lands in the States of California, Oregon, Nevada, and in Washington Territory, as amended by section 2 of the act of August 4, 1892"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 4443) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost their limbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 4444) providing for commissioners to treat with certain Indians for the surrender or modification of any rights claimed by them to hunt on the unoccupied public domain of the United States—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4445) providing for the construction of a military road from Fort Washakie, Wyo., to the mouth of the Buffalo Fork of the Snake River, near Jacksons Lake, in Uinta County, Wyo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON: A bill (H. R. 4446) for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4447) to create an executive department to be known as the Department of Commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 4448) to repeal all provisions of the law for the payment by the United States of one-half of the appropriations for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HART (by request): A bill (H. R. 4449) to change the pay and rating of the machinists in United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 4450) to provide for two artesian wells on the Yankton Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4451) to enable the Superintendent of the Geological Survey to define the location of artesian waters by test wells—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 4452) to amend section 416 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4453) granting to the Alabama tribe of Indians in the State of Texas 25,000 acres of land—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 4454) to authorize the admission into the Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers of veterans of the war of 1812 and of the Mexican war who subsequently entered the service of the Confederate States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 4455) to establish additional regulations concerning immigration to the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 4456) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to donate one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to the cemetery association in the city of St. Paul, Minn., to be used at or near the foot of the soldiers' monument in said cemetery—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 4457) for the total repeal of the internal-revenue laws—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULICK (by request): A bill (H. R. 4458) to provide a modern organization for the line of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4459) to reorganize the Navy Department and promote the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4460) to provide for the construction of a public building at York, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 4461) to provide for permanent fortifications and a system of torpedo defense at Cape Henry, Virginia, and Cape Charles, Virginia—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4462) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to lands embraced in the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 4463) to grant two condemned cannon and cannon balls to the Thirteenth Separate Company, National Guard, of the State of New York—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 4464) to amend the act approved June 18, 1874, to change the copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SAYERS: A bill (H. R. 4556) to commission pilots in the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELKNAP: A bill (H. R. 4557) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate two pieces of condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to the St. Boniface Union Soldiers' Monument and Memorial Association of Chicago, Ill.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Florida: A bill (H. R. 4558) to make Biscayne Bay, Fla., a subport of entry and delivery—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEILL (by request): A bill (H. R. 4559) to carry out section 61 of the act of Congress of August 28, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLER: A joint resolution (H. Res. 93) providing for the publication of 4,500 additional copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BULL: A joint resolution (H. Res. 94) authorizing the Secretary of War to make a survey of Seaconnet Point, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A resolution (House Res. No. 124) to authorize the contestant, A. J. Rosenthal, to amend his notice of contest in the case of A. J. Rosenthal *vs.* Miles Crowley, Tenth Congressional district, State of Texas—to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

By Mr. FLYNN: A memorial adopted at a Statehood convention held at Shawnee, Okla., December 4, 1895, urging upon Congress to pass an act at the present session to provide for the admission of Oklahoma as a State—to the Committee on the Territories.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE,

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 606) for the relief of Mary Chambers, widow of Thomas Chambers—the Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 2428) for the relief of William J. Bryan—the Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 4465) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Calvin T. Holmes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4466) granting a pension to Henry H. Wilson, of Fallowfield, Washington County, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4467) granting a pension to Michael F. Leary for long and distinguished service—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT: A bill (H. R. 4468) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Edward S. Conkling—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4469) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of John Ploss—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4470) for the appointment as lieutenants on the retired list of certain survivors of the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 4471) for the relief of the legal representatives of James T. Rape, deceased, late of Catoosa County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4472) for the relief of Isaac Whitenberg, of Bledsoe County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 4473) for the relief of John F. Hathaway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 4474) granting a pension to Sarah A. Denny, an army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4475) granting a pension to Mrs. Catherine Gaffney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 4476) for the relief of Benjamin F. Bayles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 4477) for the relief of the estate of Washington W. Miller, deceased, late of Murray County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 4478) for the relief of David Housel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 4479) for the relief of Thomas K. Hughes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4480) for the relief of the legal representatives of Robert Cornell White—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4481) granting an increase of pension to Patsey E. Broaddus, of Marion, Kans.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 4482) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John A. Swartzwelder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DANFORD: A bill (H. R. 4483) for the relief of Jonathan Milburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4484) for the relief of Sarah E. Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4485) for the relief of Thomas Reiley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4486) for the relief of Archie Grant McDonald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4487) for the relief of Jerome Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 4488) granting a pension to James Teasley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 4489) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Evans, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 4490) to restore the name of Ethan A. Sellman to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 4491) granting a pension to Sarah A. Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 4492) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary E. Sessions, of Guilford, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4493) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas W. O'Brien—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAGER: A bill (H. R. 4494) granting pension to Barton S. Dawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4495) granting a pension to Richard Barlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4496) granting a pension to Annie Schifirli—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HART: A bill (H. R. 4497) for the granting of an invalid pension to Levi Moser, late sergeant of Company I, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 4498) to correct the date of muster of Rosalvo B. Brazelton as second lieutenant of Company D, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4499) to pension Thomas T. Garrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4500) to increase the pension of Strother Brock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4501) to place the name of Anderson G. Pitman on the muster roll of Company D, Sixty-fifth Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4502) to pension John R. Dougherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 4503) to appoint Commodore Edward E. Potter, United States Navy, now on the retired list, to the rank and pay of rear-admiral, retired—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 4504) granting pensions to certain companies of scouts and guides who served with the Federal forces during the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4505) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Denson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 4506) for the relief of Elizabeth J. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4507) for the relief of James A. McElroy, guardian of Noea Wilson, an insane member of Company H, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, now deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4508) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Robinson, late an acting master's mate of the United States Mississippi Squadron—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4509) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Arthur B. Spader, late a private of Company B, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4510) for the appointment of Frank M. Marshall as lieutenant on the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4511) for the relief of Alexander D. Schenck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHESON: A bill (H. R. 4512) for the relief of C. J. Winne—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 4513) for the relief of Harlow L. Street—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 4514) for the relief of John Morgan, jr.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4515) for the relief of the heirs of John W. West—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4516) to remove the charge of desertion against Walter M. Macarty, alias Wallace M. Morton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4517) granting a pension to Washington Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4518) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4519) granting a pension to John Zellers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4520) granting a pension to E. A. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4521) granting a pension to Jacob Fetter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4522) granting to Mathew Golden a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4523) granting a pension to J. E. Ruark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4524) to remove the charge of desertion against E. A. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4525) granting a pension to Henry Hubbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4526) granting a pension to Jonathan Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEISENRING: A bill (H. R. 4527) granting a pension to Mary B. Douglass, widow of Henry Douglass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4528) granting a pension to Katherine S. McCartney, widow of William H. McCartney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 4529) for the relief of Miss Honora Ryan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 4530) granting a pension to Barney Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4531) granting a pension to William Seymour—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4532) granting a pension to Ada R. Oliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 4533) for the relief of the trustees of Mount Olivet Methodist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4534) to increase the pension of Maj. Gen. Julius H. Stahel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OWENS: A bill (H. R. 4535) removing charge of desertion from military record of Green Breeden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 4536) granting a pension to Newell F. Osterhout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 4537) for the relief of William H. Crook—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 4538) for the relief of John Keefe—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAY: A bill (H. R. 4539) granting a pension to Zolman Tyrrell, imbecile son of Lewis R. Tyrrell, late Company A, First New York Engineers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4540) to appoint Commodore James H. Gillis, United States Navy, now on retired list, to the rank and pay of rear-admiral, retired—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: A bill (H. R. 4541) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Walter B. Chester*—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4542) to increase the pension of John O. McDonald, alias William Barnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 4543) for the relief of Daniel Leary—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 4544) granting an increase of pension to William Drewitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: A bill (H. R. 4545) to increase the pension of Alfred Thurlby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRODE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4546) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Franklin Jacobs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4547) granting a pension to Silas S. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4548) granting a pension to Mary Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TARSNEY: A bill (H. R. 4549) granting jurisdiction and authority to the Court of Claims in the case of the scow *Rowena*—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 4550) granting an increase of pension to John X. Griffith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRELOAR: A bill (H. R. 4551) for the relief of W. D. McLean, alias Donald McLean—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4552) for the relief of Martha M. Welsh—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 4553) for the relief of James L. Northcut—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 4555) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Snyder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 4560) for the relief of Dr. John B. Read—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of 42 citizens of Carnot, Moon, McKees Rocks, and Shoustown, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: Petition of S. S. Mott and others, of McGees Mills, Pa., for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARHAM: Memorial by the board of supervisors of Napa County and the city council of the city of Napa, Cal., with reference to the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the licensing of masters and chief mates of sailing vessels of over 700 tons, as provided in Senate bill No. 180—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the abolition of compulsory pilotage on coastwise vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring appropriations for coast defenses—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, protest of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange against the passage of bills H. R. 1227 to 1233, inclusive, amending the navigations laws—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN: Papers relating to the claim of John L. Stone, of Sequatchie County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BULL: Petition of 97 citizens of the State of Rhode Island, in favor of the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Meade Post, No. 1, Grand Army of the Republic, Philadelphia, Pa., for the passage of bill to revive the rank of Lieutenant-General, in the interest of Maj. Gen. Nelson A. Miles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: Petition of R. W. Jordan, I. V. McPherson, and others, of Aurora, Mo., praying for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CANNON: Resolutions of the State Grange of Illinois, relative to legislation equalizing and reducing freight and passenger rates—to the Comttee mion Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the State Grange of Illinois, relative to greenback currency and silver—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the State Grange of Illinois, favoring free mail delivery in rural districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the State Grange of Illinois, relative to the veto power of the President—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, resolutions of the State Grange of Illinois, relative to option dealing in grain—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Board of Trade of Chicago, Ill., in favor of the improvement of the harbor of St. Joseph and waterway to Benton Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: Protest of merchants and river men of St. Louis against the passage of House bill No. 2698 unless the same is amended—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Petition of citizens of Galveston, Tex., favoring the passage of an act to commission pilots in the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition to accompany a bill to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John A. Swartzwelder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of Hon. Burrill Porter and others, in favor of House bill No. 4240, granting an increase of pension to Dexter B. Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of D. B. Chamberlain and 55 others, praying for the passage of the Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Resolutions adopted by the North Congregational Church, of Springfield, Mass., in behalf of the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: Testimony in the matter of Henry C. La Point, late first lieutenant, Second United States Cavalry, to restore him to his former rank, and place him on the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, testimony in behalf of Thomas W. O'Brien, to remove the charge of desertion from his military record—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, testimony in behalf of Mrs. Mary E. Sessions, of Guilford, Vt., as to granting her a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of the Board of Trade, Rutland, Vt., favoring the recognition of the Cubans as belligerents in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Letter from Ed. Sauer, of Dubuque, Iowa, favoring the establishment of a steamboatman's home by the Federal Government—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HILBORN: Resolution of the One Hundred Thousand Club, of Fresno County, Cal., for an appropriation of $200,000 for a suitable site and the erection of a building in the city of Fresno for the accommodation of the Government postal department, internal-revenue service, etc.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOOKER: Two petitions, respectively, from Nile and Alfred, Allegany County, N. Y., against Sunday observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of J. Dempsey, V. Swift, and others, relating to the payment of arrearages of pensions to honorably discharged soldiers of the late civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: Resolutions of the common council of Superior, Wis., to make the earliest and amplest feasible provision for raising and controlling the level of the Great Lakes in order to deepen their harbors, and for adequate channels from these lakes to the ocean—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of D. McKee and 34 other citizens of Hutchinson, Kans., praying for the passage of a bill granting a pension to William Seymour—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of soldiers of Snyder County, Pa., praying for the passage of a bill giving a pension of $8 per month to all soldiers who served in the war of the rebellion and were honorably discharged—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLURE: Petition of Given Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Wooster, Ohio, praying for the amendment of pension laws in such manner as will provide for the dependent families or relatives of pensioners who degrade themselves by an improper use of their pension money—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of 200 citizens of Canal Dover, Tuscarawas County, Ohio, praying for the passage of the William A. Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Ministerial Association of New Philadelphia and Canal Dover, Ohio, praying for the passage of a law to raise the age of consent to 18 years in the whole jurisdiction of the National Government, to repeal the ninety-day law of Oklahoma, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: Petition of citizens of Kansas City, Kans., and vicinity, praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of the board of directors of the American Humane Education Society, proposing a method for the settlement of the Venezuelan boundary question—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of Martin Helgerson and 170 other settlers on the Sioux Indian Reservation, asking that they be allowed to take lands on the reservation under the general homestead laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. POOLE (by request): Petition against the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 167) from voters of De Ruyter, Lincklaen, and Cuyler, N. Y., of different churches and beliefs—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial on the subject of female suffrage, by citizens of Kentucky—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition and affidavit relating to increase of pension of Cassie A. Davis, widow of James P. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of W. A. Lusby, O. C. Peyton, L. B. Chaney, and other citizens of Bedford County, Tenn., asking payment of claim of book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAYERS: Petition of citizens of Galveston, Tex., to accompany House bill favoring legislation to commission pilots in the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAHLE: Papers to accompany House bill No. 4424, in support of the claim of George I. Spangler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to the improvement of the harbor at St. Joseph, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of George Beiger and others, to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Saginaw, Mich., asking for improvement of harbors at Ludington, Mich., and Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of citizens of the Twelfth Michigan district, asking for the passage of House bill No. 1, to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Petition of citizens of Clinton, Pa., for the passage of the Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TRACEY: Papers to accompany the claim of Thomas S. Daugherty, of Company A, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: Resolution of Lieut. Josiah White Post, No. 45, Grand Army of the Republic, of Phœnixville, Pa., for the passage of a law granting a pension of $8 per month to every soldier and sailor of ninety days' service in the war of the rebellion, and who has been honorably discharged—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of Oscar Thompson, of Madison County, Ala., praying that the Committee on War Claims refer his claim to the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Mary Johnson, of Madison County, Ala., praying that the Committee on War Claims refer her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of citizens of Athens, Ala., favoring the recognition of the Cubans as belligerents in their struggle for freedom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 22, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CHAPELL, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 248) empowering and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish four pieces of condemned cannon to the city of Hastings, Mich.;

A bill (H. R. 2300) to incorporate the Supreme Council of the Thirty-third Degree of Scottish Rite Masonry for the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States;

A bill (H. R. 1785) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to the W. H. Wallace Post, No. 66, Grand Army of the Republic, of Eldorado, Kans., and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 2777) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate condemned cannon and condemned cannon balls to certain posts of the Grand Army of the Republic;

A bill (H. R. 4052) approving certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico authorizing the issue of certain bonds of said Territory;

A bill (H. R. 4254) granting to the Duluth and North Dakota Railroad Company right of way through certain Indian reservations in the State of Minnesota;

A joint resolution (H. Res. 66) to supply the Department of State with documents; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 89) concerning the erection and completion (excepting heating apparatus) of the United States post-office building at Bloomington, Ill.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AFFAIRS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in response to a resolution of the 16th instant, calling for a statement as to the names of all streets, avenues, alleys, and reservations in the limits of the cities of Washington and Georgetown which are partially or wholly unpaved, and the total length thereof so unpaved; also the length thereof unsewered; also the length thereof without water mains, together with the estimated cost of fully improving the same; also an estimate of the full amount required to carry out the provisions of the act of March 2, 1893, to provide a permanent system of highways in the District of Columbia outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, the total number of feet of land in streets, avenues, and reservations required to be condemned in each subdivision or piece of land, and the value of the same; also a statement showing the amount of taxes collected in the cities of Washington and Georgetown and the county, respectively, by years, from 1878 to 1894, both inclusive, and in like manner the amount expended in each of said sections by the District of Columbia for the same period; also the amount of the revenues of the District of Columbia applied by the Treasurer of the United States to liquidate any undue debt of the District of Columbia to the United States or other parties, from 1878 to 1895, and from what fund taken and to what debt applied, etc., stating that they will immediately commence the preparation of the statements called for, with the object of furnishing the information at the earliest practicable moment, but the scope of the resolution is so vast that with their present resources their response to some of the inquiries can only be made at a very remote period, and that if the information is desired for early use by the Senate an immediate appropriation approximating $20,000 will be requisite to enable the Commissioners to employ the extra force needful to obtain and compile the data with sufficient expedition; which was read.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President the resolution to which the communication is a response was introduced at the request of a large number of laboring people, I understand, taxpaying people, of the District of Columbia. It seems quite extraordinary that a mere matter of information of that kind should cost $20,000. But certain it is that whatever it may cost, before a great debt is incurred here, the people of the District should have some idea as to what will be required in the process of the work.

I move that the communication be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia for such action as it may see fit, and that it be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the select and common councils of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an appropriation be made for the permanent improvement of the navigation of the Delaware and Schuylkill rivers; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HAWLEY presented resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the National Board of Trade, favoring an appropriation for the construction of a ship canal from Lake Erie to tide water; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying that provision be made for the protection of all trains, boats, and vehicles carrying the United States mails; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the fortification of the east end of Long Island Sound; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for a strict enforcement of the immigration laws; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Rutland, Vt., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of California, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented the petition of James A. Edwards, of Madison County, N. C., praying that he be granted an honorable discharge; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the enactment of legislation changing the rules of practice in Federal courts, so as to prevent action against a defendant in a civil suit unless personal service has been had; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the continuation of the improvement of the Mississippi and Ohio rivers and their navigable tributaries; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations, especially with Canada, Mexico, and Central and South America; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the enactment of legislation establishing a sound and stable monetary system, and in case of failure to agree upon such a system praying for the appointment of a nonpartisan monetary commission; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of the National Board of Trade, remonstrating against the Government ownership of railroads, recommending a firm and continuous supervision over their operation and management, and praying for the extension of the bonded indebtedness of the Pacific railroads; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the passage without amendment of the so-called Patterson bill, to prevent unjust discrimination in freight rates; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the interests of those whose business relations are affected by the management of subsidized railroads; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent interested parties from being appointed receivers of bankrupt corporations engaged in interstate commerce; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BLANCHARD presented a petition of the general assembly of the State of Louisiana, praying that adequate appropriation be made for the improvement of the navigation of the Macon and Bœuf rivers in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LINDSAY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Calhoun, Ky., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Equal Rights Association of Kentucky, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect women equally with black men against State denial of the right of suffrage; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. HILL presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the appointment of a permanent nonpartisan tariff commission; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the enactment of legislation establishing an American system of navigating naval reserves; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for a reduction in postal rates and the exclusion from second-class rates of such publications as are not strictly of that class; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the postal laws; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BAKER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Leavenworth, Kans.; a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of Franklin Trussell, of St. George, Me., and 69 other citizens residing on the coast of Maine, and the petition of J. C. Gomage and 154 other citizens of Bristol, Me., praying that a life-saving station be built on Damiscove Island, Maine; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of sundry citizens of Warren, Mass., praying that the Government take such action as may be possible to relieve the sufferings of Christians in Armenia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAMERON presented a memorial of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of House bills 1227 to 1233, inclusive, proposing to amend the navigation laws; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 179, to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels in the coasting trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 180, licensing masters and chief mates of sail vessels of over 700 tons; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an appropriation be made for the completion of the general scheme of coast defenses; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 758) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust and settle the account of James M. Wilbur with the United States, and to pay said Wilbur such sum of money as he may be justly and equitably entitled to, reported it without amendment and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1048) for the relief of J. Floyd Johnston, administrator of John Floyd Johnston, deceased, and for other purposes, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PLATT. I suppose if the Committee on Foreign Relations says that that is not a bill which it ought to take jurisdiction of and that the Committee on Claims ought to have it, it is of little use for me to object. But at the same time it is a claim which grows out of the settlement of the Geneva award, and is a claim which, it seems to me, the Foreign Relations Committee might have properly considered. I shall make no objection to the bill going to the Committee on Claims, though I did hope the Committee on Foreign Relations would act upon it.

Mr. SHERMAN. The committee considered it and concluded that the bill ought to go to the Committee on Claims, because it is a claim to be enforced in the Court of Claims, and therefore not a proper subject for the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am informed by a Senator near me that the original bill was reported from the Committee on Claims.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Committee on Foreign Relations will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 65) to authorize Lieut. Sidney S. Jordan, Fifth United States Artillery, and Capt. Edward C. Carter, assistant surgeon, United States Army, to accept medals from the British Government, reported it without amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the resolution proposing to direct the Secretary of State to send to the Senate the dispatches of the consuls of the United States relating to the war now carried on in Cuba, to report it adversely.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the resolution just reported adversely may go upon the Calendar.

Mr. SHERMAN. There is no objection to that course.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed upon the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom the subject was referred, reported a bill (S. 1676) authorizing Rear-Admiral W. A. Kirkland to accept a gold box presented to him by the Emperor of Germany; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. McBRIDE, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 36) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands," reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BERRY. I ask leave to file at some time hereafter a minority report on behalf of some members of the committee. The bill is not a unanimous report from the Committee on Public Lands, and the minority desire to present their views hereafter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Leave will be granted. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was recommitted the bill (S. 57) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Morris, to report it without amendment and submit a report thereon. This bill was favorably reported yesterday, and afterwards recommitted to the committee. By mistake the report was put in print. I ask that the report which I now submit may take the same number as the report of yesterday.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 744) providing for a naval training station on the island of Yerba Buena (or Goat Island), in the harbor of San Francisco, Cal., and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

ARMENIAN OUTRAGES.

Mr. CULLOM. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report the concurrent resolutions which I send to the desk. I request that the resolutions be read at length, after which I shall ask the Senate, if agreeable and if there be no objection, to consider the resolutions at this time.

The concurrent resolutions were read, as follows:

Whereas the supplementary treaty of Berlin of July 13, 1878, between the Ottoman Empire and Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia contains the following provisions:

"LXI.

"The Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out without further delay the ameliorations and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds.

"It will periodically make known these steps taken to this effect to the powers, and will superintend their application.

"LXII.

"The Sublime Porte having expressed the wish to maintain the principle of religious liberty, to give it the widest scope, the contracting parties take note of this spontaneous declaration.

"In no part of the Ottoman Empire shall difference of religion be alleged against an individual as a ground for exclusion or incapacity as regards the discharge of civil and political rights, admission to the public service, functions and honors, and the exercise of the different professions and industries.

"All persons shall be admitted, without distinction of religion, to give evidence before the tribunals.

"Liberty and the outward exercise of all forms of worship are assured to all, and no hindrance shall be offered either to the hierarchial organization of the various communions or to their relations with their spiritual chiefs.

"The right of official protection by the diplomatic and consular agents of the powers in Turkey is recognized both as regards the above-mentioned persons and their religious, charitable, and other establishments in the holy places;" and

Whereas the extent and object of the above-cited provisions of said treaty are to place the Christian subjects of the Porte under the protection of the other signatories thereto, and to secure to such Christian subjects full liberty of religious worship and belief, the equal benefit of the laws, and all the privileges and immunities belonging to any subjects of the Turkish Empire; and

Whereas by said treaty the Christian powers parties thereto having established, under the consent of Turkey, their right to accomplish and secure the above-recited objects; and

Whereas the American people, in common with all Christian people everywhere, have beheld with horror the recent appalling outrages and massacres of which the Christian population of Turkey have been made the victims:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is an imperative duty, in the interest of humanity, to express the earnest hope that the European Concert brought about by the treaty referred to may speedily be given its just effect in such decisive measures as shall stay the hand of fanaticism and lawless violence, and as shall secure to the unoffending Christians of the Turkish Empire all the rights belonging to them both as men and Christians and as beneficiaries of the explicit provisions of the treaty above recited.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate these resolutions to the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia.

Resolved further, That the Senate of the United States, the House of Representatives concurring, will support the President in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey, and to obtain redress for injuries committed upon the persons or property of such citizens.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolutions which have been read?

Mr. COCKRELL. In what situation is the matter?

Mr. CULLOM. The resolutions are reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and with the unanimous consent of the committee, I may say.

Mr. LINDSAY. Have the resolutions been printed?

Mr. CULLOM. They have not been printed. I called the attention of the Senate to the reading of the resolutions for the pur-

pose of securing immediate action, if the Senate saw proper to take it. I should be very glad to have the resolutions adopted now, as I think there will be no discussion upon them, because it seems to be something that this Government ought to express itself about, and that without very much delay. If there is objection, of course the resolutions will go over; but if there is no objection, I hope the Senate will vote upon them without delay.

Mr. HILL. I was out of the Chamber when the resolutions were read. I ask the Senator whether he can not state concisely just what is proposed to be done?

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator from Illinois allow me?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. I think the resolutions are important. I have no idea in the world now of opposing the passage of some such resolutions. I had not the good fortune to be in when they were read. I do not think the delay of a day, which it will take to have the resolutions printed and laid on our desks, will interfere with the object the Senator from Illinois has in view, and therefore I ask that that be done.

Mr. CULLOM. In view of the fact that the honorable Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] has given notice of his desire to address the Senate this morning, I myself intended, if there was a disposition to discuss the resolutions now, to ask that they should go over. So the resolutions may go over until to-morrow. I give notice that I shall hope to secure their adoption at that time.

Mr. PLATT. I present, out of order, resolutions, in the nature of a petition, passed by the First Congregational Church of Meriden, in Connecticut, which is the city of my residence, with regard to the subject which has just been reported upon by the Committee on Foreign Relations; and I wish to express my feeling of satisfaction that the committee has made this report. The petition, I suppose, may lie upon the table, as the report has been made.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will lie on the table, and the resolutions will go over.

Mr. CULLOM. I neglected when I was upon my feet to report back a number of resolutions in the nature of petitions which have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations on the same subject. I ask that the committee may be discharged from the further consideration of the petitions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1677) for the relief of James Q. Shirley and the estate of Francis De Long, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1678) granting muster and pay and allowance of captain of cavalry to Michael Sheehy from June 13, 1864, to March 25, 1866; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1679) for the relief of Helen Larned; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1680) to place John Dolan on the retired list of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1681) to increase the pension of Mrs. Virginia E. Turtle, of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 1682) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sarah B. Leet; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1683) to place Lieut. Henry C. Keene, United States Navy, retired, on the retired list of the United States Navy with the rank of lieutenant-commander; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1684) granting a pension to Sam P. Barbee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1685) to amend the immigration and naturalization laws; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1686) granting a pension to Herman Neudick; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1687) placing the name of John W. Brooks, of Ellsworth, Kans., on the rolls of the Army, and granting him an honorable discharge with pay and allowances; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1688) granting a pensionrto Thomas Corcoran; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1689) granting a pension to John F. Hathaway; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1690) granting a pension to Richard Brookins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1691) for the relief of E. N. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1692) providing for the publication of District of Columbia advertising by contract; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1693) for the rebuilding or repair of the public wharf at Sitka, Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WALTHALL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1694) to increase the pension of Maj. Gen. Julius H. Stahel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1695) granting a pension to Annie Beach; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HILL introduced a bill (S. 1696) making an appropriation for the construction of an electrical cruiser and to provide electrical equipment for one or more cruisers already in service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1697) for the relief of J. M. Foster, of Houston, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1698) for the establishment of a subport of entry and delivery at Miami, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 1699) for the relief of William Loring Spencer; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SMITH introduced a bill (S. 1700) to provide for the erection of an armor-plate factory in the city of Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HILL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 61) authorizing and requiring the Secretary of War to contract with Charles Stoughton for the improvement of the Harlem Kills, New York City, by a canal to connect the lower Harlem River with Long Island Sound, 3,400 feet in length, 300 feet in width, and 15 feet in depth, at mean low water, or by a similar canal 18 feet in depth, at mean low water, in strict conformity with the survey and report made thereon in 1881 by Col. John Newton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. TELLER, it was

Ordered, That the papers on file in the office of the Secretary of the Senate relating to the claim of Miss Eliza A. White, in the Fiftieth Congress, be withdrawn from the files and transmitted to the Committee on Claims of the House of Representatives, there having been no adverse report thereon.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE HEARING.

Mr. CALL. I submit a resolution which I ask may be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Before the resolution is referred I wish to say that it is accompanied by a request from the president of the convention of the Woman's Suffrage Association, which will convene in Washington in the course of a few days, that a hearing shall be accorded to them. It has been accorded to them and a stenographer has been appointed to take down their statements.

The resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That the Committee on Woman Suffrage be authorized to employ a stenographer to report the proceedings at the hearing of the delegates of the woman's suffrage convention.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CHAPELL, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH], coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution relative to the payment of bonds of the United States issued under certain acts in standard silver dollars.

Mr. PUGH. I understand the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] is entitled to the floor upon the resolution.

Mr. HILL. I was going to suggest that the resolution may lead to considerable debate, and I think it should be placed upon the Calendar, where it can be brought up at any time by a vote of the Senate. Would not that course be agreeable to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. PUGH. No, sir; I object to its going on the Calendar. I shall insist on its immediate consideration and for a vote upon it without debate, if I can obtain it.

Mr. HILL. That is hardly possible, Mr. President, in the present status of affairs.

Mr. PUGH. Not with the exercise of freedom of speech possessed so eminently by the Senator from New York.

Mr. HILL. I would suggest, then, as a temporary relief to the Senate and the country, that we lay the resolution aside, in order to take up the resolution upon which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] desires to speak, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Colorado. Then we can dispose of this matter afterwards.

Mr. PUGH. On what resolution does the Senator from Colorado desire to speak?

Mr. HILL. He desires to speak on some resolution pertaining to the Monroe doctrine. I suggest that that resolution be taken up now, and we can bring up this question again after the Senator from Colorado has concluded his speech.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I shall be obliged if the Senator from Alabama will let the resolution lie over temporarily. If it suits his convenience it would very much suit mine.

Mr. PUGH. I feel compelled to yield to the request of the Senator from Colorado, but I am very anxious to have action upon this resolution, and I shall press action upon it whenever it is proper to do so. I hope that the next time it is called up there will be no objection to its consideration on the ground that we are to be inflicted with the old gold-bug argument against the passage of the resolution. If we are to suffer that infliction, the earlier the better.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over for the present.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 21st instant approved and signed the act (S. 30) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," approved March 2, 1893.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had on the 22d instant approved and signed the act (S. 628) to provide an American register for the steamer *Miami*.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL].

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays the resolution before the Senate.

The resolution submitted by Mr. SEWELL on the 16th instant was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Monroe doctrine, as originally propounded, was directed to the special prevention of the threatened action of the Allied Powers in reference to the revolted colonies of Spain and the occupation, by way of colonization, of any supposed derelict territory on this hemisphere.

2. That the question of resisting any acquisition of territory by conquest was limited, as stated by Mr. Webster, to cases in which, by reason of proximity, such acquisition would be dangerous to our safety and the integrity of our institutions.

3. That the true ground upon which the Monroe announcement was based and upon which any similar position has been taken rests for its justification upon what may be our interests, and our interests only; and that neither by the Monroe doctrine nor any other official declaration have we ever come under any pledge to any power or State on this continent that binds us to act merely for their protection against invasion or encroachment by any other power.

4. That when a case arises in which a European power proposes to acquire territory by invasion or conquest, it is then for us to determine whether our safety and the integrity of our institutions demand that we shall resist such action by armed force if necessary.

5. That the Executive has pressed the Monroe doctrine beyond what was contemplated at the time of its announcement, and that the resultant sequence of the positions thus taken seems to be a committal of this Government to a protectorate over Mexico and the Central and South American States; that this would be most unwise and dangerous, and would violate the sound and well-established policy that we should avoid all entangling alliances with foreign powers, whether they be European or American.

6. That this action was premature, looking to the history of the controversy, and inopportune in view of the business and financial condition of the country.

7. That neither Congress nor the country can be, or has been, committed by the action or position of the executive department, in reference to the Venezuelan boundary controversy, as to the course to be pursued when the time shall have arrived for a final determination. It will then be our province and our duty to adopt such a line of policy and to take such action as may be then demanded by our sense of duty to the country and by a due regard for its honor and dignity, the welfare and safety of our people, and the integrity of our institutions.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, the extraordinary message of the President of the United States having reference to a dispute exclusively between Great Britain and Venezuela, both friendly powers, was practically indorsed by both Houses of Congress. The responsibilities, therefore, which his action may have entailed rest as well upon the legislative as the executive department of the Government, and are equally shared by all political parties. The recommendations of the President that a commission be appointed to inquire into the points of difference between the two Governments concerned, and to enlighten this country as to the true divisional line separating Venezuela and British Guiana, were followed by Congress, and that Commission, eminent in ability and lacking only the joint sanction of the parties in interest, which sanction alone can give it vitality or usefulness, has duly qualified.

Under the circumstances it would ordinarily seem to be the part of wisdom to refrain from further public comment on a subject of so sensitive and delicate a character until some decisive step had been taken or some obstacle had been encountered calling for legislative interference. And neither the fact that illness prevented my presence in this body when the message was laid before the Senate nor the sporadic utterances on the subject which we have recently heard here would have served to induce me to embarrass the existing situation by further discussion.

The resolutions, however, which the Committee on Foreign Relations has reported to this body, the effect of which may be, in my opinion, most far-reaching, as affecting our policy and relations toward other and friendly Governments, require some discussion and careful investigation before we commit ourselves to their declarations, and lead me to participate in this debate.

The few remarks I shall make will be chiefly to the effect that the so-called Monroe doctrine has been misapplied in the pending controversy; that so much of President Monroe's message as referred to the colonization of portions of America by European powers could have no applicability to any boundary dispute now existing in South America; that the hostility to the extension by European powers of their systems to any portion of this hemisphere, as expressed in that message, had especial reference to the systems of government which were based on the divine right of kings, and which were directed to the overthrow of all republics, wherever existing; that the Monroe doctrine was in no wise intended as insisting upon republican forms of government in this hemisphere, or as committing this Government to maintain the doctrine outside its own borders or except as its own integrity might be affected; that this country is embarking upon a new and different policy from the one laid down by our fathers, and that from 1823 until now Congress has uniformly declined to define the so-called Monroe doctrine or to adopt it as a rule of action.

The existing condition of affairs makes the calm discussion of the principles of the Monroe doctrine most difficult at this time. It is not an easy or a gracious task to take, in this high forum, a position which apparently involves in the slightest degree the abandonment of that patriotic fervor which animates the breast of every citizen where our national pride or our country's honor is in question. There has been much tension for the past few weeks. The letter of the Secretary of State to Mr. Bayard was, from a diplomatic point of view, almost incendiary. The President's message glowed with the possibilities of war. Members of both Houses of Congress, not to be outdone, followed the President's suggestion as to the appointment of a commission with feverish haste. Just what the commission is to do, or how it is to do it, nobody knows, but we have created it, and it stands, as yet, more a menace than a guaranty of peace.

The efforts of the Government to fire the national heart have not been unavailing nor was the work difficult. We have had but two wars, except our own civil conflict and a war of conquest with the weak Government of Mexico. Both of them were with Great Britain; and while the past eighty years have seen an entire readjustment of all our relations with the mother country, a readjustment which ought to make future war with her out of the question, there are still lurking some traces of the traditional resentment. There is discontent, too, with existing conditions in many sections of the country, and men feel that any change, even war with a foreign country, could not make matters worse, and might bring improvement. There are all over the West and South men who work on their farms and find the grain they raise little more valuable for food than as fuel, who know that the railroads which charge them for the transportation of their produce are largely owned in Great Britain, and are either prosperous or, if insolvent, are fostered and protected and managed by Federal courts. They also view with distrust the close financial relations existing between the bankers of the East and those of London, and they would welcome any event, even war, that would result, as they believe a war would result, in destroying those relations and lead us to rely upon our own resources alone, and to embrace economic policies which would not be dependent on those of foreign countries. Thoughtless and weak and ignorant these views may be, Mr. President, but the person who denies their existence is not familiar with conditions or opinions in many States of the Union.

Add to all this the fact that hostility toward Great Britain is fostered by some political leaders who believe that jingo demonstrations may distract attention from domestic discontent and that this hostility is intensified by the bitterness cherished toward that Government by thousands of her former subjects, now citizens of this Republic, and it is not surprising that there exists in the breasts of many of our people an antagonism to Great Britain so rampant and so fierce that judgment is unheeded and passion and prejudice hold full sway.

It is easier to drift with such a condition than to antagonize it, but with the convictions on this subject which I hold, Mr. President, that sense of duty which accompanies us in public station as in private life prohibits a silence which would be cowardly, and impels me to the presentation of the right as light is given me to see it.

There has never been a doctrine more misunderstood or misapplied than the so-called Monroe doctrine. It is, and has ever been, without recognition by other countries, and has always been refused the approval of Congress.

The whole question first arose as follows—and in the presentation of this immediate branch of the subject I shall more than once quote from an able article in the North American Review for April, 1856, written while the whole subject was familiar to men who had been in public life when the Monroe doctrine was promulgated:

There was an unsettled controversy between Russia and the United States pending in 1823 respecting their possessions in Northwestern America, Russia claiming title along the Pacific as far south as latitude 51°. Great Britain also laid claim to much of the same territory and to a point even farther south. We insisted on our title to Oregon, not only through our treaty with Spain in 1819, which gave us all her rights north of the forty-second parallel of latitude, but also based our claim upon prior discovery and exploration of what was known as Oregon Territory.

There had been but little actual development over vast areas of the Northwest, and there was danger that some foreign powers might still claim portions of our dominion as unsettled country and open to exploration and occupation. Spain and Great Britain had entered into certain agreements prior to our treaty with Spain in 1819, and it was important to us that any rights asserted on behalf of or through Spain should be extinguished. This Government, therefore, was quick to declare that Spanish rights in this whole hemisphere had lapsed because of the revolution in South America, although the contest was not ended for twenty years longer. The use of the word "colonization" had reference, therefore, not to acquisition of territory by conquest, or treaty, or purchase, but solely to the establishment of colonies founded on priority of discovery and occupation; and so explained, the phrase, "The American Continents are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power," becomes clear enough, and its attempted application to existing disputes in South America is absurd, and this was Mr. Clay's understanding of the expression, and so explained by him in his dispatch when Secretary of State, in 1825, to our minister to Mexico.

This disposes of so much of the Monroe doctrine as applies to colonization by foreign powers. Then follows the other declaration in the message, so often quoted and misquoted and tortured in meaning:

> In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the Allied Powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. And to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere, but with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. In the war between those new governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security.
>
> The late events in Spain and Portugal show that Europe is still unsettled. Of this important fact no stronger proof can be adduced than that the Allied Powers should have thought it proper, on a principle satisfactory to themselves, to have interposed by force in the internal concerns of Spain. To what extent such interposition may be carried, on the same principle, is a question in which all independent powers whose governments differ from theirs are interested, even those most remote; and surely none more so than the United States. Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same; which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy; meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none. But in regard to these continents circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the Allied Powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethern, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference. If we look to the comparative strength and resources of Spain and those new governments, and their distance from each other, it must be obvious that she can never subdue them. It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves, in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course.

And the message of December, 1824, was still more emphatic:

> Separated as we are from Europe by the great Atlantic Ocean, we can have no concern in the wars of the European Governments nor in the causes which produce them. The balance of power between them, into whichever scale it may turn in its various vibrations, can not affect us. It is the interest of the United States to preserve the most friendly relations with every power, and on conditions fair, equal, and applicable to all. But in regard to our neighbors our situation is different. It is impossible for the European governments to interfere in their concerns, especially in those alluded to, which are vital, without affecting us. Indeed, the motive which might induce such interference in the present state of the war between the parties, if a war it may be called, would appear to be equally applicable to us. It is gratifying to know that some of the powers with whom we enjoy a very friendly intercourse, and to whom these views have been communicated, have appeared to acquiesce in them.

The circumstances attending these utterances are well known. After the Napoleonic wars, and in the reactionary period which followed the French Revolution, the sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia met personally and formed an offensive and defensive alliance intended to assert the divine right of kings and to put down with fire and sword any revolt against the doctrines of what was termed "legitimacy" and to interfere wherever, in either world, it could aid in smothering and destroying all aspirations for freedom.

It called itself the Holy Alliance, and interfered in Spain where a constitutional Cortes had superseded King Ferdinand, and it threatened to subjugate the Spanish-American provinces which had thrown off the Spanish yoke.

The English people had already secured the great bulk of the commerce with these countries, and viewed with disfavor any interference with them by European Governments, and the announcement I have quoted from President Monroe's message was largely the suggestion of Mr. Canning, then the English secretary of state for foreign affairs, and met the cordial support of the English Government. Not only was the Monroe doctrine the direct outcome of English suggestion, but in all the wars for independence fought in the swamps and jungles and in the fever-infested districts of these tropical provinces of South America, and in the long struggles for liberty which drenched the Spanish colonies in America with the blood of patriots, British volunteers fought ever in the front of battle. Veterans of Waterloo, many of them, they sought only an opportunity to fight the Spaniard, the oppressor of the New World. Their valor at the battle of the Bridge of Boyacá carried the day and set New Granada free. At the great and decisive battle of Carabobo in 1821, on Venezuelan soil, after the Venezuelan troops had been again and again repulsed and were in full retreat, the British legion, with reckless and heroic bravery and against overwhelming odds, carried the Pass of Carabobo in a bayonet charge and with it carried the fortunes of the day and of the war. At the close of the battle, of the 900 English troops, 600 lay dead or wounded on the field, their colors seven times changed hands and were dyed with the blood of the dauntless heroes who carried them, and as the few survivors, with trailing arms, filed past Bolivar when the day was won, he saluted them as the saviors of his country. Such was the example which Great Britain set and the encouragement she afforded during the long struggle for freedom in South America. Without her aid Venezuela might not to-day be free, and those who now denounce her as if she were the oppressor of Venezuelan liberties may, with profit, study the history of those early and bloody times.

The concern of President Monroe was not lest monarchies should be established in this hemisphere. He expressly recognized existing Governments, and had welcomed the Empire of Dom Pedro in Brazil and Iturbide in Mexico as freely as the Governments of Bolivar; he protested not against despotic Governments, but against their forcible extension by the dreaded Holy Alliance in this Western world, of which he stood in well-grounded fear.

In this connection I quote from the summary in the North American Review, to which I have referred:

> We have now arrived at the point in our historical review from which we can clearly perceive at what this declaration of Mr. Monroe was aimed. It was intended as a caveat to the designs of the allies, and as an earnest protest against the extension to this continent of the "political system" on which they were based. What were those designs and what was this political system which endangered the peace and safety of the United States? The history of the Holy Alliance furnishes a sufficient answer to both of these questions. The designs of the European monarchs against the independence of the Spanish American States, prosecuted as they would be in accordance with a political

system which recognized only the doctrine of legitimacy and the divine right of kings, would necessarily menace the very existence of our own institutions, since these had been founded in a most contumacious disregard of the principles deemed most "holy" by an alliance which arrogated to itself the "undoubted right to take a hostile attitude in regard to those States in which the overthrow of the government may operate as an example." In what country did the overthrow of legitimacy then exert so potent an influence as in the United States? And if the Spanish American republics were now to be assailed for their imitation of our "example," could we hope, as the federal representatives of the free principles most obnoxious to the Holy Alliance, that we should escape their flaming zeal in the cause of "order and legitimacy," after they had finished with the South American republics?

A blow aimed at them because they were republics was a blow equally aimed at the independence of our own country; and hence it was that Mr. Monroe declared that any such armed intervention by the Allied Powers of Europe could not be regarded as "in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States"—a declaration characterized no less by the calmness of its delivery than by the patriotic foresight in which it was devised. Originated for the purpose of meeting a particular conjuncture of events, it finds in them alone its real purport and its justification. Wise, and seasonable with reference to the circumstances of the time at which it was promulgated, it ceased to be of any force, even as a Presidential recommendation, so soon as the crisis which called it forth had passed.

It was the Holy Alliance he dreaded; the Holy Alliance which, as Mr. Brougham said in 1823 in the House of Commons, was—

not against freedom on the Ebro, or freedom on the Mincio, but against freedom; against freedom wherever it is found, freedom by whomsoever enjoyed, freedom by whatever means achieved, by whatever institutions secured.

These patriotic utterances of President Monroe, approved by the great Jefferson, found ready indorsement in this country and in England. We were, however, perhaps more conservative then; possibly there were enough other issues upon which votes could be solicited, and Congress, when called upon in 1824, by Henry Clay, then Speaker, to indorse the substance of the message, declined to adopt it and make it a rule of legislative action.

I read from the account of the debate:

On the 20th of January, 1824, Mr. Clay, who was Speaker of the House of Representatives, moved the following resolution in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union:

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the people of these States would not see, without serious inquietude, any forcible interposition by the Allied Powers of Europe, in behalf of Spain, to reduce to their former subjection those parts of the continent of America which have proclaimed and established for themselves, respectively, independent governments, and which have been solemnly recognized by the United States."

We need not state what was the fate of this resolution, as well as of a similar one offered by Mr. Poinsett of South Carolina. Its object, as appears from the face of it, was to give a legislative sanction to the principles enunciated in the President's message; but, whether from prudent caution or timid counsels (as to which we venture to express no opinion), it was never adopted by the House of Representatives.

And from that day to this Congress has failed to give the doctrine official sanction.

I quote from 1 Wharton:

It is seen also by the debates on the Panama mission and the Yucatan intervention that Congress has never been willing to commit the nation to any compact or pledge on this subject, or to any specific declaration of purpose or methods beyond the general language of the message.

In the debates on the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, in 1855-6, above referred to, all the speakers seemed to agree to this position of the subject. Mr. Clayton said: "In reference to this particular territory I would not hesitate at all, as one Senator, to assert the Monroe doctrine and maintain it by my vote; but I do not expect to be sustained in such a vote by both branches of Congress. Whenever the attempt has been made to assert the Monroe doctrine in either branch of Congress, it has failed. The present Democratic party came into power, after the debate on the Panama mission, on the utter abnegation of the whole doctrine, and stood upon Washington's doctrine of nonintervention. You can not prevail on a majority, and I will venture to say that you can not prevail on one-third, of either House of Congress to sustain it."

Mr. Cass said: "Whenever the Monroe doctrine has been urged, either one or the other House of Congress, or both Houses, did not stand up to it." Mr. Seward said: "It is true that each House of Congress has declined to assert it; but the honorable Senators must do each House the justice to acknowledge that the reason why they did decline to assert the doctrine was that it was proposed, as many members thought, as an abstraction, unnecessary, not called for at the time." Mr. Mason spoke of it as having "never been sanctioned or recognized by any constitutional authority."

And when a resolution respecting the Panama congress was under discussion, Congress expressly refused to commit itself to the Monroe doctrine in any form (Review, page 506):

When the resolution "to appropriate the funds necessary to enable the President of the United States to send ministers to the congress of Panama" was under discussion in the House of Representatives, it was expressly voted that such ministers should in no way make any compact or engagement with the Spanish American States in regard either to any threatened intervention or any future colonization by the European powers on the American continents. Resolutions to this effect were introduced by Mr. McLane of Delaware and Mr. Rives of Virginia, who afterwards, however, agreed to accept a "modification" presented by Mr. Buchanan of Pennsylvania, embodying the substance of both their resolutions. This modification, after reciting and approving the neutral policy of the United States, declares:

It is therefore the opinion of this House that the Government of the United States ought not to be represented at the congress of Panama except in a diplomatic character, nor ought they to form any alliance, offensive or defensive, or negotiate respecting such an alliance with all or any of the South American republics; nor ought they to become parties with them, or either of them, to any joint declaration for the purpose of preventing the interference of any of the European powers with their independence or form of government, or to any compact for the purpose of preventing colonization upon the continents of America; but that the people of the United States should be left free to act, in any crisis, in such a manner as their feelings of friendship toward these republics and as their own honor and policy may at the time dictate.

This resolution was passed in the House by a vote of 99 yeas to 95 nays; and thus was the declaration with respect to colonization left in abeyance, or rather expressly repudiated by this branch of Congress with reference to the Spanish American States.

Nor was it considered even by the generation of statesmen who controlled the destinies of our country at the time the message was transmitted that the declarations of the President involved us in the slightest responsibility to protect the countries of South America against foreign invasion.

Mr. Webster, in a speech on the Panama mission, in 1826, spoke as follows:

"It is doubtless true, as I took occasion to observe the other day, that this declaration must be considered as founded on our rights, and to spring mainly from a regard to their preservation. It did not commit us, at all events, to take up arms on any indication of hostile feeling by the powers of Europe toward South America. If, for example, all the States of Europe had refused to trade with South America until her States should return to their former allegiance, that would have furnished no cause of interference to us. Or if an armament had been furnished by the allies to act against provinces the most remote from us, as Chile or Buenos Ayres, the distance of the scene of action diminishing our apprehension of danger, and diminishing also our means of effectual interposition, might still have left us to content ourselves with remonstrance.

"But a very different case would have arisen if an army, equipped and maintained by these powers, had been landed on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico and commenced the war in our immediate neighborhood. Such an event might justly be regarded as dangerous to ourselves, and on that ground call for decided and immediate interference by us. The sentiments and the policy announced by the declaration, thus understood, were therefore in strict conformity to our duties and our interest."

And Mr. Adams, who had originated the doctrine, declared its limitations in his message of December 26, 1825.

Accordingly, in his special message to the Senate, under date of December 26, 1825, advising the appointment "of envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to the assembly of American nations at Panama," Mr. Adams took occasion to explain the principle enunciated by the late President, in the following explicit and unmistakable terms. We quote from the message:

"An agreement between all the parties represented at the meeting, that each will guard, by its own means, against the establishment of any future European colony within its borders, may be found advisable. This was, more than two years since, announced by my predecessor to the world as a principle resulting from the emancipation of both the American continents. It may be so developed to the new Southern nations that they will all feel it as an essential appendage to their independence.

* * * * * * *

And in terms still more definite in his message to the House on March 26, 1826:

Should it be deemed advisable to contract any conventional engagement on this topic, our views would extend no further than to a mutual pledge of the parties to the compact, each to maintain the principle in application to its own territory, and to permit no colonial lodgment or establishment of European jurisdiction upon its own soil.

Not only, Mr. President, was the Monroe doctrine intended simply as a declaration of limited scope and purpose, as I think I have shown, but the circumstances under which it was given to the world were far different from those which now exist; and under present conditions its assertion and maintenance to the extent claimed by the present Executive have ceased to be of paramount importance.

It was essentially a doctrine of self-defense, promulgated for our own preservation and for no other purpose. Our country, in 1823, was sparsely settled, and its boundaries but vaguely defined. Nearly half of our present area, excluding Alaska, was owned by Mexico. Russia claimed certain rights in the Northwest, and the tremendous and sinister power of Spain had not been finally shaken off by the countries to the south of us. England was our ally, our friend, although our own boundary claims with her were unsettled, fearing, as we feared, the possible encroachments of Russia and the certainty of war with Spain if she should recover her footing in South America. Any successful step in her behalf to the south of us meant the restoration of the whole continent to that cruel and reactionary people whose brutality has darkened the pages of history for four hundrtd years. The fear was then real and the danger threatening. To-day how different the picture! We have helped ourselves to what land we needed; our own borders are defined, our Government eternally planted on the solid rock; our people intelligent and lovers of liberty and devoted to free institutions. No danger threatens us from without. We are menaced by no foreign foe.

Our boundaries, as I have said, are rounded, completed, and defined. They are not assailed either on the north or on the south. We are in no danger of losing any portion of our territory, nor do we desire at this time to acquire on either side an additional acre, and vast as are our resources, intelligent as are our people, we possess an element of strength even greater than these advantages afford us; and that is that nobody wants us. We are not desirable subjects for other countries. There is not a nation in the whole world that would take one of our sovereign States as a gift, with its people. Alsace and Lorraine may be transferred from one race and one nation to another, and a generation may bring acquiescence in the change; but no country has an army large enough to hold a foot of American soil where our flag has once floated, and "Time's iron feet" can make no impress upon our love and our equal devotion to every section of our country.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If it is important, but if not I had rather go on.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I think it is important, and that it will not disturb the Senator. In the event that England to-

morrow should negotiate with the Nicaraguan Government for the purchase of all the Nicaraguan soil, I should like to know whether the Senator would say that the Government of the United States ought to protest; and if it did protest, whether it should protest in the name of the Monroe doctrine or in the name of what should it protest?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not care to be dragged into a further discussion in answer to the interruption of the Senator from Oregon, and after that I trust I may be permitted to proceed with my speech. I shall cover the very ground to which the Senator refers later, as he would have found if he had possessed his soul in patience.

Of course, if Great Britain were foolish enough to take such action, we should interfere, and should interfere to any extent; and we should interfere not in the slightest degree because of the Monroe doctrine, but because of the undoubted and inalienable right we have to protect our interests wherever anything is asserted to the contrary in any portion of the earth. [Applause in the galleries, which was suppressed by the Vice-President.]

Mr. President, it is idle to talk seriously of our integrity or perpetuity being threatened by an adjustment of boundary between Great Britain and Venezuela. That which once seemed a danger and evoked the utterance of the Monroe doctrine has passed forever away, and has left nothing to vex us but the pride of expression to which we still cling.

In the early years of the century, Mr. President, men's hearts were all aglow, the whole world over, with hopes of liberty. There was no section of the earth where there was despotism that there were not brave spirits struggling for freedom, and young republics held out the hand of friendship to each other and all men were brothers. Bolivar and other gallant leaders were battling nobly in the south, and there seemed to be promise of the same growth in civilization in South as in North America. That hope was long since dispelled. Instead of developing into self-respecting republics based upon law, advancing in morals and civilization, the peoples of South America have shown themselves so far, almost without exception, utterly unfitted for self-government. Their so-called republics are largely and usually military despotisms based on force and relying on bloodshedding and assassination for their establishment and for their brief continuance; extending only until the ruler shall have amassed from the oppression of the people a fortune sufficient to enable him to live in luxury in Europe, when he escapes or abdicates, or until some other revolutionist shall be able by violence to seize the reins of government. The rulers are despots and suffrage a farce. Not only was this the condition of affairs fifty years ago; it is equally true to-day.

Mexico, almost alone, under the able and wise rule of Diaz has enjoyed exceptional and long-continued immunity from revolution, and the Mexican Republic seems firmly established; but its early history is like that of the other Central and South American countries. From the date of the independence of Mexico in 1821 down to 1860—a period of thirty-nine years—it had thirty-six different forms of government and seventy-two individuals figured as its chief executives. They were regents, presidents, president substitutes, emperors, commanders-in-chief, generals, and dictators, but the people had no more voice in the government than they have in Russia to-day.

There is occasionally a country which, for the moment, seems to have aspirations toward good government, and for a brief period some ruler will appear to realize that a republic means something else than a bloody and oppressive despotism; but such a country and such a ruler are the exception and not the rule. The people are ignorant and submissive; the rulers are arbitrary and cruel. Let me read what the latest intelligent American traveler has to say of them. I quote from the book of Mr. Theodore Child, who saw with friendly and uncritical eyes, and sought to find only that which was attractive or gave promise for the future:

> The Argentine Republic has had an experience of sixty years of politico-electoral warfare. Party politics and personal ambition of a political nature have caused more bloodshed than the conquest of liberty itself, and yet the political education of the nation does not seem to make any progress nor the patriotism of individuals to acquire any rational development. The prosperity of the Argentine Republic has been impeded in the past by the passions, the political ambitions, and the want of morality of its criollo sons.

He again says:

> In the political struggles there are rarely questions of principles, but always questions of persons. President succeeds president, but the aim of all is equally selfish, and even if the opposition were transformed into the government the whole result would be that one set of parasites would take the place of another. In Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, Chile, and Peru the political conditions are more or less the same; they are ruled by presidents who are as absolute autocrats as the Czar of Russia, and even more so, because they are safe from the intrusion or influence of European criticism. The President of Argentina or the President of Chile is master of the whole administrative organization of the country so completely that no legal and constitutional means can be brought to bear efficaciously against his personal will or caprice. He not only disposes of the armed force of the country, but the entire administrative personnel is his creature and at his devotion. Thus the manipulation of the whole electoral machinery is under his control, and the citizens enjoy in consequence a right of voting that is purely platonic. They may vote, it is true, in many cases, as much as they please, but no account is taken of their suffrages. The whole apparatus of republicanism in these countries is a farce, and in spite of the sonorous speeches of after-dinner orators they have not yet begun to enjoy even the most elementary political liberty.

From the general discussion in the press of the country one would at first blush be inclined to believe that the United States had strong natural affiliations with these Central and South American Governments, and were tied to them in bonds of ancient affection as well as fraternal love. In all this demonstration, therefore, with which we are indulging ourselves, it may be well to remember that after the announcement of the Monroe doctrine we went to war with one of these Governments and took from it a country which doubled the size of our own territory, and that it is only five years or so ago that we were about to blow Chile off the land and out of the water because her people were too frank in the expression of their hostility to us.

Mr. HOAR. And murdered a few sailors.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, and murdered a few sailors as an evidence of friendship.

Mr. HOAR. As a very frank expression of what they feel.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As a frank expression of their friendship for us. The fact is, we have absolutely nothing in common with these countries; that with few exceptions they dislike us and are jealous of our prosperity, and only call upon us to aid them when their commercial dishonor has led them to repudiate their debts and deprive them of European friendship; or when, as in the present case, they can successfully appeal to our love of fair play, our sympathy for the weak when threatened by the strong, and especially to our instinctive devotion to everything which is labeled "American."

These people, Mr. President, though alien in race, language, and religion, are entitled to our friendly and affectionate regard; as citizens of a sister Republic in name we may even owe them protection whenever the interests of free government or the cause of civilization is attacked by assaults upon their autonomy. Beyond that point our obligation ceases. The description which I have given of the South American States generally applies with added force to Venezuela. Ever since her contest with Spain she has had revolutions at average intervals of eighteen months. Her population consists of upward of 2,000,000 people, and of these, until the recent influx to the gold fields, less than 1 per cent were whites, the remainder of the inhabitants being negroes, Indians, and the mixed races, composed of mulattoes and zambos. Much of the present friction between Great Britain and Venezuela arises because of the recent development of gold fields in southern Venezuela. These fields are already attracting the attention of our miners from the Western States; many of our people are already there and more will follow. Where the vexed boundary line will finally be located we can not tell, but I am frank to say that I sincerely hope it will rightfully be found to place these rich mines where the English-speaking people, who must develop them, will not be subject to the cupidity of the half-breeds of Venezuela, and where the English common law and the certainty of its enforcement will furnish them shelter and protection.

The phraseology of the resolutions reported by the committee, Mr. President, is as unobjectionable as any language could be which endeavored to assert in binding and final terms a policy to which this Government desired to commit itself in dealing with the relations of foreign countries to this hemisphere. It is moderate, it is clear, and it is comprehensive. The objection to it, in my opinion, is that Congress is not called upon to give its sanction to any policy to be pursued toward the Governments to the south of us; and that at this particular juncture any legislation is unwise and can only accentuate existing difficulties.

Conditions change from year to year. The policies of to-day become inapplicable to-morrow. For the last seventy years Congress has wisely refrained from placing the seal of its sanction upon the Monroe doctrine. These resolutions can not help us to a solution of existing difficulties, and at this moment of excitement and of passion we are not in the best condition to frame a policy which shall guide our country for all future time.

Our right and our duty to interfere in every South American and Central American question that in any wise affects our interests are undoubted; but that right and duty do not rest on the message of President Monroe, nor are they strengthened by legislative announcement.

The passage of the resolutions at this time can do no good and perhaps little harm, but their introduction only adds another fagot to a fire which ought not to be permitted to longer burn. From the point of view which I am presenting the diplomatic correspondence was, on our side, unnecessarily irritating, the message of the President ill advised, and the creation of a commission with no facilities for investigation not shared by us all, and without invitation by the parties in interest, was hasty and premature. Believe me, Mr. President, I do not presume to criticise our past action or to arrogate to myself superior wisdom. Under similar surroundings and with the same environment I should very pos-

sibly have joined in the unanimous action of the Senate if I had been permitted to be present in this body; but at this time it does nevertheless seem as if the further agitation of this question should cease until the resources of diplomacy are finally exhausted. Probably every American believes that Great Britain should have agreed to arbitrate the line ab initio and without reservation, but she did not so agree. Whereupon we have made it infinitely more difficult for her to accept arbitration by our demonstrative diplomacy and volunteer commission; and we are drifting into a position where Great Britain's refusal to arbitrate, and she may lawfully refuse, will be considered not as demanding from us only a dignified and earnest protest, which is as far as most thoughtful Americans believe it fitting that we should go, but may be deemed by a numerous and influential body of our people to be a justification for the severance of relations between the two countries, and perhaps for war.

We are told that we should not consider the possibilities of war; but we must look to the rational result of our interference along present lines. In my opinion, Mr. President, there will be no war. It will be avoided, not because our position toward Great Britain in her dispute with Venezuela is tenable, for I think I have shown its unsoundness, and it has been rejected by the press and public opinion of every first-class power in the world; not because by our moderation and wisdom we avert the possibilities of war, but because Great Britain will yield the whole controversy rather than face the horrors of such a war over such a question, a war out of which no victor could emerge whatever the result; a war which would put back civilization and progress for a century, and which could only mean disaster to the human race. If such a contest shall be thus avoided, as I pray it may, it will bring to us no added honor and to Great Britain no disgrace; nor will the cause of liberty in South America be furthered or our own foundations be laid the stronger.

If the Senate, Mr. President, was not responsible for the original differences which have arisen between Great Britain and this country relative to the Venezuelan boundary, it must be admitted that we have done much toward keeping the question active and the differences acute. For instance, the other day, after all the Venezuelan dispatches had been published to the world, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] saw fit to introduce a resolution having reference to the abortive revolution in the Transvaal. In what I have to say I make not the slightest reflection on the Senator from Alabama. I know his personal courtesy and his high sense of official duty, and I question neither, but I do protest that the introduction at this time of such a resolution was at least unfortunate and that its motive might be easily misunderstood. It is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the people of the United States of America, through their representatives in Congress assembled, convey to the President and people of the Republic of Transvaal their earnest congratulations upon their success in establishing free representative government, republican in form, and in their opposition to any foreign power that denies to them the full enjoyment of these rightful liberties.

The people of America having realized, through the favor of the God of Nations, the blessings of government based upon the consent of the governed, entertain with confidence the pleasing hope and belief that the principles of self-government will be securely established through the influence of the Republic of France, in her colonies, and of the Republics of Liberia and the Transvaal, founded by the people in Africa; and that those Republics will foster and give firm support to the peaceful progress of Christian civilization in the new and vast field now being opened to the commerce and institutions of all the nations of the earth throughout that great continent.

Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested to communicate this action of Congress to the President of the Republic of Transvaal.

I know but little of the Transvaal Republic, but I am advised that a large percentage of its white citizens are English-speaking people, and are denied representation, while paying their full quota of taxation; and that situation is one which ordinarily demands and receives American sympathy for people so deprived of what we cherish as an unalienable right. But whatever the cause of the uprising, or the merits of the dispute, Mr. President, my attention at that crisis was diverted to another channel. France is a sister Republic, and although most of her colonies, commended in the resolution of the Senator from Alabama, have fewer rights than Cuba, she is yet entitled to our consideration and sympathy because of her form of government. Germany has furnished us hundreds of thousands of worthy citizens, who are a credit to the Republic. Russia was our friendly ally in the late war. And yet, Mr. President, when I read that all these powerful Governments—France, Germany, and Russia—had allied themselves together against Great Britain, and that the people of those little islands, "compassed by the inviolate sea," in defense of what they deemed their rights, were marshaling their armies and assembling their navies, ready, undaunted, to face a world in arms, unyielding and unafraid, I thanked God I was of the race! There is no drop of blood in me, Mr. President, that is not of English origin, and I have no ancestor on either side since 1650 who was not born on the soil of New England; but my heart beats faster when I recall the glorious deeds of Clive, and Lawrence, and Napier, and Wellington—

> England's greatest son;
> He that gain'd a hundred fights,
> And never lost an English gun.

of Drake and Hawkins, who fought the Spaniard and swept the Spanish Main, and of the incomparable Nelson; and my pulse quickens when I realize that the splendor of their achievements is part of our glorious heritage, and that the language of Burke and of Chatham is our mother tongue!

Mr. President, we will protect our country and our country's interests with our lives, but we wage no wars of conquest or of hate. This Republic stands facing the dawn, secure in its liberties, conscious of its high destiny. Wherever in all the world the hand of the oppressed or the downtrodden is reached out to us, we meet it in friendly clasp. In the Old World, where unspeakable crimes even now darken the skies; in the Orient, where old dynasties have been crumbling for a thousand years and still hang together strong in the accumulation of infamies; in South America, where as yet the forms of free institutions hold only the spirit of cruelty and oppression; everywhere upon the earth it is our mission to ameliorate, to civilize, to Christianize, to loosen the bonds of captivity, and to point the souls of men to nobler heights.

Whatever of advancement and of progress the centuries shall bring us must largely come through the spread of the religion of Christ and the dominance of the English-speaking peoples; and wherever you find both you find communities where freedom exists and law is obeyed. Blood is thicker than water, and until some just quarrel divides us, which Heaven forbid, may these two great nations of the same speech and lineage and traditions stand as brothers, shoulder to shoulder, in the interest of humanity, by their union compelling peace and awaiting the coming of the day when "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." [Applause in the galleries.]

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills from the House of Representatives were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 248) empowering and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish four pieces of condemned cannon to the city of Hastings, Mich.;

A bill (H. R. 1785) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to the W. H. Wallace Post, No. 66, Grand Army of the Republic, of Eldorado, Kans., and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 2777) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate condemned cannon and condemned cannon balls to certain posts of the Grand Army of the Republic.

The bill (H. R. 2300) to incorporate the Supreme Council of the Thirty-third Degree of Scottish Rite Masonry for the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (H. R. 4052) approving certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, authorizing the issue of certain bonds of said Territory, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

The bill (H. R. 4254) granting to the Duluth and North Dakota Railroad Company right of way through certain Indian reservations in the State of Minnesota was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 4321) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for prior years, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 66) to supply the Department of State with documents was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BLOOMINGTON, ILL.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 89) concerning the erection and completion (excepting heating apparatus) of the United States post-office building at Bloomington, Ill., was read the first time by its title.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the joint resolution be now considered.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read for information.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas a clause in the sundry civil appropriation act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat., 395), relating to public buildings, provides: "No change in said plan involving an increase of expense exceeding 10 per cent of the amount to which said building was limited shall be allowed or paid by any officer of the Government without the special authority of Congress;" and

Whereas during the last recess of Congress the contract for the erection and completion (except heating apparatus) of the United States post-office building at Bloomington, Ill., was let for an amount less than the estimated cost, and it became advisable for the Secretary of the Treasury to so modify the drawings and specifications for said building as to provide fireproof construction and improved design: Now, therefore

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to construct and complete the above-named building as may be shown and called for by modified drawings and specifications: *Provided*, That the present appropriation for said building and its site shall not be exceeded.

Mr. COCKRELL. The joint resolution has not been referred to a committee?

Mr. CULLOM. It has just come from the other House.

Mr. COCKRELL. Are we to act upon all House bills without any reference to a committee here in the Senate? Is that to be the rule?

Mr. CULLOM. As the joint resolution does not make any appropriation whatever, but modifies the appropriation heretofore made so as really to cheapen the cost of the building below what it was before, I simply ask that it may be put on its passage, that the work may go on upon the changed plans in that respect.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Illinois please explain what the measure is?

Mr. CULLOM. The joint resolution explains itself better than I can explain it. Did not the Senator hear it read?

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator can explain it more concisely, and I shall be obliged to him if he will do so.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not think I can do so without having the measure before me.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think the bill ought to be referred. We can not legislate in the confusion in the Chamber.

Mr. CULLOM. I shall make no objection. I ask that it be referred.

Mr. SHERMAN. To the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. CULLOM. To the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The joint resolution ought to go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, not to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection to a reference to that committee. All that I ask is that it be acted upon as quickly as possible.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PAYMENT OF SUGAR BOUNTY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

In response to the resolution adopted by the Senate on December 16, 1895, respecting what action had been taken in regard to the payment of the appropriation for the bounty on sugar contained in the sundry civil bill approved March 2, 1895, I herewith transmit a communication received from the Secretary of the Treasury, which contains all the information I have upon the subject.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *January 22, 1896.*

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF VALUABLE SEEDS, ETC.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire, with the consent of the Senate, to call up the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins. I ask that it be read. I see that the clerks have made a mistake in making up the joint resolution for printing. I have marked it as it should be read. The part printed in italics shall come at the end of the part printed in roman characters. Let it be read in that way.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The SECRETARY. The joint resolution is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, directed to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896 for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, and for the printing, publication, and distribution of farmers' bulletins; and as the public exigency requires that the valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, to be purchased under the authority of the said act and by the said appropriation, may be ready for distribution at the earliest possible date, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to procure them by open purchase or contract at the places and in the manner in which such articles are usually bought and sold.

The amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is to add to the end of the joint resolution the following proviso:

Provided, That the said Secretary shall not, in said purchase, pay more than a reasonable and fair price for such commodities or for any of them: *And provided further*, That he shall not be required to expend all the appropriation available for said purchase, but only so much thereof as, considering the time when distribution can be made, may profitably be expended to promote the objects named in said act.

Mr. PUGH. I understand the Senator from North Dakota calls up the joint resolution for the purpose of addressing the Senate, but not for the purpose of securing action upon it to-day.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. What is the measure the Senator from Alabama desires to call up?

Mr. PUGH. I desire to call up the resolution that was laid aside informally to enable the Senator from Colorado to deliver the eloquent speech to which we have all just listened. If the Senator from North Dakota simply desires to address the Senate in accordance with the notice he gave yesterday, I certainly shall not interfere.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I do not believe that the consideration of the joint resolution will occupy much time this morning. If the Senator has a measure in charge, I will state that I do not desire to displace anything by the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. PUGH. If the Senator claims that his joint resolution is to be considered for final action, I must insist on calling up the resolution which was temporarily laid aside; but I do not wish to interfere with his right to address the Senate. However, if he intends to insist upon final action, I am satisfied that the joint resolution will give rise to a great deal of debate and consume a great deal more time than I am willing now to yield to him.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have conferred with Senators upon the other side on this question, and I doubt if there will be much controversy over the joint resolution. I think that we shall be able to reach a conclusion in the course of an hour.

Mr. FAULKNER. I will state to the Senator from North Dakota that he will not have an hour for its consideration. It is now a quarter to 2 o'clock, and the unfinished business comes up at 2 o'clock. I suppose there will be no difficulty on that score between the two Senators, because his remarks will occupy over fifteen minutes, and then the unfinished business, of course, will take its place.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to say to the Senator from Alabama that my object in calling up the joint resolution is that I may have an opportunity to offer some remarks upon it this morning.

Mr. PUGH. For that purpose I have no objection, but I shall call up the resolution I have in charge at the close of the Senator's remarks, to which he will not object, I understand.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I understand that the Senator will have the right of way after I get through.

Mr. HILL. I suggest, with entire respect to the two distinguished Senators, that they do not compose the whole Senate. I have great respect for the rules and I shall insist upon their enforcement. I have not the slightest objection to the Senator from North Dakota proceeding if he desires, subject to all the rules of the Senate.

Mr. PUGH. Of course it is the custom of the Senate to yield to the request of a Senator who desires to call up any matter for the purpose of submitting remarks. That is the purpose for which the Senator from North Dakota now asks that his joint resolution be called up, and for that purpose and for that alone I yield my right to call up my resolution, giving notice that after he concludes the resolution I have in charge will come up. I understand that to be in accordance with my right, and I am on the floor for the purpose of making that disposition of the resolution. I desire to call it up for consideration at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Do I understand that the Senator from Alabama proposes to call up his resolution and agree that it shall be laid aside temporarily?

Mr. PUGH. No, sir. If it interferes with the unfinished business, of course I will have to consent to lay it aside, but I shall ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of proceeding to the consideration of the resolution which has just been laid aside temporarily.

Mr. PLATT. I have just come into the Chamber. Do I understand the Senator from Alabama to claim that his resolution is the unfinished business of the Senate? I supposed there was no unfinished business in the morning hour.

Mr. PUGH. It has been laid before the Senate.

Mr. PLATT. This morning?

Mr. PUGH. This morning; as morning business. It came up in its regular order, and was laid before the Senate as a matter entitled to be considered.

Mr. PLATT. And it was laid aside for the purpose of enabling the Senator from Colorado to make his remarks?

Mr. PUGH. Yes; I gave way to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PLATT. In that case of course it is before the Senate.

Mr. PUGH. I now exercise the right, as I yielded at that time, and have a right to insist upon it until 2 o'clock; and when 2 o'clock arrives, if I can not get the consent of the Senate to lay aside the unfinished business temporarily, of course I shall have to yield to the unfinished business.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota has been recognized.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator from North Dakota allow me?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. GEORGE. The joint resolution which the Senator from North Dakota desires to have considered is one upon which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry differ. The Senator from North Dakota desired to press the consideration of the joint resolution yesterday, and probably on the day before. At my request, and to accommodate me, he consented to postpone any action looking to taking up the measure until this morning, and I con-

sented that when that was done I would make no opposition to taking it up.

Of course, if the Senator from North Dakota simply desires to address the Senate upon it, while the Senator from Alabama grants him that privilege, I would suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that he try to get unanimous consent, without displacing any pending business, to take up the joint resolution at some particular hour and proceed with it to its final determination. It is not the character of a bill upon which a Senator would care to make his remarks and just put them in the RECORD as a mere matter of debate. There will be debate on both sides. I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota, inasmuch as no consent has been given to him to do more than to address the Senate upon the joint resolution, that he ask unanimous consent to have it considered at some hour which suits him; I will agree to it. And then let us take up the joint resolution and proceed with it to its final passage or its final defeat.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask the Senator from Mississippi what hour would be convenient to him?

Mr. GEORGE. Any hour will suit me, because you have been very liberal to me. And now the Senator may exercise his discretion.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Any hour to-day, do I understand?

Mr. GEORGE. So far as I am concerned, any hour that suits you will suit me.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Very well; I ask unanimous consent that 3 o'clock to-day be fixed.

Mr. BATE. I think, to subserve the interests of all parties, the Senator from North Dakota had better go on and make the speech he desires, and let the joint resolution go over until to-morrow. There is no immediate necessity for pressing it to-day that I know of. It can be disposed of in the morning. There is no regular speech set after the morning business to-morrow, I understand, and the Senator from North Dakota can have the full time.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I will state to the Senator from Tennessee that notice has been given of two speeches for to-morrow.

Mr. BATE. But that is after 2 o'clock, not in the morning, I understand, and the Senator will have full swing in the morning. I think we had better pursue that course rather than a broken dose to-day.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Then, may I reach an arrangement with the Senator from Alabama that to-morrow morning, after the morning business, we shall proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. FAULKNER. I will state that two notices have been given for speeches to-morrow morning directly after the morning business, and I would not feel justified to agree to unanimous consent where Senators had given notice some days previous to the agreement now asked.

Mr. BATE. I was not aware of the notice as to speeches to-morrow in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITE in the chair). The matter before the Senate, the Chair understands, is the resolution of the Senator from Alabama, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to address the Senate at this time.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have asked for unanimous consent that 3 o'clock to-day be fixed as the hour when we shall consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN. I desire the attention of the Senator from North Dakota. Why not ask to have the joint resolution taken up, say, day after to-morrow, by unanimous consent, at the conclusion of the morning business and debate it until it is voted upon and finally defeated or passed?

Mr. PLATT. I am not willing at this time to give any consent which would interfere with the unfinished business. I think that bill ought to be proceeded with, as I have suggested heretofore, and I am not willing to give any consent which will interfere with the unfinished business, either for to-day at 3 o'clock or any time to-morrow after 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been made, the question before the Senate is the resolution of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I rose simply to make a similar statement to that which has just been made by the Senator from Connecticut. I can not consent that the regular order shall be displaced by unanimous consent at this time.

PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS.

Mr. HILL. Do I understand that at last the resolution of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH] is properly before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. HILL. I desire to offer an amendment to come in at the end of the resolution, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the resolution the following proviso:

Provided, however, If, for any reason, at any time our silver coins shall not be at a parity with gold coin according to their coinage ratio, then the bonds of the United States now or hereafter issued, which by their terms are payable in coin, shall be paid in standard gold coin whenever demanded.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am inclined to regret that the distinguished Senator from Alabama sees fit to press the consideration of this resolution to-day. After we have listened to the very able and eloquent remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] upon a patriotic question it is quite difficult for us immediately to take up a dry financial subject. The resolution can not be disposed of before the expiration of the morning hour. It is a resolution which in 1878 led to a very elaborate debate, occupying many days, and it must lead to considerable debate at this time; and if action is insisted upon now, it must, of course, displace the regular unfinished business, which is the bond or free-coinage bill.

In the first place, Mr. President, permit me to suggest that I can see no good to result from this discussion at this time. I know of no good reason why the resolution should be pressed at this particular monetary crisis. The principal part of the resolution consists in whereases. It consists of recitals from history. It refers in considerable detail to certain measures passed many years ago. The first measure to which it refers is the act passed in 1869, known as "An act to strengthen the public credit."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 2904, on which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] is entitled to the floor.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue, the pending question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. BUTLER to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I suppose, however we may differ as to the remedy, there will be very little dispute as to the condition of the country. I do not suppose there is any member of this body who is satisfied with the present financial condition in the United States. I should doubt very much whether there is any intelligent man in the United States who would say he is entirely satisfied with present conditions.

We find ourselves now in a very extraordinary state so far as our finances are concerned. If we may believe the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury, the finances are in a very deplorable and a very threatening condition. We know ourselves, beyond all question, that the business interests of the country are in a deplorable condition. We know they have been so for some years. We may not agree as to the cause. Some of us will attribute it to one thing and some to another, but the general condition of this country with reference to its industrial affairs I think no one will deny. I do not suppose in our history there has ever been a time when there were so many men out of employment as to-day, except it might have been for a few months during the panic of 1893.

I do not suppose there has ever been a time in our history when the productive enterprises of the country were less remunerative than at this hour. But this has been our condition now for a number of years. It is morally certain that something is wrong; it is morally certain that we can not continue in this condition much longer.

The President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury tell us that the entire difficulty arises from a lack of confidence in the money of the country. If that be true, then it behooves us to address ourselves without delay to changing this condition and to securing a proper financial system. I do not myself agree that the trouble which has arisen in this country has grown out of the distrust of the currency. I deny that there is anything which indicates that the people of the United States distrust the money in circulation; and the statement so made is opposed to the entire history of money.

In 1893, when this Administration came into power, we were told early, as we had been told in a former Administration presided over by the present Executive, that our financial affairs were about to bring us to distress, and a kind of panic spread through the country, not with reference to the currency, but with reference to some threatened, undefined danger which nobody seemed to understand. On our side of the Chamber the Republicans attributed it largely to the tariff question, and said it was because the Administration which had come into power was about to change the McKinley law.

Mr. President, the Administration came into power with nearly 400,000 more votes than the supporters of the McKinley law had

been able to rally at the polls. Then there were a million and a quarter more votes, more than a million of which were in pronounced hostility to the McKinley law. So there was a vote of the people of the United States of almost a million and a half which was not in accordance with the sentiment of our party as we had crystallized it in the legislation called the McKinley law. The disturbance and the distress and the doubt were not in reference to the McKinley law and not from a distrust of our money; that is to say, nobody doubted but that the greenback and the Treasury note and the national-bank bill would continue to perform money functions in the same way that they had been performing them for years.

For fear I may be misunderstood I want to go back a moment. When I say there were nearly a million and a half votes that appeared to be in antagonism to the McKinley law, I do not mean to say that that was an expression of hostility to that law. I believe, and I will say it now so that I shall not be misunderstood, that the American people were dissatisfied with the condition of affairs existing, and did not stop to consider what the effect of their votes would be upon the McKinley law or upon the protective system. They simply said, "A condition exists in this country which is not satisfactory; we do not like it; we do not like the party which is in power; they have not granted the relief we think they ought, and we will change."

I think that can be demonstrated by the fact that at the next election after the Democratic Administration came into power there was an equal dissatisfaction expressed at the polls, which resulted in a great Republican victory. I do not any more consider that vote an approval of the Republican doctrine than I consider the other vote a condemnation of it. The people of the United States have reached a point where they care little for party, and where they care little for the general policy for which the two political parties have been contending, for they have been and are in distress. The oldest man in this country has never seen anything like it. There have been through all our history troubles of this kind, brief in duration; there have been various occasions when labor would vainly seek employment, and when the productive energies of the country felt the paralyzing influence of improper legislation, but in a history of more than a hundred years of our governmental existence under the Constitution there has never been a time when this paralysis, when this depression, when such a dissatisfied condition as this has so long existed. The people, anxious for relief, turn first from one party to another. To me that is the most unsatisfactory symptom of the situation. I should have been better pleased to have seen the people of this country staying by the Democratic party. I do not like to see a change of many hundred thousand votes from one election to another, only two years apart.

What condition are we in now? We have been told that we must maintain the public credit, that we must keep gold in circulation and maintain the country upon a gold standard. Mr. President, in every city in the United States to-day gold is at a premium. It is a commodity; it is now bought and sold like wheat and corn. There is not a bank in the city of New York or in the country outside, unless it be in the extreme West, which, if I am rightly advised, has not practically suspended gold payments. It is true that the premium is not large; it was last week, I think, as the New York papers stated, 1 per cent, but it is too large, if the New York statements are to be credited, as the Sun's correspondent of day before yesterday stated, to allow any man to take a greenback and get gold out of any bank in New York. He can go to the Treasury and get it; but the greenback, which represents the currency of the country for many years, has now practically disappeared from circulation. It can only be obtained, as I understand, in any suitable quantities, just as gold can be, by being bought.

Mr. PLATT. Is there not a premium on greenbacks the same as on gold?

Mr. TELLER. If there is a premium upon gold it follows, of course, the one being exchangeable for the other, that there must be equally a premium on the greenback. A premium on one kind of money may or may not be a depreciation of the other. In this case it does not mean a depreciation of the other. I state this as an inflexible rule of the philosophy of money, which no man has ever seen contradicted in practical experience, that whenever money depreciates prices rise. I challenge any man, it matters not who he may be, to cite a single instance in the history of the world where the depreciation of money was not followed by a rise of prices. The way to determine, and the only way to determine, the depreciation of money is by the rise of prices.

Mr. GRAY. One is the correlative of the other.

Mr. TELLER. One is the correlative of the other, as the Senator from Delaware says.

There is, then, no depreciation of the silver certificate; there is no depreciation of the silver dollar; there is no depreciation of the bank note. There is an appreciation of gold. That appreciation, which has existed heretofore with reference to commodities, now reaches the point where it is with reference to the remainder of the money of the country. That has been the great bugbear which has been held up before the American people for the maintenance of the gold standard with all that it costs. You have reached it in spite of the gold-standard people; you have reached it without the aid of silver legislation; you have reached it because it was as inevitable as the night to follow the day.

Mr. President, that is our condition. I do not believe in depreciated money. I believe in a stable money, and I believe that money is the best which maintains a uniform rate of prices. But if I am to take the two, I shall be in accord with the best minds of the people when I say that a depreciating standard is infinitely better for us than an appreciating one. An appreciating standard means a paralysis of business, the cessation of enterprise, the destruction of the energies of the country. The other means a stimulus. So of the two it is much better that there should be a depreciation than an appreciation.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he has no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITE in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TELLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLEN. I understand the Senator from Colorado does not entertain the opinion entertained by the majority of his party, that the present industrial and financial condition has been produced by a change of tariff.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, no, Mr. President, I do not.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator's position be true, and I fully concur with him, can the Senator point out any difference between the financial policy of the majority of the Republican party and the controlling element of the Democratic party?

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will wait until I get a little further along, perhaps he will find out my views on that subject. I am painfully aware that the distinction between the Senators who are in favor of the gold standard on the other side of the Chamber and those in favor of that standard on this side is absolutely so slight that I am not able to observe it.

Mr. ALLEN. Then, if the Senator will permit me one moment more, if he desires to bring about a change in our financial policy, does he expect to accomplish that result in his own party or in the Democratic party?

Mr. TELLER. I shall not now enter upon that phase of the subject, because I may touch on that before I get through. I am opposed to the gold standard, as everybody knows. I do not believe that it is possible to maintain the gold standard in this country. I do not believe it is possible for any debtor nation to maintain the gold standard. It is only the rich and creditor nations which can maintain a gold standard at this time, unless the output of gold shall be greatly increased even beyond the present prospects.

Mr. President, I do not intend to go into a general discussion this afternoon of the silver question. I propose to discuss the conditions here and now with reference to the financial affairs of the United States, and see what the remedy is, if remedy there be.

Mr. PLATT. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT. The Senator says he does not believe the country can maintain the gold standard. Does he want to abandon the redemption of greenbacks with gold now?

Mr. TELLER. I shall get to that after a while. You have still, I suppose, the redemption of greenbacks in gold, but you have got nothing else. If there is any particular advantage to the country in maintaining the greenback redemption in gold, and having all the rest of your paper discredited by not being redeemed in gold, I fail to see it.

Mr. PLATT. The reason I asked the question was because I think the real question which is now before the Senate is that the House sends a bill here which will, in its opinion, facilitate the issuing of gold to redeem greenbacks, and the Senate proposes to change that into an unlimited silver-coinage measure. I think the real question before the Senate now is whether we shall defeat the bill sent us by the House and adopt a measure for free coinage.

Mr. TELLER. That is what I intend to direct my remarks to to-day. I said I did not now intend to make what is called a general silver speech. I am going to make a money speech, if I know how. I am going to deal with the currency question of this country, and I am going to try to show, which I think I shall be able to do without any difficulty whatever, that the gold people of this country have absolutely no idea how they are going to maintain it, except by the continual sale of bonds. The silver people have fixed ideas upon this subject. We have been presenting those ideas for many years to the Senate, and we have been told again and again that it was heresy from a proper financial standpoint. For fifteen years we have been laboring to secure what we believe

to be a proper financial system, and during that time there never has been offered to us by those who contend for a gold standard a system which they themselves dared to indorse; and I will venture to say now right here that the four members of the Finance Committee of this Senate who represent the gold sentiment of the Senate, if they could have the assurance of every silver man in the Senate that whatever they brought out, if it had the semblance of decent legislation, should be supported, could not bring forward under existing conditions a system that they dare to support themselves.

Mr. PLATT. There are five gold Republicans.

Mr. TELLER. There are not five gold Republicans on the Finance Committee. I believe my colleague [Mr. WOLCOTT], who is a member of the committee, is not one of them.

Mr. PLATT. There are five without him.

Mr. TELLER. Yes; that is correct. What I mean to say is—I do not mean to say it offensively—that we have no financial system from the members of the Finance Committee who stand for the single gold standard which is worthy of being presented to the Senate, and they never have presented one, and I doubt whether they ever do. It is not enough to say that you are going to maintain gold payments. How are you going to do it? There is nobody here who dares to stand before the American people and say he means to indefinitely continue the sale of bonds to buy gold.

Mr. PLATT. I will tell the Senator how I would do it if he will assure me that his silver monometallist friends will allow me to do it. I would enact a law that our customs should be paid in gold. Then we should not have to borrow.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, Mr. President, that is palpable evidence to my mind, not wanting to be offensive, that some members of the committee have not considered this financial question as they ought to have done. Do you suppose that you can maintain in this country the parity, which you say is essential, between the different kinds of money if you give to one money functions that you deny to another? That would be a violation of the fundamental principles of the philosophy of money. It was that weakness and vice which Thad. Stevens said would cost us a thousand million dollars with the greenbacks, and it cost more than that, infinitely more. All kinds of money must be equivalent in their functions as money, and any system which maintains one class of money which performs functions that another does not is condemned at once by intelligent political economists. There never has been in the history of the world a success of that kind, never.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If I may interrupt my colleague, I understand the Senator from Connecticut desires to destroy all other kinds of money except gold.

Mr. TELLER. Very well. If that is the Senator's idea——

Mr. PLATT. No, Mr. President; and it would take a very vivid imagination to draw any such conclusion from anything I have said; but I know the Senator from Colorado has a very vivid imagination.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I assume that when Senators in this body talk about desiring to maintain the parity of the different forms of money they are in earnest; and yet the proposition comes here at once from a member of the Finance Committee that he would destroy that parity by law. I do not wonder that the country is in distress financially. If such views come from the Finance Committee, what will you expect of those who do not have the benefit of the wisdom which always comes to a man when he gets on a committee that is compelled to deal with some particular subject? We are, of course, not expected to be so well informed. But we all realize the fact that when a man gets on the Finance Committee the very fact that he is on that committee gives him superior knowledge over the rest of the body. If that be so, what will you think of those of us who do not believe that the way to maintain the parity is by law to destroy it? The President of the United States has a theory. It is not a good one, in my judgment, but it is a better one than is proposed by this bill. The President says:

> We will destroy the paper money that the United States has got; we will retire and redeem either with gold or with bonds the $500,000,000 of circulation.

Why does he propose that? Because, he says, it is difficult to maintain the gold standard with that paper in circulation. He might have said, and truthfully said, that it is impossible to maintain the gold standard with $500,000,000 Government paper and the national-bank notes in circulation, and we have reached a point in our history when we might as well recognize that fact; and when we do recognize it we will address ourselves to some legislation that will relieve the country, and we shall not do so until then.

The President says—I am speaking now of his system, and I will touch on the other side later—that he does not know, or he is not certain, whether the banks of the United States will come to our relief or not. He does not know what will take the place of the $500,000,000 when it is retired, but he thinks if the banks do not come and furnish the money that gold will probably flow in and take its place, and we shall have no contraction; and he goes into an argument to show that the banks will take this circulation. I want to deal with that for a few moments.

Suppose, now, we concede that the President is right, and we take the $500,000,000—it does not amount to quite that sum, but I speak of it in round numbers—and we issue bonds for it; then the banks have the privilege of taking this $500,000,000 bonds and making them the basis of a bank issue. Will they do it? Is there any reason to suppose, considering the condition of the banks in this country, that they will do it? With all the advantages that they have had, we have only about $200,000,000 of bank paper in circulation, and they have attempted to retire $23,000,000 of that amount. On the 28th of September last they only had $181,000,000 in circulation for which they were responsible. Of course they had deposited the balance of two hundred and odd millions of dollars with the Treasury to redeem their notes as they come in and are redeemed, but the banks themselves had reduced their circulation in September to $181,000,000. Now, what inducement are you offering the banks so that they will give to us the $500,000,000 of currency that we destroy, and which will continue to give to us the necessary currency which the business of this country, its progress, and its growth demand?

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] who sits near me says, "In what will they redeem?" That is what I am coming to. In what will they redeem when they are on the gold basis? In gold, and gold alone. If they do not redeem in gold, if they fail to redeem in gold, I suppose from what I have heard on this floor from the advocates of the gold standard the national honor will be destroyed and we shall be disgraced.

Mr. President, there is no reason on the face of the earth to suppose that you can replace $500,000,000 of these greenbacks with paper redeemable in gold. If you give to each bank in this country the right to issue a sufficient quantity of paper so as to make up this supply, we must have seven or eight hundred million dollars of bank paper. Are the bankers in this country so stupid and so ill acquainted with the need of affairs that they, with the limited supply of gold in this country, are going to take upon themselves the burden which the Government lays down with the declaration that it can no longer maintain it? Where will that fall? Not upon the 8,000 banks which then may be in existence, but it will fall upon the associated banks of the great city of New York, and practically upon them alone. The great banks of New York City have for years declined to take out any more circulation than the law required them to have. It is the country banks which swell the nearly $200,000,000 of bank paper that is afloat. The associated banks of New York would no more assume the burden of maintaining the gold standard than they would go into liquidation, and they would go into liquidation whenever they undertook to do that. Could they do it if they tried? We need not hesitate to say, and it will not hurt our credit to say, that the gold in this country will continue going to Europe. It has been and is going there in quantities sufficiently large to disturb the business of this country, and sufficiently large to frighten the executive department of the Government and to compel the admission on their part that we have now practically reached the point where the Government can no longer maintain the gold standard and the gold redemption of its greenbacks. You have a proposition here from the Senator from Ohio that as these greenbacks come into the Treasury you shall keep them there. What is that but an admission that you can not maintain the redemption?

Mr. President, you have before you on this view what I think is a serious contraction of the circulation of this country, not less than $500,000,000. But suppose the banks say, "We will take upon ourselves this burden; we will issue an additional $500,000,000 of paper money." I do not desire to say anything that is offensive to the people who engage in banking. I recognize it as a legitimate method of doing business, and among my acquaintances are some of the very best men in the world who are engaged in it; but I could not look with complacency, nor do I believe the American people can, upon any system that puts into the hands of the 4,000 now practically, or a little under that, or the 8,000 that may take their places if we double and treble this issue, the entire financial affairs of this country.

Mr. President, the history of banking in this country and the history of banking in Europe ought to make any lover of his country stand aghast at that suggestion. For myself, I will accept the contraction of $500,000,000 of money before I will put into the hands of the banks the prerogative that I believe belongs to the Government, the issuing of the money of the country. The American people are not going to surrender that prerogative to the banks. If they did, the banks could not maintain $700,000,000 of paper money redeemable in gold. Where will the banks redeem the bills? Take the banks in Colorado, where will they redeem their bills? If they redeem their bills at the bank, which they would be able to do, what is the value of that bill? Then you make a distinction between the bills that circulate in the West

and the bills that circulate in the East. You do just what was done before the war, when Pennsylvania money coming into the State of New York was at a discount of 2 or 3 per cent; when Illinois money, perfectly good under the law and a system that was absolutely perfect, reached across the Alleghanies it was at a discount in every commercial community, and when the paper of the Southern banks (and some of the Southern banks were as solvent and safe as any Northern banks) reached the great West and the North it was at a discount without reference to its solvability. Why? It was too far away from the place of redemption.

Mr. President, any banking system that is satisfactory to the American people and maintains a uniform value throughout the country must have a central point of redemption. That must be either here, as it now is, or in the great cities of the East. If that is to be the case, then the banks of New York must take upon themselves almost the entire burden.

A few weeks ago $7,000,000 were called out of the Treasury in a week. We had in two months demands upon the Treasury for $77,000,000 of gold; $77,000,000 of Treasury notes and greenbacks came into the Treasury, principally the subtreasury in the city of New York, and called for a like amount of gold. That is more than the associated banks of New York have. That is more than they expect to have or would have. When the banks are placed face to face with this responsibility they are going to decline to take out their circulation.

Then you come down to a great contraction unless the aspiration and the hopes of the President may be realized, that gold may come from somewhere to us. Mr. President, the gold will not come to us, because the balance of trade is against us and is likely to be against us and because we owe a great debt to Europe that we are in honor bound to pay and must pay. The American people must get rid of all this fuss that comes from the Treasury Department and the Executive about the export of gold and realize that the export of gold from this country to Europe is a legitimate export, called out by the fact that we owe money and not because the people of this country or Europe are afraid of our solvency or distrust our money.

Mr. President, the national banks will not take this responsibility. If the national banks will not, the State banks will not. It is not possible, in my judgment, if it were attempted, that they could do it. The first thing you would know if those banks attempted to do it would be a run upon some bank that would call upon the other banks to assist, and in the end the gold would go out of the banks and the country would be not upon a gold basis, nor upon a silver basis, but upon an inconvertible bank-note basis; we would be upon a paper basis. Now, that is the President's proposition. I will speak a little later of the vice of this proposition in this, that it requires a great amount of indebtedness to be saddled upon the country.

Mr. GRAY. Before the Senator leaves the point of the capacity of the State banks to maintain a redeemable paper currency, I should like to ask him whether it is not a fact that prior to the war there were systems of State banks in many States in which the redeemability of all their paper was maintained in metallic money?

Mr. TELLER. Oh, yes; that is true.

Mr. GRAY. And practically in gold from 1853 to 1861?

Mr. TELLER. No.

Mr. GRAY. Well, after we got rid of foreign silver?

Mr. TELLER. After we got rid of foreign silver, then, of course, it was practically in gold.

Mr. GRAY. Yes.

Mr. TELLER. There were a few banks that maintained themselves that way, but the great mass of State banks did not, as the Senator knows.

Mr. President, I assume that if the great banks in the large cities are afraid to take upon themselves this responsibility, as they certainly are, for they have shown no inclination to do it, the State banks can hardly undertake it, or if they undertake it they will meet the same fate that I have prophesied for the other banks.

But, Mr. President, there is another objection to this besides the danger of contraction. In time of peace you add to the burdens of the people an indebtedness of $500,000,000 for what? For the purpose of exchanging a currency that has done money duty in this country for many years to the satisfaction of the people, whether it was redeemable in gold or whether it was not, for another paper issued not by the Government, but dependent entirely upon bank conditions for its solvency and its redemption.

Mr. President, the history of banking in this country is not such as to make one want to pin his faith on bank support. The banks in this country have not increased their capital in the last few years. There is a good deal less capital now in the banks than there was four years ago. I do not recall the amount exactly, but it is $30,000,000 or more, if I am not mistaken, less now than there was two years ago. The banks have not shown a disposition to enlarge their capital or to enlarge their issues.

That is one side of the case; that is the Administration side. Now, what is the other? The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] was anxious to know whether I thought the Republican party, as a party, had any better methods of solving this public question than the Democrats had.

Mr. President, I do not know what the policy of the Republican party is now. I do not know what it is to be. Conditions have changed. Conditions are likely to continue in the direction that they are now for an indefinite period. I can learn from no source that the Republicans have any other system than I find from this bill. I assume now that the bill that came from a Republican House represents Republican ideas upon this financial question. If it does, it shows that this great party of ours is as incapable of managing the financial affairs of the country as our opponents have shown themselves in the last three years to be.

What is the policy of the Republican House? What is the policy of the party, then, to which I belong, as foreshadowed by the legislation proposed here? It is not proper for me to comment upon the conduct of the other House. I only comment upon the bill as it represents, I think, Republican sentiment and Republican purpose and Republican policies when the Republicans shall have both branches of Congress and the Executive. It is an indefinite policy of running in debt without any possible hope of coming to an end until you have exhausted the available money of this country that is willing to go into national bonds.

This bill proposes that the President of the United States, in addition to the power that he has now, shall have the power to sell bonds. It is an unlimited and unrestricted authority to sell bonds, to sell them for the purpose of maintaining a gold reserve, to sell them for the purpose of maintaining the gold standard, which ought by this time to be apparent to everybody can not be maintained without a sacrifice that the American people ought not to be asked to submit to, and which, in my judgment, they will not submit to. They will make themselves heard when the time comes, as they have in the past, by turning out the party that comes into power and attempts to do such a thing, as they turned out the Democratic party by voting them out.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. In considering the Republican policy as developed by the action of the other House, is it not fair that the Senator should take into consideration a revenue bill which accompanied the bond bill for the purpose of providing a revenue of at least $40,000,000 a year?

Mr. TELLER. I am coming to that point. There may be some connection between the two measures, but they were separate in their character, and they both, I suppose, have the entire support of the Republicans of the other House. No; the bond bill did not, but the revenue bill did.

Mr. President, we have issued within the last two years, and in less than two years, $162,000,000 of bonds. Before two years from the first issue expire we shall have issued two hundred and sixty-two million three hundred and some odd thousand dollars of bonds, and that, too, in time of peace.

It is said on our side of the Chamber that we would not be required to issue these bonds if we had enough revenue. The Senator from Ohio made an extensive speech, in very much of which I was in perfect accord, to show that if you had the revenue you would not be required to sell bonds to get gold. I do not agree with that, and I do not believe that can be maintained. I think the President and Secretary of the Treasury are nearer right when they say that no amount of revenue would save us from the disagreeable alternative of selling bonds unless we have a gold income, which the Senator from Connecticut proposes to have by the way of exacting gold payment for import duties. No matter what the President may say, I have the proof here to show that more than $100,000,000 has gone to pay current expenses. It was better that it went to pay current expenses than that it should be tied up in the Treasury.

Now, let me submit a proposition to my Republican associates who believe this system could go on. No matter how much revenue you get, you still have got to get gold to meet the demand that you say our honor and our credit require you to meet in the redemption of Treasury notes and greenbacks. In addition, then, to the increased revenues that you put into the Treasury and take out of circulation, you put into the Treasury the accumulation of the sales of the bonds, and to that extent you contract the currency.

Does anybody believe that it is a good time to contract the currency now? You have contracted the currency $119,000,000 in the last two years, as shown by official reports. Do you not believe—I do, at least—that a part of the paralysis of business, the disinclination of people to go into enterprises, arises from that very fact of contraction? Do you want to continue it? You will take $100,000,000 of money into the Treasury by the 5th day of February for the new bonds, and a little more, probably. What are you going to do with it? Are you going to lock it up? Are

you going to keep it there out of circulation? When the demands of commerce and trade for gold shall have called for that $100,000,000 from the Treasury, in exchange for greenbacks, as it surely will, you will sell another $100,000,000 and put that in the Treasury, to lie there as idle and dead money. It is withdrawal from circulation that depreciates the price of the products of the country just to the extent of the proportion the withdrawal bears to the whole money in circulation.

Mr. President, you have got two propositions. One of them is the Republican and the other is the President's. If anybody can see any advantage in one over the other, it seems to me that the President's suggestion is the better of the two.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. Then was not our first mistake the repeal of what is known as the Sherman Act? If that had been in existence would it not have supplied currency so that it would have kept pari passu with the requirements of business and population?

Mr. TELLER. Our first mistake was in 1873, when we deprived ourselves of one-half the money metal of the world. I do not care to go into that, but I want to say here that I have never wasted any time over the question as to how it was done. I never regarded that question as a matter of very much consequence. I knew the American people did not ask it. Whether it was done in fraud of their rights or whether it was not, I have never concerned myself about, and never discussed that question. But the question is, What has been its influence upon this country?

Mr. President, there is where the great mistake occurred. The great mistake was when the Bland bill came into the Senate from the House of Representatives as a free-coinage measure, with then a divergency of only 8 per cent between silver and gold in the markets of the world, that the Senate did not accept the House bill and give to the world the benefit of free coinage in the United States. If you had done that there would have been no silver question here to trouble you. There would have been no silver question to trouble the world. The United States would have taken care of the surplus of silver until the silver of the world, temporarily depressed by the action of Germany, had reached its proper and original mint value.

It seems to me that we have reached a point where something must be done. It seems to me that we have reached what may be said to be the parting of the ways.

I am not insisting now in this speech that there is no other remedy except free coinage, although I do not believe there is; but I am begging my associates in the Senate, who do not believe in free coinage, whether they be on this side or the other, to present to the American people in this hour of their distress some common-sense system that the honest people of the country will believe is right, some system that shall prevent this Government from running in debt.

Mr. President, when a nation runs in debt in time of peace it either argues that it has entered upon a decay, that it is deteriorating, or it argues that the administration of public affairs is in the hands of incompetent men. I do not know that anybody will pretend that the American people are not as strong to-day as they ever were in all that makes a nation rich and great. We have had no misfortune; we have had nothing that ought to make the people of the United States poor. We have had nothing to bring distress to the people of the United States, save and except a wicked financial policy, which it appears is to be adhered to to the extent of running this country in debt indefinitely.

Mr. President, upon the question of public indebtedness I have very pronounced views. Two hundred years ago or thereabouts the system of national indebtedness practically began in the world. Before that the debts of the world were so small as to be inconsiderable, and in their influence upon affairs of states merely nothing. They are so to-day in the uncivilized regions of the world. China, with its 400,000,000 people, owes less to-day than the amount in which we have run in debt in two years. Japan, with its forty-odd million people, owes less money now after its war with China than the amount in which we have already run in debt or are to run in debt by this new bond issue.

Mr. President, there can be no excuse for it. There is absolutely no defense that can be made in a court of morals for a nation that runs in debt in time of peace. Every patriotic impulse, every interest in our country and our race, demands that we should pay as we go. I know you can not do that in time of war. The old policy was to do so even then, but the modern is that you will not, and I do not suppose that we ever shall, but it is for us now, for the first time in our history, to sit quietly by and see the Government going in debt at the rate of $260,000,000 a year in time of peace.

Mr. President, our revenues are not sufficient, but we are not running in debt at that rate because of a paucity of revenue. I suppose this year it is safe to say that the deficiency will not exceed thirty or forty million dollars. I believe a distinguished member of the other House put it at twenty or thirty million dollars. That is nothing; I would not complain of that. We could stand that, and we would so reform our system of getting revenue that we could return to proper conditions. But that does not relieve us. The President of the United States has said, ex industria, and the Secretary of the Treasury has reiterated it, that no amount of revenue relieves this situation; that nothing will relieve it but the sale of bonds, the increasing of the public debt. One proposition is to increase it by $500,000,000, and when that is done the silver money of the country will offer another opportunity to increase the public debt to $400,000,000 more.

In my judgment there is a determined effort being made in this country to create a great national debt, and in that it has got the assistance of the public authorities. It is as determined as it was that the Sherman law should be repealed. They intend to create a great debt of a thousand, fifteen hundred, or two thousand million dollars if they can.

We hear it said by those who do not appreciate what American attachment to the country is that it will bind the people to the country to have and own some of the Government indebtedness. Great heavens, Mr. President! if we have reached a point in our history when our patriotism is determined upon the dollars that we may own of the Government's debt, and our interest is only to maintain its supremacy because we have a financial interest in it, it is time, Mr. President, that the country went to the dogs, as it would when that had come. There is nothing in that. There are a few men who have the money and are controlling the politics of this country and the politics of the world. A distinguished Englishman said he could name forty men in the city of London and in Paris and in Berlin who absolutely control the destinies of the world by means of their wealth.

Mr. President, why do those people want to engage in buying bonds? Why do they want to put their money into Government funds? He who puts his money into a manufacturing enterprise, in an industrial pursuit, takes the chances of loss. The man who puts his money into Government funds takes no chances whatever. He pays no taxes. He bears no part of the burden of either the State, city, or nation. He is independent. He demands protection, but he gives nothing in return. Under existing law, as declared by the Supreme Court of the United States, it is practically impossible to compel a holder of our funds to contribute a dollar to the support of the National Government or State governments.

Mr. President, these bondholders take no risks. When everything else is doubtful, when prices are falling, when stagnation strikes the country and paralysis of trade reaches every department of labor and business, the bondholder is secure. What cares he so long as he knows that he has got the nation back of him?

Mr. President, a national debt is a national curse, and if made in time of peace it is a national disgrace—one that ought to make every American blush. A national debt is inevitable if you are to maintain the gold standard. I do not care if you pass this revenue bill, which you know you will not. I do not care if you pass other revenue bills. You may take $100,000,000 in the Treasury every year over and above the demands of the Government, and yet if you sell bonds to accumulate gold the selling of bonds will not cease until every available dollar that can be induced to be put into bonds is put in—dollars that are taken from what ought to be the circulation of the country and what ought to be invested in the active business of the country.

Mr. President, every public debt is a mortgage upon all the industries of the country. It is more than that; it is a mortgage upon every man living within the country which incurs the debt. We might submit to great mortgages in time of war, in time of distress, that would come from attacks upon our honor, but in time of peace to maintain a system that I believe the best sentiment of the world will agree with me can not be maintained in Christendom, I say is a crying shame. No man on my side of the Chamber and no man on the other side of the Chamber who believes in the gold standard has opened his mouth against a system that has surely enslaved the labor and the industries and the enterprise and the progress of this country as the black slavery enslaved the black man of the South. We alone who have a scheme that we believe is safe are the men who protest against it. We do not believe in this infernal gold scheme, and we do not believe that prosperity can come from it. We know it has not. We know that there never has been such trouble in financial affairs as exists to-day, notwithstanding the promises that you have made to us year after year that if we would adhere to this gold standard prosperity would ultimately come. I am one of those who would strain every nerve and would incur any amount of debt that was necessary to maintain the credit and honor of the people of the United States, but I am not one of those who, to maintain a gold standard that in my judgment is cursing the country, would run in debt.

Mr. President, when are we going to stop? Where are we going to quit? How are we going to pay the debt? We will increase the revenue, I trust, although I have no idea that that will be done now, nor do I believe there is any immediate haste to do it. I believe if we are to continue to sell the bonds it is absolutely criminal for us to add another dollar to the import duties now existing in this country. You have no right to take more money out of the people's pockets and put it into the Treasury to be there locked up if you are still to sell bonds to maintain the gold standard. That is the money that you ought to use, because there will be less suffering and less distress if you put it in circulation, although in the end it may be very sad for us.

The President of the United States has asserted that no more revenue is needed, and if we should vote here that more was needed it would probably be the first time in the history of our country when we had forced upon the Administration more money than it demandcd and put burdens upon the people which the authorities charged with the administration of the financial affairs declare is not necessary. I do not say but that the revenue bill may pass the Senate; but whatever it may do, Mr. President, it is to afford us no relief. If it should be signed by the President it affords no relief; the sale of bonds still continues, because it is the policy of the men who have got the money in this country to compel the sale of bonds. The President of the United States said a year ago, and so did his Secretary of the Treasury, that in December $32,000,000 of gold went out of the Treasury, and that $45,000,000 more went out the next month, and but a small portion of it, comparatively, went abroad. And then they argue from that that it is distrust of the currency that took the gold out.

Mr. President, the gold was taken out for the purpose of compelling, what it subsequently did compel, an issue of $62,000,000 of bonds. I am not speaking of the character of that issue except to say that the $62,000,000 of bonds bear to the holders 3¾ per cent. There is no other business in this country to be compared with the purchase of bonds unless it is the mining of gold. You have reached a point when it is not profitable to invest money in commercial enterprises, in industrial pursuits. There is no money for that, but there is abundance of money to buy bonds. We see a great banker in a neighboring city go to work and in a few days accumulate $200,000,000 of gold. Why? To buy securities, the very best securities in the world, at prices lower than the securities of the Australian colonies are selling in the city of London. Australian bonds are selling at from 5 to 10 per cent above the sale made in 1895 to the syndicate in New York of the bonds of the greatest nation in the world. I do not wonder that they want to accumulate their gold to buy these $200,000,000 of bonds. If that $200,000,000 could be put into industrial pursuits and give labor an opportunity it would be infinitely better, to say nothing of the wickedness of putting our funds in bonds and putting a debt upon the unborn as well as those now living. We ought to pursue a policy which would bring into active life and use the money of the country, and not allow it to be used simply for the purpose of purchasing Government bonds and holding them free from all the obligations which ought to rest upon the holder of money and wealth in every community in the world.

Mr. President, there are not more than two ways in which we can stop gold going abroad. One is, we might pay our debts, if we were able. If we could pay our debts, gold would not go. Possibly we might do it in another way, by making the prices of articles we use in this country so low that no European country would sell us anything. If we could put the price of all imports so low that European manufacturers would find no profit in sending articles here and we could keep on exporting our products, we might ultimately, probably, pay our debts, but when you put the prices of foreign goods low you put your own prices low, and you bring your own people down to a condition that is not remunerative and supporting.

I am one of those who believe that you can not maintain in this country freedom, and independence, and republicanism unless you do it by giving to the laboring people of the country remunerative wages. A great writer on political economy said, "Comfort is essential to morality in any community." If you make your people uncomfortable you make them vicious. Gaunt poverty and dire distress are not the incentives to patriotism.

Our interests are not with the men who own the money, not with the men who own the bank capital, not with the men who have $600,000,000 of money in bank stock. The product of the farmers of this country, who produce chickens and turkeys and geese and eggs, is every year equal to the entire bank capital. What is the bank capital of this country worth? If it should be sunk to-morrow we should be better off. I do not mean to say that we should be better off in sinking it; I mean that we should be better off than to follow the present system to its logical results. I do not want to make any objection to banks. I have no objection to banks of deposit and discount, but I am opposed to banks of issue.

I called attention a few moments ago to prices. The Secretary of the Treasury in his last report talks about the beneficent results of the last bond issue. Having spoken of bonds, he says:

> The beneficial effects of this transaction were felt immediately, not only in this country, but in every other having commercial or financial relations with our people. Confidence in our securities as safe and profitable investments was at once restored to such an extent that they ceased to be returned to our market for sale, and a very considerable demand for them was created abroad—

That seems to be now the idea, that it means prosperity; that whenever you can borrow money, whenever you can sell your securities in Europe, not national, but industrial securities, then you are getting rich—

> but the most gratifying evidences of improvement in our condition were afforded by the prompt revival of business among our own people, the increased activity and extension of our domestic, industrial, and commercial operations, the rise in the prices of our principal agricultural products, and the general feeling of relief and security which became apparent in every part of the country. These encouraging indications of increasing prosperity still continue—

That was the 19th of December—

> and it is reasonably certain that if our progress is not checked by a repetition of large demands upon our resources, or by a failure to meet the just expectations of the people in respect to the reformation of our fiscal system, we are entering upon an era of material growth and development not surpassed in our history.

Mr. President, I wish that were true. I would rather see prosperity than adversity. With all due deference to the Secretary of the Treasury, that is a misstatement of facts. Throughout the world prices have steadily fallen this year, and prices are lower to-day than they were a year ago in every market of the earth. The English statistical papers show that. There was a little rise last summer for two or three months, but that rise has been lost in the last two months, and I have before me the financial statement from the English Economist that we have not only lost that rise, but gone several points below.

Mr. President, we owe a great debt abroad. I do not know how much. Nobody else does. I know we are not sending gold to Europe for the pleasure of sending it; I know that if it goes there is goes there to pay a debt of some kind. So do you; so does everybody else. I know that the exports from this country have been very large. I know that the exports have increased. Of course they fell off after the panic of last year about $75,000,000; but I am speaking now of a long line going back twenty years. There has been a gradual increase from 1873 up to the present time of American products. An English financial paper, the Statist, in an article last summer, discussing the question whether England had been benefited or injured by the fall in the gold price of silver, made this statement, which I submit to the exporting people of the United States, the men who produce and who sell, that if European prices had been maintained at the high price rate of 1873 and the bulk of American products had not been increased, there would not have been a dollar of indebtedness from this country to Europe. A system which has compelled us to send increasing products every year to Europe, and that, too, at prices which have prevented us from materially reducing our debt to Europe, is a system which ought to be resisted, and it will be resisted by every patriotic man.

I have before me the last copy of the Statist, in which I find a statement something in the line of the other, to show the great advantage England has gained. The writer shows the fall of prices within the last year and figures out from that that Great Britain has made large sums and has purchased at a price very much below what she paid last year. Then he says if prices had been the same last year we should have had to pay so much more. I want to read a little of that. I now read from the Statist of January 11, 1896, the last number which came to me. I have taken these financial papers, the Statist and the London Economist and French Economist, for the purpose of keeping in touch with what is going on in those countries as well as our own. The article I shall read is headed "Our foreign trade; the effect of low prices." I shall not read it all, but I shall add the whole of it to my remarks as an appendix; I wish now to call attention to some of the statements in the article:

> Our foreign trade in 1895 has been the most profitable in the history of the country, and very much more profitable than it was in 1890, when superficially it appeared to be extremely prosperous. Reckoned by its cash value, our foreign trade has been slightly better in 1895 than in 1894, and much worse than in 1890. In 1890 our imports amounted to £420,692,000, in 1894 they were £408,345,000, and in 1895 they have been £416,618,000. That is to say, our imports have been £8,342,000 greater in 1895 than in 1894, and £4,000,000 smaller than in 1890. As regards the cash value of our exports, an increase of £10,000,000 has occurred in 1895 compared with 1894, and a decline of as much as £37,400,000 compared with 1890, exports in 1890 having been valued at £263,530,000, in 1894 at £216,194,000, and in 1895 at £226,169,000.

I omit some of the article, and come to what the editor is trying to show:

> The cash value of our foreign trade is, however, no guide to its real value or its profitableness. The United Kingdom is a consuming country, and it imports the greater portion of its food supplies, as well as nearly the whole of its raw materials for textile manufactures. These food stuffs and raw materials are sent here in payment for purchases of British manufactured goods, for interest and profits upon capital due to Great Britain from producing nations, and for transport and other services rendered. Consequently, the lower the prices for food stuffs and raw materials the greater will be the

quantity required to be sent to this country to meet interest and other obligations and to pay for other services rendered. Further, should prices of British manufactured goods not fall to an extent corresponding to the fall in prices of foreign and colonial produce, the profit on the sale of British goods to foreign countries and our colonies would be enhanced.

The conditions of 1895 compared with both 1894 and 1890 have been that prices of foreign and colonial produce have been extremely low, and that consequently a great deal more produce has had to be sent to this country in order to meet interest and other obligations. Further prices of British manufactures exported have not fallen to an extent corresponding to the decline in prices of foreign and colonial produce imported, and consequently the cash proceeds of our exports have purchased a relatively larger quantity of British and foreign produce.

A year ago we drew attention to the effect on our trade of the enormous fall in prices, and showed that whereas in 1894 our imports were valued at £408,500,000, we had for this sum been able to purchase foreign and colonial produce which, had we had to pay the prices of 1890, would have cost us £477,500,000. On the other hand, we showed that in 1894 our exports were valued at £216,194,000, whereas at the prices current in 1890 they would have fetched £246,000,000. On balance, therefore, there was a greater profit upon our foreign trade in 1894 than in 1890 of about £39,000,000.

In 1895 this country has been able to purchase foreign and colonial produce even more cheaply than in 1894.

That is in answer to the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury as to a rise in prices.

We have calculated what all the chief articles would have cost had we had to pay and had received similar prices in 1895 to those current in 1894. It is impossible to estimate the prices of a great many articles in either year, but, having analyzed the prices of commodities comprising 60 per cent of our total imports and exports, we have estimated the movement of prices of the remaining 40 per cent on the same basis.

It seems the writer has made a careful calculation, and I should say it was on a safe basis.

In 1894 the cash value of our imports was £408,345,000, and in 1895, £416,687,000. Had we paid the same prices in 1895 as in 1894, our imports in 1895 would have cost us about £433,800,000. Hence we have benefited from a further fall in prices of foreign produce to the extent of about £17,000,000. On the other hand, the cash value of our exports in 1894 was £215,824,000, and in 1895 it amounted to £226,169,000. Had we been able to obtain the same price in 1895 as in 1894 the cash value would have been £234,800,000. The fall in prices of our manufactures exported in 1895 compared with 1894 thus entailed a loss of £8,600,000, as against the profit of £17,000,000 from the fall in prices of commodities imported.

I want to call attention to a further statement here.

The benefit to this country, therefore, from the fall in prices of foreign and colonial produce in 1895 compared with 1890 thus amounted to the enormous sum of £90,400,000.

Mr. President, does anybody wonder why Great Britain insists that we shall maintain the gold standard, with these necessary low prices? Low prices are absolutely the logical result of the gold standard.

We have had some talk recently about war with Great Britain. Great Britain will not go to war with us. We are her greatest trading nation. These statistical papers are full of statements made every month that the improvement in British trade is caused by the increased exports which they have been sending to the United States, and because of the low price of the products they buy in such immense quantities from us.

Mr. BACON. What date is that?

Mr. TELLER. The 11th day of January, the last paper which has come to me.

Then the article proceeds to show that notwithstanding manufacturing prices have fallen and they have had to sell their goods all over the world at a less price, yet the net profit to them is £49,000,000—$250,000,000 net on the articles mentioned here.

Then the editor goes on to show what is gained by the low price of cotton. I will quote a portion of that; I do not care to read it all.

In 1895 we purchased 15,688,000 hundredweight of raw cotton, against 16,013,000 hundredweight in 1890, a diminution of 345,000 hundredweight, or 2 per cent, but we paid for our raw cotton supplies £12,327,000 less in 1895 than in 1890. Had we purchased the same quantity in both years the benefit to this country from the fall in price of cotton would have been £11,500,000.

Fifty-six million dollars they made upon the difference between the price of cotton in 1890 and 1895.

Then the writer goes on to show how much the English people have made on the fall in wool, the fall in sugar, and these other articles. I ask leave to append the whole of that article to my remarks. I have read enough to show what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Leave will be granted, in the absence of objection.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not intend to go into the subject of prices to any considerable extent, and I am going to stop. I do not care to-day to take up and discuss in the formal way, which sometimes we have done here, the question of what would be the result of the passage of the amendment which the Committee on Finance have advised in place of the bond bill. I wanted to present to the Senate what it seemed to me from any standpoint we have got to meet. It is most deplorable to go on in the way we are going. Our gold is being exported to Europe, and will continue to be so exported. It will go in spite of us, and every day we seem to be putting ourselves in a worse position than heretofore. If we attempt to maintain the gold standard we must maintain it with the knowledge of what it is going to cost. I want the American people to know what it is going to cost, and if the American people, when they know what it is going to cost, shall be in favor of its maintenance, I as one who recognizes the right of majority rule in this country, shall have to submit; but I do not believe that the American people understand what it costs to maintain the gold standard. I do not believe the American people understand the danger which threatens not only their industrial pursuits, but threatens the very existence of this nation as a free people by the gold standard.

Mr. President, the enslavement of the world in the future will not be by armies and by force, but it will be through the agency of money. It is the most potent and the easiest instrumentality to use. You will have no war unless the great capitalists of the world will consent. The other day, when there was a little flurry here, when the American Senate felt like asserting that under certain circumstances it would vindicate the honor of the nation—I do not care whether there was any occasion for it or not—there was one sentiment from the great financial center of this country, and that was, we can not afford to go to war. Mr. President, we can; but we do not intend to. We wish, however, to be in a position where we can go to war if our honor requires it. We want this country put upon a financial basis which will enable us to cease running in debt in time of peace. We want this country put upon a financial basis that will give to the flagging and languishing industries of the country renewed life. I do not believe you can do it with a revenue bill. I yield to no man in devotion to the doctrine that the Government of the United States is bound, so far as it can, to assist in maintaining the wages of American labor. I would have a tariff duty, if I had my way, just high enough to give to the American manufacturer the markets of his own country, just high enough that if he attempted to impose upon the consumer the profits would be such that the importer could compete with him. That is my doctrine. I know that you can not maintain the price of American labor in this country on that principle now. I know that American labor is threatened with Asiatic prices. I do not care to go into that now. It has been touched upon by several Senators at this session. Have the Senators who insist upon maintaining the gold standard calculated what it is to cost? Have they considered it with reference to what the influence must be upon the industries of this country, not this year, and perhaps not within ten years, but at some time? He who does not look beyond the present hour with reference to these influences is unworthy of a place in the American Senate.

Mr. President, what is going to be the influence not to-day, not to-morrow, but five, ten, twenty years from now? It is my solemn conviction, and I stated it seriously ten years ago, that that would be the result. We are building up in Asiatic countries a competition which can not be met by the American people. You can not put the American citizen upon a plane to compete with the Japanese, the Chinese, or the Indian, and it is inevitable as that the day shall follow the night that this is to come. Ten years ago in the Senate I said that the philosophy of it was that we should build up Asiatic manufactures. It took nearly ten years before that prophecy began to be realized. To-day the manufacturers of Christendom are being threatened by the manufacturers of heathendom; to-day the manufacturers of the United States are in jeopardy and in peril by the manufactures growing up with Asiatic capital in Asiatic countries, where the people can live on a few cents a day, where few of the obligations that are put upon us are put upon them, where the citizenship of those countries carries with it no burden such as citizenship carries with us, and where they can live, as they have been living for thousands of years, in what they call comfort and happiness, in a manner that would send our people to the grave or to revolution.

Mr. President, this is not a fanciful sketch; this is not a theory, nor the statement of an enthusiast. It can be demonstrated beyond question, though I shall not undertake it now, that there is great danger that the manufactures of Europe and the manufactures of the United States will be transplanted to Asiatic lands; and when once transported, nothing can take them away. Those people are cunning and skillful, and patient and enduring, and unaccustomed to the civilization that we rejoice in; they will continue to become competitors to a degree which will absolutely destroy American and European laborers. Yet the men who profess here the greatest interest in our industries, the men who profess the greatest interest in labor, are absolutely silent when this great question confronts the American people, and not one of them has ever been heard any more than they have been heard in defense of this bill. Up to this hour nobody has been heard in defense of the pending bill or in defense of the system which I have been condemning at this session, and I predict that nobody will.

At some other stage I shall take up this question with reference to its influence upon American and European industries, but it should not be necessary for me to do so. The literature of the country is full of it, the English and other European consuls in other countries have given the facts that ought to be convincing to you, that if the gold standard is desirable, it is not sufficiently desirable to have it maintained at the great cost at which it is being maintained.

APPENDIX.

OUR FOREIGN TRADE—THE EFFECT OF LOW PRICES.

Our foreign trade in 1895 has been the most profitable in the history of the country, and very much more profitable than it was in 1890, when superficially it appeared to be extremely prosperous. Reckoned by its cash value, our foreign trade has been slightly better in 1895 than in 1894, and much worse than in 1890. In 1890 our imports amounted to £420,692,000. In 1894 they were £408,345,000, and in 1895 they have been £416,618,000. That is to say, our imports have been £8,342,000 greater in 1895 than in 1894, and £4,000,000 smaller than in 1890. As regards the cash value of our exports, an increase of £10,000,000 has occurred in 1895 compared with 1894, and a decline of as much as £37,400,000 compared with 1890, exports in 1890 having been valued at £263,530,000, in 1894 at £216,194,000, and in 1895 at £226,169,000.

The course of our foreign trade as reflected in the cash value of our imports and exports will be seen from the following contrast of our imports, exports, reexports, and total foreign trade in 1895 with those of the ten previous years:

Total trade of Great Britain, 1885 to 1895.

Year.	Imports.	Exports.	Reexports.	Total.
1895	£416,688,000	£226,169,000	£59,971,000	£702,828,000
1894	408,344,000	215,824,000	57,961,000	682,129,000
1893	405,068,000	218,496,000	58,935,000	682,499,000
1892	423,793,000	227,077,000	64,563,000	715,433,000
1891	435,441,000	247,235,000	61,878,000	744,555,000
1890	420,692,000	263,530,000	64,721,000	748,944,000
1889	427,637,000	248,935,000	66,658,000	743,230,000
1888	387,636,000	234,535,000	64,042,000	686,213,000
1887	362,227,000	221,914,000	59,349,000	643,490,000
1886	349,863,000	212,725,000	56,234,000	618,823,000
1885	370,968,000	213,115,000	58,539,000	642,442,000

The cash value of our foreign trade is, however, no guide to its real value or its profitableness. The United Kingdom is a consuming country, and it imports the greater portion of its food supplies, as well as nearly the whole of its raw materials for textile manufactures. These food stuffs and raw materials are sent here in payment for purchases of British manufactured goods, for interest and profits upon capital due to Great Britain from producing nations, and for transport and other services rendered. Consequently, the lower the prices for food stuffs and raw materials the greater will be the quantity required to be sent to this country to meet interest and other obligations and to pay for other services rendered. Further, should prices of British manufactured goods not fall to an extent corresponding to the fall in prices of foreign and colonial produce, the profit on the sale of British goods to foreign countries and our colonies would be enhanced.

The conditions of 1895, compared with both 1894 and 1890, have been that prices of foreign and colonial produce have been extremely low, and that, consequently, a great deal more produce has had to be sent to this country in order to meet interest and other obligations. Further, prices of British manufactures exported have not fallen to an extent corresponding to the decline in prices of foreign and colonial produce imported, and consequently the cash proceeds of our exports have purchased a relatively larger quantity of British and foreign produce.

A year ago we drew attention to the effect on our trade of the enormous fall in prices, and showed that whereas in 1894 our imports were valued at £408,500,000, we had for this sum been able to purchase foreign and colonial produce which, had we had to pay the prices of 1890, would have cost us £477,500,000. On the other hand, we showed that in 1894 our exports were valued at £216,194,000, whereas at the prices current in 1890 they would have fetched £246,000,000. On balance, therefore, there was a greater profit upon our foreign trade in 1894 than in 1890 of about £39,000,000.

In 1895 this country has been able to purchase foreign and colonial produce even more cheaply than in 1894.

We have calculated what all the chief articles would have cost had we had to pay and had received similar prices in 1895 to those current in 1894. It is impossible to estimate the prices of a great many articles in either year, but, having analyzed the prices of commodities comprising 60 per cent of our total imports and exports, we have estimated the movement of prices of the remaining 40 per cent on the same basis.

In 1894 the cash value of our imports was £408,345,000, and in 1895 £416,687,000. Had we paid the same prices in 1895 as in 1894, our imports in 1895 would have cost us about £433,800,000. Hence we have benefited from a further fall in prices of foreign produce to the extent of about £17,000,000. On the other hand, the cash value of our exports in 1894 was £215,824,000, and in 1895 it amounted to £226,169,000. Had we been able to obtain the same price in 1895 as in 1894, the cash value would have been £234,800,000. The fall in prices of our manufactures exported in 1895 compared with 1894 thus entailed a loss of $8,600,000, as against the profit of £17,000,000 from the fall in prices of commodities imported. There has thus been a further profit in 1895 compared with 1894 of some £8,500,000.

The cash value of our imports in 1895 was £416,687,000, but at the 1890 level of prices the value would have been no less than £507,100,000. The benefit to this country, therefore, from the fall in prices of foreign and colonial produce in 1895 compared with 1890, thus amounted to the enormous sum of £90,400,000. On the other hand, our exports in 1895 were of the cash value of only £226,169,000, whereas at the prices of 1890 the value would have been £267,600,000, thus entailing a loss of £41,500,000, due to the fall in prices. On balance, therefore, the fall in prices in 1895 compared with 1890 gave a profit to this country amounting to about £49,000,000.

We compare below the actual cash value of our imports in 1895 wth what the value would have been at the prices current in 1894 and 1890:

Value of imports, 1895.

At prices of 1895	£416,687,000
At prices of 1894	433,851,000
At prices of 1890	507,096,000

Below we give the value of our exports in 1895 compared with what the value would have been at prices current in 1894 and 1890:

Value of exports, 1895.

At prices of 1895	£226,169,000
At prices of 1894	234,802,000
At prices of 1890	267,638,000

In 1895 we purchased 15,688,000 hundredweight of raw cotton, against 16,013,000 hundredweight in 1890, a diminution of 345,000 hundredweight or 2 per cent; but we paid for our raw cotton supplies £12,327,000 less in 1895 than in 1890. Had we purchased the same quantity in both years the benefit to this country from the fall in price of cotton would have been £11,500,000. In 1895 we purchased 100,118,000 hundredweight of wheat and flour, as against 76,247,000 hundredweight in 1890, an increase of 23,871,000, or 31 per cent, while we have actually paid about £2,451,000 less in 1895 than in 1890, the value of our wheat and flour imports in 1895 having been £30,207,000, against £32,651,000 in 1890. In other words, at the 1890 level of prices we should have paid £42,880,000 for our wheat and flour supplies in 1895, whereas we have actually paid only £30,207,000, a benefit from the lower price of no less than £12,600,000. Our imports of wool for 1895 exceeded those of 1890 by 142,000,000 pounds, or 22 per cent; but in 1895 we actually paid £830,000 less than we did in 1890—that is to say, we have paid £26,321,000 for wool in 1895 which at the 1890 level of prices would have cost us £33,100,000, a benefit of about £6,800,000. In 1895 we imported 31,157,000 hundredweight of sugar, as against 25,693,000 hundredweight in 1890, an increase of 5,464,000, or 21 per cent, and with this enormous increase in quantity we have actually paid £390,000 less in cash, the cash value of our sugar imports in 1895 having been £17,685,000, as against £18,075,000 in 1890. At the 1890 level of prices we should have paid for sugar imported in 1895, £21,870,000, as against the actual cost of £17,685,000, a benefit from the fall in price of over £4,000,000.

Below we contrast the values of our principal imports in 1895 with those of 1894, and with their estimated value in 1895, had prices maintained the level of the average in 1894:

Imports, 1894 and 1895.

Articles.	1894.	1895.	1895.*
Cotton	£32,944,000	£30,429,000	£32,426,000
Wheat and flour	26,755,000	30,205,000	29,542,000
Wool	24,791,000	26,031,000	27,277,000
Sugar	19,172,000	17,685,000	20,903,000
Wood	16,086,000	14,917,000	15,140,000
Butter	13,456,000	14,245,000	14,766,000
Tea	9,764,000	10,278,000	10,178,000
Leather	7,094,000	8,051,000	7,880,000
Maize	7,952,000	7,809,000	7,630,000
Bacon	8,084,000	7,936,000	8,902,000
Oxen	8,225,000	7,150,000	7,195,000
Barley	7,090,000	5,538,000	5,354,000
Woolen stuffs	5,665,000	6,472,000	6,765,000
Wine	5,018,000	5,412,000	5,490,000
Cheese	5,475,000	4,674,000	5,156,000
Copper	4,624,000	4,639,000	4,963,000
Mutton	4,341,000	4,593,000	4,935,000
Jute	4,622,000	4,358,000	5,343,000
Beef	4,213,000	4,275,000	4,384,000
Eggs	3,786,000	4,003,000	4,054,000
Caoutchouc	3,272,000	3,760,000	3,693,000
Oats	3,900,000	3,723,000	4,042,000
Iron ore	2,979,000	2,978,000	3,003,000
Petroleum	2,485,000	3,368,000	2,701,000
Flax	2,525,000	3,270,000	3,611,000
Hides	2,231,000	2,804,000	2,732,000
Margarin	3,045,000	2,557,000	2,579,000
Meat	1,490,000	2,040,000	2,302,000
Sheep	805,000	1,782,000	1,769,000
Miscellaneous	20,638,000	21,874,000	23,134,000
Total analyzed	262,527,000	266,856,000	277,849,000
Miscellaneous	145,818,000	149,831,000	156,002,000
Total	408,345,000	416,687,000	433,851,000

* On basis of prices current in 1894.

Below we contrast the values of our principal exports in 1895 with those of 1894, and with their estimated value in 1895 had prices maintained the level of the average quotations obtained in 1894:

Exports, 1894 and 1895.

Articles.	1894.	1895.	1895.*
Cotton:			
Piece goods	£50,219,000	£46,780,000	£47,577,000
Yarn and twist	9,285,000	9,292,000	9,915,000
Total cotton	59,504,000	56,072,000	57,492,000
Woolen and worsted tissues	11,234,000	16,444,000	16,331,000
Woolen and worsted yarn	4,718,000	5,374,000	5,446,000
Iron and steel	14,350,000	15,450,000	15,525,000
Coal	17,371,000	15,443,000	17,383,000
Linen, yarn and piece	4,401,000	5,047,000	5,539,000
Tin plates	4,339,000	4,245,000	4,487,000
Copper	2,365,000	2,825,000	2,785,000
Jute, yarn and piece	2,425,000	2,527,000	2,608,000
Manure, chemical	2,329,000	1,952,000	2,164,000
Boots and shoes	1,614,000	1,582,000	1,629,000
Alkali	1,631,000	1,560,000	1,706,000
Beer and ale	1,463,000	1,524,000	1,532,000
Miscellaneous	7,478,000	8,178,000	8,905,000
Total analyzed	135,222,000	138,223,000	143,532,000
Miscellaneous	80,602,000	87,946,000	†91,270,000
Total exports	215,824,000	226,169,000	234,802,000

* On basis of prices current in 1894.

†Estimated by supposing that shrinkage of prices in 1895 compared with 1894 has been at the same rate as the decline in prices of articles whose values have been analyzed.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I do not intend to enter into the debate upon this question, because it seems to me, and I believe it seems to the great body of Senators on this side of the Chamber, that we are now discussing a moot question, which ought not to have been thrust into the consideration of the measure that we are really acting upon. I have no doubt that there is a majority of the Senate in favor of the free coinage of silver. They

no doubt represent the opinions of their constituents, and they honestly support that view. The country has, however, for the last four or five years been gradually settling down to the opinion that the free coinage of silver would bring us to the single silver standard, which would separate us from all the great Christian and civilized nations of the world.

This question has been talked of very much among the people, and latterly, especially, the people of State after State have settled down into the conviction that we ought to maintain the present bimetallic system of money—that is, to maintain the standard of gold and to maintain silver in circulation in the largest quantity possible for use by the people. It so happens that under the present system we use more silver, either in the form of circulating silver money or in the form of silver certificates representing silver actually in the Treasury, than has ever been heretofore used in the United States, and we on this side of the Chamber believe that that is the better plan, at least for the present, and that until the market value of silver shall approach its coinage value that is the true policy to be adopted. Therefore I do not think there is any disposition on this side of the Chamber to discuss that question, which has been discussed often and well.

What we do complain of, and what we think is not exactly right in the Senate of the United States, is that this proposition, which everybody knows can not pass this Congress, is thrust in the way of measures which the executive department says are absolutely necessary to carry on the Government. We say, therefore, that the thrusting of this proposition into this debate for the relief of the Treasury is not a wise measure of legislation. It is perfectly well known to every Senator here that if the amendment for the free coinage of silver should be adopted it would have to be sent to the House of Representatives, and it is absolutely certain that that House would reject it, and thus the measures of relief which have been recommended by the President of the United States and by the executive authorities will fail, unless those who favor the amendment should finally, after this long debate, recede from their views and allow the measures to which I have referred to pass.

What are those measures? They are not such as I would advocate. I would not propose such measures if the conditions were not precisely as they are; but we became convinced that under the present revenue law there was a deficiency in the revenue. One of two things must inevitably occur, we must either supply more revenue or we must cut off great branches of public expenditure which Congress has determined are necessary and proper, and for which Congress has made appropriations.

The House of Representatives, composed of more than three-fourths of members of the Republican party, opposed to this Administration, yet, desiring to do what was best for the country at large, said: "We will at once give immediate relief to the executive authorities; we will provide means and measures by which they can raise money to meet current expenses while passing along, and, besides that, create additional revenue by a simple law"—not such a law as I would frame or desire to have passed, but a law that would in the shortest time produce forty or fifty million dollars additional revenue without increasing the public debt. We all feel the real difficulty, the danger that threatens our financial operations, is the want of revenue. We are substantially in the same condition as a private citizen who expends more than he earns. As a matter of course, he will meet difficulties and probably become bankrupt. The United States is not a bankrupt, and can not be. We have ample sources of revenue. Why, therefore, should we not confine ourselves to those two measures—not framed by Republicans according to Republican ideas and policy, but framed to meet the exigency caused by the condition of affairs by, as I think, faulty Democratic legislation?

It seems to me that this debate ought not to be prolonged so as to interfere with all the great business of this country. There are many important measures on the Calendar, far more important than this, because they are measures that will be adopted, and they are measures necessary to carry on the Government, and consequently they will be acted upon by both Houses in a friendly way, while this is a mere moot debate, a debate upon an old subject which has been thrashed out over and over again—a debate upon a subject upon which every Senator has absolutely made up his mind. Why, then, continue this debate? If Senators desire to make speeches, I shall be very glad to hear them; and at any time, even if other measures are pending, according to the courtesy of the Senate, an opportunity will be afforded them.

But what we object to is that this measure, which every Senator here knows can not become the law of the land, stands in the way of measures which are deemed by the Administration to be absolutely necessary to carry on the Government, which we say is not only faulty legislation, but is obstructing legislation.

Mr. COCKRELL. Do I understand the Senator to say that the Executive Administration wants to have passed the revenue bill which is now pending in the Finance Committee?

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, it is not for the President of the United States to say what revenue shall be furnished for the support of this Government. It has been the established policy of the Government from the days of Washington to this time that revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives, which directly represents the people. The members of that body come from every district in the country, and their opinion as to what taxes should be levied upon the people is practically that which should govern.

In England the House of Commons would not allow the House of Lords to cross a "t" or dot an "i" on a revenue measure, on the ground that the House of Commons must legislate to impose the necessary taxation to meet the obligations of the Government. We have a broader power, and to my knowledge we have grossly abused that power on several different occasions. We have on some occasions trenched upon the power of the House of Representatives. We, of course, under the Constitution of the United States, have the power to amend revenue bills, but the House of Lords has not that power. We have it, and generally exercise it to an undue extent.

But now, when a measure comes to us, authorizing the Government to borrow money directly from the people by the issuance of small bonds, it is arrested by this process, which everybody knows can not become effective in the shape of law; and when the other measure comes to us, adding to the customs duty and producing some $40,000,000 of revenue, it is not for the President to say whether it is the best form of taxation. It is the best form as the House of Representatives thinks; it is the best form as the Senate thinks; and therefore that bill was reported, I think, almost on the unanimous vote of the Committee on Finance as a measure not of wisdom, not such a one as we of the Republican party would pass if we were framing a bill for increased revenue, not such a one as we would otherwise favor, but such a one as would quickly, certainly, and surely furnish the revenue necessary for the support of the Government.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator has alluded to the fact, as he states it, that this bill is occupying the time of the Senate unduly and to the detriment of other measures, especially a revenue measure to supply the deficient revenues of the Government. I ask him where that revenue measure is? Is it before the Senate?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will refer the Senator from Delaware to the Senator from Arkansas on his right.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That measure is in the hands of the Republican Finance Committee, Mr. President. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERMAN. I beg pardon. The Committee on Finance is now practically a Democratic committee, and Democratic Senators know it. They can at any moment, or any member on the other side of the Chamber belonging to the Committee on Finance, by his assent, can secure at once a report on that bill. We can not cheat each other.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. We are very glad to find that some Republican member of the Finance Committee has come to our side, but I am not advised as yet as to who he is. The Republicans organized the committee only a short time ago, and we have always understood that they had a majority.

Mr. SHERMAN. In that you are very much mistaken. Let us not misunderstand each other. Any one of the six Democratic members of that committee may authorize a report of the tariff bill at any moment, and could have done so at any time within the last two weeks. It is true that one of the members of the committee who classes himself as belonging to the——

Mr. PLATT. The Populists.

Mr. SHERMAN. He would hardly call himself a Populist; but, at any rate, has separated himself for the time being from the Republican party. He chooses not to allow that bill to be reported unless some additional provisions shall be added to it.

Mr. MORRILL. I think I ought to say that the Senator referred to was not present at the meeting of the committee when the bill was before the committee and has not been since.

Mr. SHERMAN. He was not present. But any member of the committee on the other side of the Chamber—and I emphasize that statement—can by a single "yes" within five minutes get that bill reported to the Senate, and then we shall have a measure before us for the relief of this Administration.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator complains that this bill is being delayed. Does the Senator regard this bill as a system of relief of the present condition of the country?

Mr. SHERMAN. Which bill?

Mr. TELLER. The bond bill. Suppose we do not put a free-coinage amendment on it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will answer the Senator frankly. I think that bill is a great measure of relief, and for this reason: Under the present law, or under the practice which has sprung up under the law, we have issued 4 per cent bonds and sold them, I think, on terms that were very harsh to the Government. I think we ought to have sold those bonds at a much higher rate. Therefore, in order to avoid the loss of selling 4 per cent bonds at 105 or 106, or whatever it may be, we should provide for a 3 per cent bond, which I know would be cheerfully and rapidly taken by the people of the United States, and give all the relief that is necessary to meet current deficiencies—for that is what the bonds are intended for—and it could be passed at once.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator tell us how long we are to continue to sell bonds to maintain the gold reserve?

Mr. SHERMAN. We will sell enough to cover actual deficiencies as they occur, actual deficiencies made by this Administration, and then provide additional revenue for the future; but I suppose the $40,000,000 additional revenue provided by the tariff bill, as it is called, will be sufficient; if not, we can increase it. If it is thought that that will not raise a sufficient amount of revenue, any Senator, when the bill is pending, may propose to put on additional duties. In the meantime the Republican party here stands ready to do its duty to maintain the credit of the Government of the United States and to pay off past deficiencies instead of running in debt.

My friend from Colorado was speaking a while ago about the increase of the public debt. Why did he not say frankly that that increase was because of the deficient revenue?

Mr. TELLER. I do not think so.

Mr. SHERMAN. What is the cause?

Mr. TELLER. You have not had $262,000,000 deficiency yet.

Mr. SHERMAN. One hundred and sixty-two million dollars, I think.

Mr. TELLER. You have $262,000,000 practically out; that is, you will have it out on the 5th of February.

Mr. SHERMAN. What is the cause of that deficiency? Whence comes it?

Mr. TELLER. I have not been talking about the deficiency. You are not selling bonds to meet deficiencies. The deficiency exists. You are selling bonds to accumulate gold, and you can not sell them for anything else under the law.

Mr. SHERMAN. If there was no deficiency there would be no demand for gold. For fourteen years that $100,000,000 of gold stood there in the Treasury, a standard of credit, and no one approached it or diminished it. But the moment the deficiencies occur, then they say they sell the bonds to keep the gold reserve good; but it is to meet deficiencies, because to meet the deficiencies they take the gold.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator from Ohio allow me to ask him if in his opinion there is any authority under the law to sell bonds for any purpose except to get gold to redeem greenbacks?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think not.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then, in your opinion, the law is deliberately violated in each sale of these bonds, as you say they have been sold for the purpose of raising money to defray expenses?

Mr. SHERMAN. That has already been explained over and over again.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I simply wanted to have the Senator make the statement.

Mr. SHERMAN. That money in the Treasury is superadded to the money put there for the redemption of United States notes. There was no segregation of these two sums; they were put in a mass, and the present Administration, since it came into being, has taken the money pledged to redeem United States notes, and has thus created a fright about gold, and the withdrawal of gold, and the shipment of gold abroad. Not only that, but the banks of the United States—and I say it is to their discredit—have withdrawn for United States notes about $50,000,000, which is now held as a part of their reserve.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Did the deficiency in the Treasury have anything to do with that?

Mr. SHERMAN. The deficiency in the Treasury was primarily, because it created this fear. It was the Government that first drained this fund for the maintenance of specie payments. Each bank, governed by its own interest, naturally saw that if the Government was using this fund very soon there would be no funds to be paid, and therefore the banks withdrew gold and put it in their reserve, which was required to be kept up in lawful money. It should be in United States notes. Always before the present Administration the banks kept up their reserve in United States notes and Treasury notes, but when they saw the Government taking this fund reserved for another purpose, because it had not been segregated in the general fund in the Treasury, they, as a matter of course, became alarmed, they became surprised, and they drew gold also.

As I have expressed before (and I did not intend to say so much as I have said), in my opinion all that is necessary is to pass these two bills. Therefore I wish it distinctly understood, so far as my voice can carry what I utter at this moment, that the whole trouble and fear in the Senate of the United States grows out of the desire of debating an old, worn issue, the free coinage of silver, instead of applying the remedy which the President asks for, which a Republican House has cheerfully granted, and which we on this side of the Chamber are ready at any moment to pass.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I did not expect when I was on the floor to have my statement that the Republican members of this body who believe in the gold standard have no other scheme but to sell bonds indefinitely verified quite so soon as I have. I understand the Senator from Ohio to say that that is all we need now to clear the atmosphere.

Mr. SHERMAN. To meet the deficiency. I do not propose to continue that. I have no doubt when the Republican Administration comes into power my friend and I will join together in providing for all the money necessary.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator, I think, is somewhat mistaken in his suggestion that the President has asked for anything of this character, to begin with. The President of the United States has asked for a gold bond, and he has asked for the gold bond not because he did not have the power to issue bonds, but because he does not have the power to issue gold bonds. He has the power under the act of 1875, he says, and the Senator agrees with him, to issue any amount of bonds that may be necessary to maintain the gold reserve, and as fast as the Treasury is emptied by the demand on the Treasury of the exporters of gold, it is to be filled up. I stated to-day that there was no end to that which anybody could see, and it seemed to me that our side of the House who believe in gold had neither the wit nor the wisdom to propose, or else they were afraid, or something else—at least they did not propose any system except to continue to sell bonds ad infinitum.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Colorado is clearly mistaken, because I do say that the bond bill was simply to provide for past deficiencies—to meet and square the accounts up to the time when the new bill, the tariff bill, can furnish revenue to support the Government, and that measure is to be carried on for only two years, when we hope a different state of things will occur.

Mr. TELLER. Say for three years at least the Government has had no gold in its collection. I think about three years ago the gold payments fell off. Since that time we have had silver certificates and Treasury notes mainly, with now and then a sprinkling of greenbacks. How is the Government to get the gold that the Senator says is essential to maintain its reserve if it does not sell bonds, or unless it makes its collections in gold? Can the Senator tell us how? Does he expect the Government to go into the market with greenbacks and buy gold as a commodity?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have already said in the remarks I made a few days ago that the very moment it is sure to the business men of this country that the gold will not be depleted and exhausted and thus leave our paper money unprotected from redemption, the moment that the conditions cease to exist, the demand for gold will cease to exist.

Mr. TELLER. Does the Senator understand that the failure to pay gold by way of duties on imports arises from any lack of revenue; or what is the cause?

Mr. SHERMAN. No. For fourteen years the customs duties were paid by United States notes entirely, and yet the gold was carried to the Treasury and exchanged for United States notes. The gold constantly increased year by year, for the reason that everyone who desired to use money preferred the notes to the gold, and therefore the gold was carried to the Treasury and the notes were in circulation.

Mr. TELLER. Just as long as the balance of trade was in our favor to the extent that we would cover what we had naturally to send abroad the gold would remain in this country. The moment that the balance of trade is against us we must pay it in gold. In the latter part of the season of 1890 the gold which had been coming into the Treasury for duties on imports at the rate of about 90 per cent by the way of gold certificates began to fall off, and the Treasury notes and greenbacks and other paper of that character began to take its place. So, by the following January, when there was no deficiency whatever and very few at least supposed that there would be a deficiency, gold payments had practically ceased at the collection office.

Something else, Mr. President, intervened. It was not a failure of revenue. I do not know whether it was a surplus of paper money, as some people contend, or what it was, but it is certain that before there was any lack of revenue the Government was out of gold. The Government has been out of gold on several occasions. I remember that in July, 1885, the bankers in New York met and held a conference and signed a paper and sent it to

the Treasury Department, in which they said it was apparent to them that we would in a very short time be unable to make gold payments. We had an abundance of revenue then. Thereupon they loaned to the Government of the United States a certain amount of gold. We all recollect that occurrence. We have been threatened with this before.

The lack of gold in the Treasury is not, in my judgment, the result of a lack of revenue. It is because there is an increased demand in Europe for the gold to pay our debts. That may be owing to two or three causes. One is, granting now that this is the scheme of the Administration, that it is distrust. That may be the cause. It may be that the distrust has occasioned the sending here of our securities and selling them. It does not make any difference what the revenue is, if that distrust exists our securities will come here. It does not make any difference what the revenues are, if the balance of trade is against us we have got to send the gold abroad.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me a question?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I presume the Senator is as well aware as I am that prior to the 4th of March, 1893, the incoming of the present Administration into power, at no time was the uncovered gold in the Treasury less than $100,000,000.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, yes; I am quite well aware of that fact.

Mr. ALDRICH. There were fluctuations up and down, it is true, but the uncovered gold never fell below $100,000,000, and the gold actually in the Treasury was always greatly in excess of that sum.

Mr. TELLER. That is a fact which everybody understands. We did not break into the reserve of $100,000,000 until after the present Administration came into power. To be fair, I am bound to say that I have not the slightest doubt but that we should have broken into it if Mr. Harrison had been reelected. It was not the Democratic party that came into power that made it, it was the condition of the country.

Mr. SHERMAN. It was Democratic law.

Mr. TELLER. It was not a Democratic law. There was not any law and had not been any law. That was long after, and it may have accelerated the thing and helped it; I have no doubt it did. But certain people were alarmed, and yet when I realize that the Democratic candidate had nearly 400,000 more votes than our candidate had, I can not see why the American people should be disturbed at what they themselves had done. The Republicans might have been somewhat disturbed. But the gold began to run down, and the demand for it in Europe was increased. As our exports fell off the demand for gold to take their place increased, and that is what is the trouble now, and it will continue for all time until we pay our debts. We might just as well make up our minds that we have got to furnish the gold, and in my judgment the Treasury Department can not maintain that reserve by the sale of bonds, unless they continue to sell year after year just as they are selling now.

If the Senator will get up here and say that in his judgment the maintenance of the gold standard and the maintenance of $100,000,000 in the reserve is compensation for what we suffer in the issuing of from two to three hundred million dollars a year of bonds, that will be all right; we shall know where to meet it. What I complain of is that on this side of the Chamber the majority of the Republicans are absolutely without a policy. You have not got any, you have not dared to have any, and you will not have one now. You dare not redeem the greenbacks. That you know would afford you relief. You dare not go before the public in 1896 with your candidate on that kind of a platform. You know where you would land. You would be landed where the Democrats were landed at the last election and where they expect to be landed now if we do not make some such blunder as that. You are afraid to do that. A majority of the gold men in this Chamber believe it ought to be done. You are in sympathy with the President, in my judgment, on that point, and if you are going to maintain the gold standard, I repeat what I said before, that is the logical and the only way out of it, unless you are willing to increase the public debt just as long as men will buy bonds at 3 per cent or 5 per cent or any other rate per cent.

I do not care, as I said, to debate the silver question. I know this bill is not going to become a law. I do not know it any more certainly than you know that your revenue bill is not going to become a law. If we all vote for that bill, and two or three Populists vote for it, and it passes the Senate, you know it is not to become a law. It was not introduced for the purpose of becoming a law. If it had been supposed it would become a law, it would have been a different bill from what it is. It was brought in for the purpose of making political capital and keeping the question before the public. I do not say that I shall not vote for it. I am a protectionist, and I believe we need more protection and more revenue, but I do not mean that the Senator shall get up here and lecture me because I am talking about a bill which he says we can not pass with this measure on it. He knows that the other bill will not pass, and he ought to know that this bond bill, sheared of the free-coinage provision, will not pass this body.

Mr. PLATT. Let us try it.

Mr. TELLER. We will try it when the time comes, but as this is a little play of politics, we will play it on our side, too, just as well. We will take occasion to see what your policy is. We will take occasion now to see when the Republican party comes into power what it is going to do. So far we who believe that something ought to be done to bring this country out of its condition have got no encouragement whatever except that you are to continue to sell bonds indefinitely until you have piled up a great debt against the people of the United States. You know and I know that just as long as those men in New York can buy these bonds at the prices at which they bought the last issue they can not put their money in anything that is equal to it. You know that is what we are going to do, to keep on selling bonds. That may be a Republican doctrine, but I do not believe it. Whenever the Republican party shall become the party of increasing our indebtedness in time of peace, the people will withdraw from it that confidence which they have shown in it in years past.

I do not care what the name may be or what it may have done, the people of the United States are now demanding of us some action that will relieve the country, not a temporary thing, not the issuing of bonds to-day and more to-morrow, and then wonder what we are going to do at the end, but they ask for some system. The President and the Secretary of the Treasury have offered us one. We reject it. Now, then, ought we not to offer something? We offer free coinage. You offer nothing.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, I think that this discussion lacks just one additional item to complete it for the day. In January, 1893, as I remember, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] proposed an amendment to an appropriation bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue, I think, some $50,000,000 of 3 per cent bonds in order to avoid what, in the Senator's judgment, was a possible danger to the reserve fund. I should like to inquire of the Senator now whether his proposition to amend in the manner I have designated was because there was a deficiency in the revenue?

Mr. SHERMAN. There had been no deficiency in the revenue up to that time; but I believe the amount of the surplus the year before was only about $9,000,000. The present Secretary of the Treasury was then a member of the Senate, and on the question of giving the incoming Administration an opportunity to meet any possible deficiency that might arise such a proposition was introduced and passed this body nem. con. without objection. It was sent to the House of Representatives and there disagreed to, and in conference it was dropped out. The Secretary had probably consulted his then superiors, and it was dropped out.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether that statement is entirely complete? Was there not an existing law, the statute of 1875, the resumption act, which had been referred to in the statute of 1890, which gave the power already to issue 4 per cent bonds? Was the statute proposed in 1893 anything more than an authority to use a power already existing on terms much more favorable to the Government?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, the proposition submitted by me, agreed to, I believe, in the Committee on Finance unanimously, and which passed the Senate, I think, without objection, simply added to the bonds that were authorized to be sold under the resumption act, the 4, 4½, and 5 per cent bonds, a bond bearing 3 per cent interest, so that the Government might avail itself of the very lowest and best terms possible in borrowing money in case the necessity should arise.

Mr. GRAY. That was, then, practically the measure which has come here from the other House.

Mr. SHERMAN. It was practically that measure.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, I think, is very inaccurate. I think the Senator will remember that this matter was discussed in this body a year and a half ago when we were considering the revenue measure, and we produced here the statement made by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Foster, before a committee of the House of Representatives, in which he admitted that the revenue under the McKinley Act, up to and prior to the election of President Cleveland in 1892, was deficient, and suggested that $50,000,000 additional revenue should be provided to meet the deficiencies in the Treasury, not for the purpose of maintaining the reserve.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am quite sure——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GORMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no recollection that Secretary Foster

asked for the sale of bonds. I am quite sure he did not. I think I would have known if he had. Besides, there was no deficiency. The official records show that there was no deficiency until July 1, 1893, which was some four or five months after the incoming of the present Administration. I think that any recommendations which were made then were made in view of possible future contingencies.

Mr. GORMAN. No; it was a condition that confronted the Secretary of the Treasury at the time. We talked the matter over here frankly, because there was no secret about it. The Secretary of the Treasury had issued an order preparing the bonds that were authorized by the act of 1875 to the extent of $50,000,000, and that order has been produced, and is printed in the RECORD.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is printed in the RECORD.

Mr. GORMAN. It is printed in the RECORD. I can not for the moment lay my hand on it. The Presidential election occurred. The Republican party were to be put out of power on the 4th of March, and understanding perfectly well their responsibility to the country, knowing that this financial panic was impending, like patriotic men they sought us on this side of the Chamber to state frankly the condition. Mr. Foster sought me, as I have before stated to the Senate, telling the condition of the Treasury, that he was short of revenue, and that some remedy must be provided. The result of that conference was the proposition introduced by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who is always ready to come to the relief of the Treasury when it is in distress, and we sought to have $100,000,000 of 3 per cent bonds authorized, placing a provision for that purpose upon the appropriation bill.

Afterwards the Committee on Finance reported in favor of the issue of $50,000,000 of 3 per cent bonds, and the condition that the proceeds of those bonds should be used for no other purpose except to maintain the gold reserve was insisted upon and incorporated in that amendment, and in that form it passed the Senate. That, of course, defeated the main object in view that had been suggested by the Republican Secretary, and it was rejected in another place, not here. In the meantime Secretary Foster went before a committee of the other House. In his statement, which was read in the Senate, he frankly said that $50,000,000 more of revenue was needed. I do not happen to lay my hand on the statement, although I thought I had it here, but I will produce it. The Secretary stated to the committee that he wanted, say, $50,000,000 more of revenue to pay the current expenses of the Government.

Mr. SHERMAN. There is no use to dispute about facts which are certified to us. It is certain that until after the 1st of July, 1893, which was four or five months after the present Administration came into power, the revenues were sufficient to meet the expenditures, and there was still $2,000,000 of surplus that year.

As to precisely when the revenues fell off, my own opinion has always been that the change of Administration, which had been determined early in November before Mr. Cleveland came into office, necessarily had a disturbing effect upon the business of the country. A sudden change of Administration always does, more or less, but the deficiency did not occur until July 2, 1893. I have no statement here to show it, but it is a matter of public notoriety that there was $2,000,000 of surplus on the 1st of July for that year.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, nominally there was a surplus of $2,000,000 that year, but the fact remains (and the Senator, when his attention is called to it, will admit it) that the only way possible by which $2,000,000 of surplus appeared was that the Treasury had instituted a system of accounts which enabled them to use the fund for the redemption of national-bank notes, which ought to have been a charge against the Treasury. It was a mere system of bookkeeping. Secretary Foster, within six months after the operation of the McKinley Act, was compelled to treat the Treasury, as the Senator from Ohio a few days ago suggested that the present Secretary ought to treat it, by the heroic measure of suppressing appropriations made by Congress. The Senator knows that the appropriations for the fiscal years of 1891, 1892, and 1893, three years of President Harrison's Administration, exceeded by $362,926,881.35, including the sinking fund, the total receipts of the Government under the McKinley law:

The revenues from all sources for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1891, 1892, 1893 were...	$1,133,368,860.33
And the appropriations made by Congress during the same years were	1,496,295,741.68
Excess of appropriations over revenues..	362,926,881.35

In addition to that, Secretary Foster was compelled to resort to the method suggested by the Senator from Ohio, by suspending the payments directed to be made by Congress for various public works, and it is only by that system that you maintained the balance at all. The present Secretary has followed that policy. At the end of the fiscal year there was $116,000,000 that had been appropriated and not paid, and that is exclusive of the sinking fund. Add that sum and then one hundred and fifty or one hundred and sixty million dollars. The fact is that there has not been revenue enough from the day of the passage of the McKinley law until now to meet the wants of the Government and keep up the sinking fund, and there is no system of bookkeeping that will wipe that out. I admit there is not revenue enough now.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will ask the Senator if he does not think that the Secretary of the Treasury is justified in neglecting to use money appropriated which is merely permissory? Did he not do right? The present Secretary and Secretary Foster and every Secretary that held office since the time of Alexander Hamilton have done precisely that thing. Wherever appropriations are made of mandatory character to carry out existing law the Secretary must meet those contingencies; he must provide for the law so as to prevent the Government from violating its promise; but from the beginning of the Government every Secretary of the Treasury has exercised the right to decline to use money appropriated by Congress when in his judgment it ought not to have been used.

Mr. GORMAN. I think that it is a very bad policy. When Congress makes an appropriation for any purpose we should provide the money by taxation, and the Secretary of the Treasury and the executive officers ought to carry out the will of Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. The will of Congress is expressed——

Mr. GORMAN. If the Senator will permit me to finish the sentence, when the condition arises, as it did arise after the passage of the McKinley law, when there was not enough revenue in the Treasury to meet the appropriations made by Congress, when there has not been at any time since, the Secretary of the Treasury was bound to suspend and not spend more money than he received, providing it could be suspended without interfering with the honorable obligations of the Government. Secretary Foster had an unexpended balance of appropriations on July 1, 1891, exclusive of sinking fund, of $112,043,711.64. But when Mr. Carlisle came in as Secretary of the Treasury with a depleted Treasury and this depression became more acute and the revenues were falling off, he suspended not only $116,000,000 in the last year, but he did more than that, he used the greenbacks and Treasury notes that he had redeemed, and paid out $132,000,000 on them for what? He paid it out for pensions and for expenditures of the Government that could not be suspended.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question before he sits down?

Mr. GORMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator expresses his disapprobation of the refusal of the Secretary of the Treasury to expend money appropriated by Congress. What does he make of the usual phraseology in an appropriation bill, to wit, that the payment shall be made out of money in the Treasury, and that it shall be out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated? I had always conceived that that phrase was inserted for the express purpose of withholding the authority from any head of Department, from the President, or anybody else, to spend money when the ways and means were not provided as well when the appropriation was made.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, all the Secretaries from 1879 have pursued the same policy that the present Secretary has pursued. There is no difference whatever. It has been done from the day that the Senator from Ohio was Secretary of the Treasury. Secretary Carlisle states the case properly when he places the responsibility for the use of the greenbacks when redeemed back to the decision of the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I believe that they have all followed it since. The law was construed and the precedent set by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. Here is what he said, as quoted in Secretary Carlisle's last report, admitting, as a matter of course, that the system ought to be corrected:

> A note redeemed with coin is in the Treasury and subject to the same law as if received for taxes, or as a bank note redeemed by the corporation issuing it. The authority to reissue it does not depend upon the mode in which it is returned to the Treasury.

He then, of course, was discussing the question whether the notes which might be redeemed after the 1st of January, 1879, under the resumption act would be lawfully reissued. He held that they could, and insisted that the question should be settled by a distinct provision of the law. Secretary Carlisle proceeds:

> The result was that Congress passed the act of May 31, 1878, making it mandatory upon the Secretary of the Treasury to reissue the notes. Since the passage of that act the right and duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to reissue the old legal-tender notes, no matter how received into the Treasury, provided they belong to the United States, has never been questioned in any quarter, and, as to the Treasury notes issued under the silver-purchasing act, they must be reissued when redeemed in gold, or, if canceled, standard silver dollars must be issued in their place.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GORMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish my friend from Maryland to understand that a Democratic House at that time did take my advice and carry it out very fairly and fully. It did provide for the reissue of United States notes, because when notes were presented for redemption there was a faint doubt about it. There were a few people in the United States, especially those who were opposed to the greenback circulation, who insisted that having been once redeemed they could not be reissued. I remember distinctly writing to the House, then very strongly Democratic, and stating the point that had been raised, and the House at once acted and the law was passed at my request; and that has been the law ever since.

Mr. GORMAN. So there can be no complaint of the present Secretary of the Treasury, because he simply followed the precedent of his predecessors and carried out the provisions of the law. That it has become necessary to use any part of that fund for the purpose of paying the current expenses of the Government is to be regretted. That the responsibility for it can be placed upon the Democratic party, as the Senator from Ohio has sought to do, I deny. The facts will not warrant the statement of the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Congress that passed that law was Democratic in both Houses.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, Mr. President; and it was passed upon the advice of the then Secretary of the Treasury, who is now the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. I suppose Congress alone had the power to pass the law. I certainly did not have it.

Mr. GORMAN. So it had the power; but the act was approved by a Republican President and in an Administration of which the honorable Senator from Ohio was known to be the power behind the throne. So the law stands. It is not of our making. It is an unfortunate condition for the country that we have reached, and this attempt to place the responsibility alone upon the Democratic party is not worthy the great reputation of the Senator from Ohio. It has come upon us from causes beyond the control of the Democratic party. I would not charge it upon the Republican party that you deliberately passed the McKinley Act to create a deficiency in the Treasury. You did not anticipate it. No Senator on the other side who had charge of that bill would have been guilty of such an act. But the fact is that your bill did not produce revenue enough. The fact is that Secretary Foster was compelled to say before closing his administration of the Department, in answer to a question of Mr. TURNER of Georgia:

> I think an annual increase of $50,000,000 would make the Treasury easy, and if I were going to manage it I would want to have it.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator ought to read, in justice to Mr. Foster, the remaining portion of that interview, in which he says this money was required, not for the ordinary expenses of the Government, but to maintain the gold reserve, which was then being depleted somewhat.

Mr. GORMAN. Ah! The Senator now thinks it was the gold reserve that was depleted. I thought the Senator from Ohio and his Republican confreres charged the depletion of the gold reserve to the Democratic Administration?

Mr. ALDRICH. It was the shadow of the Democratic Administration which was then upon the country, the election having taken place in November and this statement having been made in the middle of February, after the election was held. It became known to the country that a Democratic Administration was to take possession of the Government, and the gold reserve immediately began to decline.

Mr. GORMAN. Ah! Mr. President, the Senator's memory is again at fault.

Mr. ALDRICH. But it never fell below $100,000,000 within the time——

Mr. GORMAN. No; but his partisanship is so strong that he can not remember the facts. There was not a Democratic Administration in 1891, and no Republican would admit that it was possible to elect a Democratic President in 1891.

Mr. ALDRICH. But Mr. Foster——

Mr. GORMAN. You were then in the height of your power, and you had every branch of the Government of the United States under your control.

Mr. ALDRICH. But the sentence which the Senator has read from the interview with the Secretary of the Treasury was uttered in February, 1893, and not in 1891.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, Mr. President; that is true, but the Secretary of the Treasury, before the Presidential election in 1892, had prepared his bonds to issue, knowing the condition of the Treasury.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator can not certainly be willing to make any such statement.

Mr. GORMAN. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not before the Presidential election.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes; before the Presidential election, Mr. President.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is absolutely mistaken. The preparation of bonds was made after the election. The Secretary's letter, which has been published in recent debates in another place, shows that the bonds were prepared not only after the election, but after a bill had passed the Senate of the United States, at the suggestion of the incoming Administration, to allow a different issue of bonds. After that was done, in February, I think, 1893——

Mr. SHERMAN. In February, 1893.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then the Secretary of the Treasury ordered the preparation of bonds. There was no thought of issuing any bonds before that time.

Mr. GORMAN. I read his statement in February, 1893.

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. GORMAN. And prior to that the Secretary had prepared to meet the emergency in which he found the Treasury. But let that go. I will furnish the date of the order of the Secretary of the Treasury to his Printing Bureau to prepare the bonds.

Mr. ALDRICH. That was in February, 1893.

Mr. GORMAN. Very good; suppose it was. Let us see who is responsible for this. There was no threatened Democratic legislation or Democratic President in 1891. The revenue laws passed by the Fifty-first Congress were your acts.

What affected the gold reserve? It began to diminish as soon as the Sherman law went into active operation. You had plenty of gold up to that time. Nobody will hold us responsible for that act. Every Democrat in this Chamber voted against it. The law was yours, and yours alone. Up to that time you had received in gold, or gold certificates, which are the same as gold, an average of 84 per cent of all customs duties, and that kept up your gold reserve. As soon as you passed the McKinley law and put the Sherman law into full operation, the receipts of gold from customs ceased, and the duties were paid almost exclusively in silver notes, in Sherman notes, and Treasury notes, so there was a constant stream of gold going out of the Treasury and none coming in. That was before the Presidential election, before we had an opportunity to frame legislation affecting the Treasury Department.

It is true that when we came into power we inherited all these bills which had been produced by bad legislation, by a tariff law which did not furnish revenue enough to pay the expenses of the Government, and by the operation of a law which excluded gold from going into the Treasury.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator has the figures before him, will he not be kind enough to state to the Senate what amount of gold was in the Treasury in 1891? It is not what was paid in, but what amount of gold was in the Treasury which we are discussing.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, they managed to keep in $100,000,000 of gold, and a little more, but I say there stands the fact that the operation of your laws had produced this result so far as legislation had produced it.

I admit frankly, sir, that there were causes outside of the legislation of the Republican party, as there are causes outside of the legislation which has been enacted or threatened to be enacted since we have been in power. They are beyond the confines of this country. The general upheaval, the fall in prices, the depression of business, the anxiety and fear of business men as to legislation made them solicitous as to the future. There has been another class which appeared during this time of distress and panic—the money lenders, who desire to take advantage of the distress of the Government, as they take advantage of the distress of individuals, and they unquestionably, in my judgment, have formed combinations which make it easy to take gold from the Treasury and get bonds issued for it.

Since you have only had a reserve of $100,000,000 behind the greenbacks, $346,000,000 in amount, and then added $150,000,000 of Sherman or Treasury notes, you have made the pile top-heavy, and there is but one thing for us to do, to increase the base, which is gold, or else to issue bonds, and take those notes out of circulation, putting something in their place which will not enable the money lenders to come back to the Treasury to demand gold for them. This difficulty can not be met by a discussion of whose fault it is, and I should not indulge in it but for the repetition of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who seemed so anxious to throw the entire responsibility upon the Democratic party. Mr. President, party responsibility is nothing; it is the condition we must consider. It must be met, Mr. President, in an entirely different spirit. The condition exists; it confronts us; we all admit that something ought to be done. What the remedy shall be I believe is yet to be formulated, as I do not think any of the pending propositions can be enacted into laws.

That we want more revenue I frankly admit. The last revenue law which was passed, if it had been sustained in all its parts, would have produced revenue enough to pay the ordinary expenses of the Government. The Senator from Ohio says that it was a measure which would never have produced sufficient revenue as it passed. The Democratic party is responsible for the measure as it became a law. We in this body, it is true, added $75,000,000 per annum to the bill as it came here from the House of Representatives. As the Senate always does, we perfected the measure. With ordinary conditions of trade and commerce, if the provisions for the tax on incomes had remained, the law would have produced a surplus revenue; it would have, even in these times of depression, as the Senate passed it, produced enough revenue to pay the current expenses of the Government. Unexpectedly, however, to everybody, there was the decision described by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] a few days since, which I shall not comment upon, as he has expressed my views so perfectly. I voted for that provision only because I believed the emergency existed for it, not because I believed in its policy; but I did believe in its constitutionality.

Mr. President, we ought from this hour forward not to arraign the two parties for this condition. In a certain sense we may both have responsibilities about it. I do trust, however, that we may consider the question with a view of relieving the condition of the country.

For one I should never agree to vote for any measure which I should regard as repudiating in the slightest degree the highest obligation of the Government. If we have contracted, as the executive branch of the Government has uniformly decided, and as Congress has never negatived, that we are to pay all these outstanding obligations in gold, I would so pay them, no matter how much it might cost the people of the country.

But when you come to the other question, which has been presented so ably by the distinguished Senator who has reported the amendment to this bill, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], we might as well admit here frankly, and the country must know it, that as earnest and honest men as there are in the Union differ as to what is to be done hereafter.

It is a question which can not be decided by the divisions on this aisle. No majority of the Senate can be had upon either side. You can not and I can not frown down the sentiments and the convictions of such men as my distinguished friend from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] who sits in front of me. We can not ignore the weight of the arguments which they make. We can not, if we would, ignore their power in the Senate and ride roughshod over their sentiments and their convictions. It is too serious a matter for the people of the country that we should bandy words here and taunt each other with failure to legislate fairly in the past. This matter must be settled, preserving the honor of the people of this country so that not the slightest taint shall ever attach to us because of the want of faith in carrying out and paying every obligation of the Government which has been incurred in the past. But we ought to discuss it and meet it, as we have to meet it, and adjust it as all great questions have been met in the past, by fair consideration and fair concession, so that by our united action we may give the people of this country opportunity to go on with their affairs and to build up enterprises and make thrift and prosperity again the order of the day.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, when I came into the Chamber I heard the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] making a statement which seemed to me so extraordinary that I should be very glad to ask his attention to it for the purpose of seeing whether I understood him aright. I understood the Senator to say that when the present Democratic Administration came into power it found $350,000,000 of suspended appropriations which there was no money to pay. Did the Senator make that statement?

Mr. GORMAN. I said—and I will give the Senator the figures for it—that Congress had appropriated three hundred and fifty-odd million dollars more than the revenues of the Government.

Mr. ALDRICH. Including, the Senator said, the sinking fund?

Mr. GORMAN. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Including the sinking fund. How much for that and how much for other appropriations?

Mr. GORMAN. I can give the Senator the figures in a moment.

Mr. ALDRICH. If there was a deficiency of $350,000,000, during the three years which have elapsed there must certainly have been $200,000,000 more and $115,000,000 additional. The present deficiency, therefore, must be six hundred or seven hundred million dollars, based upon the same method of calculation, I should think.

Mr. GORMAN. I have the figures here, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall be very glad to have them.

Mr. GORMAN. For 1891, 1892, 1893, and 1894, taking all those years together, the appropriations were in excess of the revenues $296,868,547.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am talking about the condition which existed at the close of the last Republican Administration, and I desire to ask the Senator, if he makes such a statement in detail, what that deficiency consists of? If there was $350,000,000 of appropriations which there was no money to pay, I should be glad to know what amount of that was for the sinking fund. That is one question. If it was appropriations, that is another question. We have not paid any money on account of the sinking fund for many years. I presume there is not a Senator within my hearing who believes we ought to have gone on paying into the sinking fund at the time the Senator suggests, or that we are now under any obligation to buy bonds for the sinking fund. The statement is certainly very disingenuous if a large portion of that amount is made up of appropriations for the sinking fund, as I presume it is.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I do not intend to extend this debate, but in justice to one of my constituents, the Hon. Charles Foster, I feel bound, after what has been read as coming from him, to read what he said recently in a public speech:

It is charged by resolves of Democratic conventions, by Democratic orators of high as well as low standing, and by the Democratic press, that the Harrison Administration left the Treasury in a bankrupt condition: that the late Secretary of the Treasury was in such an embarrassed condition financially as to induce him to ask Congress for $50,000,000 of additional revenues, and that he had ordered plates prepared for the issue of bonds, which were afterwards used by Secretary Carlisle, and that bonds would have been sold but for the intervention of the President: that the panic of 1893, with all of its distressing effects, was due to Republican legislation: that the panic would have come even if Harrison had been reelected, and that the present improved condition of the business of the country is due to the late legislation of Congress.

FALSITY OF THEM.

The absolute untruthfulness of each and every one of these allegations is easily established. The fact is, that in each and every year of the Harrison Administration the revenues exceeded the expenditures, as shown by statements now published by Secretary Carlisle.

WHAT THE HARRISON ADMINISTRATION DID.

Besides paying all the expenses of the Government, including enormous payment for pensions, payments much larger than have been paid before or will be paid hereafter, aggregating an excess of approximately $100,000,000 more than was paid by the first Cleveland or will be paid by his second Administration, it paid also all the extraordinary expenses for rivers and harbors and new Navy and the other expenses of the "billion-dollar Congress," and in addition paid, including premiums, about $200,000,000 of the public debt. On the 4th of March, 1893, we turned over to the new Administration nearly $125,000,000 in cash, more than $100,000,000 of which was gold.

Notwithstanding that Carlisle's statement shows the facts just stated, true to their habits and instincts which have abided with them in the past, and will no doubt continue in the future, they make these false allegations in the face of their refutation over the signature of their own Secretary.

THE TWO FALSEHOODS MOST PLEASING TO DEMOCRATS.

The two falsehoods that the Democratic leaders persistently publish, and in which they would take fiendish delight if true, are that American genius is incapable of producing tin plate, and the Treasury under Harrison was bankrupt.

ORDERING PLATES FOR BONDS.

Now, as to the charge that the Secretary was so straitened for cash that he ordered plates for bonds to be prepared, I believed at that time that the gold reserve of one hundred millions should be maintained, and I would have sold bonds to replenish it had this reserve fallen below the $100,000,000 limit.

I believe now that much of the trouble that came to the Treasury could have been avoided if Secretary Carlisle had promptly announced that he would maintain his gold reserve at all hazards. I feared such a contingency might occur in my time. To fortify myself and be ready for such an emergency I conferred with capitalists and found I could sell bonds for gold on a basis of 3 per cent interest. The only bonds available were those authorized by the resumption act of 1875, none bearing interest at a less rate than 4 per cent. The plates for these bonds had been prepared while Mr. Sherman was Secretary, and quite a supply were already printed and ready for final execution. Mr. Carlisle, I suppose, used this class for delivery to the purchasers of bonds sold by him. About the 20th of March, 1893—

That, I think, should have been February instead of March, though I am not sure but that it was during the called session—

the Senate, with the approval of Mr. Carlisle, who was then known to be the incoming Secretary, passed an amendment to an appropriation bill authorizing the issue of a 3 per cent bond by a practically unanimous vote. I had no doubt then that the House would concur, and that a 3 per cent short-term bond would be authorized. The emergency was such that I thought it prudent to direct the preparation of plates for these anticipated new 3 per cent bonds, which were, in all respects, a better bond than those authorized for the use of myself or my successor, at the earliest date possible.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Maryland, in the latter part of his argument, made the statement that in 1891 the gold in the Treasury was reduced.

Mr. GORMAN. No; I said that in 1891 the receipts of gold from customs began to be reduced.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator intend to show that the amount of gold held by the Government was reduced?

Mr. GORMAN. No; it was not reduced until some time afterwards, but the moment that the supply was cut off, as a matter of course, whenever a demand occurred for gold, as it did afterwards occur, the gold reserve was encroached upon. That was all there was of it.

Mr. ALDRICH. The figures, perhaps, may refresh the Sena-

tor's memory. In July, 1891, as shown by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, the amount of gold in the Treasury was $239,263,689.

Mr. GRAY. What is the date of that?

Mr. ALDRICH. July 1, 1891. That was some time after the passage of the McKinley law—about nine months after. On the 1st of July, 1892, the amount of gold in the Treasury was $255,706,611, or an increase of $16,000,000 in the amount of gold in the Treasury between the 1st of July, 1891, and the 1st of July, 1892, the McKinley law being in force all the time, and this latter period bringing it within four months of the election of 1892, when the Democratic party was placed in power.

The next year the amount of gold in the Treasury—July, 1893—Mr. Cleveland then being President, was reduced to $189,162,000, and in 1894 to $131,000,000. So the gold coin and bullion held in the Treasury kept increasing from 1891 up to 1892, practically to the election of 1892.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to ask the Senator if he will give us the amount of gold certificates. It is important to know how much there was of free gold.

Mr. ALDRICH. There were no gold certificates outstanding. Of course there was a certain amount of gold certificates in the Treasury.

Mr. TELLER. They count as money.

Mr. ALDRICH. They count as money. The gold certificates outstanding were $130,000,000 in 1891 and $120,000,000 in 1892.

Mr. GRAY. That has to be subtracted from the Senator's statement as to the gold reserve?

Mr. ALDRICH. Of course.

Mr. SHERMAN. The gold certificates are the same as gold.

Mr. GRAY. Not when they are outstanding, as I understand.

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly. They are to be deducted from the gold and bullion in the Treasury.

Mr. GRAY. Exactly.

Mr. ALDRICH. What I was undertaking to show was that the gold in the Treasury had actually increased during the period in which the Senator from Maryland said we were not receiving any gold at the custom-houses, showing very plainly to my mind that it made no difference as to the condition of the Treasury whether the customs were paid in gold certificates or in gold.

Mr. GORMAN. Now I ask the Senator to look at his table. He will find that the net gold in the Treasury in 1891, for the month of January, was $149,000,000.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not talking about January.

Mr. GORMAN. If he will follow that table down he will find the gold ran down gradually to $141,000,000, then to $132,000,000, with scarcely an increase except in December, 1891, when there was $120,000,000. Then, during the remainder of the time, it ran down until it got to $61,000,000 without any increase, showing that from the day the revenues were not paid in gold, gold decreased in the Treasury as a matter of course, running through the latter part of Harrison's Administration and during this Administration, until it has culminated in the great withdrawals which have occurred.

Mr. ALDRICH. The figures the Senator has and the figures which I have read are at the end of the financial year. They are found on page 27 of the Statistical Abstract and, I presume, are correct.

Mr. GORMAN. I have read from the last Treasury report, pages 46 and 47, in which the Secretary gives the total amount of gold in the Treasury, the certificates in use, and then the net amount of gold in the Treasury.

Mr. ALDRICH. What was the amount in July, 1892?

Mr. GORMAN. In July, 1892, it was $110,000,000.

Mr. ALDRICH. Ten million dollars in excess.

Mr. GORMAN. Before the Sherman law went into effect the average was $168,000,000. As soon as that law went into operation nobody paid any gold for customs, and the amount of gold ran down to almost nothing. Not a single dollar of gold or of gold certificates was paid in, and the drain on the Treasury began, and it has been going on from that day to this.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator think the enactment of that law was the cause of the reduction of the gold reserve?

Mr. GORMAN. I will say that the effect of it was that the Treasury had not any use for gold when the point was reached——

Mr. ALDRICH. What happened when the Sherman law was repealed? Did the gold increase in the Treasury?

Mr. GORMAN. As a matter of course, not.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ALDRICH. For a question.

Mr. LINDSAY. I ask if the Senator from Rhode Island desires the Senate to understand that there was not a diminishing gold reserve all the while during 1891 and 1892?

Mr. ALDRICH. What I meant to say was that there was no substantial diminution in the amount of the gold reserve in the Treasury at any time prior to the incoming of the present Administration.

Mr. LINDSAY. Then the Senator differs very widely from the last Republican Secretary of the Treasury upon the subject. With his permission, I will read from the report of the Secretary of December, 1892, only one month after the election. I read from page 13. The Secretary says:

> One of the embarrassments to the Treasury, in the opinion of the Secretary, is the inability, with the limited amount of cash on hand above the one-hundred-million reserve, to keep up a sufficient gold supply. When the demand comes for the exportation of gold the Treasury is called upon to furnish it. If this demand should prove to be as large the coming year as it has been—

When?—

> for the past two years—

That is, since the passage of the McKinley law and the Sherman Act—

> gold in the Treasury would be diminished to or below the reserve line.

Then he does not rest upon the idea at all that the balance of trade was against us. After reciting the fact that Congress had enacted this law because the $100,000,000 was originally a sufficient reserve, he then says:

> But, if $100,000,000 in gold was a suitable or necessary reserve in 1882 and in 1885, it would seem clear that a greater reserve is necessary now. It should be remembered that since 1882 we have added to our silver circulation the sum of $259,016,182 in standard silver dollars coined under the old silver act of 1878. These dollars are nearly all outstanding, and largely represented by silver certificates. We have also increased the legal-tender paper circulation by issuing about $120,000,000 of the Treasury notes authorized by the act of July 14, 1890, and to this we are adding about four millions each month in payment of silver bullion purchased.

Then he says:

> In view, therefore, of these increased and increasing liabilities, the reserve in the Treasury for the redemption of the Government obligations should, in my opinion, be increased to the extent of at least 20 per cent of the amount of Treasury notes issued and to be issued under the act of July 14, 1890.

There is not one word about the balance of trade being against us, but it is put wholly upon the idea that we are increasing the amount of outstanding obligations payable on demand in gold under and in virtue of the Sherman purchasing act of July, 1890.

Mr. ALDRICH. The extract which the Senator from Kentucky has read shows, of course, that the late Secretary of the Treasury was desirous of increasing the gold reserve on account, as he himself states, of the increased amount of currency which was outstanding and redeemable in gold.

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. He also shows another thing: That, in his opinion, the cash balance in the Treasury at that time was not sufficient to enable him to hold what he believed to be a sufficient gold reserve. That condition grew out of two or three different circumstances, if the Senator will excuse me, and I think it is very easily explained, and anyone who was familiar with the matter at the time will recall it upon the mere statement of the fact.

The act of 1890 was passed to do two things, so far as the effect upon the revenue was concerned. It was passed at the request and solicitation of the President of the United States, to reduce the surplus and to reduce surplus revenue——

Mr. PLATT. We cut off $65,000,000 on sugar.

Mr. ALDRICH. As the Senator from Connecticut very well suggests, we cut off $65,000,000 on sugar. We reduced the revenue purposely by the act of 1890 in order to reduce the surplus which Mr. Cleveland said in several messages to Congress was a very undesirable thing to have. He said we were taking money from the people and locking it up in the Treasury, thus bringing about a contraction of the currency and hard times. In order to relieve that condition of affairs, the act of 1890 was passed for the express purpose of reducing the revenue, and when it reduced the revenue, of course it reduced the amount available for the gold reserve in excess of the $100,000,000.

Another thing was done by the Republican Administration. It used the money in the Treasury, the surplus revenue, for the redemption of the debt of the United States, and, according to the opinion of Mr. Foster at the time of which he is now speaking, they reduced that cash balance by the purchase of bonds to so low a state that it was impossible for him to hold the gold reserve which he thought was necessary for an effective redemption of the Treasury notes in addition to the United States notes then outstanding.

This accounts for the diminishing balance of gold in the Treasury in 1892, or whatever the date was. It was on account of a constantly decreasing cash balance growing out of two causes; one the reduction of revenue by the act of 1890, and the other the purchase of the debt by a Republican Administration.

The Senator from Kentucky stopped reading at an unfortunate point——

Mr. LINDSAY. I did not intend to stop, if the floor had not been taken away from me by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understood I retained the floor and yielded to the Senator from Kentucky for a question. I did not understand that I was interrupting him.

The very next sentence in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury to that read by the Senator from Kentucky lets in a flood of light upon this whole question as to the views of the Secretary of the Treasury at that time and as to what the effect of the act of 1890 has been. He says:

As will be seen by the estimates submitted, the receipts of the current and the next fiscal year are not likely, if present conditions continue, to fall below expenditures.

That statement was absolutely accurate.

Mr. GORMAN. What date was that?

Mr. ALDRICH. In December, 1892; the last report of the then Secretary of the Treasury.

His predictions were absolutely verified, because, as shown by the report of Secretary Carlisle for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1893, which was the next report made, the excess of revenue, as stated by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] the other day, was more than $2,000,000. So there was not an hour or a day or a month from the time the act of 1890 was passed until the close of the first fiscal year during the present Administration when the McKinley law did not produce a surplus revenue instead of a deficiency.

It is idle for Senators to spend the amount of time they do trying to prove that Mr. Foster or anybody else said there was then a deficiency after the statement read by the Senator from Ohio to-day, which shows plainly what Mr. Foster's idea was at that time; but whatever his opinion may have been, the fact confronts us that the act of 1890 did produce a sufficient amount of revenue up to the time of the incoming of this Administration, and while the law was administered by Republicans, to carry on the Government and to produce a surplus.

Now, the Senator from Maryland says that the act of 1890 was deficient for revenue-producing purposes. If that were true, why did he and his party pass a law which they knew would make that deficiency even greater, and why does he—differing, perhaps, from his associates—say now that we need more revenue, and still, with his party associates, refuse to vote for the only possible measure which can produce more revenue?

Mr. LINDSAY. The Senator from Rhode Island shifted the point that I was attempting to make. I was not reading from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of 1892 to show that the act of 1890 would not yield revenue enough, but to rebut the theory of the other side that it was the incoming of the Democratic Administration which produced the raids upon the Treasury. This report shows that, owing to two Republican acts, raids had been going on two years before the Democratic President had been elected. I will again call the attention of the Senator to what Mr. Foster said:

One of the embarrassments to the Treasury, in the opinion of the Secretary, is the inability, with the limited amount of cash on hand——

Now, the election of Mr. Cleveland had nothing to do with that condition—

above the one-hundred-million reserve, to keep up a sufficient gold supply When the demand comes for the exportation of gold the Treasury is called upon to furnish it.

That is, the Treasury before the election of Mr. Cleveland. It was called upon to furnish this gold for exportation.

Mr. ALDRICH. But, if the Senator will allow me a moment, the table submitted by the Senator from Ohio shows that up to a time six months subsequent to that period the whole amount of gold taken from the Treasury to redeem United States notes had been only $38,000,000.

Mr. LINDSAY. Let me show you what the Secretary says about that:

If this demand—

This was about thirty days after the election—

If this demand should prove to be as large the coming year—

That is, the first year of Mr. Cleveland's Administration—

as it has been for the past two years—

Under Mr. Harrison's Administration—

gold in the Treasury would be diminished to or below the reserve line.

Mr. ALDRICH. But at the time the Secretary wrote that report the reserve was $110,000,000, and in order to reduce it to the amount of the reserve it would have been necessary to reduce the amount only $10,000,000.

Mr. LINDSAY. The question is not what the reserve then was, but whether the gold in the Treasury was being reduced by the enforced redemption of greenbacks, for purposes of exportation or for any other purpose.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator from Kentucky allow me just there?

Mr. LINDSAY. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. I have before me the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Foster, made in February, 1893, before the Committee on Ways and Means, in which I find a passage which bears upon the line of thought which the Senator from Kentucky is pursuing. In reply to a request for information in regard to the gold reserve, Secretary Foster says:

Seeing these things, the Secretary—

That is, himself—

felt that we should keep all the money we could in gold. About $25,000,000 was the limit he could pay for. He had no trouble to get gold if he had the money to get it with.

Mr. ALDRICH. Exactly.

Mr. GRAY. The Secretary proceeds:

Possibly, sometimes, when five or six or seven millions of requisitions would come in in a day, for which he would have to pay gold if all were paid in a day, I probably have suggested to Mr. MacLennan that he had better wait a day or two until we got in a better shape, because I did not want to pay out gold for current liabilities. I knew just as well as I was living that this thing was going to come, and I wanted to be as strong as I possibly could.

He was referring to a condition of things certainly antecedent to the election of 1892. He proceeds:

So you see in my report I made as good a statement as I could of our condition, and asked you to give the Treasury more money, so this gold reserve might be increased.

In another place he says, in reply to a question from Mr. PAYNE, what I shall read. Mr. PAYNE said:

You went on to a point where, if you continued the old statement—

That is, the old method of bookkeeping—

it would have showed a deficit, but you still had plenty of money in the Treasury for all needs?

Secretary FOSTER. Certainly.

That is, if he had kept the old method of bookkeeping he would have showed a deficit. He states in another place that that change in the method was by treating as available cash $54,000,000 of money that was kept as a redemption fund for the national-bank notes——

Mr. ALDRICH. That was done in accordance with a provision of an act of Congress; he was required to do that by the act of 1890.

Mr. GRAY. And extending $25,000,000 of the maturing Government obligations.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President, it is not to be supposed that Mr. Foster would have failed to make identically the same report in regard to the raids that had theretofore been made upon the Treasury if Mr. Harrison had been elected that he made after the election of Mr. Cleveland, and that is, that if this demand for gold should prove to be as large the coming year as it had been for the past two years the gold in the Treasury would be diminished below the reserve line.

My friend says I failed to read the next paragraph, which is a very important one.

Mr. ALDRICH. I wish the Senator would read it now.

Mr. LINDSAY. I will read it now:

As will be seen by the estimates submitted, the receipts of the current and the next fiscal year are not likely, if present conditions continue, to fall below expenditures.

Mr. ALDRICH. Go on.

Mr. LINDSAY. "Yet"—what?

Yet in view of the fact that the surplus for this year will be small, upon the basis stated, with the probability of a falling off in receipts for causes mentioned—

Not the election of Mr. Cleveland, not the change of control of the Government to the Democratic party, but for reasons that he had before mentioned—

with the probability of a falling off in receipts for causes mentioned, I think the revenues should be so increased as to enable the Treasury Department to maintain a gold reserve of not less than $125,000,000, and to maintain a comfortable working balance in the Treasury cash.

Which it is very clear was not then in the Treasury.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will allow me right there, in order to show that the Secretary of the Treasury did mean exactly the conditions I have alluded to, namely, the election of a Democratic President, I read from page 10 of his report:

The estimated receipts are based upon conditions prevailing prior to the late election. Public opinion having decreed a change of policy, particularly in the tariff laws, the altered conditions resulting therefrom render it impossible at the present time to estimate the annual income with any marked degree of accuracy, and it is impossible to predict the effect that such proposed radical changes would have upon the future revenues of the Government.

So the exact conditions to which I have referred were the conditions the Secretary of the Treasury had in mind in making the statement which the Senator has read.

Mr. LINDSAY. It has not been the history of tariff legislation in this country that to change a prohibitive tariff, such as the McKinley Act was in many respects, to a revenue-producing tariff would reduce the revenues of the Government. My friend says that the express purpose of the McKinley Act was to reduce the revenue. That was certainly the declared purpose of it, and every possible method known to human experience to reduce the

revenue had been resorted to. Under all the old tariff acts, revenue tariffs, low tariffs, had increased the revenues rather than diminished them. So that was not what Mr. Foster was looking forward to. He was looking forward to the operation of other and different causes than the reform of the tariff. He says on page 14 what I was about to read when I was interrupted:

As a general revision of our customs laws is now probable, I do not feel at liberty to suggest any special method for increasing the revenue, though I should otherwise think that an additional tax on whisky, which could be collected without additional cost, would furnish an easy method.

That is, if his own party had continued in power and he had felt authorized to give advice, he would have advised the increase of revenue in order to keep gold in the Treasury and in order to have a comfortable working balance after keeping up a gold reserve of $125,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. LINDSAY. The Senator can not take me off the floor.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I beg pardon; I thought the Senator from Kentucky was through.

Mr. LINDSAY. I will yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas moves that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 23, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 22, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE OF CAMPBELL VS. MINER.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Elections No. 2 to make a report in the contested-election case of Timothy J. Campbell against Henry C. Miner, from the Ninth Congressional district of the State of New York, and to say to the House that the committee desires its consideration at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana, chairman of the Committee on Elections No. 2, makes a privileged report, which the Clerk will read. Does the gentleman desire to have the report read for immediate action?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Yes, Mr. Speaker; that is the desire of the committee, and I ask that the report be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on Elections No. 2, to whom was referred the contested election case of Timothy J. Campbell against Henry C. Miner, from the Ninth Congressional district of the State of New York, respectfully report to the House that they have had said case under consideration and find the facts to be as follows:

The contestant was an independent candidate, and the contestee was the regular Democratic candidate, for Representative in Congress from said district at the regular election held therein on the 6th day of November, 1894.

The Republican candidate was John Simpson, and the Socialists and still another organization had candidates for the office. Soon after the election the State board of canvassers of the State of New York canvassed the vote of the district, and declared the contestee elected over the contestant by a plurality of 954 votes; and the secretary of state of said State issued to him a certificate of his election, and he now represents the district in the House. That, after this certificate was issued, the contestant served a notice of contest of the election upon the contestee, in which he alleged, as the sole grounds for the contest, the failure of the contestee to file the itemized statement of his expenditures in aid of his election, as required by the statute of New York, the casting of illegal votes at the election, and the bribery and intimidation of the voters by the contestee. To this notice the contestee served an answer in denial and made counter charges therein of the same character as the charges made against himself in the notice.

Subsequent to this testimony was taken in support of the contest; but no testimony whatever has ever been taken by the contestee; and neither party has filed a brief in the case.

Your committee report that they have carefully examined said evidence and fail to find anything therein which even tends to support any of the grounds of contest set forth in the notice, except the testimony of one witness. This witness swore that, on the day of the election, a Democrat named Benjamin, who was near one of the voting precincts in the district, proposed to him that if he would stay in a store there located he would pay him for his day's work, and that he gave him some money to give to other persons with which to buy votes for the Democratic ticket; that the witness gave to four or five persons $2 each of this money for the purpose of enabling them to purchase votes therewith, and that Benjamin gave to them the Democratic pasters, and that witness saw Benjamin give money and pasters to an indefinite number of other men during the day. It is not shown, however, that any of the men to whom money and pasters were so given either voted themselves or procured others to vote at said election; nor is it shown what was done by them with the money and pasters; nor does it anywhere appear in the evidence what number of precincts there were in the district; what vote was polled or returned at any precinct, or at what particular precinct the transaction testified to by this witness occurred.

While, therefore, the testimony of this witness raises a presumption that money was illegally used at this election to bribe the voters at one of the precincts, yet there is not sufficient evidence in the record to enable the committee to determine that it was actually so applied, or the extent to which it affected the result; and they are of the clear opinion that the contestant has wholly failed to establish any of the grounds of contest which were set out in his notice in the case.

Your committee further show that after the reference of this case to them, and before the final hearing of the same, the contestant moved the committee, under oath, for leave to reopen the case and to take further testimony therein to prove the matters alleged in his notice of contest, and also to prove that he had been regularly indorsed and nominated, before the election, as the candidate of the Republican party in said district, and that said Simpson had been induced to become a candidate for such nomination by contestee, but had not received the regular nomination of said party, and that when the question as to whose name should be printed on the Republican ticket as the candidate for Representative came before the board of police commissioners of the city of New York, the board being equally divided as to whether the name of Simpson or the name of Campbell should be placed thereon, Simpson, at the instigation of the contestee, applied for a mandamus before Judge McAdams, a judge of a court of record in said city, to compel said police commissioners to place his name upon the ticket as the Republican nominee, and that the court refused to give contestant a fair opportunity to be heard on such application and granted the mandamus; that thereupon the said board placed the name of Simpson on the ticket and, by reason of this, the said Simpson received at the election 5,214 votes, being the entire vote cast for him at said election, and which votes, the contestant alleges, would otherwise have been cast for him. That contestant was prevented from proving these facts while he was taking his testimony in the case by reason of his arrest upon certain proceedings for contempt which were instituted against him before said judge, on account of some things said by him while testifying in this contest in his own behalf, which arrest had interfered with his taking of testimony and scared and intimidated witnesses who, but for the institution of these proceedings, would have testified for him in the case; that said proceedings for contempt were kept hanging over him until long after his time of taking testimony had expired, and that one week of the time for taking testimony allowed to him by statute was lost to him through the misconduct of the contestee's attorneys. This motion of the contestant was resisted by the contestee, who filed his affidavit in opposition thereto.

Your committee show to the House that these facts, which the contestant asked leave to prove, were not stated and set forth as a ground of contest in his notice in the case. They also show that the testimony in the record utterly fails to disclose the truth of contestant's statement that he lost any time by the conduct of contestee's attorneys; but does clearly show that, without any just excuse or reason therefor, he permitted all but five days of the forty days' time allowed him by law in which to take his testimony in the case to expire before he took any evidence whatever; that he was not arrested for contempt until after the time for taking his testimony had expired and was not held in custody upon said charge except for a few moments, and that his witnesses were in no wise intimidated from testifying; all as is shown by his own evidence now on file in the case.

The committee, waiving the question as to whether the facts which contestant asked permission to prove would, if proven, constitute a valid ground of contest, declare that the testimony already taken by him shows that it is very doubtful whether he would be able to establish such facts even if the case were opened up for his benefit. Actuated in the matter by the considerations which have been submitted, the committee overruled the said motion of the contestant, and declined to permit him to take additional testimony.

The committee also report that on the final hearing of the case before them the contestant urged that the election law of New York, under which said election was held, was unconstitutional and void, for the reason that the provision requiring the candidate for Representative in Congress to be nominated for the office by a party convention or petitioned for by a certain per cent of the voters before his name can be placed upon the ticket to be voted for constitutes an abridgment of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, and is a denial by the State to persons within its jurisdiction of the equal protection of the laws as guaranteed in section 1 of Article XIV of the Federal Constitution. For this reason he insisted that the election was a nullity, and that the seat in controversy in this contest should be declared vacant.

This provision of the New York election law, whose unconstitutionality is urged, is a conspicuous feature of what is known as the Australian ballot system, which system has been in force in a number of States of the Union for a considerable period of time, and the constitutionality of this feature has never, to the knowledge of your committee, been questioned in the courts. It is to them incredible that it should have gone so long without having been challenged, if it is in contravention of the Constitution. If it is really open to this objection, a large per cent of the members now holding seats in this body are not entitled to retain the same. The committee themselves entertain no doubt of the constitutionality of the provision, but do not deem it advisable to prolong this report by giving the arguments in support of their views.

In view of the matters and things hereinbefore set forth, your committee in conclusion recommend to the House the adoption of the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That Timothy J. Campbell was not elected a Representative to the Fifty-fourth Congress for the Ninth Congressional district of the State of New York, and is not entitled to the seat.

"*Resolved*, That Henry C. Miner was elected a Representative to the Fifty-fourth Congress from the Ninth Congressional district of the State of New York, and that he is entitled to his seat."

The resolutions were agreed to.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolutions were agreed to was laid on the table.

SEAL FISHERIES OF ALASKA.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on a resolution of inquiry. The report is favorable.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to furnish the House of Representatives with a copy of the report of Henry W. Elliott, made pursuant to the order of special act approved April 5, 1890, on the condition of the fur-seal fisheries of Alaska, together with all maps and illustrations accompanying said report, as submitted by the author to the Secretary of the Treasury November 17, 1890.

The report (by Mr. PAYNE) is as follows:

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred House resolution No. 110, having duly considered the same, report: That the information sought by this resolution will be of great value to the House in its investigation of the line of the seal fisheries; and the committee recommend that the resolution pass without amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

SCHOOLS OF MINES.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up House bill No. 3558 and to substitute in lieu thereof a bill unanimously passed by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a Senate bill. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill (S. 790) to aid the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, and South Dakota to support schools of mines was read at length.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is that bill reported from the committee?

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Idaho to have the authorization of the committee to bring up this Senate bill——

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. I have, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. This being identical with the House bill reported from the committee?

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. I have that authority.

Mr. DINGLEY. I reserve the right to make a point of order on the bill.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. May we have some explanation from the gentleman, subject to the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The point of order can be reserved, if there be no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that this bill was considered by the Committee on Public Lands, when all the members of that committee were present; that it was considered for upward of an hour, and that committee unanimously instructed me to report the House bill favorably.

I am informed that a similar bill, in fact an identical bill, was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining erroneously, and that committee reported it favorably. I will say that the Senate has twice passed upon this bill favorably. The Senate Committee on Public Lands recommended it unanimously and the Senate passed it Monday. I have consulted the Commissioner of the General Land Office and he has no objection to the bill, and there is no objection from any quarter, so far as I know.

In explanation of the bill I will say that it is intended to aid in the establishment of schools of mines and mining where mining is practically conducted. The Philadelphia Public Ledger, an independent journal of high character, has indorsed this bill editorially. I will add further that the only place where mineralogy and metallurgy and kindred sciences can be scientifically and successfully taught is where mining is practically carried on. Had schools of the character contemplated by this bill been established in the past, our mineral resources would have been much more rapidly and largely developed than they are up to this time.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, is this a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. It is.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which involves an appropriation, and therefore it must be considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. It does not necessarily involve any appropriation.

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, certainly it does. It proposes to take one-fourth of the receipts from the sale of mineral lands and use the money for this purpose.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. The bill simply provides that 25 per cent of the receipts from sales of mineral lands shall be given for these schools; and also that a like amount shall be appropriated by the States in which the schools are located. It provides further that students from all the States shall be admitted to these schools on equal terms and conditions with students from the mining States, although the latter States will pay probably four-fifths of the amount required for the support of these schools.

Mr. AITKEN. Does this bill provide for aid to mining schools that are now maintained in States that have no Government mineral lands?

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. It provides for taking 25 per cent of the receipts from the sale of Government mineral lands for the support of these schools.

Mr. DINGLEY. The bill proposes to take 25 per cent of the receipts from the sale of mineral lands, which would otherwise go into the Treasury, and devote it to this purpose, and therefore it is a bill which must be first considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. POWERS. I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether the sciences of mineralogy and metallurgy are not taught by the agricultural colleges throughout the United States?

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. It may be that they are taught in some of the agricultural colleges, but not intelligently and scientifically, because they can not be taught in a thorough and practical way except where mining is actually conducted.

Mr. POWERS. Is there not an agricultural college in your State?

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. No.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I will say that in my State we have a mining school and also an agricultural college, but they are separate institutions.

Mr. POWERS. Why do you separate them?

Mr. PICKLER. The mining school is where mining is carried on practically.

Mr. POWERS. The very theory of the agricultural colleges is that they shall teach all these branches.

Mr. PICKLER. It may be that they do teach them in some States, but not in my State.

Mr. AITKEN. I wish the gentleman from Idaho would inform us what advantage this bill offers to States that have mining schools already established and are maintaining them, but that have no Government mineral lands for sale.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. We will admit their students on the same conditions as students from the mining States. You can not teach these sciences practically unless the students have an opportunity to go out and examine the mines and shafts and tunnels and all operations of mining.

Mr. AITKEN. The gentleman does not mean to say that there is no mining going on, except in States where there are Government mineral lands for sale?

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. There is practically no mining for the precious metals, except in the mineral-land States.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the consideration of this bill, provided it shall be considered first in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. AITKEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House go into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. That can be done only by unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. AITKEN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

REPORT OF MANAGERS OF SOLDIERS' HOMES.

Mr. STEELE called up for amendment the House concurrent resolution in relation to printing and binding the report of the managers of Soldiers' Homes, but at the suggestion of the Speaker consented that it should lie over until to-morrow.

INCLINE RAILWAY, WEST MOUNTAIN, HOT SPRINGS.

Mr. LITTLE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for the completion of an incline railway upon the West Mountain of the Hot Springs Reservation as provided by act of Congress approved December 21, 1893, is hereby extended for the term of three years from and after the passage of this act.

SEC. 2. That said act is hereby continued in full force and effect.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LITTLE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved and signed bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 4241) for improving Aransas Pass; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 25) to extend the time for making the assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate bills were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A bill (S. 790) to aid the public-land States to support schools of mines—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (S. 879) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1230) to extend the limits of the port of entry of New Orleans—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A bill (S. 1547) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United

States court in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT CHICAGO.

Mr. LORIMER. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for consideration at this time the joint resolution (S. R. 50) authorizing the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for the public building at Chicago, Ill. This resolution was passed by the Senate on last Monday.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That in addition to the amount authorized to be expended for the temporary employment of draftsmen and skilled service in the preparation of plans and specifications for the public building at Chicago, Ill., as provided in the sundry civil appropriation act approved March 3, 1895, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, out of the appropriation heretofore made, a sum not exceeding $25,000 for the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for said building.

Mr. DOCKERY. Reserving the right to object, I trust we shall have some explanation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER] will be permitted to explain.

Mr. LORIMER. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I called, with other members of this House, upon the Secretary of the Treasury and asked him to take up immediately the work of constructing the new public building at Chicago. He said that he had not yet received a sufficient appropriation to employ a skilled architect and other skilled labor to do the work of drawing the plans and specifications. He suggested that he draft a resolution to carry out that object, and send it to the Senate; which he did on the 9th of this month. As I have stated, that resolution was passed by the Senate on last Monday; and I hope there will be no objection now to concurrence in it by the House.

This House passed a year ago a bill authorizing the construction of a public building at Chicago, and appropriating $300,000 for the purpose of building a temporary post-office. By the same bill authority was given that $80,000 be used for architect services. When the bill reached the Senate it was so amended that only $30,000 was appropriated for such services, and the bill in that shape was concurred in by the House. Since that time the Secretary of the Treasury has discovered that it is impossible to have the work of drawing the plans for that building done properly for $30,000, and he now states that, in his opinion, $25,000 additional will give him a sufficient amount of money to proceed with the work.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LORIMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. COX. The gentleman's proposition is to increase the amount for the architect?

Mr. LORIMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman state how much of the increased appropriation which he now asks is to be paid to the architect?

Mr. LORIMER. It all comes out of the appropriation already made.

Mr. COX. I understand that; but if this bill should be passed how much will be appropriated to pay the architect for drawing the plans?

Mr. LORIMER. Fifty-five thousand dollars to do all the work.

Mr. COX. And the gentleman stated in his remarks, as we understood, that the $300,000 heretofore appropriated is only for a temporary post-office in Chicago.

Mr. LORIMER. This is to pay for the services of the architect.

Mr. DOCKERY. I observe that this bill refers to an appropriation made in the sundry civil act of last year. I was not a member of the subcommittee which prepared that bill, and I do not now recall the exact amount of the appropriation for this purpose or the terms on which it was made, but as I catch the reading of this bill, it makes an additional appropriation for a special architect.

Mr. SAYERS. Not at all.

Mr. LORIMER. This is to be taken out of the appropriation already made.

Mr. SAYERS. This bill proposes merely to give the Secretary of the Treasury authority to use for this purpose $25,000 out of the appropriation made at the last session of the last Congress for the construction of a public building in the city of Chicago.

Mr. LORIMER. That is the idea.

Mr. HENDERSON. And it does not increase the appropriation, as I understand it, one dollar.

Mr. LORIMER. Not a dollar.

Mr. SAYERS. It does not increase the appropriation because there is a limit fixed on the cost of the building, and there was a certain amount of the appropriation heretofore made which was allowed to be used for this purpose.

Mr. LORIMER. Yes, of the $300,000.

Mr. SAYERS. That was appropriated for the purpose indicated.

Mr. LORIMER. Yes; for the purpose of constructing a temporary building, and to pay the architect for the preparation of the plans.

Mr. CANNON. If I understand my colleague's proposition, it is this: It is believed that the authorization of $25,000 to an outside architect will not only beget haste where a building is so much needed, but it will be economy as well.

Mr. LORIMER. Undoubtedly; and the Secretary of the Treasury states that he can not go on with the work until this additional amount of the money heretofore appropriated is set aside for this special purpose.

Mr. DINGLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question for information. As I understand the matter, an appropriation of $300,000 was made as a beginning for the construction of the post-office building in the city of Chicago——

Mr. LORIMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY (continuing). But, of course, it is expected that the appropriations for this purpose will go on from time to time, and that the building will finally cost between four and five million dollars?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes; undoubtedly.

Mr. DINGLEY. And authority was given to use $30,000 of that sum for the preparation of plans, etc.?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; $55,000.

Mr. COX. There was thirty thousand to start with, I think.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And it is proposed to increase it now to $55,000.

A MEMBER. Let us have the bill read; perhaps that will settle the matter.

Mr. DINGLEY. Let me proceed for a moment. Thirty thousand dollars of the appropriation was set aside for the purpose of securing the services of architects, and now it is proposed to increase this allowance $25,000 more for the same purpose—that is, for the preparation of plans and specifications and the superintendence of the building—making a total of $55,000 in all to be taken from the original appropriation. But, gentlemen, we must not lose sight of the fact that whatever increase is made here, the cost of the building will be just that much more in the end, and that we are, undoubtedly, if we take any portion of this appropriation already made for the purpose indicated, simply increasing the total cost to that extent.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You are right about that.

Mr. DINGLEY. But the only point that I wish to draw the attention of the House to—for I am in harmony with the construction of this building—is that it was thought originally that $30,000 was a sufficient sum for the preparation of the plans. It is now thought necessary to set aside $25,000 additional—making $55,000 in all—for the same purpose. Now, what I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois is this: Is it possible that the mere preparation of the plans of the building is to cost $55,000?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is the preparation of the plans simply?

A MEMBER. No; it includes superintendence.

Mr. DINGLEY. I understand the language is the preparation of plans only. I have not examined the bill.

Mr. COX. The amount sought to be appropriated here would go to the architect.

Mr. DINGLEY. For the preparation of the plans——

Mr. LORIMER. And for the superintendence of the construction.

Mr. CANNON. If my colleague would allow me——

Mr. MILNES. The appropriation is simply to assist the Government Architect.

Mr. CANNON (continuing). As I understand it, and my colleague can correct me if I am wrong, the $55,000 means something more than the bare preparation of the plans.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is exactly what I am trying to find out.

Mr. CANNON. Am I not correct?

Mr. LORIMER. Undoubtedly. It means that the assistant architect shall follow up the work and supervise the construction of the building.

Mr. MILNES. Let us have the bill read. That is the best way.

Mr. LORIMER. I desire to say that $55,000 is a very small amount of money to pay for the preparation of plans, investigation of materials, and the supervision of a building which is to cost $4,000,000.

Mr. SAYERS. If the gentleman will allow me a moment before proceeding, I would like to read the exact language of the sundry civil appropriation act which was approved on the 2d of March, 1895, bearing upon this subject. It provides:

In pursuance of the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the erection of a Government building at Chicago, Ill.," approved February 28, 1895, the sum of $300,000 is hereby appropriated for the commencement and continuation of the building, of which amount the sum of $30,000 is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of the Treasury to employ tem-

porarily draftsmen and skilled service which may be necessary in the preparation of plans and specifications for the said building, this amount to be exclusive of any moneys that he may be authorized to expend for the services of engineers, draftsmen, and other persons employed in the preparation of plans and specifications for any other public buildings.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is only for the preparation of plans?

Mr. SAYERS. That is all.

Mr. DINGLEY. And this bill is only for the preparation of plans.

Mr. LORIMER. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury says that with the amount of work on hand, and because of the size of the building, and the amount of money to be expended on this public building in Chicago, it will be necessary to employ an assistant architect, and that with the money which he has on hand, $30,000, he can not proceed with the work.

I was about to say that $55,000 is a very small amount of money to employ an architect to do the work that an architect is supposed to do in the construction of a building the cost of which will be $4,000,000. There is not a concern in this country that would undertake the construction of a building of that magnitude for less than 5 per cent, which would amount in all to about $200,000. The doing of this work for $55,000 means that the work of supervising and drawing the plans of this building will cost the Government about 1⅜ per cent.

Mr. LOUD. But I should like to suggest to the gentleman that the architect would also supervise the construction of the building, which in this case the Government will provide for at an expense of several thousand dollars.

Mr. LORIMER. The architect who is to be employed under this resolution will supervise the construction of the building.

Mr. LOUD. But, as I understand, he will be paid an additional salary. There will be two inspectors.

Mr. LORIMER. We have a Supervising Architect, and the architect that this money will employ will look exclusively after the construction of the Chicago building.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman permit me a question? Is it true that the new building is to be erected upon the same ground upon which the old building stands?

Mr. LORIMER. On the same ground; yes.

Mr. SAYERS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will say that from the experience the Government has had with reference to the construction of the old building upon this particular piece of ground I do not believe that this House could do a wiser thing than to pass this bill or to so amend it that the Supervising Architect shall have the very best assistance that can be obtained in order to personally superintend the beginning of the construction of this building. There is very great danger that if the foundation of the building is not properly constructed there will be a sinking at one part of the building, so as to bring about in the course of time a necessity for large expenditures for repairs, which will cost the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars. Now, this is to be a very large building. The Government will expend $4,000,000 or more for its completion, and I regard it as of the very greatest importance that the Supervising Architect of the Treasury shall have the very best assistance in superintending the construction of the foundation.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman allow me to add right there that I concur with every statement that has been made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] as to the necessity of employing a competent architect? But as I understand the original bill and supplemental bill which is now pending, with the point of order reserved, this provides $55,000 for the simple preparation of plans.

Mr. HENDERSON. And specifications.

Mr. DOCKERY. Plans only, and I should like the gentleman to give us the items of that estimate, because this House can not act intelligently until we have the items of that estimate of $55,000. What amount of the $55,000 is to go to the payment of the salary of an architect?

I want to say further that I am in sympathy with the proposition to secure outside skilled service for the preparation of these plans, and while that is true, it is not necessary to absolutely ravish this $4,000,000 appropriation for the benefit of some architect who may be employed in this connection. As I remember it, with the enormous expenditures which were made for the construction of public buildings at the World's Fair, we only paid $10,000 for the plan of any building submitted by an architect. The association employed some of the most skillful architects in the United States, but the highest price ever paid to any of them for the preparation of plans for any of these buildings was $10,000. In all, I think, we paid $100,000 perhaps for the plans for ten buildings. Now, I think the House is agreed that we want to expedite the preparation of these plans and the construction of this building, but we do not want concealed in this appropriation of $55,000 a magnificent bonus to some architect, which is not necessary to secure the safety of the building or its architectural appearance.

Mr. SAYERS. If the gentleman will allow me, upon the line of the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri, I would suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that after the word "Illinois," in line 6, he insert the words "and for the supervision of its construction."

Mr. DOCKERY. I would be content to compromise on that, if we can get the plans and supervision of the building for that sum of money; but I apprehend that the gentlemen representing the city of Chicago would not consent to that, or somewhere along the line there will be an objection.

Mr. LORIMER. I will accept that amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that we can not hear a word of what is being said.

The SPEAKER. It is impossible for the Chair to hear.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer this amendment——

Mr. RICHARDSON. Has consent been given to the consideration of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent has not been given. This debate has been proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I desired to hear what my distinguished and economical friend said on this matter. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. You want to hear from me? [Laughter.]

Mr. SAYERS. After a while. I have the floor. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor; but the Chair is not quite sure that anybody has the floor. The question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRISP. We would like to hear something about it. I would like to ask the gentleman if this bill has been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House?

Mr. LORIMER. This resolution has not.

Mr. CRISP. This seems to be a very important measure to be considered without a report.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that I have some little knowledge touching this matter. This joint resolution has passed the Senate, and its importance is such that my colleague is justified in asking the House to consider this Senate resolution; and I feel quite sure, with the amendment which my colleague stands ready to accept, to be offered by the gentleman from Texas, who is entirely familiar with this matter, that the Government will be amply protected; and I want to ask the gentleman from Georgia, with that statement, if he can not see his way clear to let the matter be considered by the House at this time, with such an amendment to be offered?

Mr. CRISP. I only want to understand what it is. I have not heard one single suggestion that has been made over there. It has been a private conversation between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], and gentlemen on that side, and I could not hear it, except to know that it is a proposition (I gathered that much) to pay $50,000 or $60,000 to an architect in Chicago.

The SPEAKER. If the House would consent to be in order something better might be done.

Mr. CRISP. I have no objection to its consideration if we can go into Committee of the Whole, where it ought to go, and where we can have some explanation.

Mr. HENDERSON and other members. That is right.

Mr. CRISP. That would not delay it more than a moment.

Mr. LORIMER. Then I ask unanimous consent that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the joint resolution (S. R. 50) authorizing the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in perfecting designs, plans, and specifications for a public building at Chicago, Ill.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of asking should not this have first gone to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds?

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent is asked to go into Committee of the Whole. By unanimous consent the House can do almost anything. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider joint resolution S. R. 50, which has been reported to the House. The first thing in order will be to report the resolution.

The resolution was again reported.

Mr. LORIMER. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with all general debate, and that the bill be taken up by sections under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that general debate be considered as closed, and that the bill be read by paragraphs for amendment.

Mr. CRISP. I want to have some explanation of the bill. That is what we went into committee for.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. CRISP. The Hall is very large, and gentlemen will have to elevate their voices so as to be heard.

Mr. LOUD. We ought to have some copies of this resolution so as to know what we are passing upon.

Mr. LORIMER. Mr. Chairman, some time ago certain of the members of this House called upon the Secretary of the Treasury and asked him if the work of drafting the plans and specifications for the public building at Chicago had been begun. He made the statement to the members who waited upon him that he had not yet money enough to do that work, and he would not begin the work until a sufficient sum of money had been set aside from the appropriation already made to complete the work. He agreed to draw a resolution, which he did. He sent it to the Senate on the 9th of January, and this resolution that we are now considering was drafted by the Secretary of the Treasury. It passed the Senate on Monday last.

Now, I want to say that $30,000 has been already set aside out of the $300,000 appropriated last year, and the Secretary says that that amount is just sufficient to do the work of preparing the plans for the building, and that he will not have enough left out of the $30,000 to do any other work on the building. He stated further that the Supervising Architect had so much work to do that it would be impossible for him to look after the construction of so large a building and give it the time and attention that would be required during the three or four years that would be occupied in completing the building; and for that reason he said he wanted about $25,000 more set apart out of the appropriation for the purpose of employing an architect to assist in making the plans and specifications and to supervise the construction.

Mr. PICKLER. As I understand, this appropriation is for the purpose of paying an assistant supervising architect?

Mr. LORIMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PICKLER. Now, will this appropriation pay for the services of this assistant architect as long as they will be needed to complete the building?

Mr. LORIMER. The Secretary of the Treasury said he thought that $25,000 would be the limit of the amount he would require for that purpose in order to complete the building—$25,000 in addition to the $30,000 already set aside.

Mr. LOUD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois what is the special necessity of bringing this matter before the House at this time, when there are many similar cases throughout the country, notably one in my own city, where a post-office building was provided for by an appropriation four years ago. In the city of Philadelphia, also, a mint building was provided for five or six years ago, and provision was likewise made for other public buildings in other places; all of which buildings are in practically the same situation as this proposed public building in Chicago. The same story is told to gentlemen who urge the construction of those buildings that is told to the gentleman from Chicago, namely, that there is not sufficient force in the Department to prepare the plans. Now, if this subject is to be dealt with here at this time, why should not all the other buildings be included in the proposition as well as the Chicago building? I know that I have been urged for several years to give way to Chicago, and have been assured that Chicago would help us in return, but when it comes to helping us, Chicago does not respond. [Laughter.]

Mr. LORIMER. Mr. Chairman, when the appropriation of $300,000 was made the construction of a temporary post-office in Chicago was immediately begun. That building is completed, but I want to call attention to the fact that the Government building proposed to be erected at Chicago is intended not alone for post-office purposes. The offices of the collector of internal revenue, of the collector of the port, of the subtreasurer of the United States, and of the local pension bureau are all to be located in that building. At present the Government is at an expense for the rent of quarters to accommodate these different Government offices amounting each year to more money than what is asked for here by the Secretary of the Treasury to pay for the services of an assistant architect.

Mr. MILES. As I understand the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, the total appropriation which it is proposed to make for architectural designing for this building is $55,000. Is that right?

Mr. LORIMER. That is right.

Mr. MILES. What percentage is that of the total cost of the building?

Mr. LORIMER. One and three-eighths per cent.

Mr. MILES. That is for designing alone, I understand.

Mr. LORIMER. For designing, for preparing the specifications, and for superintending the construction of the building.

Mr. MILES. That amount is for the preparation of the plans, etc., but it does not include any money for the actual supervision of the building.

Mr. SAYERS. I will say to the gentleman from Maryland that the gentleman from Illinois has agreed that I shall offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. MILES. Very well.

Mr. LORIMER. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury states that he can not proceed with the work on the Chicago building until a sufficient amount of money has been set aside for the particular purpose provided for in this resolution. As I have already said, the Government is now at an expense of at least $25,000 a year for the rent of offices in different office buildings in Chicago, and one year's delay in the construction of this public building will cost more than the amount now asked for by the Secretary. Another disadvantage of the present situation is that the people of Chicago who desire to do business with the Treasury Department, with the collector of internal revenue, and with the Post-Office Department are compelled now to go to three different sections of the city, whereas they could just as well and as easily do their business in one place if this building were completed. It is clear, therefore, that there is no economy in delaying the completion of this work. On the other hand, it will cost the Government every year that the work is delayed at least $25,000 for the hire of offices.

Mr. MILLIKEN. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit me, I desire to say that I went to the Supervising Architect myself, near the close of the last session of the last Congress, and asked him why the buildings that had been appropriated for during the Fifty-first Congress had not yet been constructed, or even the plans for them prepared. In reply he stated that he had not sufficient force in his office to make the plans or to begin the construction of those buildings. Now, the complaint which the gentleman from Illinois makes in regard to the Chicago building is the general complaint in regard to all the buildings that were appropriated for in that Congress. The appropriations were nearly all made at that time. No appropriations for public buildings have since been made, except four or five at the close of the last Congress. Now, Mr. Chairman, in one way or another, either as the gentleman from Illinois is proceeding or in some other way, there must be some change made in that Department, so that the work already provided for shall go on. The money must be appropriated in some way, so that when a building has been authorized by Congress and the appropriation for it has been made the work of construction shall at least begin. Now, I do not think it right that when money has been appropriated for public buildings so far back as the Fifty-first Congress, not even a plan has, in some cases, yet been made. Such was not the design of these appropriations. The purpose was that the work on these buildings should be commenced and their construction completed within a reasonable time.

Now, in this way or in some other way, appropriations of money for the making of these plans will have to be provided for. For my part I think it necessary that there should be a thorough overhauling of the office of the Supervising Architect. Gentlemen know how that office has grown up. There never was any law originally creating it as it now exists. It grew up as the result merely of a custom or practice. I believe the fact to be as claimed here—for such is the best information I can get from the Supervising Architect—that either he must have money for making these plans or he can not start this building.

Mr. DOCKERY. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER] whether he has a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury or the Supervising Architect approving this proposition?

Mr. LORIMER. The letter for which the gentleman inquires went to Senator CULLOM.

Mr. DOCKERY. Is there a letter indorsing this bill?

Mr. LORIMER. There is not only a letter in existence indorsing this bill, but this bill was drawn by the Secretary of the Treasury himself.

Mr. DOCKERY. Is the letter in the RECORD this morning?

Mr. LORIMER. I do not know that it is.

Mr. CANNON. When did the bill pass the Senate?

Mr. LORIMER. On last Monday. I repeat that this resolution was drafted by the Secretary of the Treasury himself.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from Illinois is looking for the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, I wish to submit one or two remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER] yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY]?

Mr. DOCKERY. I understand that he does.

I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that this House desires to appropriate whatever sum may be necessary and proper for the preparation of plans and specifications. I am also persuaded that, whether or not it is carried in this bill by way of amendment, there will be appropriated now or hereafter a sufficient amount for supervision of the construction of the building. Now, in order that we may intelligently consider this bill, with the amendment which the gentleman from Illinois has agreed to accept, we ought to have the items of both estimates. The gentleman from

Illinois [Mr CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who advocates this proposition, knows the practice which has obtained heretofore in considering appropriations, especially appropriations that do not come before the House with the sanction of any committee, which have not even been considered by a committee. He knows that in such cases we ought to have from some authoritative official source the items of the estimate.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER] has already agreed to accept the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Texas authorizing the expenditure of this appropriation and the $30,000 heretofore appropriated, not only for the preparation of plans and specifications, but also for the supervision of the construction of the building. The gentleman having agreed to accept that amendment, it goes without saying that in his judgment $55,000 will be a sufficient sum for the preparation of plans and specifications and also to pay for the supervision and construction of the building. Now, I do not believe that any gentleman on this floor will claim that $55,000 is sufficient to cover both the preparation of the plans and specifications and also the supervision of the construction of the building from start to finish. Yet the gentleman in charge of this bill has agreed to accept an amendment which will limit the cost of all this work to the sum of $55,000. Now, then, we ought to deal fairly with ourselves and fairly with this great interest at Chicago. We ought to give enough money for the preparation of the plans and specifications, and there should also be provided hereafter a sufficient sum to pay for the supervision of the construction of the building. But this House ought not to be misled on this question by the acceptance of the amendment to which I have referred. I apprehend that the result of the matter will be that the $55,000 will all be expended for the preparation of the plans and specifications.

The question now becomes material, what is the correct and necessary amount to be appropriated for the preparation of plans and specifications? So far as it appears from any evidence yet submitted on this floor during the course of the debate, there is not a line or a word or a syllable or a figure tending to enlighten this Committee of the Whole on that question. Now, this bill ought not to be rushed pellmell through this House before such information has been furnished. We all want to do what is right in respect to this matter; but these able advocates of the interests of the city of Chicago—not any more zealous than some of the rest of us—ought at least to give us the items of the estimates of this appropriation. So far as I am concerned, I shall not be misled by the acceptance of the amendment providing that the $55,000 shall also cover the expense of the supervision of the construction. No one, I imagine, believes that this sum will be sufficient for both purposes. At all events, Mr. Chairman, that is not the issue here. The question is, what is necessary to prepare the plans and specifications; and in determining that question I ask gentlemen who represent Chicago to state to the House frankly what sum it is proposed to give to the architect and assistant architects who are to prepare these plans. If those estimates aggregate $55,000, and if they are reasonable estimates, I shall cheerfully support the bill now pending. But until such information is secured, I do not believe this House ought to be asked either to approve or to disapprove the pending proposition.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman from Missouri, before taking his seat, permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. If I can have the consent of the gentleman from Illinois, who is entitled to the floor, I will do so.

Mr. COX. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to the language of the bill. It is as follows:

> That in addition to the amount authorized to be expended for the temporary employment of draftsmen and skilled service in the preparation of plans and specifications for the public building at Chicago, Ill., as provided in the sundry civil appropriation act approved March 3, 1895, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, out of the appropriation heretofore made, a sum not exceeding $25,000 for the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for said building.

Now, an appropriation of $30,000 was made for that purpose heretofore. This bill is to permit the employment of another man, as an assistant, at $25,000 more. I want to know what the original supervising architect is going to do when we supplement him, as we propose now to do, with an assistant?

Mr. DOCKERY. Well, I have no further information than that which is carried in the bill. I will say to the gentleman that I have been a diligent inquirer after the truth, but have not secured any yet.

Mr. LORIMER. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Missouri has said, $55,000 is a very small amount of money to prepare the plans and to supervise the construction of this building, which is to cost ultimately $4,000,000 or over. I agree that it is a very small amount. I know something of building, and have had some experience in that line myself, and I know that there is not a firm in the city of Chicago who would undertake the construction of this building at less than perhaps 5 per cent.

Mr. MILES. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question right there favorable to the proposition?

Mr. LORIMER. Certainly.

Mr. MILES. Is there not in this country an association which includes all of the reputable architects?

Mr. LORIMER. There is.

Mr. MILES. Have they not a fixed rate of percentage upon the cost of buildings?

Mr. LORIMER. I think so.

Mr. MILES. Is that not 3½ per cent when it includes also supervision?

Mr. LORIMER. I am not so sure. I had the impression that 5 per cent was the amount.

Mr. MILES. I mean including the supervision. Does it not amount to 3½ per cent on the total cost?

Mr. LORIMER. I can not state the exact amount.

Mr. MILES. You have said that the cost of preparing the plans and supervising this building is less than 2 per cent?

Mr. LORIMER. Yes; 1⅞ per cent.

Mr. MILES. And does the gentleman hope to have the designs prepared, and the specifications, and the supervision of this building done at such a rate per cent upon the whole cost? I do not think you can.

Mr. LORIMER. I was about to say that I considered it a very small amount for the work; but the Secretary of the Treasury stated to me that he thought $30,000 would pay for the drawing of the plans.

Mr. COX. Just at that point let me ask the gentleman if he has a letter or written statement of any kind from the Secretary of the Treasury to that effect?

Mr. LORIMER. No; I have not. But I will state now what the Secretary of the Treasury stated to me. He said that $30,000 would pay for the drawing of the plans, and that he thought $25,000 would pay, or about that sum, for the services of the assistant architect. Now, if $30,000 will pay for the drawing of the plans, and it takes three or four years to construct the building, then this assistant will be paid at the rate of about five or six thousand dollars a year for assisting in the work, and probably you can find a competent architect in this country who would be willing to work for that sum. If that be true, then preparing the plans and superintending the structure can be done, according to the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the amount of $55,000, which is asked.

In addition to that, if the architect is not employed, and the Secretary of the Treasury is not authorized to employ an architect, then they can not begin the construction of the building, and every year that the construction of that building is delayed will cost this Government $25,000, or perhaps more than that, in money; so that just one year of delay is throwing away $25,000 or more in Chicago.

I can see no objection to taking up the resolution and passing it, and giving to the people of Chicago that which they so much need at the present time.

Mr. ATWOOD. Will the gentleman inform me how much this building is to cost in all?

Mr. LORIMER. Four millions of dollars.

Mr. ATWOOD. Is that the amount fixed by law?

Mr. LORIMER. It is.

Mr. ATWOOD. And it can not be exceeded?

Mr. LORIMER. Not unless the law is changed.

Mr. ATWOOD. Then, in my judgment, $55,000 will not be enough, nor more than a quarter enough. You will have to come back to Congress three or four times for the same amount of money that is appropriated in this resolution.

Mr. LORIMER. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury is the person who is in charge of the affair. He is the man to whom we have to look for the construction of this building. If he says that $55,000 is sufficient for this purpose, then we ought to be satisfied with that.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask the gentleman from Illinois to yield to me.

Mr. LORIMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS].

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, if I can get the attention of the committee, I desire to submit a few remarks in reference to the pending resolution. My judgment is, from the experience of the office of the Supervising Architect in employing superintendents of buildings during their construction, that the $25,000 additional will be sufficient for architectural supervision. Allowing the building to be completed within four years, $25,000 will make a salary of something over $6,000 a year, and I venture the assertion that the Secretary of the Treasury can advertise or send out notices that he desires to employ a competent person for the architectural supervision of this building for four years and that he will get fully one thousand letters from competent architects who will be willing to undertake it for $25,000, provided its completion is not delayed longer than four years. I think the appropriation

is large enough, and I also think the expenditure upon this building for plans and specifications and for architectural supervision should be limited to $55,000. I do not think it ought to exceed that amount. At the same time the party employed in giving this architectural supervision should be amply paid—about $6,000 a year.

Before I sit down I will say further that there is a prime necessity for the immediate construction of this building. As I understand, the old building has been torn down or is about to be torn down, and the Government has been compelled to construct temporary buildings upon some vacant lots in the city. The buildings constructed upon these vacant lots will not be sufficient to meet the demands of the courts that sit month after month in the city of Chicago, not to speak of other branches of the Government service. It will cost the Government $28,000 a year, if I remember correctly, to rent rooms for judicial purposes in that city, and unless this building is undertaken at once and brought to completion as rapidly as practicable, considering the size and character of the building, we shall spend five times or ten times this amount in rent that we could avoid if we proceeded with its immediate construction.

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman from Texas know that it would be impossible, in advance of the performance of at least two-thirds of the work of the architect, to give to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] the categorical information that he requires before he will support this bill? I should like the judgment of the gentleman from Texas on that point. The gentleman from Missouri insists on a lot of information which he ought to know, as a practical man, could not possibly be given to him at this time.

Mr. SAYERS. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that all the committee desires to know is what will be the reasonable length of time within which this building will be completed. If it shall be completed within four years, then if this bill shall become a law, we shall have $25,000 with which to pay for architectural supervision. I understand from the gentleman from Illinois who has this resolution in charge that the $30,000 heretofore appropriated has been sufficient for the preparation of plans and specifications?

Mr. LORIMER. That is the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SAYERS. And all that is necessary now is to have an additional appropriation for the architectural supervision?

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, no.

Mr. SAYERS. That is what I understood the gentleman from Illinois to say.

Mr. LORIMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the gentleman from Texas, I will say that as I understand, the experience of the United States in the construction of a great public building in Chicago has not been an agreeable one. Somewhere from $5,000,000 to $6,000,000 in the last twenty-odd years has been expended for a post-office and custom-house in Chicago upon the square fronting the Grand Pacific Hotel. Most gentlemen here know the location.

That building was a flat failure. It is dangerous to life. It is not suited to the purposes for which it was erected; and although it has been occupied during these years, for repairs and otherwise it has been wonderfully expensive, and it is a burden now, because it costs something to get rid of it. Now, then, with the great increase in population in the city of Chicago, which we can not promote much, and which nothing seems to be able to stop, with its 2,000,000 of people——

Mr. QUIGG. How many?

Mr. CANNON. Sitting in the gateway of the commerce of the great West, the whole Northwest, as well as the East, are interested in sufficient quarters in the city of Chicago to enable the officials of the Government to properly transact the public business; and it has become an absolute necessity that this building should be removed and something put in its place. Gentlemen understand something about the ground and its formation at Chicago; the great difficulty in getting foundations; how these difficulties have been overcome, practically, by that enterprising people; how the architects and builders have been equal to the occasion; and in the light of their experience how these great buildings, 20 stories high, have been constructed, and safely constructed.

This building is authorized to cost $4,000,000, to be completed in four years. We have put up a temporary building on the Lake Front to house the post-office. The courts of the United States are in the Monadnock Building; the other Federal offices are moving over into the McNally Building—just moving in. We made an appropriation on yesterday, practically, of $35,000 for the furniture and authorizing its movement out of the public building and temporarily having it adjusted to the McNally Building. The rents are simply enormous. It is desirable to do this building rapidly, and to do it well. Now, then, for the plans and specifications—that is, where it is done upon the scale down here in the Supervising Architect's Office, working by the day and the month, and where the draftsmen are upon salaries—for the material alone in drafting these specifications and making these plans, like unto those made for the building to be torn down, and under the same system, $30,000 is an exceedingly low estimate to cover the cost.

Now, then, public sentiment in Chicago and throughout the Northwest, if not the whole country, demands that in this instance at least—and I believe it would be a wise precedent to make as to all public buildings—that there be a new departure, namely, that the local talent, that the best skill, under the plans of which the city has been builded, and safely builded, should be utilized on the plans for this four-million-dollar public building. This $25,000 that is proposed to be made available out of money already appropriated will enable the Secretary of the Treasury to go into the open market and get the best talent and best skill, that has been educated through the years that have passed in the construction of great buildings in Chicago, to bring their plans; and, with this appropriation, secure those plans; and so at a total of $55,000 to make complete specifications to build this building from the foundation to the cupola, if there is to be a cupola. That is, all the architectural work, including the plans, specifications, and drawings, is to be paid for out of this $55,000 appropriation.

Gentlemen may ask, do I understand $55,000 will be sufficient to pay the man who draws the plans and specifications, who creates this building, if you choose, upon paper, to stand over this building for the four years while it is being constructed, and to see that the material is inspected and the contract complied with in the construction? I answer no; I do not so understand. Public buildings are not erected in that way. There are superintendents of the building, men sufficiently skilled in plans and specifications, who inspect the materials and see from hour to hour and from day to day, from foundation to cupola, that the construction complies with the creation that is first made in the brain of the architect and wrought out with the aid of the draftsmen.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Is it not true that Chicago is the great distributing post-office for the whole Northwest?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes. The crying necessity for this work, and at once, is very great. I want to be frank with the House. As I understand it, $25,000 will utilize the best talent in Chicago and throughout the country that is skilled in putting up buildings in that locality, and for the want of the utilization of which $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 was worse than thrown away in the great pile that is now to be torn down before we can commence this construction.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKEN. How long does the gentleman think it would have taken the Government of the United States, proceeding by its usual processes, to have erected the buildings that were erected by the Chicago people for the World's Fair?

Mr. CANNON. Ask me something easy, my friend. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. Well, I asked the same question of my colleague, Mr. BOUTELLE, when I met him there, and he said he thought that if the Government had begun at the time Columbus discovered America and had been diligent, it would have got about two-thirds through by the time of the World's Fair.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Illinois to admit frankly, as is his usual habit, that $55,000 would not be sufficient to prepare the plans and specifications and also to supervise the construction?

Mr. CANNON. I think it would not.

Mr. MILES. When the gentleman speaks of "supervision" he limits it to what is called architectural supervision, and does not include such supervision as a superintendent of buildings would give?

Mr. CANNON. That is correct. I think this bill covers the ground. The Secretary of the Treasury has control of the expenditure of the money. If the expenditure of this $25,000 is authorized, the Secretary goes out into the open market and employs the best skill in the country to make a plan and prepare specifications for this great building. In my judgment that is necessary, and therefore I am for the appropriation.

In conclusion, let me call attention to what I understand to be perhaps the most magnificent public building on earth, the one that is just approaching completion here, our great Library building. That was not planned under the ordinary rules which control the designing of public libraries. The design was paid for by appropriation, and, while perhaps the building is not constructed entirely in accordance with the first plan, I am sure there is no one of us that has seen it grow month by month and year by year who is not glad that Congress took that departure in procuring the plan for that great building. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate joint resolution without amendment may pass, because the

sooner it passes the sooner we shall get at this work and get at it properly, and the sooner we shall get rid of the burden we are bearing in the form of rent paid in imperfect quarters in the great city of Chicago for housing the Government officers in inconvenient quarters there. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken I wish to say a few words about this method of considering a proposition of this kind. I may premise by saying that I am not opposed to the erection of this public building at Chicago. I favored it at the last session of Congress because I had looked into the question and knew the necessity for it. Of course, I might have prevented the consideration of this joint resolution at this time by making an objection, but I was willing that the House should go into Committee of the Whole to have it explained, so that members might understand the case fully.

There has been some explanation, but I submit that it has not been that character of explanation upon which this committee or the House ought to act on an important business proposition of this kind. In the first place, we spend about $200,000 a year to maintain the Supervising Architect with his assistants and surroundings, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] who has been here for a long time and has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, what is the business of the office of the Architect of the Treasury, for which we pay $200,000 a year? What is the Architect's occupation?

Mr. CANNON. His occupation is to superintend a number of assistants, draftsmen, copyists, etc., in the making of plans and specifications for public buildings; but, if my friend will allow me, I will say that most gentlemen who have had much to do with that office believe that it does not promptly perform, and sometimes does not well perform, its functions.

Mr. CRISP. I do not know about that, but I suppose that we keep this officer and pay $200,000 a year to maintain his office to do this very work of preparing plans of public buildings. But, Mr. Chairman, from the pending proposition it would appear that he does not engage in that work, or that he is considered incompetent to make plans for this Chicago building, or else that there is some other reason, I do not know what, which actuates gentlemen in this case and causes them to propose to go outside of the Supervising Architect's Office and employ an architect not connected with the Government. Now, there ought not to be any necessity for this, and if there is necessity, we ought to know the reason, and why this special appropriation is necessary. If this bill had gone to a committee of the House, as it ought to have done, we would have had a report from that committee explaining the situation. As it is, we have not a line from the Treasury Department as to the necessity of this bill; we have not a line as to the desirability of this bill. Of course the gentleman from Illinois states the substance of an interview between himself and the Secretary, and of course we all know that he states it correctly. I do not question that at all; but it has been usual in the House of Representatives, as well as in the Senate, when it was proposed to deal with a measure like this, to send it to the Department and invoke the judgment of the officer in charge of that Department. If there is any reason why this money ought to be appropriated the Secretary ought to have an opportunity of saying so. If the Supervising Architect is incompetent, let us know that. If he is overworked so that he can not attend to this business, let us know that. If this is a proposition to give some architect in Chicago or elsewhere, not connected with the Government, a job, let us know that. Let us know what the purpose of the proposition is. That, I submit, is only right and fair.

Now, we have already appropriated $30,000 for the plans; and, as I understand, the proposition of this bill is to appropriate $25,000 more for the plans. I confess my ignorance as to what plans of this sort are worth, or rather what the services of gentlemen who produce such plans are worth. I know that of course services of that kind are sometimes very valuable; but I think the House ought to have some information to go upon the record showing what the services to be paid for in this case are worth.

My friend from Texas proposes to add to the bill an amendment so as to cover by this appropriation the supervision of the construction of the building. That is well enough; but it will not amount to anything; it will probably be struck out in conference, or, if not, it can be changed in the next appropriation bill.

Practically, as I understand, this proposition is to add $25,000 to the appropriation already made for the purpose of obtaining plans for the Chicago public building. Now, the Supervising Architect, I presume, is not required to do anything in this matter until the contract is made; so that if my friend from Texas is right in his amendment there is no urgent necessity for the passage of this resolution. I do not know whether the contract is yet let. Will the gentleman from Illinois state whether they have the plans yet?

Mr. LORIMER. The plans are not yet made.

Mr. CRISP. This is to complete the payment for the plans?

Mr. LORIMER. No; this is to employ an architect to assist in drawing the plans and to assist in supervising the construction of the building.

Mr. CRISP. What is the $30,000 for?

Mr. LORIMER. It is to be used for the same purpose. That amount not being enough, the Secretary of the Treasury asks for $25,000 more.

Mr. CRISP. But he does not ask it in any report to Congress.

Mr. LORIMER. Does the gentleman suggest that we send this proposition back to the Secretary of the Treasury to get a report from him?

Mr. CRISP. Oh, no; what I suggest is that the bill go to a committee of the House, so that they will let us know in due time all about the matter. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds should consider this proposition before the House acts upon it.

Mr. LORIMER. I want to say to the gentleman that the Secretary of the Treasury himself drew this bill.

Mr. CRISP. Then he ought to have sent a communication to Congress on the subject.

Mr. LORIMER. The resolution was sent to the Senate and was passed there; and I think that very probably the Secretary of the Treasury sent a communication to the Senate.

Mr. CRISP. Of course that would meet my suggestion, if we knew that to be a fact.

Mr. LORIMER. I do not know it to be a fact.

Mr. CRISP. We would like to know it; we would like to know the necessity for the passage of this resolution. We would like, in other words, to have it stated, if it be true, that notwithstanding we pay $200,000 for services in connection with the drawing of plans for public buildings, the Secretary of the Treasury recommends an expenditure of $55,000 additional for the preparation of plans for this building in Chicago; that he proposes to appoint an architect to supervise the Supervising Architect in the drawing of plans for that building. If that is the fact, we ought to know it.

Mr. LORIMER. Did the gentleman understand my statement that I called with other gentlemen on the Secretary of the Treasury and asked him to begin the work for the plans of the Chicago building——

Mr. CRISP. Yes, I caught that statement.

Mr. LORIMER. And that the Secretary of the Treasury stated in reply that there had not been a sufficient amount of money set aside to complete the work of drawing the plans and of looking after the construction of the building?

Mr. CRISP. What is the difficulty in having the work done by the present force?

Mr. LORIMER. He said that the Supervising Architect had so much to do that he feared he could not properly look after this work; that he wanted to employ an assistant architect to aid in supervising the drawing of the plans and specifications for the building and in looking after its construction. That is the statement the Secretary of the Treasury made to me; and he suggested that he would draw a resolution (if Senator CULLOM would look after it in the Senate and I take care of it in the House) providing that a sufficient amount of money be set aside from the money already appropriated, to complete the work of drawing the plans, so as to begin the construction of the building.

Mr. CRISP. Does the gentleman know for what purpose the Secretary of the Treasury has set down in his estimates now before the Committee on Appropriations an estimate of $50,000 increase for this building? Does that cover the same matter as the bill now proposed, or is it for something else?

Mr. LORIMER. I do not know.

Mr. CRISP. That is one of the facts that we ought to know; and if this bill should go to a committee we would know all those facts. There is no better system on earth for accomplishing legislation intelligently than our system of first referring a bill to a committee and having the committee investigate the matter. Our committees are composed of gentlemen of each party; and in their investigations they send for witnesses, they examine documents, they finally make report, and then when we need information on any point we can get it from the committee. I repeat what I have learned from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], that the Secretary of the Treasury has sent in his estimate increasing by $50,000 this very fund—an estimate of an appropriation to go into the regular appropriation bill of this year. We do not know whether that is intended to cover this $25,000 or something else.

Mr. LORIMER. I do not think the Secretary of the Treasury would say that $25,000 would be sufficient in addition to what he has to begin and complete the work, and at the same time ask an additional appropriation of $50,000 for the same purpose. It does not seem likely that the Secretary of the Treasury would make such a statement and demand at the same time.

Mr. CRISP. The trouble is that he has not made one statement in reference to it.

The gentleman must remember that the Executive Departments

of the Government only communicate to the House of Representatives through the Speaker. No private conversation could be considered a report from the Secretary of the Treasury upon any proposition. The rules of the House require that whenever the Secretaries desire to communicate to the House they can do so only by committing the communication to the Speaker of the House, by whom it is referred to the appropriate committee. But what took place between the gentleman himself and the Secretary of the Treasury is simply a private conversation, and can have no more effect than any other private conversation.

Mr. LORIMER. Then it must be taken for what it is worth.

Mr. CRISP. Ah! but it is merely a second-hand statement, and not sent officially by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. LORIMER. Then the second-hand statement is to be taken for what it is worth.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman, of course, understands that this statement or such a statement in the courts would not pass at all. It is a mere expression of opinion.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend from Georgia will allow me, I think I can make an explanation that will reconcile the difference that seems to exist.

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. This proposition says:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, out of the appropriation heretofore made, a sum not exceeding $25,000 for the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for said building.

Now, I call the attention of my friend from Georgia to the fact that that indicates the demand of legislation—not the demand of appropriation——

Mr. CRISP (interrupting). Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois and myself have been too long together here for him to undertake to intimate that you do not legislate on appropriation bills.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, I am not speaking of that. I say that it is legislation. Under the law as it now stands, if the Secretary had in the vaults of the Treasury for this building four million or forty million dollars, he could not utilize it for the employment of this supervising architect without the power that we propose to give him here. He could not do anything that would enable him to utilize the people who have skill in Chicago building for this purpose.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON. Well, if my friend from Georgia will permit me to occupy the floor; I am holding it in his time.

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. POWERS. If I understand the matter rightly, in the original proposition $30,000 was set apart to pay the charges of an architect to prepare the plans and specifications of this building?

Mr. CANNON. No; for the preparation of plans and specifications; and under the law he would utilize the Treasury Department, through the Supervising Architect's Office, only.

Mr. POWERS. Very good; then $30,000 of the total appropriation was to be allowed for that purpose?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. Now, the Supervising Architect and the assistants are paid officers of the Government, are they not?

Mr. CANNON. They are.

Mr. POWERS. Then, for what purpose was the $30,000 set apart to be used?

Mr. CANNON. Why, for paying salaries——

Mr. POWERS. Salaries in the Supervising Architect's Office?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Oh, no.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes.

Mr. CRISP. No; the gentleman is mistaken. Two hundred thousand dollars is appropriated for that purpose. No part of the $30,000 goes to keep up the annual expenses of the Supervising Architect's Office. The gentleman certainly knows that.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me, the employment of draftsmen and the clerical assistance necessary must be paid from the appropriation for the public buildings, and there is a limitation placed upon it that it shall not exceed the sum of $200,000 yearly, and this is drawn from these various appropriations for public buildings throughout the country. So that this $30,000 does go exactly in the payment of salaries for clerical services. I will say to my friend that it is peculiar in that respect. He has probably not examined it.

Mr. POWERS. My point is this: Does not the $25,000 now proposed to be appropriated go to the same service that has already been appropriated for?

Mr. CANNON. In addition thereto; and the object of the additional twenty-five-thousand-dollar authorization is to utilize the best skill and talent that is not in the public service for these plans.

Mr. POWERS. The object of the twenty-five-thousand-dollar appropriation is to employ an outside architect?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. To do the work that it was supposed the Supervising Architect himself would do, or his office?

Mr. CANNON. To assist him in doing it, just as we did with the Congressional Library.

Mr. POWERS. Now, does the gentleman say that the Supervising Architect pays out that $30,000 originally appropriated to any outside parties?

Mr. CANNON. To draftsmen and other employees.

Mr. POWERS. Then it comes to this, does it not, that we are appropriating $55,000 to pay outside parties?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; $25,000.

Mr. POWERS. I wish the gentleman would make that clear. I do not think it is understood here.

Mr. CANNON. I will read it:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, out of the appropriation heretofore made, a sum not exceeding $25,000 for the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for said building.

Mr. POWERS. What I want to get at is this, because I know the gentleman can give me the information if he understands the inquiry: I want the gentleman to explain to the House how the $30,000 heretofore appropriated is to be paid out, and also how this $25,000 is to be paid out. I understand that the $25,000 is to go to outside parties.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely.

Mr. POWERS. To assist the Supervising Architect?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. Now, I wish to know how the Supervising Architect is going to utilize, in addition to this outside service, the $30,000 that has heretofore been appropriated.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely as he now would if he would go on.

Mr. POWERS, How is that?

Mr. CANNON. In the payment of copyists, draftsmen, and the whole clerical force in the Supervising Architect's Office, which force is paid from the appropriations for public buildings throughout the country, now limited to $200,000. That is, that there can not be more than $200,000 taken from the appropriations for public buildings to pay the force in the Supervising Architect's Office.

Mr. POWERS. Then the $30,000, in short, will go to pay the salary of officials in his office?

Mr. CANNON. Draftsmen and so on.

Mr. POWERS. For the work done in preparing these plans?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. Then what becomes of the suggestion that the $25,000 is to pay for supervision?

Mr. CANNON. In my judgment it is only such supervision as architects ordinarily give. The supervision of the actual construction of a public building comes from the superintendents or inspectors, and it would be just as well to look this squarely in the face. This is a proposition to appropriate $25,000 to bring in outside talent to assist in the preparation of these plans, so that we may, as we hope, avoid having another four or six million dollar failure in the construction of a public building in Chicago.

Mr. POWERS. Then the $25,000 does not go to pay some official for supervision of construction?

Mr. CANNON. Only as architects always supervise constructions?

Mr. POWERS. Now, what is the occasion for paying for any supervision of that building before you have got your plans made?

Mr. CANNON. There is no supervision until the plans are made.

Mr. POWERS. The supervision is as the work progresses along from month to month and year to year?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and can not commence until the plans are made.

Mr. POWERS. Is there any occasion to appropriate money for that purpose until the work is commenced?

Mr. CANNON. We are not appropriating for it.

Mr. HENDERSON. The money is appropriated now.

Mr. POWERS. The architectural supervision can not take place until the construction begins, can it?

Mr. CANNON. We have got to have the plans first.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CANNON. I am talking in the time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the other gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON]?

Mr. CANNON. By the permission of his colleague only.

Mr. CRISP. I will yield the floor in a moment or two.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he thinks this is a safe, sound precedent to set in Congress——

Mr. CANNON. I do.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (continuing). To employ outside skill, at a cost of $25,000, to prepare plans for a public building? Do you propose to follow it up with all the other public buildings of the United States for all time to come?

Mr. CANNON. If I could have my way about it, I would utilize

the best architectural skill in this country in the construction of public buildings; and believe I could save 10 or 20 per cent by it. [Applause.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then you would have to reorganize the division in the Treasury Department?

Mr. CANNON. I do not desire to make an unnecessary attack upon that division.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. CANNON. I believe it could be changed or reorganized, and in many respects to the profit of the Government, without abusing it at all.

Mr. CRISP. My friend from Illinois I think practically stated—I was going to say "admitted," but perhaps that would not be the right word—"stated," I will say, a fact I intended to try to elicit by a question. He said we should deal frankly with each other; and I will agree to that; and I understood him to say that this was an appropriation of $25,000 to provide plans for a Chicago building. Now, is not that all there is in it—to employ additional architects, with an opportunity to get $25,000 to erect a building for Chicago? Is not that all there is of it?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend that is the kernel of this proposition, as I understand it. It may have some additions.

Mr. CRISP. Some trimmings. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. No; it may have some additional things, but that is the kernel of the proposition; and I am clearly of the opinion, from the standpoint of economy, that it is a wise expenditure.

Mr. CRISP. I did not expect the gentleman, in view of the peculiar surroundings, to oppose this proposition.

Mr. CANNON. I am for it, as I was for the Library building over here.

Mr. CRISP. Yes, sir; but the Library building was erected in a different manner from that in which this building is to be erected. It was erected by a gentleman who—no man knows better than my friend—has never had a superior in the supervision and management of the erection of great buildings. I mean General Casey.

Mr. CANNON. But the plan was made outside of the Supervising Architect's Office, and we paid for it.

Mr. CRISP. I do not know that I shall oppose this resolution, but I want the House to understand it. Here is a proposed bill authorizing the construction of a building at Chicago. We understand when gentlemen come in asking for a public building they are then very anxious to conform to all the usages in this respect, and reduce as far as possible all the expenses incident to it. They came in and asked for the erection of a public building at Chicago at a limit of $4,000,000. As public buildings are ordinarily constructed under the supervision of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, they asked that $30,000 be given to that officer to make plans of the building. In that condition the bill is passed. Now these gentlemen are here appealing to this House and asking for $25,000 more; and for what? to employ an assistant architect—an assistant architect! to devise plans for this building. That simply means that it will take this building out of the office of the Architect of the Treasury and give it to some gentleman of some city, somewhere, to make the plans for that building.

Now, that is all there is in it. If it is necessary to do that in this case, why not abolish the office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury? Why spend $200,000 a year to keep up that paraphernalia, and then, when important work is to be done, to come here and ask for $25,000, not for the supervision—do not confuse this thing—not to do a thing but furnish plans; and when he furnishes the plans he gets $25,000 and his work is ended. Now, then, if it is necessary to do this we ought to abolish this Supervising Architect; and I am not sure but that it would be a good plan to let out all plans for public buildings to the architects generally of the country; it certainly would be economical, if we have to keep up a Supervising Architect's Office at $200,000 a year and at the same time pay $25,000 for the plans of a single building in a single city. That is exactly what you are doing; and if this committee votes to report this resolution favorably, it simply means that, in addition to what has been done in respect to this very appropriation, $25,000 is to be paid for suggestions from some outside architect to the Supervising Architect of the Treasury. That is all.

Mr. SAYERS. There is no estimate at all to this session of Congress for the continuance of the construction of the building at Chicago, the reason being, I suppose, that the Supervising Architect's Office has not been able and will not be able to complete the plans and specifications in time to enter into a contract during the next fiscal year involving a greater sum than the amount appropriated by the last Congress.

Mr. CRISP. I will ask my friend from Texas, because he knows and the matter has passed from my memory, how many public buildings are there the construction of which is now authorized by law, but which have not been built?

Mr. SAYERS. I can not answer definitely; but I should say from forty to seventy-five.

Mr. CRISP. From forty to seventy-five cities of the United States have secured legislation authorizing the construction of public buildings within their limits?

Mr. SAYERS. You mean cases where the buildings have not been completed?

Mr. CRISP. Yes; and the larger portion of them perhaps not begun, though I am not sure about that. I do know, however, that there are some of them, at least, on which no progress has been made. Now, all those public buildings stand exactly on the same footing with the Chicago building. They are all necessary, and they ought to be constructed, but here we have a proposition to take this case out of the general rule and pay $25,000 for the privilege.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman is correct as to the purpose of this proposition, but I will say to him that the case of Chicago is entirely different from that of any other city. Take Philadelphia, for instance. The construction of a mint building there was authorized by the Fifty-first Congress, and that building has not been commenced, although $1,000,000 or thereabouts has been appropriated for the purpose of constructing it. But the present mint building in Philadelphia is being used, whereas in Chicago the building which this new public building is intended to supersede has been or is being torn down, and the United States courts are being held in rented premises at a cost of $25,000 or $30,000 a year.

Mr. CRISP. But the gentleman knows that we are paying five times that amount of rent in this city.

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. Then why is the construction of the Chicago building more important on that account than the construction of other buildings here and elsewhere?

Mr. SAYERS. It is important to save the rent we are paying there.

Mr. CRISP. But is it not important to construct the other public buildings in other places that have been authorized, so as to avoid paying rent? Is it not important to construct additional buildings here?

Mr. SAYERS. They are being constructed. The new post-office building here, which will be completed next year, will accommodate 2,500 clerks.

Mr. CRISP. Yes; but it will not more than half supply the deficiency of accommodation for Government offices.

Mr. SAYERS. Yes; I think it will supply more than half. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think one of two things ought to be done; either the Supervising Architect's Office ought to be increased to such an extent as will expedite the preparation of plans and specifications and the construction of this building, or outside help ought to be obtained. It would, in my opinion, be false economy to delay the construction of this building, the old one being pulled down and the Government being compelled to pay a large yearly sum for rent of other buildings for the courts and other branches of the public service. It would, I think, be inexcusable extravagance to do otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, if the Secretary of the Treasury says that he ought to have this amount of money, and that if he does not get it the plans and specifications for the building can not be completed soon enough to begin its construction during the next fiscal year, then, under the circumstances, he ought to have the money. The gentleman from Illinois assures us that the resolution under consideration was actually prepared by the Secretary, and his assurance should be sufficient.

Mr. MILLIKEN. And he ought to have the money also for all the other public buildings which have been authorized.

Mr. SAYERS. There is not the same necessity for the other buildings that there is for this building.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman knows that we are paying rent in nearly every place where there is no public building, and the smaller the place the larger the rent in proportion to the cost of a suitable building.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, if this matter were my own I would probably have followed the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] and would have come here armed with a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury; or I might have asked first to have the bill sent to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] that that is the wiser and safer course to pursue as a general rule, and if this were a new proposition being considered for the first time in Congress I would insist upon that course now. But this measure comes here from the other end of the Capitol indorsed by that branch of Congress, and the situation is practically this: This joint resolution does not increase the limit of the appropriation for this building. That is fixed at $4,000,000. When the Representative from the district [Mr. LORIMER], who went with his Senator—Senator CULLOM, if I may be permitted to mention his name—to the Treasury Department to see if he could

not get things in motion for the construction of this building, knowing how much it was needed, the Secretary said to him in effect: "I can not go ahead with your building unless I have a supervising architect. Thirty thousand dollars is already segregated from the $300,000 appropriated, but I must have $25,000 more before I can move, and if you and your Senator will put a proposition through Congress, by joint resolution or otherwise, which will give me that amount, I will go ahead with the work."

Now, the gentleman from Illinois is serving his first term here. He did not know the technicalities which would come up, but in accordance with an understanding between him and Senator CULLOM a joint resolution has been passed by the Senate, and the gentleman from Illinois now calls it up here—a joint resolution based upon a suggestion emanating from the brain of the Secretary of the Treasury, and upon conditions which justify this proposed legislation.

Now, one word about the suggestion that there may be in this some scheme for the benefit of some pet architect. I wish to call the attention of the Committee of the Whole to the fact that when a committee of this House investigated the World's Fair we had before us Mr. Burnham, the chief architect engaged in the construction of the Fair buildings, and we learned from him, when we were pressing him as to the value of architectural services, that under no circumstances would he make a contract which would give him a less salary than $50,000 a year. It was in evidence before us that $10,000 was paid to several leading architects simply to consult as to the construction of an individual building. That evidence appears in the record of that investigation.

Now, we have before us the fact that this is a pressing matter. This discussion has enlightened us as to the situation. This resolution has already passed the Senate. The sum of $28,000 is now being paid in that city by the Government for rent. Under these circumstances, I waive the feeling which ordinarily I would share with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] that these things should go to a committee. We see that no mistake can be made; that the aggregate of appropriation is not increased; that these skilled services are needed; and with the experience before us of a building being torn down because of want of architectural skill in its construction, I say let us not hesitate at this initial point, but let us lay the foundations broad and deep. Let us in constructing this building avail ourselves of the highest architectural skill, so that this four-million-dollar building may not have to be torn down a few years hence on account of inefficient work. Let us act wisely; and I hope we shall act now. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, let me express at the outset my regret that this bill did not in the first place go to the appropriate committee; because I think it is always wise to have matters of this kind considered by a standing committee before they are brought up here for action. Yet, unanimous consent having been given for the consideration of the bill, we have it now before us, and I desire simply to explain as briefly as possible the situation in which we are placed.

As has been already said, the Office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department rests upon a simple act of legislation creating the Office of Supervising Architect, while all the machinery of that office rests on appropriation bills. For example, here is the provision in the last legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act:

Office of the Supervising Architect: In the construction branch of the Treasury: For Supervising Architect, $4,500; and one assistant messenger; in all, $5,220.

Then there comes in this provision under which all this machinery in the Office of the Supervising Architect depends:

And the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, computers, accountants, assistants to the photographer, copyists, and such other services as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary and specially order, may be employed in the Office of the Supervising Architect exclusively to carry into effect the various appropriations for public buildings, to be paid for from and equitably charged against such appropriations: *Provided*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, shall not exceed $200,000.

Now, that is the whole legislation on which the Supervising Architect's Office rests. That sum of $200,000 which is to be equitably assessed on the various appropriations for public buildings is the fund which the Supervising Architect uses to employ, at whatever compensation he sees fit, architects, draftsmen, clerks, copyists, and all other officials employed in his office. Contrary to the principle carried for years in our legislative appropriation bills, by which this House in general controls every official and his salary in a distinct item, we give the Secretary of the Treasury, for the purposes of the Supervising Architect's Office, $200,000 to be assessed upon appropriations for public buildings, from which fund are paid the expenses of preparing plans and specifications and of employing superintendents of construction in the erection of all our public buildings.

Now, how comes about the slow processes by which public buildings are now being constructed? The difficulty is simply this: First, that in the machinery of that office, as in most Government offices, there is so much red tape that often the regular office force is not able to do the work as efficiently as an outside force controlled by ordinary business methods would do it. That is incident to whatever work the Government does. Whenever it undertakes to do a particular piece of work it does it more slowly and more expensively than a private establishment would do similar work.

But there is another special difficulty that comes up. We authorized for a number of years the construction of an unprecedented number of public buildings. We have not done much in that direction during the last four years. I believe that hardly a single public building has been authorized during the last four years. But it appears from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury that there are to-day a large number of public buildings authorized the construction of which has not yet been commenced, besides a great many buildings which are proceeding by the slow, creeping process, which is always very expensive.

Now, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Supervising Architect say the difficulty is that Congress is not sufficiently liberal in its appropriations for the Supervising Architect's Office. They claim that they can not procure the services of draftsmen, clerks, copyists, etc., in sufficient numbers, under the appropriations made (although we give them $200,000), to keep up the work, and that on account of that fact slow progress is made with reference to these buildings.

Now, to get outside of that slow process in the construction of the building at Chicago, which ought to be expedited, I agree entirely with what has been said upon that subject to-day—in order to get outside of that process in the last sundry civil bill we provided for an expenditure of $30,000, to be taken from the appropriation for the building itself, to prepare the plans and specifications. That, of course, gave the Supervising Architect's Office not only the $200,000 of the general appropriation, but $30,000 additional to be devoted exclusively to this building.

I understand from what has been said on the floor during this discussion that the Secretary of the Treasury says that $30,000 is not enough to prepare the plans and specifications, and that $25,000 more must be had, making $55,000 in all, to prepare the plans and specifications. I do not have sufficient information to know whether this is a larger sum than ought to be appropriated for that purpose or not; but I call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury is simply given authority to expend not exceeding this amount for the purpose named. I take it for granted that he will expend the sum properly in order to secure a more rapid completion of the building. I think this building ought to be expedited; there is no doubt about that. It is not only a public building in one of the greatest cities of the land, but in one of those cities which is growing most rapidly, and I believe that it is a matter of economy, as well as justice to the people of that city and to the country, to expedite its construction. I do not know that there is any better way to do it than that proposed here, which is to specifically set apart the sum named for the purpose contemplated.

Mr. DOCKERY. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Maine that there has been no expression on this floor by any gentleman in this discussion in opposition to expediting the work on that building. The only question is as to the proper compensation that should be awarded to the architect.

Mr. DINGLEY. I understand that.

This should be exclusively under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury; and I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I feel we can rest safely in his discretion in the circumstances. I wish the matter had been considered first by the proper committee of the House, for we should have had more definite information; but unanimous consent was given to take it up in this way without the prior consideration of the proper committee, and we must base our action on such information as has been produced in the discussion. For myself, after an examination of the matter with some care, it seems to me that the plan proposed here is, on the whole, perhaps the only practical solution of the matter now. Hence I shall give my vote for the resolution.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I hope the gentleman from Maine, my colleague, will permit me to say that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have been ready and are ready now to consider any bill which may be sent to them.

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly. I do not mean to say that it is any fault of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. COX. Why not consent that it shall go there now?

Mr. LORIMER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman must not forget that I have an understanding with him as to an amendment.

Mr. LORIMER. I supposed that that amendment was already in. I had already given consent to it.

Mr. SAYERS. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "Illinois," in line 6, insert: "And for the architectural supervision of its construction."

Mr. DINGLEY. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Texas that perhaps it would be better to insert the amendment at the close of the paragraph. That is where reference is made to the designs, plans, and specifications of the building.

Mr. SAYERS. That, I think, would be proper, Mr. Chairman, and I ask that the amendment be added at the close of the bill in line 13, after the word "building."

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. SAYERS, it was agreed to.

Mr. LORIMER. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill as amended back to the House, with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill back with the recommendation that it be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CANNON. Is that motion made by way of amendment, or does it take precedence of the other?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it takes precedence of the other. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

The motion of Mr. CRISP was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER], that the committee rise and report the joint resolution to the House with the amendment, and recommend to the House that as amended it do pass.

The motion of Mr. LORIMER was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the joint resolution (S. R. 50) authorizing the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for the public building at Chicago, Ill., and had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, and with the recommendation that as amended it do pass.

The amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole was agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LORIMER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

THE PUBLIC LANDS AND THEIR WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a concurrent resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, under the direction of the Department of the Interior, 6,000 copies of a paper contained in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Director of the United States Geological Survey, entitled "The public lands and their water supply," together with the accompanying maps and illustrations, of which number 1,500 copies shall be for the use of members of the Senate, 3,000 for the use of members of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 for the use of the Geological Survey.

The SPEAKER. It requires unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PERKINS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report back to the House two bills (H. R. 328 and H. R. 347) both having for their object the disposition and sale of lands known as the Vashon Island Military Reserve, in the State of Washington. Those bills were sent to the Committee on Public Lands, but they relate to lands still under the control of the Secretary of War, and they should be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask for that change of reference.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction in the reference will be made.

CHAPLAIN AT WEST POINT, ETC.

Mr. HULL. I desire to submit a report from the Committee on Military Affairs and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes.

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 1309 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as provides for the appointment at the United States Military Academy at West Point of "one chaplain, who shall also be professor of history, geography, and ethics, and one assistant professor of the same," is hereby repealed, and instruction in said branches of history, geography, and ethics shall hereafter be given by such other professors and instructors as may be designated by the Secretary of War; and the duties of chaplain shall be performed by a chaplain detailed from the Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CANNON. I have no objection, if it is to go to the Committee of the Whole, where it should go.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the report be read, and I think my friend will not ask for the consideration of the bill in Committee of the Whole after he hears the reading of the report. The result of it will be a cutting down of expense.

The SPEAKER. The report can be read if there is no objection.

The report (by Mr. HULL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the appointment of chaplain at West Point, have had the same under consideration, and have instructed me to report the same back with the recommendation that it be amended by striking out all after the word "repealed," in the eighth line, and inserting the following:

"*Provided*, That the duties of chaplain at the Military Academy shall hereafter be performed by a clergyman from civil life, to be appointed by the Secretary of War for a term of four years, and the said chaplain shall be eligible for reappointment for an additional term or terms, and shall, while so serving, receive the same pay and allowances as are now allowed to a captain mounted."

The duties of chaplain have heretofore been performed by the professor of history, geography, and ethics. These duties have so largely occupied his attention that the duties of chaplain have been neglected.

The recent death of the professor, who was also the chaplain, has made a vacancy, and it is the unanimous opinion of the academic board at West Point that the law should be amended so that whoever shall be appointed chaplain can devote his entire time to such duties, and the instruction in branches heretofore taught by the chaplain can be taken up by other professors now in the Academy.

It will be a saving in the expenses of the Academy, and result in an improved condition so far as the moral instruction is concerned.

The committee recommend the pay of captain mounted, which is $500 additional pay to Regular Army chaplains, but regard this post of sufficient importance to justify this slight increase.

A letter from the Superintendent of the Military Academy is also submitted, and made part of this report.

Mr. HULL. I ask that the letter of the Superintendent of the Academy be read.

The letter was read, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 22, 1896.*

SIR: Referring to the bill now before your committee for amending section 1309, Revised Statutes United States, I beg leave to submit the following statement of the needs of the Military Academy, which call for some legislation upon the subject of the chaplaincy.

It is hardly necessary, I presume, to point out the importance of the most careful attention to the moral and religious training of the cadets. These young men, removed as they are from their homes and family influences, should be given every advantage that it is possible to give them for the cultivation of those elements of character without which the high training which their minds and bodies receive can bring but secondary results. The degree of success which has attended the efforts of their religious advisers heretofore is shown by the fact that more than one-third of them are communicants, over 80 being of the Protestant and over 30 of the Roman Catholic faith. It may be doubted whether so large a percentage of church communicants can be found in any other lay institution.

It is the opinion, however, of the academic board that these good results have been obtained in spite of certain difficulties which can be removed, and that but for those difficulties the results would have been still greater. The duties of a professor are to some degree those of a disciplinarian. There can be but little doubt that many young men are deterred from seeking the advice of the chaplain if they see in him a master rather than a friend, and if they fear the imputation that their visits to him are for the purpose of gaining his favor as a professor rather than due to religious interest. It is the opinion of the board that the chaplain will have a better opportunity if he be relieved of all academic duties.

The instruction now given in the department of history, geography, and ethics, the head of which is, under the present law, also the chaplain, can very well be given in the department of law without overloading that department. Under the latest allotment of time the department of law will have the first class for two hours on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, while the department of history, if continued, will have the same class for two hours on Tuesdays and Thursdays of each week. Neither department will be fully employed, which is at variance with the usually compact organization of the academy. If the two be consolidated, the head of the department will still have but ten hours a week in the class room, which is less than the time employed by a majority of the professors.

Having abolished the separate department of history, etc., it remains to provide for the duties of chaplain, and here lies the opportunity to do a great good or a great harm to the country. There is probably no place in this country where the wrong man can have so far-reaching an influence for evil. He is to come in contact with and profoundly influence the characters of a body of young men every one of whom is to be placed in a position of grave responsibility under the Government. The man fitted to occupy the position of chaplain must be young, active, highly educated, talented, manly, sympathetic, and broad in his religious views; one who can command the respect and affection of the cadet, and at the same time share his feelings; one whose own convictions are deep and strong, and who can at the same time teach the Christian religion to persons of every shade of feeling and sentiment, without too much insistence upon dogma or church etiquette. Such a man being not easy to find, it is important that the field of selection should be the widest possible. The whole body of clergy of the United States is not too wide a field. To provide that an Army chaplain be detailed, as has been proposed, is to restrict the choice to a very narrow field, and is, in my judgment, full of dangers. Having made the field as wide as possible, the social standing and the compensation offered should be such as to attract the best material in it.

It is the opinion of the academic board that the chaplain should, in these respects, be on a footing of equality with themselves; that is, that when first appointed he should receive the pay and allowances of lieutenant-colonel. Aside from the expense of living at West Point, which is greater than at less isolated places, and the importance of giving the chaplain abundant means for entertaining the cadets at his table, it is not to be expected that the person possessing the rare combination of qualities enumerated above will consent to enter a community in which he is not to receive a consideration equal to the highest.

The advantages of the proposed legislation are, in brief:

1. Greater efficiency of the chaplain in his special work.
2. Fuller employment of the department of law.
3. Economy in reducing by one the number of assistant professors.

4. Greater simplicity of administration, it being necessary to detail as instructors officers who shall be satisfactory to only one head of department instead of to two, as at present.

Yours, respectfully,

O. H. ERNST,
Colonel of Engineers, Superintendent United States Military Academy.

Hon. JOHN A. T. HULL,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DINGLEY. I understand the chairman of the committee to say that this reduces the number of employees in the Military Academy and reduces the expenditure?

Mr. HULL. It does. It dispenses with the employment of one professor, who is now, because of length of service pay, getting $4,500 a year, and it cuts off an assistant professor.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

Mr. PICKLER. What is the pay of the chaplain?

Mr. HULL. Two thousand dollars a year and his allowance of quarters as captain of cavalry.

Mr. PICKLER. What does that amount to?

Mr. HULL. It amounts to quarters and the privilege of purchasing his supplies at the Government stores.

Mr. PICKLER. Do you expect to obtain the services of the chaplain described there for $2,000 a year?

Mr. HULL. He also gets pay for length of service, which makes it $500 a year more than a chaplain of the Army.

Mr. PICKLER. What is this theology that is laid down?

Mr. HULL. That is the theology of the Superintendent of the Academy. The board does not prescribe what a man's religious view shall be.

Mr. PICKLER. Why were the services of the chaplain absolutely unsatisfactory?

Mr. HULL. They were absolutely unsatisfactory on the ground that he was a teacher more than a chaplain.

Mr. PICKLER. I mean the office of chaplain heretofore.

I ask if it has been unsatisfactory in its results upon the army officers?

Mr. HULL. It is unsatisfactory to the academic board at West Point, on the ground they set out there that he was more of a teacher than a chaplain.

Mr. PICKLER. I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that there is quite a platform of principles or doctrine to be taught by this chaplain, and I only inquired as to whether that is binding on the chaplain.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House do now adjourn. [After a pause.] I withdraw the motion for a moment to allow my colleague to ask a change of reference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine must withdraw his motion entirely.

Mr. DINGLEY. I do.

FIRING ON SCHOONER HENRY CROSBY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, in compliance with the resolution of the House of Representatives of December 28, 1895, a report from the Secretary of State, with copies of all the correspondence of record in the Department of State, in relation to the schooner *Henry Crosby*, fired upon while at anchor at Azua, Santo Domingo, December 10, 1893.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 22, 1896.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask a change of reference of the bill (H. R. 3202) to pay for improving the streets in front of the post-office site in the city of Sacramento, State of California, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Claims. It was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I also ask change of reference in the bill (S. 427) to provide for a municipal building and court-house in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. It should go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the changes of reference will be made. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

HOWARD ELLIS.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present the petition of Howard Ellis, late consul at Rotterdam. I ask the Clerk to read it, and I also ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent for the reading of a memorial. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not hear the request.

The SPEAKER. The request is for the reading of the memorial.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. It is simply the petition of Howard Ellis.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Was the request to print the memorial in the RECORD?

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. It was also to print the memorial in the RECORD.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is very unusual to print memorials in the RECORD, and I dislike to have to make objection.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Then I ask that it be read.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have no objection to its being read, simply for information. Do I understand that the object of the memorial is to make an inquiry?

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Simply as to the injustice done Mr. Ellis when he was consul at Rotterdam.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It ought not to be printed in the RECORD; but I do not object to its being read.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the memorial will be read. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The memorial was read.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Pending that motion, the Chair submits a request of a member.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MARSH, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

The motion to adjourn was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of that Department suggesting the printing of a compilation of trade returns of the United States from 1790 to 1895—to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, together with a copy of a report of a survey for a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River, District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. UPDEGRAFF, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 878) to reduce the cases in which the penalty of death may be inflicted, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 108); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3827) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 110); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. MCRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, adversely reported (Report No. 109) the bill (H. R. 14) for the relief of purchasers of timber and stone lands under the act of June 3, 1878; and the same was, under the rule, laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 4561) to amend section 628 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 4562) to amend an act entitled "An act for the sale of timber lands in the States of California, Oregon, Nevada, and Washington Territory"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 4563) providing for a survey and estimates for a new lock at Spottsville, Ky., on Green River, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 4564) to extend the provisions of an act to provide for the muster and pay of certain officers and enlisted men of the volunteer forces—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Br. Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 4565) to amend the Revised Statutes with reference to the compensation of the United States district attorney for the eastern district of New York—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 4566) to amend the postal laws relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BENNETT: A bill (H. R. 4567) to carry out section 61 of the act of Congress of August 28, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 4568) to appropriate $40,000 to continue the improvement of the Gasconade River from its mouth to Arlington—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 4569) providing an appropriation for the construction of a reservoir and dam at Gull Lake, Minnesota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 4570) to appropriate $2,000,000 to permanently improve the Osage River by locks and dams—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. AITKEN: A bill (H. R. 4571) to create a national reserve—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4572) amending section 6 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4573) authorizing the United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries to purchase certain real estate in Virginia, and authorizing the use of an appropriation for the purchase and establishment of a fish-cultural station in Tennessee—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 4574) to relieve vessels from seizure in admiralty—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 4575) to amend chapter 67, volume 23, of the Statutes at Large of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TALBERT: A bill (H. R. 4576) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war," approved July 27, 1892—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 4577) to provide for the construction of a harbor of refuge on Lake Pepin, Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 4578) to provide for the adjustment and payment of certain claims against the District of Columbia by drawback certificates, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 4579) to fix the time for delivery of mail by carriers at fifty-six hours per week—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 4580) to amend section 3449 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4581) granting an appropriation toward the construction of a dry dock at the Portsmouth Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 4582) to remove charges of desertion against certain veterans of the late civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAY: A bill (H. R. 4583) regulating the conduct of certain executive officers of the Government of the United States, and providing for the adjudication of constitutional questions arising in the Executive Departments—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 4584) for the relief of certain volunteer officers and soldiers of the civil war, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4585) to regulate passenger rates on railroads in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 4586) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1895—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4587) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect the birds and animals in the Yellowstone National Park, and to punish crimes in said park, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 4588) to provide for the erection of a statue of Gen. U. S. Grant—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 4589) to extend to the port of Eagle Pass and other ports in Texas the privileges of immediate transportation of dutiable goods—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 4590) making an appropriation for the construction of United States prisons—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. AVERY: A bill (H. R. 4591) granting pension of $8 per month to Union soldiers of the war of the rebellion who served sixty days and are now 60 years of age—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A joint resolution (H. Res. 95) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to enable the President to veto items in appropriation bills, and to enable the Congress to pass bills over the veto by a majority vote—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP: A resolution (House Res. No. 126) requesting information from the Secretary of War relative to the deepening of the harbor at Frankfort, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a resolution (House Res. No. 127) requesting information from the Secretary of War relative to the deepening of the harbor at Ludington, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A resolution (House Res. No. 128) requesting the President to furnish copies of the correspondence with the German Government in relation to exclusion of American life-insurance companies—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A resolution (House Res. No. 130) authorizing and directing the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to visit Ellis Island, in New York Harbor—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 4290) to place on the pension roll the name of Isaac Bloss—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4316) granting a pension to Margaret Meyer—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 4592) granting a pension to Susie Margarite Landrum, of Warsaw, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURRELL: A bill (H. R. 4593) granting a pension to Mary E. Hamill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4594) granting a pension to James H. Willis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4595) for the relief of James C. Finn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4596) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Timothy W. Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 4597) granting a pension to John Gough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 4598) granting a pension to Mary Cray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 4599) to grant an honorable discharge to Claus Maxfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4600) to restore a pension to Sarah T. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCKRELL: A bill (H. R. 4601) for the relief of Juan S. Hart, administrator of Simeon Hart, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4602) for the relief of Calvin R. Rutherford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also a bill (H. R. 4603) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Private Land Claims to try and determine a title—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 4604) granting a pension to Jane Fisher (colored), of Madisonville, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4605) granting a pension to John W. Alyea—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 4606) to grant an increase of pension to Mary B. Houk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A bill (H. R. 4607) for the relief of George T. Dudley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 4608) granting a pension to Lydia Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 4609) for the relief of William R. Steinmetz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 4610) for the relief of Mary E. Bradford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4611) for the relief of Antoinette Acken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 4612) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Thomas V. Atchley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4613) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Jehu Robinson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4614) granting a pension to R. M. Blankenship—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4615) for the relief of George Barron—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 4616) for the relief of B. F. Myres—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 4617) to pay W. C. Gilbert $150—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KULP: A bill (H. R. 4618) for relief of owners or legal representatives of canal boats *Swan* and *Lewis and Butler*—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 4619) to continue the pension of Alice E. Rodgers, the helpless child of Henry Rodgers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 4620) granting a pension to Samuel McKinsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4621) granting a pension to Andrew J. Arnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4622) granting a pension to Mrs. J. J. Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 4623) for the relief of the Selma and Meridian Railroad Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOODY: A bill (H. R. 4624) to correct the military record of Leverett Bradley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 4625) for the relief of Charles Hurrle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4626) for the relief of R. H. Crider—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4627) for the relief of McHenry Robinson, executor of the estate of Elizabeth S. Cushing—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOZLEY: A bill (H. R. 4628) to carry out the finding of the Court of Claims in the case of William A. Carr—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4629) granting a pension to William R. Harless—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4630) to carry out the finding of the Court of Claims in the case of Mangram E. Langston—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: A bill (H. R. 4631) granting a pension to Ellen D. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PITNEY: A bill (H. R. 4632) for the relief of Frederick B. Betts, surviving partner of the firm of Betts, Nichols & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 4633) for the relief of Joseph Fields—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POOLE: A bill (H. R. 4634) for the relief of Thomas N. Molloy, United States consul at St. Johns, Newfoundland—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANEY: A bill (H. R. 4635) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James H. Moyer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4636) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of George A. Carlisle, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4637) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John T. Lynch—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4638) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of David Lynch, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4639) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John W. Hancock—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 4640) granting an increase of pension to Ellis P. Phipps, late lieutenant of Company A, Twelfth New Jersey Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4641) for the relief of Waterman Clift, Robert May, and James M. Shackelford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4642) to remove the charge of desertion against William W. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4643) granting a pension to Hannah S. Comstock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4644) granting a pension to Annie C. Collier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4645) granting a pension to Abby J. Hyde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A bill (H. R. 4646) for the relief of Thomas Bevington and Delilah Bevington—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 4647) for relief of Howard Ellis—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4648) granting a pension to Cyrus S. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4649) for the relief of John J. Waters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4650) granting a pension to Charles E. Lewis, a dependent father—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4651) for the relief of A. E. Tower, late captain Company E, Sixth Michigan Cavalry, now of Ionia, Mich.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4652) granting a pension to Dolly Burger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 4653) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Cornelia I. Skiles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4654) granting a pension to Harriett Johnson, formerly Harriett Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4655) granting a pension to Frederick A. Driscol—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4656) granting a pension to Henry M. Behymer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4657) granting a pension to Josephine Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4658) granting to Charles F. Leimer the sum of $400—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4659) granting an increase of pension to William B. Douglas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4660) directing the Secretary of War to place the name of William Slater on the muster roll—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4661) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Reece, of Golden, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4662) granting a pension to Stanley M. Casper, of Denver, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4663) granting a pension to Charles H. Gorham, of Golden, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4664) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Wright, of Denver, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4665) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Geiger, of Denver, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: A bill (H. R. 4666) awarding a medal to John Betchen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4667) for the relief of Thomas S. McCullough—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4668) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hollis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4669) granting an increase of pension to James W. Manly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4670) granting a pension to Mrs. Thomas B. Kent—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4671) granting an increase of pension to John Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 4672) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Joseph L. Walls—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4673) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of H. M. Withers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4674) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Thadeus Collard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4675) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Reuben Claypool, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 4676) to correct the military record of John H. Finfrock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4677) for the relief of Benjamin F. Fortney, of Belper, Washington County, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODMAN: A bill (H. R. 4678) to remove the charge of desertion against and complete the military record of Richard P. Gardner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4679) allowing a pension to Thomas Clifton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 4680) for the relief of Ira Seeley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4681) for the relief of Henry H. Wright—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4682) for the relief of Benjamin F. Hershe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4683) for the relief of Michael Houps—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4684) for the relief of George E. Butin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4685) for the relief of Joseph M. Clark—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4686) for the relief of F. B. Matthews—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4687) for the relief of Austin A. Scott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 4688) for the relief of Miles Holton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4689) for the relief of Abram Treadwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: Petition of J. C. Mitchell and others, of Mahaffey, Pa., for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARNEY: Memorial of A. J. Frame and 88 others, of Waukesha, Wis., in favor of an appropriation to establish and maintain a 21-foot channel in the harbor at Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Memorial of American seamen of the port of Philadelphia, Pa., discountenancing the repeal of the act of Congress of February 18, 1895—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BISHOP: Two memorials of the Saginaw Board of Trade and the Saginaw Lumber Dealers' Association, relative to the deepening of the harbor at Ludington, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CHICKERING: Petition of the Historical Society of Jefferson County, N. Y., in relation to settlement of Indian reservations—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COOK of Wisconsin: Memorial of N. Simon and 100 other citizens of Neenah, Wis., favoring an adequate appropriation to establish and maintain a 21-foot channel in the harbor of Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CRAIN: Petition of citizens of Galveston, Tex., favoring the passage of an act to commission pilots in the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRISP (by request): Memorial of the National Board of Trade, in favor of the Torrey bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of the National Board of Trade, praying for the enactment of Senate bill No. 2523 of the Fifty-second Congress, for the improvement of the postal service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also (by request), memorial of the National Board of Trade, praying for the appointment of a permanent nonpartisan tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of the National Board of Trade, favoring aid in the work of uniting the railway systems of North and South America—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALZELL: Memorial of Rev. Henry M. Bowden, of Braddock, Pa., relative to the troubles in Armenia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Equal Rights Association, of Kentucky, for equal protection of woman's rights—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of M. F. Randolph and 17 others, of Harrison County, W. Va., against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Fred S. Goodrich and 28 ex-soldiers of Grant Post, No. 1, together with 8 citizens of Oklahoma City, for the passage of a bill granting a pension to J. A. Courtney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Resolutions of Company H, Lytle Post, No. 47, Grand Army of the Republic, Cincinnati, Ohio, and Buell Post, No. 178, Department of Ohio, protesting against the passage of any more legislation relieving soldiers from the penalty of desertion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of T. P. Andrews, Thomas Zinn, and 20 others, of Farina, Fayette County, Ill., against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Fifteen petitions, respectively, as follows: Three of citizens of Brookville; two of citizens of Westmoreland County; one each of Jefferson and Indiana counties; one each of Platt, Deanville, Cokeville, Reynoldsville, Mendon, Hillsdale, and Cherrytree, Pa., together with resolutions of Irwin Council, No. 44, Junior Order United American Mechanics, praying for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of citizens of Stamford, Conn., concerning immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Petition to accompany bill (H. R. 4503) to appoint Commodore Edward E. Potter, United States Navy, now on the retired list, to the rank and pay of rear-admiral, retired—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUBBARD (by request): Petition of Thomas W. Shelton, R. H. Stewart, and 20 ex soldiers and sailors of the late war, favoring the passage of a bill granting $8 per month to those who have served not less than ninety days in the Army or Navy during the rebellion and were honorably discharged—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts: Two resolutions, respectively, of the First Baptist Church and the Broadway Baptist Church, of Cambridge, Mass., favoring the discontinuance of Indian contract schools—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOZLEY: Petition of citizens of Douglas County, Mo., asking that a bill be passed placing William R. Harless on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of West Virginia: Petition of C. S. Noyes, W. E. Adams, and 31 others, citizens of Roane County, W. Va., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin: Memorial of 60 resident electors of the Eighth Congressional district of Wisconsin, asking for further improvement of the harbor at Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: Petition of R. C. McClelland and 58 other soldiers of Ashtabula County, Ohio, praying that a pension graded on length of service be granted to all soldiers of the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Petition of citizens of Newcastle, Cal., and vicinity, for the passage of the act designed to secure a better grade of immigrants, introduced by Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PUGH: Petition of Delmore Daulton and 87 others, citizens of Mason County, Ky., praying for the adoption of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAY: Petition of voters of Lincklaen, Chenango County, N. Y., against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SAUERHERING: Memorial of L. Breese and 27 citizens of Portage, Wis., in favor of an adequate appropriation to establish and maintain a 21-foot channel in the harbor of Manitowoc—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: Petition of Howard Ellis, for relief—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Two petitions, respectively, of C. D. Finilon and 85 others, of Phillips, and E. B. Thayer and 58 others, of Wausau, Wis., asking for the further improvement of the Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Seven petitions, respectively, as follows: Two of citizens of Allegheny County, two of Jefferson County, one each of Butler and Montgomery counties, and one of Lansdale and vicinity, all of the State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TRACEY: Letter of J. B. Douglass, superintendent of agricultural college lands, Columbia, Mo., relating to bill H. R. 1892—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3527, granting increase of pension to Col. J. B. Meriweather—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 3528, granting a pension to Thomas Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Petition of Benjamin F. Fortney, of Companies A and G, First West Virginia Cavalry, to remove the charge of desertion from his military record—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Perry, Wyoming County, N. Y., in regard to the sale of beer to immigrants—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WHEELER: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Dr. John B. Read—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 23, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Auditor for the State and other Departments, of the 22d instant, submitting certain items of deficiencies in appropriations for expenses of United States courts, and recommending that the same be included in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print 6,000 copies of a paper contained in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Director of the Geological Survey, entitled "The public lands and their water supply," together with the accompanying maps and illustrations.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation; and

A bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that appropriations be made for the completion of the general scheme of coast defenses; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 179, to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels engaged in the coasting trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of House bills 1227 to 1233, inclusive, proposing amendments to the navigation laws; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 180, licensing masters and chief mates of sail vessels over 700 tons; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of the Brightwood Avenue Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for an increase in the police force of the District of Columbia, and also that additional protection against fire be given the citizens of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Brightwood Avenue Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the completion of the contemplated extension of the Piney Branch sewer, in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. VEST presented the petition of Charles A. Beadle and sundry other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., members of the Order of United American Mechanics, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. IRBY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Georgetown, S. C., praying that an appropriation be made for deepening Winyah Bay bar, South Carolina; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WHITE presented petitions of the board of supervisors of Placer County, Cal.; of the board of supervisors of Ventura County, Cal.; of the board of supervisors of Contra Costa County, Cal., and of the board of supervisors of Nevada County, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the further development of the mining industries of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. NELSON presented the petition of C. J. McCollom, of Hallock, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting option dealing in wheat, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELKINS presented the petition of J. H. B. Justice and 453 other citizens of West Virginia, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of Maynard Post, No. 49, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Elysian, Minn., praying that the pension law of June 27, 1890, be so amended as to grant an increase of pension to the widows of soldiers; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HILL presented sundry petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Randolph and Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of beer at Bedloes Island and at Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island, N. Y.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented sundry petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Brooklyn, Silver Creek, and East Randolph, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of beer and all fermented and spirituous liquors at Ellis Island, New York; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Southampton, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that appropriations be made for the completion of the general scheme of coast defenses; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 179, to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels engaged in the coasting trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of House bills 1227 to 1233, inclusive, proposing amendments to the navigation laws; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 180, licensing masters and chief mates of sail vessels over 700 tons; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SEWELL presented the petition of Edward Silverthorne and sundry other citizens of Lyons Farms, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to the American missions in Turkey and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petitions of George H. Kupfrian and 269 other citizens of Jersey City, N. J., of James G. Porch and 52 other citizens of Ocean City, N. J., and of S. W. Warner and 29 other citizens of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of Frank P. Blair Post, No. 1, Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of House bill No. 1196, giving relief to soldiers and sailors formerly pensioned under the act of June 27, 1890, and who have been dropped from the pension roll, or who have been rerated thereon at a lower figure, and establishing a standard rating under that act; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the construction and control by the Government of the Nicaragua Canal; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the passage of the so-call McRae bill, providing for the protection of forests from fires; which was referred to the Select Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Board of Trade, praying for the enactment of legislation uniting the railway systems of North and South America; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Missouri, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a petition, in the form of a series of resolutions adopted by the citizens of Oak Park, Ill., which is practically a part of Chicago, praying for an enactment granting protection to the American missions in Turkey and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians. The petitioners are very earnest in their call upon the Government to take proper action. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition, in the form of resolutions, of sundry citizens of Springfield, Ill., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PLATT presented resolutions of the Board of Trade of New London, Conn., in the nature of a petition praying for the establishment of a harbor of refuge at Block Island, in that State; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GORMAN presented a petition of the Presbyterian Ministers' Association of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of

legislation raising the age of consent in the District of Columbia and the Territories from 16 to 18 years, and also for the enactment of improved Territorial divorce laws; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Baltimore, Brunswick, Knoxville, Sandy Hook, Point of Rocks, Millstone, and Weverton, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1409) providing for the construction and equipment of two steam revenue cutters for service on the Great Lakes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1478) providing for the construction and equipment of a steam revenue cutter for service on the Atlantic Coast of the United States, with headquarters at the port of New York, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1243) for the construction of a dry dock at Key West, Fla., to submit an adverse report thereon. I ask that the bill be placed on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 541) for the relief of Orin R. McDaniel, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 213) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Missouri River between its mouth and the mouth of the Dakota or James River; and across the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Minnesota River, in the State of Minnesota, and South Port, in the State of Louisiana; and across the Illinois and Des Plaines rivers between the mouth of the Illinois and the city of Joliet, in the State of Illinois; and to prescribe the character, location, and dimensions of the same, to report it with amendments. I call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. VEST. I am instructed by the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1419) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak., to report it adversely, with the recommendation that it be indefinitely postponed, as a similar bill, in fact the identical bill, has already been reported.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 176) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1353) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the building of a railroad bridge at Little Rock, Ark.," approved March 2, 1891, reported it without amendment.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 295) making an appropriation for the improvement of the road to the national cemetery near Pensacola, Fla., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 256) to establish a military post at or near the city of Grand Forks, in Grand Forks County, in the State of North Dakota, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 39) to provide for the construction of a military and commercial telegraphic line along the coast between Yaquina, on Yaquina Bay, and Port Orford, to connect with Newport, on Yaquina Bay; Alsea Bay; Florence, on Siuslaw Bay; Gardiner, on the Umpqua River; Empire City and Marshfield, on Coos Bay, in the State of Oregon, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 174) to construct a road to the national cemetery at Dover, Tenn., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 340) to amend the military record of John H. Skinner, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 285) for the relief of the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1445) to authorize the St. Louis and Oklahoma City Railroad Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 167) for the relief of John O'Keane, of the State of Washington, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FRYE. I am unanimously instructed by the Committee on Commerce to report favorably a bill to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, with a written report, as a substitute for the bill (S. 1461) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service. I ask that Senate bill 1461 be indefinitely postponed, and that the substitute be treated as an original bill and placed on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill (S. 1461) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service will be postponed indefinitely, and the original bill will be read by title and placed on the Calendar.

The bill (S. 1701) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service was read twice by its title.

Mr. VILAS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1675) to prevent the carrying of obscene literature and articles designed for indecent and immoral use from one State or Territory into another State or Territory, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 556) to prevent the carrying of obscene literature and articles designed for indecent and immoral use from one State or Territory into another State or Territory, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. SEWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 253) for the relief of Charles H. Wilson, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 252) for the relief of Stalnaker Marteney, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

ADMISSION TO SOLDIERS' HOMES.

Mr. SEWELL. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 46) entitling veterans of Indian wars to admission to soldiers' homes in the United States on the same terms as veterans of the late war of the rebellion, to report it adversely. I beg leave to read an extract from the present law on this subject in explanation of the adverse report:

SEC. 2. That all honorably discharged soldiers and sailors who served in the regular and volunteer forces of the United States who are disabled by disease, wounds, or otherwise, and who have no adequate means of support, and by reason of such disability are incapable of earning their living, shall be entitled to be admitted to said Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, subject to like regulations, as they are now admitted to existing branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

So there is no occasion for the proposed law; and the committee directed me to report the bill adversely.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be indefinitely postponed.

SANTEE SIOUX INDIANS.

Mr. ALLEN. I am instructed by the Committee on Indian Affairs to ask that the papers I present relating to the bill (S. 1284) making appropriation to pay the Santee Sioux Indians in Nebraska and South Dakota for lands, unpaid annuities, and for other purposes, be printed as a public document, and that the original papers be returned to the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1702) to provide for doing away with certain grade crossings on the lines of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad in the city of Washington, D. C., and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1703) to amend section 416 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WILSON introduced a bill (S. 1704) for the relief of Quin ne mo se, an Indian; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1705) to correct the military record of William Murphy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1706) granting a pension to Julia A. Powell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1707) defining the qualifications of chief inspector and deputy inspectors of plumbing in the

District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1708) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Benjamin Walker, of Ottawa, Kans.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 1709) for the relief of J. Henry Rives; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1710) to authorize a survey of the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River, Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1711) for the relief of Theodore Teed; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1712) for the relief of the trustees of the Mount Olivet Methodist Protestant Church, Alexandria County, Va., near Balls Cross Roads; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1713) for relief of the estate of Charles N. Gregory, late of Alexandria, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MILLS. I introduce a bill, which I ask be read the first time to-day and laid on the table for a second reading to-morrow, when I want to get a vote of the Senate on the bill if I can do so.

The bill (S. 1714) to repeal "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, and "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, was read the first time by its title.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie on the table until to-morrow.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1715) for the relief of E. B. Bailey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1716) for the relief of W. H. Ferguson, administrator of the estate of Thomas H. Millsaps; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 1717) to grant to the city of Charleston, S. C., the old post-office lot and building for the use of the commercial bodies of the city; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1718) for the relief of Gen. Francis L. Hagadorn; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VEST (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1719) to provide a temporary government for that portion of the Indian Territory heretofore occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, and to be hereafter known as the Territory of Indianola; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 1720) for the relief of John W. Kennedy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1721) to remove the charge of desertion from John Lyons; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1722) to approve and ratify the construction of a bridge across the Sulphur River, in the State of Arkansas, by the Texarkana and Fort Smith Railway Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1723) to approve and ratify the construction of a bridge over and across Caddo Lake, at Mooringsport, La., by the Kansas City, Shreveport and Gulf Railway Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1724) authorizing the Kansas City, Watkins and Gulf Railway Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Black River, in Louisiana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1725) authorizing the Kansas City, Watkins and Gulf Railway Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Red River at the city of Alexandria, La.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1726) to approve and ratify the construction of a bridge across the Red River, between the States of Arkansas and Texas, at a point above the town of Fulton, in Arkansas, on said river, built by the Texarkana Northern Railway Company, but now owned and operated by the Texarkana and Fort Smith Railway Company, and to authorize the latter company to maintain said bridge over said waterway, subject to certain stipulations and conditions; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CAMERON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1727) to reorganize the Pay Corps of the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1728) granting a pension to W. F. Randolph; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1729) to prevent the oppressive exercise of judicial power in the courts of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 1730) for the relief of Thomas F. Tobey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 1731) for the relief of Maj. William M. Maynadier, a paymaster in the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1732) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah Elizabeth Holroyd, widow and administratrix of the estate of John Holroyd, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1733) for the relief of Capt. W. J. Kountz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 1734) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah H. Wood; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HILL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1735) to authorize the Secretary of War to issue arms to National Guards; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1736) to grant a tract of land in the District of Alaska to the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1737) granting a pension to James G. Hartzell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1738) to regulate interstate traffic in wild game; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 1739) granting an increase of pension to Elijah N. Wines; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (S. 1740) to amend section 5294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relative to the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to remit or mitigate fines, penalties, and forfeitures, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1741) to authorize the Muskogee, Oklahoma and Western Railroad Company to construct and operate a line of railway through Oklahoma and the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. CALL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 62) for the survey of the route of a ship canal across the Peninsula of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. WILSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAVIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 812) to provide for appointment by brevet of active or retired officers of the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELKINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, in making the inquiry concerning the prices of armor for naval vessels under the resolution of the Senate of December 31, 1895, be authorized to employ stenographers and to send for persons and papers, and that the expenses of the inquiry shall be paid upon proper vouchers from the appropriation for the contingent expenses of the Senate.

ZEBULUM PARKER.

Mr. GEAR. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, requested to inform Mrs. Albert Hurn, sole surviving heir of Zebulum Parker, as to what use, if any, was made by the Government of the plans and patents of Zebulum Parker in the construction of the canal around the Des Moines Rapids, Iowa.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PLATT. I do not think the resolution is in proper form. In the first place——

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to strike out "Mrs. Albert Hurn," etc., and insert——

Mr. PLATT. That the Secretary of War be directed to inform the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. That he be "directed to inform the Senate as to what use, if any, was made by the Government of the plans and patents of Zebulum Parker."

Mr. GEAR. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to inform the Senate as to what use, if any, was made by the Government of the plans and patents of Zebulum Parker in the construction of the canal around the Des Moines Rapids, Iowa.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN ALASKA.

Mr. PERKINS. I desire to offer a resolution. I do not apprehend that it will incite any opposition. I ask for its consideration at this time.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas, notwithstanding the laws of the United States prohibiting the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquor in the Territory of Alaska, complaints are made that intoxicating liquor is imported, manufactured, and sold within the limits of the Territory; and

Whereas the collector of customs and the presence of a revenue cutter have not been able to put a stop to the aforesaid illicit traffic; and

Whereas the facility with which intoxicating liquor is introduced and sold within the Territory begets a disregard for law, fosters smuggling, and enables the illicit traffic to become so well organized as to render it almost impossible of detection; and

Whereas the liquor traffic in Alaska, carried on as it is in violation of existing law, has a demoralizing effect upon the people, both white and native: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be directed to report to the Senate such information as he may possess of the ways in which the existing laws are violated, the extent of such violations, the defects, if any, in existing laws which enable such violations to occur, and to suggest such changes in the laws now in force as will enable the United States to regulate or prohibit the importation, manufacture, or sale of intoxicating liquors in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. FAULKNER. I fully concur with the views expressed in the resolution offered by the Senator from California, and have introduced a bill that is now before the Committee on Territories covering the question embodied in the resolution. I sincerely hope that as soon as the information is obtained from the Secretary of the Interior the Committee on Territories will act upon that bill and report something to relieve that section of the country from the misfortunes that follow the illicit selling of liquor all through the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. HOAR. Let the resolution be read once more.

The resolution was again read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

FLORIDA SHIP CANAL.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be instructed to examine into the subject of a ship canal across the peninsula of Florida, and report to the Senate as to its advantages to the commerce of the Gulf of Mexico, and to report to the Senate in regard to it.

Mr. PUGH. I wish to inquire what has become of the resolution which I introduced and which was partially considered yesterday morning. I desire to call it up when the morning business is closed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Alabama that the Senate is still under the order of morning business. Are there further concurrent or other resolutions?

IMPRISONMENT OF EUGENE V. DEBS.

Mr. CALL. I have been requested to offer a resolution, which I ask may be read and lie over under the rule.

The resolution was read, and ordered to lie over, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators shall be appointed who shall be charged with the duty of inquiring into the imprisonment of Eugene V. Debs for an alleged contempt of court, who shall report to the Senate and recommend such legislation as may be necessary for the just enforcement of the law and the protection of citizens from arbitrary and offensive exercise of judicial power.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The bill (H. R. 4145) to amend section 1309, Revised Statutes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RIGHTS OF CITIZENS OF ARMENIAN BIRTH.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, on motion of Mr. CULLOM, referred, with the accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, in answer to a resolution of the Senate of the 16th instant requesting information in regard to the treatment of naturalized citizens of the United States of Armenian origin and their families by the Turkish Government.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 23, 1896.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 50) authorizing the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for the public building at Chicago, Ill., with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the joint resolution which has just come from the other House be laid before the Senate. I should like to have the Senate concur in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HALE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 50) authorizing the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for the public building at Chicago, Ill.

The amendment of the House of Representatives was, on page 2, line 14, after the word "building," to insert "and for the architectural supervision of its construction."

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

PRESERVATION OF HERDS AND FLOCKS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] coming over from a previous day. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. WARREN on the 20th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That in view of the late unprecedented shrinkage in numbers and values of farm animals throughout the United States, as shown by the last published reports of the Department of Agriculture, the attention of the Committee on Agriculture is hereby especially directed to this subject, with the request to consider and report to the Senate, or to invite the Finance Committee to consider and report, by bill or otherwise, what legislation, if any, is necessary to preserve our herds and flocks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the indulgence of the Senate to submit some remarks upon the resolution under a notice which I have heretofore given.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. PUGH. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Wyoming has a right to address the Senate on his resolution.

Mr. PUGH. I understand the resolution which I have charge of has precedence of the resolution of the Senator from Wyoming. I should like to inquire as to the status of my resolution?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator that, under the rule of the Senate, his resolution went to the Calendar.

Mr. PUGH. That was not my understanding. Precisely the same action, as I understood, was taken on the resolution yesterday morning as had been taken on the two or three mornings previous—that it retained its place, and was to be presented to the Senate in its order by the President of the Senate. I certainly did not understand that it went to the Calendar, or I should have objected and asked that the resolution retain its place and go over, as it had done on three or four different days previously, without prejudice. If that is the position of the resolution, I ask that by unanimous consent it be restored to its former place and that it be in order to be presented, as it has been heretofore, during the morning hour. Of course I shall give way to the Senator from Wyoming to address the Senate on his resolution, as he has given notice of a desire to do so; we always yield to such requests, and I have done so uniformly. I ask unanimous consent that my resolution be restored to the position it had and that I thought it retained and had not been displaced from by the action taken yes-

terday morning. That was certainly the understanding of the friends of the resolution on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. HOAR. If the Chair will look at page 976 of the RECORD, the Chair will see that it must have been the understanding of the Senate that this resolution merely went over without losing its place. The request was that it should be laid aside. Then the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] said:

We can bring up this question again after the Senator from Colorado has concluded his speech.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] then said:

I shall be obliged if the Senator from Alabama will let the resolution lie over temporarily.

The Vice-President then announced:

The resolution will go over for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have not forgotten the circumstances under which the resolution of the Senator from Alabama was before the Senate yesterday. The RECORD shows that the predicament in which the resolution would find itself was foreshadowed, and the Senator was warned of the very difficulty which he now encounters.

Mr. PUGH. I deny that statement.

Mr. HILL. The Senator's denial can be put in the RECORD, but the fact remains nevertheless.

Mr. PUGH. If such a statement was made it was not heard by me. I certainly would not have consented.

Mr. HILL. The difficulty was that the distinguished Senator did not give the attention to my opening remarks to which they were entitled. I distinctly stated that I regretted that the Senator from Alabama should press the resolution at that time. We tried to have an agreement so that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] could make his speech. We could not agree. Therefore, the resolution was pressed about ten minutes before 2 o'clock.

Mr. PUGH. The Senator from New York asked me distinctly to allow the resolution to go on the Calendar. He made that distinct request of me, and I refused it.

Mr. HILL. The Senator will please not interrupt me without my permission. The Senator would make no agreement whatever. He pressed the resolution for consideration, and forced me to speak. I stated in my remarks substantially that I should only be enabled to speak a few moments and then I should have to discontinue, that that was the predicament unless the Senate displaced the regular order of business which was to come up at 2 o'clock. With that situation perfectly understood, the resolution was then before the Senate, although I protested that I did not wish to speak then and have my remarks cut in two, but I was forced to speak, and in about five minutes my remarks were cut off by the announcement that it was 2 o'clock by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] who was then in the chair. Therefore, the resolution of the Senator from Alabama has gone where all such resolutions go, to the Calendar, to be called up at some future time by motion of a Senator. The resolution of the Senator from Wyoming is properly before the Senate. He gave notice that he desired to speak this morning, and he has a right to proceed. That is the exact parliamentary situation.

Mr. PUGH. Mr. President, I have no idea that the Senator will ever finish his speech on my resolution, whenever he can delay action upon it and get time to make his remarks some other day.

I am very much embarrassed by the statement which the Senator makes, that the status of my resolution and the destiny of my resolution was fully understood. I am constrained to say that in my belief he was the only Senator who did understand that the fate of the resolution would be what he insists upon now it was when 2 o'clock arrived for the unfinished business. I think he is the only Senator who understood that that would be the effect of the action taken on my resolution, or of anything that was said about it, or that occurred about it.

Mr. HILL. I trust the Senator does not mean to make that question. I think there are several Senators who understand it precisely as I do. The clerks so understand it, the Presiding Officer so understands it, and I think the Presiding Officer yesterday so understood the effect of it. The Senator then walked right into the place which had been left open for him. [Laughter.]

Mr. PUGH. I can easily be entrapped by such a skillful parliamentarian as the Senator from New York.

Mr. HILL. I tried to avoid it and to have an agreement so that when we did take up the resolution we could finish it. I do not like to discuss the resolution for a short time and then to be cut off. Whenever the resolution shall be taken up let the discussion be continued until it is finally acted on. It is a very important resolution.

Mr. PUGH. So I understand, and so I have frequently stated. Ever since it has been in order during the morning hour for my resolution to be laid before the Senate it has been laid before the Senate, and I never imagined that anything which occurred yesterday morning placed the resolution in a different position from what it occupied when the hour of 2 o'clock was reached previously, when the resolution had been laid before the Senate. I have been misled if that is the decision of the Chair, and I do not believe that many Senators understood that that was to be the position that the resolution occupied on account of the action taken yesterday morning. I ask the Vice-President to decide what is the status of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Alabama that this is a matter over which the Chair has no control. The rule of the Senate must be enforced. The resolution was considered up to the hour of 2 o'clock, when, under the rule, it went to the Calendar. The Senator from Alabama now asks unanimous consent——

Mr. PUGH. I now move that the resolution be taken from the Calendar and placed upon——

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama can not take the Senator from Wyoming off his feet. The Senator from Wyoming has a right to address the Senate on his resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands. The Chair will state to the Senator from Alabama that the Senator from Wyoming was recognized, and yielded to the Senator from Alabama to ask unanimous consent. Does the Senator from Alabama desire to ask unanimous consent that his resolution be again placed before the Senate?

Mr. PUGH. I ask that it may occupy the status it did yesterday morning, and then that it go over, without prejudice, to allow the Senator from Wyoming to address the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will put the question to the Senate, and then will recognize the Senator from Wyoming. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. I object to the speech of the Senator from Wyoming being interrupted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will submit to the Senate——

Mr. PUGH. I understand the Senator from New York objects to my request.

Mr. HILL. I object to it being made at this time. The Senator from Wyoming is entitled to the floor, and he has not yielded, as I understand.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will submit to the Senate the request of the Senator from Alabama that the resolution be taken from the Calendar and lie on the table subject to call. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. To that I respectfully object, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being interposed, the Chair will recognize the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. PUGH. I give notice that I shall renew my motion tomorrow morning in the morning hour and call for the yeas and nays on it. The Senator from New York can not escape going on record on the resolution.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. What has become of the resolution reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM]?

Mr. CULLOM. That resolution has not been called up for the reason that the Senator from Wyoming had given notice that he desired to speak this morning. I determined, therefore, to wait until he had concluded his remarks, when I shall attempt to call up the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to know if the resolution does not come up as of right after the Senator from Wyoming shall have concluded?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will determine that question when it arises.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope, whether the resolution comes up at that time of right or not, that the Senate will allow me to call it up for disposition.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to renew the notice given yesterday that I shall ask the Senate, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business to-morrow, to consider the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is before the Senate, on which that Senator is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it has occurred to me during the late very interesting debates in this body upon foreign relations, gold and silver, bonds and loans, popular and otherwise—mostly otherwise—to inquire, are there not other interests equally im-

portant that should be kept fully abreast in the public mind with these acknowledged burning subjects? For instance, how fares thefarmer and stockgrower? What efforts are we making to sustain the greatest of all our interests, that of agriculture?

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], and the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] have in late speeches touched upon certain of the products of agriculture, and to some of the contentions of the Senator from Missouri I intend briefly replying before I am through. Comparisons disclose that the returns from all other avocations and industries combined are insignificant when measured by the fabulous total of our farm production. I need only mention the one product of hay, little thought of and rarely ever discussed, to illustrate my proposition. The annual hay crop of the United States is worth over $450,000,000—more than four times as much as our annual product of both gold and silver at its coinage value, or over six times its present market value, and about one and one-fifth times as much as the total annual product of gold and silver of all the world. Yet hay is seldom mentioned in the halls of Congress, while gold and silver engage us at times for days, I might almost say months, together. I desire not to detract one iota from the importance of our precious metals, and I wish to be distinctly so understood, but I use this comparison to fortify my position, that I am justified in inviting your attention at this time to grave questions of public policy respecting certain languishing industries.

I desire, in proceeding with the discussion of live stock this morning, not to attack any political party as such, but I propose to follow the official figures in this investigation, casting the responsibility where I believe it rests, and let the chips fall where they may.

AGRICULTURE SUFFERING.

I contend that agricultural interests, along with others, are in a bad condition, and that there is a remedy; that the present bad condition is the direct consequence of the application of one theory or policy, and its remedy lies in adopting an opposite policy; that free trade or insufficient tariff is the bad policy; that a sufficient tariff, with incidental or even intended protection, is the remedy. The former is the policy of the Democratic party, the latter of the Republican party.

A CONDITION, NOT A THEORY, NOW CONFRONTS US.

I do not propose at this time to elaborate on theories and policies; "it is a condition, not a theory, that now confronts us"; and I offer, Mr. President, the official books and figures of the Democratic Administration to demonstrate that condition.

The Agricultural Department in its report No. 123, Division of Statistics, gives a table showing the numbers and values of farm animals in the United States from 1868 to 1895. An examination of that document can not fail to fill our hearts and minds with apprehension, as well as with a desire, if we be patriotic citizens, to overcome or improve the appalling conditions made there so painfully apparent. To be fair, and brief as well, I will date my comparisons no further back than the year 1879. It was in that year—because of resumption of specie payment—that values became stable, and gold, silver, and paper reached a parity, which has been since maintained. Dividing the time between 1879 and the present in cycles representing Republican and Democratic Administrations, the result is the following:

LIVE STOCK TABLE.

A comparison between Republican and Democratic Administrations as shown by the values of domestic animals, horses, mules, cattle, sheep, and swine.

When we resumed specie payment in 1879 our domestic animals, horses, mules, cattle, sheep, and swine, were valued at	$1,445,423,063
During the ensuing six years, until the election of Mr. Cleveland in 1884, the values increased to	2,467,868,924
A gain during six years of Republican rule of	1,022,445,862
During the ensuing four years, until the election of Mr. Harrison in 1888, values decreased from	2,467,868,924
To	2,409,043,418
A loss during four years of Democratic rule of	58,825,506
During the ensuing four years, until the second election of Mr. Cleveland in 1892, values again increased from	2,409,043,418
To	2,461,755,698
A gain during four years of Republican rule of	52,712,280
During the last two years, under the second Administration of Mr. Cleveland, and under proposed and accomplished free trade and sweeping tariff reductions, values again decreased from	2,483,506,681
To the comparatively insignificant total of	1,819,446,306
Showing the enormous loss in two years of Democratic rule of	664,060,375

Mr. President, over $664,000,000 loss in two years in live stock! Do the American people comprehend this? That their losses in live stock alone have been $1,100,000 for every working day during the past two years? And this, too, in these piping times of boasted plenty, prosperity, and pugnacity—toward England!

That there may be no misunderstanding the facts, I ask that the official table of the Department of Agriculture be printed as a part of my remarks:

Number and value of farm animals in the United States for the years 1868–1895.

January 1—	Horses.		Mules.		Milch cows.	
	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.
1868	5,756,940	$432,696,226	855,685	$66,415,769	8,691,568	$319,681,153
1869	6,332,793	533,024,787	921,662	98,386,359	9,247,714	361,752,676
1870	8,248,800	671,319,461	1,179,500	128,584,796	10,095,600	394,940,745
1871	8,702,000	683,257,587	1,242,300	126,127,786	10,023,000	374,179,093
1872	8,990,900	659,707,916	1,276,300	121,027,316	10,303,500	329,408,983
1873	9,222,470	684,463,957	1,310,000	124,658,085	10,575,900	314,358,931
1874	9,333,800	666,927,406	1,339,350	119,501,859	10,705,300	299,609,309
1875	9,504,200	646,370,939	1,393,750	111,502,713	10,906,800	311,089,824
1876	9,735,300	632,446,985	1,414,500	106,565,114	10,085,400	320,346,728
1877	10,155,400	610,206,631	1,443,500	99,489,976	11,260,800	307,743,211
1878	10,329,700	600,813,681	1,637,500	104,322,939	11,300,100	298,499,866
1879	10,938,700	573,254,808	1,713,100	96,033,971	11,826,400	256,953,928
1880	11,201,800	613,296,611	1,729,500	105,948,319	12,027,000	279,899,420
1881	11,429,626	667,954,325	1,720,731	120,096,164	12,368,653	296,277,060
1882	10,521,554	615,824,914	1,835,166	130,945,378	12,611,632	326,480,310
1883	10,838,111	765,041,308	1,871,079	148,732,390	13,125,685	396,575,405
1884	11,169,683	833,734,400	1,914,126	161,214,976	13,501,206	423,486,649
1885	11,564,572	852,282,947	1,972,569	162,497,097	13,904,722	412,903,093
1886	12,077,657	860,823,208	2,052,593	163,381,096	14,235,388	389,985,523
1887	12,496,744	901,685,755	2,117,141	167,057,538	14,522,083	378,789,589
1888	13,172,936	946,096,154	2,191,727	174,853,563	14,856,414	366,252,173
1889	13,663,294	982,194,827	2,257,574	179,444,481	15,298,625	366,226,376
1890	14,213,837	978,516,562	2,331,027	182,394,099	15,952,883	352,152,133
1891	14,056,750	941,823,222	2,296,532	178,847,370	16,019,591	346,397,900
1892	15,498,140	1,007,593,636	2,314,699	174,882,070	16,416,351	351,378,132
1893	16,206,802	992,225,185	2,331,128	164,763,751	16,424,087	357,299,785
1894	16,081,139	769,224,799	2,352,231	146,232,811	16,487,400	358,998,661
1895	15,893,318	576,730,580	2,333,108	110,927,834	16,504,629	362,601,729

January 1—	Oxen and other cattle.		Sheep.		Swine.		Total value of farm animals.
	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	
1868	11,942,484	$249,141,599	38,991,912	$98,407,809	24,317,258	$110,766,266	$1,277,111,822
1869	12,185,385	306,211,473	37,724,279	82,139,979	23,316,476	146,188,755	1,527,704,029
1870	15,388,500	346,226,440	40,853,000	93,364,433	26,751,400	187,191,502	1,822,327,377
1871	16,212,200	369,940,056	31,851,000	74,035,837	29,457,500	182,602,352	1,810,142,711
1872	16,389,800	321,562,693	31,679,300	88,771,197	31,796,300	138,733,828	1,659,211,933
1873	16,413,800	329,298,755	33,002,400	97,922,350	32,632,050	133,729,615	1,684,431,693
1874	16,218,100	310,649,803	33,928,200	88,690,569	30,860,900	134,565,526	1,619,944,472
1875	16,313,400	304,858,859	33,783,600	94,320,652	28,062,200	149,869,234	1,618,012,221
1876	16,785,300	319,623,509	35,935,300	93,666,318	25,726,800	175,070,484	1,647,719,138
1877	17,956,100	307,105,386	35,804,200	80,892,683	28,077,100	171,077,196	1,576,506,083
1878	19,223,300	329,541,703	35,740,500	80,603,062	32,262,500	160,838,532	1,574,620,783
1879	21,408,100	329,543,327	38,123,800	79,023,984	34,766,100	110,613,044	1,445,423,063

Number and value of farm animals in the United States for the years 1868-1895—Continued.

January 1—	Oxen and other cattle.		Sheep.		Swine		Total value of farm animals.
	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	
1880	21,231,000	$341,761,154	40,765,900	$90,230,537	34,034,100	$145,781,515	$1,576,917,556
1881	20,937,702	362,861,509	43,576,899	104,070,759	36,247,603	170,535,435	1,721,795,252
1882	23,280,238	463,069,499	45,016,224	106,594,954	44,122,200	263,543,195	1,906,459,250
1883	28,046,077	611,549,109	49,237,291	124,365,835	43,270,086	291,951,221	2,338,215,268
1884	29,046,101	683,229,054	50,626,626	119,902,706	44,200,893	246,301,139	2,467,868,924
1885	29,866,573	694,382,913	50,360,243	107,960,650	45,142,657	226,401,683	2,456,428,380
1886	31,275,242	661,956,274	48,322,331	92,443,867	46,092,043	196,569,894	2,365,159,862
1887	33,511,750	663,137,926	44,759,314	89,872,839	44,612,836	200,043,291	2,400,586,938
1888	34,378,363	611,750,520	43,544,755	89,279,926	44,346,525	220,811,082	2,409,043,418
1889	35,032,417	597,236,812	42,599,079	90,640,369	50,301,592	291,307,193	2,507,050,058
1890	36,849,024	560,625,137	44,336,072	100,659,761	51,602,780	243,418,336	2,418,766,028
1891	36,875,648	544,127,908	43,431,136	108,397,447	50,625,106	210,193,923	2,329,787,770
1892	37,651,239	570,749,155	44,938,365	116,121,290	52,398,019	241,031,415	2,461,755,698
1893	35,954,196	547,882,204	47,273,553	125,909,264	46,094,807	295,426,492	2,483,506,681
1894	36,608,168	536,789,747	45,048,017	89,186,110	45,206,498	270,384,626	2,170,816,754
1895	34,364,216	482,999,129	42,294,064	66,685,767	44,165,716	219,501,267	1,819,446,306

CLASSIFIED TABLE.

Mr. President, I will give the classified shrinkages for the last one year quoted as to both numbers and values. All classes shrank except milch cows.

	Number.	Value.
Milch cows alone gained	17,229	$3,603,068
Horses shrank	187,821	192,494,219
Mules shrank	19,123	35,304,977
Oxen and other cattle shrank	2,243,952	53,790,618
Swine shrank	1,040,782	50,883,359

But it remained for sheep to show the most disastrous shrinkage in both numbers and value and to mark most plainly the poisonous effect of an un-Republican policy.

SHEEP TABLE.

In 1884, under Republican policy, our sheep were 50,626,626 in numbers and of the value of	$119,302,706
Under influences of the threatened Mills bill they shrank to 42,599,079 in numbers and to the value of	90,640,369
A shrinkage of 8,027,547 head and in value	29,262,337
From the lowest point recorded under the Mills bill fright up to 1893, under Republican guardianship, sheep increased to 47,273,553 in numbers and to the value of	125,909,264
An increase of 4,674,474 head and an increase in value of	35,268,895
But again upon Mr. Cleveland's second election we turn backward and downward as usual under the blighting, withering influence of a wrong policy, and in two years sheep decreased to 42,294,064 head, of the value of	66,685,767
A loss of 4,979,489 head and a loss in values of	59,223,497

A shrinkage in two short years of nearly one-half!

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE LEDGER.

Now, to exhibit the other side of the ledger. Here is a statistical table (I ask to have it incorporated in my remarks) which shows our importation of wool has increased to nearly triple, not in two years nor three years, but in the first ten months of this present year, ended October 31, 1895.

Imports of wool (in pounds).

	Ten months ending October—	
	1894.	1895.
Class 1	25,807,462	113,672,709
Class 2	2,841,422	16,731,985
Class 3	54,574,386	80,652,544
Total	83,223,270	211,057,238
Rags and waste	1,081,441	17,824,008

Imports of wool goods (values in dollars).

	October—		Ten months ending October—	
	1894.	1895.	1894.	1895.
Carpets	$109,752	$89,841	$614,421	$1,356,307
Clothing	77,228	113,302	673,088	1,296,210
Cloths	405,339	1,911,057	4,775,874	21,807,899
Dress goods	285,841	1,248,895	6,506,170	19,528,051
Knit fabrics	48,196	318,183	503,069	1,988,349
Shawls	10,165	57,789	69,553	370,264
Yarns	20,327	107,186	236,388	1,632,852
All others	73,020	171,156	542,235	1,919,785
Total	1,029,868	4,017,409	13,981,398	49,899,717

SHODDY.

And in the meantime our importations of wool goods have nearly quadrupled, the last month quoted (last October) showing increasing importations, while shoddy—that abomination which cheats alike the woolgrower, by displacing his product, and the consumer, by affording but insignificant wearing service—increased 1,700 per cent in number of pounds imported—from 1,081,441 to 17,824,008—and this, too, in ten months.

With absolutely no benefit therefrom, we depreciate our wool-growing property nearly one-half and wool-manufacturing assets also, while we pour out to England, China, and other foreign countries a stream of gold increasing from 300 per cent to 1,700 per cent per annum for wool and wool commodities that we could as well produce ourselves if we but return to the sane common-sense principles of collecting smart revenue tariffs from wools and woolens inaugurated nearly eighty years ago and never overturned until by the notorious Fifty-third Congress, which the American people so signally repudiated at the polls in November, 1894.

Can a plainer story than this be told? Or can figures be produced from nearer the throne than those I offer?

These figures are taken from the ledgers of a Department presided over by that Cabinet officer who essays to speak oftener and plainer of the policies of the Executive and his Administration than anyone, and whose utterances are usually accepted as inspired by the present head of the Democratic party.

DESPERATION.

And yet, Mr. President, the able Senator from Missouri, with Spartanlike valor and desperation, throws himself into the breach and attempts to maintain the Administration, the Wilson bill, and the utterly false and untenable position that woolgrowers are more prosperous under free wool than ever before. Prosperous? How? Because the value of their flocks is nearly cut in half and numbers greatly reduced?

NOT DUE TO PANIC.

Mr. President, it will not do in this connection to lay the blame to a panic, and then assert that Republican wrongdoing brought on the panic and consequent dissipation of both numbers and values of live stock, because, sir, we have endured panics before with no such results. We had a panic in 1873, but the fluctuation in values and numbers of live stock was, according to the Agricultural Reports herewith submitted, scarcely noticeable. The shrinkage after 1873 is just clearly enough shown in these tables to indicate that there was some disturbance and that live stock took notice thereof; but the change was so unimportant and infinitesimal that when quoted it only serves by comparison to show the enormity of our late losses. I would make comparisons but for want of time.

It is not alone to panic values, so called, that I call your attention, but to the fact made absolutely manifest in these tables that numbers increase and values appreciate invariably under Republican Administrations, while with corresponding regularity and mournful emphasis they decrease and depreciate under Democratic rule.

NOT DUE TO RISE AND FALL OF GOLD AND SILVER.

And it will not do to attribute all of this remarkable shrinkage to the rise of gold and fall of silver, because neither one of the metals has gone up or down in the scale correspondingly with live stock in the changes of Administration.

Mr. President, the shrinkage in values in live stock, always attendant upon a Democratic Administration of this Government, has become so marked in the past few years, so tremendous, so appalling, as to seem to point, unless soon corrected, to almost annihilation of the flocks and herds of the United States, obliging us to soon depend upon other nations for even our meat as well as our wool product.

POLITICAL FUNERALS.

The Senator from Missouri taunts the Republican party upon the political effect of the McKinley bill, and he says:

What was the result of that legislation? The Republican party came back from their appeal to the people utterly discomfited and defeated. They gathered into this hall a funeral procession, stamped with the disapproval of the people of this country. The McKinley law was repudiated distinctly and emphatically.

Well, Mr. President, it is a tender subject, this of political funeral processions. They are always sad and sometimes expensive, but the one mentioned by the Senator is now ancient history—a chestnut, so to speak. Why didn't my friend allude to something more recent? For instance, the very marked obsequies accorded the late and lamented Fifty-third Congress?

The McKinley bill was passed by a House of Representatives consisting of 173 Republicans, 156 Democrats, and 1 Independent. A not large Republican majority, in truth.

The Wilson bill was passed by a House consisting of 127 Republicans, 219 Democrats, and 10 Farmers' Alliance or Populists. A pretty decided Democratic majority, it is admitted.

The Democrats thus gained from 156 in the Fifty-first to 219 in the Fifty-third Congress. The Republicans lost from 176 in the Fifty-first to 127 in the Fifty-third Congress. A Democratic gain of 53 and a Republican loss of 54.

In the present Fifty-fourth Congress the Republicans gained from 127 in the Fifty-third to 244. The Democrats lost from 219 to 105. A Republican gain of 117 and a Democratic loss of 114.

Nothing to brag of from a Democratic standpoint, it seems to me.

HOODOO VS. JONAH.

And judging by the "off-year" elections of 1895, the election of 1896 will leave scarcely a "corporal's guard" of the faithful to mark the spot where once stood an imperious, triumphant, rampant Democracy fighting under the unpatriotic black flag of Wilsonism—emblem of protection to foreign industries and distress to our own. Gentlemen on the other side are welcome to all the satisfaction they can get from the contemplation of results of the McKinley bill displaced by the Wilson bill. If the McKinley bill of Republican fame was a "hoodoo," your own Wilson bill has certainly been a "Jonah," and it seems to me a most conspicuous, indigestible, and soul-stirring Jonah at that. If I may be permitted to make comparisons, I believe that the Jonah of Biblical times was a sweet morsel in the bosom of that ancient and respectable whale when compared with the nauseating, rantankerous Wilson bill in the distended stomach of the corpus delicti of Democracy. After the next November election, when my friend from Missouri and the remnant of the Democratic party shall have taken to the woods and are anxiously inquiring if indeed there is still "a God in Israel," and pleading that if so His face may be again shown them, they will never utter the name Wilson as a talismanic persuader nor present the flagrant Wilson bill as their testimonial of character and their evidence of good faith.

FREE WOOL NOT A BOON.

Mr. President, I listened to the able and eloquent Senator from Missouri, as I always do, with pleasure, whether agreeing with him or not, willing and anxious to be convinced that free wool is a boon and a deficit in revenues a blessing. But, alas! he did not, to my mind, produce one tittle of responsible proof beyond his own dogmatic declaration that such was true.

I have not the time now nor the disposition to enter into an extended wool speech—I may do so at some future time—but I desire in passing to notice some of the contentions of the Senator from Missouri on this subject. His first proposition is as follows:

I believed then and can prove now that free wool has done more for the woolgrowers of the country and for the woolen mills of the country than any legislation that the Republican party has ever enacted.

Where is his proof? I search the printed copy of his speech in vain. Beyond showing the reaction—and it was disappointingly slight in this case—always following a complete demoralization of prices and which is so well understood, nothing is in evidence to substantiate the claim. What would be the best evidence to prove this proposition? Why, the testimony of the woolgrowers themselves, and the testimony of the wool manufacturers themselves, to be sure. Has he introduced such? No! Who are the best judges of the prosperity of woolgrowing? The woolgrowers themselves, or men not interested in the business and who have no particular knowledge of its ramifications? Who are the best judges of woolen manufacturing? Have the growers petitioned Congress for free wool, or the manufacturers for lower tariff? On the contrary, they are on record, in the archives of this Capitol, through petitions, memorials, and resolutions innumerable. Individuals and associations unanimously claiming distress under free wool and asking for relief for an industry almost annihilated as to woolgrowing and severely crippled as to manufacturing.

Mr. President, the evidence is on the other side. I am unwilling to discredit or impeach the testimony of witnesses who know the facts and who tell the truth, having certainly no incentive for lying, for if they are making more money now than before they would as a matter of course desire present conditions to continue.

FALLING PRICES OF WOOL.

Now, as to figures, I deem those most correct that are obtained from direct financial transactions in business. I have here in my hand the actual statements, accounts current, bills of sale, and memorandum covering the shipment and sale of all the wool grown by one firm covering the nine years from 1887 to 1895, inclusive, (the period covering threatened Mills, actual McKinley and Wilson bills). The papers are too voluminous to print in full, and as they are the private papers of a business office I will not ask that they be incorporated in my remarks, but submit an abstract, showing concretely the transactions. These papers are originals, not copies, can be verified by affidavits of both vendors and vendees, and I will hold them at my desk subject to the inspection of any interested party.

I offer this as a fair criterion, because it is from not only a large but an old holding, founded over twenty years ago, using the same ranges ever since, and one methodically conducted. Furthermore, I know personally both sellers and buyers and all particulars about the flocks and their clip.

Under the baneful influence of the threatened Mills bill this wool in 1888 brought but a trifle over 14 cents per pound. It rose regularly through a Republican Administration to 18½ cents per pound, and when a Democratic Administration came it as regularly and more rapidly fell to 9 cents per pound.

Can anything be more conclusive than such evidence as this, drawn from the actual daily or yearly transactions in wool?

COMPARATIVE PRICES OF WOOL.

Table showing annual shipments and returns from the total clip for nine years of a Western sheep grower to a Boston commission house, the wool being all that was grown from their flocks and their increase, and handled and shipped and sold in the same way every year.

Year.	Number of pounds.	Net per pound at shipping point.	Date account was closed.	Remarks.
		Cents.		
1887	262,773	14.06	Nov.29,1887	
1888	229,646	14.06	Nov.14,1888	
1889	304,961	15.9	Dec. 5,1889	Administration changed this year from Democratic to Republican.
1890	369,387	17.8	Nov.21,1890	McKinley bill passes, but after portion of clip was sold.
1891	390,701	18.5	Feb. 27,1892	McKinley bill in full force.
1892	318,630	17	Apr. 4,1893	Large part of clip yet unsold when Democratic party won at polls.
1893	303,174	13.4	Jan. 1,1894	Free wool threatened and Wilson bill introduced last of year.
1894	218,388	9	Apr. 17,1895	Wilson bill passes.
1895				Clip not yet all sold, but that portion sold indicates no higher prices than for 1894.

But I present further evidence.

It has been the custom of wool merchants and commission men to issue for the use of their clients and customers circulars from time to time, quoting market rates—prices actually given and taken in daily commerce. I have here in this bundle a full set of such circulars covering the past ten years. I have selected those showing prices of Wyoming, Utah, and vicinity wool at and near important dates in the consideration of tariff bills, and I have marked off from the circulars I present all extraneous matter and the quotations of other sorts, so that the RECORD may not be unduly encumbered. But the entire collection is subject to the inspection of any Senator.

MILLS BILL WOOL FLUCTUATIONS.

January 5, 1888, before the Mills bill was introduced, prices were:

Territory (including Wyoming, Montana, and Utah) wools: The principal sales now are on a scoured basis of 62 to 65 cents for fine; 58 to 60 cents for fine medium, and 55 cents for medium. Prices of wool in the grease have ranged from 15 to 24 cents; but the bulk of the transactions were at 17 to 20 cents per pound.

Mills bill reported in the House April 2, 1888.

April 13, 1888, prices had fallen:

Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah wool—	Cents.
Fine, average	14 to 16
Fine medium, average	16 to 19
Medium	17 to 20
Coarse	14 to 17

The Mills bill passed the House July 21, 1888, and was referred to Senate Finance Committee, and July 27 prices were:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, average	14 to 16
Fine, heavy	12 to 14
Fine medium	15 to 18
Medium	19 to 21

Thus it seems wool fell from 15 cents to 24 cents January 5 to 11 cents to 20 cents per pound April 13. The introduction of the bill had done this, whereas when the bill actually passed the House wool did not drop, but reacted to 12 cents to 21 cents, effects having been overdiscounted.

The Mills bill was reported to the Senate October 3, 1888, with free wool eliminated, and October 5 prices showed:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, average	15 to 17
Fine, heavy	13 to 15
Fine medium, average	16 to 19
Fine medium, heavy	14 to 16
Medium	18 to 21

A slight increase.

In November, 1888, occurred the election of a Republican President and Congress, and November 23 wool is quoted at:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, average	16 to 17
Fine, heavy	14 to 15
Fine medium, average	18 to 21
Fine medium, heavy	16 to 17
Medium	20 to 23

An increase to just the prices prevailing before the Mills fiasco was precipitated upon us.

M'KINLEY BILL WOOL FLUCTUATIONS.

In April, when the bill was introduced, prices were:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good	16 to 17
Fine, heavy	13 to 15
Fine medium, good	18 to 19
Fine medium, heavy	16 to 17
Medium	20 to 22

In October, after the bill passed, the quotations were:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good	16 to 17
Fine, heavy	14 to 15
Fine medium, good	19 to 21
Fine medium, heavy	16 to 17
Medium	22 to 23

In April, 1891, the quotations show:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good	16 to 17
Fine, heavy	14 to 15
Fine medium, good	19 to 21
Fine medium, heavy	16 to 17
Medium	22 to 23

October, 1891, values have remained the same for nearly eighteen months last past:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good	16 to 17
Fine, heavy	14 to 15
Fine medium, good	19 to 21
Fine medium, heavy	16 to 17
Medium	22 to 23

April, 1892, showed a slight average fall from six months before, but the same average as two years before, as follows:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good	16 to 17
Fine, heavy	14 to 15
Fine medium, good	18 to 20
Fine medium, heavy	16 to 17
Medium	20 to 21

And now, after six quotations each, showing effects of Mills bill threatening, and McKinley bill accomplishments, we turn to

WILSON TARIFF BILL FLUCTUATIONS.

The bill was introduced in the House December 19, 1893, and December 29, ten days afterwards, we find the prices of wool have slumped away to but two-thirds the price last before quoted and before a free-wool bill was drawn; thus again showing how the effect of threatened changes are discounted before their passage:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good	12 to 13
Fine, heavy	9 to 11
Fine medium, good	13 to 14
Fine medium, heavy	11 to 12
Medium	13 to 14

One month more of Wilson bill scare and up to January 26, 1894, wool has slumped another cent per pound:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good	10 to 11
Fine, heavy	9 to 10
Fine medium, good	11 to —
Fine medium, heavy	10 to 11
Medium	11 to 12

Wilson bill passed the House February 1, 1894, and February 23 wool had risen a little, as follows, showing again the paradoxical reaction process; but, aside from this, there existed a suspicion that the bill could not pass the Senate:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good	10 to 11
Fine, heavy	9 to 10
Fine medium, good	11 to 12
Fine medium, heavy	10 to 11
Medium	11 to 13

June 22, 1894, the Senate having in the meantime agreed to the free-wool provision of the bill, another fall is recorded:

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good	10 to 11
Fine, heavy	7 to 9
Fine medium, good	10 to 11
Fine medium, heavy	9 to 10
Medium	11 to 12

September 28, 1894, one month after the passage of the bill, the following quotations, slightly higher, still again show that always present, but difficult to explain, "reaction":

Utah and Wyoming wool—	Cents.
Fine, good	10 to 11
Fine, heavy	8 to 9
Fine medium, good	11 to 13
Fine medium, heavy	10 to 11
Medium	13

AS TO 1895.

The following is the market quotation for January 1, 1895, and is lower than the last quotation (September, 1894):

Utah and Wyoming—	Cents.
Unwashed, light fine	8 to 10
Unwashed, heavy fine	7 to 9
Unwashed, fine medium	10 to 11
Unwashed, selected medium	11 to 13
Unwashed, low	10 to 11

April 1, 1895, finds prices unchanged, as follows:

Utah and Wyoming—	Cents.
Unwashed, light fine	8 to 10
Unwashed, heavy fine	7 to 9
Unwashed, fine medium	10 to 11
Unwashed, selected medium	11 to 13
Unwashed, low	10 to 11

The 1st of April having passed, elections in many small cities and nearly all country towns showed the overwhelming drift of public sentiment in favor of Republicanism and protection, and confidence returned. Also the belief grew that 1896 election would emphasize those of 1894 and 1895 in this regard. Thus, the shortness of time remaining to the present Administration and the prospect of change, added to the unprecedented short stocks of woolen merchandise, have stimulated production and trade, and the convening of the Fifty-fourth Congress, with avowed intentions of imposing a tariff on wool, has also improved prices.

But the fact remains that fine staple Wyoming wool was selling in Boston at the beginning of 1893 at 60 cents the scoured pound. It is worth to-day barely 37 cents—other wools in proportion. These prices can be verified from the market reports of any reputable Boston journal or from the books of any reputable dealer.

Mr. President, I quote from the speech of the Senator from Missouri:

Fine, unmerchantable, was worth in September, 1894, 13 to 15 cents. December 19, 1895, it was worth 14 to 15 cents, showing a gradual improvement in prices during one year under the Wilson law. These figures are taken from the American Wool and Cotton Reporter for December 19, 1895, which I have and can produce if necessary.

This is the nearest to proof of anything the Senator offered as to improving wool prices, but expected tariff relief is what stimulated this rise, as shown by the following, published just after the date mentioned. I ask the Secretary to read.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Boston Commercial Bulletin, December 28, 1895.]

The situation shows a decided change. There is more confidence among holders and more interest on the part of the buyers. The prompt movement in Congress to restore a duty on wool and to give greater protection to manufacturers is responsible for the changed condition of the market. * * *

Holders in some cases have virtually withdrawn their wools from the market; others in some instances have placed limits on their stocks anywhere from 1 to 4 cents per pound above the level of early December sales, and all are indifferent about accepting business on the terms at which they would have taken it a fortnight ago. The advances asked, however, have not been established by actual sales, and the market is largely nominal pending developments. * * * The situation is a novel one, as the wool trade never before faced the possibility of legislation to take wool off the free list, although it had abundance of experience of the disturbing effect of the movement to put it there and its results.

But whether the protective policy shall prevail in this instance or be halted by Executive disapproval, wool men generally feel that the vital change is not far off, and are therefore less disposed to part with stocks at recent low prices.

WHO KILLED COCK ROBIN?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri asserts that sheep have been butchered by the thousands, and that the shepherd kings, Mr. Lawrence and others, have caused it. True, the sheep have been, necessarily, butchered by thousands—yes, even by millions—to pay debts and expenses and provide food for the poverty-stricken sheep husbandman; in poverty because of the hostile or "incompetent Democrats"—to borrow the Senator's words—but not because of the advice of shepherd kings.

I send to the desk and ask to have read, first, a quotation from the Senator's speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The paper will be read in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

We have heard from interested protective sources that sheep have been butchered by the thousand. It is true. Who caused it? The shepherd kings of Ohio, Mr. Lawrence and his colleagues, who, when we passed the Wilson bill, went among their people and said, "These incompetent Democrats have rendered your sheep worthless; cut their throats and pile them on the market."

Mr. WARREN. My esteemed friend from Missouri does himself great injustice in this declaration. He has been misinformed, and his statement is wholly without foundation in fact.

Mr. President, it is said figures will not lie. They will not if honestly given and not juggled with, but so-called statistics and

figures under prejudiced and unfair arrangement are sometimes, indeed, the blackest of liars. I am reminded of this whenever called upon to scan the humbuggery of wool figures offered by free traders and self-appointed guardians of sheep growers and wool manufacturers, who assume to know more of these industries and what is good for them than the men who have devoted a lifetime to their upbuilding and improvement. It is asinine for those who repealed the McKinley bill to protest that they did it in the interest of the woolgrowers and wool manufacturers and to claim credit for self-imposed services, patronizing hospitality, and chaperonage.

Now let Mr. Lawrence speak. I send to the desk and ask to have read a quotation from a speech delivered by him before the Association of Woolgrowers of Ohio, copies of which were sent to thousands of sheep growers. Mr. Lawrence has in all his private and public utterances and letters, widely distributed, given similar advice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH OUR SHEEP?

Woolgrowing can not be made fairly remunerative under free wool. Our policy is to fatten and sell the wethers and old ewes, but keep all suitable for breeding and increase the number as rapidly as possible. The year 1896 will, to a moral certainty, reverse the free-wool perfidy; then, even in advance of a new protective tariff law, sheep will rapidly go up in value.

We naturally ask, will not conditions improve before 1896, even under free wool? It is safe to say prices of wool will, like all other commodities, fluctuate, sometimes advance somewhat, and it is scarcely possible that prices can decline below the level of the free-wool prices of the last year.

In view of all this, woolgrowers are advised to keep and enlarge their flocks of breeding sheep.

Mr. WARREN. Now I ask to have read from the desk the marked paragraph in Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 77, which I send up, showing what the woolgrowers say, through their national association, in an address directed to every woolgrower in the land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whatever may be the result, this association urges all engaged in sheep husbandry—

(1) To maintain State and county woolgrowers' associations.

(2) To cooperate with the national association.

(3) To maintain their flocks of sheep and especially to keep and increase the number of ewes, at whatever sacrifice. We so advise because, first, until the President's message of December 6, 1887, there never had been any political party which ventured to favor free wool; second, because only a portion of any political party now is committed to any such policy; and third, because, judging by apparent public sentiment manifested in many forms, and by the justice of the policy of protection, it is believed there never will be in any future Congress any danger to sheep husbandry by hostile legislation.

INKY BLACKNESS.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this only serves to show the density, the enormous breadth, width, and depth, and the inky blackness of the Senator's misinformation regarding this whole subject.

NO SUCH MONOPOLY.

It is idle to say that the wool men and woolgrowers are in connivance against consumers and that they propose "to exclude foreign wools, and to shut out the foreign manufacturer and give them the monopoly." It has not been so during the eighty years of tariff. There has never been a year, perhaps never a month, that wool and woolen cloths have not come into this country from foreign shores. The Senator himself disproves this part of his speech by another portion when he says: "We imported of woolen fabrics $36,987,904"—referring to 1893 under the McKinley tariff.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri says, and I quote him:

I see from the returns of protection papers, which never breathe a sentiment in favor of my opinions upon the tariff question, that the price of domestic wool has gone up in the United States; and, in addition to that, I can prove from the same sources that the woolen mills were never so prosperous as they are to-day and have been during the year 1895.

Protection papers, indeed. The Senator then offers as his only evidence from such quarters two items from the Wool and Cotton Reporter, one relating to wool, the other to manufacturers, neither one of which proves the Senator's assertion. But before disposing of the items let us accord due examination to their source.

Is this paper a protection sheet, and is its editor prominent in the ranks of protection? By no means. It was this very journal, the Wool and Cotton Reporter, that circulated the free wool petition in 1890 and presented it to Congress. Its proprietor, F. P. Bennett, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and, though not favoring "radical changes," as he said, fought the protectionist schedule and personally advocated free wool, or, what is much the same, a greatly reduced and ad valorem duty. The attitude of this very paper, later on, is shown by the article I send to the desk to have read:

The Secretary read as follows:

[From American Wool and Cotton Reporter of August 24, 1893.]

[Editorial.] A SIGNIFICANT APPOINTMENT.

* * * But with Mr. Wilson at the head of the committee, ably seconded with reference to the woolen interests by the Hon. M. T. Stevens, woolen goods manufacturers may rest assured that their interests will not be unduly discriminated against. They may congratulate themselves that after the unsatisfactory experience which we have had under an excessively high protection, the new Administration gives evidence that it is not its intention to go to the other extreme. With free wools, which will enable our manufacturers to purchase their raw materials on the same terms with their foreign competitors, and an average duty on goods of about 40 per cent, which may be increased or decreased as the class of goods made may demand, there is abundant reason for the manufacturer to look forward with confidence to the future, which, when our currency laws are placed on a sound and business-like basis, will bring, we believe, a good measure of prosperity.

[At this point the honorable Senator from Wyoming yielded the floor to Mr. PUGH to offer a resolution.]

Mr. WARREN. I have sent to the table and there has been read an editorial, which shows that that paper was for free wool. I desire to present to the Senate another article from that paper, and ask, Do the wool manufacturers indorse the paper quoted and its editor?

I send to the desk a few lines and ask that they be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The National Association of Wool Manufacturers has thought it necessary to adopt by unanimous vote a statement that—

In the judgment of this association Mr. F. P. Bennett, editor of the Wool Reporter, is not in accord with the views of the great body of the wool manufacturers of the United States, and his advocacy of tariff legislation prejudicial to the manufacturer, from the standpoint of membership in this association, is damaging to the best interests of the industry.

Mr. WARREN. After this reproof from the manufacturers we next find the proprietor of this "high protection paper" affiliating with the woolgrowers' association, and the American Sheep Breeder and Woolgrower of December, 1895, reporting the same, comments as follows. I send the item to the desk to be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested:

The Secretary read as follows:

The trend of the convention was generally harmonious, and good humor and fellowship prevailed. The proceedings, however, took a ludicrous turn when Frank Bennett, of the Wool and Cotton Reporter, complacently came forward to offer himself for membership in the association and the influence of his free-wool paper in the cause of protection.

Mr. WARREN. So much for the "protection" standing of the Wool and Cotton Reporter and its editor and proprietor among wool manufacturers and woolgrowers.

WHAT ABOUT WOOLEN MILLS?

Referring to the statement in that uncertain sheet—the Wool and Cotton Reporter—that there were 45 woolen mills or parts of mills or improvements erected in 1894, against 61 in 1895, and admitting it true, if you please, it does not prove prosperity in the woolen manufacturing business of 1895, but in the light of common sense and precedent and well-known established principles, it proves in a way exactly the reverse. "Coming events cast their shadows before." And this never becomes truer than when applied to commercial business. Look, for instance, at the resumption of specie payment. The knowledge promulgated long beforehand that specie payment was to occur served to reduce the price of gold, and long before resumption was an established fact, we were near a parity with gold, silver, and paper. The Sherman Act of 1890, for the purchase of silver, sent silver up in price during its consideration and before its passage to nearly the highest point it ever reached, while the reaction and lower prices followed soon after the law itself had actually passed.

The same with wool. When the Mills bill threatened, wool went down, low down; with the Wilson iniquity measure pending in 1894 and before the repeal of the McKinley law, wool went down, lower than ever before in the history of the world, and reaction, either slight or marked, follows as a matter of course. But, Mr. President, aside from this well-known principle, other factors entered into mill building in the years mentioned.

It was known during all of 1894 that sweeping changes and reductions would be made in the woolen schedule, and added to this was the uncertainty as to just how the changes would affect the woolen manufacturing; consequently every mill halted its building operations and waited to know what should be the final result. Needed extensions and repairs were left undone. The Wilson bill passed; the tension over, the worst known, and a certainty—even though a sad one—established, the mill men then knew what they had to meet. In many cases repairs, extensions, or additional buildings for existing manufacturing plants were made absolutely necessary, in order to change the mode of manu-

facturing to meet conditions imposed by the new tariff in competing with foreign manufactures. They had to invest more money to save that already invested in the business. This accounts, in part, for the building exhibit, but, Mr. President, what counts for still more is the fact that in the elections of 1894 the American people rose in their might and declared at the polls they would not rest under the Wilson bill and they stamped the indelible seal of their disapprobation upon this un-American measure. Thereupon the mill men and the sheep men once again took heart, firmly believing, as they do now believe, and as I believe, that they must only await the next Presidential election and the action of the Fifty-fifth Congress to again see reasonable prosperity through judicious Republican legislation.

Now, as to what the wool manufacturers say. Note their annual report for 1895, from which the Clerk will please read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the annual report of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, January 8, 1896.]

The American mills have partaken of none of the prosperity which has blessed Bradford and Batley, England. In some lines of manufacture they have been fairly busy; but in others, and notably in the cloth manufacture, which employs the looms of the great bulk of our mills, the year has been one of severest trial; some of these mills have not been in operation; others have run only portions of their machinery; the most have been obliged to market their production at prices which render it hardly worth while to manufacture, if not at actual loss.

In summarizing the effects of the tariff it may be said that the cloth manufacture has suffered more seriously than any other branch, and the woolen-cloth maker more than the worsted; that some features of the schedule have not worked as disastrously as was anticipated, although sufficient time has not yet elapsed to permit a fair test of their bearing upon the industry, and, generally, that the schedule is found in operation to be unequal and ill balanced, weak at vital spots, and a failure as a revenue-getting measure. Experience completely sustains the assertion made at the time of its passage, that this industry was dealt with more harshly than any other manufacture, and that it must necessarily stagger under the blow. This fact is now thoroughly understood by the public and appreciated in legislative halls.

The reason why the existing tariff is working so disastrously to the American wool manufacturer may be stated in one sentence: It is due to the substitution of purely ad valorem duties for the compound duties of previous laws.

* * * * * * *

It was argued that, by reason of the advantage of free raw materials, the American manufacturer would find himself not only in full control of the domestic market, but actively competing for the markets of the world. We have seen the havoc played with the domestic market. As for the foreign market, it has been practically confined, as nearly as can be ascertained, to two cases of woolens shipped to Bradford early in the year, and there discovered by the American consul, who immediately telegraphed to the Secretary of State in Washington that the conquest of the foreign markets had been accomplished! That episode has been the one amusing feature of the whole business.

MANUFACTURERS LOSE 55 PER CENT.

Mr. WARREN. As to the manufacturers generally, Dun's Review at the close of 1895 records the mournful fact that "there has been an increase of 55 per cent in manufacturing failures in 1895 as compared with 1894."

PRICE OF CLOTHING.

As to the price of woolen clothing, it has been growing gradually lower for years, but no consumer can tell the dates or percentages of the great shrinkages in wool prices by his bills paid for clothing, because prices have grown lower, tariff or no tariff, just the same.

WAGES ARE LOWER.

The assumption that wages are higher now than before the passage of the Wilson Act is a fallacy. Late advances in wages have simply been to the extent of restoring part or all, as the case may be, of the reductions made since 1892.

I quote again from the speech of the Senator from Missouri:

I have here a list of the advances in wages by woolen mills. Twice during the last year, in some instances, and three times in other, the wages of employees were advanced by the woolen mills.

I, too, have here a very complete list of over 450 establishments giving lists of wages, number of hands employed, etc., and the reverse is shown. In 1895 there were 13 per cent less hands employed than in 1892 at average wages of 14 per cent less than in 1890 and 17 per cent less than in 1892. Here are figures on a lot of 32 wool manufacturing establishments, taken as they come, being all in a given locality:

FEWER LABORERS EMPLOYED.

Number of establishments in which—	
Wages are now as high as they were in 1891-92	10
Wages are now lower than they were in 1891-92	22
The number of hands employed are now as many as in 1891-92	17
The number of hands employed are now fewer than in 1891-92	15
Production and demand are now as good as in 1891-92	9
Production and demand are less than they were in 1891-92	23
The Wilson bill has compelled a resort to lower grade production	17

So that 10 are paying the same wages as in 1892, 22 are paying less; 17 are employing as many men as in 1892, 15 are employing less; 9 have as good a demand for goods as in 1892, 23 have less demand; 17 have been compelled to lower their grade of production, 15 have not.

SUMMING UP.

Now, in summing up, Mr. President, I have shown by evidence of irrefutable character—

First. That our live-stock interests had always thrived under Republican administration, the numbers and values together increasing, thus showing that it is not a matter of inflated inventory.

Second. That under Democratic administration both numbers and values of farm animals decrease, thus showing that it is not a change of bookkeeping, but is a contraction such as the state of business and the markets of the day alone enforce.

Third. That this variation in prices applies to all classes of farm animals with the single exception of the comparatively unimportant item of milch cows.

Fourth. That while many causes growing out of a wrong administration of our national affairs conduce to this shrinkage, yet in taking up the item of sheep and wool—the only one permitted me to review to-day—it is clearly demonstrated that in the free list and the lower-revenue tariffs imposed by the Democratic party occurs the assassination of the sheep and woolgrowing industry.

Fifth. That the shrinkage shown in other farm-animal values is as surely, if not as directly, traceable to free-trade ideas and practices.

Sixth. That corresponding with our own great national shrinkage is an immense increase in the business of foreign countries in crowding our markets with products which our own wanton legislation has crowded its citizens out of producing.

Seventh. That while sheep of the United States are worth but slightly more than one-half what they were two years ago, the wool exportation from England to America in 1895 was nearly triple that of 1894, the importations of woolens nearly quadrupled, and shoddy, that iniquitous adulterant and counterfeit, which defrauds the wearer of cheap and medium-priced clothing, increased by about 1,700 per cent.

Eighth. That the sheep growers, merchants, and woolen manufacturers alike protested against the changes proposed by the Wilson bill, and they have likewise all appeared before Congress since its passage with memorials, resolutions, and petitions asking immediate relief.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri held awe-stricken in their seats the members of this body by his scathing, drastic excoriation, or bastinado rather, of the members, individually and collectively, of the highest tribunal in the greatest and most illustrious Government on earth. Senators sat hushed and with bated breath listening to his brilliant, eloquent phrases, to his earnest pathos, as he fearlessly denounced the wearers of judicial ermine—who, from long-established custom and environment, are debarred from "talking back"—for unworthiness and unfairness. And for what? Because, forsooth, law, or ordinance, or precedent, or rule, of nearly one hundred years standing had been reversed by that court. And yet this same Senator glories in the fact accomplished, that the economic law, rule, and precedent of wool tariff—established and continuing for nearly eighty years—has been overturned by that anomalous absurdity, the Wilson bill, that crowning infamy that the Senate first pitied, then endured, and then embraced.

Will the Congress of the United States duly weigh and consider the deplorable conditions of our live-stock interests? Shall we not "about face" and change our un-American, unpatriotic policy of especial protection to foreign stock growers and manufacturers to that time-honored American policy of protecting the interests of our own citizens and institutions?

Shall we stop this drain of our gold for foreign wools and woolens, and turn the tide again in our favor by the collection of gold for imports on such as we do not produce?

Why, sir, the birds of the air, the beasts of the field, the very reptiles beneath our feet, protect their own! Is it then too much to ask the great American people, including the Democratic party, to do likewise? Shall we do less?

PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS.

During the delivery of Mr. WARREN'S speech,

Mr. PUGH said: Will the Senator from Wyoming give way a moment?

Mr. WARREN. I will yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. PUGH. I offer a concurrent resolution which I send to the desk and ask that it lie over under the rule. I give notice that I shall call it up to-morrow morning.

Mr. HILL. I should like to have the resolution read for information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HALE in the chair). The concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Alabama will be read.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas by the act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," approved March 18, 1869, it was provided and declared that the faith of the United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment in coin or its

equivalent of all interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had expressly provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver; and

Whereas all the bonds of the United States authorized to be issued by the act entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, by the terms of said act were declared to be redeemable in coin of the then present standard value, bearing interest payable semi-annually in such coin; and

Whereas all bonds of the United States authorized to be issued under the act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, are required to be of the description of bonds of the United States described in the said act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt"; and

Whereas at the date of the passage of said act of Congress last aforesaid, to wit, the 14th day of July, 1870, the coin of the United States of standard value of that date included silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains each, declared by the act approved January 18, 1837, entitled "An act supplementary to the act entitled 'An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,'" to be a legal tender of payment, according to the nominal value, for any sums whatever: Therefore

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in violation of the public faith nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama offers a resolution and asks that under the rules it lie over for one day.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. What is the order of business we are now on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming was addressing the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. I will inform the Senator that I yielded to the introduction of a resolution, presuming that it would not even be read, and that it would lie over.

Mr. HILL. I asked to have it read, so as to know what it is.

Mr. WARREN. I did not yield the floor for the purpose of the consideration of the resolution, but merely that it might be offered under the rule.

Mr. HILL. The inquiry I rose to make was whether at this time it does not require unanimous consent to introduce a resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York object?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. This is the morning hour, Mr. President.

Mr. HILL. The morning business had been concluded, and we had taken up the unfinished business of the preceding day. Therefore I raise the point of order, and object to the presentation of the resolution at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that the resolution can not be received if the Senator objects to its reception.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

After the conclusion of Mr. WARREN'S speech,

Mr. DUBOIS said: Mr. President——

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator from Idaho yield a moment for a formal matter?

Mr. DUBOIS. Certainly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. PLATT. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado moves that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next, upon which motion the Senator from Connecticut asks for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Before the yeas and nays are ordered, as the Senator has put himself upon record by that announcement, I desire to inquire if he knows of any important matter to come up between now and Monday? If he has any remarks to make, or knows of anything important to be done, I shall be very glad to withdraw my motion. I supposed I was expressing the view of nearly every Senator when I submitted the motion; but if the yeas and nays are called I might be put in the position of one who desires to pass over important business.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to state that I should like the opportunity to submit some remarks to-morrow.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then I withdraw the motion, Mr. President, in order to allow the Senator that opportunity.

Mr. PLATT. Perhaps I ought to make an explanation. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH], who is not now in his seat, has been exceedingly anxious to get consideration, yesterday, to-day, and this week, and is especially anxious to secure consideration to-morrow of a matter which is very near to him.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the Senator from Connecticut had made that statement before, he knows, as does the Senator from North Dakota, that I would never for a moment have thought of offering the motion.

Mr. PLATT. The only parliamentary thing I could do was to call for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Colorado is withdrawn. The Chair had recognized the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS].

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I gave notice that I would address the Senate to-day, and it is according to the custom of the Senate when a Senator has given notice to speak at a particular hour that he is usually recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair knew nothing whatever of the notice that had been given by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DANIEL. It is of record, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] rose in his place, and the Chair recognized him. If the Senator from Idaho will yield the floor to the Senator from Virginia——

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I do not wish to seem to be discourteous. The Senator gave notice that on Thursday, January 23, he would submit some remarks on Senate resolution No. 70, relating to the Monroe doctrine. I desire to submit some remarks on the matter that is pending before the Senate, which I am anxious to get a vote on. I desire to discuss it. Yesterday it seemed that no one was prepared to speak except myself. I was then ready to proceed, but other outside, extraneous matters took up the time, and I was unable to speak. So I announced to the Senator in charge of the bill and to various other Senators that I should speak to-day in the morning hour. I shall only speak a short time, say about thirty-five or forty minutes. I can finish to-day and so can the distinguished Senator from Virginia. If he speaks first I can not finish, because his speech will be much longer than mine.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Senator will allow me, I will state the case to the Senate.

Mr. DUBOIS. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. I desire to say that I gave the formal notice, which is customary among Senators, that I would submit some remarks on the Monroe doctrine to-day, immediately after the conclusion of the speech of the Senator who has just yielded the floor; that I saw the Senator [Mr. JONES of Arkansas] who has charge of the bond bill, who stated that if I were speaking at 2 o'clock he would be willing to extend the time, and that it would not interfere with the arrangements of the committee. Having acted in conformity to the invariable rule and courtesy of the Senate, and after consultation with those who have the matter specifically in charge, I shall of course bow to whatever any other Senator or to whatever the Senate may decide.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue, the pending question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. BUTLER to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HILL and Mr. JONES of Arkansas addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], who is in charge of the pending bill.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I regret exceedingly that there should be a misunderstanding as to the order of debate here. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] states correctly that he spoke to me several days ago about his desire to give notice that he would address the Senate on the subject mentioned by him, and asked me if he should be on the floor at 2 o'clock if I would not permit him to conclude his remarks. I told him there would be no disposition to cut him off and there would be no disposition on the part of anyone to limit him in time. Yesterday the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] also mentioned to me that he would be glad to occupy the floor on this bill at 2 o'clock to-day. Of course, it is a very unpleasant thing to me that two Senators should desire to occupy the floor at the same time, but I can not undertake to do anything to control the rights of either Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the unfinished business has now been laid before the Senate, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that when the hour of 2 o'clock arrived the unfinished business was laid before the Senate. That took from the floor any Senator who had been upon it before upon any other subject.

Mr. HILL. Therefore, I am entitled to the floor now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] in charge of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Now I desire to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York.

Mr. HILL. I yield the floor to the Senator from Virginia if he desires to speak at this time. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. DANIEL. I render my profound thanks to the Senator

from New York for that characteristic courtesy which becomes his position and which is always shown by him to his colleagues; but I beg leave to say that I prefer, under the circumstances which have existed, not to interfere with the recent arrangements made by the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. HILL. Then I will reserve my remarks, Mr. President.

Mr. DUBOIS. I think the Senator from Virginia and all Senators will understand that I have not any desire to be discourteous in the slightest degree. I should regret very much that such a thought should enter the mind of any Senator. What I have to say will not take long. I understand the speech of the Senator from Virginia will be quite lengthy, and I have risen to say the few words I desire to utter to-day. If I thought for a moment, or could conceive that I would be discourteous to the Senator from Virginia I would not go on. I can not think so, therefore I shall proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I presume the real question which is directly before the Senate at the present moment is whether by a vote of this body we will give our authority and sanction for the issuance of interest-bearing bonds, or whether we will declare that in the judgment of the Senate the unlimited coinage of silver is the first step which should be taken in any further financial legislation by this country.

No one here, I take it, expects or believes that anything will be accomplished at this session of Congress, so far as financial or tariff legislation is concerned. There is more politics than anything else in the seeming attempt to enact legislation on either of these subjects. The President and Secretary of the Treasury have informed the Congress and country in written communications what their views are and what should be done in the way of legislation relating to the finances.

The House of Representatives, very largely Republican, in part answer, has passed a bond bill, which in no sense fully meets the monetary suggestions of the President. The House of Representatives has also passed a tariff bill in order to raise sufficient money to carry on the affairs of the Government and pay its current expenses. The President and Secretary of the Treasury insist that a new tariff bill is not needed; that there is an abundance of money with which to pay the everyday expenses of conducting our affairs. The Senate committee, which has these bills in charge, has substituted a bill for the free and unlimited coinage of silver for the bond bill of the House and has not yet passed upon the tariff bill.

The views entertained by the different branches of the law-making power of the Government are so antagonistic and radical on the questions of finance and tariff as to preclude any reasonable hope of legislation on either subject at this time. The President insists on maintaining the single gold standard, and is for the nearest possible approach to free trade. He has no tolerance for any revenue legislation which goes further than providing sufficient funds to pay the running expenses of the Government. In addition to that he is a firm believer and most earnest advocate of free "raw material," especially wool.

The House of Representatives believes with the President in maintaining the single standard of gold, but there parts company with him. The House is committed to, and fully indorses, the doctrine of protection to American industries, not for the sake of revenue, but on account of its belief that these industries should be adequately protected by legislation against foreign competitors.

The Senate does not agree with the President on either question, nor does it agree with the House on either.

It is patent to anyone who has given the matter any careful investigation that the Senate is opposed to the maintenance of the single gold standard. There are a number of Senators who are not in favor of the single gold standard, and who will vote against a bond issue, who will not vote for the unlimited coinage of silver. They favor some medium course. It is reasonably safe to say, however, that the Senate will pass the bill before us for unlimited coinage as soon as a vote can be reached. This body neither indorses the President's radical views for "free raw material" and the lowest possible duties, nor does it indorse the policy of high protection. It is not certain that any tariff bill can receive a majority of the votes in the Senate, as now constituted. It is quite certain that no bill can pass which does not place a duty on "raw materials."

I have called attention to the political condition which the country finds itself in regarding the attitude of the President, Senate, and House on financial and revenue legislation in order to demonstrate the inutility of our votes and speeches, so far as enacting legislation is concerned, on the two great subjects which confront us, owing to the action of the House of Representatives.

I believe in discussion, especially of the financial question, and wish those Senators who always vote to maintain the single gold standard would give their reasons for their votes. They content themselves, for the most part, in decrying the unlimited coinage of silver, but fail to support their sneers with arguments, nor attempt to demonstrate the advantage of gold monometallism to this country.

I wish, Mr. President, we could pass laws at this session of Congress for the unlimited coinage of gold and silver and for such protection to "raw materials" and the manufactured products of the United States as would prevent the ruinous competition of the poorly paid labor of foreign countries. I believe emphatically in silver and protection, and think one is indispensable to the other, and that both are absolutely essential to the prosperity and happiness of our people.

The Populist Senators have had considerable to say during this session on financial and other subjects, and I heartily subscribe to many of their utterances. There seems to be, however, a concerted movement on their part to place Senators in the Democratic and Republican parties who are, and have always been, able and fearless advocates of the full and complete restoration of silver in the position of being untrue to silver unless they blindly indorse Populistic doctrines and methods. For the time being they are keeping the real aims and policies of their party in the background, so far as they can, and are posing here as the especial friends and advocates of silver. The junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] called attention to a circular letter addressed to the advocates of silver coinage which was issued at the beginning of this Congress, and argued from the fact that the Democratic and Republican silver believers in free coinage did not attend this meeting, that they were not genuine silver advocates. I will quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 30, 1895, page 428:

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] if he did not receive an invitation as follows:

"Hon. I. G. HARRIS.

"DEAR SIR: There will be a meeting of Senators friendly to silver in the Marble Room of the Capitol, on Monday morning, December 2, at 11 a. m., with a view of organizing the Senate on silver lines. You are respectfully invited to attend."

Signed by W. M. STEWART, W. V. ALLEN, W. A. PEFFER, and MARION BUTLER. Senators KYLE and JONES were not present, but came in that night and indorsed it.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee replied that he had received the invitation, but did not accept it.

I was the recipient of a similar invitation, as were all real and supposed silver Senators. I am informed that two or three silver advocates responded to the call, merely to protest against the policy suggested in the circular. Nothing in the interest of silver could have been accomplished if the programme of the Populists had been carried out. Silver interests, so far as the Senate committees are concerned, are in the Finance Committee. Under the organization which has been consummated, or under any organization which would have been allowed, the silver sentiment predominates in that committee in the ratio of 8 to 5. We could not have done better under any other plan of reorganization of the committees, so far as silver interests are concerned.

Had the attempt been made and carried out to reorganize the Senate on silver lines, and thus form in the Senate a distinct silver party, our weakness would have been displayed just so soon as we attempted legislative action on any other subject than finance. It would be as hard for our gold friends in the Senate to unite on all matters as it would be for us. I agree fully, for instance, with the distinguished Senators from Missouri [Messrs. COCKRELL and VEST] and the distinguished Senators from Alabama [Messrs. MORGAN and PUGH] and the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] on the money question, but aside from that we differ on almost everything, more especially the tariff. The Senate has been organized on silver lines, plainly and distinctly, and it could not have been organized on any other lines, because a majority of the Senate, outside of the Populist vote, is clearly and distinctly in favor of silver.

The Senate does not depend, fortunately, on the Populist vote for its silver strength. It is not necessary, luckily, in order to gain votes for silver, that we indorse Populistic ideas in general. The Populists in the Senate will vote for the bill under consideration, and for any free coinage bill, and true silver men, regardless of party, are pleased to receive their votes. They do not vote for the unlimited coinage of silver, however, because they believe that silver should be basic money.

They want more money. They do not believe in basic money of ultimate redemption. Their theory is that the Government by its fiat can make money, and that it should do so, the amount of the money thus created to depend on the will of the people as expressed by its representatives in Congress. The hard-money men, who constitute a majority in this Chamber—this majority made up of Democrats and Republicans—believe that gold and silver should form the basis of our currency and that all forms of money should rest on those two metals, and that they should be the money of ultimate redemption.

Our argument is that there is not enough of gold to form a safe and adequate basis, and that the basis should be broadened by restoring silver. Our Populist friends care for neither gold nor

silver, and would discard both and have the Government issue paper money, which is redeemable in itself.

I call attention to a debate in the Senate during the debate on the repeal of the Sherman Act, which clearly defines their position. It will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 28, 1893, page 2923:

Mr. PEFFER. I move an amendment to be inserted immediately after the repealing clause.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add after the word "repealed," in line 13 of the amendment of the committee already agreed to:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be prepared immediately Treasury notes to the amount of $250,000,000, said notes to be in form, dimensions, and general appearance similar to those which have been prepared under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890. They shall be of the denominations $1, $2, $5, $10, and $20, one-fifth part in value of the total issue to be in each of said denominations; they shall be made payable in lawful money; they shall be received by the Government of the United States, and the officers thereof, for taxes and all public dues, and they shall be lawful money and legal tender, at their face value, in payment of debts to any amount whatever."

* * * * * * *

"SEC. 4. That when any of the said notes are received in the Treasury in the course of business they shall be reissued, and thus kept in circulation.

"SEC. 5. That this act shall take effect immediately after its passage."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, the Senate will see from the language of the amendment that it simply proposes the issue of $250,000,000 of Treasury notes payable in lawful money, and that the notes shall be receivable for taxes and all public dues, and shall be legal tender in payment of all debts to any amount whatever.

Mr. BATE. We can not hear a word on this side.

Mr. PEFFER. The amendment provides for the issuance of $250,000,000 of Treasury notes in the denominations mentioned in the amendment, payable in lawful money, and it provides that they shall be receivable for taxes and all public dues, and be legal tender in the payment of debts to any amount whatever. Whenever they are received in the Treasury in the regular course of business the amendment provides that they shall be reissued and kept in circulation; in other words, that they shall be placed as nearly as possible upon the plane of the greenbacks which are now in circulation.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator a question? Do I understand him to say that when these notes are issued they will themselves be lawful money?

Mr. PEFFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOAR. Then, if one of these notes, say a twenty-dollar note, be presented to the Treasury it will be redeemable in other notes of the same kind?

Mr. PEFFER. In lawful money.

Mr. HOAR. A twenty-dollar note issued under this amendment would be redeemable in the Treasury in ten-dollar notes or five-dollar notes of the same issue?

Mr. PEFFER. Or anything that is lawful money.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator understands, then, that these notes, being a legal tender——

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Senator to speak louder; we can not hear him.

Mr. HOAR. I want to understand the financial theories of the Senator from Kansas. The Senator understands, then, that these notes are to be lawful money, as he has said, and therefore if one of them is presented to the Treasury, say a twenty-dollar note, it may be redeemed by the Treasury in ten-dollar, or five-dollar, or one-dollar notes of the same issue, as lawful money. Is that the Senator's purpose?

Mr. PEFFER. It may be paid in lawful money, whatever kind of lawful money the Treasury has on hand, which can be used for any purpose, no matter whether it be gold, silver, or notes.

Mr. HOAR. Or paper?

Mr. PEFFER. Or paper.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read again.

* * * * * * * *

Mr. HOAR. I do not desire to prolong the debate, and I do not intend to do so; but I think it is important, after the part the Senator from Kansas has taken in the various discussions, that we should understand and the country should understand the financial theory which he represents.

This is a proposition to issue $250,000,000 of currency, to be legal tender for all debts, past and future, which is to be redeemable in itself. The Government is to be under no obligation, if a twenty-dollar bill of this currency so issued be taken to the Treasury for redemption, to redeem it in anything except two ten-dollar bills, or four five-dollar bills, or twenty one-dollar bills of the same issue—the same kind of money.

So it is irredeemable money, pure and simple. It differs from the greenbacks of the war (which it was intended to redeem when the Government had the power) by declaring on its face, in substance, that it is never to be redeemed—that is, unless the Government please—that there shall never be any obligation to redeem it. I think it important (as I have put the question to the Senator whether that is his meaning, and he has answered that it is) that his views should be understood.

Mr. President, a vote was had on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas, and on the roll call the amendment received 7 votes, the other Senators, 58 in number, voting against it. Every Populist Senator voted for it. If you can issue $250,000,000 of irredeemable paper money to-day, you can issue $250,000,000 more to-morrow, and so on without limit.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Idaho permit me? I desire to correct the Senator, and I shall occupy his time but a mo ment. The Senator from Idaho ought not to put in a speech delivered in this Chamber the remarks of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] as defining the Populist position. Let me say that the statement that the Populist party here or elsewhere ever favored an irredeemable currency is not correct, and I hope——

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator will have ample opportunity to make that plain, if he can. I am reading their record. I am endeavoring to give their record.

Mr. ALLEN. But you are giving the Republican record and not the Populist record.

Mr. DUBOIS. I have quoted the amendment which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] offered and for which the Senator from Nebraska voted.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me, he puts in as part of that the definition which the senior Senator from Massachusetts gives of Populist doctrine. The Populist party does not recognize the senior Senator from Massachusetts as a Populist, nor does it recognize his authority to define the Populistic position.

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator from Massachusetts asked the Senator from Kansas, and got a reply in the affirmative. The Senator from Massachusetts said, as I just read, in closing the colloquy—I quote his language—

I think it important, as I have put the question to the Senator whether that is his meaning, and he answered that it is, that his views should be understood.

There was no objection to that interpretation by the Senator from Kansas or on the part of any other Senator here, and the vote given is on record.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him one moment longer, I will not do so again. The Senator from Kansas all the way through insisted that the $250,000,000 which it was proposed to issue was to be in the same form and the same substance as the greenback; that it was to have the same legal construction and effect as the greenback. The Senator from Idaho understands well, and so does the senior Senator from Massachusetts, that the greenback is a redeemable money. What the Senator from Kansas was insisting on was that the volume of money such as we have now should be enlarged, and he sought to enlarge it in that way.

Mr. DUBOIS. Nothing could more clearly demonstrate the views of the Populist party on the money question than this amendment, debate, and vote. It is strictly in accord with their national platform. It may be that some day both gold and silver will of necessity be discarded as basic money, because there will not be sufficient of both metals to meet the demands of business and population, and that the Governments will furnish paper money, for money uses, such money based solely on the credit of the Government.

I do not think it wise, safe, or expedient to inaugurate that contest now, however, and, for one, object to being committed in the slightest degree, even by indirection, to such a policy. Our fight is for gold and silver as basic money, as against gold alone. That contest we can and will win if we can keep the issue clear and distinct.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] was not here when this position was taken by his party on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER]; but, no doubt, he would subscribe to the doctrine of his party as then announced. Within the last few days the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], who is, without doubt, the best exponent of the principles of his party in this Chamber, stated his belief that the Government should own and operate the Pacific railroads, if not all railroads. That doctrine also is incorporated in their national platform.

I do not subscribe to it, and will not support it.

It would not be to the advantage of the people in any portion of the country, it seems to me, and in our own far Western section such a policy would be ruinous. The States of Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, for instance, are very large in area, and, in proportion to their area, sparsely settled. In many counties in these States the railroad companies pay from 50 to 75 per cent of the taxes, and they pay from 10 to 25 per cent of the State taxes. You can not tax Government property; so that the moment the Government became the owner of these roads this additional burden of taxation would fall upon the few people in these counties.

It would be an unbearable burden to them, and there would be no advantages to compensate. The Government could not confiscate these roads. Even the Populists do not advocate that, for widows and minors and innocent people own their bonds and stocks in many instances, who could not be ruthlessly robbed of their property. It would require vast sums of money to buy them, which the people would have to pay. There are so many objections, in my mind, to the proposition, which could easily be enumerated, that I am utterly opposed to it.

Then, again, the Populists are free traders if they are anything on the question of the tariff. Every member of their party in the House voted for the Wilson bill, which was as nearly a free-trade measure as could be passed. The Senator from Kansas, Mr. PEFFER, voted against the amended Wilson bill in the Senate, but their party record and party platform are favorable to free trade. At any rate, they are not advocates of protection. I am, and especially to the so-called raw materials of wool, lumber, and lead ore. I could not properly represent the people of my State or do justice to my convictions if I were not.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Idaho permit me a moment? In so far as my tariff views are concerned they are strictly in accord with the Republican platform of 1860, upon which Mr.

Lincoln was elected to the Presidency, and which is found revamped, I think, in the Democratic platform of 1884. The two platforms, if the Senator will examine and analyze them, are in almost the same language. They are both to the effect that the primary purpose of the tax is to raise revenue, and that incidentally it may be so adjusted as to protect industries.

Mr. DUBOIS. I do not understand the Senator from Nebraska to say that the Populist party are in favor of protection.

Mr. ALLEN. No; I state my tariff views. The Populist party platform of 1892 makes no definite declaration on the subject of the tariff. So far as my views are concerned, I say I entertain the same views that are declared in the platform of 1860, upon which Mr. Lincoln was elected, and which, if the Senator will examine carefully, he will find to be a revenue platform, and which the Democratic party declared in 1884 in almost identically the same language. I want to say to the Senator that if he will take the two planks out of those two different platforms and mix them up he can not tell to which platform either belongs.

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator will have ample time to define his position. I make only one positive statement here. I am very guarded in my language. I state that at any rate they are not advocates of protection. Does the Senator from Nebraska say that they are?

Mr. ALLEN. No, sir.

Mr. DUBOIS. I am, as I said.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will excuse me just a moment, I will state that the Republican party as it now exists, I understand, declares in favor of protection in the first instance, with revenue as the incident of protection. I do not believe in that doctrine. The Republican party of 1860 declared in favor of revenue as the primary purpose of all taxation and protection as an incident to the levying of that revenue. I believe in and subscribe to that doctrine.

Mr. DUBOIS. The reasons given are sufficient to explain why the silver Republicans did not join with the Populists. There is no sympathy between us. The silver Republicans are in favor of hard money, while the Populists are in favor of irredeemable paper money. They vote for unlimited coinage of silver, not because they believe in silver as basic money; not because it is the money of the Constitution, but because the coinage of silver will make more money and will increase the volume of money per capita.

Unlimited coinage to them is but a stepping stone, a preliminary to irredeemable paper money. Unlimited coinage to us means a safe and adequate basis of money of ultimate redemption. Unlimited coinage will receive the vote of the Populists in this Chamber, and I am glad of it; but I object very seriously to being committed myself or of allowing the cause of silver to be committed to Populist doctrines in general.

Mr. President, on the 30th day of October, 1893, when the measure to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act was before us, I had the honor of addressing the Senate, and made use of the following expression:

> I can be a Republican and a consistent advocate of free coinage. I prefer to hold to my convictions on the other great questions while maintaining my convictions on the money question, relying on the good sense, judgment, and independence of the American people. So long as I am honored with a seat in this Chamber I shall continue this fight. I shall not cease the struggle here until free coinage shall prevail or I am no longer a member of this body.

There is nothing in present conditions to induce me to change the position announced at that time.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the report of the Finance Committee, which is before us and which declares for the unlimited coinage of silver, and regret that the vote of the Senate will not avail to secure its enactment.

There is plainly something wrong in this country, so fruitful in resources and opportunities, and so filled with intelligent, law-abiding, and industrious people. Business is slack, employment at fair wages, or at any wages at all, hard to get. Factories and mines are either idle or working at much less than their full capacity, while the great agricultural classes receive scarcely enough for their produce to pay the running expenses of their farms and plantations. There is no prosperity among the toilers, notwithstanding the statement made now and then that this or that factory or industry has commenced operations with an increased number of employees and increased wages.

An investigation of each isolated case reported, will show, in nearly every instance, that the increase has been from no employees to a few, and from very low wages to an amount which hardly affords a living. Since silver was demonetized, the condition of affairs has been growing steadily worse, and the prices of everything steadily falling. Various devices have been resorted to to stop this persistently declining market, but to no avail. We have passed the Bland-Allison and the Sherman silver laws, which, while only making a commodity of silver, and adding to the burdens of gold, still did some good and afforded some temporary relief, because they increased the volume of money; and we have repealed those acts, which made matters worse. We have passed the McKinley Tariff Act, a high protective measure, and we have repealed it. We have passed the Wilson-Gorman Act, and now desire and intend to repeal it.

The people have alternately defeated the Republican and Democratic parties in national elections since 1876, hoping, in their restlessness and hard condition, to find relief in a change.

The prophecies of those who object to unlimited silver coinage, that the repeal of the Sherman Act, or the enactment of the McKinley law, or the enactment of the Wilson Act, or the repeal of the McKinley law, or anything else they have tried, have been proven to be idle vaporings. They certainly must know that the evil lies somewhere else; they must know that the trouble has come through the demonetization of silver, and that it will remain so long as we adhere to the single gold standard.

I assume that they recognize this because nearly every one of them, if not quite all, declare that they would gladly restore silver, provided England would join with us in doing so. It does not occur to me that they can reasonably hope that England will take this step.

England adopted the gold standard in 1816 and has been striving ever since to induce the other great nations to do the same. She succeeded practically in accomplishing her object in 1873, when Germany and the United States demonetized silver. England is the great creditor nation, and the scarcer and dearer money is the greater is her gain and power. With our debts, and with the constantly increasing demand for money to develop our immense resources, we can not compete with England and the other European countries in the scramble for gold. When we get the gold we can not keep it, and about the only way we can get it at all, apparently, is to borrow it.

We owe Great Britain and her citizens two thousand millions of dollars; whenever she needs money she dumps as many of our securities as may be necessary upon our market and takes our gold. She has done that on a large scale several times within the last few years, with the result that business on this side has each time been paralyzed. Still, wise business men and great financiers, to say nothing of the metropolitan press, insist that the way to choke Great Britain into subjection is to send over another $200,000,000 worth of bonds and draw that much gold from her. England holds our indebtedness precisely as a banker holds a man's paper to whom he has loaned money on call. What must English financiers think of men who pursue such an argument as that?

But, Mr. President, there is much more to this business.

England purchases of us annually food products, cotton, and other raw materials in vast amounts. I suppose that last year those purchases amounte1 to $400,000,000; that represented only 60 per cent of what the same articles would have brought had silver never been demonetized. Thus she gets cheap material for her factories to work upon, cheap food for her operatives, and over all clears directly probably $160,000,000 in the purchase. Moreover, we have to pay England annually in interest and dividends $150,000,000 in gold, or its equivalent, and we are going to force her to adopt bimetallism! We are going to force her to give up annually a sum equal to 5 per cent interest on all the gold in the world, and at the same time force her to raise the price of the materials she uses in the factory and the food she feeds to her operatives!

We are going to do this, too, when her commissioners directly snubbed us in an international conference called for the special purpose of trying to give silver an international status as money. By this I do not mean to say that a majority of the people of Great Britain do not favor bimetallism—I believe they do; but it is over there as it is here, those in power are determined to destroy silver as money, despite the demand of the people. And now, Mr. President, let us, at the risk of repeating some things which have already been better said, look the real situation in the face, and try to reach a conclusion which will meet the approbation of millions of our countrymen who have imposed this great trust upon us.

There is business congestion, almost business prostration, in nearly all foreign lands—in Australia, in Argentina, in England herself—everywhere, indeed, except in bimetallic France and where the mines in South Africa are being worked. In our own country production has ceased to be profitable. The strength of our country, the men who give laborers employment in the field, factory, and mine, and who produce the articles the exchange of which makes commerce, have worked without reward for years. Though the people are increasing, agricultural lands are declining in value and a host of strong men, enough to make a mighty army, are unemployed. In the words of Mr. Balfour—

> We are undergoing that appreciation in the standard of value which is probably the most deadening and benumbing influence that can touch the springs of enterprise in a nation.

Because of new motors and labor-saving machines the working forces of the world have within a few years been doubled. In such a situation we are called upon to continue the gold stand-

ard and to increase our stock of money only as we can borrow gold by issuing bonds. This policy persisted in will still further reduce the value of every staple, the value of all agricultural lands, and make worthless the railroad securities throughout the country.

It will still further close the doors to labor; it will cripple capital by making all investments worthless, and all men who are in debt bankrupt. I believe the strain will put the very life of our Republic in jeopardy. I know it will greatly reduce the number of children in our schools and greatly increase the number of inmates in our prisons. On the other hand, Mr. President, I believe there was no mistake made when the motors and the labor-saving machines were invented; I believe there was no error on the part of the Infinite when the silver was planted in the hills and the deserts of the West.

I believe it was intended to be the lubricating fluid of commerce as the peaceful conquest of this continent by the Anglo-Saxon should progress, until every needed road, bridge, city, and school-house should be built, till the land should be subdued, and the mines worked to the extremes of both British and Spanish America. All admit that more money is an absolute necessity. Not paper evidences of indebtedness to pass as money, but real money. There is but one place from which it can be obtained; that is from the silver mines of the West. The money would cost the Government nothing but the recognition it gave it prior to 1873.

The withdrawal of that recognition has already cost the Government and the people more than the money cost of the great war, while through it the shrinkage in property values has been beyond estimate. There must be renewed prosperity given the people; there must be work supplied to the unemployed to avoid danger to our Republic. There must be more money—not purchased gold, not paper promises to pay, but the money of the Constitution—and it must come in a way that will not cost the Government anything to receive it. The men of the United States, man for man, need two dollars where any other people need one. We have a continent yet to subdue.

Let us cease to worry so much over the 3 per cent of our trade which is foreign, and try to quicken and make profitable the 97 per cent which is domestic. The internal purchases last year would have been a thousand millions of dollars more had the people been reasonably prosperous. The trade of the Eastern cities would have doubled and would have been conducted on fair margins of profit; the banks would have been more prosperous, and this policy would, in twenty-five years, cause the commercial center of the world to gravitate to New York.

Let us get Spanish America in accord financially with a common currency, and we will get its trade. 'Tis there the children of the next generation will have to seek their homes. It is in that field where the resistless energies of the Anglo-Saxon race on this side of the Atlantic must be exerted. This is our great national opportunity, and we shall be recreant to the mighty trust which has been placed in our hands if we do not improve it.

I do not intend, Mr. President, to make a long-drawn-out argument in favor of restoring silver. The subject has been treated exhaustively many times, much more ably than I could hope to present it, and no answers have been made to the arguments presented by bimetallists which attempt to prove our contention is not correct in principle. In fact, our opponents seem to rely chiefly on personal abuse of silver advocates in the Senate, and of ridicule of the States which they represent. There is nothing too mendacious or vicious for those advocates of the gold standard to say.

They deplore constantly the fact that the Western silver States have two Senators here, while New York State has but two, and point out the difference in population with an air of triumph, as if this disparity in population were ample reasons why the representatives of the smaller States should surrender their convictions to the keeping of the larger. They seem to forget that New York State has thirty-six members of the House, while Idaho, for instance, has but one, and that this proportion extends to all the States, and that the people are represented fully in respect to their numbers in the respective States in the House of Representatives and the electoral college.

This matter of representation in the Senate and House was fought out when our Constitution was framed. It would be profitable for these critics to read the debates which occurred on this subject at that time. The conclusion reached finally was that each State should have two Senators, and the prime reason was that the great and small States might meet on equal terms here; that the brutality of mighty majorities might be checked and justice done to the minorities; that the States might meet on common ground in this body, and from each other obtain justice for all.

Notwithstanding this, I read in the press of the East almost every day that the region I represent is but a "pocket borough," not entitled to consideration at your hands, and the inference is that it is peopled by a class of men who are a perpetual shock to the refined and virtuous East. California, Montana, Colorado, and all the mining States represented by silver advocates here are similarly attacked, and the personal and private characters of Senators representing those States are most wantonly and viciously assailed. No one escapes.

I could read extracts by the hour, embracing direct attacks on the private character of every silver advocate on this floor, but they are so vile that I do not care to dignify them by reproduction in the RECORD. The meanest and most vindictive of these newspapers are published in New York City, where for fourscore years the worst elements of our foreign immigration have found a lodgment and where there have been more scandals in connection with their city government and elections than in any other spot in our country.

Idaho and the West need no defense at my hands, much less is there any need for its representatives to explain their actions to the obsequious press of New York City. If our States are proper subjects for abuse, however, because they have two Senators each, with but a small population, as compared with New York or Pennsylvania, why should not some of the Eastern States, represented by gold advocates, be proper objects for attack also. Our mining States, these "rotten borough" States, have immense areas, are boundless in their resources, and are increasing in population in a marvelous manner.

They are the haven now, as they have been in the past, for the energetic and industrious and law-abiding people of our own and foreign countries. I do not wish to nor intend to disparage the smaller States of the East, for I have the greatest respect for them and their representatives, past and present; but they are small in area, as well as population, and their resources are well-nigh exhausted.

The increase in their population must, of necessity, be limited, and confined chiefly to the cities. Washington State, for instance, has an area of 66,880 square miles, while New Hampshire has 9,005 square miles. Washington Territory had 24,000 people in 1870, and New Hampshire State 318,300 in the same year. Washington State had 349,390 in 1890 and New Hampshire 376,530. Washington State is five years old, New Hampshire more than a century. Colorado is little more than twenty years old, yet has more population than either New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, or Delaware, and more resources and area than all of them combined. California has more resources and area and nearly as great a population as all of them combined. Utah, the new State, almost equals them in population, and I have no doubt that the next census will show that all of the new States of the West surpass these smaller States of the East in population.

The census for 1880–1890 shows that the percentage of increase in population during these ten years was: Washington, 350 per cent; Montana, 238 per cent; Idaho, 158 per cent; Colorado, 117 per cent; Rhode Island, 24 per cent; Delaware, 14 per cent; New Hampshire, 8 per cent; Vermont, 0.004 per cent.

While there are no great fortunes owned by families or individuals in our section, the facts are, as shown by the last census, that these mining camps, these "rotten borough" States of the New York press, rank first in wealth per capita, surpassing any other States of the Union. Massachusetts and Pennsylvania are old established and rich States, yet the people of Idaho are worth $2 each, as against $1 for each citizen of these great Commonwealths.

I repeat, Mr. President, that these States nor their representatives deserve the slurs and anathemas of an insolent, if not a purchased, press. It is no criterion because a State is small in population that its Senators will not be able and conscientious. In reviewing in your mind the long list of American statesmen who have occupied positions here, it will come to your recollection that the smaller States are not afraid of or ashamed to compare their list of illustrious Senators with the greater States. I believe that the smaller States select their Senators with more care than the larger.

The States of the East and South which are small in population have every reason to be proud of their Senators, past and present, and so far as the Senators from the mining States of the West are concerned, they will account to their constituents, and not to the New York press, and will not fear the judgment of their colleagues or of the country at large as to their ability, patriotism, or honor.

I desire to say distinctly, in order that I can not be misunderstood, that none of these vicious attacks of the metropolitan press on the advocates of silver have been countenanced by the Senators here who disagree with us on this great question, It would be well for these papers to follow the example of the Senators who support their side of the question at issue. They will not frighten anyone, nor will they make converts by their personal abuse.

Mr. President, I say, and challenge truthful denial, that there is scarcely anything recorded in history comparable with the work performed and the transformation produced by the men who during the past generation have dedicated the western half of this continent to civilization. I am not boasting, Mr. President; I am speaking in this strain only because I am tired of the sneers and the arrogance of the ignorant or willfully perverse. In this same connection, I beg further to say that until this West, which is my home, began to turn its streams of silver and gold upon the East, this Republic was but a second-rate power in the opinion of the world; but a fourth or fifth rate power in financial standing, on a level merely with Egypt and Turkey.

While the men of the West have been blazing the trails for and uprearing the temples to civilization they have at the same time supplied the men of the East with their vitalizing agent called real money, which has enabled them to transport and realize on their common, coarse commodities until they now have reached a point where their poor memories and their absence of common gratitude and their overwhelming egotism cry out, "Not unto you, but unto ourselves, all the glory is due."

The reason why the mining States of the West are for silver is not to be found in the statement that they have silver to sell. They have the gold also, and probably in as great abundance as silver. As silver depreciates gold appreciates, so that so far as the mere dollars and cents are concerned in the purchasing values of the metals it is practically immaterial to us whether we have gold monometallism, silver monometallism, or the double standard of gold and silver.

In addition to that, the value of the silver which is now being dug out or which can be produced in our States under any conditions amounts to but very little in comparison with our other resources.

It is and has been one of our industries, however, the same as gold production, and it has been, and should now be, treated as money of the Constitution. When the money function was taken away from silver by unjust and uncalled-for legislation, and the industry of silver mining crippled, our people and their representatives in Congress naturally inquired the reason, and this led them to study the question of money. The attention of our people has been especially and directly called to the subject of silver, no doubt, because we are producers of both gold and silver, and the results of investigation have united them firmly in favor of the restoration of silver.

As a fact, we suffer less absolutely than any other portion of the country on account of the demonetization of silver, and can endure the single standard of gold with less personal hardship than any other section. Taken all in all, as communities we are to-day, I think, better off than the Eastern States, and will continue to be. It is of little importance to us as compared with the farmers of the South, middle West, and East, and the wage earners generally, whether silver is restored or we maintain the single standard of gold.

Speaking for my State alone, which is not so well known and not so well equipped, perhaps, as some of her mountain neighbors, Idaho has more agricultural land than all of New England combined, and its soil ranks with the most fertile and productive to be found within the boundaries of our country. Almost every day there is filled with sunshine. In mountain and river and landscape there is an ever-changing and a never-dying charm. The ratio of deaths there, notwithstanding her bad people, is less than any other spot on earth. In mineral and agricultural and fruit-raising resources the State is so equipped that were it set apart and made an island of the sea she would be an empire within herself, without one needed attribute wanting.

Mr. DANIEL. I ask that the pending business be informally laid aside, and that the resolution offered a few days since by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be informally laid aside, not losing its place, that he may call up the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

Mr. DANIEL. I can not yield to anyone.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Virginia must ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understood that unanimous consent was asked for something, and I simply desired to call the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to the strong desire there is, certainly on this side of the Chamber, to have some time fixed for taking a vote upon the unfinished business.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I intended to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to agree to take the vote on a day next week, but I did not want to interfere with the Senator from Virginia. He desires to proceed, and I preferred not to interrupt him, even so much as for a moment.

Mr. ALDRICH. It will take only a single moment to do that.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not like to interfere with the Senator from Virginia, but I am very anxious to secure an agreement.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Virginia is asking for unanimous consent, and I do not understand that it will interfere with him at all. I do not intend to make a suggestion that will lead to discussion.

Mr. DANIEL. I have taken the floor in pursuance of the formal notice given several days ago to the Senate, after, for the first time in the history of the Senate within my knowledge, having been taken from the floor by one who had not given notice.

Mr. ALDRICH. I certainly had no intention of interfering with the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia, that the unfinished business be informally laid aside and that the resolution of the Senator from New Jersey be laid before the Senate? The Chair hears none.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. DANIEL. I ask that the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Jersey be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution called up by the Senator from Virginia will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. SEWELL on the 16th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Monroe doctrine, as originally propounded, was directed to the special prevention of the threatened action of the Allied Powers in reference to the revolted colonies of Spain, and the occupation, by way of colonization, of any supposed derelict territory on this hemisphere.

2. That the question of resisting any acquisition of territory by conquest was limited, as stated by Mr. Webster, to cases in which, by reason of proximity, such acquisition would be dangerous to our safety and the integrity of our institutions.

3. That the true ground upon which the Monroe announcement was based and upon which any similar position has been taken rests for its justification upon what may be our interests, and our interests only; and that neither by the Monroe doctrine nor any other official declaration have we ever come under any pledge to any power or State on this continent that binds us to act merely for their protection against invasion or encroachment by any other power.

4. That when a case arises in which a European power proposes to acquire territory by invasion or conquest, it is then for us to determine whether our safety and the integrity of our institutions demand that we shall resist such action by armed force if necessary.

5. That the Executive has pressed the Monroe doctrine beyond what was contemplated at the time of its announcement, and that the resultant sequence of the positions thus taken seems to be a committal of this Government to a protectorate over Mexico and the Central and South American States; that this would be most unwise and dangerous, and would violate the sound and well-established policy that we should avoid all entangling alliances with foreign powers, whether they be European or American.

6. That this action was premature, looking to the history of the controversy, and inopportune in view of the business and financial condition of the country.

7. That neither Congress nor the country can be, or has been, committed by the action or position of the executive department, in reference to the Venezuelan boundary controversy, as to the course to be pursued when the time shall have arrived for a final determination. It will then be our province and our duty to adopt such a line of policy and to take such action as may be then demanded by our sense of duty to the country and by a due regard for its honor and dignity, the welfare and safety of our people, and the integrity of our institutions.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, resolutions of the general assembly of Virginia indorsing the message of the President upon the Venezuelan complication with Great Britain were some days since laid by me before the Senate, and in venturing to-day to address the Senate upon that subject I have the gratifying assurance that I shall speak not only my own earnest personal convictions but those as well of the honored constituency which I in part represent.

Least of all the nations of the earth can Great Britain fitly object to the assertion of the Monroe doctrine by the United States, for, in the language of Edward Everett, it was announced not merely with the approval of the British minister of foreign affairs but had his earnest and oft-repeated solicitation.

Least of all nations does it become her to contend that it is not recognized as international law because it is not founded on the general consent of nations, for Great Britain herself invoked the United States to its utterance, not only without the consent but as well against the strong menaces of France, Austria, Russia, and Prussia.

Least of all nations can Great Britain fairly controvert that governmental policy which underlies the Monroe doctrine, for she, foremost and most conspicuously of all nations, has intervened in the affairs of the world at large, not only whenever her peace and safety were even remotely involved, but also wherever and whenever her capital could be invested, her commerce expanded, or territorial aggrandizement be exercised.

Even as to the existing dispute with Venezuela we perceive the outcropping of her own Monroe doctrine, so to speak, by her demand in a cession to Venezuela, at one time proffered, that no portion of the territory proposed to be ceded should be alienated at any time to a foreign power.

Yes, Mr. President, even the term "jingoes," now derisively

applied to Americans who would resist foreign encroachments on American soil, is borrowed from the nomenclature of our British kin across the sea, they using it specially to designate the followers of Lord Beaconsfield, who favored a vigorous foreign policy. The expression was caught up from a popular song which ran:

> We don't want to fight, but, by jingo, if we do
> We've got the ships, we've got the men, we've got the money, too.

The American jingoes are only chips of the old block—and very mild, moderate, abbreviated, and conservative chips at that, considering the block.

Least of all can the great nation from whom we derived "the language of Milton, the code of Blackstone, and the creed of Christ" flout the policy of arbitration. The main reason assigned by her prime minister for not accepting it—that is that many thousand British subjects have settled upon the disputed territory—begs the question. If they are there lawfully, an honest arbitrament would so ascertain and end the controversy. If they are but squatter sovereigns and land grabbers, or within Venezuela's rightful borders, neither they nor their sovereign can take advantage of their own wrong;—then they are a colony within the recognized denunciation of the Monroe doctrine, and even within the pale of the diluted resolutions of the Senator from New Jersey and the attenuated Americanism of the opposition.

Arbitration is the modern and the rightful method of settling differences between nations. It is the substitute for war. It appeals to humanity. It is necessary to civilization. It is Christianity.

The refusal of Great Britain to arbitrate a question, nominally one of boundary between British Guiana and the Republic of Venezuela, involving many thousand square miles of territory, has led to controversial correspondence between the British Government and the United States. In this correspondence our Government has stood for and recommended arbitration, but Great Britain has stood out against it and repelled it.

The circumstances of this controversy peculiarly impressed the policy of arbitration.

1. Boundary lines must rest on historic evidences and are readily capable of demarcation. Every civilized nation has a system of jurisprudence under which such a subject is easily explored and adjudicated.

2. Venezuela is in possession of much of the disputed territory, and has been long in possession. The loss to her would be greater than the gain to Great Britain, for it would be accompanied with all the humiliation and distress which are associated with the bereavement of national territory and the degradation of the national name.

3. Venezuela is the weaker nation. Would Great Britain treat Russia, Germany, France, or America as it treats her?

> Oh, it is excellent
> To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous
> To use it like a giant.

This is a free translation into our language of the French phrase "noblesse oblige."

The anxiety of the United States for a peaceful solution of the issue and their great concern in the interests involved have been continuously manifested, and, in every form of dignified diplomacy, have been communicated to the British nation.

Presidents have written messages, Secretaries of State have tendered the good offices of the United States, and Congress has passed resolutions—all in the spirit of conciliation, and all in vain.

In his message to Congress of December, 1891, Benjamin Harrison, then President, expressed his regret that the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela, touching the boundary of British Guiana, had not been disposed of, and that the friendly efforts of the United States in that direction had thus far been unavailing. This Government, he said, will continue to express its concern at any appearance of encroachment on territories under the administrative control of the American States, and he well added:

> The determination of the disputed boundary is easily attainable by an amicable arbitration where the rights of the parties rest, as here, on historical facts readily ascertained.

President Cleveland, in his message to Congress of December, 1894, said:

> The boundary of British Guiana still remains in dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela. Believing that its early settlement, on some just basis alike honorable to both parties, is in the line of our established policy to remove from this hemisphere all causes of difference with powers beyond the sea, I shall renew the efforts heretofore made to bring about a restoration of diplomatic relations between the disputants and to induce a reference to arbitration, a resort which Great Britain so conspicuously favors in principle and respects in practice, and which is earnestly sought by her weaker adversary.

In February, 1894, the Congress of the United States resolved:

> That the President's suggestion made in his last annual message to this body, namely, that Great Britain and Venezuela refer their dispute as to boundaries to friendly arbitration, be earnestly recommended to the favorable consideration of both the parties in interest.

To all of those appeals—and to the appeals of the present Administration, of which I shall more specifically speak—and well knowing the American policy and the American interests in the question involved, Great Britain has turned a deaf ear. We fix the responsibility of the first wrong on Great Britain and we range both Congress and the Administration in their appropriate attitude as friends of justice and friends of peace.

Both the United States and Great Britain have been professed friends of arbitration between nations. They have both time and again added example to precept by so settling differences between themselves and by commending such plan of settlement to other nations. Twice has Great Britain arbitrated the question of her colonial possessions with the United States, twice with Portugal, and once with Germany. When the Franco-German war was brewing, Great Britain urged upon the two great nations a conference with each other to settle by arbitration. France refused—Sedan was her awful penalty. It is within recent memory that the *Alabama* claims preferred by the United States against Great Britain were settled by arbitration, the United States winning the case and Great Britain honorably paying the penalty. The controversies over the fisheries and the Bering Sea were both settled between them by arbitration, and in this century the United States has settled over forty international questions in this manner and over three-score and ten have been so settled among the various nations.

Just in proportion as mankind progresses and the arts of peace surround him with the comforts and luxuries of life, so increase the interdependence of man upon man, state upon state, and nation upon nation. As civilization advances, the complexity of its mechanism grows greater, and war in the like degree becomes the more destructive and the more horrible. Sweep commerce from the seas, break up the railroad and telegraph line, sever the electric line, cut the water pipe or gas pipe, and instantly hunger and thirst and darkness assail the city, while crops rot in uncultured fields and goods rot on deserted counters; while idle and famished throngs, demoralized and maddened, are ready to become a despot's tools. To bring upon the world the curse of war or to provoke it is a crime against God and man, a deed "to make all heaven weep, all earth amazed."

If so horrible a thing shall come to pass, be it remembered that the first step toward it was taken by Great Britain, when, being solemnly invoked for years to arbitrate a chronic question in which this Government felt deep concern, she refused to do it.

Some minor points should be eliminated from this discussion. The contention that the dispute covers but a narrow strip of territory, which is derided as "the mud flats of the Orinoco," is answered by the fact that between the extreme lines of boundary claimed by Great Britain and Venezuela are some 90,000 square miles of land, an area greater than any one of the thirteen original States of this Union as now bounded, and nearly twice as great as the Empire State of New York. Lord Salisbury describes the subject-matter as—

> Large tracts of territory which, from their auriferous nature, are known to be of almost untold value.

We are told in one breath that the President has gone a bow shot beyond Monroe, and that he has adopted a jingo policy. In the next breath we are told that he has given the whole matter away by saying that—

> Any adjustment of the boundary which Venezuela may deem to her advantage and may enter into with her own free will can not, of course, be objected to by the United States.

This is specific language applied to a specific condition of things. It was not destined to commit the United States to the doctrine that a foreign nation might be permitted to acquire American territory by any arrangement satisfactory to the grantor, and it is not fair to convert into the declaration of a general principle the mere utterance of a specific phrase containing a suggestion of adjustment, for as much was implied in the recommendations of both President Harrison and President Cleveland and in the resolutions of Congress recommending arbitration. The major proposition is "arbitrate by reference to a third party." It contains the minor proposition "agree with free will and in good faith without reference."

Two sets of resolutions are pending in the Senate. Those proposed by the Committee on Foreign Relations are now on the Calendar, and I shall not discuss them in advance of their due consideration, further than to say that I regard them as simply embodying a detailed statement of the Monroe doctrine as embraced in the more general language in which it was uttered, and as according with the view given by Mr. Jefferson to Monroe that—

> We will oppose with all our means the forcible interposition of any other power as auxiliary, stipendiary, or under any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer [that is, of any of our American territories] to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way.

I heard yesterday, Mr. President, a most eloquent and engaging speech from the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT]. I imagined at one period of his speech, so high was his eulogy upon

the British Empire and its heroes, and so severe some of his strictures upon the present Administration, that he was in fact opposing the doctrine of Monroe, or anything like it, but when I came to read it in cold type, I perceived that, instead of being the subjects of his strictures, those who advocate this doctrine are in reality the subjects of his praise, for he says, as to the Davis resolutions, which are so much misrepresented:

> The phraseology of the resolutions reported by the committee, Mr. President, is as unobjectionable as any language could be which endeavored to assert in binding and final terms a policy to which this Government desired to commit itself in dealing with the relations of foreign countries to this hemisphere. It is moderate, it is clear, and it is comprehensive. The objection to it, in my opinion, is that Congress is not called upon to give its sanction to any policy to be pursued toward the Governments to the south of us; and that at this particular juncture any legislation is unwise and can only accentuate existing difficulties.

So between the two Senators who have spoken to these resolutions offered by the Senator from New Jersey there is this difference, that the Senator from New Jersey thinks that his resolutions go far enough, while the Senator from Colorado characterizes those of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as moderate, clear, and comprehensive, his only objection being not to what they contain, but as to the methods of dealing with the subject. The resolutions offered by the Senator from New Jersey seem to me to misinterpret the history and to pervert the plain language of the doctrine of Monroe; and if they be a correct reading of the last seventy years of our history, then I can readily believe with the Senator from Colorado that this doctrine has been greatly misunderstood.

That it was directed especially to the prevention of the threatened action of the Allied Powers in reference to the revolted colonies of Spain and the occupation, by way of colonization, of any supposed derelict territory on this hemisphere may be true, but it is only a half truth, for the language of Monroe covers—

> any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power.

Why do Senators attempt to quote history, and quote but half of a sentiment or a sentence?

To their statement that the acquisition of territory by conquest was limited, as stated by Mr. Webster, to cases in which, by reason of proximity, such acquisition would be dangerous to our safety and the integrity of our institutions, the answer is complete that Mr. Webster himself applied the doctrine to the South American Republics, and that instead of being farther away from us now than they were at that time, they have practically grown closer by those bonds of civilization produced by rapid transit and communication.

It is admitted that the Monroe doctrine rests solely upon our interests, and that we have come under no pledge to any power or state that binds us to act for their protection. No one now desires to promulgate or to apply the doctrine with any other view than to act as an independent nation should act in furtherance of its own interests. But what resolution upon this floor or what Senator has suggested another idea; and why should the Senate resolve upon a question as to which there is no controversy?

The view of the resolutions offered by the Senator from New Jersey, which limits the doctrine to cases of invasion and conquest, is controverted by its own language, and as he has invoked Mr. Webster's name, let me reply to that resolution from Mr. Webster's speech in the Senate touching the transfer of Cuba by Spain to another European monarchy:

> An honorable member from Kentucky [Mr. Wickliffe] argues that, although we might rightfully prevent another power from taking Cuba from Spain by force, yet if Spain should choose to make the voluntary transfer, we should have no right whatever to interfere. Sir, this is a distinction without a difference. If we are likely to have contention about Cuba, let us first well consider what our rights are, and not commit ourselves. And, sir, if we have any right to interfere at all, it applies as well to the case of a peaceable as to that of a forcible transfer.

Mr. President, I could range a constellation of distinguished American names around the doctrine thus stated by Daniel Webster, but as it is lit up by a star of the first magnitude, I leave it alone in its glory.

That the President's action was premature and imprudent in view of our business and financial condition, it seems to me as but superficial criticism. The financial crisis came on five or six years ago—it may last five or ten years more. Meantime are the United States to take no cognizance of great affairs, but sit down supinely and let the wide world wag as it will? "Unsettled questions have no regard for the repose of nations"; we had to meet the question when it was presented, nor did it lie within our power or province to dictate to Great Britain and Venezuela when they should present it.

That the Executive could not commit Congress or the country by his action is readily admitted. But it may as well be stated at the same time that the country has never refused yet, in all its history, to stand by a President who was guarding its rights and interests, and that the masses of the people, as well as their representatives in Congress, will support him is too manifest to need argumentation.

The declaration of the resolutions that the Executive has pressed the doctrine beyond what was contemplated at the time of its announcement, and that it commits us to a protectorate over Mexico and the Central and South American States, is farfetched. And now I shall attempt to show this by analyzing the doctrine and its history. But let me say I am not for the doctrine because Monroe uttered it or anybody else has supported it. I am for it because it is sound American doctrine and embodies an American policy which is necessary to our tranquillity and safety.

And let me say, Mr. President, that while I am a believer in the doctrine of Monroe, I do not rest my advocacy of the principles embodied in the President's message upon that doctrine alone. If there had never been a Monroe doctrine, I should be in favor of making an American doctrine now, not resting it upon tradition, but upon the obvious interest and policy of the people of the United States.

Rufus Choate was once addressing a court and made a legal proposition. "Can you refer me, Mr. Choate," said the presiding judge, "to any precedent?" "I hope, sir, that none can be found," answered Mr. Choate, "for then your court would have the honor of making one to be respected hereafter." That is the way I feel as to the American doctrine embodied in the language of Monroe.

I shall, however, note before I go fully into the discussion, the declaration of the Senator from New Jersey, that Monroeism is a dead letter, and I shall have regard to his consignment of it to the tomb of the Capulets.

I can not better describe the effect of the Monroe doctrine than by adopting the language of Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State, in his report to President Grant of July 14, 1870, in which he said:

> This declaration resolves the solution of the immediate question of the independence of the Spanish-American colonies, and is supposed to have exercised some influence upon the course of the British Government in regard to the Absolutists' claims in Europe as well as in America. It has also exercised a permanent influence on this continent; it was at once invoked in consequence of the supposed peril of Yucatan on the side of Europe; it was applied to a similar danger threatening Yucatan; it was embodied in the treaty of the United States and Great Britain as to Central America; it produced the successful opposition of the United States to an attempt of Great Britain to exercise dominion in Nicaragua under the cover of the Mesquite Indians, and it operated in like manner to prevent the establishment of a European dynasty in the United States.

In extension or furtherance of the doctrine, Mr. Frelinghuysen, as Secretary of State, wrote on January 4, 1883, that, on the ground that the decision of American questions pertains to America itself, the Department will not sanction any arbitration by European States of South American difficulties, even with the consent of the parties. Mr. Blaine, in 1881, informed Mr. Noyes, our resident minister at Paris, that this Government would regard with grave anxiety an attempt on the part of France to force by hostile pressure the payment by Venezuela of her debt to French citizens, and the same year advised Mr. Morton, then our minister at the same court, that it was inexpedient for the United States to join with France and Great Britain in intervening to terminate hostilities between Chile and Peru.

For a dead letter and for a corpse in the tomb of the Capulets this doctrine has indeed played a great figure in the affairs of the world.

President Cleveland's message of December 17, 1895, with respect to the differences between Great Britain and Venezuela, was the most notable political event of that year. Its reception by Congress was worthy the dignity of the subject and the occasion. Controversies of party instantly subsided and in the hush of all personal, sectional, and political contentions both Houses instantly responded by voting the hundred thousand dollars asked for the constitution of a commission to investigate the subject. It was a sublime spectacle to behold how the call of patriotism made the people one. The commission of five eminent citizens has now been organized to give careful and impartial investigation of the matter, and pending that investigation I do not see fit to discuss the merits of the question. But if Congress has been unanimous, there have been dissenting voices from different parts of the country, mostly from the stock exchanges and centers of trade, which have found rumors of war disturbing to their business.

I am glad to say, however, that in the great State of New York he who once presided as Vice-President over this Chamber, and who is now the governor of New York, has not lost the equanimity of his American sentiments. Governor Morton says, in a message to the legislature of that State:

> The doctrine formulated by President Monroe, and which has since borne his name, has become so well established in American national policy that there is no room for doubt as to the opinion of our people concerning it.

He well adds:

> Arbitration affords a simple, humane, and peaceful method of determining the dispute, and it is scarcely conceivable, at this period of the world's history, that any great nation is willing to take the responsibility of the sacrifice of human life and the wanton destruction of property which would be the inevitable result of an armed conflict.

Since 1814, when Great Britain acquired Demerara, Essequibo, and Berbice by treaty with the Netherlands, the dividing line between these establishments, now known as British Guiana and Venezuela, has been a subject of difference between Great Britain and that country.

It is observable in the British Blue Book and the Colonial List that this line between 1885 and 1886 leaped forward so as to embrace 33,000 square miles of territory never claimed ostensibly in the official publications of the British Government before.

In 1840 Great Britain sent Sir Robert Schomburgk to ascertain and lay down the western boundaries of British Guiana. He proceeded to fix the line since known as the Schomburgk line, outlined it on maps, and marked it by posts and other indicia of boundary. Venezuela protested against this line, and the boundary marks set up by Schomburgk were removed by order of Lord Aberdeen. From time to time since 1840 various lines have been proposed by Great Britain.

Lord Aberdeen proposed a line in 1844 beginning at the River Moroco.

Lord Granville in 1801 indicated another line placing the starting point at a distance of 20 miles from the Moroco, in the direction of Punta Barima.

Lord Rosebery in 1886 placed the boundary west of the Guaima River.

Lord Salisbury in 1890 fixed the starting point of the line in the mouth of the Amacuro River, west of Punta Barima, on the Orinoco.

Lord Rosebery in 1893 brought forward a line again from a point to the west of the Amacuro as far as the source of the Cumano River and the mountains of Usupamo.

In 1876 Venezuela proposed to close the dispute by accepting the Moroco line proposed by Lord Aberdeen in 1844.

Lord Granville rejected this proposal and suggested a new line taking in a much larger tract of territory. Venezuela declined this proposal in 1882 and suggested arbitration. But before this had taken the form of any definite proposal Great Britain suggested a treaty which should determine the boundary and other disputed questions. In 1886 the Gladstone Government, as we are told by Mr. Olney, practically agreed upon a treaty containing a general arbitration clause, but before it was signed Lord Salisbury superseded Mr. Gladstone in office and declined to acceed to the arbitration clause unless Venezuela should confine it to such of the disputed territory as lies west of the line designated by him and abandon claim to the residue. Weary of the dispute, Venezuela, in 1887, withdrew her minister from the Court of St. James, and protesting before Her Majesty's Government and before all civilized nations and before the world in general against the acts of spoliation committed to her detriment by the Government of Great Britain, which she will at no time and on no account recognize as capable of altering in the least the rights which she had inherited from Spain, and respecting which she will ever be willing to submit to the decision of a third power.

On January 20, 1895, Mr. Olney, the American Secretary of State, addressed a note to our minister to Great Britain, in which he set forth the facts which I have related, with many others pertinent to the controversy, and fully expounding the American policy with relation to the aggrandizement of territory in this country by the nations of the Old World. His note is a powerful, clear, and unanswerable exposition of the subject. He explained the Monroe doctrine and cited the instances in which our Government had applied it. He referred to the British demand that her right to a disputed portion of the territory should be acknowledged before she would consent to an arbitration as to the rest, which, as he declared, "in effect deprived Venezuela of her free agency and puts her under virtual duress."

Territory—

He said—

acquired by reason of it will be as much wrested from her by the strong hand as if occupied by British troops or covered by British fleets. It seems, therefore, quite impossible that this position of Great Britain should be assented to by the United States, or that, if such position be adhered to with the result of enlarging the bounds of British Guiana, it should not be regarded as amounting in substance to an invasion and conquest of Venezuelan territory.

Further he stated:

Great Britain's assertion of title to the disputed territory, combined with her refusal to have that title investigated, being a substantial appropriation of the territory to her own use, not to protest and give warning that the transaction will be regarded as injurious to the interests of the people of the United States, as well as oppressive in itself, would be to ignore an established policy with which the honor and welfare of this country are closely identified.

Under these circumstances he instructed Ambassador Bayard to present these views to Lord Salisbury by reading to him his communication and to reenforce them by such pertinent considerations as would doubtless occur to him. Our Secretary of State thus called for a definite decision upon the point whether Great Britain would consent or decline to submit the Venezuelan boundary question in its entirety to impartial arbitration, and he expressed in conclusion the earnest hope of the President that the conclusion would be on the side of arbitration and that Great Britain would add one more to the conspicuous precedents she has already furnished in favor of that wise and just mode of adjusting international disputes.

Lord Salisbury replied to Mr. Olney's communication in two dispatches, both dated November 26, 1895, in which he disputed the applicability of the Monroe doctrine to the question, and declined on the part of Great Britain to submit to arbitration the territory in question beyond the Schomburgk line. Speedily after the receipt of these messages the President sent his message to Congress in reply to Lord Salisbury's contention that the doctrines of Monroe are generally inapplicable to the state of things in which we live at the present day, and especially inapplicable to the controversy involving the boundary line between Great Britain and Venezuela. He stated that—

The doctrine upon which we stand is strong and sound, because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a nation and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions and the tranquil maintenance of our distinctive form of government. It was intended to apply to every stage of our national life, and can not become obsolete while our Republic endures. If the balance of power is justly a cause for jealous anxiety among the Governments of the Old World and a subject for our absolute noninterference, none the less is an observance of the Monroe doctrine of vital concern to our people and their Government.

If a European power, by an extension of its boundaries, takes possession of the territory of one of our neighboring republics against its will and in derogation of its rights, it is difficult to see why to that extent such European power does not thereby attempt to extend its system of government to that portion of this continent which is thus taken.

In reply to the suggestion that the Monroe doctrine does not embody any principle of international law which is founded on the general consent of nations, he conclusively answered that—

while it may not have been admitted in so many words to the code of international law, but since in international councils every nation is entitled to the rights belonging to it, if the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine is something we may justly claim it has its place in the code of international law as certainly and as securely as if it were specifically mentioned.

The President, further summing up his views, recommended the appointment of an American commission to investigate the case and declared that—

When such report is made and accepted it will, in my opinion, be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which after investigation we have determined of right belong to Venezuela.

In support of these sentiments I speak now with such feelings as must have possessed Lewis Cass, of Michigan, when as a member of this body he here declared in 1856, with reference to the Monroe doctrine, that—

We ought years ago by Congressional interposition to have made this system and policy an American system by a solemn declaration, and if we had done so we should have spared ourselves much trouble and no little mortification.

Indeed, one of the grounds taken by the British prime minister in his letter to Mr. Olney is that this Government has never formally notified the government of any other nation of its claims under the Monroe doctrine. Why, sir, if he had turned over the archives of his own office and explored the letters of Secretaries Blaine and Frelinghuysen he would have found that he was in error in that statement, and surely he has access to the Parliamentary proceedings of his own country, which would abundantly enlighten him. For my part I am in favor of clearing the way so that he may have no excuse for falling into such an error hereafter.

The great names of our history are identified with this doctrine.

Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, John Tyler, James K. Polk, James Buchanan, Abraham Lincoln, U. S. Grant, R. B. Hayes, James A. Garfield, Chester A. Arthur, and Benjamin Harrison, and now notably Grover Cleveland, have given it their approbation.

Daniel Webster, Edward Everett, Henry Clay, John M. Clayton, William H. Seward, Lewis Cass, Hamilton Fish, William M. Evarts, Theodore Frelinghuysen, James G. Blaine, Thomas F. Bayard, and now Richard Olney are among the distinguished Secretaries who have indorsed and advocated it. It is embedded in the minds of the people as a necessary principle of American policy and is dear to their hearts as a glorious tradition of their national life. If it has been a dead letter, the Presidents and Secretaries of State of the United States and the great statesmen who have led their movements and molded their measures have been singularly ignorant and misinformed.

The immortal Farewell Address of Washington gave to this country an invaluable legacy in warning us to avoid implication in the ordinary vicissitudes of European politics or in the ordinary combinations and collisions of its friendships and enmities. The felicitous phrase of Jefferson, "Friendly relations with all nations, entangling alliances with none," became a proverb, and the successors of the fathers have often repeated this counsel, which was as obvious in its wisdom as it was impressive and cogent in its utterance. It was mainly based by Washington upon the fact that Europe has a set of interests which to us have none or a very

remote relation, and that hence she must become engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns, while our detached and distant situation invited and enabled us to preserve a different course.

At the time when this advice originated the United States was the only republic—indeed, the only independent nation—of the Western Hemisphere. Its territory consisted of a narrow strip of land on the Atlantic coast, its population was thin and scattered, it had entered upon the experiment of a federated republic surrounded north and south by the colonial possessions of the great monarchies of Europe, while its boundaries, distant but a few hundred miles from the seaboard, were yet tenanted by powerful tribes of savages. The domestic situation naturally prompted and impressed the lesson of Washington, while beyond the seas the turmoils and perturbations which grew out of the French revolution were in themselves warnings to us to abstain as far as possible from implicating ourselves in them.

Beyond these considerations lay the fact that we had many perplexing questions of our own to deal with. We were in the infantile and formative period of independent existence. There was a new heaven and a new earth to the people, who felt the quickening pulses of freedom, independence, union, and nationality. To the new conditions our statesmen addressed themselves with vigor and skill, and if the spectacle of the rapid advancement through the wilderness of a fresh young people, the rise of new States, and the rounding out of our natural empire by diplomatic address and the conquests of arms be an imposing one in the physical progress of the race, yet more so must be the rare phenomena of intellectual development disclosed in the masterful statecraft with which new problems, novel and difficult, which pressed upon us, were grasped and solved.

As time progressed it soon became evident that if Europe had her set of primary interests which did not concern us, the American continent had a set of primary interests in which our concern was necessary and paramount to that of Europe. If nonintervention of America in European affairs was the policy of our situation, to preserve our peace and safety, so the noninterference of Europe with the affairs of independent American States became the corollary. As new republics sprung up in America, it became as manifestly our duty to assert the counterpart of Washington's advice as it was to him to utter it. Our international creed was not complete until we had rounded the declaration that we would not interfere in European affairs with the additional declaration that we would not regard with friendship European interference with those of independent sister American States.

James Monroe, the first of a line of Presidents who have taught this creed, was the fifth President of the United States, twice chosen to that office. He was one of the band of worthies who are regarded as the Conscript Fathers of the Republic. He was a profound student of political systems, policies, and movements, and he was deeply imbued with the spirit of Democratic faith and with the principles of our free Constitution. For over half a century his name was associated with the great events of war and peace which marked the rise of the American people, the extension of their empire, and the formation of their institutions. His Administration was known as the era of good feeling. John Quincy Adams called it "the golden age." His teachings have left a deep and lasting impression upon our history.

He was born in Westmoreland County, Va., on the 28th of April, 1758, and at the outbreak of the Revolutionary war he was a student at the old college of William and Mary. Laying aside his studies at the outbreak of hostilities in 1776, he, with three of its professors and some threescore of his fellows, including John Marshall, afterwards our first Chief Justice, joined their comrades from Harvard, Yale, and Princeton as volunteers in the Continental Army. Becoming a lieutenant in the Third Virginia Regiment, commanded by Hugh Mercer, he and his captain, William Washington, fell wounded side by side in the battle of Princeton, where their brave colonel lost his life; and early distinguished by his acts of gallantry in the northern campaigns, he arose from one degree to another until none surpassed him in public service or in the esteem and confidence of his countrymen.

His intimacy with Thomas Jefferson began in 1780, when he studied law under his direction while he was governor of Virginia, and he was a lifelong friend of his distinguished compatriots, Washington, Jefferson, Marshall, and Madison. His public employments were various, and his restless activity was always directed to the highest tasks. He was singularly wise, discreet, courageous, practical, and successful. He was so perfectly honest that Jefferson said of him—

If his soul were turned inside out, not a spot would be found on it—

And—

There was a downrightness and manliness and crystal-like integrity in his character which constantly grew upon his associates.

No American that ever lived was in closer sympathy with the genius of his country or more useful in the steady and able maintenance of its just policies. He was a member of the executive council of his State, three times a member of its legislature, and three times its governor. He was a member of the Continental Congress, a Senator of the United States, a member of the Virginia convention which ratified the Federal Constitution in 1788, and more than forty years afterwards he sat with Marshall and Madison in the convention that formed the Virginia constitution in 1830. He became minister to France under the appointment of Washington in 1794, and in that country he was received with great favor, while for his part he expressed his own and his country's sympathy with the French Republic so earnestly that his language was deemed by Washington scarcely in keeping with the neutral policy which his Administration proclaimed. He was again employed in the diplomatic service in 1803, in the Administration of Jefferson, and was associated with Livingston, our resident minister at Paris, in negotiating the purchase of New Orleans and the territory embracing the mouth of the Mississippi, which formed a part of the province of Louisiana recently ceded by Spain to France. He was Secretary of State and Secretary of War in the Cabinet of Madison, and at one time performed the functions of both offices.

As a member of the Virginia legislature he was one of those who brought forward the bill by which Virginia confirmed the Northwest ordinance of 1788 for the colonization by freemen alone of the Northwest Territory, which she gave to the Union, and dedicating portions thereof to educational purposes, thus laying the foundation of the great free and independent States which now occupy so commanding a position in the Union. He was destined to play a conspicuous part in rounding the dimensions of the United States to their natural boundaries by the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean. In the treaty of peace with Great Britain it had been stipulated that the Mississippi River from its source to its mouth should be open to the subjects of Great Britain and the citizens of the United States. Spain, then holding the Floridas, which included the territory afterwards known as Louisiana, objected, and many were disposed to surrender the American claim of right to this highway to the ocean. The Virginia delegates in Congress persistently refused to yield, and among them was Monroe, who in 1786 wrote a pamphlet asserting the right of the inhabitants of the Western country to the free navigation of the Mississippi.

It was due to the persistence of a few strong men, thus led by him, that the Spanish closure of the mouth of the Mississippi was prevented, and that the territory which passed from Spain to France was added to the United States of America, and it was his singular good fortune to have been Secretary of War of the United States at the time when Jackson won his famous victory over Pakenham at New Orleans on the 8th of January, 1815, and I will here indulge in the pleasing reflection that the great States of the West which now fill this Chamber with the representatives of their equality won to us by the policy of Monroe are parts of that territory, and that my own State had no small part in the far seeing and brave statesmanship which commenced the negotiation for its acquisition in the Administration of Washington and consummated it in the Administration of Jefferson.

Monroe succeeded Madison as President in 1816, and was reelected without opposition in 1820. For his Cabinet officers he chose John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State; John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War; W. H. Crawford as Secretary of the Treasury, and William Wirt as Attorney-General; and with these able officers he dealt with consummate ability with the issues that came before him. He accomplished in 1819 the acquisition of the Floridas which, as minister to Spain, he had failed to do in 1804. But the act of his Administration by which his name is most distinguished was the promulgation of what is known as the Monroe doctrine, an utterance of his seventh annual message, of the 2d of December, 1823.

The occasion for the promulgation of that doctrine, its significance, its utility, and its place among the traditional principles of the American people I propose now to consider. It was brought forth by two important complications in our foreign affairs. In 1820 the Russian Emperor had issued a ukase declaring that the pursuit of commerce, whaling, fishing, and all other industries, whether on the islands or in the ports and gulfs of the northwestern coast of America from Bering Straits to 51° north latitude, belonged exclusively to Russia and that no foreign vessels should come within 300 miles of the coast.

About the same time affairs in Europe assumed a threatening attitude toward America. Napoleon had been overthrown at Waterloo on the 18th of June, 1815. The Bourbons were again in power, Louis XVIII longing to imitate "the Grand Monarque," came once more to the throne of France. The Allied Powers in Europe found fitting opportunity for undertaking to suppress the popular spirit engendered by the American and the French revolutions and to assert the divine rights of kings.

Their treaty was signed at Paris by Alexander of Russia, Francis of Austria, and Frederick William of Prussia, acting as absolute sovereigns, without the intervention of ministers or diplomatic agents. To read it in the garish light of these practical times one

would suppose that these visionary monarchs imagined that they could make the world "one entire and perfect chrysolite"—that the millennium was about to flower out over the lava beds of exhausted revolution. Led on by Alexander of Russia, who was himself inspired by the Baroness Krudener, a woman of mystic eloquence, they assumed themselves to be the delegates of Providence, charged with governing three branches of the human family and consecrating themselves to an indissoluble fraternity for the protection of religion, peace, and justice. They invoked their peoples to glory in the principles which the divine Saviour had taught to man, and they invited all sovereigns to join their order of the Holy Alliance. The irreverent populace fitly nicknamed their scheme "The Conspiracy of Kings." They were "moral agriculturists," after the manner of Captain Wragge. There was never among nations a more complete exhibit of the wolf in sheep's clothing. Under this guise of sanctity lay dreams of conquest and a determination to suppress all assertions and advancements of the popular spirit. As vicegerents of fate, they proposed a crusade against the liberties of mankind. Of a tender disposition by nature, but wholly possessed by the doctrine of absolutism, Alexander was not unwilling to make concessions to liberal views, but he recognized no rights in peoples to move on their own lines of progress, and taught that policy and privilege should flow downward to the people from the throne.

The allied sovereigns of this alliance held congresses from time to time at Aix-la-Chapelle, Troppau, Laybach, and Verona, concerting plans for the propagation of their doctrines. The first manifestations of their power appeared in an effort to strengthen the shaky thrones of Europe and to crush out mercilessly every appearance of democratic principle and popular institutions. In pursuance of this behest an Austrian army exterminated the Neapolitan revolution and reestablished the Bourbon house against the protest of France and the disapproval of England. Soon another moved against the Piedmontese. France now cooperating with the alliance, a French army of 100,000 men was sent by Louis XVIII in 1823 under the Duc d'Angouleme into Spain to support the incapable Bourbon king, Ferdinand VII, who has been well described as an indolent sovereign who had neither the courage which commands respect, the generosity which wins affection, nor the wisdom which averts catastrophe. He, by the decree of Valencia, had abrogated the democratic constitution of 1812, which was ill suited to the Spanish nation, then in the throes of internecine strife, and he was without either the material resources or moral qualities which enabled him efficiently to cope with it and with the treasury depleted by the loss of revenues from the revolting colonies of America.

Europe indeed had been left in a most unhappy state by the wars which preceded the downfall of Napoleon, who in opening the career to talent had set aflame the ambitious spirits of the populace, which broke out afresh under the slightest relaxation of despotic vigilance. In Naples and Piedmont and in Spain and in France insurrection time and again sounded its angry note; secret societies menaced the Czar and swarmed throughout Russia; a regiment of his household troops mutinied in St. Petersburg, and all was not quiet even in Warsaw, where the Polish Diet rejected laws proposed by Alexander. Greece was in revolution against the Turk. The Holy Alliance in religious garb proposed to combine the kings of the earth together and wipe out all malcontents, and held out to Ferdinand of Spain that if he would crush constitutionalism and democracy in his kingdom they would combine and restore to his throne the now revolting South American States.

It is to be remembered that, while the Spanish Peninsula was the theater of the great struggle in the Napoleonic war, the colonies of Spain in South America had seized the opportunity to slip the noose of despotism and to assert their faith that Columbus had not discovered America to feed the mutineers of La Mancha and the cobblers of Castile.

While Soult and other veteran marshals of France were warring upon the Spaniards, the revolt of South America, which broke out at Caracas, in Venezuela, in 1810, had spread until now Mexico, Guatemala, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Chile, Bolivia, the Argentine Republic, and Uruguay had set up their independence and had been recognized by the United States. Great Britain had held aloof from the Holy Alliance. Lord Castelreigh, representing a country which had "extorted its liberties over its sovereign and changed the dynasty on the throne to secure them," pursued that line of conduct which became the representatives of a free people and abstained from complication with the conspiracy of kings.

Now, at last, her silence was changed to mutterings of discontent. She was unwilling to see the fruits of the Peninsula war thrown away and Spain made at last the prey of France. She saw in these new States of South America a fine opportunity to open marts for her own commerce free from Spanish restrictions and impositions which she was unwilling should be restored, and she found in them also a fine field for the operations of her capitalists, who had largely invested in South American bonds. Determined, if possible, to put a stop to the far-reaching designs of the alliance, and prompted by the natural interests of his country and her natural rivalry of the great powers, George Canning, the secretary of state for foreign affairs, arrayed himself against it and invoked American cooperation. Shrewdly did he say to Richard Rush, the American minister to England:

> Are the great political and commercial interests which hang upon the destinies of the new world to be canvassed and adjusted in Europe without the cooperation or even the knowledge of the United States?

The United States had indeed received a suggestion from the Emperor of Russia that they should join the alliance, but John Quincy Adams, Monroe's Secretary of State, had promptly answered:

> The political system of the United States is essentially extra-European. To stand in firm and cautious independence of all entanglements of the European system has been the cardinal point of their policy under every Administration of their Government from the peace of 1783 to this day.

And the overtures had been declined. He was still Secretary of State when it became necessary for the United States to declare the corollary of this doctrine and to warn Europe against interference with American affairs. "America for Americans" was a sentiment which had been greatly promulgated among the people, and it was for him to take an honorable and noteworthy part in its promulgation.

It was under the circumstances that I have described that Monroe delivered the message of December 2, 1823. In reference to our differences with Russia in respect to the interests involved on the northwestern coast of this continent, he indicated his assent to the proposal of the Russian Imperial Government to settle them by amicable negotiation and declared the disposition of our Government to cultivate the best understanding with it. But he added this sentence:

> In the discussion to which this interest has given rise and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power.

With reference to the conditions of Europe he then declared as follows:

> In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparations for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere, we are, of necessity, more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the Allied Powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective Governments. And to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.
>
> With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere.
>
> But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.
>
> Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none. But in regard to these continents circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the Allied Powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition, in any form, with indifference.

In the quotations which I have made from Monroe's message is found the Monroe doctrine. It will be observed that it is clear and comprehensive and that it embraces these propositions:

1. Noninterference on our part with the internal concerns of European powers.
2. Noninterference with existing colonies in America.
3. No colonization of free and independent American States for the future by any European powers.
4. No extensions of the political systems of Europe in America.
5. No interposition of any European power for the purpose of opposing or controlling in any other manner the destiny of American States.

Mark the words "any European power." No limitation to the Holy Alliance there.

This message was welcomed with joy in Great Britain and South America as well as in our own country. The price of South American securities leaped upward, much to the joy of English investors. The assurance of liberty rendered South America enthusiastic. The brave and statesmanlike utterances of our Chief Magistrate made American hearts leap for joy.

Sir James McIntosh declared that—

The coincidences of the two great English Commonwealths can not be contemplated without the utmost pleasure by every intelligent citizen of the earth.

The Marquis of Lansdowne said in the House of Lords:

If we had been tardy it was a satisfaction to find that America had on this occasion taken that decisive step which so well became its character and its interest. As that important decision was of the utmost consequence to every portion of the world where freedom was valued, he could not grudge to the United States the glory of having thus early thrown her shield over those struggles for freedom which were so important not only to America herself, but to the whole world.—*Hansard's Debates*, February 3, 1824.

Mr. Brougham, afterwards Lord Brougham, was cheered in the House of Commons when, in language of lofty eloquence, resembling that of Webster, he referred to Monroe's message:

An event had recently happened than which no event had dispersed greater joy, exultation, and gratitude over all the powers in Europe—an event in which he as an Englishman, connected by ties of blood and language with America, took peculiar pride and satisfaction—an event, he repeated, had happened which was decisive on the subject; and that event was the speech and message of the President of the United States to Congress. The line of policy which that speech disclosed became a great, a free, and an independent nation; and he hoped that His Majesty's ministers would be prevented by no mean pride, no paltry jealousy, from following so noble and illustrious an example. He trusted that as the United States had had the glory of setting, we would have the good taste to follow, the example of holding fast by free institutions and of assisting our brother freemen, in whatever part of the globe they should be found, in placing bounds to that impious alliance which, if it ever succeeded in bringing down the Old World to its own degraded level, would not hesitate to attempt to master the New World too.

And yet, sir, the British prime minister to-day criticises the United States because Great Britain was not formally notified in writing of a doctrine which both Houses of the British Parliament received with enthusiasm and the Commons with cheers, and which was decisive of the question then perplexing the British throne.

But with all the exultation with which Great Britain welcomed her American ally against the machinations of the Holy Alliance, there was a sting in it for her as well as for Russia. President Monroe had not only put a lion in the path of a particular scheme of despotism and aggrandizement, but had declared broad American principles which were thorns in the side of Great Britain and forewarnings to her as well as to the then conspiring monarchs. What England wanted was the cooperation of America to prevent other European powers from interfering in South America. She had no idea of inviting prevention of her own interference, while Canning, never assenting to the specific declarations of Monroe, held that "the United States had no right to take umbrage at the establishment of new colonies from Europe on any unoccupied parts of the American Continent." Indeed, England became in time so offended by Monroe's declaration against further colonization that she refused to cooperate with us in settling the Russian question. While great credit is often assumed by Great Britain for her stand against the Holy Alliance, and while some is deserved, she was not inspired so greatly by the spirit of freedom as by the spirit of self-interest in her profitable markets.

In a letter dated December, 1823, to the British minister to Spain, Mr. Canning displayed plainly enough his animus, for he said:

Monarchy in Mexico and monarchy in Brazil would cure the evils of universal democracy and prevent the drawing of demarkation which I most dread—America *vs.* Europe. The United States naturally enough aim at this division and cherish the democracy which leads to it, but I do not much apprehend their influence, even if I believe, which I do not altogether, in all the reports of their activity in America. Mexico and they are too neighborly to be friends. In the meantime they have aided us materially.

In other words, he was glad enough to get our aid to thwart a rival, but deplored and dissented from the principle on which the aid was given.

John Quincy Adams succeeded Monroe as President in 1825. No one was better fitted to propagate the policy of his predecessor. Indeed, the first hint of the Monroe doctrine in official documents is found in a communication of John Quincy Adams, the Secretary of State, to Richard Rush, our minister to England, dated July 2, 1823, in which he said:

These independent nations (meaning those on the American Continent south of us) will possess the rights incident to that condition, and their territories will of course be subject to no exclusive right of navigation in their vicinity or of any access to them by any foreign nation. The necessary consequence of this state of things would be that the American colonies henceforth will no longer be subject to colonization.

In the same month he informed the Russian minister that—

We should contest the right of Russia to any territorial establishment on this continent, and that we should assume distinctly the principle that the American Continents are no longer subject to any new European colonial establishments.

And it is unquestioned that it was at his suggestion that Monroe inserted the anti-European colonization clause in his message. To him, therefore, must be given full and unequivocal credit for this proposition, to the support of which he brought great abilities, indomitable courage, and untiring energy. His voluminous diary exhibits the zeal with which he propagated the idea, and his Chief as well as his country were greatly indebted for his splendid service. But Monroe added the broader proposition which virtually made this country in a broader sense the protector of South American independence.

President Adams in 1826 announced to Congress the expediency of accepting an invitation from the Republics of Colombia, Mexico, and Central America to take part in a congress at Panama. Out of this message grew a violent political agitation, and occurring at a time when the slavery question was forming into sharp issues, it has not yet ceased to be the subject of differences and misrepresentation. President Adams nominated as our representatives to the Panama congress Richard C. Anderson, John Sargeant, and W. B. Rochester, and they were confirmed by a decisive majority, but the Democratic party in Congress stoutly opposed the scheme of Mr. Adams, and it has been repeatedly stated that the Southern members joined in this opposition because one of the subjects proposed for consideration by the congress was the concerting of measures having reference to the more effectual abolition of the African slave trade. This is a very narrow and false view of the situation. To assume its correctness is to make a catch phrase of political campaigns a landmark of history. No doubt the question of slavery has often warped the opinions and actions of sections in this country on different questions, as it notably did in turning New England against the Mexican war and in the annexation of Texas, but the opposition to our participation in the Panama congress was based upon principles as old as the Government and as deeply rooted in popular conviction as the Monroe doctrine or any other tradition of our people.

Perusal of Mr. Adams's message shows that it contemplated not only the union of American States for liberal commercial intercourse, the adoption of principles of maritime neutrality, the doctrine that free ships make free goods, the invasion of Cuba and Puerto Rico, the status of Haiti, and lastly, as President Adams said:

The congress of Panama is believed to present a fair occasion for urging upon all the new nations of the south the just and liberal principles of religious liberty.

This was a bombshell. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate at that time consisted of Macon of North Carolina, Tazewell of Virginia, Gaillard of South Carolina, Mills of Massachusetts, and White of Tennessee—men of exceptional ability and distinction. The report of that committee, made by Mr. Macon, but drawn by Mr. Tazewell, shows that the opposition to our participation in the congress was rested upon considerations as broad as the limits of our nation, as patriotic as the spirit of independence and liberty, and as conservative and just as was the farewell message of Washington.

The report said:

If there be any subject more sacred and delicate than another as to which the United States ought never to intermeddle, even by obtrusive advice, it is that which concerns religious liberty. The most cruel and devastating wars have been produced by such interference; the blood of man has been poured out in torrents, and from the days of the Crusades to the present hour no benefit has resulted to the human family from discussions carried on by nations upon such subjects.

As to interference with Cuba and Puerto Rico, the report declared that the United States could never regard with indifference their actual condition or future destiny, but deprecated any joint action with the South American republics in relation with them, and it totally discountenanced any joint discussion or action with relation to Haiti.

If—

It said—

the United States permit themselves to be associated with these nations in any general congress assembled for the discussion of common plans in any way affecting European interests, they will, by such an act, not only deprive themselves of the ability they now possess to render useful assistance to the other North American States, but also produce other effects prejudicial to their own interest.

In respect to Haiti it set forth the difficulties involved in diplomatic intercourse with her, then recently assuming a position which was the result of a successful negro insurrection, and no doubt this question intermingled its great force with that of other considerations in reaching the conclusion to which the committee came.

At this distance of time it seems to me that the Senate committee acted with wisdom, and in the event this appears to have been demonstrated, for the congress itself proved a fiasco, although the Senate confirmed the ministers appointed by the President and the House voted the necessary appropriation.

After all—

Says Mr. Benton in his Thirty Years' View—

the whole conception of the Panama congress was an abortion. It died out of itself without ever having been once held, not even by the States which had conceived it. It was incongruous and impracticable even to attempt, more apt to engender disputes among themselves and utterly foreign to us, and dangerous to our peace and institutions.

Mr. Adams, in his message to Congress on this subject, impressed the wisdom of the Monroe doctrine, but suggested that if deemed advisable to contract any conventional agreement as a means of resisting interference from abroad with the domestic concerns of the American Governments, our views would extend no further

than to a mutual pledge of the parties to the compact to maintain the principle in application to its own territory and to permit no colonial lodgment or establishment of European jurisdiction upon its own soil.

These expressions of Mr. Adams have been by some regarded most mistakenly, most unjustly, as limitations by John Quincy Adams upon the Monroe doctrine, whereas, according to the plain facts, they were extensions. According to the Monroe doctrine, we are unwilling to enter into any alliance with foreign nations for any purpose not in war, but are willing for ourselves to assert the doctrine of non-intervention by any European power. John Quincy Adams, while asserting the Monroe doctrine, was willing to enter into conventional arrangements with other countries for them also to assert it in their proper sphere, and yet Senators upon this floor quote his elongation of the Monroe doctrine as but an abbreviation thereof.

To give the abbreviated and tortured construction would refute the tenor of President Adams's repeated declarations and his entire career. He might well hold back from entering into the stiff and peremptory terms of a treaty with other nations binding us to interfere to protect them, and yet might reserve and insist on the policy of interference by us, our conduct in the premises being regulated solely with regard to our own interest and convenience. We have his own authority for the statement that he approved President Polk's emphatic indorsation of the doctrine, which is entirely inconsistent with the narrow interpretation given to his own language.

Henry Clay was a stanch friend of the South American Republic and availed himself of every opportune occasion to advance the republican spirit and to assert the doctrine of Monroe. His eloquent appeal in the House of Representatives in 1818 for the recognition of the independence of these Republics will never be forgotten, and in January, 1824, while Speaker of the House, he moved a joint resolution that the people of the United States—

would not see, without serious inquietude, any forcible intervention by the Allied Powers of Europe in behalf of Spain to reduce to their former subjection those parts of the continent of America which have claimed and established for themselves, respectively, independent governments, and which have been solemnly recognized by the United States.

But he never pressed the resolution, because the question was soon abated. When Secretary of State in the Cabinet of John Quincy Adams, he directed Mr. Poinsett, our minister to Mexico, to urge upon the Government of that country the expediency of asserting the principles laid down in the message of Monroe, and emphatically declared against the establishment of new European colonies upon this continent.

On the 14th of April, 1826, Daniel Webster, then a member of the House of Representatives, addressed that body on the Panama mission and traced the history of the Monroe doctrine.

In answer to the criticism that it was loose and vague, he gave his view that it was—

sufficiently studied, considered, weighed, and distinctly and decidedly approved by every one of the President's advisers of the time.

He declared that—

It can not now be taken back, retracted, or annulled without disgrace. It met—

He said—

with the entire concurrence and the hearty approbation of the country. The tone which it bore found a corresponding response in the breasts of the free people of the United States. The people saw, and were rejoiced to see, that on a fit occasion our weight had been thrown into the right scale, and without departing from our duty we had done something useful and something effectual in the cause of civil liberty. One general glow of exaltation, one universal feeling of the gratified love of country, one conscious and proud conception of the consideration which the country possessed, and of the respect and honor which belonged to it, pervaded all bosoms. I look—

He added—

on the message of December, 1823, as forming a bright page in our history. I will help neither to erase it nor tear it out, nor shall it be by any act of mine blurred or blotted. It did honor to the sagacity of the Government, and I will not diminish that honor. It elevated our hopes and gratified the patriotism of the people over whose hopes I will not bring a mildew, nor will I put that gratified patriotism to shame.

Tyler's Administration did not have to deal directly with the Monroe doctrine, but the President had occasion to enunciate the principle on which it rests in general terms. Lord Brougham and Lord Aberdeen had animadverted on the proposed annexation of Texas in unfavorable terms; and in his Texas message of June, 1844, he expressed surprise that—

a Kingdom which was made what it now is by repeated acts of annexation—beginning with the time of the Heptarchy and concluding with the Kingdoms of Ireland and Scotland—should perceive any principle either novel or injurious in the late proceedings of the American Executive in regard to Texas.

The Government and people of the United States—

He said—

have never evinced nor do they feel any desire to interfere in public questions not affecting the situation existing between the States of the American Continent. We leave the European powers exclusive control over matters affecting their Continent. The United States claim a similar exemption from any such interference on their part.

What is this but the doctrines of Washington and Monroe in two instances?

President James K. Polk expressed his cordial concurrence in the wisdom and sound policy of the Monroe doctrine in his message of December 2, 1845, and frequently reiterated it. He declared in that message that it should be distinctly—

announced to the world as our settled policy that no future European colony or dominion shall, with our consent, be planted or established on any part of the North American Continent.

The insertion of the word "dominion" does not alter the sense of the broad doctrine of Monroe, but it distinctly expresses the interpretation that President Polk gave to it. This expression was elicited by the differences between the Government of Great Britain and the United States as to the northwestern boundary. On April 29, 1848, he sent a special message to Congress with relation to the Indian insurrection in Yucatan, which Government, through its commissioner, elicited the aid of the United States. For this aid the dominion and sovereignty of the Peninsula was offered to the United States, and similar appeals had been previously made to the Spanish and English Governments. This country was then at war with Mexico, of which country Yucatan was a State. President Polk expressed his willingness to hold military possession of Yucatan and to defend the white inhabitants against incursions of the Indians, and he reaffirmed the doctrine of Monroe, declaring that the reassertion of this principle, especially in reference to North America, is at this day but the promulgation of the policy which no European power should cherish the disposition to resist.

The differences of Yucatan were soon settled by treaty between the whites and Indians, and the affair passed off without further consequence. (See his message, Wharton, volume 1, page 282.)

James Buchanan, who served his country in many high places, as Representative, Senator, Secretary of State, minister to England, and finally as President, was a constant and undeviating upholder of the Monroe doctrine. It is true that he drew the resolution which was adopted by the House of Representatives in 1826 by a vote of 99 to 95, in which that body expressed its opinion that the United States ought not to be represented at the congress of Panama in a diplomatic character, and they ought not to form any alliance, offensive or defensive, or negotiate respecting such alliance, with all or any of the South American republics; nor ought they to be comparted with them, or either of them, in any joint declaration for the purpose of preventing interference of any of the European powers with their independence or form of government, or any compact for the purpose of preventing any colonization to the colonies of America, but that the people of the United States should be left free to act in any crisis in such manner as their feelings of friendship toward these republics and as their own honor and policy may at the time dictate.

That resolution for lack, I fancy, of better material, has been proffered here as an indication that Congress, when adopting it, refused to adopt the Monroe doctrine. But we have from the lips of its author that he was careful to say not a word that trenched against the Monroe doctrine, and an inspection of its face is sufficient to show that he was so successful that there is not an intimation in that resolution against it.

In his resolution it will be seen that he happily combined the doctrine of Washington with that of Monroe. He entered into no entangling alliance with foreign nations, but preserved his own country in that independence of relation which it so long and proudly occupied and still occupies.

As Secretary of State of President Polk, he was his adviser when his messages relating to the doctrine were delivered, and he well declared in his letter to Mr. Hise of June 3, 1848, that the independence as well as the interests of the nations on this continent required that they should maintain an American system of policy entirely distinct from that which prevailed in Europe. To suffer any interference on the part of European governments with the domestic concerns of the American Republics and to permit them to establish new colonies upon this continent would be to jeopard their independence and ruin their interests. In his very last annual message to Congress, in 1860, at the time when the awful shadow of civil war stretched over us, he did not fail to consider the situation of Mexico and to express his hope for such a condition as would deprive European governments of all pretext to interfere in the territorial and domestic concerns of that country, then itself torn with revolution which afterwards resulted in the triumph of Juarez. We should thus, he said, have been relieved from the obligation of resisting, even by force, should this become necessary, any attempt of these governments to deprive our neighboring Republic of any portions of her territory, a duty from which we could not shrink without abandoning the traditions and established policy of the American people.

Mr. Cass, Secretary of State, declared in 1858 the United States will not consent to the subjugation of any of the independent States of this continent to European powers, nor to the exercise of a protectorate over them, nor to any other direct political influence to control their policy or institutions.

The civil war, vast and engrossing as it was, caused no inter-

ruption in the assertion of the Monroe doctrine by this nation. Under most difficult and trying circumstances it still held aloft that oriflamme.

Mr. Seward, as Secretary of State, went to the verge of war with France in his correspondence upon the subject with reference to the French occupation of Mexico. The United States refused to take part in the movement of France, Spain, and Great Britain to compel Mexico to the payment of her debts to other nations; and from 1861 to the fall of Maximilian and the reembarkment of the French army to France our diplomatic history is filled with his letters and dispatches containing intimations and declarations that this time-honored doctrine would be enforced.

Even while the civil war was flagrant and the final year-long battle between Grant and Lee was imminent, the House of Representatives of the United States by unanimous voice declared on April 4, 1864:

That the Congress of the United States are unwilling by silence to leave the nations of the world under the impression that they are indifferent spectators of the deplorable events now transpiring in Mexico, and that they think fit to declare that it does not accord with the policy of the United States to acknowledge any monarchical government erected on the ruins of any republican government in America under the auspices of any European power.

With General Grant facts spake. The appearance of an American Army on the Rio Grande under Sheridan was his way of giving notices to quit to those who would seat the monarchies of Europe on American soil.

The Hon. Thomas F. Bayard is known to be a great admirer of the English people and on the most friendly terms with them, but, however much he may honor and respect them, as to this doctrine of Monroe he is just as flat-footed and goes just as far as any American goes. In 1887, as Secretary of State, he communicated to President Cleveland a full history of the case of Pelletier, who many years before had been arrested in Haiti on the charge of attempted enslavement of Haitian citizens.

It would not be worth while to go into the details of that question further than to say that Pelletier's conduct was deemed reprehensible, and that the Cleveland Administration refused to press the claim against Haiti, and Mr. Bayard, stating the consideration which actuated our Government, said:

The United States has proclaimed herself the protector of this western world, in which she is by far the stronger power, from the intrusion of European sovereignties. She can point with proud satisfaction to the fact that over and over again has she declared effectively that serious indeed would be the consequences if European hostile foot should, without just cause, tread those States in the New World which have emancipated themselves from European control. She has announced that she would cherish as it becomes her the territorial rights of the feeblest of those States, regarding them not merely as in the eye of the law equal to even the greatest of nationalities, but, in view of her distinctive policy, as entitled to be regarded by her as the objects of a peculiarly gracious care. I feel bound to say that if we should sanction by reprisals in Haiti the ruthless invasion of her territory and insult to her sovereignty which the facts now before us disclose, if we approve by solemn Executive action and Congressional assent that invasion, it will be difficult for us hereafter to assert that in the New World, of whose rights we are the peculiar guardians, these rights have never been invaded by ourselves.

We are told, Mr. President, that the time is past for the preaching of the Monroe doctrine, and that in the present condition of things it is inapplicable. The United States are no longer some sweet Arcadia, dreaming the happy hours away in the solitudes of pastoral life, and, in my humble judgment, every revolving sun since 1823 has strengthened the necessity for the application of this doctrine and for its firm, outspoken, bold, and intrepid maintenance by the American people, for we are not ready to be circumvented and bottled up by British empires all around us, on land and by sea, and cut off from free and unmenaced access to the highways of the world's commerce.

The colonial empire of Great Britain comprises forty-two distinct and independent governments, with many scattered dependencies and protectorates under the Queen which have no regularly formed administrations. It embraces also large territories controlled by the British North Borneo Company, the Imperial British East Africa Company, and the Royal Niger Company.

The first reaching out for colonial settlements by Great Britain dates as far back as 1583, but beyond the American continents, which finally developed into the United States, the close of the seventeenth century found Great Britain with no great acquisitions to her colonial possessions. She had at that time St. Helena, two slave-trading stations in Africa, the Bermudas, Jamaica, Barbados, and several minor West Indian islands, and New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, north of us.

As we learn from the British colonial office list, the peace of 1815, secured by the downfall of Napoleon, left Great Britain—

with most of the West Indies, South Africa, and a free hand in India, North America, and the Pacific.

The reign of Queen Victoria has been the period marked by the aggressive colonial policy of Great Britain all over the world. During that time she has occupied Natal, British Bechuanaland, Basutoland, and the Transkei, Zululand, British Columbia, the northwestern territories of the Canadian Dominion, Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania, New Guinea, and North Borneo, and she has acquired by cession Labuan, Lagos, the greater portion of the Gold Coast, Fiji, the Island of Cyprus, and the basin of the Niger, besides countless small possessions and nearly all the isolated rocks and islands of the ocean.

In 1890 numerous additions were made to the Empire in Africa by arrangements with Germany, France, and Portugal for the delimitation of their respective possessions and spheres of influence in that continent; and Great Britain claims now the indisputable right to acquire nearly 2,500,000 square miles of a total of 11,700,000 square miles included in that continent. Including India, the Empire now extends over eleven millions of square miles, or ninety-one times the area of the mother country. The area of the colonial empire alone is seventy-seven times that of the United Kingdom.

The British Empire has great power in both hemispheres and in all the continents of the earth, and in America it embraces the Bermudas, the Dominion of Canada, British Guiana, British Honduras, Newfoundland, and Labrador, and in the West Indies the Bahamas, Barbados, Jamaica, the Leeward Islands, Trinidad, which is immediately north of the mouth of the Orinoco River, and the Windward Islands, which are between Martinique and Trinidad.

In Australasia and Oceanica the Empire embraces Fiji, or the Fiji Islands, New Guinea, New South Wales, New Zealand, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria, Western Australia, and many small islands, groups, islets, and reefs lying along Australia and New Zealand and which may be regarded as parts of those colonies.

In Asia it holds the volcanic peninsula of Aden, on the Arabian coast, and the Island of Perim, at the entrance to the Red Sea; the Somali coast, which is a British protectorate of an area of 75,000 square miles. The islands of Socotra, off the coast of Africa, and Kuria Muria, off the coast of Arabia, are attached to Aden, which is a coaling station.

The Bahrein Islands, in the Persian Gulf; North Borneo, which is part of the Island of Borneo, midway between Hongkong and Port Darwin, in Australia; Brunei and Sarawak, on the northwest coast of Borneo; the Island of Ceylon, Cyprus, Hongkong, and the great dependency of British India, where about a million square miles of territory and 221,000,000 of people are under British control. Less than one-fourth of 1 per cent of the present population is of the Aryo-European stock, the British born amounting to about 100,000.

Feudatory to India are Baluchistan and Sikkim, Andaman and Nicobar, and Laccadive Islands.

In Africa, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and the Cape of Good Hope, British Central Africa, East Africa, the Western African colonies of Gambia, the Gold Coast, and Lagos, Matabeleland and Mauritius, Natal, the Niger coast, and the Niger territories, British South Africa, or British Zambezia, Zanzibar, and Zululand.

At Gibraltar Great Britain guards the entrance into the Mediterranean with about 4,000 soldiers. At Malta, some 58 miles from Sicily, she holds the Mediterranean with about 10,000 troops. She controls the Suez Canal, which is about 87 miles long and which connects the Mediterranean with the Red Sea. Through that canal in 1893 nearly 8,000,000 of gross tonnage passed under the British flag, while not a million passed under the flag of any other nation, and only 6,528 under the flag of the United States.

With the immense navies upon the sea, which intercommunicate between those widespread possessions all over the earth, Great Britain is evidently a power not to be despised by any nation; but it is not for us to sit idle and see her surround us on this continent with new settlements and extensions, and enmesh us with her fortifications on land and on the islands of the sea.

I am indebted, Mr. President, and the country is indebted, to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who pointed out in an address which he made in this body a year ago how Great Britain has belted the globe with her fortifications, with her coaling stations, and with her great guns, and his able contributions to the learning and literature of this subject have done no little to enlighten public sentiment and show the necessity of a firm and alert American policy on the subject. I will detract nothing from what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] said so eloquently yesterday of the British people. While I may concur with him as to the greatness and glory of the land of which our country is a scion, and come from a State whose people are one of the purest, if not the purest, strain of the Anglo-Saxon blood in the New World, I make bold to say that we, too, have "names to conjure with" that are just as bright and just as full of patriotic inspiration as any that British history discloses.

If Great Britain has had her Burke and her Chatham, we have had our Otis and Henry, our Webster and Clay. If she has had her Drake, Hawkins, and Nelson, have we not had our John Paul Jones, our Bainbridge, Decatur, Hull, Perry, Reed, Barron, Farragut, and Semmes? If she has had her Wellington, Havelock, and Wolseley, have we not had our Washington, Warren, Starke, Putnam, and Greene, our Morgan, Clark, and Campbell, and Light-Horse

Harry, our Old Hickory Jackson, our Grant, our Lee, and Stonewall Jackson? We admire and honor the great heroic figures of Old England; but our home heroes are those from whom we should catch the flame of American patriotism, policy, and duty. As to fighting qualities, let it be remembered that more men have fallen in the one county of Spottsylvania, in Virginia, than have fallen in the British army in a hundred years.

This pending question is inherited from the American Revolution of 1776, and is but the sequence of history which has flowed in a continuous and connected stream from its source; it is the aftermath of 1776 and 1812. From our Revolution France caught her inspiration and rose up against the accumulated burdens of centuries. Napoleon, the imperial democrat of Europe, was the child of that revolution, and the free movements that stirred the Continent before and after his fall led to the conspiracy of despots, to which our Monroe doctrine was as necessary a response as the declaration of 1776 was to the British statutes and to the obduracy of George III.

The instinct which led Great Britain to hold aloof from the machinations of the alliance was the conjoint product of her commercial sagacity, her independent spirit, and her inborn love for personal freedom. Deep answered unto deep when she called to America for cooperation and when America so promptly responded. The strain now placed upon the relations of the two countries, brought about by the present collision between her colonial policy and our natural primacy in the Western world, is but momentary and must be relieved by common sense; yea, by that saving common sense which is the true solvent of difficulty and is as salt to the sea, which preserves its freshness.

The Englishman has that fine quality which Emerson describes as "animated moderation." He will not tear a passion to tatters for an empty notion. He will check up before he jumps over a precipice. Let him display that wisdom now. He has "a free hand" on all the oceans. He preserves the balance of power in Europe. He has in Asia, Africa, and Oceanica a full and fertile field for all his jingo propensities. He has already vast possessions on this continent and strongholds in the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Caribbean Sea. Let him leave alone the ewe lambs of the great Western Republic, which knows its own sphere of influence and will brook no intrusion thereupon.

The sweet singer whose voice, alas, is now silent, said of Queen Victoria, his august sovereign, whose laureate he was:

> Statesmen at her counsel sate
> Who knew the seasons when to take
> Occasion by the hand and make
> The bounds of freedom wider yet.

The season for such statesmen is now full and shines in the light of the harvest moon.

The Administration and those who believe its course has been wise and just are fully aware of the heavy responsibility assumed, but are not to be deterred from pursuing a policy impressed upon our history by the pens of sages, and now more necessary than ever to our tranquillity by gusts of criticism or crimination from within or from without.

With us are the law and the prophets, and behind us are the intelligent, patient, and patriotic masses of a great people, whose instincts have guided them to appreciate the situation and whose approval of the American principles that have been uttered is unmistakable. I fully agree with those who caution us against inflammatory and irritating speeches.

If speeches had not been made against the position which our country has already taken by the action of its Chief Magistrate, speeches which can only tend to divide counsels which should be united and stimulate expectations abroad which would be doomed to disappointment, for my part, I would have awaited the event of negotiations without a word. I still agree that all aggravating utterances on both sides are out of place and that the public and the vehicles of public opinion should alike await developments in confidence that justice has a power of its own that will attract men to its standard, and in the further confidence that whoever may represent the honor and interests of the American people will not allow them to suffer.

While the sharp joinder of issue in verbal colloquy has excited apprehensions of war and the war spirit has been stirred in some breasts, neither Great Britain nor the United States has any desire to fight the other. They hearken to the great poet's saying:

> War's a game which were their subjects wise
> Kings would not play at.

As said by John Randolph of Roanoke, one of my distinguished predecessors in this Chamber, these two great nations can do each other more harm and more good than any other two nations of the earth. They mutually recognize that fact, and the atmospheric pressure of public opinion is for peace in both nations; the clergy, the metropolitan press, the boards of commerce, and thoughtful men of all classes—all declaring against the folly and the crime of war.

It can not be doubted under such circumstances that the way can and will be made clear for peace with honor to all concerned.

But common sense looks at facts as they are, and it is a fact so plain that he who runs may read that this nation will not recede from the Monroe doctrine, or from the position taken by the President, that it applies to this controversy. All critics, all dissenters, all friends of peace should recognize this fact and govern themselves accordingly. And it is not to be expected of us who have time-honored principles to vindicate, an obvious and wise policy to subserve, and a noble, aspiring nation to uphold in its dignity as the great and paramount power of the Western Hemisphere, to speak in whispers, to startle at shadows, or to mope in pusillanimous silence when the corridors of the Capitol are ringing with denunciations of our course and with ill-conceived belittlements of our fixed faith.

I am one of those who regard the doctrine we avouch as the subjects of the great White Czar regard the legendary will of Peter the Great, and as the Germans regard the Watch Upon the Rhine. And the time has passed—it has long been overpast—when the foot of foreign intrusion could be set upon American soil either to assail us in our homes or to seize and appropriate the territory of our neighbors to their uses under any kind of pretext, or to envelop us with armaments of war without arousing the universal resentment and resistance on the part of our people. This our traditional creed rests in the very nature of things which Canning discerned when he asked Minister Rush that memorable leading question:

> Are the great political and commercial interests of the New World to be canvassed and adjusted in Europe without the cooperation or even the knowledge of the United States?

Since that question was asked in 1823 to 1896—during a period of over three-score years and ten—the United States have had but one answer.

That answer it made then, and if those who advise or sympathize with Great Britain in this generation have the discernment and prescience of that British minister, George Canning, who boasted as to South America that he had "called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old," they must know that this Republic will not permit those balances to be disturbed by the weight of an iron hand, nor that New World to be made the prey of European adventurers; they must know that that answer was final and forever; they must know that were all Europe to form itself again into a new conspiracy of kings to make spoil of any portion of the American Continents, under any kind of cloak or pretext, and were to lay hands of violence for that purpose upon any, even the weakest, of our neighbors, the United States would rise and face embattled Europe as one man—American sailors would scourge the seas from pole to pole, and six millions of American soldiers would spring to their guns.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (S. R. 50) authorizing the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for the public building at Chicago, Ill.; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Mr. HAWLEY. I desire a brief executive session.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask unanimous consent before the Senator makes that motion.

Mr. HAWLEY. Very well.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that there may be a vote had on the regular order, the pending bill, with all amendments, on Thursday next.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. What is the precise proposition?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas will state the proposition.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that a vote may be had on the regular order, the pending bill, together with all amendments, on Thursday of next week.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the Senator had better ask unanimous consent to-morrow morning when the Senate is full.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HAWLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twelve minutes spent in

executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 24, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23, 1896.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Hiram A. Seymour, of Florida, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed N. E. Cutchin, promoted. Mr. Seymour is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

This nomination is made to correct error in former nomination of Mr. Seymour to be a second lieutenant in said Service, which nomination is withdrawn.

William L. Maxwell, of California, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Charles F. Nash, promoted. Mr. Maxwell is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

This nomination is made to correct error in former nomination of Mr. Maxwell to be a second lieutenant in said service, which nomination is withdrawn.

POSTMASTERS.

J. F. Banning, to be postmaster at Monrovia, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Joseph P. Briare, to be postmaster at Martinez, in the county of Contra Costa and State of California, in the place of Ellen D. Bailhache, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

John E. Carr, to be postmaster at Nevada City, in the county of Nevada and State of California, in the place of Leonard S. Calkins, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

J. Allen Butler, to be postmaster at Portland, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut, in the place of Charles H. Edwards, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

William J. Hunter, to be postmaster at Newcastle, in the county of Newcastle and State of Delaware, in the place of Robert C. Gordon, whose commission expired January 18, 1896.

William Heeb, to be postmaster at Newman, in the county of Douglas and State of Illinois, in the place of T. W. Sidenstricker, whose commission expired January 19, 1896.

Marcus H. Ogden, to be postmaster at Carbondale, in the county of Jackson and State of Illinois, in the place of J. T. Evans, resigned.

Joseph J. Cannon, to be postmaster at Knox, in the county of Starke and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1896.

Laora M. Rowe, to be postmaster at Lagrange, in the county of Lagrange and State of Indiana, in the place of David A. Fawcett, resigned.

John N. Leithold, to be postmaster at Postville, in the county of Allamakee and State of Iowa, in the place of James Perry, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

J. R. Lynch, to be postmaster at Lindsborg, in the county of McPherson and State of Kansas, in the place of Sarah E. Henry, whose commission expired January 21, 1896.

T. J. Glenn, to be postmaster at Carlisle, in the county of Nicholas and State of Kentucky, in the place of Homer B. Bryson, whose commission expired January 21, 1896.

Chandler C. Harvey, to be postmaster at Fort Fairfield, in the county of Aroostook and State of Maine, in the place of Asa C. Cary, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

Harlan M. Raymond, to be postmaster at Cumberland Mills, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine, in the place of Joseph Dunnell, whose commission expired January 21, 1896.

Albert L. Stephenson, to be postmaster at Togus, in the county of Kennebec and State of Maine, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

George L. Swett, to be postmaster at Portland, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine, in the place of John C. Small, whose commission expired December 16, 1895.

Martin McCabe, to be postmaster at Winchenden, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Charles A. Merrill, whose commission will expire February 9, 1896.

Thomas J. Dougherty, to be postmaster at Northfield, in the county of Rice and State of Minnesota, in the place of Arthur W. Dampier, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

Miles A. Hanchett, to be postmaster at Orange, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in the place of Augustus W. Condit, whose commission expired February 14, 1895.

Nathan Robins, to be postmaster at Metuchen, in the county of Middlesex and State of New Jersey, in the place of Charles Ayres, whose commission expired January 19, 1896.

Douglas C. Adams, to be postmaster at Randolph, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York, in the place of Odell H. Dean, whose commission expired January 19, 1896.

Edward C. Bersie, to be postmaster at Adams, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York, in the place of N. M. Wardwell, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

Lester B. Colwell, to be postmaster at Friendship, in the county of Allegany and State of New York, in the place of Frank R. Utter, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Milo B. Gregory, to be postmaster at Unadilla, in the county of Otsego and State of New York, in the place of Alanson H. Meeker, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Frank J. Kearney, to be postmaster at Warsaw, in the county of Wyoming and State of New York, in the place of James A. Webster, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

Peter J. Kiernan, to be postmaster at Rosebank, in the county of Richmond and State of New York, in the place of William H. Ludlow, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Lewis W. Y. McCroskery, to be postmaster at Newburg, in the county of Orange and State of New York, in the place of Joseph A. Sneed, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

James McLean, to be postmaster at Cohocton, in the county of Steuben and State of New York, in the place of Andrew J. Hyland, whose commission expired January 19, 1896.

James M. McQueen, to be postmaster at Oyster Bay, in the county of Queens and State of New York, in the place of Annie Larrabee, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Frank Pickard, to be postmaster at St. Johnsville, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York, in the place of John J. Reardon, whose commission expired December 17, 1895.

Francis Riley, to be postmaster at Hoosick Falls, in the county of Rensselaer and State of New York, in the place of Cassius A. Johnson, whose commission expired January 19, 1896.

William K. Roy, to be postmaster at Wappingers Falls, in the county of Dutchess and State of New York, in the place of John W. Bartram, whose commission expired December 22, 1895.

John S. Tighe, to be postmaster at Avon, in the county of Livingston and State of New York, in the place of Orange Sackett, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

W. D. Gaster, to be postmaster at Fayetteville, in the county of Cumberland and State of North Carolina, in the place of Benjamin H. Henderson, whose commission expired January 21, 1896.

W. N. Pritchard, to be postmaster at Chapel Hill, in the county of Orange and State of North Carolina, in the place of Thomas M. Kirkland, whose commission expired January 21, 1896.

S. Gibson Barr, to be postmaster at Hollidaysburg, in the county of Blair and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Frank J. Over, whose commission expired January 20, 1896.

John Casey, to be postmaster at Conshohocken, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Joseph K. Moore, whose commission expired January 21, 1896.

Joseph M. Fronefield, jr., to be postmaster at Wayne, in the county of Delaware and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of George P. Fallon, resigned.

Lewis W. Reed, to be postmaster at Beaver, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Andrew G. White, whose commission expired December 22, 1895.

Edwin S. Ames, to be postmaster at Hot Springs, in the county of Fall River and State of South Dakota, in the place of William R. Morgan, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

Knudt Schyan, to be postmaster at Flandreau, in the county of Moody and State of South Dakota, in the place of William P. Hess whose commission expired January 19, 1896.

Adolph J. Burg, to be postmaster at Kenosha, in the county of Kenosha and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Charles Frantz, whose commission expired January 19, 1896.

E. H. Ellis, to be postmaster at Green Bay, in the county of Brown and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Gustave Kustermann, whose commission expired January 19, 1896.

O. T. Wicker, to be postmaster at Farmville, in the county of Prince Edward and State of Virginia, in the place of George Richardson, whose commission expired January 21, 1896.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23, 1896.

CONSUL.

John T. Barron, of New York, to be consul of the United States at St. Johns, Newfoundland.

PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Asst. Engineer Horatio N. Wood, of New York, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Corps of Engineers.

Capt. William Trent Rossell, to be major.

Cavalry arm.

Second Lieut. Clough Overton, Fourth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. William Jefferson Davis Horne, Ninth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant.

Artillery arm.

Second Lieut. Edmund Molyneux Blake, Fifth Artillery, to be first lieutenant.

Cavalry arm.

Second Lieut. Robert Lee Howze, Sixth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Elmer E. Halsey, of Marquette, Mich., to be receiver of public moneys at Marquette, Mich.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

James E. Otis, of New Jersey, to be collector of customs for the district of Little Egg Harbor, in the State of New Jersey.

POSTMASTERS.

George W. Ford, to be postmaster at Pullman, in the county of Whitman and State of Washington.

Fletcher A. Jones, to be postmaster at Millersburg, in the county of Bourbon and State of Kentucky.

Abner V. C. Grant, to be postmaster at Ludlow, in the county of Kenton and State of Kentucky.

Harriet S. Coffeen, to be postmaster at Homer, in the county of Champaign and State of Illinois.

Eben S. Clemens, to be postmaster at Chester, in the county of Randolph and State of Illinois.

Edward W. Weathers, to be postmaster at Elkton, in the county of Todd and State of Kentucky.

William B. Fleming, to be postmaster at Bement, in the county of Platt and State of Illinois.

Nettie Flack, to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Iroquois and State of Illinois.

John A. Dufield, to be postmaster at Woodstock, in the county of McHenry and State of Illinois.

Lyde A. Keagy, to be postmaster at Cambridge, in the county of Henry and State of Illinois.

John D. Martin, to be postmaster at Carmi, in the county of White and State of Illinois.

Michael Maloney, to be postmaster at Dixon, in the county of Lee and State of Illinois.

Howard H. Thomas, to be postmaster at Polo, in the county of Ogle and State of Illinois.

Nathaniel R. Davis, to be postmaster at Barry, in the county of Pike and State of Illinois.

Fred. K. Bastian, to be postmaster at Fulton, in the county of Whiteside and State of Illinois.

James Fielding, to be postmaster at Colfax, in the county of McLean and State of Illinois.

Henry F. Day, to be postmaster at Moweaqua, in the county of Shelby and State of Illinois.

Gerettus Clover, to be postmaster at Gardner, in the county of Grundy and State of Illinois.

Thomas M. Moran, to be postmaster at Coal City, in the county of Grundy and State of Illinois.

John M. Mills, to be postmaster at Tiskilwa, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois.

Hattie Holliday, to be postmaster at Blandisville, in the county of McDonough and State of Illinois.

Charles M. Wright, to be postmaster at Gilman, in the county of Iroquois and State of Illinois.

Lewis K. Thompson, to be postmaster at Walnut, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois.

Fred J. Nirider, to be postmaster at Kinmundy, in the county of Marion and State of Illinois.

Joseph E. Carrier, to be postmaster at Ridgeville, in the county of Randolph and State of Indiana.

Enoch E. Black, to be postmaster at Summitville, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana.

Ulysses M. Baughman, to be postmaster at Monon, in the county of White and State of Indiana.

Anderson H. Lilly, to be postmaster at Middletown, in the county of Henry and State of Indiana.

Thomas S. Spencer, to be postmaster at Sheridan, in the county of Hamilton and State of Indiana.

Charles Egg, to be postmaster at Jasper, in the county of Dubois and State of Indiana.

John W. Brown, to be postmaster at Nappanee, in the county of Elkhart and State of Indiana.

William T. Wright, to be postmaster at Frankton, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana.

John E. Talbott, to be postmaster at Ladoga, in the county of Montgomery and State of Indiana.

Watkins L. Moorman, to be postmaster at Lynchburg, in the county of Campbell and State of Virginia.

Thomas C. Humphries, to be postmaster at Berkley, in the county of Norfolk and State of Virginia.

James Norton, to be postmaster at Ewen, in the county of Ontonagon and State of Michigan.

J. H. Watson, to be postmaster at Indianola, in the county of Warren and State of Iowa.

Henry A. Pike, to be postmaster at Tyndall, in the county of Bonhomme and State of South Dakota.

Marvin L. Bishop, to be postmaster at Casper, in the county of Natrona and State of Wyoming.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 23, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, before that question is submitted I call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the Friday night session provided by the rule. I understood that the chairman on Invalid Pensions desired that we should have a Friday night session this week.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was told that there was no objection to the adjournment over until Monday; but, of course, if they desire to have a Friday night session, I withhold the motion.

Mr. PICKLER. If the adjournment is had on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa, can not it be so arranged as not to interfere with the Friday night session?

Mr. HENDERSON. If the adjournment is had on the motion, that will be the result.

The SPEAKER. It would require unanimous consent to hold the session on Friday night in the event that the House should agree to the motion to adjourn over.

Mr. PICKLER. Then I ask unanimous consent that the Friday night session may be had, notwithstanding the motion.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the Chair will submit a request for unanimous consent, I will withdraw the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask unanimous consent, then, that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next, with the understanding that the Friday night session will be had under the rule; that is to say, that the House will meet at 8 o'clock on Friday night and adjourn, in pursuance of the rule, thereafter until Monday. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 227) to permit the withdrawal of certain papers and the signing of certain receipts by John Flinn or his attorney;

A bill (S. 1344) providing for the selection of the lands within Fort Pembina Military Reservation, N. Dak., by the State of North Dakota;

A bill (S. 1271) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore English;

A bill (S. 249) granting a pension to Charles E. Jones;

A bill (S. 54) for the relief of Ezra S. Havens;

A bill (S. 56) for the relief of John M. Davis;

A bill (S. 57) for the relief of Napoleon B. Giddings;

A bill (S. 58) for the relief of John S. Neet, jr.;

A bill (S. 59) for the relief of Joseph W. Carmack;

A bill (S. 61) for the relief of Frederick Gramm;

A bill (S. 60) for the relief of George A. Orr;

A bill (S. 565) providing for the establishment and enforcement of rules and regulations for the use and navigation of the United States canals and similar works of navigation, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 564) providing for the collection of fees for furnishing certificates of title to vessels;

A bill (S. 153) authorizing the persons herein named to accept certain decorations and testimonials from the late Hawaiian Government;

A bill (S. 661) to amend section 2880 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, fixing time for vessels to unlade;

A bill (S. 69) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle the claims of the legal representatives of S. W. Marston, late United States Indian agent at Union Agency, Ind. T., for services and expenses;

A bill (S. 130) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.;

A bill (S. 259) granting to the Columbia and Red Mountain Railway Company a right of way through the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 147) granting a pension to Elvira Bachelder;

A bill (S. 136) granting an increase of pension to Horace Townsend;

A bill (S. 137) granting an increase of pension to William W. French;

A bill (S. 140) granting a pension to Mary A. Wise;

A bill (S. 836) for the relief of William J. Murray;

A bill (S. 944) granting a pension to Robert Gamble;

A bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to Florence W. Buskirk;

A bill (S. 149) granting a pension to Helen M. Jacob;

A bill (S. 730) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Helen Morrell Carroll;

A bill (S. 1051) granting a pension to Elizabeth New, widow of Jethrow New;

A bill (S. 710) granting a pension to Ada J. Schwatka, widow of the late Frederick Schwatka;

A bill (S. 145) granting an increase of pension to Maude Ardelle Bliss;

A bill (S. 746) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Donahue;

A bill (S. 1311) granting an increase of pension to Dudley F. Brown;

A bill (S. 585) granting an increase of pension to Martha R. Hitchcock;

A bill (S. 341) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon B. Breedlove;

A bill (S. 148) granting a pension to Catharine Dillon;

A bill (S. 640) to increase the pension of Joseph W. Fisher;

A bill (S. 1037) for the relief of John Clyde Sullivan;

Jont resolution (S. R. 15) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the Mountain View Cemetery Association, at Oakland, Cal., certain cannon, etc.;

A bill (S. 466) granting a pension to William Brown;

A bill (S. 507) to pension Mollie Crandall;

A bill (S. 1303) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Holly;

A bill (S. 748) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Dent;

A bill (S. 1203) granting an increase of pension to Mary Doubleday, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Abner Doubleday;

A bill (S. 1176) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Oregon and Washington Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Columbia River between the State of Oregon and the State of Washington, and to establish it as a post road:"

A bill (S. 214) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, from some suitable point between the north line of St. Clair County, Ill., and the southwest line of said county;

A bill (S. 636) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Chamberlain, in Brule County and Lyman County, in the State of South Dakota;

A bill (S. 25) authorizing the Dyersburg and Mississippi River Railway and Improvement Company to bridge the Obion River in the State of Tennessee;

A bill (S. 90) for the relief of William P. Buckmaster;

A bill (S. 32) for the relief of the legal representatives of John C. Howe, deceased;

A bill (S. 271) for the relief of Newberry College, Newberry, S. C.;

A bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants, made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1450) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889;

A bill (S. 1423) to protect the wages of seamen;

A bill (S. 248) granting a pension to Martha Allen;

Joint resolution (S. R. 47) relating to the Federal census;

A bill (S. 82) for the relief of the heirs of James Bridger, deceased;

A bill (S. 535) for the relief of William A. Starkweather, of Oregon;

A bill (S. 529) for the relief of Peter Grant Stewart, of Oregon;

A bill (S. 709) for the relief of W. L. Adams, of Oregon; and

A bill (S. 1046) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893.

THE RULES.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, when we had the subject of the rules up for consideration at an earlier date in the session Rule XV was temporarily laid aside.

There seems to be some confusion or misapprehension in the minds of members as to the status of the rules. It will be remembered that we adopted the rules of the Fifty-first Congress early in the session, and the report that the Committee on Rules made was simply a report as to certain amendments to these rules previously adopted at the beginning of the session. The Committee on Rules have had a session and have taken up Rule XV, which was laid aside, and recommend a substitute for it, and also two other verbal corrections which are embraced in the report which I send to the desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HENDERSON, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following amendments to the rules:

In section 1 of Rule X amend paragraph 8 by inserting after the word "on" the words "Interstate and Foreign"; so that the paragraph as amended will read, "on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—to consist of thirteen members."

In section 2, Rule XIII, strike out the words "clause 51 of Rule XI," and insert "clause 57 of Rule XI."

Amend Rule XV, paragraph 4, as follows:

"4. Whenever a quorum fails to vote on any question, and a quorum is not present and objection is made for that cause, unless the House shall adjourn, there shall be a call of the House, and the Sergeant-at-Arms shall forthwith proceed to bring in absent members, and the yeas and nays on the pending question shall at the same time be considered as ordered. The Clerk shall call the roll, and each member as he answers to his name may vote on the pending question, and, after the roll call is completed, each member arrested shall be brought by the Sergeant-at-Arms before the House, whereupon he shall be noted as present, discharged from arrest, and given an opportunity to vote and his vote shall be recorded. If those voting on the question and those who are present and decline to vote shall together make a majority of the House, the Speaker shall declare that a quorum is constituted, and the pending question shall be decided as the majority of those voting shall appear. And thereupon further proceedings under the call shall be considered as dispensed with.

"At any time after the roll call has been completed, the Speaker may entertain a motion to adjourn, if seconded by a majority of those present, to be ascertained by actual count by the Speaker; and if the House adjourns, all proceedings under this section shall be vacated. But this section of the rule shall not apply to the sessions of Friday night, until further order of the House."

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment is the amendment to Rule X, and I will state to the House the effect of it. In the Fifty-first Congress this committee referred to therein was known as the Committee on Commerce, but in the Fifty-second Congress it was known as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This is to adopt the name "Interstate and Foreign Commerce," and I assume that there will be no objection to the change. I ask a vote upon it.

The question being taken on the first amendment submitted by the Committee on Rules, it was agreed to.

Mr. HENDERSON. The next amendment grows out of the fact that in Rule XI we increased the number of committees, and this amendment simply changes the figures so as to refer to clause 57 instead of to clause 51 of Rule XI. It in no way changes the rule.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In section 2 of Rule XIII, strike out the words "clause 51 of Rule XI" and insert "clause 57 of Rule XI."

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, that brings us to the substitute for Rule XV.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment as it will stand if adopted.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before it is read I will simply state that this is a substitute for amendment 4 contained in the report of the committee, the one that was laid aside for the time being.

The Clerk again read the amendment as above.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this substitute differs in only three particulars from the amendment which was formerly reported by the committee. First, it exempts Friday night sessions from the operation of this clause. Second, it provides for an adjournment. One motion to adjourn may be entertained, so that if a majority desire to adjourn they will have the power to do so. Third, inasmuch as there might be doubts as to what the effect of such an adjournment would be, it is expressly provided in the substitute here presented that the effect of an adjournment will be to dispense with all proceedings then pending, including an order for the yeas and nays. This brings us to the only question which seems to have troubled some members of the House, the question whether a majority of those voting, a constitutional quorum being present, can transact business. I would remind the House that the Constitution of the United States puts no restriction upon us in this particular. It treats of the subject, and, so far as restricting the House in this particular is concerned, it is silent. The provision of the Constitution is:

A majority shall constitute a quorum to do business.

This rule provides for securing a quorum—a majority of the House. It establishes a by-law providing how that business shall be transacted, and there is nothing in the Constitution which clashes with the provision contained in this rule.

To-day, with the present total membership of the House, 179 members are required to make a constitutional quorum. We will suppose that when the 179 are present, 100 members vote on a proposition and the remainder of the quorum remain silent. Those not voting are present. The Journal will show their presence. A lawful constitutional quorum is in the House. The contention in favor of the rule is that 100 members having voted for the proposition, if no more than that number vote against it the business will be transacted.

This rule has another great purpose which must not be lost sight of. In times of great excitement and of partisan conflicts, the minority, in order to prevent legislation, will often leave the Chamber, so that they can not be counted, leaving the House without a quorum to do business. This rule lays down a well-defined method by which a lawful constitutional quorum can be brought into this House and held here until the business before the House is disposed of.

A lengthy argument was made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMillin] against the Sergeant-at-Arms going forth and laying hands upon members without a special order of this body. He seemed to think that that would be a hardship to the members. Mr. Speaker, can it be less severe on the members of this House to have a special order made on a special occasion to bring them into the House than to have a general law laid down by the vote of the majority of this House apprising each and every member thereof that he must be here to transact business, and that if his action prevents the presence of a quorum, so that business can not be done, the officer of this House shall go forth and bring him into this body? I see no hardship to any member in this proposed rule. If this amendment is adopted it will be a standing rule of this House, warning each member that he must be here to help make a lawful quorum for the transaction of business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have heretofore made some observations on the merits of this subject, I intend to reserve the remainder of my time until I hear from those who contend for the opposing doctrine that only a majority of those voting can transact the business of this House; reminding them, however, that this proposition first came from the distinguished John Randolph Tucker, at one time chairman of the Judiciary Committee of this House, and recognized by all who know him as an able lawyer. In the Forty-sixth Congress he first brought this proposed rule forward. In the Fifty-second Congress, Mr. Reed, then a member of the House, again brought it forward. He had been a member of the Judiciary Committee; and has been, I believe, recognized generally as a high authority in parliamentary law.

With these suggestions, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time until I hear from those who are opposed to this rule.

Mr. DOCKERY. As I understand, there is no provision whatever made in this rule for securing the attendance of a quorum at Friday evening sessions?

Mr. HENDERSON. No; the rule does not apply to Friday evening sessions.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, under this rule, if 180 members are present and if two members should vote for a proposition and one against it, the proposition will be considered as carried.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is exactly the operation of the proposed rule.

Mr. De Armond addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Henderson] yield the floor?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, sir; I reserve the residue of my time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Crisp], a member of the Committee on Rules, if he desires to occupy any time.

Mr. CRISP. Let the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. De Armond] go on.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, there is one feature of the pending proposition to which I desire to address myself. It is one which was discussed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Henderson] this morning and discussed some days ago by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Bailey] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Catchings]. It is the question of the constitutional power of this House, by a rule such as that suggested, to provide that, a quorum being present, a number less than a majority of that quorum or of a quorum voting in the affirmative, and being a majority of those voting, shall be sufficient to carry a proposition. The contention of the gentleman from Texas, who is an exceedingly good lawyer and who presented his view in a most clear and able manner, is that a quorum being present, it is necessary in order to carry a proposition that a majority of that quorum, whatever its size, shall vote in the affirmative. The gentleman from Mississippi, equally clear and happy in the statement of his position, took the ground that a quorum being present, without reference to the size of that quorum—whether the exact constitutional quorum or a number in excess of the smallest number that can constitute a quorum—there must be at least a majority of the constitutional quorum voting for a proposition in order to carry it.

Now, then, the question presented by these conflicting and varying views, as well as the question raised by the amendment to the rules now pending before the House, is, first, as to whether anything less than a majority of a constitutional quorum, voting in favor of a proposition, can under the Constitution be sufficient to carry that proposition; next, whether—a quorum being present—anything less than a majority of that quorum voting for the proposition will suffice to carry it; and third, whether—a quorum being present—a majority of those voting shall be sufficient to carry the proposition.

For a long time, as we all know, it was accepted as parliamentary law that when a yea-and-nay vote was taken in either House of Congress the presence of a quorum was to be ascertained solely and exclusively by the responses of the members when thus called. Afterwards, by a rule of this House, sustained by the Supreme Court, it was determined that the presence of a quorum could be ascertained and established by means other than or additional to the responses of the several members to their names as called upon a yea-and-nay vote. The question, I think, remains open yet as a constitutional question whether—the presence of a quorum being authoritatively ascertained by whatever method may be adopted for that purpose and sanctioned by the Constitution—a majority of those voting may or may not suffice to pass a bill or other measure.

Now, it has been the general doctrine, I think, of the law in some jurisdictions that the majority of a quorum must vote for a proposition, no matter how many are present constituting the quorum—whether more than a sufficient number or not; and in other jurisdictions it has been held that a majority of those constituting that particular quorum, if in excess of the smallest number that will make a quorum, must vote for a proposition in order to carry it.

If we proceed now upon the theory that the only way of ascertaining the presence of a quorum is by the responses of the members upon a yea-and-nay vote, I believe it would follow logically that a proposition could not be carried except by a majority of those thus responding, and of course that would be the majority of that particular quorum as well as a majority of the absolute constitutional quorum.

But it having been clearly established, and I think rightfully, too, that the presence of a quorum may be ascertained in some other way, in part, than by exclusive dependence upon the simple responses of the members upon a yea-and-nay vote, may not those voting, the quorum of course being present, decide the question voted upon? In this House of 357 members, where the smallest constitutional quorum is 179, must at least 90 members, a majority of such quorum, vote for a bill in order to pass it? Or, if the actual quorum present when the vote is taken exceeds in numbers the constitutional quorum, must a majority of the quorum present vote for a measure in order to carry it?

Now, Mr. Speaker, this, it seems to me, is a nice question for gentlemen who have given any consideration to the question involved or to the current of discussion as to the methods of ascertaining the presence of a quorum. I can easily see how gentlemen maintain the position taken by the gentleman from Mississippi—and no one in this House is better able to sustain his position than that gentleman, who is exceedingly clear and felicitous always in the expression of his ideas as well as clear in those ideas—I can see how he can well sustain that position by authorities, for decisions do sustain it. I see, too, how the very able gentleman from Texas, who is also always strikingly clear in thought and in the presentation of his views, can maintain himself in his position by respectable authority. The question, however, recurs, notwithstanding all that, whether it be not true, in view of the fact established by the decision of the Supreme Court that the presence of a quorum may be ascertained otherwise than by the exclusive method of determining it by the responses of members upon a yea-and-nay vote—whether or not, that being true, it is not also within the constitutional power of the House to provide by rule that a majority of those voting, a quorum being present, shall determine the result upon the pending proposition.

Without very much examination into the question so far as authorities go, but conceding that there are authorities sustaining the position of the gentleman from Mississippi and the position of the gentleman from Texas, I am yet inclined to the belief (and the more I reflect upon it the more that belief becomes strengthened) that it is within the constitutional power of the House to provide by rule that, the presence of a quorum having been ascertained, a majority of those voting shall decide the matter submitted to vote.

It seems to me, as between the other two positions, if choice were to be taken between them, that the better reasoning is to be found upon principle in favor of the position taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Bailey]. First, there must be a quorum, or no

business can be done. Waiving the question of how its presence shall be ascertained, there must be a quorum. The decision, however you ascertain it, or whatever may be competent or constitutional in that way, must be a decision of that particular quorum, not a decision of 179 members of this House, if upon the particular question there be, say, 200 present, but a decision of that quorum, consisting then of 200. According to the contention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] 101 affirmative votes would be required.

According to the other contention, it would be sufficient for 90 men to vote aye if less than that number vote nay. If this view be correct, 200 members might be present, their presence ascertained, and the 200 listed and computed in making up the quorum; 90 voting for a measure, 89 voting against it, and 21 not voting at all, and yet the measure would be carried. Now, how could that be, as a matter of correct reasoning? Let me say that instead of 89, 88 or 87 or 85 vote nay, and 90 vote yea, less than a quorum voting. Now, according to the contention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS], as I understand it, in that case, a quorum not having voted, there must be a placing in some way—in order to have a quorum to transact business—of a portion of those present constituting the quorum, but not expressing by direct vote their judgment upon the pending proposition. Why a portion and not all of the quorum actually present and shown to be present?

One of the two distinguished gentlemen to whom I have alluded would say, "You must take the entire quorum present into account; you must have a majority of all of those present and constituting that quorum, noted and counted in constituting it, voting aye in order to pass anything." The other would say, "Having a quorum present, having taken cognizance of the presence of a certain definite number, say 200, if you have the votes of 90 of those in favor of the proposition and a lesser number than 90 against it, it is only necessary at that particular moment, when ascertaining the result upon that particular proposition, to include with those voting enough to make up the necessary 179, being utterly indifferent as to the other members present and constituting a part of the actual quorum present." Now, there must be some sort of presumption, it seems to me, indulged in as to how those gentlemen who did not vote shall be counted or rated. It will not do to say that a man not voting is present merely for use in determining whether you have a quorum; he is here because without him you would not have a quorum, but that which he thinks, where he stands, is a matter of absolute and utter indifference.

If members are present, authoritatively, constitutionally, ascertained to be present and to constitute part of the then present quorum, it will not do, it seems to me, so long as you are determining the very matter that that quorum is constituted to determine, to ignore any member included in that quorum. Since you can not at one and the same moment count or estimate and ignore a member or any number of members included in the quorum and not voting, where shall they be placed? Where are they? Are they with the majority or are they with the minority?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it would be entirely competent by a rule, in so many words, to say that those present, not disqualified or excused from voting, constituting a part of the quorum, taken into account in the make-up of the quorum, who, if they have not answered, are listed and present and constituting a part of the quorum, shall be counted as voting with the prevailing side. I do not see why that would not be constitutional and within the power of this House, Of course I understand how there may be present in the House, we will say, 250 members. One hundred and seventy-nine only are needed to make a quorum. I can see how, upon a vote, less than 179 respond to their names, and how, in order to constitute a quorum, to declare definitely and authoritatively upon the Journal that a quorum is present, and to say what individuals compose it, you might not list and make mention of the entire 250; but say the presence of 200 several individuals of them would be shown by the Journal, but as to the other 50 actually present there would be no record and no showing.

As to that particular fifty, those not making manifest their own presence by responding to a call of their names, not noted as present in any authoritative way, practically and actually, as to that journal, they would be treated as not present; they would not be taken into account; they simply would be left out. I can see that those silent, unnoted fifty should not be considered in determining the result of a yea-and-nay vote. But if you have counted, listed them, and ascertained by an existing and authorized rule, in an authoritative way, that there are 200 present, and show by the journal who the 200 are, then it seems to me logical that one of two conclusions must follow. Either that a majority of the 200 shall be necessary to carry a proposition, or that those of the 200 not voting shall be taken as concurring in the decision of the majority of those voting. If not in effect joining the majority, they could and would readily express their dissent and reverse the decision.

Is not this view clearly in harmony with the course of legislation of this House and in this Congress and in legislative bodies all over the country this year and in all the years since the formation of our Government?

Mr. MILES. I want to ask you if it is not the rule of nearly every legislative body in nearly all the States of this country that there shall be a majority of a quorum in order to pass a bill?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I think so, but by their respective constitutions; and a very good rule, I think, too. There is such a constitutional provision in my own State, and a good one. There, and in many other States, it is provided in the constitution that no bill can pass without receiving the votes of a majority of all the members in each house, taken by yeas and nays. But I am talking about the Federal Constitution, which contains no such provision. I am talking about whether or not it is within the constitutional power of this House to provide that, a quorum being present, a majority of those voting may determine the fate of that upon which they vote. I am addressing myself to that constitutional question. I believe it would be well, well indeed, if the Federal Constitution contained such a provision as is to be found in many of the State constitutions requiring in all cases a yea-and-nay vote and a majority of each house voting for a bill in order to pass it. But we must take the Constitution as we find it.

What would the result be if a bill were on its passage in this House and the Speaker, having said, "The ayes appear to have it," some gentleman in the House should demand a division? The House divides, the Speaker counting the ayes and noes. He announces the result of the count, "The ayes are 40, the noes are 30 (let us suppose); the ayes have it; the bill is passed." There are 70 members voting, yet it is presumed that this occurs in a constitutional House. Everyone familiar with legislative bodies knows this has been the procedure here and in all legislative bodies except where, in the constitution, there is such a provision as that referred to by the gentleman from Maryland, requiring a majority of all elected to the body to vote in favor of a bill in order to pass it.

Now, then, unless it will be presumed, unless it must be presumed, that in the case I have supposed—and a most familiar one it is—those not voting in fact do vote in effect with the majority of those formally voting, not only would that bill, with 40 votes for it and 50 against it, fail to pass, but three-fourths, four-fifths, and nine-tenths of the bills passed in Congress or in the State legislatures (except where the constitutional provisions require a definite number of votes) would be absolutely destroyed. But a small fraction of what people and courts regard as law would have the least particle of law in it. Is it, then, within the power of the House to provide by rule for the occurrence of precisely that which does occur almost daily, often many times a day? If this power is lacking, then for years and years, more than a hundred years, in both branches of Congress, in State legistures, nine-tenths of all the legislation of all those bodies is and has been all along absolutely void if called in question; is and has been law only on account of the forbearance of those who do not question it.

Mr. HALL. I wish to ask my colleague if he has examined the question as to whether or not the courts, the Supreme Court and the courts of all the States, have not decided in express terms that whenever a bill is signed by the Speaker, by the presiding officer of the Senate, and by the President or the governor, as the case may be, and filed with the Secretary of State, that the question of the method of passing that law can not be inquired into; and I would ask him if that is not conclusive of the whole matter?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Why, I think not. I am not aware of such a line of decisions at all.

I take it that the presumption lies in favor of that which is offered as a law, with these evidences of its authentication and of its being a law. Does the gentleman contend that it would not be competent to show by the very Journal itself, by the RECORD, which contains in detail the proceedings had in all the stages of the enactment of the so-called law, that there was no quorum present to pass it, and that no quorum did pass it? If, to suppose an impossible case, the Speaker of this House were to affix his name to something which never had been acted upon by this House as to a law duly passed, and if the presiding officer at the other end of the Capitol were to affix his name to it as to a bill passed by the other branch of Congress, though not passed by it, if the President of the United States were to sign it, and if then this extraordinary and utterly void measure. this thing purporting to be a law and having all the marks of a law upon it, were lodged with the Secretary of State, would it be pretended that the presiding officers of the two Houses of Congress and the President had actually made a law, and that you could not get rid of that

which had been, in the way I have suggested, foisted into the archives of this Government as a law?

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I will say I think that the court has decided that question, and has declared that the very presumption which the gentleman from Missouri uses by way of illustration can not be indulged. But he will permit me to say, further, that the court has never decided, and, I apprehend, will never decide, that it can not examine the Journals of the House which the Constitution requires to be kept to ascertain whether a majority voted for or against a measure.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I think that is correct. The Journals, I think, are always open to be resorted to, not merely for the naked purpose of determining whether a majority voted for or against a measure, but also for the purpose of examining all the other recitals of the Journals, kept in the ordinary course and within the constitutional provision, to ascertain who was present and whether there was actually a House present at all, as well as other facts rightfully recorded there. The Journal can properly be resorted to for authentic information on all the points upon which it does speak and ought to speak.

But, Mr. Speaker, recurring to what I suggested a moment ago, if upon a division being taken in this House it is shown that 40 members vote for a bill and 30 against it, and that bill passes the other branch of Congress by, say, 20 votes for it and 15 against it, less than a quorum voting for it, and it is signed by the President, then if you can not absolutely overthrow that measure which purports to be a law, it must be only because it is conclusively presumed or satisfactorily shown that a quorum was present in each body when the vote was taken, and, further, because the presumption natural among reasonable men must be indulged and is indulged that those who were present and did not individually say "aye" or "no" agreed with the prevailing side and ratified in a less formal manner, but so as to actually do what they did who said "aye" when called upon to vote or when rising from their seats they were counted in favor of the bill.

If that be true, and I believe it is incontestable, the only question that would seem to remain on this point is as to the policy—whether it would be better to require by our rules that a majority of a quorum or a majority of the quorum present should vote for a proposition in order to pass it, or that the method should be adopted which is provided for in this rule. That is a question of judgment, of expediency, not a question of constitutionality. I believe that cases might arise when it would be better to have a rule requiring the votes of a majority of the quorum present to pass a measure. I believe such a rule would be safer and better than that proposed; but, as I have already said, it is purely a question of method, of expediency, and not at all a question of power. There certainly is no occasion in the present House to adopt this rule, and the gentlemen on the other side are hardly tempted by any consideration of the relative strength of parties here to make the rule as they propose to make it upon this point.

The question whether less than a majority of a quorum voting for a bill can pass it could not arise under the yea-and-nay method of ascertaining the presence of a quorum. In such case it is absolutely ascertained that a quorum has voted; and, of course, nobody ever contends that any proposition is carried except by a majority of those who do vote.

There is now presented, it seems to me, a new question of parliamentary law, and the authorities cited by gentlemen have reference to another condition of things. The authorities relied upon to sustain the contention that it is only constitutional upon a yea-and-nay vote to declare a measure carried when a majority of a quorum has voted for it, or the other contention that a measure is only constitutionally carried when a majority of the actual quorum present at the time has voted affirmatively—supported it—I say the authorities relied upon to sustain those positions are largely authorities with reference to proceedings of minor bodies—school boards, town trustees, and the managing boards of corporations.

Mr. MILES. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Certainly.

Mr. MILES. Has not the Supreme Court of the United States decided in terms that in the case of those private corporations and minor legislative bodies of which the gentleman speaks the principle is the same as in this case? Has not the court so decided?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I do not know that it has. I was coming to that question.

Mr. MILES. Will the gentleman allow me a further interruption?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Very well.

Mr. MILES. The Supreme Court of the United States in deciding the Ballin case used these words:

It is true that most of the decisions touching this question have been in respect to the action of trustees and directors of a private corporation or of minor legislative bodies which represent and act for cities and other municipal corporations. But the principle is the same.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Very well. I was coming right to that question. I lay down another proposition. In the organization of a corporation it is competent to provide that any definite number may constitute a quorum, and that the vote of any portion of that quorum in favor of a measure (a quorum itself being constituted) shall be sufficient to carry it. Then bear in mind that for years and years the presence of a quorum of this House was ascertained solely by and through the responses of members upon a yea-and-nay vote. The practice was for those present to vote yea or nay; and so until comparatively recent years the question of whether others present as members of the body, but not actually voting, should be or could be computed in the make-up of a quorum did not arise. That is a question of comparatively modern origin. I venture to say that in the early days of the Republic the presence of persons as members of this body, or of the one at the other end of the Capitol, who were not excused from voting, and not under disability, and who failed to vote, was rare.

Now, that being true—and I think it is true—I think history will bear me out in the statement that in the early days of the Republic when a roll call took place those present voted yea or nay. If that is true, then the question whether there could be a decision of a pending question in such a way as suggested by this rule did not really arise.

It is another fact, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the provision of the Constitution (I have it not at hand and will not undertake to quote it literally) as to the entering of the yeas and nays upon the Journal does not necessarily imply that the only way of determining the presence of a quorum shall be through the responses of the members. It seems to mean, more than anything else, that the actual position of those who do vote shall be made manifest by a permanent record of their votes. That method of voting seems to be primarily designed to disclose for all time how A, B, and C voted, and not to change or to make rules as to the passing or the defeating of a pending bill.

Now, I have said that it is competent to provide in the organization of a corporation that something less than a majority of its members shall constitute a quorum to do business. Such a provision is not unconstitutional unless there be a clause in the constitution to the contrary. And it is competent to provide that any definite vote of those constituting a quorum of that body shall be sufficient to pass a measure. For instance, it is competent as a matter of constitutional law, there being no inhibition in the constitution, to provide that the quorum of a corporate body, whether governing a municipal corporation or a private corporation, consisting, we will say, of 18 members, shall be regarded as constituted if 6 of them be present. It is equally competent to provide that of those 6 members present, only 3 of them voting, the votes of 2 shall carry against the vote of 1. There is no constitutional law invaded in that kind of legislation or in that sort of a provision.

Now, then, we come back to the original proposition. Unless the Constitution clearly contemplates and means, with reference to this yea-and-nay vote, that the yea-and-nay vote shall determine the presence of a quorum as well as determine the vote on the pending proposition, it appears to me there is nothing in the contention that, having gone beyond that, beyond that yea-and-nay vote, to ascertain the presence of your quorum—to make your quorum, without which you can do nothing—having gone beyond that for that purpose, you can not go beyond it for any other purpose.

If I am part and parcel of a quorum on a particular occasion, I am here charged with all the duty and all the responsibility of a member of this House, however my presence here may be ascertained or whatever I may do or choose not to do. I can not be ignored by a body which in constituting itself takes me in. If I am essential to the make-up of the quorum, or if in declaring what constitutes the quorum I am enumerated as part and parcel of the body, I am here for all purposes so far as the pending proposition is concerned. It will not do to say that I am here simply to make—to constitute—a part of a quorum, and that I can be and must be put in one place against a bill upon its passage, though I say nothing, and that I can not be put, as members are placed every day, in favor of it when I do not vote against it.

What, after all, constitutes a quorum? It consists of the individual members. They have their names on the records of this House. Now, some members vote, some do not, some say "yea," and some say "nay." What right have you to say that the man who does not vote at all is with those voting "nay" in case the nays are a minority, or "yea" if the yeas are not sufficient to pass a measure? You assume to count those who are silent as voting with the weaker party. Is it not more in accordance with common sense, more in accordance with the common judgment of mankind, is it not absolutely without a break, in fact, in legislative bodies, when not restrained by constitutional provision, and the unbroken history of the country for over a hundred years, to count the man who does not vote, viva voce or in a division of the House,

as being in sentiment, in spirit, in everything but the mere verbal declaration of his intention with the prevailing side rather than with the minority, whether that larger number vote "aye" or "nay"? The proposed amendment is to extend this practice, so universal, to the yea-and-nay vote, and I think the Constitution does not forbid it.

I thank the House for its courtesy. [Applause.]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I objected to this rule when it was first under consideration, because it permits a question to be decided by a majority of those voting, although a majority of those voting might not constitute a majority of those present or even a majority of a quorum. I contended that it is not competent for the House to establish such a rule, and asserted that no bill can legally pass this body unless a majority of the members present, or at least a majority of a quorum, has voted for its passage.

The best and the safest doctrine requires a majority of those present voting affirmatively to decide a question, and I think that the Supreme Court has clearly sanctioned that doctrine in the case of The United States *vs.* Ballin. I shall not now review that decision, or attempt to point out the distinction between "a quorum" and "the quorum," which, it seems to me, the court clearly intended to make. I dwelt briefly upon that several days ago, and I assume that the gentlemen who heard me then will remember what I said, if indeed anything I say is worth remembering. In any event, I feel that I can best employ my time on this occasion in presenting to the House what has been said by great authors and by great judges when this subject was directly under consideration. Perhaps it is not accurate to say "when it was directly under consideration," because it is true, as my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] has said, that the decisions reported have generally been rendered in cases involving the validity of the acts of private and municipal corporations. But, as my friend from Maryland has properly suggested, the principle of law is the same, and that it is the same has been expressly declared by the Supreme Court of the United States, which in the Ballin case says:

It is true that most of the decisions touching this question have been in respect to the action of trustees and directors of a private corporation, or of the minor legislative bodies which represent and act for cities and other municipal corporations—but the principle is the same.

The court here affirms that the law which governs Congress in this respect is the same as the law which governs municipal and private corporations; and, therefore, if I can show that all of the great text-books and all of the courts—except only the supreme court of Minnesota—have held either that it requires a majority of those present or a majority of a quorum to decide a municipal or corporate question, then I feel confident that the House will be convinced that this rule ought to be amended.

In the beginning we must fix in our mind the difference in the law as applicable to indefinite and to definite bodies. As to indefinite bodies, the rule is that a majority of those who appear may act, and a majority of those who vote may decide; while as to definite bodies, the rule is that a majority of all who compose the body must be present, and a majority of those present, or at least a majority of a quorum, may decide. This is the doctrine announced by all of the great authorities in this country, from Kent's Commentaries down to the latest work upon the subject. Chancellor Kent lays down the rule in these words:

The same principle prevails in these incorporated societies as in the community at large, and the acts of a majority, in cases within the charter, bind the whole. The majority here means the major part of those who are present at a regular corporate meeting. There is a distinction to be taken between a corporate act to be done by a select and definite body, as by a board of directors, and one to be performed by constituent members. In the latter case—that is, when it is to be performed by the constituent members—a majority of those who appear may act, but in the former case—that is, when it is to be determined by a select and definite body—a majority of the definite body must be present, and then a majority of the quorum may decide. This is the general rule on the subject, and if any corporation has a different modification of the expression of the binding will of the corporation, it arises from the special provisions of the act or charter of any corporation.

The doctrine, then, as announced by Chancellor Kent, is that except where there is a special provision in the charter of a corporation—which corresponds to the Constitution under which we proceed—it requires a quorum to act and a majority of a quorum to decide. Not only is that the doctrine of the greatest of American commentators, but Judge Cooley, in his great work on Constitutional Limitations considers that doctrine so well settled that he does not deem it necessary to discuss it at length, and in his chapter on the enactment of laws dismisses the subject with this comment:

For the vote required in the passage of any particular law the reader is referred to the constitution of his State. A simple majority of a quorum is sufficient unless the constitution establishes some other rule, and where by the constitution two-thirds or three-fourths is made essential to the passage of a particular class of bills, two-thirds or three-fourths of a quorum will be understood.

I have here the most excellent work on the law of private corporations that has ever been written; certainly the best ever written up to the time it was published, and the best now, unless it is excelled by the work, not yet completed, of Mr. Thompson. Judge Dillon, the author of this work, was for years a member of the supreme court of Iowa, and I take it that my friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] will attach great weight to his opinion. Judge Dillon first and properly distinguishes between definite and indefinite bodies and declares that in an indefinite body a majority of those who appear may act, but where the action is to be taken by a definite body it takes a quorum to act and a majority of the quorum to decide. His language is this:

The common-law rules as to quorums and majorities, established with reference to corporate bodies consisting of a definite number of corporators, have also in general been applied to the common council, or select governing body of our municipal corporations, where the matter is not specially regulated by the charter or statute. Thus, to use Mr. Dane's illustration, if the body consists of 12 common councilmen, 7 is the least number that can constitute a valid meeting, though 4 of the 7 (the 7 being duly assembled and present) may act.

In section 279, Judge Dillon says:

So, if a board of village trustees, consisting of 5 members, and all, or 4, are present, 2 can do no valid act, even though the others are disqualified by interest from voting, and therefore omit or decline to vote; their assenting to the measure voted for by 2 will not make it valid.

Mr. DALZELL. May I interrupt my friend?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. Is that Judge Dillon's proposition, or is there a case cited?

Mr. BAILEY. That is Judge Dillon's proposition, for which he cites authority.

Mr. DALZELL. Has my friend examined authorities in support of the proposition?

Mr. BAILEY. I have.

Mr. MILES. The case of Cole *vs.* Williamsburg, reported in 10th Wendall (New York), is an identical case.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Is not this a case where the quorum is not present because some members of the body are disqualified to act on account of interest?

Mr. BAILEY. No. The opinion in one of the cases cited to support the text was delivered by Judge Dillon himself, and holds that the presence of a man interested in the result does not disqualify him from being counted to constitute a quorum.

Mr. DALZELL. Yes; but is it not a fact that these did not vote because disqualified?

Mr. BAILEY. In this particular case that is true, but it is immaterial in this connection, for I am replying now to the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri that a quorum was not present.

Mr. DALZELL. That is to say, the proposition is that a body may be constituted lawfully, or may be constituted a legal body to act, made up by parties disqualified from acting.

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly. I think I can find a decision from the gentleman's own State which holds that while members may be disqualified by interest from voting, they can still be counted for the purpose of creating a quorum.

Mr. DALZELL. I would like to see it.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman does not really doubt that?

Mr. DALZELL. I do.

Mr. BAILEY. I know the gentleman is a good lawyer, but I also know that "even great Homer sometimes nods."

In section 282 Dillon says:

In the absence of special provision *the major part of those present* at a meeting of a select body *must concur* in order to do any valid act.

And he italicizes the words "the major part of those present" and the words "must concur."

Again, in section 283, Judge Dillon says:

And, as a general rule, it may be stated that not only where the corporate power resides in a select body, as a city council, but where it has been delegated to a committee or to agents, then, in the absence of special provisions otherwise, a minority of the select body, or of the committee or agents, are powerless to bind the majority or do any valid act. If all the members of the select body or committee, or if all the agents are assembled, or if all have been duly notified, and the minority refuse or neglect to meet with the others, a majority of those present may act, provided those present constitute a majority of the whole number. In other words, in such case, a major part of the whole is necessary to constitute a quorum, and a majority of the quorum may act. If the major part withdraw so as to leave no quorum, the power of the minority to act is, in general, considered to cease.

Mr. MILES. Right there I desire to interrupt the gentleman, to say that this quotation that you have made from Dillon is precisely cited in the Ballin case.

Mr. BAILEY. It is not only approvingly cited in the Ballin case, but also in the case of Brown *vs.* The District of Columbia, reported in 127 United States.

In section 292 Judge Dillon declares—

[that acts done when less than a legal quorum is present, or which were not concurred in by the requisite number, are void.

In the very latest work upon this subject—the work of Judge Thompson, which I believe is to comprise six volumes, and is still incomplete—the doctrine announced by Chancellor Kent and Judge Dillon is unreservedly approved. In paragraph 728 he combats the position that a majority of those voting can decide, and says:

Authority is found for the proposition that where the meeting is duly convened and a quorum is present a majority of those who actually vote is suf

ficient to a valid choice; but it is apprehended that this can be affirmed only in the cases of municipal corporations or any other cases where the elective body is indefinite and where a quorum consists of those who actually assemble at the proper place and time in pursuance of a valid notice.

In other words, Judge Thompson teaches that a majority of those who actually vote can only decide the action of indefinite bodies.

And now, Mr. Speaker, proceeding one step farther, I assert that, with the single exception of the Minnesota case—which was not reasoned at all and which, as I remember, did not even cite an authority—the only cases which can be found to contradict my assertion that a majority of all those present are required are cases which affirm my alternative proposition, that at least a majority of a quorum must vote affirmatively to decide. One of the best considered cases in the books is that of Green *vs.* The State in the Ohio Reports. It was there held that a majority of a quorum could elect the clerk of a city council; but even in that case the learned judge who delivered the opinion recognized that the cases had distinguished between the election of an officer, which they permitted by a bare majority of a quorum, and the transaction of more important business, which required a majority of those present. Judge Johnson, referring to an English case, said:

In all the opinions in that justly celebrated case the doctrine announced by Lord Mansfield was approved when limited to election; but it was held that if the question was the levying of a tax or the transaction of a corporate business a majority of those present must vote for it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Let me ask the gentleman whether that is the case where there were 18 voting—9 voting for and 9 against the proposition?

Mr. BAILEY. It is the case where 9 voted for and 9 refused to vote at all. Of the 18, 10 was a quorum, and the 9 who voted constituted a large majority of a quorum.

Mr. HENDERSON. But there were only 9 voting for and 9 against, so that there was no majority.

Mr. BAILEY. But a quorum was present and a majority of a quorum voted affirmatively. It is precisely on all fours with the New Hampshire case, where there were 3 voting and 3 silent, and the court declared that 4 was a quorum of the body, and 3 being a majority of a quorum, the clerk was lawfully chosen.

In the case of the Rushville Gas Company *vs.* City of Rushville the court says:

It is not a majority of the whole number present that is required. All that is requisite is a majority of the number of members required to constitute a quorum.

In that decision the court to sustain its position that a majority of all those present was not required, but that a majority of a quorum sufficed, undertook to combat the contention of counsel who had cited the quotation from Judge Dillon. The learned court declared that the counsel had misapprehended the meaning of Judge Dillon, and that he did not intend to assert that it required a majority of all those present to decide a question. When Judge Dillon published the fourth edition of his excellent work he had read that opinion, and he adds a note in which he calls attention to it and concludes his note with a query, whether the decision does not contravene the rule as to the majority required to decide in bodies of a definite number.

Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition to detain the House on this question, nor have I any inclination to charge that my friends here who hold a different view from myself are influenced by their pride of opinion. I am willing to believe that they judge this rule to be within the law, but I confess my inability to understand how lawyers of their attainments and capacity in the face of these authorities can entertain that view.

POWER OF HOUSE TO MAKE RULES.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question for information to remove a difficulty that is on my mind? The gentleman has stated his proposition very clearly, and now I want to ask this question: As I understand it, the Constitution of the United States gives the House the right to make rules to govern its own proceedings. As I understand the rule here proposed by the Committee on Rules, it provides a method of proceeding for ascertaining or securing the attendance of a quorum in this House, and provides that those members not voting either in the affirmative or in the negative shall be considered simply as acquiescing in what a majority of those voting do. Now, I ask the gentleman whether he thinks that is a part of the constitutional power given to the House to make rules for its own proceedings? Suppose that a corporation had in its charter a provision that a majority should be empowered to do business, and another provision that the corporation or its stockholders should have the right to make rules to regulate the proceedings of the board, does the gentleman think that the power thus given would include the power to say how those not voting should be counted, as I understand this rule does provide with reference to the proceedings of this House?

Mr. BAILEY. I have made no objection to that part of the rule which provides for ascertaining the presence of a quorum or to its method of taking the vote. My objection is that when a quorum is ascertained, and the vote is taken, the question may be decided by less than a majority of a quorum. I do not think that this can be done, because, there being no constitutional provision on the subject, the power of the House is limited by the common law. In one of the earlier cases decided by the supreme court of South Carolina it was distinctly stated that as neither the constitution of that State nor the Constitution of the United States contained any special provision touching this matter, the common law prevailed, and it required a majority of the body to act and a majority of a quorum to decide. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the Ballin case, lays down the same doctrine in so many words, and as the language is so plain and leaves so little room for doubt as to its meaning, I will venture to read it in full.

The other branch of the question is, whether a quorum being present, the bill received a sufficient number of votes; and here the general rule of all parliamentary bodies is that, when a quorum is present, the act of a majority of a quorum is the act of the body. This has been the rule for all time, except so far as in any given case the terms of the organic act under which the body is assembled have prescribed specific limitations. As, for instance, in those States where the constitution provides that a majority of all the members elected to either house shall be necessary to the passage of any bill. No such limitation is found in the Federal Constitution, and therefore the general law of such bodies obtains.

What can be plainer than this? The court declares that it requires a majority of a quorum to act—

except in so far as in any given case the terms of the *organic act under which the body is assembled* have prescribed specific limitations.

And then expressly declares that—

no such limitation is found in the Federal Constitution, and therefore the general law of such bodies obtains.

The court does not say that the general rule prevails unless a different one is established by the House, but expressly says that the general law obtains unless the "*organic act*" prescribes a different one. It will not do to say that this question was not before the court, and that consequently their language can not be construed with reference to it. It is true that this precise question—the power of a minority of a quorum to decide—was not presented, but it was necessarily involved in the question which was presented. In other words, the validity of the law was assailed upon the ground that it had not received a sufficient number of votes. The court decided that as it had received the votes of a majority of those present it had regularly passed the House; and it was in passing upon this very branch of the case that the court declared that, except where the Constitution ordained otherwise, that a majority of a quorum only was required by the common law. I submit to the candor of gentlemen on the other side that when the court declared that in the absence of a special provision in the Constitution no more than a majority of a quorum could be required to decide, it follows as a corollary that no less than a quorum can be permitted to decide, for it is a poor rule that will not work both ways. If this House can change the general law by its rule, the Supreme Court, in the passage which I have quoted, was inexcusably unfortunate in its choice of words; and as it is not the habit of that great tribunal to speak loosely and inaccurately, I am unwilling to believe that it did so in this case. They had considered the question well in all its phases, and we are safe in believing that their language expresses their opinion as to the law.

Not only does the Ballin case seem to settle the question upon authority, but it is supported by the best of reasons. The question of my friend from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] practically admits that what I have said is now the law, but implies that it is within the power of the House, by a simple rule, to change that law. To my mind this is a startling proposition. Does he mean to assert that either House of Congress can change the law of the land by its rule? I hazard nothing in saying that there is not a gentleman on this floor who will insist that this House can repeal or amend a statute of the United States by its mere rule; and yet, sir, I defy the ingenuity of the most skillful debater to show any substantial difference in this respect between statutory and common law. The common law is as valid and as binding upon the consciences of courts and legislators as the statutes are, and a power admitted over the one can not be successfully denied over the other. If the House can change the common law in this particular by a rule, no part of that splendid system of justice is exempt from its impatience or its caprice; and it can, by its single will, destroy what Lord Coke has aptly described as "the perfection of reason."

Upon what, sir, is this extraordinary power predicated? Upon the simple and necessary power of the House to "determine its own rules of proceeding."

This rule involves much more than a method of proceeding. It involves what, according to the Supreme Court, has been for all time the law of the land. I do not doubt the power of the House to adopt any reasonable rule for ascertaining its will, but that does not free us from this difficulty, for with that power conceded

we are still confronted with the question as to what is its will. To be sure, the will of the House is the will of the majority. But of what majority? A majority of those present, or a majority of a quorum, or a majority of those voting? The courts all hold that within the meaning of the law the action of the majority is the action of the body itself, but just as it requires a majority of the body to act for the body, so it requires a majority of that majority to act for the majority. If the House can permit the decision of a question by a minority of those present, it can go further and permit it to be decided by a minority of those voting. If the authority to determine the rules of its own proceeding confers upon the House the unlimited power for which gentlemen contend, then it would be permissible for the House to adopt a rule providing that every bill which had received 100 votes should become a law, notwithstanding the fact that 200 votes might be recorded against it. This must be true, unless, indeed, the courts would hold such a rule void as a violation of fundamental right, but this would be fleeing from one danger to another, for if the rules of this House are within its own discretion, then that discretion ought not to be controlled by the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say frankly that I have had some difficulty in disposing of the members who are present and who for any reason refuse to vote. I once thought with my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] that they ought to be counted on the prevailing side. "If a majority want it done," he says, "the silent members ought to be counted with them; if a majority do not want it done, the silent members ought to be counted with them." I know that there are many timeserving politicians who are extremely anxious to be always on the winning side, but this is carrying it a little too far. [Laughter.] We ought to assume that the gentlemen who decline to vote do so for a sufficient reason. The earlier cases, under the sanction of the great name of Lord Mansfield, declared that silent members ought to be considered as consenting, but the later cases have rejected that doctrine. A distinguished judge who for years adorned the bench of Pennsylvania, and a greater than whom never illustrated the jurisprudence of that or any other State, has declared that the legal intendment is that the silent member votes neither one way nor the other.

Mr. DALZELL. But my friend will admit that Judge Sharswood based his decision in that case upon the precise language of the statute governing it.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true. The case was this: There were 112 members of a certain school board. The man whose election had been certified to the proper authorities received 56 of those votes; the other candidate received 55 votes, and one member refused to vote. But Judge Sharswood said that the legal intendment was that he voted for neither the one nor the other.

Mr. DALZELL. But the statute in that case required that a person to be elected must receive a majority of the votes of all the members of the body.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand that perfectly well, and I am not citing this case as authority on that particular point. I am merely citing the declaration of Judge Sharswood that the silent member should not be counted either way.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman is citing the case as if Judge Sharswood had laid down a general proposition on this subject, whereas in point of fact he undertook to decide nothing except what was involved in that particular case, and he put the decision upon the very ground I have stated.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman's familiarity with the case misleads him as to the purpose of my citation. I did not cite the remark to show that the court decided that it required a majority of all present. If I had done so, I would have used the citation in another branch of my argument. I simply referred to Judge Sharswood's opinion in that case in answer to the declaration of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] that the members present and not voting should be counted as acquiescing in the result.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, not only I do think it a matter of doubtful wisdom to count the whole number of silent members as consenting, but the mature judgment of your constituents is that it is unwise. For thirty years all of the new States which have adopted constitutions and all of the old States which have adopted new constitutions have, with rare exceptions, expressly written in their fundamental law the provision that no question shall be decided except upon the affirmative vote of a majority of all the men elected to the legislature.

Shall Congress, in the face of this well-defined policy on the part of the various States, proceed contrariwise? Shall we provide that fewer men may make laws, while the States are requiring more men to do so? The adoption of this rule proclaims to the world that the House of Representatives can decide questions deeply affecting the honor, the welfare, and even the liberties of this Republic under circumstances which would disable the directors of a private corporation from deciding a question of profit. Sir, it is not lawful for us to do so, even if it were wise; and it would not be wise for us to do so, even if it were lawful.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, the change proposed by the Committee on Rules, now under consideration, is but one more step in that evolution of parliamentary law that was so successfully set afloat in the Fifty-first Congress by the present eminent Speaker of this House.

The practical question of law we are called upon to determine is to be answered by an examination of those provisions of the Federal Constitution that govern the action of this body. It is provided, in one clause of the Constitution, that the House of Representatives shall be competent to do business when a majority of its members are present. In other words, the language of the Constitution is that the majority of the House shall constitute a quorum; and the instrument goes a step farther and declares the purpose for which the quorum is constituted, namely, to do business.

Now, furthermore, the Constitution has left us in the dark as to how the quorum is to be ascertained and as to the manner in which the House will do business. But in another paragraph of that instrument it is provided that the House of Representatives may frame rules and regulations for its government and procedure. I do not undertake to quote the exact language of that instrument, but only give the substance of it. Now, we are to take these provisions of the Constitution and read them together in order to obtain a clear interpretation of the purposes of the framers of that instrument. It is a familiar principle of law, that applies not only to the organic law but to the statutory law as well, that provisions in pari materia relating to the same subject-matter are to be construed together in order to ascertain the exact scope and meaning of each. These two provisions of the Constitution, therefore, are to be considered together. First, we must have 179 members present in the Hall of the House before we can do business. Then the Constitution says that this House shall have the power to provide, by rules, how it shall proceed to transact business; and that is precisely what the Committee on Rules attempts to do in this report—that is, to exercise that power given to the House by the provisions of the Federal Constitution—to make rules and regulations as to how, when, and the manner in which that business which the quorum is qualified to do may be performed.

Now, sir, we are not to resort to the text-books, as my friend from Texas has done, and examine decisions relating to the government of private corporations to find a light on the subject of these rules. We are to resort to the provisions of the Constitution itself, and having found what they are, apply them in a common sense way to the problem before us, in order to carry out the purposes of the founders of the Government. What was the object of the framers of the Constitution in providing that a majority of the House should be present before it assumed to do business? What was the purpose and spirit that actuated the incorporation of that language into that instrument? Why, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in analogy to the law in all other branches it means that a majority of the House shall be present, not necessarily for the purpose of acting, but for the primary purpose of deliberating. The object in having a quorum present is that a stated number, to wit, a majority of the House, shall be present to deliberate upon pending matters of legislation. I repeat this proposition, because I think it goes to the very root of this question, that the sole object and purpose of requiring a majority of the House to be present when matters of legislation are taken up is that there shall be a majority here who can deliberate. In other words, deliberation is the sole purpose and aim that actuated the framers of the Constitution in requiring the presence of a majority of the members in the House. They purposely left the language general.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. POWERS. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. If he will read the debates, he will find it was not for the sake of deliberation, but it was expressly upon the ground that the people ought not to be bound by a law passed by less than a majority.

Mr. POWERS. I have always noticed, Mr. Speaker, that when gentlemen are troubled with the plain, common-sense explanation of the meaning of the Constitution they always go behind it and quote Elliott's Debates, or some of the debates of the constitutional convention which framed the instrument, to obtain light as to the meaning of its text. I agree that in proper cases that is a proper method of ascertaining its meaning; but my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] is too good a lawyer not to know that all this matter of debate that took place in the Federal convention was crystallized and ended in the text of the instrument itself. He might just as well quote the debates in this House upon the passage of a law that we enact, and say that you can get from his speech or from mine, or from the speech of somebody else, some light as to the meaning of that law. But did he ever hear of a court going back of the text of a law to inquire what the gentlemen who participated in framing it understood it to mean, or what they said about it in the legislature when it was enacted?

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman from Vermont will permit me, I will say to him that I can find many cases where the Supreme Court of the United States have gone to Elliott's Debates to discover the purpose with which that convention adopted a particular provision of the Constitution.

Mr. POWERS. My friend is no doubt correct in his statement. I myself said that in proper cases that was a proper method of ascertaining the meaning of the Constitution.

Mr. BAILEY. I thought you said the courts did not do that.

Mr. POWERS. I say the courts do not do it when it comes to the consideration of statutory law. If we pass an act of Congress here the courts never come in and take up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read what you and I said about it. They take the text of the law itself, and make that carry its own meaning on the face of it, and that is the only sensible way in which they could treat the subject.

Now, I have said, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose and object of requiring a quorum to be present is that a fixed number, to wit, a majority of the House, shall participate in the deliberations that go on here, and it is left to the other power that is given in the Constitution to ascertain how the will of that majority shall find its expression. As a matter of common practice we all know that hardly any bill passes this body, unless the yeas and nays are called, upon which 20 men vote; but the other 160 men who sit here, by expressing no dissent to the action of those who do vote, practically accede to it, and they have participated in the deliberations. Now, when you come to the question of acting, they do as they please about it. They can sit still and allow those who have louder voices or better lungs to respond to the demands of the Chair, or they can give their votes if they please; but if they sit silent in their seats they practically accede to what is done by those who do act, and this is in accord with the analogies of the law, too. Why, every lawyer knows perfectly well that if any man makes a statement in the presence of another that concerns his interest and he makes no reply to it, if he does not dispute it or qualify it, he is bound by it on the ground of an estoppel. He is bound by the statement that is made concerning his interest, unless he sees fit to make objection. So here. Every member who deliberates participates in the deliberations of the House. When the question is put to a vote and he fails to respond one way or the other, but the others respond for him, he accedes to what they say the action of the majority shall be. He is estopped from saying that he voted against that bill, because by sitting silent when he is called upon to act he allows others to act for him, to assume to represent him, and impliedly he gives them the authority to represent him.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that this practice has grown up here, and this construction of the language of the Constitution is in strict accord with all the analogies of law. We have in my State a statute which requires the grand jury to be composed of 23 men, and that a bill of indictment or presentment must be agreed to by 12, which, as you observe, is a majority. In many States the grand jury is lawfully constituted with 18 men, but 12 must concur. The question arose a few years ago in respect to the validity of a presentment that was made by the grand jury where it was made to appear that only 20 grand jurors were present when the case was under investigation; and the court said that that indictment was bad, because the requirement that there should be 23 members of the grand jury was a requirement that called for the deliberation of 23 men; and unless 23 men had actually participated in the deliberation, although 12 concurred in the indictment, it was invalid.

Now, the same principle applies in the election of our minor officers. In my State that is undoubtedly true; in all States it is provided that town representatives, representatives of the municipality, shall be elected by a majority of votes. We go to our several voting places and nine-tenths, perhaps, of the legal voters in that municipality sit on their seats and do not act, and 10 men go forward and deposit their ballots and elect the representative to the State legislature. Has any man ever questioned the propriety of that action?

Mr. BAILEY. And I do not. That is an indefinite constituency, and that action is entirely valid. I do not question it.

Mr. POWERS. Many of these provisions, Mr. Speaker, result, as I agree, in the action of the minority. The whole theory of our Government is that our laws shall be enacted by a majority. That is true, but oftentimes, possibly in a majority of instances, our laws are passed by a very small minority; but if a majority is present, participating in the deliberations of the legislative body, the requirements of the Constitution that a quorum shall be present has been answered.

Now, then, this rule, as I have insisted, simply provides a way of ascertaining the voice of the majority. They must be here. There must be 179 gentlemen present. The next step in the procedure is to ascertain the voice and the act in the vote of that 179 members. I think it is perfectly competent to pass a rule that unless a majority of the 179 members expressly dissent from the proceeding or the act it shall be valid. It is perfectly competent for the House to say that a majority of voices that the Speaker shall hear, when they are called upon to act, shall govern the decision of the body, although that is a minority.

Mr. BAILEY. If it would not interrupt the gentleman, the suggestion the gentleman makes as to the power of the House to adopt rules is only one of the difficulties that I discover. I desire to submit this view, and to have his answer. I think that power of adopting rules means, perhaps, the parliamentary procedure. If it means more than that, and authorizes the House to reverse the doctrine that it takes a majority to pass a bill, then would it not follow that the House can absolutely declare that a minority can pass a bill, however foolish it may be to suppose that the House would do that—the House would have that power unless there is a restriction of its power to adopt a rule?

Mr. POWERS. I would not insist, Mr. Speaker, that the House by a minority vote in the affirmative could pass a law.

Mr. BAILEY. If it had a rule to that effect, why not?

Mr. POWERS. Why, the gentleman can suppose a case that makes anything absurd, but the proposition that we should adopt a rule that the vote of a minority should enact legislation is giving it a pretty wide range.

Mr. TOWNE. Let me make this suggestion: Is it not in effect only a proposition to enact a rule of procedure which shall enable the quorum to ascertain what the will of the majority is?

Mr. POWERS. Precisely that.

Mr. BAILEY. I submit that it is not the will of the majority of those present; and if it is competent to say that a minority of those present can decide a question, then it is competent to go a step further, and say a minority of those voting may decide.

Mr. TOWNE. I do not see that at all.

Mr. POWERS. I think, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman had given attention to the suggestions I have made, there would be no particular trouble with the argument I was undertaking to offer. I insist, first, that the House must have a quorum present to do business; second, that it is entirely competent for the House to prescribe the manner in which that quorum shall act. Now, that quorum is a majority, not a minority, of the House, and the House prescribes a rule for ascertaining what the pleasure of that majority is.

Mr. BLACK of Georgia. I would like to ask my friend, either at this point or before he concludes, to give us his view as to the wisdom of adopting such a rule, waiving the question of the constitutional power of the House to do it.

Mr. POWERS. Well, Mr. Speaker, the wisdom of adopting the rule is founded in the way that we are made up as men. We know perfectly well—and it is characteristic not only of this body, but of all legislative bodies—that generally three-fourths of the members do not actively participate in the business of the House. When a vote is called for, perhaps 20 men will respond and 120 will remain silent. Now, you can not change the nature of those men and compel them to say yea or nay. They sit here silent, and the usage which has grown up has made it the law of the House that the will of those who speak shall bind the majority, unless they choose to express their dissent.

Mr. BLACK of Georgia. If this rule shall be adopted and there is a very small minority vote in favor of a given proposition, will it be competent to call the attention of the House to that fact and to ask for an expression of the will of the majority?

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman from Georgia is very well aware that if only half a dozen respond to the call for a vote, and he, being one of the silent members, desires a fuller vote, he can ask for a division or for the yeas and nays. He is not precluded by anything in this rule from interposing an objection to this mode of procedure.

Mr. SWANSON. But this rule, as I understand, does not apply except in cases where there is a call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. POWERS. This rule provides the manner in which the presence of a quorum may be ascertained if anybody disputes it.

Mr. HENDERSON. In reply to the question of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] I will say that the rule provides that absent members shall be brought before the House by the Sergeant-at-Arms and shall then be discharged from arrest and given an opportunity to vote. Before that is done the roll will be called twice, as it is now, and then members will be brought in, discharged from arrest, and given an opportunity to vote, so that there is nothing in this rule to interfere with the fullest expression of their will that members can desire.

Mr. POWERS. The rule, as I understand it, is framed for the government of practical men engaged in the transaction of practical business, and we have to deal with those men as they are, not as if all of them were always ready to answer yea or nay upon any particular proposition. The condition of things which this rule contemplates is not peculiar to this body. It runs through all the legislative bodies in the Union; it runs through all our municipal bodies at our homes. When any proposition is submitted to a large body of voters, a few respond and the rest keep

silent. Now, I hold that the silent man here who, having a duty to perform, sees fit to remain silent, thereby impliedly authorizes those who do speak to represent his choice, and he is estopped from denying this on the ground that, having a duty to perform himself, and somebody else assuming to perform it in his presence without objection on his part, he can not question the result.

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Does the gentleman think that the doctrine of estoppel applies in legislative matters?

Mr. POWERS. I think it applies to the individual member. I say that he can not dispute the action of the majority who have undertaken to act. Whether the result would stand the test of the court upon a question as to the validity of the action taken is quite another question. The point I make is that if I vote, and you, being present, do not dissent, I represent you as well as myself in giving that vote.

Supposing this question were brought before the court on a test case, I ask my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], who has evidently given much study to this problem, whether he thinks that, the Speaker of this House having affixed his signature to an enactment certifying that it had passed the House on a certain day, and the President of the Senate having affixed his signature attesting the fact that it had passed the Senate on a certain day, and the enactment thus certified being sent to the President of the United States—I ask my friend whether he thinks that the President of the United States could say that the measure had not been properly presented to him for his signature? Is not the certification of the very officers who have been appointed to do that work a certification by a public officer which admits of no contradiction? Most clearly so; and I think the gentleman from Texas himself concedes that if a law is properly certified by all the officials through whose hands it must pass, you can not go back of that certification and look at the Journal or prove by a majority of the members that they did not vote for it.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman is quite right in saying that you can not prove by the members that they did not vote for it, and it has been held that you could not go to the Journal to prove that the measure had passed in a different form from that in which it was signed and sent to the President; but the court expressly declined to say that you could not go to the Journal to ascertain whether the bill had passed on a yea-and-nay vote, and in the Ballin case the court intimate that you can go to the Journal, and in fact in that case they did go to it.

Mr. POWERS. I think the gentleman's statement supports my proposition that you can not go to the Journal, because he says the court did not decide that you could go there.

Mr. BAILEY. In one case; but in the Ballin case the court did go to the Journal.

Mr. POWERS. In what State did that case arise.

Mr. BAILEY. That was a case involving the question of the constitutionality of what is known as the McKinley Act. In that case the court did go to the Journal, the court being the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. POWERS. There are some State constitutions which provide that legislative acts to be valid must be passed by a majority of all the members of the legislative body.

The State of Missouri, I am told, has such a provision in its constitution, and that majority must be ascertained by a yea-and-nay vote. Now, under such a restriction, where the constitution prescribes a rule for the passage of a bill, it is very evident that it must be followed. But the Federal Constitution is entirely silent on that question; it does not touch the question of what number is necessary to pass a bill. It simply provides that a majority shall be present to do business. The method of doing that business is left to be regulated by the House itself. If a majority of the House are here for the purposes of deliberation, the requirement of the Constitution is answered. If a majority of this House chooses to adopt a rule, for instance, that the will of a majority of those voting or the majority of those whose voices the Speaker hears shall be taken as the action of the majority, that is the end of it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Speaker, I simply want, in a very brief manner, to enter my protest against this proposed rule, as being an improper and unwise method of procedure for this House. I have listened to the gentleman from Texas and the gentlemen on the other side. It seems to me that there might be authority for this House to adopt this as a rule of procedure. The Constitution gives the House authority to make its own rules. I think possibly the Constitution gives the House of Representatives ample authority to ascertain whether those voting or not voting shall be counted in the affirmative or negative. This rule says they shall not be counted either way, but shall be regarded as acquiescing in what the majority of those voting may do. Now, this House may have authority under the Constitution for establishing such a rule. But that does not diminish the importance of the question which we are to consider, whether this is a wise rule for the control of legislation in this body. It is upon that view of the question that I desire to submit a few remarks for the consideration of this House.

I believe that no rule established at this session—none at least that I can conceive of—would be more unwise and result in more pernicious effects than to say that legislation should be passed by the method proposed in this rule. As appears by the answer of the acting chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. HENDERSON], if 180 members are present, 2 of whom vote for a proposition and 1 against it, that proposition under this rule would be enacted into law. Now, I say, in a great body like Congress, with great jobs seeking legislative sanction, with great claims clamoring to get through this House, it is unwise to adopt a rule to facilitate legislation so far as this will do.

We have adopted at this session a rule which says that every member shall vote unless excused. We thus make it imperative upon a member to vote on every proposition propounded here. Yet here we have presented to-day a proposed rule which enables members to "trim," enables them to sit silent and vote neither for nor against a proposition, thus enabling legislation to be enacted by the few who may vote. Now, every man who has had any experience in Congress knows how often a member is approached by another member who says, "if you can not vote for my proposition don't vote at all, or be absent." Now, I say we should not have a rule that will enable members to "trim" more than they can do at present, which will enable them, by being absent, or by sitting silent in their seats, to aid in the enactment of pernicious legislation.

I know that gentlemen who favor this rule say that members who are present and do not like the proposition presented have an opportunity to defeat it by participating in the action of the House upon it. Now, I take this ground: Legislation changes present conditions, and present conditions should not be changed except by the acquiescence of a majority. I say it is bad policy for any party to inaugurate a system which will enable 177 members to sit silent, letting 2 members vote for a proposition and 1 against it, and then have that proposition enacted into law. I might go further. Under this proposition 179 men may sit silent in their seats or answer present and be counted to make a quorum, and then when it comes to a vote on the proposition a single member may vote for it, and if there be no vote against it that proposition can be enacted into law.

In view of the temptation for the enactment of different kinds of jobs, in view of the personal favors which are exchanged between member and member, in view of the personal popularity of members who may be anxious to do something for their districts, anxious to get through private bills, anxious to get through something beneficial to themselves and their special sections, it is poor policy to facilitate the enactment of such legislation by the adoption of such a rule as this. I say no measure should be placed upon the statute book unless a majority of those present who are deliberating upon it agree that it is necessary and beneficial to the country. This proposed rule reverses that policy. As has been well said in this discussion, there is scarcely a State legislature in the Union, whether Democratic or Republican, which has not a rule providing that those members not voting shall be counted in the negative. Such rules proceed upon the idea that no legislation should be enacted, no change made in present conditions, unless the majority of those who are giving the matter deliberation and consideration think the change is beneficial and will subserve some great public interest.

This occasion marks the first departure from what has hitherto been the wise, conservative, and sensible method of procedure, and it marks the entrance upon a new policy, which this House will surely rue if it adopts it as a method of procedure. I have not heard any member who has advocated this rule give any reasonable, sensible excuse for reversing the policy of one hundred years and allowing a small minority to put legislation upon the statute books.

I will go so far as to say that I would vote for a rule of this House providing that every member who is present and not voting shall be considered as voting in the negative upon the pending proposition. I think the House has ample authority to pass such a rule, and it would be conducive to better legislation, would be conducive to economy, would be conducive to the prevention of all kinds of jobs and schemes which clamor for passage through this body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the wiser course. Why? Because the experience of every State, the experience of every legislative body, shows that it is much wiser to count those not participating in legislation in that manner rather than to count them in the affirmative, or acquiescing in what was done.

But I simply wish to put myself on record as opposed to the adoption of such a rule, because I believe that its effect will be pernicious, and that this Congress, or any other Congress that will adopt such a rule, will rue it when they see its effects upon legislation in this country.

Mr. MILES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the pending rule.

The SPEAKER. The amendment will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lines 14 and 15 of section 4, Rule XV, strike out the words "which shall be decided as the majority of those voting shall appear" and insert in lieu of said words "shall be decided as shall appear by the votes of a majority of a quorum of the House."

Mr. MILES. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire, being a young member of this body in two senses of that word, to occupy much of the time of the House in the discussion of this important constitutional question. I do desire, however, in a very few words to go on record, according to my lights as a lawyer, in favor of the view which was expressed in reference to this matter, when it was up a few days ago, by that distinguished lawyer, General CATCHINGS, of Mississippi. I do not entertain the view which I think has been very plausibly put before the House by the distinguished lawyer from Texas [Mr. BAILEY]. I do not entertain the view, sir, that it was ever contemplated by the framers of the Constitution or that it was ever contemplated by the Supreme Court of the United States in the decision which it rendered in Ballin's case that there should be a majority of those present, or, to use the language of the distinguished gentleman, a majority of the quorum. What I apprehend the Supreme Court in Ballin's case meant by the term "the quorum" was a constitutional quorum. It meant to recognize the fact that in this matter there was a constitutional limitation upon Congress, and, as a lawyer, according to the lights I have and the decisions which have been so numerously cited by the gentleman from Texas, agreeing to the conclusions which have been reached by every English lawyer from the time of Lord Mansfield to the present time, I assert that it has never been determined that any body similar to this can pass a law by a less vote than a majority of the quorum of the whole body. But the words "a quorum" and "the quorum," I apprehend, mean exactly the same thing.

When my friend from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] in his very interesting remarks made the point seriously (and I know that he is a lawyer and an able one and must have read the decision in the Ballin case) that all the decisions on this point had been rendered with reference to private corporations and minor municipal bodies, I humbly called his attention, and I beg here to call the attention of this House again to the fact that the distinguished jurist of the Supreme Court of the United States, in rendering his decision in this case, starts that very able opinion with this important language:

It is true that most of the decisions touching this question have been in respect to the action of trustees and directors of a private corporation, or of the minor legislative bodies which represent and act for cities and other municipal corporations—but the principle is the same.

This is, Mr. Speaker, the gist and very kernel of the decision, and I want to say here, sir, that I have entertained no view contrary to that expressed in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upon this subject. I have always believed that it was within the power of Congress to pass a rule requiring the members of this body to be present to perform their acts and duties. I have always believed in the policy and wisdom of the rule passed upon in the Ballin case, and I think it is a monument to the distinguished ability of the present Speaker of this House that he was the author of the rule determined by the Supreme Court in its decision in that case to be a sound one. I have never differed with that rule, but it seems to me that the Supreme Court in passing upon it passed upon the question now before the House.

After stating that the principle is the same in a case of this kind as in the case of private corporations and minor municipal bodies, the court goes on to cite approvingly these various cases which lay down the rule invariably that the majority of a quorum, and only the majority of a quorum, shall pass a bill. Every decision which the court quotes is a decision based upon a case of a private corporation or of a minor municipal body. So that it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this very question which my friend [Mr. DE ARMOND] raised has been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States.

My friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] quoted from Judge Dillon, and the decision before me in the very outset ratifies and approves what Judge Dillon says by quoting it verbatim et literatim as it has already been quoted by my friend from Texas.

It also quotes the case of State against Green, the Ohio case, approvingly, which my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] also quoted.

It quotes from Chancellor Kent and it also quotes from 1 McCoid, which is a celebrated case, and I desire especially to call the attention of gentlemen on the other side to that case. I will not consume the time of this House, Mr. Speaker, in any effort to make a constitutional argument. My sphere as a lawyer has been an humble one, but being a lawyer, I take it, sir, that it is my duty to go according to my lights as a professional man as well as my lights on any question of fact before this House. I can not conscientiously vote for this rule, because, as it seems to me, it is in direct conflict not only with the spirit but with the letter of the Ballin case.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, every bill which shall have passed the House and the Senate must, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President. How must it be passed? That is the whole question. Passed under such rules as the House and Senate may determine for their proceedings. Those proceedings are controlled by three conditions in the Constitution, and there are no others.

First, if the President disapproves a bill and returns it to either House, two-thirds of the House on a yea-and-nay vote must vote for it or it fails to become a law. And in impeachment trials in the Senate, in order to secure conviction two-thirds of those present must vote for it.

One other provision in relation to how the proceedings of either House shall be conducted. One-fifth of those present can have the yeas and nays recorded on any question. Where is there any provision in the Constitution limiting or controlling the discretionary powers given to each House to determine its rules of procedure? The fixed rule of the Supreme Court, that I do not think is ever departed from, is that where there is a grant of discretionary power to anything or anybody in the Constitution of the United States, the Supreme Court of the United States will not sit in judgment on the exercise of that discretion, no matter what it is. It was upon that doctrine that the constitutionality of the legal-tender quality of the United States notes was sustained in the first decision by the court. The Constitution gave to Congress the power to declare war, and the Supreme Court held the power to declare war carried with it, in the discretion of Congress, the doing of anything that the war-making power might think necessary to bring the war to a successful close.

In the making of rules to conduct the proceedings of the House there is one other condition fixed by the Constitution. I have referred to those that relate to voting. There is only one other. There must be a majority of the members chosen to constitute a quorum to do business. What is a quorum was raised in this Hall on the 4th of July, 1861. The then occupant of the chair decided that a quorum consisted of a majority of the members chosen from the Congressional districts. What is the evidence of a quorum, if that quesiton had been raised, the then occupant of the chair would have decided that the evidence of the choosing is the number of members who take the oath of office. That Congress might have been blocked in its proceedings if the strict construction that I hear gentlemen placing upon the constitutional power of the House to make its rules had prevailed.

The quorum consists of a majority chosen. The choosing is not completed or determined except by the oath of office taken by those who are chosen. A Congressional district is not obliged to send a member, and there is no power to compel it to. No State in the Union is obliged to send a Senator to the United States Senate, and there is no power to compel it to do so. If a Congressional district had elected a member, and instead of coming and discharging his duty and taking the oath of office, he had done as a good many did in 1861, had gone into another Congress, how could a constitutional quorum be determined except by the oath of office of the members chosen, for that is necessary to complete the choosing, for the House could not send for any others and bring them in to make a quorum. A quorum being present, the House determines the rules of its proceedings, subject only to the conditions in the Constitution to which I have referred. What nonsense to make a rule which will allow the minority to obstruct all business!

The majority makes rules to facilitate business, and so long as its rules do not contravene conditions of the Constitution, they can make just such rules as they please. Suppose the record of the House should go to the Supreme Court on a question whether a law was passed in due form. The Supreme Court, looking over that Journal, would see whether the President had vetoed a bill and it was attempted to be made a law by less than two-thirds of the votes of the two Houses on a yea-and-nay vote. If the record showed that, the law would be a nullity. In the other case, that of impeachment in the Senate. It must show that two-thirds of those present in the Senate voted for conviction. If two-thirds did vote for conviction, the conviction would be held good.

Now, where in the Constitution is there any other condition that they are going to examine in restraint of either House determining the rules of its proceedings? There is nothing fixing how the House shall vote, nothing about majorities, and nothing about yeas and nays besides the cases referred to, except one-fifth of those present may have the yeas and nays entered on the Journal on any question. With the exceptions referred to, the House can make what rules it pleases to facilitate the transaction of business. Take an extreme case. Make the rule as proposed, that a majority of those voting, a quorum being present, will pass any bill in the House, no matter what the others do—say there were but two voting. What would the court do in examining, to see

first whether there was a quorum present? How could they determine that? They take the record of the House and find 357 men have taken the oath of office. A quorum is a majority of that number. The House has passed a rule that if members sit in their seats they are to be counted as present with those who vote whether they vote or not. Has the House the power to do that? The court has already declared they have. A quorum being present for business—the positive requirement of the Constitution—and the House having determined in its rules how a bill shall be passed, what could there be for the Supreme Court to inquire into if the record showed the bill passed as required by the rules of the House?

The power to make the rules is conferred absolutely upon the House, to be exercised in their own discretion. How is the Supreme Court, under their own rule of construction, to limit that discretion? The rules of the House as passed provide that every member, when his name is called, shall vote, except in certain specified cases. He refuses to do it. There is no power that can compel him to vote if he resolutely refuses. It is a plain violation of the rules of the House, and prevents the transaction of its business. Can it be possible that the Supreme Court of the United States would hold that the discretionary power conferred on the House to determine its rules of proceedings would not have the power to neutralize this violation of its rules by providing that those members who comply with such rules shall not carry on the business of the House? The rule as proposed neutralizes the refusal of a member to comply with the rules determined by the House for its proceedings. The rule neutralizes his refusal to do what the rules require by saying he is to be counted in constituting a quorum. Then, whoever votes on the question, if the rule so provides, concludes him and the whole House. Where is there anything in the Constitution that says a bill shall pass the two Houses in any particular way unless it is returned from the President without his approval? There is nothing about a majority in the Constitution; nothing about how many votes shall be required to pass a bill, except in case of a veto. It simply says that a bill which shall have passed the House and the Senate, before it becomes a law, shall, so and so, be submitted to the President.

Now, the House determines its own rules of procedure, and like any other discretionary power granted by the Constitution is to be exercised in its own discretion, not subject to review by any court as to the wisdom of the exercise of that discretion. I need not take the time of the House except for one instance——

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Will you permit me to ask you a question?

Mr. GROW. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. While I expect to vote for this rule, I would like the ex-Speaker, who ruled in 1861, to be logical in his statement. Can you explain why there would be any prejudice to legislation by counting a portion of a quorum silent against a bill and having that same number of silent men counted against it the same as if they had voted no?

Mr. GROW. You undertake to grant the same power to a member who refuses to obey our rules as to one who does.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I ask the question, if there were, for instance, 50 men on the floor who declined to vote, but who are counted for the purpose of making a quorum, wherein is the legislative effect more disastrous by their refusing to vote than if they had actually voted no?

Mr. GROW. The House undoubtedly has the power to make such a rule, but why should the negative side of the question be strengthened by all refusing to vote any more than the affirmative? I should oppose the adoption of any rule that required the recording of any member for or against any question except by himself. My own conscience and judgment must make that record, and nobody else has the right to make it for me. But the House can neutralize my refusal to vote, so far as practical legislative results are concerned.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I am not certain that I have made my question clear to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. As I understand him, his proposition is that a majority of those who vote——

Mr. GROW. A quorum being present.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Yes; that a majority of those who vote, a quorum being present, shall have power to enact a law. Now, why should there not be a majority of the quorum voting when a portion of those present are silent any more than if that portion voted "no"?

Mr. GROW. I do not require a majority of the quorum.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. No; but if those who remain silent had voted "no," then it would have taken a majority of the quorum to pass the measure. Now, if they do not vote, how can there be any prejudice to them by counting them as voting "no"?

Mr. GROW. Because in that case you put me on record, to be read in the future, as having voted for or against a measure that I might be unwilling to be responsible for to the public opinion of the world. You undertake to put my convictions on that question on the records of the House. But if I sit silent, withholding my vote, the House can nullify my refusal to vote, so far as legislation is concerned, and that is all they would have a right to do.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Do you, as one of the ablest and oldest members here, think it would be policy for the Congress of the United States to enact laws by less than half of a quorum of this body?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Nine-tenths of the measures passed are passed in that way.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, it is just as good policy and just as wise for one man to vote on a bill in this House with 356 sitting silent as it is for 200 to vote and the balance sit silent. If those who are present sit silent and refuse to vote, that, under this rule, would not prevent one man or any number of men from representing the House by their action. If members desire to defeat a measure, they must put themselves on record in opposition to it, and not, by a mere failure to comply with their duty under the law, nullify the action of those who do their duty. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] spoke about members being enabled, under this rule, to skulk and avoid proper responsibility.

Why, sir, any member can dodge to-day or any other time if he wants to, and this rule only provides that dodgers shall not accomplish any practical results, so that they might as well vote. It is a rule against dodgers. The dodger is the man who will not vote, and you have no power to compel him to vote; above all, you have no right to put him on record in favor of a measure that he is opposed to in conscience, or to put him on record except in his own way. You have no right to do that whether he is silent or not; but you have a right to neutralize his violation of the rules in attempts to defeat legislation, and you do that by making a rule that those who do discharge their duty under the rules of the House shall, by their action, bind those who refuse to by remaining silent, just as the voters who go to the polls and cast their votes, even though they be an infinitesimal portion of the voters of the election precinct, can by their action bind those who stay away. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to occupy so much of the time of the House, and I would not have done so but for the questions that have been put to me.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], if he is about to proceed now, permit me to call his attention to a question which I should like him to consider? I wish to bring it to his attention now because I shall not have an opportunity to reply to him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the greatest questions that can possibly call forth the ability, wisdom, and patriotism of this House; and I believe it is a question that is now being discussed for the last time in this generation, and that when this House shall have adopted the pending rule it will have clinched the proper construction of the Constitution of the United States on this matter and will have made the rule of the Fifty-first Congress on the quorum question an absolute finality. Referring to the court decisions that have been cited against this rule, I will say that it is one of the easiest things in the world for a man who is skilled in the practice of the law to go into the digests and find decisions of the courts that will support almost any contention. I remember that when I was at the law school at Albany, and a question was presented by one of the professors of the moot court, a student, in giving a judicial opinion in the case, as he was required by the rules to do, having examined every authority that he could find pro and con in the various digests, discovered that there were forty-five decisions on one side of the question and forty-three on the other, and thereupon gave his opinion on the side of the majority. [Laughter.]

There is no trouble in finding court decisions upon any side of a controverted question, just as there is no trouble in finding Bible texts to support almost any denominational vagary. We are told that even the devil himself can cite Scripture for his purpose.

There is one strange thing that must have attracted the attention of every patriot, and that is that the Constitution of the United States is constantly invoked to defeat the will of the American people, to obstruct the progress of legislation, and even to overthrow the country itself; but it is very seldom invoked in order to effectuate the will of the people, or in order to perpetuate liberty, or in order to carry out the spirit of patriotism that some men fail to discover within the Constitution. "The letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive."

Now, then, what are both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution on this subject? The Constitution says:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States; * * * and a majority of each House shall constitute a quorum to do business.

Now, what is this thing called "the House"? This being denominated the House is the assembly under the Constitution of those members who have been chosen; and so, during the war of the rebellion, it was decided that a quorum was constituted of a

majority of the members chosen in the loyal States; and, as to those States that were entitled to membership but did not choose members, their membership was not to be counted in constituting a quorum. So, then, a quorum is a majority of the members chosen. Now, how is that majority to be ascertained? How is the Speaker to ascertain whether a majority is present or not? The only way we can perceive a physical fact is by the senses—ordinarily by the sight or by the hearing.

Let us look at this thing from a common-sense standpoint—not from any standpoint of hypercriticism, not from any standpoint of a purpose "how not to do it," but from a standpoint of common reason and common sense, aided by a broad patriotism. How does the Speaker ascertain whether a majority is here present or not? By the sight or by the sound. Now, is it any better test of a man's presence to hear his voice than it is to see his person? We are told that "hearing is knowing, but seeing is the very truth." So the Speaker can ascertain whether a quorum is present or not either by sight or by sound, or by both concurring, if there be a concurrence.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution says that "a smaller number" than a quorum may "compel the attendance of absent members." Suppose every member chosen in this House is present and yet only one member votes, and the question of quorum or no quorum is raised. In the case I am supposing there are no absent members whose attendance is to be compelled; all the members are here in their seats. It is said that there ought to be a rule compelling men to vote, and that under the rule now proposed a few men may pass a law. Why, sir, it is the experience of every man who has ever served in a deliberative assembly, who has ever been a member of a State legislature, or who has served in this body during even the present session, that a very large proportion of all the bills and resolutions passed are passed by a comparatively few votes. And since I have been here at this session of Congress there have been no less than two resolutions passed without a solitary human being voting either one way or the other. That is common experience.

A majority of those voting is sufficient to pass any measure, if a quorum is actually present, even though a majority of the quorum do not vote. Those who are present are presumed to acquiesce in what is done. "Silence gives consent." That is a maxim as old as the English language, and it has its counterpart in the language of every civilized nation under the sun. It expresses the common and universal judgment of mankind. It is a maxim practiced upon every day in the courts that when a man keeps silent when it is his duty to speak he shall not be allowed to speak when it is his duty to keep silent. That is known as the doctrine of estoppel, and members here who fail to vote on a given measure when a quorum is actually present are estopped in law from contending that that measure has not received the approbation of a constitutional majority, when, in fact, it has received a majority of those actually voting. In such a case the majority of those voting is all sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, constitutions grow. I know that there was an old construction of the Constitution and an old construction of parliamentary law under which it was held that a member of this House was to be regarded as absent if he did not vote, even when he was present in fact. But "old things have passed away and all things have become new." The Constitution which was established for 6,000,000 people is not the Constitution for 70,000,000 people. The Constitution which was invoked by George Washington to put down a rebellion in a part of a State is not the Constitution which was invoked by Abraham Lincoln to put down a rebellion in eleven whole States and in parts of three other States. Constitutions are evolved; they expand; they grow to suit the times. Whenever we have a Constitution that becomes as cast iron and will not expand to suit the expansiveness of our national growth and the development of our jurisprudence, then there will come a time when it will be necessary either to reorganize our form of government or to break the Constitution itself.

The American people have now got to the time when the presence of a member in his seat is to be noted and he is to be deemed as constituting one of the quorum to do business in the American House of Representatives. And the other branch of the Congress of the United States will be compelled by the American people to subordinate their views to this doctrine. So that it may be laid down as a part of the permanent policy of the American Congress, in both of its branches, that the Speaker can use both his sight and his hearing in determining whether a quorum is present or not.

If "those voting on the question, and those who are present and decline to vote, shall, together, make a majority of the House, the Speaker shall declare that a quorum is constituted." That is the language of the proposed rule. The only objection I have to it is the use of the word "constituted." He should declare that a quorum of the House is present. When a man is in his seat he is here, and, as has been well said by the venerable Representative from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW], there is no power under heaven to compel a man to vote. There ought not to be any such power; but a man who sits silent in his seat is deemed by all the experience of the past and by common consent of mankind as agreeing to what is being done. He does not dissent; therefore he gives his acquiescence. Those who were silent when they should have objected shall not be allowed to object when the act of which they complain is brought in question.

So I am of opinion that this rule is not only in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution itself, but that this construction of the Constitution by the Fifty-first Congress has been indorsed by the American people themselves.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the pending proposition has received such very elaborate debate and consideration during the time it has been before the House that I have no inclination or desire to detain this body at any great length.

Prior to the Fifty-first Congress there were three potent methods of filibustering in this body. The first was by dilatory motions, the second was by a silent or nonvoting quorum, and the third was by what has been called the "vanishing" quorum. In the Fiftieth Congress—those gentlemen present who were members of that body will no doubt recall the fact and will sustain me in my recollection—we spent some seven or eight days, without an adjournment, as a result of repeated dilatory motions, such as the motion to take a recess, to adjourn to a certain day, to adjourn, and other motions of that character that were then admissible under the rule. That practice was made an end to in the Fifty-first Congress by the adoption of a rule which prevented the Speaker from entertaining dilatory motions, and the adoption of that rule has practically done away with that species of filibustering from that time to the present.

With respect to the second method of filibustering, where gentlemen sat in their seats and refused to be recorded, that practice has been abolished by the method introduced by the Speaker of this House, who was also the Speaker of that House, of counting a quorum; a method that has been sustained by the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States. But there still remains a method of filibustering unprovided for, that is to say, by members again retiring from the hall after having been brought in on a call of the House and answering to their names, so that when a quorum has been had and further proceedings under the call of the House been dispensed with, a quorum is again wanting. To illustrate, a proposition is pending on which the yeas and nays are being taken. It is ascertained that no quorum is present. A call of the House is ordered. The Sergeant-at-Arms brings in members from time to time who answer to their names, and it is then ascertained by the report of the Clerk that a quorum is present. A motion is then made to dispense with further proceedings under the call, and the House returns to the consideration of the business that it had in hand when the call was ordered, which was the calling of the yeas and nays. It then again appears that no quorum is present. Those gentlemen who were brought in, but who are unfavorable to the legislation pending, have exercised their privilege and have again gone from the House.

The purpose of the pending rule is to meet that emergency. Under the pending rule when there is a call of the House there is also a yea-and-nay vote pending, and as members are brought in and recorded as present they are offered an opportunity to vote, with the result that all present are recorded, and when those members who voted and those members who refused to vote are counted, legal action is had upon the pending measure, and the Journal shows that that action has been had in a legally constituted House, a quorum being present.

Now, let me call the attention of the House to this circumstance in connection with the proposed rule. There is no necessity, so far as this side of the Chamber is concerned, to insist upon the adoption of this rule, because our large majority renders it almost impossible that any contingency should arise when the rule would become necessary. It is because of that very fact, and because under the circumstances our motives could not be impugned, that the Committee on Rules thought that it was desirable now to introduce into the body of rules a rule which would round out the system, and would do away for all time with the possibility of filibustering in this House and with the wasting in this manner of the public time.

Now, against the adoption of this rule it is claimed that the law is that a voting majority of a quorum is necessary to pass a law, and that this rule therefore infringes the law, because it proposes that a majority merely of those voting shall pass a bill. Now, if I should concede—as I do not—that the question as to existing law upon the subject of a voting majority of a quorum had anything at all to do with the question now before the House, I should still say that, so far as there are any decisions at all, they are against the propositions asserted by our friends upon the other side. I call attention particularly to two cases. The first is a case reported in 34 Minnesota, the case of the State of Minnesota ex rel.

John Martin and others *vs.* Samuel H. Chute and others, in which this proposition is laid down by the court:

At a valid stockholders' meeting, the charter and by-laws being silent on the subject, a majority of the votes cast, though but a minority of the stock represented, prevails. Those having an opportunity to vote and not voting are held to acquiesce in the votes actually cast.

The court, in its opinion, says:

At a valid meeting of stockholders, if no contrary rule is established by the charter or by-laws, a majority of those voting prevails. Those who have an opportunity to vote and refrain, though they have a majority of the stock, must be held to acquiesce in the result of the votes actually cast. A stockholder not voting can not get relief from the courts if he voluntarily refrained from voting if he had an opportunity and his claim of right to vote was not excluded.

This is one positive decision upon a proposition, corresponding exactly with and in all respects analogous to the proposition now before the House.

Conceding, as I do not, that the question before the House is as to existing law with respect to counting the majority of a quorum, the other case to which I desire to call attention is a case that was cited by my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and which he will pardon me for saying does not seem to me to sustain his contention. That is the case of the State ex rel. William M. Shinnich, jr., *vs.* John A. Green, reported in 37 Ohio State Reports. The gentleman, if he had examined that case carefully, would have found that it only decided that a majority of those present is not necessary. It does not decide that a majority of a quorum should vote.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will examine the case he will find that 10 was a quorum, and that the clerk received a majority of that number.

Mr. DALZELL. I will read from the case what my friend did not read. In the opinion of the court I find the following:

The body was duly constituted to hold an election of clerk; only one candidate was before it for the votes of members; no question entitled to precedence was before the body; the election was being held, and those declining to vote must be deemed to acquiesce in the choice of those who do, though protesting against the mode of voting, the decision of the mayor being that there was a quorum and that the relator was elected. This is the settled rule of the common law as to elections in corporate bodies. Willcock on Corporations, section 546, says: "After an election has been properly proposed whoever has a majority of those who vote, the assembly being sufficient, is elected, although a majority of the entire assembly altogether abstain from voting, because their presence suffices to constitute the elective body, and if they neglect to vote it is their own fault and shall not invalidate the act of the others, but be construed an assent to the determination of the majority of those who do vote. And such an election is valid, though the majority of those whose presence is necessary to the assembly protest against any election at that time or even the election of the individual who has the majority of votes."

I contend, therefore ——

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania does not intend to intimate that I intended to mislead the House?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly not.

Mr. BAILEY. In that case 10 was a quorum and the clerk received 9 votes, which was a clear majority of a quorum.

Mr. DALZELL. I understand; but the point I make is that the report of the case does not show how many voted.

Mr. BAILEY. It does.

Mr. DALZELL. I have not so found it. But we will pass that. So far, then, as the decisions are concerned, it certainly can not be contended that the law has been decided to be that there must be a majority of a quorum voting in favor of a measure to make that measure law.

But I submit to the House that the question as to what the law is with respect to the number that is necessary to pass the measure is not the question that is now before this House at all.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, on the point between us a moment ago. I have examined the case in 37 Ohio, and it does show the number present and the number voting.

Mr. DALZELL. I will look at the case further, but I believe, from my examination of it, that my statement is correct; and as I read it the case decides that a majority of those present is not necessary, but it does not show that a majority of a quorum did vote.

Now, leaving all that I come back to the proposition that I advanced a moment ago. The question before this House is not what is the existing law in respect to the vote necessary to pass a law, but the question is with respect to the power of this House to pass this rule—to make a law for itself; and the only question involved, the question involved here, is precisely the same question that was involved in the Ballin case, which was passed upon by the Supreme Court, and with which we are all familiar.

The Constitution of the United States says:

Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business.

But the Constitution of the United States also says, in the same section:

Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members, etc.

There is, then, this constitutional provision with respect to the existence of the kind of a House competent to do business. Now, then, there is a constitutional provision that clothes this House with power, that clothes it with exclusive and unlimited power to make rules for the conduct of its proceedings, and so the Supreme Court of the United States substantially settled in its decision in the Ballin case.

Now, let me call your attention to that case. The question involved there, as you will recollect, was the validity of a rule that authorized the Speaker to count present and nonvoting members, and record them as present upon the Journal. The Supreme Court of the United States, in passing upon that question, said this:

The action was taken in direct compliance with this rule. The question, therefore, is as to the validity of this rule, and not what methods the Speaker may of his own motion resort to for determining the presence of a quorum, nor what matters the Speaker or Clerk may of their own volition place upon the Journal. Neither do the advantages or disadvantages, the wisdom or folly of such a rule present any matters for judicial consideration. With the courts the question is only one of power. The Constitution empowers each House to determine its rules of proceedings. It may not by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights, and there should be a reasonable relation between the mode or method of proceeding established by the rule and the result which is sought to be attained.

The House will observe that the result sought to be attained by the pending rule is precisely the result sought to be attained in the rule that was in question in the case cited.

But within these limitations all matters of method are open to the determination of the House, and it is no impeachment of the rule to say that some other way would be better, more accurate, or even more just. It is no objection to the validity of a rule that a different one has been prescribed and in force for a length of time. The power to make rules is not one which once exercised is exhausted. It is a continuous power, always subject to be exercised by the House and within the limitations suggested, absolute and beyond the challenge of any other body or tribunal.

If, then, it be true that all that is demanded of this House by the Constitution in order to pass a valid law is that there shall be a quorum present, and if beyond that there is no limit to the power of the House, except that no constitutional provision shall be violated, to make rules for its own proceedings, there is in this decision not only nothing to stand in the way of making this rule, but a judicial sanction of the power to make it. It matters not how many cases my friend may cite holding that a majority of a quorum is sufficient to pass a law. There is no necessity for resorting to judicial decisions to support that proposition. The question to which he should have directed his attention is whether there is any authority which holds that less than a quorum under the conditions proposed is not sufficient to pass a law.

Now, let us recur again to this Ballin case. The method of filibustering prior to the institution of the rule to count a quorum was for a sufficient number of gentlemen in this House to remain silent in order to break a quorum. It is now proposed, because that is the logical result of the doctrine of my friends on the other side—it is now proposed to provide a method to continue the system of filibustering by the very easy device of having a sufficient number of members remain silent not only to break a quorum, but also to prevent a majority vote of a quorum upon any pending measure. Therefore, if that proposition be correct, it must be affirmed that it is not in the power of this House to adopt a rule that shall compel members to act in accordance with their duty, in accordance with what must be held to be their duty, according to the decision in that case.

Now, what did that case decide? It decided that what the Constitution required was a present and not a voting quorum. It decided further that the presence of that quorum might be ascertained in any way that the House might fix by rule. But I want you to observe that it went further than that, it decided impliedly that it was not possible to prevent legislation by nonaction, because the real question involved in that case, although on the surface it was a question of the validity of a rule and of a method of count—the real question, the underlying question, involved was whether it was possible by nonaction to prevent legislation, and the court evidently had that in mind when it used the language which I shall now read to the House. In its opinion in the Ballin case the Supreme Court cites the case of Attorney-General *vs.* Shepherd, 62 New Hampshire, 383:

There the question was whether an amendment to a city charter had been properly adopted by the board of aldermen. All the members of the board were present but one. The ordinance was duly read and put to a vote and declared by the chair to be passed. The yeas and nays were then called. Three voted in the affirmative, three refused to vote, and the chair declared the ordinance passed. The court held, Chief Justice Doe delivering the opinion, that the amendment to the charter was legally adopted by the board of aldermen. He said—

And this is what I desire to call special attention to—

The exercise of the lawmaking power is not stopped by the mere silence and inaction of some of the lawmakers who are present. An arbitrary, technical, and exclusive method of ascertaining whether a quorum is present, operating to prevent the performance of official duty and obstruct the business of government, is no part of our common law.

Mr. BAILEY. Has the gentleman read that case himself—the New Hampshire case?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAILEY. Then the gentleman will remember that the court expressly says that 4 is a quorum of the body and that 3 is a majority of that quorum.

Mr. DALZELL. I am not addressing myself to that question now. I am addressing myself to the proposition that there was impliedly decided in this case—necessarily so because of its facts—the proposition that nonaction in a legislative body is ineffectual to prevent that body from performing its lawful functions, and that it is within the power of the body to make a rule to render such inaction fruitless.

Mr. BAILEY. I desire to say further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he misjudges my object. He remarked a moment ago that we on this side were proposing to continue filibustering. I am not. I will vote for the rule if it is amended as I have suggested.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I impute no such motive to the gentleman. I was simply trying to point out the logical consequences of the position taken by him. I acquit my friend from Texas of that imputation, and of everything but a desire to do his duty, as I believe he does, according to his conscience, to the fullest extent on all occasions in this House.

Now, one word more by way of summing up, and I conclude. The only questions before the House are two: First, as to the power of the House to make this rule, and second, as to the expediency of making the rule. As to the first question, I think I have demonstrated that there is an absolute and unqualified power in the House to adopt the rule. As to the question of expediency, I can only appeal, and I think I can appeal with confidence, to gentlemen who were members of this House in the days when filibustering prevailed, before the introduction of the rules of the Fifty-first Congress, which rules were adopted in order that the House might do business in preference to the rules of preceding Congresses, which at times had the effect, whether adopted for that purpose or not, of preventing the House from doing business. [Applause.]

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I will now ask for the previous question on the pending amendment reported from the committee, and the amendment to it which has been offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILES].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa demands the previous question upon the section and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILES. Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have the word "a" in my amendment stricken out and the word "the" substituted, so that it will read "the quorum."

Mr. BAILEY. If that is adopted I will not offer my amendment, because the one offered by the gentleman from Maryland seems to cover the ground.

The amendment proposed by Mr. MILES in the amendment offered by him was agreed to.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. MILES as amended, the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MILES. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 24, noes 120; so the amendment was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now upon agreeing to the substitute.

The substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now upon the adoption of the pending clause.

The question was decided in the affirmative.

Mr. CRISP. Now, Mr. Speaker, I offer——

Mr. HENDERSON. The gentleman will allow me a moment. The impression seems to have obtained among some gentlemen that all these amendments would have to be gone over again. In my view the action taken the last time when these rules were up and the action to-day disposes of all these amendments. As I stated in my opening remarks, the rules of the Fifty-first Congress were adopted early in the session; and there was no further action needed except upon the amendments—that is, upon new matter which might be brought up.

Mr. CRISP. I suppose not, after the vote on the substitute. I propose merely to offer as a substitute for these rules the rules of the Fifty-third Congress. Without reading them, I move to substitute the rules of the Fifty-third Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia moves that the rules of the Fifty-third Congress be substituted for the rules agreed to by this House.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Before that motion is admitted, if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] will withdraw his proposition for a moment, I would like to offer an amendment to Rule XXXII, which I believe is not included in the report of the Committee on Rules. I ask to have the proposed amendment read.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts offers as an amendment to the rules the proposition which will be read.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Before the amendment is read I wish to say that this proposition becomes necessary because of the prejudice that exists in the mind of the present Speaker [Mr. REED], and which also existed in the mind of the Speaker who preceded him [Mr. CRISP]—a prejudice which prevents the appointment of new members as chairmen of committees. In view of this practice, which has always been followed from the beginning, of appointing old members to such positions, it seems to me there should be a little change in the rule as to the choosing of seats.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of Rule XXXII and insert the following:

"DRAWING OF SEATS.

"1. At the commencement of each Congress, immediately after the Members and Delegates are sworn in, the Clerk shall number the names on the roll of the House in order. He shall divide the names on the roll into classes, according to the number of times each person has been elected to the House. Each class shall include all the names of those who have been elected the same number of times. The drawing of numbers and the choosing of seats shall be by classes. The class composed of those persons who have been elected the largest number of times shall first choose their seats. The class composed of those who have been elected for the next highest number of times shall then choose their seats, and so on until all the remaining classes of members have chosen seats in the order of length of service in the House. The Clerk shall place in a box, prepared for that purpose, a number of small balls of marble or other material equal to the number of Members and Delegates in that class that is then to choose seats, which balls shall have on them the numbers corresponding to the numbers on the roll opposite the names of the persons who make up that class. The balls shall be thoroughly intermingled, and at such hour as shall be fixed by the House for that purpose, by the hands of a page, said balls shall be drawn one by one from the box. The Clerk shall announce the number as it is drawn, upon which announcement the Member or Delegate whose name on the numbered alphabetical list shall correspond with the number on the ball shall advance and choose his seat for the term for which he is elected.

"2. Before said drawing shall commence each seat shall be vacated and so remain until selected under this rule, and any seat having been selected shall be deemed forfeited if left unoccupied before the call of the roll is finished, and whenever the seats of Members and Delegates shall have been drawn, no proposition for a second drawing shall be in order during that Congress."

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take it that the effect of this proposed rule is obvious to the House. Of course our present Speaker is the most unprejudiced and fair-minded man that was ever chosen to the position he occupies, unless I except the preceding Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia, who occupied the chair in the last Congress. [Laughter.] And for the purposes of this case, as the lawyers say, I would be willing to say that these two gentlemen are the most unprejudiced, fair-minded men who have ever been elected by the House to the Speaker's chair. Yet both these gentlemen have failed to see that members elected here to supplant old members must be far superior to those old members; else they would not have been chosen in place of them, in spite of all the advantages which the sitting member has for retaining his position. Yet these prejudices are so keen and all pervading in the minds of Speakers of the House that new members have great difficulty in securing chairmanships of committees.

The practice of appointing old members to such positions having become so embedded in the customs of the House, it becomes necessary that these older members should have the preference in choosing their seats, in order that the business of the House may be properly conducted; that the discharge of their duties may be facilitated by the conspicuous places which they will thus be enabled to occupy on the floor; that all the members of the House may have knowledge of what is going on. It seems a little singular, for instance, that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], or the gentleman from New York [Mr. DANIELS], who are in charge of some of the most important business of the House and whose voices seem to be in inverse ratio to their information and ability, which is not the case with all of us, as gentlemen well know [laughter], should have drawn seats on the extreme wings of the House, positions from which we could not hear them. The Speaker needs the assistance of such gentlemen in conducting properly and expeditiously the business of the House; and it is important that they should occupy on the floor places from which we can all hear them.

Now, this proposed rule simply divides the members into classes. Those members who have been reelected the greatest number of times will have the first choice; then those who rank next as to the number of times they have been elected will make their selections, and so on. I would not suggest for a moment that we who may be here in the next Congress will then be old members and that those who may then come in for the first time will be new members and not fare as well. I so fully appreciate the fairness of this House that I would not for a moment ask it to adopt any such rule for any selfish motive; I have too much respect for those who will be the incoming members in the next Congress. This proposed rule does not affect the present Congress. It is proposed wholly because of the prejudice existing in the minds of that class of gentlemen who are always elected to the office of Speaker and who insist upon selecting as chairmen of committees members who have served here many years. For this reason I think we need a change in the rule for seating members;

and I feel confident that no member present will vote against this proposition, although it may seem to be in favor of us who will be old members in the next Congress if we succeed in getting back and may seem, and it is only in the seeming, to operate to the prejudice of the newer members.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why not make it apply to this session?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. No; I do not think any such proposition as that would be unanimously agreed to.

Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and especially on the grounds of self-interest. I am, as you all know, a new member, and in drawing seats it happened that the gentleman from Massachusetts himself drew a seat immediately opposite to mine, in what is known as the "Cherokee Strip." Now, I do not want him to get any advantage of me and have a seat over on this side of the House, because by so doing I would miss those continual rehearsals of speeches on banking and currency and thus lose much valuable information. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, would an amendment to the amendment be in order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to move to amend the amendment by providing that in arranging these classes the gentleman from Massachusetts be included in neither one of them. [Laughter.] We all know he is entirely sui generis, and I would not have him classed, by the mere accident of election, with the other members. With that amendment, I have no objection to his proposition. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to move a substitute for the proposition; and that is, in selecting the seats, that the members be called in their alphabetical order. [Laughter.]

Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania. I second that motion.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. That is a favor I would extend to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a special favor. [Laughter.]

I would also retain the "Cherokee Strip." I think that should not be abolished; so that we can keep him perpetually there. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRISP. Now, Mr. Speaker, I offer, as a substitute for the rules adopted, the rules of the Fifty-third Congress.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I would like to inquire whether the gentleman from Georgia means the rules of the Fifty-third Congress as originally adopted or the rules of that Congress after they had substituted the rules of the Fifty-first Congress? [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have been faithfully present, as I always try to be when constitutional debate is on in this body. I always like these constitutional discussions. It is a great luxury, to those of us who are not recognized as "constitutional authorities," to hear distinguished representatives of that branch of jurisprudence certify to one another's skill and judgment as doctors of the law. [Laughter.] But as a very humble survivor of the Democratic riots of 1890 on this floor [laughter], I have felt it would not be entirely out of place to avail myself of the opportunity to utter a word of congratulation, not especially directed to my friend from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], but a word of congratulation to all sides of the House, that after the prejudices of a political and constitutional character of six years have passed away we have finally come to the orderly reign of common sense in the management of this House. [Laughter.]

If anybody had predicted six years ago that, by general consent, in 1896, the despised and rejected principles embodied in the rules of the Fifty-first Congress would be offered for indorsement here on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia, he would have been discredited as the author of a most improbable fiction. [Laughter and applause.] And yet to-day not only by what has been done, but by what has been said, that very thing came to pass before our eyes; and in my judgment it presents a situation of more than transitory interest, for it shows that even the Democratic party can recognize a good thing when it sees it for a sufficient length of time. [Laughter and applause.]

While the virtues that grow out of necessity are not very high in the scale of moral beauty, they are nevertheless virtues, and are entitled to be recognized as such, and to command respect to that extent. The present attitude of my friend from Georgia and his colleagues on this floor make their conduct in the Fifty-first Congress appear like the noise of bedlam; and the noise of bedlam it veritably was. [Laughter.] For bedlam itself was outdone in that notorious madhouse of 1890, when the whole Democratic party were railing against our benign and amiable "Czar," now everywhere accepted as the reformer of old, absurd, and worthless parliamentary usages. [Applause.] We on this side have never expected the Democratic party to make any apology, either to us or to the American people, for their behavior in the early winter of 1890. In fact, no apology was adequate for the offenses that were committed against the offices and dignities of this House. The only possible apology has been made. And while it comes to us whimpering and complaining, under the lash of necessity, nevertheless we ought to accept it at its true value.

The reform has come up slowly, through great trials and tribulations. Its progress has seen the invention of more morbid species of parliamentary law than were ever before witnessed outside of a village debating society. In the last Congress we saw the exaltation of the Committee on Rules, to which my friend from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] adverted the other day, an exaltation that actually beat the Clerk out of his right to read the Journal of this House, that refused to entertain an appeal from the judgment of the Chair, that declined to hear a point of order, that silenced a question of privilege involving the dignity and the rights of the House itself, and, in my judgment, if the political exigency had arisen, would have driven the Chaplain of this House from his sacred office and substituted a report of that committee for the daily invocation of the Divine mercy, never so much needed in this country as during that Congress. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Nevertheless, all that was said and all that was done was not enough to save the Fifty-third Congress from the derision of mankind. I think I intrepret the feelings of both sides of this House, taking into consideration what has been said here, and what the Democratic managers are about to vote for now, when I say that these proceedings will be recalled in the future by the student and the antiquarian only as interesting reminiscences of the memorable session of 1890, when this and all kindred questions were settled by new precedents, for all time to come, by the historic leadership of THOMAS B. REED. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I had been content, in view of the majority of 150 on that side, to permit these rules to be adopted without any special resistance here, because resistance was useless, the determination on that side was fixed and we felt that we could as well enter our protest by simply voting against the rules. But my friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], always anxious to score a point, as he thinks, against the Democratic party, has submitted remarks which have been applauded on that side of the House, and which remarks are wholly and entirely unjustified by anything that has gone before. Under these circumstances a few words are necessary.

There is great misconception, even in the minds of some members of the House, it seems, as to what were the rules of the Fifty-first Congress and what has taken place since in respect thereto. The body of the rules which have just been adopted have been the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker, for more than fifty years. The radical changes made in the Fifty-first Congress were two in number; first, the ascertainment of a quorum outside of the responses to the roll call, and second, the incorporation in the rules of a provision that the Speaker should not recognize a dilatory motion. Now, the great controversy and contest to which my friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] refers did not arise upon the rules of the House. It arose upon what we then considered, and what I may be pardoned for saying I still consider, a usurpation of power on the part of the Speaker of the House. There was no rule authorizing the Speaker of the House to count a quorum.

There has never been any authority of any court that has justified the action of that Speaker of the House in counting a quorum. This great difficulty, or contest, or struggle to which my friend from Iowa refers occurred in this wise: That Congress met on the first Monday in December, and proceeded without any rules until the 29th day of January. At that time there was presented for the consideration of the House a contested-election case. When it was called up I had the honor myself to raise upon it the question of consideration; that is, Shall the House now proceed to consider the case? The yeas and nays were ordered. A vote was taken. It appeared from the responses of the members that no quorum had responded to their names when called by the Clerk. Whereupon the Speaker, without any authority from the House, without any authority from parliamentary law, without any authority from any source, except his own arbitrary desire and purpose so to do, noted gentlemen who were present in the House, and announced from the chair that he noted so many members as present, who, in addition to those who had answered to the roll call, made a quorum, whereupon I respectfully entered an appeal from that decision, and that matter was debated for three days.

Upon the consideration of that question it was shown that disguished men of the country, for years and years prior to that time, had discussed this question in the House. The Speaker himself had been one the distinguished men who had participated in that discussion, and it was shown that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], at a time when he was not Speaker, from his place upon the floor of the House, protested against a construction which afterwards, as Speaker, with no authority from the House, he put upon the rules. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Thus were overturned the practices of the House of Representatives by action which we then characterized as revolutionary, and which I

now characterize as revolutionary. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will my friend permit me?

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I understand him to say this occurred before the rules were adopted?

Mr. CRISP. It did.

Mr. DOLLIVER. How does my friend account for the fact that the entire Democratic party fled from this Chamber in September following, when the contested-election case of Miller *vs.* Elliott was under debate, long after those rules and methods of conducting business had been established?

Mr. CRISP. Oh, Mr. Speaker, we are discussing now a rule of the House, and not the action of any members of it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I alluded to the violation of the rule of the House by the whole Democratic party.

Mr. CRISP. Oh, well, that does not at all affect the question. The gentleman from Iowa arose here when we were proceeding as peaceably and calmly as on a summer sea, and stated that this side of the House was now accepting without protest a rule which in the Fifty-first Congress we condemned or fought vigorously, and I am simply explaining to him that he has taken counsel rather of his partisanship than of his fairness and justice, that he is commenting upon a condition of affairs that does not exist.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the radical changes that were made in the Fifty-first Congress were as I have said. After the Speaker had made this ruling, there was a report from the Committee on Rules, and his ruling was put substantially into the form of one of the rules of the House. Now, it is pretty well known to many of those who were here at the time that that rule of the House never would have been adopted but for the condition in which the occupant of the chair placed his own side of the House by his unauthorized ruling. We on this side learned from the newspapers—they are generally pretty accurate chroniclers of what takes place—we learned from the newspapers that the Republicans had caucuses on the rules; that they were endeavoring to make a rule providing for the counting of a quorum, and yet we know that there was in fact no action by the caucus up to that time. We would see the statement in the newspaper that "Mr. So and So"—I might name them if it were proper to do so—and "Mr. So and So" and "Mr. So and So" were resisting the proposition to provide for counting a quorum outside the roll call when the yeas and nays were ordered. And from day to day that condition existed. Then, when this struggle arose the Speaker made the decision to which I have referred. An appeal was taken from his decision, and that side of the House was put in the position that it must either indorse the action of the Speaker upon what was considered a partisan question or they must vote against him and thus leave him discredited in the house of his friends. That side did as has almost uniformly been done in the House of Representatives—they sustained the Speaker in his ruling, and by so sustaining him they committed themselves to the rule which was afterwards made.

Now, the Fifty-first Congress adopted two new rules—that is, the present method of ascertaining the presence of a quorum, and that the Speaker should not entertain dilatory motions. This side contended that the first proposition was unconstitutional; that it was illegal. The question had never been before the courts. Upon this rule a case was made. It went to the courts, and the decision has been read and referred to to-day. The court held that it was competent for the House to make rules for its own government under the Constitution. The court never held that it was competent for the Speaker to make rules. The court never held that the Speaker had a right to ascertain a quorum outside of the rules which were made for his government by the House. The court never held that the Speaker was the master of the House. But they held that he was simply the organ, the servant, of the House, who executes its will as expressed in its rules. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman pardon me, right on that point, inasmuch as this subject has been introduced? The gentleman has stated that the Speaker made a certain ruling in thus counting a quorum before the rules of the House had been adopted. Was it not true that an appeal was taken from that and that the House on that appeal sustained the decision of the Speaker, thus pro tanto from that time making it a rule of the House?

Mr. CRISP. Why, I have just stated, Mr. Speaker, that gentlemen on that side of the House, many of them, I have no doubt, were forced against their wills to sustain the decision of the Speaker. [Cries of "Oh, no!" on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. CRISP. I am assuming that gentlemen on that side exercise some will of their own independently of that which may be determined for them.

Mr. BOUTELLE. They generally express it by their votes, which is the reasonable way to express it.

Mr. CRISP. I am not assuming that the gentleman from Maine will be courteous, because I have never known him to be so. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The House will please be in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is about as correct as the gentleman's assumptions generally are.

Mr. CRISP. Now, Mr. Speaker, gentlemen may as well be quiet. This proposition was suggested entirely from that side. There was no disposition on this side to recur to this incident, but my friend from Iowa could not resist the opportunity to make a speech. Now, I have no objection to his speeches; they are generally good and sometimes witty, but they ought to be always founded on fact, and when not so I respectfully take the liberty to correct him.

A rule was made and the highest court in the land decided that a quorum might be ascertained in the way provided by the rule of the Fifty-first Congress, as made by the House, not by the Speaker. In the Fifty-second Congress we did not incorporate in our rules any provision with reference to counting a quorum other than the rule which had always prevailed. The Fifty-third Congress met and still we adhered to the old rule. We were met with obstructive tactics. Day after day, on that side of the House, on the most insignificant matters, on the approval of the Journal, on the reference of a bill, and such matters, we encountered those tactics. Day after day the distinguished leader of the minority made the point of "no quorum," so that we could not even approve the Journal of our proceedings, owing to the dilatory tactics of that side of the House, led by the distinguished gentleman from Maine, who had formerly so vigorously denounced filibustering.

Day after day these tactics were resorted to, so that the House could not proceed to dispatch the public business. In that condition of affairs what did this side of the House do? They looked to the decision of the Supreme Court. They recognized that court as the highest tribunal in the land. If that court decided to be constitutional a proposition which we had previously considered unconstitutional; if, in other words, the question of constitutionality was removed, then the question of expediency arose in that particular case. Upon that question we decided—at least a majority of us did, for even to that proposition some members on this side did not agree—we decided that as we could constitutionally ascertain the presence of a quorum, we would incorporate into our rules a provision for so doing; but not the provision in the rules of the Fifty-first Congress.

The rules of that Congress provided that the Clerk or the Speaker—I believe a clerk under the direction of the Speaker—might count a sufficient number of members present and not voting who, added to those voting, would make a quorum, and, Mr. Speaker, very much of the complaint, very much of the discord, very much of the discontent and dissatisfaction that arose from the operation of the rule in the Fifty-first Congress was caused by the manner and method of its execution. Gentlemen were counted as present in this Hall who were really in the cloakroom. There was a question as to when a member's presence should be ascertained, whether it should be when the roll call began or when his name was reached. There were several cases (all of which are referred to in various places in the RECORD) where gentlemen were counted as present although they were down town. I recollect one case where a member was perhaps in Ohio at the time he was entered as present in this Hall.

The great complaint was that that rule was not executed in fairness and justice. In the Fifty-third Congress we decided to make a rule to ascertain a quorum, and in doing it we sought to avoid the difficulties that had arisen under the rule of the Fifty-first Congress, so we provided that where the yeas and nays were ordered the Speaker should appoint a member of the majority and a member of the minority, and they should take their places at the Clerk's desk, and should together note the gentlemen who were present and not voting. Those two members, one representing the majority and the other the minority, had to concur as to the presence of Brown or Jones or Smith before he could be noted as present and not voting. Under that system no man could be counted in Ohio, no man could be counted who was really down Pennsylvania avenue at the time, because the rule required the concurrence of two minds, that of a Republican and that of a Democratic member. That was the rule adopted by the Fifty-third Congress, and therein was the radical difference between that rule and the rule of the Fifty-first Congress.

Why, Mr. Speaker, when we meet here before we have an organization and when the Clerk of the preceding House calls the roll in order that we may proceed to the election of a Speaker, what does he do? Does he appoint a clerk to count? Not at all. He appoints two members, one from the majority and one from the minority, to take their seats at that desk to ascertain the presence of members and report the result. The rule of the Fifty-first Congress left it to a clerk—not the Clerk of the House, mind you, but a subordinate clerk at that desk, who was naturally and necessarily a partisan of the power that put him there—left it to that clerk to decide whether or not I was in my seat when the roll

was called. The plan adopted by this side of the House was that no man should be noted as present if he had not voted unless one Democratic and one Republican member concurred in certifying the fact that he was present.

The Fifty-third Congress never adopted that provision of the rule of the Fifty-first Congress relating to dilatory motions. My friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has criticised—and I believe that is the only provision in the rules of the Fifty-third Congress he has criticised—the power given to the Committee on Rules in that Congress. And he speaks of their coming in with their reports before the reading of the Journal and at other times when, in his judgment, it was improper to do so. That provision of the rules of the Fifty-third Congress excites his animadversion. Now, Mr. Speaker, it may be a surprise to that gentleman—it will not be to the Speaker, but it will be to my friend from Iowa—to know that that odious, that objectionable, that miserable rule of the Fifty-third Congress to which he has especially referred has been copied, word for word, in the rules just adopted, with the concurrence of the gentleman himself, as the rules of the Fifty-fourth Congress. The Republican majority have copied that rule from the rules of the Fifty-third Congress; and the gentleman from Iowa in his ignorance [laughter] has voted for that rule, and then in his earnestness and eloquence he gets up here and denounces it. [Laughter.] That is merely a suggestion to my friend that before he makes a speech again he ought to know a little more of the subject on which he proposes to talk. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, there are other provisions in the rules of the Fifty-first Congress, some of which I approve, some of which I disapprove; but the radical differences I have pointed out. Now, I merely want to say, in conclusion, that this side of the House is not, in my judgment, amenable to criticism, certainly not to the ridicule which my friend from Iowa seeks to heap upon us. We avoid no responsibility; we seek to avoid none. We see, ourselves, a broad and clear distinction between the rules of the Fifty-third Congress and those of the Fifty-first. We believe any man who will examine the two systems of rules will recognize these distinctive differences; and so believing we are entirely content with the record. I was content to let the record be made up without a word of debate on the subject; but inasmuch as my friend had sought to heap some ridicule on this side, and to make some cheap capital for the other side, I thought it well enough to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that this is simply one more of the efforts so numerous now to make political capital on false pretenses. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend when I took the floor a moment ago to say anything that should disturb the serenity of the temper and good will of my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. CRISP]. I think there is nobody on this floor who takes a more philosophical view of the experiences through which we have passed than I do, unless it be my friend from Georgia. I recognize the fact that nearly everything which happened in 1890 happened in an atmosphere hot with political and partisan contention; and I apprehend I ought not to leave the impression that I have sought to rekindle any of the malice that belonged to that year and the succeeding years.

I recognize the fact that both parties have grown out of the size of that controversy. I recognize the fact that both parties are now above the noise of that debate. And it was for the purpose of making a cheerful reference to our experience and our growth that I took the floor a few moments ago. [Laughter.] I rejoice that the leaders of the Democratic party have seen many of the errors of their way, or if not the errors at least the difficulties of their way. I do not dispute the fact that they have made a good fight; and I will say that they have made a fight to which we who are used to political encounters do not at this time of partisan calm and repose make special objection. We all appreciate the fact that these debates about the rules are now quieted by a common agreement; and I am glad for one to testify that the Democratic leaders of this House have, in a spirit of fairness and equity, entered upon the discharge of the solemn responsibilities that are before us. And if I said a word calculated to hurt the feelings of my friend or to stir up evil memories of the blunders of the past, I regret that I should have been led into that line of discussion. I attribute it altogether to the nervous irritation occasioned by spending an afternoon with the Constitution. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will detain the House but a moment. I believe there was just one authenticated case in the Fifty-first Congress of a gentleman being recorded as present when he was absent, only one well-authenticated case, and in that instance the mistake was not made by the gentleman who is now the Speaker of the House, but by a member who was called to the chair by the Speaker [Mr. REED]. So that it may be said there is not a single well-authenticated case of an error being made by the Speaker with reference to a roll call in the Fifty-first Congress, when those present and not voting were noted by the Clerk. But in the Fifty-third Congress, over which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] presided, there were at least a dozen errors—errors where a quorum had erroneously been made to appear by counting as present gentlemen who were not present, and by two members of the House as tellers—and that quorum was subsequently made good by gentlemen saying that they had been present and voted, but were not recorded. This is a matter of public knowledge and of record.

Again, the difference between the rules of the Fifty-first Congress and the rules of the Fifty-third was principally in this: That in the Fifty-first Congress a sworn officer of the House, the Clerk, who knew every member of the House, was the officer upon whom was devolved the duty of discovering and revealing the presence of members present and not voting, and entering them on the record; while in the Fifty-third Congress the duty of ascertaining the presence of a quorum was committed to two members, who naturally could not know every member of the House, and whose knowledge of the personality of different members was, in fact, so deficient that these dozen or more errors to which I have alluded occurred.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is admitted on all hands that the Supreme Court has decided that the House can make the rules that shall govern it. No man disputes that. The gentleman from Georgia has made the point not only to-day, but on several other occasions, that in the Fifty-first Congress this House was without rules, was not under parliamentary rule or parliamentary law, until February 16, 1890, for two and a half months.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this could not possibly be. This House decided, purposely and deliberately, that the rules of this body should be the rules of every deliberative body which does not have special rules, namely, what is known as general parliamentary law—not a freak, not a whim, but the common law of parliamentary bodies, which is well recognized everywhere, whose rules are as fixed and well established as any law governing man. Why, Mr. Speaker, until statutes are adopted the common law is as clearly defined, is as controlling, and as well understood, and as certainly executed, as the statute law when statutes are enacted, wherever the English-speaking people are to be found, and the House was as clearly, according to the decision of the Supreme Court, under rules and under parliamentary law before we had adopted the House rules drawn up by the members of this body and voted for by them in a formal vote as we were afterwards; just as clearly and distinctly. Therefore, when the assertion is made that the House went forward without rules and not under any law for two and a half months, there is no man familiar with the transaction of business in public assemblies in this land who does not know that to be an entirely mistaken statement.

It is well known that all the great business of this country, involving millions upon millions and billions of dollars, is transacted under the precise law that the House acted under until the 16th day of February, and there is not a shade or shadow of difference, so far as the rules of the House go, between those rules deliberately adopted for the guidance of the House before February 16 and the special rules which were adopted afterwards, as far as that question of being under rules is concerned. That is all I desired to say. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the proposition of the gentleman from Georgia, that the rules of the Fifty-third Congress be substituted for those which the House has just had under consideration, and has agreed to.

The question was taken and the substitute was rejected.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands it, the rules have now been adopted by the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask the gentleman to withdraw that for a moment and permit me to offer a resolution in reference to the printing of the Digest.

Mr. HENDERSON. Very well; I will do so.

PRINTING THE DIGEST.

Mr. PERKINS. I offer the resolution I sent to the desk.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Before that, the suggestion has been made that we have omitted to adopt the rules as a whole.

The SPEAKER. That is a mistake. The rules have been adopted.

Mr. HENDERSON. All of them.

Mr. PICKLER. When was this last rule adopted?

Mr. HENDERSON. Some time ago, by the vote of the House, thus completing the whole body of the rules.

The SPEAKER. The rules have been adopted as a whole.

The Clerk will report the resolution presented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PERKINS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 2,600 copies of the Digest and Manual of the Rules and Practice of the House of Representatives, for the first session of the Fifty-fourth Congress, the same to be bound and distributed under the direction of the Speaker and Clerk of the House, 100 copies thereof to be bound in paper covers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution submitted by the gentleman from Iowa?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the correction of the reference of the bill (H. R. 2440) for the necessary and better protection of American labor, etc., from the Committee on Labor to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks this was referred to the proper committee. Has the committee requested this change?

Mr. TAWNEY. It has been done at the request of the Committee on Labor; at least I was requested by a member of that committee to ask the change.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would require unanimous consent in that form. Is there objection to the change of reference?

There being no objection, the change of reference was made as requested.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL SERVICE, COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS.

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Accounts desire to submit a report at this time for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred the accompanying resolution of December 23, 1895, introduced by Mr. PICKLER, providing that three assistant clerks be allowed the Committee on Invalid Pensions during the sessions of the Fifty-fourth Congress, at a compensation of $6 each per day, to be paid from December 23, 1895, out of the contingent fund of the House, respectfully report that they have carefully investigated the matter and beg leave to submit and recommend the passage of the following substitute:

Resolved, That the Committee on Invalid Pensions be, and they are hereby, authorized to employ one person who is an experienced typewriter and stenographer and one additional person who is experienced in pension work and competent to examine pension laws, papers, and reports, and intelligently report on the same to the committee, with the compensation of $6 per day each from the date of employment to the close of the session.

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of the report, I sent to the desk a communication from the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, which I think sufficiently explains the reason for its adoption. I ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 22, 1896.*

GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to call the attention of your committee to the absolute necessity for more clerical force for the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

There are now before the committee for consideration about 922 bills. During the three sessions of the Fifty-third Congress there were 1,236 bills introduced and referred to same committee. Of this number there were favorable reports in 111 cases and adverse reports in 14 cases, leaving, apparently, 1,085 bills which were not acted upon.

The number of bills considered and acted upon necessarily depends largely upon the amount of clerical force allowed us. Members of Congress are constantly requesting that their cases be considered. It is impossible to give their bills the consideration which they merit without at least two more assistant clerks.

This committee is in immediate need of one clerk who is educated in stenography and typewriting, and another who is experienced in pension work, who is competent to examine pension laws, papers, reports, etc., and who has a general knowledge of public business.

I inclose herewith copy of resolution unanimously adopted by this committee December 23, 1895, and which is the basis upon which I offer the resolution now before your committee for consideration.

Very respectfully,

J. A. PICKLER, *Chairman.*

THE COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS,
House of Representatives.

Mr. HENDERSON. I should like to ask the gentleman if this makes an increase in the force over what it has been in past Congresses?

Mr. TRACEY. I understand it is the same as it has been in past Congresses.

Mr. HENDERSON. With these additions?

Mr. TRACEY. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Exactly the same number?

Mr. PICKLER. There is one additional assistant during the session.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why should he be needed now any more than in past Congresses?

Mr. PICKLER. Simply because there is a great deal more work than there has been in the past.

Mr. GIBSON. And the work is going to be done this time.

Mr. PICKLER. This matter has been delayed for some time. The Committee on Accounts appointed a subcommittee to come in and review our work. The subcommittee have reported to the full committee, and this report, which is presented, is the unanimous report of the Committee on Accounts, after a thorough investigation. We can not do that work unless we have the proper facilities.

Mr. HENDERSON. I should like to have it explained why you need more assistants now than were needed prior to the passage of the act of June 27, 1890. Since that time there has been a great increase in the allowance of claims under general laws.

Mr. PICKLER. My judgment is that we have more cases arising out of the act of June 27, 1890, than out of any other law.

Mr. MILES. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PICKLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILES], a member of the committee.

Mr. COX. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MILES. The gentleman from South Dakota has yielded to me.

Mr. COX. Does not this give your committee substantially three clerks?

Mr. MILES. The gentleman has yielded to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota is not entitled to the floor. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TRACEY], in charge of the resolution, has the floor at present.

Mr. MILES. Will the gentleman [Mr. TRACEY] yield to me for one moment?

Mr. PICKLER. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TRACEY] has the floor unless he yields.

Mr. TRACEY. I believe I am entitled to the floor. I desire to say, in corroboration of what has just been said, that being myself a member of the subcommittee which made this examination, this report that is now before the House is in exact accordance to what we have found to be the fact. Now, if it is desirable to introduce these pension bills into the House it certainly must be desirable to have them considered by the committee. The Subcommittee on Accounts which made the investigation became thoroughly convinced after a very careful examination of the matter that it would be impossible for the committee, as it has been impossible for past Committees on Invalid Pensions, without assistance, to give the necessary consideration to all these bills and the reporting of them to the House, and because of the additional fact that we believe the bills sent to the Committee on Invalid Pensions ought to be considered and reported to the House, we have reported in favor of giving this additional clerical force.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. TRACEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. HENDERSON. I move that the House do now adjourn.

FRIDAY EVENING SESSION.

The SPEAKER. While that motion is pending, the Chair desires to announce as Speaker pro tempore at the Friday evening session the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. The Chair desires also to obtain unanimous consent that appropriation bills may be reported to the House on that evening. This is merely a formal action to allow the bills to be printed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution (H. Res. 50) authorizing the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for the public building at Chicago, Ill.; when the Speaker signed the same.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MAHANY, for five days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. STRONG, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. WELLINGTON, for ten days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. CONNOLLY, for ten days from January 26, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. MCRAE, for the Friday evening session.

To Mr. PARKER, for two days, on account of illness in his family.

RECESS UNTIL FRIDAY EVENING.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to suggest to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] that he should move that the House take a recess until Friday evening at 8 o'clock, in accordance with the understanding heretofore arrived at.

Mr. HENDERSON. I supposed that was covered by the original agreement, but I will make the request, if there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the House will now be in recess until Friday evening at 8 o'clock.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until Friday evening at 8 o'clock.

[*Continuation of proceedings of the legislative day of January 23.*]

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 8 o'clock p. m., January 24, by Mr. PAYNE, as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report clause 2 of Rule XXVI.

The Clerk read as follows:

2. The House shall on each Friday at 5 o'clock p. m. take a recess until 8 o'clock, at which evening session private pension bills, bills for the removal of political disabilities, and bills removing charges of desertion only shall be considered; said evening session not to extend beyond 10 o'clock and 30 minutes.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering bills on the Private Calendar, under the special rule.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. TALBERT. I demand a division on that question, so as to see how many are present.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 75, noes none.

So the motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering bills under the special rule as read, of clause 2 of Rule XXVI.

Mr. PICKLER. I ask the Clerk to report the first bill on the Calendar.

JAMES H. OSGOOD.

The first business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of James H. Osgood, late a seaman on the U. S. S. *Circassian*, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. PICKLER. Let the report be read. I will ask that in reading the report the reading of the certificates of the physicians, on page 2, be omitted.

The report (by Mr. SULLOWAY) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood, have examined the same, and, adopting the accompanying Senate report as their own, respectfully recommend its passage.

—

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood, have examined the same, and report:

This bill has already passed the Senate twice, to wit, in the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses, the report in the Fifty-third Congress being as follows:

Claimant was a seaman in the United States Navy, and during the war of the rebellion received a severe injury to his left leg, which resulted in varicose veins and ulcers, for which he is pensioned at the rate of $30 per month. Not only is soldier in such condition from this injury as to incapacitate him from manual labor, but he is also suffering from heart disease and other disabilities, which, it is claimed, are the result of blood poisoning and constitutional debility due to the original injury. The last examination of claimant was made by the pension examining board at Concord, N. H., composed of surgeons of long experience, and they reported as follows:

"Upon examination we find the following objective symptoms: Pulse, 92; respiration, 19; temperature, 99½; skin sallow, conjunctiva jaundiced, tongue furred, abdomen flat and tympanitic over colon; area of hepatic dullness increased; splenic dullness normal; sphincter not relaxed; one indurated pile one-half inch in diameter; area of cardiac dullness increased about one-third; valvular sounds roughened, with action irregular and intermittent. Hopping on one leg across the room raises the pulse to 120, and action of heart is very tumultuous and the valvular sounds can scarcely be made out. Lungs normal. Crepitus in both shoulders and knees, but no enlarged joints; all the muscles are flabby, and he is poorly nourished; has varicose veins of left leg from top of foot, completely surrounding the ankle and leg, running up inside of thigh, and the pudendal veins are all varicosed, some of the bunches at this point being an inch in diameter. From the ankle up, for a distance of 8 inches, the leg is a mass of cicatricial tissue, the result of varicose ulcers. The leg is useless so far as the performance of manual labor is concerned, but is of some use to him in standing or walking, though for these purposes an artificial limb would be much better. The foot is œdematous and the ankle almost anchylosed."

As a result of the above examination, the pension examining board recommended a rate of $36 per month for the disability caused by injury to leg, and a third-grade rating ($24 per month) for that caused by rheumatism and resulting heart disease, making a total of $60 per month. The Pension Office declined to increase the rating for the injured leg above $30 per month, there being no intermediate rating between $30 and $72, and rejected the rating for rheumatism and resulting heart disease.

Your committee respectfully submit that a board of distinguished surgeons who personally examined the injured limb must necessarily know the extent of the disability, while it is a generally recognized fact among medical men that such an injury as this soldier sustained, with open sores covering the limb, and the veins being diseased and broken down, can not do otherwise than result in blood poisoning and a consequent undermining of the entire system, culminating necessarily in diseases precisely such as claimant is to-day suffering from.

Medical affidavits are herewith appended showing the present deplorable condition of the claimant.

The bill was ordered to be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

ANNIE M. GREENE.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Annie M. Greene, dependent and invalid daughter of Jeremiah Greene, late a private in Company A, First Regiment New Hampshire Artillery Volunteers, at the rate of $12 per month.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a demand for the reading of the report?

Mr. TALBERT. I would like to have the report read, Mr. Chairman.

The report (by Mr. SULLOWAY) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene, have examined the same, and, adopting the accompanying Senate report as their own, respectfully recommend its passage.

[Senate Report No. 3, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene, have examined the same, and report:

A bill in behalf of this claimant passed the Senate during the Fifty-second Congress at the rate of $15 per month. In the last Congress the rate was reduced to $10. The bill passed both Houses, but so near the close of the Congress as to remain unacted upon by the Executive. The present bill proposes to grant a pension at the rate of $12 per month, which the committee thinks will be a fair rating for claimants of this class. The report in the case was as follows:

Annie M. Greene is the dependent and invalid daughter of Jeremiah Greene, late a private in Company A, First Regiment New Hampshire Artillery Volunteers. The evidence clearly shows that from infancy claimant has suffered from an affection of the eyes, which has resulted in almost total blindness, the sight of one eye being entirely gone and the other being practically of no use. She is in destitute circumstances, unable to labor, and appeals to Congress for relief. Many similar cases have been enacted into law, and this case seems to be specially meritorious. Affidavits are appended showing the condition of the claimant, both physically and financially.

—

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Respectfully represents Annie M. Greene, of Franklin, Merrimac County, N. H., 49 years of age.

That she is a daughter of Jeremiah Greene, late of said Franklin, deceased, who enlisted on the 14th day of July, 1863, and was mustered into the service of the United States as a private in Company A, First Regiment Artillery, New Hampshire Volunteers, on the 18th day of July, 1863, and was honorably discharged for disability at Fort Constitution, Portsmouth, N. H., July 22, 1865.

That she is in need of assistance, and is unable to obtain a suitable living from her own efforts.

That since she was an infant she has been afflicted with the partial loss of her eyesight, being unable to distinguish any objects with the left eye and having but a weak and partial use of the right eye.

That the said Jeremiah Greene was not a pensioner at the time of his death, though entitled from his disabilities to apply for such aid.

That she desires a special appropriation to be made by the United States for her benefit, as she is wholly dependent upon her own resources and is unable to properly support herself.

ANNIE M. GREENE.

DECEMBER 22, 1891.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, *Merrimack, ss:*

Then personally appeared Annie M. Greene, and made oath that the statements subscribed by her are true.

Before me.

[SEAL.] JAMES E. BARNARD, *Notary Public.*

I, E. Thayer Drake, of Franklin, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire, on oath depose and say as follows:

That I am a practicing physician and surgeon in said Franklin, and have been acquainted with Annie M. Greene for the past seven years.

That I have made a careful examination of said Annie M. Greene, and find her suffering from the results of a corneitis, which developed during infancy, affecting both eyes; there is no vision in left eye, and that of the right is so slight as to seriously interfere with her work, upon which she depends for a livelihood.

There is no prospect of any improvement in the condition of the eyes.

E. THAYER DRAKE, M. D.

JANUARY 26, 1892.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, *Merrimack, ss:*

Subscribed and sworn to before me.

[SEAL.] ROBT. W. BENNETT, *Notary Public.*

—

We, Amos S. Ripley, Edrick S. Avery, and Charles N. Emerson, all of Franklin, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire, on oath depose and say:

That we are the board of selectmen and assessors of said town of Franklin, and are personally acquainted with Annie M. Greene, daughter of Jeremiah Greene, late private in First Company, New Hampshire Heavy Artillery.

That said Annie M. Greene is without pecuniary means, and is entirely dependent upon her own labor for support, and by reason of her increasing blindness and lack of anyone legally holden for her support is liable to become a public charge.

AMOS S. RIPLEY,
EDRICK S. AVERY,
CHARLES N. EMERSON,
Selectmen of Franklin.

JANUARY 30, 1892.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, *Merrimack, ss:*

Severally subscribed and sworn to before me.

[SEAL.] ROBT. W. BENNETT, *Notary Public.*

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions a question. Is it not true that if this party were the widow of a soldier of the late war, though she might be in the same condition that this applicant is, she could only receive $8 per month? Is not that correct?

Mr. PICKLER. Under the law of June 27, 1890, she would receive $8 per month, but if her husband died of disabilities contracted in the service, under the general law she would receive $12 a month; but if it was shown that the widow was in a helpless condition, such a condition as this dependent is in, she might receive any sum that this Congress saw fit to grant.

Mr. LOUD. I understand that. Does the fact appear that the father died of a wound received in the service?

Mr. PICKLER. That would not affect the daughter.

Mr. LOUD. I asked that in order to get at the facts. The chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions is evidently trying to evade answering the question.

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, no.

Mr. LOUD. I will put the question again. If this party were the widow of a soldier in the late war she would only be entitled, under the law, to a pension of $8 per month?

Mr. PICKLER. Under which law does the gentleman mean?

Mr. LOUD. It must be under either the law of 1890 or some preceding law. I asked if the soldier had died of wounds received in the service. The gentleman said it was immaterial. Of course, I am assuming that the case comes under the act of 1890.

Mr. PICKLER. I do not know that it makes any difference so far as a dependent daughter is concerned. It is exactly the same in both laws.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman will understand what I am trying to arrive at. Why should we make a special exception in respect to 200,000 or 300,000 widows in this country to-day? That is the question I would like to have carefully considered.

Mr. PICKLER. I understand that is a question open to discussion, but the belief of the committee was that this daughter, being in this condition, was entitled to this pension, and of course the gentleman has well stated the law so far as the widows are concerned. But he understands full well that if a widow were found to be in this helpless condition we could give her whatever we saw proper.

Mr. LOUD. I recognize that fact.

Mr. PICKLER. It is only $12 a month.

Mr. LOUD. I understand. I would like to suggest to the chairman of the committee——

Mr. PICKLER. Let me suggest one further fact that occurs to me. While under the law of June 27, 1890, widows are only allowed $8 a month, I believe the gentleman will bear me out, because I know he is a constant attendant at these Friday night sessions——

Mr. LOUD. No; that is incorrect.

Mr. PICKLER. You are generally here.

Mr. LOUD. Sometimes.

Mr. PICKLER. We never grant a widow less pension than $12 by special act—I do not believe we ever do. When we take up one of these claims of a widow in a special act I believe we always give her at least $12 a month, and on a parity of reasoning along that line the committee granted it in this case.

Mr. LOUD. I do not care to put any serious impediment in the way of this bill, but I think, in the opening night session of this Congress that the gentleman misinterprets the temper of the American people if he believes that our people are crying for increased pensions in special cases.

I do not think the people of this country will uphold the hands of any Congress that picks out a person who is not entitled to a pension under the law, makes an exception of that case, and increases the pension above that which the person would be entitled to if it were granted under the general law. There are too many widows in this country for us to be justified in making an exception of any one case. I simply throw out these suggestions, Mr. Chairman, at this time, because we are about to start out upon pension legislation in this Congress, and as the Committee on Invalid Pensions is now provided with five clerks, I venture to say that we shall have brought before us by that committee a very large volume of this kind of legislation during the present session.

Mr. WANGER. Will the gentleman from California permit a question?

Mr. LOUD. I will, though I do not think that I can answer anything about this case.

Mr. WANGER. Do you not think that the pension of every dependent widow who was married to a soldier during or prior to his service in the late war of the rebellion ought to be at least $12 per month, and that the country would approve of the action of Congress in fixing it at that rate?

Mr. LOUD. If you ask me that question personally, I say no. I think the people of this country have about all the pensions on their hands that they want at the present time. I believe the American people are willing and ready at all times to do full justice toward those who upheld the flag during the rebellion, or to those who were dependent upon them, but I think that we have already gone, if possible, to the very extreme verge of legislation in that direction.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I only desire to say that the gentleman from California certainly does not remember the report in this case. The bill passed both Houses in the last Congress, so that there is nothing in the case to justify him in intimating that the present Committee on Invalid Pensions are undertaking to raise pensions at this early stage of the session. I ask the gentleman's attention also to the fact that we are not giving this dependent daughter a dollar more than she would receive if she were able to prove up her case under the general law; but the act of 1890 does not extend to dependent daughters, and we simply seek by the pending bill to bring this case in as if it came under the general law, and we fix the pension at the statutory amount.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, this Annie M. Greene is the only child of an old soldier who served well and fought well during the war of the rebellion. He died because he had been in the service of his country. He left a daughter who was an invalid and poor in eyesight from her birth, and who now can not see at all out of one eye and only dimly out of the other. She has no property whatever, and the question stares us squarely in the face whether she shall have this little pittance of $12 per month or shall go to the poorhouse. This bill passed the Senate at the rate of $15 a month. It was cut down in the House in the last Congress to $10 a month, and failed to become a law only because it did not receive action by the President.

Now, it has again passed the Senate and is before the House. This lady is fully known to all the people in the vicinity where she lives and has the respect and sympathy of all parties and all classes. To my mind there never has been a more meritorious case before this House appealing to our sympathy and our justice than this case of Annie M. Greene. I know of no cause of objection on the part of anyone to the granting of this small pension, and I hope the bill will be passed unanimously.

The bill was laid aside, to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ANNIE J. CORBETT.

The next bill on the Calendar was the bill (H. R. 925) granting a pension to Annie J. Corbett, of Providence, R. I.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the act of June 27, 1890, the name of Annie J. Corbett, widow of William Corbett, late of Company K, Second Regiment of Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry. This pension to cease in case it be shown that the soldier is alive.

The report (by Mr. POOLE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 925) to pension Annie J. Corbett, have examined the same, and respectfully recommend its passage, with the following report:

The petitioner was married to William Corbett December 21, 1865. He had previously served in Company K, Second Rhode Island Volunteers, from October 16, 1861, until March 6, 1863, when discharged on surgeon's certificate of disability by reason of hypertrophy of the heart, contracted in service. He has never applied for pension, and, if living, is about 55 years old. The petitioner alleges that he disappeared in the spring of 1866 and has never been heard from since; that their relations were pleasant, and she went to live with his mother and sisters, and has lived with them ever since, and they have never heard anything of the soldier to the present time.

Two witnesses testify that the petitioner has not remarried, was never divorced from soldier, and that she is without means of support. The marriage and soldier's service are shown by record evidence.

The claim is rejected by the Pension Bureau, because it is impossible to show clearly the fact of soldier's death.

This bill was favorably reported in the last Congress. Your committee regard the presumption of death as conclusive from the evidence, but it is specifically provided in the bill that the pension shall cease in case it be shown that the soldier is alive.

Mr. ERDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire who has charge of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill was introduced by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. BULL.

Mr. ERDMAN. If the gentleman is here, or if some one can speak for him, I should like to hear an explanation of the bill.

Mr. POOLE. If the gentleman from Rhode Island is present I would like to have him give the explanation. If he is not, I will speak for him.

Mr. BULL. Mr. Chairman, the report of the committee states this case very clearly, and I do not know that I can say anything in addition to what the committee have there set forth. The evidence as presented to the committee shows that this soldier entered the service in 1861, and was discharged in 1863. At the time of his discharge he was suffering from heart disease. In the spring of 1866 he disappeared and has not been heard of since. The relations between the husband and the wife were always pleasant, and at the present time the widow is living with his family, his mother and sisters. The testimony before the committee shows that the petitioner was never remarried and was

never divorced and that she has no means of support. Her application was rejected by the Pension Bureau because it was impossible to show clearly the fact of the soldier's death. A bill for the relief of this lady was reported in the last Congress, but was crowded out at the end of the session owing to the pressure of business. The case is a very meritorious one and I hope the bill will pass. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, what is the rate of pension provided in this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill simply provides for placing the applicant "on the pension roll subject to the provisions and limitations of the act of June 27, 1890."

Mr. ERDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have some further information upon which to act in this case. I should like to know the facts and circumstances of the case, so as to judge whether the presumption of death arises in this case or not. We are presuming here to overrule the Pension Bureau, which has all the facts and circumstances before it——

Mr. HARDY. That is exactly what we propose to do.

Mr. ERDMAN. I suppose so; but I do not think the House proposes to do it without proper consideration. The Pension Bureau has adopted the rule which governs in all the courts of the country, and if we intend here, without a knowledge of facts and circumstances, to overrule the Department and grant pensions indiscriminately, it would be well to have that understood.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Let me ask the gentleman what length of absence should be required, in his opinion, to raise the presumption of death?

Mr. ERDMAN. If the circumstances under which the soldier left his home were such that it was to be presumed he would return if alive, seven years is the length of absence that I would require; that being the common-law rule.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I understand that, and in this case the soldier has been absent thirty years.

Mr. ERDMAN. But we do not know the circumstances under which he left home, and I should like to know more about them.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Chairman, I personally have examined all the facts and circumstances in this case. I find that the soldier was discharged for hypertrophy of the heart——

Mr. MILES (interrupting). Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York will permit me to interrupt him for a moment, I think the point of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is that there is nothing in this report to show that the man did not leave home for some reason of a criminal character.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Chairman, I think I understand the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The fact that this soldier lived in amicable relations with his wife is established. There is nothing in the testimony to show that they had ever had a quarrel. Since his leaving home in 1866, the widow has been and is now living with his relatives. They have given their testimony in the case and there is nothing in it to show that there was any reason for his leaving home or for not returning. He was simply a sick man, unable to support himself and his family, and he left home undoubtedly to die soon after. He has been gone now thirty years. The testimony shows also that the widow during all this period has been practically a pauper.

She is now 52 years of age and he would be 55 if alive, and I appeal to any old soldier to say whether it is likely that a man who was discharged from the service thirty years ago on account of heart disease is still alive. The circumstances of the case all point to his death, and yet this woman's application was rejected by the Pension Bureau solely because she was unable to prove his death. It is time, Mr. Chairman, that the law of the United States in this respect should be changed and that we should adopt in such cases the common-law rule, which is that seven years' absence raises the presumption of death, provided everything else in the case is right. The testimony in this case is very clear. The service of the soldier is shown, the disease is shown, the poverty is shown, the physical condition of the soldier and all the facts and circumstances point to the conclusion that he undoubtedly died many years ago. I believe the committee have been thoroughly conscientious in examining the case and in reporting the bill granting this widow the small amount of $8 a month, and I trust that it will meet the approval of this Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DOCKERY. When was the application rejected?

Mr. POOLE. Within two years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall this bill be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass?

Mr. HULICK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word before the vote is taken. This is the first time in this session of Congress that we have met to consider pension legislation, and it would be well for us to come to an understanding as to the principle upon which we are to act in cases of this kind, for undoubtedly there are many such before the Pension Committee, and I know I have some myself. This is a case in which, if I were Commissioner of Pensions, I would allow the pension, and I will vote for this bill; but I would like to know what the rule is, and I now appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions and ask him what he understands to be the rule of the Pension Office on the question of presumptive evidence of death in cases like this? Has the Bureau adopted a rule by which we can be guided in these cases?

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the gentleman has asked that question. I will refer him to the rule of the Department, a rule which makes such bills as this necessary. I quote from volume 9, Decisions of the Department of the Interior, in the case of Melinda L. Crider, found on page 462. To save time, I will read only the closing paragraph of the decision:

> In view of these findings, I therefore feel it incumbent upon me to lay down the rule that, independent of absence for any period of time, it must be held in pension cases that the facts attending the absence must show beyond a reasonable doubt that the party is dead.

That is the criminal-law rule. This decision was rendered by Assistant Secretary John M. Reynolds.

A MEMBER. When was the decision rendered?

Mr. PICKLER. It is in volume 7 of Decisions of the Department of the Interior in Appealed Pension and Bounty Land Claims. The date is March 6, 1895.

I desire, for the information of the gentleman, to read further from this decision:

> I am fully convinced—

This gentleman is not satisfied with reliance upon the decisions of the courts, it seems—

> I am fully convinced that more urgent reasons exist for the modification of this rule in the consideration of pension claims than any shown in the decisions of the courts, and I conceive the requirements herein indicated as necessary in this class of cases to be eminently desirable for the protection of the Government as well as the soldier who may be entitled to the bounty.

Mr. HULICK. That is the holding of the Commissioner.

Mr. PICKLER. No; it went up on appeal from the decision of the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Reynolds——

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. In the Interior Department?

Mr. PICKLER. Yes, sir. It was the decision of the Assistant Secretary on an appeal.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. What do you mean by an appeal? Do you mean an appeal in the courts or in the Department?

Mr. PICKLER. I referred to an appeal in the Department. Appeals are taken from the decision of the Commissioner of Pensions to the Secretary of the Interior, and that is the law that governs in pension cases. This, however, is the decision of the Secretary of the Interior upon an appeal.

Mr. MILES. Mr. Chairman, it is simply impossible to hear anything of the debate on this side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. It is difficult even for the Chair to hear it, and he hopes that there will be order. The Chair will endeavor to maintain order.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. The question I asked the gentleman from South Dakota was whether the appeal was an appeal to the courts or from the Commissioner of Pensions to another man in the Interior Department. In other words, then, as I understood his answer, this is a ruling upon a ruling in the Interior Department.

Mr. PICKLER. That is right.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. That is, that every presumption of law and fact is to be against the soldier, and still more in that Department than in any court of justice in the land.

Mr. MAHON. Do they not presume everything against the soldier up there?

Mr. PICKLER. Well, I do not like to say exactly that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania heard the testimony, and he has heard part of the decision that I started to read. For myself, I know of no rule that a lawyer can cite in any court of justice in this country in a civil case where you must prove a fact beyond a reasonable doubt, or where the presumption of death does not exist after the party has been absent for a reasonable length of time. If there is such a rule I do not know it.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I think it is the intention of Congress and the lawmaking power generally that the construction shall be in favor of the soldier in every case. If that is not the rule it certainly ought to be, because it was the intention of the lawmaking power. It has been the case in every instance where these laws have been enacted, and in all special legislation on this subject Congress has indicated very clearly its intention. The more or less taxation required to meet these expenditures amounts to nothing in the view of our people in comparison with doing justice to the soldiers and their widows, and ninety-nine men out of a hundred would desire that to be the intention.

Mr. HICKS. The hundredth man is against it; that is the only difference.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, further replying to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HULICK], the committee thinks that the common-law presumption to which reference has been made

ought to apply in all such cases as this. Of course he understands the rule of the common law better than I do, and it is not necessary for me to cite it in this connection. But when a soldier is absent for the time fixed in the law, the presumption is of his death, and especially in a case like this, where he never applied for a pension himself.

Mr. PITNEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Dakota a question.

Mr. PICKLER. I have not the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. HULICK. I yielded to the gentleman from South Dakota to ask a question, and now wish to claim the floor in my own right.

Mr. Chairman, this is a practical issue which we must now meet, on the very threshold of this session, and I raised the question at this time in order to obtain an expression of sentiment on the part of the House. We are going to do justice to the soldiers and their widows and children; but we must have some guide, and we want to act in unison with the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Now, on this question of presumption, if it is a question that the House is to act upon—that is, the legal presumption after seven years of the death of the party—if that is to be the rule, then we ought to understand it, and if it is to be the rule, why not have the Committee on Invalid Pensions report a bill fixing by express statute that rule of presumption in favor of the death of the soldier in the absence of any contrary proof? That is to say, an absence of seven years without proof to the contrary to be presumptive evidence of his death.

Now, I understand the theory of the Department is that it must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the man is dead or that he will never return to claim his pension. If that is the ruling of the Department I respectfully dissent from it.

Mr. MILES. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. HULICK. Certainly.

Mr. MILES. I hope the gentleman will bear in mind that the House has two sides to it, and that the committee has a part of its membership on this side.

Mr. HULICK. If that suggestion is because the gentleman can not hear me, I will divide my time, and if necessary to convince that side of the House as to the justice of the position I take, I will myself pay my respects to it, so that there can be no question of hearing me.

Mr. MILES. I wish to remind the gentleman that I am a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and I am interested in his very instructive remarks.

Mr. HULICK. I thank the gentleman. I want to know on what basis the committee is to report bills of this character, so that hereafter we shall have no controversy, and when a bill of this kind comes up we shall be ready to vote upon it, so that you will not be interrupted by remarks from me or any other gentleman.

I favor the passage of this bill; but I have some bills of the same kind, and I want to know if it is a mere question of fact that I have got to prove to the committee. I now address myself to the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions and other members of that committee, and I ask, if we present a case of this kind, shall we be required to introduce evidence to satisfy the committee of facts sufficient to sustain the common-law presumption of death after an absence for seven years, or shall we have to introduce evidence to prove the death beyond a reasonable doubt?

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. This committee takes up questions as they come before it. If a case shall appear where the circumstances show a presumption that the soldier is not dead, if he has been heard from, or something of that kind, then I do not suppose the committee would report favorably; and it would be impossible for me to say to the gentleman from Ohio in advance what we should do in a particular case until we know the facts of that case. It is the province of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to do justice to these soldiers and their widows and dependent children, and we shall endeavor to do justice in each case as it comes up. We can not decide a case until it comes before us.

Mr. HULICK. I thank the gentleman for his expression. I have no doubt the committee will do that, and I think from what the gentleman has said we can reach an understanding.

Mr. ERDMAN. I desire to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question. Does he think that the House or the Committee on Invalid Pensions ought to overrule the Pension Department without any evidence whatever before it?

Mr. HULICK. Not at all; and that is the reason I propounded the question to the chairman of the committee. I wish to know whether, when we present cases of this kind, we shall introduce evidence to establish the facts beyond a reasonable doubt, or whether we shall simply establish facts to raise the common-law presumption of death after an absence of seven years. That is what I wished to find out.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I think we are on the safe side in this matter, at all events. It has been clearly proven that somebody connected with this household is entitled to a pension. The man if living would be entitled to it according to the laws which have been passed by Congress, and if the man is dead the woman is entitled to it. It has been clearly proven that she is an invalid, and in need of this money. Why should we waste so much time over a saving of $96 a year, at the risk of breaking a human heart and sending a woman in distress to the grave. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall this bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation? Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ANNA KELLEY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1605) granting a pension to Anna Kelley.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Anna Kelley, of Manchester, N. H., widow of Charles T. Kelley, alias Charles J. Kelley, who served in Company C, Fourth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteers, and on the U. S. ships *Ohio* and *Macedonia* in the United States Navy, and pay her a pension of $12 per month.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the report.

The report (by Mr. SULLOWAY) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1605) granting a pension to Anna Kelley, having carefully considered the same, respectfully report:

The claimant was married to Charles T. Kelley, alias Charles J. Kelley, on April 21, 1860. September 18, 1861, her husband enlisted in Company C, Fourth New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry. He was discharged for disability December 1, 1862, at Washington, D. C. On March 4, 1863, he enlisted as ordinary seaman in the United States Navy, and served on the *Ohio* and *Macedonia*, from which service he was honorably discharged.

After the war Kelley returned to his home in Manchester, N. H., and lived with his wife, the claimant, until 1871, when he went abroad to seek employment. A short time afterwards Kelley's brother, now deceased, received a letter from him, stating that he was at some point in New Jersey, sick, and in need of relief. That was the last ever heard of the soldier.

In July, 1890, the claimant filed a claim (No. 477579) as widow, under the act of June 27, 1890, which was, in October, 1893, transferred to the Navy files of the Bureau of Pensions and thereafter known as No. 13757. On April 20, 1895, the claim was rejected on the ground that the "sailor's death is not shown nor presumable." This seems to be the only point in the case on which direct evidence is lacking.

We think that, after the lapse of twenty-five years, taken in connection with the fact that when last heard of the soldier was many miles from his home, sick, and in need of relief, the claimant is surely entitled to the benefit of the doubt, and your committee, therefore, respectfully report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that it do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall this bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation? Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GILMAN WILLIAMS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1020) granting an increase of pension to Gilman Williams.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to increase the pension of Gilman Williams (insane), of Company H, Third Ohio Infantry Volunteers, to $72 a month, subject to the limitations of the pension laws; said pension to be in lieu of that which he is now receiving.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions recommended an amendment, in lines 5 and 6, striking out the words "seventy-two" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thirty."

The report (by Mr. BAKER of Kansas) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1020) granting an increase of pension to Gilman Williams, having carefully considered the same, respectfully report:

The soldier is hopelessly insane and very poor, and dependent upon the support of his sister, who is a woman of small means.

The evidence of service—origin of the disability—is not regarded by the Pension Bureau as sufficient to justify the allowance of the claim under the general law, but there is considerable evidence upon the subject, the case having been examined specially in the field by officers of the Pension Office.

The guardian of the insane soldier is drawing a pension of $12 a month under the act of June 27, 1890, under certificate 613722. The soldier served in Company H, Third Ohio Infantry, from August 23, 1862, to December 19, 1863, when he was discharged on account of fracture of right patella. The Pension Office rejected the claim of the guardian under the general law "on the ground that the alleged insanity did not originate in the service, but was contracted after discharge therefrom, as shown by testimony taken on special examination as well as the record of the inquest upon which he was adjudged insane in 1872."

The records of the War Department show that the soldier was captured at Rome, Ga., May 3, 1863, and was confined at Richmond, Va., May 9, 1863, and was paroled at City Point May 14, 1863, and reported at Camp Parole, Md., May 15, 1863, and sent to Camp Chase, Ohio, May 19, 1863. The records show fracture of right patella from a runaway horse and discharge on that account.

The injury to patella occurred when he was on furlough during his parole.

The evidence is not sufficiently clear to justify the Pension Bureau in allowing a claim based upon insanity, and the action of the Pension Bureau was approved by Secretary Bussey on appeal.

Your committee think that there is considerable evidence to justify the belief that the soldier's insanity is due to his army service. The evidence is very voluminous, and we do not therefore set it out in this report. Special examiners took the testimony of the insane soldier, and this evidence is somewhat relied upon in the appeal as a ground for rejecting the claim. In view of the mental condition of the soldier we do not think that evidence should have been considered against him.

He would be entitled to $72 a month under the general law, and is drawing $12 under the disability act of 1890. We are not prepared to say that the evidence of service origin of his insanity is such as to require the allowance of the claim on that ground. At all events there is considerable evidence justifying the claim that it was of such origin.

It appears that the soldier, who lives in Iowa, was at one time in the State hospital for the insane, but was discharged therefrom because, as stated, he was too unmanageable and too great a charge.

A similar bill, allowing $30, was favorably reported by the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the last Congress, but it died on the Calendar.

It is a case appealing strongly to the sympathy of Congress, and one in which we think some of the doubts should be resolved in favor of the soldier.

Your committee therefore recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the words "seventy-two" in lines 5 and 6, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thirty," and that as so amended the bill do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "thirty."

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I think this House is performing an act of injustice to this worthy soldier. Surely if he is entitled to more than $12 a month he is entitled to $72. I do not see on what ground the Committee on Invalid Pensions can say that his present disability is not traceable to his service, but that they think it is traceable $30 worth. It is either traceable to his service or it is not. If it is traceable to his service to the extent of $30, why it is traceable to his service to the extent of $72. If you are going to do an act of justice in a worthy case, why not give him the pension that he would be entitled to under the general law? Can the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions enlighten us upon that point?

Mr. PICKLER. I hope the gentleman will offer an amendment if he thinks this is not high enough.

Mr. LOUD. The bill is all right in its original form.

Mr. PICKLER. I yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BAKER], who made the report in this case.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, your committee, after an investigation of this case, felt that we had a rather peculiar one to deal with. There was some evidence that went to show that this insanity was the result of his service in the Army. There was one witness who testified that he had been a physical wreck ever since he left the Army. There was not enough to fully satisfy your committee in believing that it was wholly owing to the fact that he rendered service in the Army. From the time that he left the Army until the present time he has been an invalid. He has been gradually growing worse since he had the injury which is spoken of here. A sister of his has taken care of him until she is no longer able to provide for his wants. They refuse, as I understand, to continue him longer in the asylum in that State where he now is, and some provision, we felt, should be made for him.

Mr. LOUD. On what ground do they refuse to continue him?

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. It raised a very strong presumption in our minds that his insanity was due to his service in the Army.

Mr. LOUD. You say that the asylum refused to retain him. On what ground?

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] told me because he was so filthy and so incorrigible that they would not continue him.

Mr. LOUD. Is that the way the insane asylums are managed in the State of Iowa?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. They claimed also that he was not a citizen of the State of Iowa. He appears to have been removed from the State of Ohio when he was insane. He had been in the State of Iowa for a considerable length of time. He was very hard to control and care for, and they refused to continue to keep him. A sister had taken care of him and had provided for him so far as she was able, until she has exhausted her resources. And we have evidence that she will, in all probability, lose her home, having mortgaged it to enable her to give proper care to this insane brother; and we felt bound, under the laws of humanity, to do something for him, and thought we could not do less than to make some provision by which he could be better cared for in the future than he had been in the past. While we did not feel warranted in grantng an increase to $72, as we thought that proper care could be taken of him for less, we thought it would be right to grant him $30 a month, learning as we did that in a private asylum he could be provided for for that sum. Remember, this is in lieu of $12 a month he is now receiving, so that it is only an increase of $18 a month, which will provide for him and relieve the sister of his care.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the committee, to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "thirty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

ANDREW B. KEITH.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 994) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Keith.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Andrew B. Keith, late private in Company F, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him $30 per month, the same to be paid him in lieu of the pension now paid him of $12 per month, upon pension certificate No. 222783, the same to be subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect and be in force on and after its passage.

The report (by Mr. KERR) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 994) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Keith, respectfully report:

The soldier is now on the pension roll at $12 per month for chronic diarrhea and resulting piles and rheumatism. In November, 1888, he filed an application for an increase, alleging as the ground therefor disease of the eyes as a result of rheumatism. His application was rejected upon the ground that the form of disease with which his eyes were afflicted was not ordinarily the result of rheumatism or that when the disease resulted from rheumatism it appeared in a different form from that found in this case.

The rejection was based wholly upon the opinion of the medical referee. This decision was carried up on appeal and was affirmed by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and this affirmance rested solely upon the opinion of the medical referee.

There seems to have been no question but that the soldier was afflicted with a disease of the eyes. The whole inquiry was directed to finding its origin, and the decision was based wholly upon the determination of that question.

The evidence of Dr. Irwin, an eye specialist, is very clear as to the cause of the disease. His evidence is not simply expert, but is based upon years of treatment of the soldier for the trouble for which the increase was claimed. This doctor began treating the soldier in 1884 and it has continued with intervals ever since. The doctor's evidence as to his present condition is as follows. After describing the treatment and condition, he says:

"Causing failure of sight and increase of his myopia, and finally cataract of both eyes. His sight is now so bad that he can barely go about without an assistant."

He further testifies that the disease is sclera choroiditis, and was evidently rheumatic.

The evidence of this witness should be given great weight. He was for years the eye expert of the examining board at Mansfield, Ohio, and is a noted specialist in eye diseases.

This evidence is strongly corroborated by the examination of two medical boards and an examination by a medical expert, to whom this case was referred. These examinations are as follows: In March, 1887, a board reported: "Eyeballs prominent and quite tender to the touch; large posterior staphyloma, more extensive in right." In July, 1889, a board reported: "Media cloudy; eyeballs prominent; myopia of high degree; accommodation limited. * * * Balls tender to pressure. * * * Posterior staphyloma of both eyes; the whitish crescentric feature notable; sclerotic; probably rheumatically affected in some degree."

Expert Clark, of Columbus, Ohio, to whom the pension authorities referred the soldier for examination, reported that his condition was not typical of simple myopia or shortsightedness, but probably the result of rheumatism.

These boards and this expert made personal and physical examinations, while the medical referee who rejected the claim only examined their examinations, and for that reason their conclusions should be received as the more satisfactory.

As stated at the beginning, there was but one question—a medical one—and about this the doctors disagreed. The medical referee admits that a disease of this kind results from rheumatism, but when it does, as he affirms, its presence "is anterior instead of posterior."

The other medical evidence says that it appears in both forms, but more frequently in the anterior.

A large number of citations from medical authorities treating upon the subject of diseases of the eye have been examined, and they seem to sustain the theory and evidence of soldier's witnesses and examinations, that his eye disease resulted from rheumatism.

The passage of the bill is therefore recommended with an amendment fixing the rate at $30 per month, as follows:

In line 7 strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty."

During the reading of the report,

Mr. PICKLER said: I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the report be omitted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After apause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I hope some gentleman will explain this bill. I have listened as attentively as I could to the reading of the report. Of course, it is a very funny business; I understand that; but I have listened to the reading of the report as attentively as I could, and have failed to discover one word, from the report, in the testimony of these physicians that indicates that the present disease of this applicant is due to his service. Of course, they all go on and describe his present condition. Now, as the report has not all been read, if some gentleman can explain what these doctors have said and show what reference it had to his service, I would be very glad. Simply because a person is pretty nearly blind to-day, I——

Mr. PAYNE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LOUD. I would rather that you should wait half a minute, until I get through with that sentence; but I will yield to you now.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman from California if he does not get the idea, further, from the reading of the report that there is something pretty serious the matter with this man? [Laughter.]

Mr. LOUD. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. PAYNE. And the only doubt the gentleman has as regards the case is as to whether it is attributable to his army service?

Mr. LOUD. That is the only cause; and I am addressing myself to the matter in all seriousness.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to ask the gentleman a further question. I do not know how much pension it is proposed to give him.

A MEMBER. The bill was introduced at $50.

Mr. LOUD. As amended, $30 a month.

Mr. PAYNE. But, in either case, if the soldier served regularly and had a regular discharge, would he not be entitled to some sort of a pension?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. He is getting $12 a month.

Mr. LOUD. He is getting $12 a month, and that is all he is entitled to under the law.

Mr. HICKS. He is nearly blind.

Mr. LOUD. Oh, when you talk about blindness, I want to say to you that there are at least 10,000 men in this country who served well during the late war who are to-day nearly blind, if not totally blind.

Mr. HARDY. And entitled to $72 a month.

Mr. LOUD. Then pension them under a general law.

Mr. HARDY. This is the place to make the law to pension them.

Mr. LOUD. That is all right; but do not do it by special acts.

Mr. HICKS. We have not time to make a general law.

Mr. BRUMM (to Mr. LOUD). I understand you are opposed to an extension of the pension law?

Mr. MILES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILES. This debate is not proceeding in an orderly way. Gentlemen are addressing each other without addressing the Chair and without addressing the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. LOUD. This seems to be regarded by some gentlemen as a very amusing affair, but it seems to me a very serious matter. Now, I am free to say that if the medical testimony in this case goes to show that this man's present disability is the result of his service, no man in this House will go further than I to grant him the pension asked for; yes, and more than what he would be entitled to under the law. But I want to say to members that no series of questions addressed to me, no query about my position upon pension legislation, can deter me from pursuing such a course in this House as I think becoming in a member of it.

I sit pretty near the Democratic side, but I want the brethren to understand that I am not a Democrat. I want them to understand, further, that I have as much sympathy for the soldier as any man on this floor; but if you are going to pick out special cases and go away beyond what the law would allow the applicant if his case came under the general law, I can not go with you to that extent. It is very true that I can not prevent you from passing these bills, but I do not believe that this House ought to pursue the course they are to-night entering upon so precipitately. I think that before this session of Congress is over, gentlemen, you may possibly have cause to regret the hasty action that you have taken to-night in some of these cases.

A MEMBER. That makes no difference.

Mr. LOUD. Well, perhaps it does not make any difference to you, but it does make some difference to me. I am a Republican. I desire to see my party as a party pursue a course of justice toward all the old soldiers, and not to pick out, here and there, the case of some soldier and, simply because he has an able advocate upon this floor, grant to him, or to his widow, an exceptionally large pension. Now, I say to you again, Mr. Chairman, that I failed to hear one word in the report just read which goes to show, even in the remotest degree, that any of these eye experts claim that the disease from which this applicant is now suffering is the result of his service. If it be the fact that it is not the result of his service, then why should we grant him a pension of $30 a month?

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Is it not a fact that the expert doctor whose testimony is presented in this report says that in his opinion, which is based not only on his general skill as a doctor, but upon actual care and treatment of this patient, the disease of the eyes is the result of rheumatism, resulting from the man's army service? I so understand the report.

Mr. LOUD. If the report states that, I did not catch it. If the gentleman did, his hearing is much better than mine.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. That is how I understand it.

Mr. LOUD. I did not hear that part of the report.

Mr. TALBERT. I will say to the gentleman from California that that part of the report was not read.

Mr. LOUD. I am of the opinion that the Clerk did, perhaps, skip a portion of the report. If any gentleman will state that the report does contain evidence that the disability results from the man's service, that of course alters the case.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me to read it now?

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. I will read that portion of the report.

Several MEMBERS. Read the whole report. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. I will read the portion of it to which I desire to call the attention of the committee. If other gentlemen want to read the rest of it they are at liberty to do so. This is the portion to which I ask attention:

Expert Clark, of Columbus, Ohio, to whom the pension authorities referred the soldier for examination, reported that his condition was not typical myopia or shortsightedness, but probably the result of rheumatism. These boards and this expert made personal and physical examinations, while the medical referee who rejected the claim, only examined their examinations, and for that reason their conclusions should be received as the more satisfactory.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, this whole case in a nutshell is that three examining boards and one medical expert found that this man's blindness did result from his rheumatism, and the medical referee at the Bureau said they were in error, and the committee took sides with the three boards and the one medical expert against the medical referee.

Mr. LOUD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say for my own sake that that portion of the report which the gentleman from New York has just read had not been read to the House before. I simply rose to my feet for the purpose of seeking further information about this case, which I have finally secured.

The amendment of the committee striking out "$50" and inserting "$30" was adopted.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MARY E. HULL.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1141) granting a pension to Miss Mary E. Hull, dependent sister of John A. Hull, deceased, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the late war of the rebellion.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place upon the pension rolls the name of Miss Mary E. Hull, dependent sister of John A. Hull, deceased, late of Company F, in the Eighty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the late war of the rebellion, and that she be paid a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The report (by Mr. WOOD) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions have considered the bill (H. R. 1141) granting a pension to Mary E. Hull, the dependent sister of John A. Hull, deceased, late a member of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment, Illinois, and submit the following report:

The evidence fully establishes the fact that the beneficiary in said bill was the sister of James and John A. Hull; that said James died in the service of his country in the war of the rebellion; that said John A. was a member of Company F, Eighty-first Illinois Volunteers, in the war of the rebellion, and also was in the Mexican war; that said Mary E. is now and always has been a single woman.

That her brother, John A., was a widower when he entered the service of the United States in the war of the rebellion; that she lived with and was keeping house for him at said time; that he then had three young, helpless children, and the said Mary E. took charge of them during his absence, cared for and educated them; that she had no money or property of her own, but devoted her energies and life to her said brother, John A., and his children, both during and after the war; that her brother, John A., remained a widower till his death.

That he died about eight years ago, leaving no property or money, and that said Mary E. has no property or money, is near 63 years of age, from disability is unable to support herself, and is dependent on her friends for support. That said John A. Hull contracted disabilities while in the line of duty in the service of his country in the late rebellion from which he never recovered and of which he died; that he was at the date of his death drawing a pension for such disabilities. That said Mary E. was dependent on her said brother, John A., for support during his life, and since his death on the charity of friends. That from medical evidence furnished your committee she is now, from age and disability, unable to work or labor to support herself.

That she is, and always has been, a lady of good and irreproachable character and reputation, respected by those who know her. That said Mary E., by her devotion to the family of her said brother, John A., caring for and rearing them from childhood to maturity, lost and abandoned the opportunities of young womanhood, and your committee, fully believing that after these years of devotion to this soldier of the Union and his children, she should in her old days be cared for by a generous Government, recommend that said bill do pass, with the following amendment, viz, in line 8 strike out the word "fifty," and insert in lieu thereof the word "twelve."

The amendment recommended in the last paragraph of the report was adopted.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

GEORGE W. CASE.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 147) granting a pension to George W. Case, late private Company B, Twenty-second New York Cavalry.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll of the United States the name of George W. Case, late a private of Company B, Twenty-Second New York Cavalry, at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of the pension now received by him under the act of June 27, 1890, the pension hereby granted to date from the passage of this act.

The report (by Mr. POOLE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 147) granting an increase of pension to George W. Case, having fully considered the same, together with the evidence submitted, respectfully report:

From the records of the Pension Bureau it appears that George W. Case enlisted December 22, 1863, as a private in Company B, Twenty-second New York Volunteer Cavalry, and was honorably discharged August 1, 1865; that he is now on the pension roll of the United States under the act of June 27, 1890, and in receipt of a pension of $12 per month; that his application for further increase of his pension has been rejected because of failure to produce evidence required by the rules of the Pension Bureau. His present certificate recites as his disability paralysis of both hands and lower limbs, and the report of the examining surgeons upon which his present rating was established shows that his physical condition is such as to require the regular and constant attendance of another person.

The affidavits, photographs, and other evidence submitted to the committee show that Mr. Case is in a most pitiable condition. He is utterly helpless, can not stand upon his feet or move himself, can not feed himself, and has to be lifted onto his bed by a mechanical contrivance constructed for

that purpose. He also suffers constant severe pain, sometimes of the most excruciating character. Dr. Jonathan Kneeland, his family physician, testifies:

"He (Case) is now and has been for over four years completely crippled in hands and feet. The nerves of sensation are keenly alive, and the sense of touch and feeling more acute than ever. He suffers from neuralgia very much, and in all changes of the weather, while the nerves of motion are so ailing that he can not even brush off a fly. I have never seen a person suffer more with no power of relief."

It is also shown by abundant testimony that Mr. Case is now in destitute circumstances, his savings have been exhausted, and he has been obliged to sell his modest home to defray the expenses attendant upon his long illness. He is now, and for some time past has been, dependent upon his relatives and friends and the small pension he receives.

The death of the surgeon and assistant surgeon of his regiment seems to have prevented Mr. Case from supplying evidence sufficient to enable him to trace his present disabilities to his army service, so as to bring him within the benefit of the general law relating to pensions. Your committee, while not questioning the justice of the action of the Bureau of Pensions in this case under the existing law and the rules and regulations governing the adjudication of pension claims, are of the opinion, after careful review of all the evidence submitted, that the present condition of Mr. Case is fairly attributable to exposure and injury received by him while in the service and in the line of his duty.

The evidence shows Mr. Case to have been, both while in the Army and since his discharge therefrom, a man of good habits and of excellent character. The evidence as a whole is exceptionally strong and convincing, and the witnesses are men of character and repute.

Your committee think this bill ought to pass, and so unanimously report.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

UZZIEL B. CHURCH.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 711) to increase the pension of Uzziel B. Church.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension rolls Uzziel B. Church, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of $20 per month.

The report (by Mr. WOOD) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 711) for the relief of Uzziel B. Church, submit the following report:

The evidence in this case shows without controversy that the claimant was a soldier from July 10, 1862, to June 30, 1865, and has an honorable discharge and record. He received a gunshot wound, while in line of his duty, in the left forearm, for which he was pensioned, first at $2 per month, then $4, and in March, 1890, it was increased to $6, which he is now drawing. For this wound he is rated at six-eighteenths. He is now suffering from disease of lungs, for which he is rated twelve-eighteenths. He is confined to his bed and will be very soon a subject of charity.

For this last disability his application for increase was rejected by the Commissioner, whose decision, on appeal, was affirmed by the Secretary of the Interior, on the ground of no ratable disability under act of June 27, 1890, and that disease is not shown to have originated in service.

His first application made mention of no other disability than gunshot wound. April 24, 1890, he alleged that he contracted swamp fever in September, 1864, in Louisiana, which left a cough. The record shows treatment for malarial fever from September to November, 1864, and an attack of erysipelas in the spring of 1865.

Medical examinations of this claimant began in 1880, and confined themselves to wound of arm until 1890, but at the same time giving weight, respiration, and pulse. He was heavier in 1883 than in 1880, and in 1886 heavier than ever before. In 1886 medical certificate states: "No disability other than left forearm exists." In 1888 it closes with: "Lungs and heart normal." In 1890, after application on disability of lungs, his disability for that cause was rated at $4.

The surgeon of his regiment in 1890 makes no statement, because his books and records were turned over, and he can not recollect individual cases.

The testimony of two soldiers in the same company shows that in September, 1864, claimant contracted swamp fever in Louisiana, and was sent to camp hospital; as a result, there was an affection of the lungs and a distressing cough, which afflicted him at his discharge.

This testimony is corroborated by the record. The testimony of five other witnesses shows that from his discharge he has suffered from this disease—has never been in good health; and all this evidence, presumably given by credible witnesses, is now corroborated by the medical examination, showing his rating from disease of the lungs to be twelve-eighteenths.

The only contradiction to this evidence is the circumstance that in the numerous examinations made by examining boards of the injury from the gunshot wound, they made no mention of the lung disease and that claimant first applied only for pension from this wound.

In view of this evidence, and the further fact that the medical examinations disclosed disease of lungs when claimant first alleged it, and that he is now, as shown by the reports of examining boards, suffering from disease of lungs, your committee believe that this disease was contracted in the service and that he is now incapacitated for labor to the extent of two-thirds.

The committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. AVERY. What is the rate, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PICKLER. Twenty dollars per month.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

CAROLINE PARKER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to Caroline Parker.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, at $12 per month, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Caroline Parker, of Waverly, Kans., widow of Asbury M. Parker, alias Asbery Parker, who enlisted in the Fourteenth Kansas Cavalry, and was examined by Dr. Chenneworth, surgeon of the Fourteenth Kansas Cavalry, was accepted, but was killed, with 16 other men who had enlisted, before they were mustered into the service; said men being killed in camp at Lawrence, Kans., on the 21st day of August, 1863, by Quantrill.

The report (by Mr. KIRKPATRICK) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to Caroline Parker, submit the following report:

Caroline Parker is the mother of Asbury Parker, alias Asbery Parker, who enlisted in the Fourteenth Kansas Cavalry at Lawrence, Kans., prior to the 21st day of August, 1863. Asbury Parker, with 22 others who had regularly enlisted for the Fourteenth Cavalry in the late war at Lawrence, Kans., had been examined and accepted by the surgeon of said regiment and in camp and under military orders, although not formally mustered in, and while so encamped, and on the 21st day of August, 1863, Quantrill and his command entered the city of Lawrence, killed about 200 of its citizens, including 17 of the recruits before mentioned, the said Asbury Parker being one.

The bill for the relief of the heirs of these 17 recruits was introduced in the Senate in the Forty-ninth Congress and was favorably reported and passed, and was also favorably reported for passage in the House.

Your committee are of the opinion that Asbury Parker lost his life in the service of his country prior to being regularly mustered in, and if the records had been completed there would have been no question but that his mother would be entitled to a pension; but the failure to perfect the papers resulting from an action of war in which this soldier lost his life, gives claim for Congressional action.

Your committee further report that Asbury Parker at the time of his death was a single man, leaving neither wife nor children.

Thomas Parker, father of the deceased, died March 27, 1874. Caroline Parker, the mother of the deceased soldier, is 72 years of age and in destitute circumstances.

Your committee therefore recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the word "widow," in the seventh line, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "dependent mother," and by striking out all after the word "Cavalry," in the eighth line, and that the bill be passed as amended.

The amendments recommended in the last paragraph of the report were adopted.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MICHAEL BRICKER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1616) to pension Michael E. Bricker, of Edgerton, Ind.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, directed to inscribe on the pension roll of the United States Michael E. Bricker, of Edgerton, Ind., late a private in Company D, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteers, at the rate of $12 per month, to date from the taking effect of this act.

The report (by Mr. KERR) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1616) to pension Michael Bricker, submit the following report:

The beneficiary, Michael Bricker, of Edgerton, Ind., was a member of Company D, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteers, and was pensioned under the act of June 27, 1890, at the rate of $6 per month. On June 2, 1894, he made application for an increased rating, alleging total incapacity to perform manual labor. On the presentation of this claim for increase it was discovered by the Pension Bureau that the soldier had never been regularly mustered into the service, and he was consequently dropped from the rolls, and has received no pension since. The soldier was sick and at the hospital at the time his company was mustered, and the fact that he was not mustered seems to have been entirely overlooked, and he was regularly discharged by order of General Thomas, bearing date August 24, 1864, and was paid for his services subsequent to his discharge as a private in said company and regiment from August 29, 1863, to the day of his discharge.

Your committee, being satisfied that the soldier is totally incapacitated from the performance of manual labor, which would entitle him to a pension, except that he was not regularly mustered, believe this to be a case for the special intervention of Congress, and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "inscribe" and insert the word "place"; so as to make the language of this bill conform to that of pension bills generally.

The amendment was agreed to.

MRS. JANE DULANY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane Dulany.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of Mrs. Jane Dulany, widow of Col. William Dulany, from $50 to $100 per month.

The report (by Mr. MILES) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane Dulany, having carefully examined the same, respectfully submit the following report:

Jane Dulany is the widow of the late Col. William Dulany, of the United States Marine Corps, who died on the 4th of July, 1868.

This officer entered the service of the Corps June 10, 1817, as second lieutenant. He served continuously on shipboard and at different naval stations to July, 1828, having been promoted in the meantime to first lieutenant, captain by brevet, captain, and commanded the guard of the United States frigate *Constitution* in December, 1825.

He was the first officer of the Marine Corps to volunteer his services for field duty at the breaking out of the Florida war, and he served with conspicuous gallantry and untiring energy and devotion throughout that war, commanding the Marine and a part of the Army.

He was complimented by Major-General Jesup in General Order 102, and tendered the thanks of the country therein, and Gen. P. F. Smith also testified in the highest terms to the Navy Department his appreciation of Dulany's brilliant services, and in his honor Fort Dulany was named.

During these campaigns he was prostrated by disease, and advised by a surgeon that to remain longer in that malarious climate would endanger his life, but notwithstanding this advice he continued in the field until the close of the war, when he returned in command of his force.

When in command of Fort Pickens, in 1846, he again tendered his services for the Mexican war, and commanded the marines in that war with marked gallantry, and was at the storming and capture of the castle of Chapultepec and the capture of the Belen Gate and the City of Mexico, and in the meantime was promoted and commissioned major by brevet and major; and for

gallant and meritorious conduct received, after the capture of the City of Mexico, as a high appreciation of his splendid and noble services, the brevet of lieutenant-colonel.

After the close of the Mexican war he served continuously in command of the Marine Barracks at New York, Boston, and Portsmouth; and, although a native of Virginia, at the firing of the first gun at Fort Sumter he again offered his services to his country for duty in the field, and he was at once commissioned by the lamented President Lincoln colonel and placed in command of the marine battalion at Norfolk, Va., and continued in active service until after the close of the late civil war.

On the 8th of November, 1865, after having served his country faithfully for almost half a century, he was retired under the act of Congress retiring officers of forty-five years' service. He died upon the retired list July 4, 1868, as before stated, leaving no blot upon his name. The physician who attended him in his last sickness certified that he died of congestion of the brain arising from causes produced while in the service of his country and in the line of duty.

A bill granting Mrs. Dulany $50 per month was enacted during the Forty-fourth Congress, and this is the rate of pension which she is now drawing.

Since that time, however, the pensioner has become blind; she is perfectly helpless and requires constant aid and attention.

Your committee, therefore, in view of all the facts, respectfully recommend that in line 6 of said bill the words "one hundred" be stricken out and the words "seventy-two" inserted in lieu thereof, so as to allow the pensioner $72 per month, and that as so amended the same do pass.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman in charge of this bill to make some explanation of it. I think the report is hardly sufficiently explanatory.

Mr. MILES. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from South Carolina that the splendid history which has just been read of this old veteran, whose widow it is proposed to pension by this bill, presents a better explanation of the merits of the proposition than any which I could hope to give to this House.

This bill, sir, was introduced by me by chance. My colleague, Mr. RUSK, filed a petition with our committee in behalf of this old lady, and because of his absence from the House about that time, and in consequence of the extreme old age and condition of this applicant, I felt compelled to bring the case speedily to the attention of the committee; and therefore it was without ever having seen this old woman, without knowing anything of her antecedents, except as I learned them from the reports submitted to the Forty-third, Forty-fourth, and Forty-seventh Congresses of the United States, I filed a bill in her behalf asking an increase of pension from that she is now receiving to $100 per month.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions referred this bill to me as a subcommittee for consideration and report. I made, as my report to that committee, the report which was made to the Forty-seventh Congress of the United States, so that the language of that report in the main is not my own, but it speaks of Chapultepec and of the Belen Gate. It speaks, Mr. Chairman, of a war that this country waged forty years ago. It is all history to me. It comes to us hallowed by the memories of a war in which the guns of Lee and of Grant were fired in unison. It comes to us sanctified by the recollections of a period in our country's history when all the sections of this common country united to defend it against the aggressions of a foreign foe.

This old woman, sir, is 84 years of age, more than an octogenarian. Can it be possible, under these circumstances, that there is any member of this House who will object to this paltry increase in her pension, since the history which has been recited from the desk shows her to be the widow of a soldier who served first in the war of 1812, then in the Florida war, later on in the Mexican war, and finally who served throughout the war for the suppression of the rebellion?

Mr. Chairman, I think that the history of this case, as written in that report, speaks more eloquently and appeals more potently in behalf of this old woman to the members of this committee than any language that I could use. I submit the case, therefore, to the committee for its consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment recommended by the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-two," so that the bill will read "$72 per month."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MRS. EVA DAVIS COGSWELL.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding to the next bill on the Calendar, there is another bill very similar to the one which we have just passed, which should be on the Calendar about at this point, but has been omitted by some error. It has been reported by the committee. I refer to the bill to pension the widow of General Cogswell, late a member of this House; and I ask unanimous consent now that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POOLE] may present that bill, it being very similar, as I have stated, to the one just passed. It should be properly upon the Calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Chairman, before that is done I ask unanimous consent that the next bill to the one just passed, Calendar No. 23, be passed over without prejudice and retain its place on the Calendar. This bill was introduced by myself. It is a bill to pension Martha Brooks. I ask that it retain its place on the Calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Chairman, I now call up the bill to which the gentleman from South Dakota referred, the bill to pension Mrs. Cogswell. I move the passage of Senate bill No. 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair, upon consideration, is inclined to doubt whether it is competent for the committee, under the order by which it meets to-night, to take up and pass that bill. It has not been referred, as the Chair understands, to the Calendar. It has not been reported by the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PICKLER. The gentleman from New York can explain that. It has been reported, however.

Mr. POOLE. This bill has been reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, but by a mistake of the Clerk it was not printed in the regular order on the Calendar. It was passed some days ago by the committee, and should have been on the Calendar, occupying a place even above the place where it would appear under this order.

The CHAIRMAN. This bill has been reported?

Mr. POOLE. It has been reported favorably by the committee, and should be on the Calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a different situation. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the general pension laws, the name of Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell, at the rate of $75 per month.

The report (by Mr. POOLE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell, having carefully considered the same, adopt the accompanying Senate report (No. 5) as their own and respectfully recommend the passage of the bill.

[Senate Report No. 67, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Eva Davis Cogswell, have examined the same, and report and refer to the following military record:

It is shown by the official records that William Cogswell was mustered into service as captain of Company C, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, May 25, 1861, to serve three years; was detailed as acting major of the regiment September 25, 1862; was mustered in as lieutenant-colonel February 28, 1863, to date October 23, 1862; as colonel, same regiment, July 11, 1863, to date June 25, 1863. Under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 3, 1884, and the acts amendatory thereof, he has been recognized by this Department as commissioned to the grade of colonel, Second Massachusetts Volunteers, to take effect from June 6, 1863. He was appointed brevet brigadier-general of volunteers to rank from December 12, 1864, and commissioned as such January 12, 1865.

By direction of the President he was assigned to duty as brevet brigadier-general of volunteers January 12, 1865, whereupon he was designated to command the Third Brigade, Third Division, Twentieth Army Corps, January 16, 1865. He assumed command of that brigade on the same day, and continued with the same until June 13, 1865, when the Twentieth Army Corps was discontinued. He was mustered out and honorably discharged the service as colonel, Second Regiment Massachusetts Infantry, and brevet brigadier-general of volunteers, July 24, 1865. During the period of his service this officer was almost continuously on active duty in the field with his successive commands.

On May 3, 1863, in the Chancellorsville campaign near United Ford, Va., while lieutenant-colonel of the Second Massachusetts Infantry, he received a severe wound of the left arm, on account of which he was furloughed for thirty days on May 9, 1863.

Your committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill with an amendment. Amend by striking out the words "one hundred" in line 7 and inserting in lieu thereof the words "seventy-five."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment recommended by the committee.

Mr. PICKLER. This is the Senate bill, and it provides for the payment of $75 a month. We desired to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill, and, as I understand it, this report is made on the Senate bill. So the question is on the bill itself as passed by the Senate at $75 a month. There is no amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the Senate bill?

Mr. POOLE. We have adopted the Senate report in our report.

Mr. PICKLER. There is no amendment to the Senate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The question is, Shall this bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation? Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUSAN D. WRIGHT.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 952) granting a pension to Susan D. Wright.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Susan D. Wright, former widow of James W. Wells, late a private in Company I, Tenth New York Volunteer Cavalry.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions reported the following amendment:

In lines 4 and 5 strike out the words "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws" and insert in lieu thereof the words "at the rate of $12 per month."

The report (by Mr. POOLE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 952) granting a pension to Susan D. Wright, have duly considered the same, and report as follows:

It appears from the evidence submitted to the committee that Susan D. Wright, prior to her marriage to one Artemus Wright, was the widow of James W. Wells, of Company I, of the Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, who died April 27, 1864. As such widow she was placed upon the pension roll of the United States and was in receipt of a pension, under certificate No. 44793, from the date of her first husband's death to the 4th day of March, 1872.

On the 9th day of March, 1872, said Susan D. Wright (then Wells) was remarried to Artemus Wright and has since drawn no pension, and her name has been dropped from the pension roll of the United States.

On the 25th day of May, 1894, said Artemus Wright died at Middlebury, in State of Connecticut, and said Susan D. Wright again became and now is the a widow.

Said Susan D. Wright is in indigent circumstances and in poor health, having no means of support except her daily labor. She is now 61 years of age, and by reason of age and feeble health is unable to do hard work.

Having carefully considered the bill, and in view of the foregoing facts, your committee recommend that the words "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws," in lines 5 and 6, be stricken out, and the words "at the rate of $12 per month" be inserted in lieu thereof, and that as so amended the bill do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment recommended by the committee.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. If I understand this case correctly, this lady became the widow of the soldier, remarried, and is again a widow. I should like to inquire if that is the fact?

Mr. PICKLER. That is as I understand it.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I think we have gone quite far enough when we have pensioned soldiers' widows who have not remarried, especially if the marriage to the soldier took place long after his service. I am thoroughly of the opinion that no woman who marries a soldier at this time, thirty years after the soldier's service in the Army, should ever be pensioned. If she takes the man as a husband because she loves him, she does not take him because of his service solely, and there is no reason in my mind why, after this long period has elapsed, she should receive a pension at all. This case goes even beyond that. After this woman became the widow of the soldier, and was entitled to a pension under the statutes of the United States, she saw fit voluntarily to relinquish that pension and to remarry. I am opposed to the granting of pensions under those circumstances, and I do not believe there is a proper justification for them. For one I stand here to oppose such pensions, and shall continue to oppose them whenever they are presented, unless some better reason can be given for their enactment than I believe can possibly be given. I think this woman should stand by her own election, and that this rule should go out before the country as one upon which all must stand. I am opposed to the passage of the bill.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BAKER] is mistaken in his premises. I understand him to say that this woman did not marry the soldier until a number of years after the war.

Mr. BAKER of New Hamsphire. Will the gentleman permit me? The gentleman has misunderstood me. I laid that down as a principle, but not as one applicable in this case. I said that this woman was the widow of the soldier, and as such became entitled to a pension, but subsequently by her own option relinquished her right to that pension by remarriage, and that now, as I understand, it is the object of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to pension her after she had voluntarily abandoned all right to a pension under the statutes of the United States.

Mr. POOLE. I misunderstood the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. POOLE. I have not yielded the floor. She married this soldier before the war. She was his wife until he died, during the war. He was killed in battle April 27, 1864, and she received a pension as his widow.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. That is right.

Mr. POOLE. To that extent we both agree. The point upon which we disagree is this: She did voluntarily give up this pension and marry another man. By so doing she relieved the Government of the payment of the $8 a month that she was receiving, and would have continued to be entitled to receive but for her re-marriage. For the length of time that she was remarried the Government was relieved from the payment of that pension. Her second husband died and she is destitute to-day, an old woman, and she again appeals to us to place her upon the pension roll. I think it is right that under such circumstances, where a woman has voluntarily saved the payment of $8 a month during the time of her remarriage, then, after she has again become a widow, she should again be placed upon the pension roll. I think we ought to place all widows of that class upon the rolls again. I hope this bill will pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to answer the gentleman from New Hampshire on the general proposition, and say if there is one class of women or class of widows who ought to be pensioned it is this class. Now, here is a woman who was a widow of a soldier killed in battle. She is his widow to-day. You can not blot that out. I do not mean in a legal sense. But she is the same woman who sent this young man into the war, and he was lost there, as he lost his life. Now, suppose she has remarried; she has saved this Government $1,820. And I wish the Committee on Invalid Pensions would bring in a general bill and make it the law if a woman remarries, that during the continuance of that marriage her pension shall be suspended, but on the death of the second or third husband, if she has one, she shall be again placed on the pension rolls unless the second or third husband shall have left her a competency on which to live. There is no reason or justice in depriving this woman of a pension.

In the case of a woman who lost her husband in the service of his country and was placed upon the pension rolls because he lost his life, I would keep her there as long as she lived, even if she married a dozen men. [Laughter and applause.] What reason or justice is there in this country taking the pension from the widow of a soldier who died in actual battle if she does see proper in after years to take another partner that she may have a companion during the remaining days of her life? That is her pension, and I say she should not be deprived of her pension on that account. I do hope that the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions will bring in a bill providing that these women who remarry shall not lose their pensions, because there are a great many who are getting well advanced in years, but there are still some who are 65 or 70 who do marry other men.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I presume the reason why a pension has ever been granted to a widow is because in the death of the husband she has lost the natural protector of her life and the one to whom she could naturally look for support. When a woman remarries she regains all that.

Mr. MAHON. Not always.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. And if she does not regain it, that is her misfortune; and she is no more liable to make a mistake in her maturer years than in her younger years.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Certainly.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I understand you are a bachelor, and therefore it is supposed that you do not sympathize with those who have married.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I plead guilty to one part of the impeachment and not to the other. [Laughter.] I am a bachelor; but I believe that when a woman marries and has a good husband that she ought to be content with that without a pension.

But now, coming back to the case, here is an instance: The woman marries; she becomes a widow, and under the circumstances of her becoming a widow she is entitled under the laws of the United States to a pension. She voluntarily relinquishes that pension for the privilege of marrying again. She has chosen her own option; she has taken it deliberately; and having made the selection, she should be bound by it.

Again, even if that were not so, it would be inappropriate to grant this pension in the way proposed by the committee, because it is not a solitary instance; it is not a lone case. There are unquestionably 50,000 cases just like it, and there is no reason why the time of this House should be taken up here this evening, or any other evening, in considering questions where there is only one of a great class like the present one. If this thing is done it should be done deliberately, by a general act, and under a law which should be made applicable to all. I am opposed to this one to-night, as I should oppose the general enactment, and certainly it is not appropriate that this case should pass. There are those around me who have already stated that they have twenty-five bills that they want to put in if this becomes law, and this Committee on Invalid Pensions will be swamped by these bills, to the utter exclusion of those of greater merit. I therefore oppose the passage of the bill.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to detain the committee a moment. If my memory serves me right, and I am quite sure it does, the Committee on Invalid Pensions in the last House reported a general bill for this particular purpose. If we were to agree with the argument of the gentleman from New Hampshire, we would do away with all these bills. His argument is simply because we have no general law that we should not pass a single bill. Now, is that any reason why we should not do justice to single individuals until a general bill is passed? And, Mr. Chairman, it is beyond comprehension that any gentleman can lead himself up to reason that a widow having married a second husband and he dies, she should be cut off from her pension when she again becomes a widow.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Having been the widow of

the soldier during the service, having given him to the service, and made the sacrifice necessary when he went into the Army.

Mr. PICKLER. If you are in favor of that why are you not in favor of the soldier, when he remarries, losing his pension?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I will tell the gentleman why if he will permit me.

Mr. PICKLER. I can not yield now. The laws of all civilized countries encourage marriage. It begets homes. It is a moral proceeding. It builds up communities. It is believed to redound to the happiness of the people and to their morality and prosperity. Now, why should a woman, if her soldier husband goes down to the grave, and she has twenty-five or thirty years before her and some good man proposes to marry her and care for her and give her a good home in her declining years—why should she lose, on that account, the advantage of the pension in case her second husband dies? The pension is suspended during the second marriage, but why should she not have it again when the husband dies? To say that she should not is simply to discourage marriage. It is simply saying to the widows of soldiers: "You shall not have a comfortable home, even if some good man offers to provide it for you." Moreover, the economical aspect of this question, stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, ought to be considered. While the widow is married the Government is paying her no pension, and I merely wish to add that if gentlemen would consider the age of these old veterans, their diseases, their rheumatism, their pains and aches, and their general disabilities, I think they would be convinced that any woman who lives with one of them now for even a year is entitled to a pension for all the rest of her life. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Chairman, I am exceedingly sorry that any pension case coming before this House should, under any circumstances, meet with my disapprobation. I am one of those who believe, as I stated on this floor the other day, that the debt of gratitude, and not only of gratitude, but the actual business debt, if you choose to call it so, which this Government owes to the soldier, is one that is incalculable, and no man will charge me with being in any way unfavorable to the idea of pensions, without regard to the amount, within the scope of our ability to pay.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is an element in the pension laws that I think it is our duty to remember and try to be consistent with. We all know that the Pension Bureau, from some source of power that I stated the other day I did not believe originated in the Bureau itself, has established the principle that pensions is a gratuity, that it is a gift, that the man, the woman, or the child who obtains a pension obtains it because we, as the representatives of the people, feel that we owe them some little favor, or that in the goodness of our hearts and in our patriotism we wish to give them something. I for one, with the Republican members generally, and, I believe, with many of our Democratic friends, have stated that that is not the proper basis of the pension system, that a pension is a right, not a gratuity.

Mr. MILES. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILES. Does not the idea that it is a gift from the Government ennoble the pension rather than degrade it?

Mr. BRUMM. No, sir.

Mr. MILES. I beg leave to differ with the gentleman.

Mr. BRUMM. Well, you are entitled to your opinion; but my opinion is that a pension is a debt, that the obligation of the Government to grant it is a matter of right, and that the function of the legislative power in the matter is merely to say what the amount shall be and to provide for the system under which the soldier may demand and receive his pension as a right. Now, if the pension is a right, it is a right that is due to the woman, whether she be mother, widow, or daughter of the soldier; not because she is a mother; not because she is a widow; not because she is a daughter, but because her son or her husband or her father did service for the country. In other words, it is because of her relationship to the soldier that we grant her a pension. It is not because the woman happens to be old or poor, but simply because of her relationship to the dead soldier.

Now, if, having been married to a soldier, the woman breaks that relation herself, whether the soldier dies or not, if she chooses to change her relationship to him, which is the condition precedent, which is the very foundation upon which the granting of a pension to her is based, why should she not forfeit that pension? I repeat, her title to a pension is based, not upon the fact that she is old, not upon the fact that she is poor, but upon the fact of her relationship to the soldier. The argument was made here the other day that the woman who was married to a soldier and who has become a widow ought to have a pension, and that the question of poverty should not be raised at all, and we on this side maintained that that was the proper doctrine.

The question of poverty is a mere incident which may exist in any given case, but it is not the basis upon which the pension should be granted. Proverty being an incident in some cases, it may tend to regulate the amount of the pension, but that is all. The essence of the matter is, the principle upon which the widow is entitled to a pension is, that she is the widow of a soldier, and the moment she relinquishes that position her right to the pension dies. It dies upon the very principle that we have argued and maintained on our side of the House ever since I have been in Congress, the principle that the woman's relationship to the soldier is what entitles her to a pension, that her right to a pension rests wholly upon the service of her husband.

A soldier enters the service, leaving a wife at home; he dies in the service, and thereupon his widow becomes entitled to a pension. She has a right to say, "My husband is dead, and by virtue of my relationship to him I have a right to demand a certain amount of pension which is my due." Now, that woman determines to marry again, and when she does, her right to the pension dies. She relinquishes it of her own free will. She has changed her relationship to the dead soldier. No one has changed it for her; she has changed it herself. It is a voluntary act on her part, and having changed that relationship, when she comes and asks for a renewal of the pension we ought to be consistent and say to her: "No matter how poor you may be, no matter how old you may be, you are not entitled to a pension, because we do not give these pensions as gratuities; we give them upon the principle that the applicant is the widow or other surviving dependent relative of the dead soldier."

Mr. MAHON. I will ask my colleague whether all pensions to widows are not based on this principle: That while the Government can not restore what it has taken away, the life of the husband, it will, as far as possible, repair the injury that has been done to the widow by allowing her a certain amount of money in the form of pension. Is not that the principle upon which widows' pensions are based?

Mr. BRUMM. Oh, no.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRUMM. No. There is no such thing as compensating in dollars and cents for the blood of the soldiers of the Union. [Applause.] It can not be done.

Mr. MAHON. I speak of the widows.

Mr. BRUMM. Even as to the widows, you can not compensate them in dollars and cents. There is a principle involved that goes beyond dollars and cents, and I stand here in favor of the widows and the orphans and the mothers of our soldiers to assert that principle, because I am in favor of it.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. BRUMM. Certainly.

Mr. PICKLER. Does the gentleman contend, when the widow of the soldier marries a second time, that she reveres any the less the memory of her dead husband? Has she less respect for his memory because she marries again?

Mr. BRUMM. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I would be sorry to be the keeper of the consciences and the affections of all the widows in this country. I would not undertake anything of that kind. The question of the gentleman has no relevancy to the discussion of this question.

Mr. PICKLER. Well, the gentleman can answer yes or no.

Mr. BRUMM. The presumption is that when a widow marries another man it is because she loves him and that she loves none other, and I am not going to answer any further the question than this, for it is not necessary. The soldier's widow has just as good a right to marry as any other widow, and I could only wish that every soldier's widow throughout this broad land could marry and be taken care of by her husband very much better than the Government takes care of them under our present pension system.

But this question of remarriage is a matter of election with her. She marries and takes her chance. If she changes the relationship which she holds toward the Government, she loses her right to demand a pension. That is my view of the case, and gentlemen in dealing with this question should be consistent. You can not say in the one instance this matter of pension is a right, and that they should demand it, and then when that relationship which the party holds toward the Government is changed come in and declare, as gentlemen do on this side of the House occasionally, that the pension is a mere matter of charity. Let it be the one or the other. If it is a matter of right, then that right terminates when she changes her relationship.

But there is another thought to which I shall briefly allude. There is an effort being made all over the country, north as well as south of us—why, we have some in the North not very far from us, Republicans as well as Democrats—few of them, comparatively, perhaps—who are finding fault with the immense amount of money that is being paid out to the soldiers in the way of pensions. They are poisoning the minds of the people because of the amount—the number of dollars and cents involved. This sentiment, Mr. Chairman, is being nursed and fostered among a certain class of people, and it is becoming somewhat dangerous in certain locali-

ties, against the pension laws and the pensions to be granted to worthy soldiers as well as to the worthy widows, mothers, and daughters of soldiers.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a motion to rise, and let this bill remain until the next evening? We must rise in a few moments, in order to succeed in passing the bills which have been acted upon by the committee.

Mr. BRUMM. I will close with a few words. I will occupy but a very brief time of the committee. It will save time for me to continue now and conclude what I desire to say upon this subject.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope the gentleman will yield to the motion and let this matter go over, as there is a question I would like to ask him before the debate closes. Let it go over until next week.

Mr. BRUMM. I do not care to occupy further time upon this particular question, and prefer to conclude now.

There is such a thing, Mr. Chairman, as riding a pension and a good thing to death; and if we want to do the right and proper thing for the soldiers of this country, and for their orphans and widows, we must be sure to be consistent as we proceed, and the American people, with argument properly in our favor, will stand with us, and the question of dollars and cents will be but a small item in their estimation.

That is all I desired to say upon this question.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bills to the House with the recommendations of the Committee of the Whole.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. PAYNE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HEPBURN reported that the Committee of the Whole House, having had under consideration the pension bills on the Private Calendar, had directed him to report sundry bills to the House with various recommendations; and also that the committee had had under consideration House bill No. 952, and had come to no resolution thereon.

BILLS PASSED.

The following bills, reported from the Committee of the Whole, were severally considered, the House bills ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and the Senate bills ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed:

A bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood;

A bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene;

A bill (H. R. 925) to pension Annie J. Corbett;

A bill (H. R. 1605) granting a pension to Anna Kelley;

A bill (H. R. 147) granting a pension to George W. Case, late private Company B, Twenty-seventh New York Cavalry;

A bill (H. R. 711) to increase the pension of Uzziel B. Church; and

A bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell.

The following bills, reported from the Committee of the Whole with amendments, were severally considered, the amendments agreed to, the House bills ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and the Senate bills ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed:

A bill (H. R. 1020) granting an increase of pension to Gilman Williams;

A bill (H. R. 994) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Keith;

A bill (H. R. 1141) granting a pension to Miss Mary E. Hull, dependent sister of John A. Hull, deceased, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the late war of the rebellion;

A bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to Caroline Parker;

A bill (H. R. 1616) granting a pension to Michael E. Bricker, of Edgerton, Ind.; and

A bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane Dulany.

On motion of Mr. PICKLER, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the several bills were passed was laid on the table.

And then, on motion of Mr. PICKLER (at 10 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Monday, January 27, 1896, at 12 o'clock m.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate bills were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A bill (S. 227) to permit the withdrawal of certain papers and the signing of certain receipts by John Flinn or his attorney—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1344) providing for the selection of the lands within Fort Pembina Military Reservation, N. Dak., by the State of North Dakota—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1271) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore English—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 249) granting a pension to Charles E. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 54) for the relief of Ezra S. Havens—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 56) for the relief of John M. Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 57) for the relief of Napoleon B. Giddings—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 58) for the relief of John S. Neet, jr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 59) for the relief of Joseph W. Carmack—to the Committee of War Claims.

A bill (S. 61) for the relief of Frederick Gramm—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 60) for the relief of George A. Orr—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 564) providing for the establishment and enforcement of rules and regulations for the use and navigation of the United States canals and similar works of navigation, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

A bill (S. 564) providing for the collection of fees for furnishing certificates of title to vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

A bill (S. 153) authorizing the persons herein named to accept certain decorations and testimonials from the late Hawaiian Government—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 661) to amend section 2880 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, fixing time for vessels to unlade—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A bill (S. 69) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle the claims of the legal representatives of S. W. Marston, late United States Indian agent at Union Agency, Ind. T., for services and expenses—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 130) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.—to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 259) granting to the Columbia and Red Mountain Railway Company a right of way through the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 147) granting a pension to Elvira Bachelder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 136) granting an increase of pension to Horace Townsend—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 137) granting an increase of pension to William W. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 140) granting a pension to Mary A. Wise—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 836) for the relief of William J. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 944) granting a pension to Robert Gamble—to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to Florence W. Buskirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 149) granting a pension to Helen M. Jacob—to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 730) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Helen Morrell Carroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 1051) granting a pension to Elizabeth New, widow of Jethrow New—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 710) granting a pension to Ada J. Schwatka, widow of the late Frederick Schwatka—to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 145) granting an increase of pension to Maude Ardelle Bliss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 746) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Donahue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 1311) granting an increase of pension to Dudley F. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 585) granting an increase of pension to Martha R. Hitchcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 341) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon B. Breedlove—to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 148) granting a pension to Catharine Dillon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 640) to increase the pension of Joseph W. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 1037) for the relief of John Clyde Sullivan—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Joint resolution (S. R. 15) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the Mountain View Cemetery Association, at Oakland, Cal., certain cannon, etc.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 466) granting a pension to William Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 507) to pension Mollie Crandall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 1303) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Holly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 748) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Dent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 1203) granting an increase of pension to Mary Doubleday, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Abner Doubleday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 1176) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Oregon and Washington Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Columbia River between the State of Oregon and the State of Washington, and to establish it as a post road"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A bill (S. 214) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, from some suitable point between the north line of St. Clair County, Ill., and the southwest line of said county—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A bill (S. 636) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Chamberlain, in Brule County and Lyman County, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A bill (S. 25) authorizing the Dyersburg and Mississippi River Railway and Improvement Company to bridge the Obion River in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A bill (S. 90) for the relief of William P. Buckmaster—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 32) for the relief of the legal representatives of John C. Howe, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 271) for the relief of Newberry College, Newberry, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1450) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

A bill (S. 1423) to protect the wages of seamen—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

A bill (S. 248) granting a pension to Martha Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Joint resolution (S. R. 47) relating to the Federal census—to the Committee on Labor.

A bill (S. 82) for the relief of the heirs of James Bridger, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 535) for the relief of William A. Starkweather, of Oregon—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 529) for the relief of Peter Grant Stewart, of Oregon—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 709) for the relief of W. L. Adams, of Oregon—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1046) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas City, Pittsburg and Gulf Railroad Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1893—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker, as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of an officer of engineers, with a report of an expert commission, on certain matters relating to the Washington Aqueduct and the water supply of the city of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General of the United States, responding to the House resolution of December 12, 1895, relative to expense and emolument accounts rendered by United States court officials—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of resurvey of Merrimac River, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FISCHER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1265) to authorize the proper accounting officers of the Treasury Department to examine and audit, according to equity, the claim of Grubb & Robinson, a firm consisting of Alfred B. Grubb and William H. Robinson, and of Alfred B. Grubb, for building material sold and delivered to members of the Prairie band of Pottawatomie Indians in Kansas, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 113); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2917) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay, from their own funds, for certain legal services rendered the "Old Settlers" or Western Cherokee Indians, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 114); which said bill, amendment, and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ODELL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 650) to incorporate the Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 115); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EDDY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3009) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 116); which said bill, amendment, and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ODELL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2656) to provide for the incorporation and regulation of medical colleges in the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 117); which said bill, amendment, and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EDDY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1442) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 119); which said bill, amendment, and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. TARSNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 3139) for the relief of M. R. William Grebe. (Report No. 112.)

By Mr. WOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1185) granting a pension to Rachel Patton. (Report No. 121.)

By Mr. CROWTHER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2326) granting a pension to Thomas Holaday. (Report No. 118.)

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2224) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Shilling. (Report No. 123.)

By Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2797) granting a pension to Peter B. Palmenteer. (Report No. 122.)

By Mr. MILES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 3432) for the relief of John E. Evans. (Report No. 125.)

By Mr. POOLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4220) granting a pension to Charles A. Foster, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army. (Report No. 124.)

By Mr. POOLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell. (Report No. 127.)

By Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 141) granting a pension to Julia A. Hill. (Report No. 128.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ATWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4690) for the erection of an appraiser's warehouse in the city of Boston, Mass., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania (by request): A bill (H. R. 4691) to regulate and advance the salaries of the watch force in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4692) providing for the transfer of a certain class of pensioners from one set of rolls to another set of rolls in the Pension Department—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 4693) to amend an act establishing Atlanta, Ga., a port of delivery, approved February 28, 1881—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 4694) to amend section 1 of the act of March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. OWENS: A bill (H. R. 4695) for the erection of a public building at Paris, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. QUIGG: A bill (H. R. 4696) to amend section 4504 of the Revised Statutes, relative to the duties of shipping commissioners—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 4697) to relieve James M. Busby and others—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOW: A bill (H. R. 4698) to provide an American register for the steamer *Matteawan*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4699) making an appropriation for the improvement of Congaree River, South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CULBERSON: A bill (H. R. 4700) to limit the jurisdiction of the district and circuit courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRAIT (by request): A bill (H. R. 4701) to develop fourteen water transportation routes to the seaboard, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4702) to enact a general bridge law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4703) providing for a life-saving station at the entrance to Rogue River, in Oregon, and for life-saving crew—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa (by request): A bill (H. R. 4704) providing for advertising in the District of Columbia by contract—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4705) making an appropriation for the construction of an electrical cruiser and to provide electrical equipment for one or more cruisers already in service—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 4706) to grant land to the State of Alabama for the use of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOCKERY: A bill (H. R. 4707) for the relief and protection of American seamen—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KYLE: A bill (H. R. 4708) to make an equitable adjustment of the grants of land to the several States of the Union for seminaries of learning or universities—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 4709) for revenue, to favor a more equitable distribution of wealth by discouraging vast accumulations in a few hands, and as a recompense for its fostering protection which has made the accumulation of vast private fortunes possible—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4710) to amend the pension laws by increasing the pensions of certain soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARRETT: A bill (H. R. 4773) to amend sections 2527 and 2529 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 4774) for optional and compulsory retirement of Government employees of the Executive Departments in the classification service, and for the creation of a fund for the protection of such employees—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H. R. 4775) to remove navy-yard and estimate cost of reclaiming Eastern Branch flats—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Utah: A joint resolution (H. Res. 96) providing for the disposition of certain property now in the hands of the receiver of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWE: A joint resolution (H. Res. 97) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage and divorce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A resolution (House Res. No. 131) providing that the laborer, Thomas H. Adams, shall be reinstated as an employee in the west cloakroom of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HERMANN: A resolution (House Res. No. 132) of inquiry relating to the appointment of certain officers in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McRAE: A memorial of the Arkansas general assembly, asking for the permanent improvement of the Ouachita River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 4711) for the relief of Jacob Mann, of Baltimore City, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 4712) granting a pension to Margaret A. Luthy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4713) removing the charge of desertion standing against Edgar B. Willoughby, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4714) granting an increase of pension to Norman C. Webster, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4715) granting a pension to D. W. Marshall, of Eldorado, Kans.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DANFORD: A bill (H. R. 4716) for the relief of Benjamin F. Cooper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4717) for the relief of Whitner Symmes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 4718) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of William Thixton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request) a bill (H. R. 4719) for the relief of S. H. Lyne & Co., late of Lynchburg, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4720) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Whetsel, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4721) granting an increase of pension to Orleina J. Clark, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 4722) to correct an act entitled "An act to pension George Hunter"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 4723) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kiger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 4724) to increase the pension of Mrs. Mary L. Aleshire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 4725) for the relief of Joseph Stevenson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 4726) for the relief of Richard A. Winscott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 4727) granting a pension to Jared S. Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4728) granting a pension to Nellie L. Groshon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 4729) for the relief of Benjaman Weille—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4730) for the relief of John W. Peek—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 4731) for the relief of C. M. Carter—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4732) granting a pension to Sarah J. Stewart, of Brookville, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4733) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Enoch W. Smith, of Leechburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4734) removing charges of desertion from the military record of Theodore H. Weaver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4735) granting a pension to Mary J. Adair, of Indiana, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4736) for the relief of James E. Cann, paymaster in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4737) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Conner, of Apollo, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4738) to increase the pension of Frank Donahugh to $50—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4739) to increase the pension of Col. George C. Anderson, of Latrobe, Pa., to $72—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4740) to correct the military record of George W. Warren, of Smicksburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWE: A bill (H. R. 4741) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Frederick Castine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4742) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of James Murphy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 4743) to increase the pension of Woods W. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4744) to increase the pension of Adam Dennis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULING: A bill (H. R. 4745) to carry out the findings

of the Court of Claims in the case of Charles L. Pyles—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 4746) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Wilber F. Barr—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KULP: A bill (H. R. 4747) granting a pension to Marian J. Kline—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEONARD: A bill (H. R. 4748) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to revoke the order dismissing Second Lieut. Edwin F. Nixon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4749) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of George W. Davis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4750) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Sterling M. Davis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 4751) granting a pension to Lydia M. Cutshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4752) for the relief of Daniel M. Frost—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 4753) granting an increase of pension to Lambert L. Mulford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 4754) for the relief of Dollie E. Vedder—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 4755) for the relief of Elizabeth J. Cook, of Arkadelphia, Clark County, Ark., widow of Robert T. Cook—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. QUIGG: A bill (H. R. 4756) granting a pension to Catherine R. Jardine, widow of Brig. Gen. Edward Jardine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 4757) removing the charge of desertion from the record of James Larkin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STAHLE: A bill (H. R. 4758) to correct the military record of William R. Cox, Fourteenth Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 4759) granting a pension to Eli Overhultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRODE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4760) granting a pension to Henry Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRELOAR: A bill (H. R. 4761) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George H. Smallwood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4762) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4763) for the relief of W. H. Ferguson, administrator of Thomas H. Milsaps—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4764) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Latham, of Brooksville, Blount County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WATSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4765) to increase the pension of Capt. D. W. Hamelton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 4766) to refer claim of Thomas M. Hobbs to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 4767) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Phœnix, Yazoo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4768) for the relief of the estate of Leroy B. Wilkins, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4769) for the relief of Edward P. M. Robinson, of Fairfield County, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 4770) for the relief of John S. Appleton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 4771) for the relief of John H. Neidigh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 4772) for the relief of the estates of John Flower and Thomas B. Flower, etc.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOZLEY: A bill (H. R. 4776) for the relief of Mary E. Layton, administratrix of John M. Layton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4777) for the relief of William McDaniel—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring appropriations for coast defenses—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, protest of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange against the passage of House bills Nos. 1227 to 1233, inclusive—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the abolition of compulsory pilotage on coastwise vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the licensing of masters and chief mates of sail vessels over 700 tons, as provided in Senate bill No. 180—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania: Petition of John M. Baker and others, of Chester Hill, Pa., favoring the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of F. Potts Green and 68 other citizens of Bellefonte, Pa., praying for according belligerent rights to Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of L. R. Mortimer and others, of Lawsonham, Pa., for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BREWSTER: Memorial relating to a pension to Mary Cray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: Petition of M. G. Roberts, W. T. Plumb, and 17 other citizens of Chattanooga, Tenn., favoring the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of the estate of John C. Gillespie, deceased, late of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BULL: Resolutions of citizens of Pawtucket, R. I., in favor of the recognition of Cuban insurgents—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, in reference to the recognition of the belligerent rights of Cuban patriots—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: Petition of voters of Welton, Clinton County, Iowa, against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Muscatine (Iowa) Commercial Club, praying for liberal appropriation for the improvement of the Mississippi River and the speedy completion of the Hennepin Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Company A, Fourth Regiment of the Iowa National Guard, indorsing House bill No. 2294—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. DANFORD: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Benjamin F. Cooper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Three petitions, as follows: From members of Company C, Fourth Regiment Iowa National Guard, Webster City, Iowa; Company G, Fourth Regiment Iowa National Guard, Fort Dodge, Iowa, and Company I, Fourth Regiment Iowa National Guard, Boone, Iowa, indorsing House bill No. 2294, for the organizing and disciplining of the militia of the several States—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Petition of the mayor and citizens of Darlington, S. C., for the improvement of Winyah Bay, South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of Orlenia J. Clark, of Louisville, Ky., for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Meta Coleman and others, asking an increase of the pension of Mrs. Orlenia J. Clark, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of Urban A. Woodbury, of Burlington, Vt., and 8 others, to amend an act entitled "An act to amend chapter 67, volume 23, of the Statutes at Large of the United States"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARMER: Petition from citizens of Germantown, Twenty-second Ward of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of an act designed to secure a better grade of immigrants to this country—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Charles A. Bell, for the removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Memorial of Washington Council, No. 1, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Butte, Mont., favoring the Monroe doctrine—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: Petition of H. G. Snyder, Levi Wolf, J. M. Miller, and 38 other citizens of Rockwood, Pa., for restricted immigration and enactment of the law known as the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Memorial and resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held in Anniston, Ala., January 10, 1896, sympathizing with the Cuban patriots, and asking that they be accorded belligerent rights—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the National Live Stock Exchange of Chicago, Ill., praying that Congress will enact such legislation as may be deemed expedient looking to a reciprocal exchange of productions, and thereby affording an opportunity of sending the live-stock and meat-food products of the United States to the markets of the world, unhampered by any unnecessary and uncalled-for restrictions—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOOKER: Five petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of East Randolph, Franklinville, and Silver Creek, N. Y., praying for the prohibition of the sale of beer at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of 37 voters of Little Genesee, Allegany County, N. Y., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Chautauqua County Pomona Grange, against the manufacture and sale of filled cheese—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KULP: Petition in support of joint resolution (H. Res. 90), to revive the grade of Lieutenant-General in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of George P. Emerick and others, of Shamokin, Pa., praying for the passage of an act to secure a better grade of immigration, known as the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAYTON: Petition of S. B. Ellsworth, of Logansville, Ohio, favoring an amendment to section 4 of the act of March 2, 1889—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of United States Maimed Soldiers' League of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring House bill No. 851, for increase of pensions of certain maimed soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of E. E. Perry, secretary of the Winter Wheat Millers' League, Indianapolis, Ind., asking for the passage of House bill No. 3212—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEONARD: Petition of voters of Shinglehouse, Potter County, Pa., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LINTON: Resolution of the board of directors of the Saginaw Board of Trade, asking that certain Michigan docks be perfected—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Cephas A. Christian, of Newton County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: Petition of the Equal Rights Association of Kentucky, in favor of woman suffrage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McRAE: Resolution of the Western waterways convention, recommending the permanent improvement of the Ouachita River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of voters of North Loup, Valley County, Nebr., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin: Petition of 365 resident electors of Waupaca, Portage, and Wood counties, Wis., asking for the improvement of Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NEILL: Petition of citizens of Lonoke County, Ark., for passage of a bill for the relief of the publishing house of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of B. F. Rogers, E. W. Childs, and 22 others, against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of members of Mathew Gray Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, in behalf of service-pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POOLE: Petition of the Hansman Pipe Factory and citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., relating to tariff on clay smoking pipes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of voters of Brookfield, N. Y., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. QUIGG: Petition of American Authors' Guild, asking that authors' manuscripts be allowed to pass through the mails as merchandise—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Atlantic Coast Seamen's Union, praying that laws heretofore passed for the amelioration of the condition of American seamen be not repealed—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROYSE: Petition of John C. Miles, A. B. Personett, and 26 other veterans of the late war, asking that a pension of $8 a month be granted to those who served not less than ninety days in the Army or Navy and were honorably discharged—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Resolutions of New London (Conn.) Board of Trade, favoring a harbor of refuge at Block Island, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHANNON: Petition and papers of Edith A. A. Merriam, relating to letters patent No. 234417—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of voters of the town of Verona, Oneida County, N. Y., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAHLE: Petition of citizens of New Cumberland, Pa., in favor of pension for Jacob Witmer, of Company E, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, to accompany House bill No. 3319—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Integrity Council, No. 197, Order United American Mechanics, of Mechanicsburg, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill No. 884, in relation to the improper use of the American flag—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of A. J. Stakebrake, W. S. Diggs, and 60 others, to increase the pension of William Grose, colonel Thirty-sixth Indiana Infantry, brigadier and brevet major general of volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Three petitions, respectively, of P. Chandler and 74 others, of Fifield; D. F. Tyler and 91 others, of Glidden; E. B. Gordon and 76 others, of Morse and other localities in the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to further improve the harbor at Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SORG: Petition of J. A. Patterson, C. T. Chambers, and 96 others, of Middletown, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the Toledo Produce Exchange, favoring the issue of long-term bonds in sums of $50 and less at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 per cent, to be offered to the people of this country and no other—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCER: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Leon Strauss, of Caddo Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNE: Petition of G. M. Holland, M. L. Toole, and 68 other citizens of Minnesota, for the enactment of House bill No. 3821—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of James J. Wylie, of Humphreys County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Solomon De Brow, of Davidson County, Tenn., asking reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: Papers to accompany House bills for the relief of the following-named parties of Madison County, Ala.: Senia McClelland, Edward Moore, William Jones, and Corland M. Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Mary Abernathy, of Lawrence County, Ala., praying that the war claim of R. B. Abernathy, deceased, late of Giles County, Tenn., be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of John S. Cochennour, for increase of pension, to accompany House bill No. 3189—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial and resolutions of public meeting of citizens of the city of Olney, Ill., praying action by the United States in regard to Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *January 24, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Auditor for the State and other Departments, of the 23d instant, submitting additional items of deficiencies in appropriations for expenses of United States courts, and recommending that the same be included in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 30, 1895, the correspondence and other papers in his possession relating to the First National Bank of Orlando, Fla., and the receiver last appointed, and the transactions connected with the bank under his administration, together with a report of the Comptroller of the Currency; which, on motion of Mr. CALL, was referred to the Select Committee on National Banks, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 13th instant, calling for information as to what amount is necessary to be appropriated for payment of the cost of sites for the purpose of erecting fortifications and coast defenses, a report of W. P. Craig-

hill, brigadier-general, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on the subject; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, in response to a resolution of December 3, 1895, calling for the number of suits against the United States filed in the Court of Claims and not adjudicated at the commencement of the present term thereof, with certain specified details, stating that the suits against the Government in that court are separated into two distinct classes, the first class including all except suits for Indian depredations, and the second including those for Indian depredations; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Auditor for the War Department, submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for pay of two and three year volunteers' certified claims for the current fiscal year, amounting to $75,000, and recommending that the same be included in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MARYLAND AND WASHINGTON RAILWAY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary of the Baltimore and Catonsville Construction Company, transmitting, in compliance with law, the first annual statement of the receipts and disbursements of the Maryland and Washington Railway Company of the District of Columbia; which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. ALLEN. I present the petitions of D. C. Zink, of Grand Island, Nebr.; of George C. McKay, of North Platte, Nebr., and of John H. Blacklock, of Baltimore, Md., in favor of the passage of the bill heretofore introduced by me authorizing the creditors of insolvent national banks to elect a permanent receiver. I move that the petitions be referred to the Select Committee on National Banks.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VEST presented resolutions adopted by the Presbyterian Ministers' Association of St. Louis, Mo., indorsing the resolution upon the Armenian question lately offered by Senator Hoar; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a series of resolutions adopted by the First Congregational Church of Manasquan, N. J., relating to the Armenian question and calling upon Congress to demand of the Turkish Government that it protect our own citizens dwelling or passing through its Empire. As the subject has been reported upon, I ask that the petition lie on the table.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Illinois pardon an interruption? What has become of the resolutions which were reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations relating to the Armenian question?

Mr. CULLOM. The resolutions are upon the table, and I have been waiting for two days since I reported them to call them up. As the Senator may remember, I asked to have them taken up for consideration at once, but it was suggested that they ought to be printed before being considered, and hence they went over. I desired to call them up yesterday.

Mr. PLATT. I understood they were to be taken up the next day after they were laid over.

Mr. CULLOM. They were to have been taken up yesterday, but several Senators were very anxious to address the Senate, and I gave way and gave notice that I would call them up this morning. I hope that immediately after the morning business, as I believe their consideration will take very little time, I may be given the floor for the purpose of calling up those resolutions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from Illinois will lie on the table.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the Peace Society of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation looking to the restoration of peace in Cuba through arbitration; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Peace Society of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation creating a peace fund to consist of 1 per cent of all sums appropriated for war purposes; such fund to be drawn upon by the President for the purpose of settling difficulties by mediation, arbitration, and conciliation; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the speedy passage of the pending tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that appropriations be made for the completion of the general scheme of coast defenses; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 179, to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels engaged in the coasting trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 180, licensing masters and chief mates of sail vessels over 700 tons; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of House bills Nos. 1227 to 1233, inclusive, proposing amendments to the navigation laws; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of National Council, Order of United American Mechanics, held in Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill No. 884, making it unlawful for any person to print, stamp, or impress any words, figures, or designs upon the flag of the United States, or any representation thereof; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of H. H. Minnick and 29 other citizens of Rock, of H. C. McKinley and 73 other citizens of Meyersdale, of Frank Patterson and 22 other citizens of Fayette County, of H. C. Lewis and 94 other citizens of Cokeville, and of J. A. Warden and 270 other citizens of Allegheny County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PEFFER. I present a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia, praying for legislation in relation to Armenian affairs. The petitioners state that they represent a membership and following of not fewer than 1,000 people who believe that the protection of the home is the supreme duty of statesmen, and they earnestly and solemnly beseech Congress to take such action as shall put our home-loving Republic on record as having used its moral and material influence by the expression of its opposition to the Armenian outrages. I move that the petition lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Warren, Mass., remonstrating against the atrocities in Armenia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Skagit River in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that appropriations be made for the completion of the general scheme of coast defenses; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 179 to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels engaged in the coasting trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of House bills 1227 to 1233, inclusive, proposing amendments to the navigation laws; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 180, licensing masters and chief mates of sail vessels of over 700 tons; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LINDSAY presented petitions of sundry citizens of Newport, Ky., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of the Federation of Labor of the District of Columbia, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1247, creating a public circulating library for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. THURSTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Falls City, Nebr., ex-soldiers and ex-sailors of the Union Army and Navy during the war of the rebellion, praying for the enactment of legislation granting a pension of $8 a month to every man who served not less than ninety days in the Army or Navy and was honorably discharged, and also that a pension of not less than $12 a month be granted to the widows of these soldiers or sailors; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the managing board of the Boston Evangelical Alliance, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to the American missions in Turkey, and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HAWLEY presented a petition of the Board of Trade of New London, Conn., praying Congress to take such action as is necessary to make the Great Salt Pond in Block Island a permanent harbor of refuge; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Portland, Me., praying for the further improvement of Portland Harbor; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SENATOR FROM DELAWARE.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I present the affidavit of William Michael Byrne, of Wilmington, Del., relative to the case of Henry A. Du Pont, claiming to have been elected a Senator from that State. I move that the affidavit be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. In this connection I ask for the adoption of the order I send to the desk.

The order was agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate, for the purpose of considering the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BERRY. On the 22d instant the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE], on behalf of a majority of the Committee on Public Lands, reported with amendments the bill (S. 36) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the payment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands." I desire, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], and myself, to file the views of the minority, and I ask that they be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The views of the minority will be received and printed.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 753) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 641) to promote Commodore Louis C. Sartori, now on the retired list of the Navy, to be a rear-admiral on said list, in accordance with his original position on the Navy Register, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 642) for the relief of Commodore Oscar C. Badger, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 716) to correct the naval history of John C. Dull, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 982) to grant medals to survivors and heirs of volunteers of the Port Hudson (La.) forlorn-hope storming column, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

CRIPPLE CREEK DISTRICT, COLORADO.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution of the Senate relating to printing the paper entitled "Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado," to report back the amendment of the House of Representatives and move that it be concurred in.

The amendment of the House of Representatives was read and concurred in, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *January 20, 1896*.

Resolved, That the foregoing concurrent resolution of the Senate to print a paper entitled "Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado," do pass with the following amendment:

Line 2, strike out all after "That," down to and including line 16, and insert: "There be printed, at the earliest day practicable, 5,000 copies, in separate form, with paper covers, of the paper entitled 'Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado,' constituting pages 1 to 209 of part 2 of the Sixteenth Annual Report of the United States Geological Survey, with the accompanying illustrations, of which 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies for distribution by the Geological Survey."

EULOGIES ON DECEASED REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania; upon the Hon. Marcus C. Lisle, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky; and upon the Hon. George W. Houk, late a Representative from the State of Ohio, be printed as required by law.

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 88) authorizing the distribution of copies of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in Congressional districts where distribution has not been made, to report it without amendment. I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Navy to send the undistributed copies of the Official Records of the War of the Rebellion, both of the Union and of the Confederate navies, to such libraries, organizations, and individuals as may be designated before the meeting of the next Congress by the Representatives in the Fifty-fourth Congress of the districts whose Representatives in the Fifty-third Congress failed to designate the distributees of their quota of the Official Records or any part thereof, as authorized by the act of Congress approved July 31, 1894, and the joint resolution approved March 2, 1895, to the extent and in the manner and form provided in that act.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT IN ALABAMA.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. ALLEN on the 7th instant providing for a select committee to make inquiry whether there is, and for the last two years and a half has been, a republican form of government in the State of Alabama, reported it back with the recommendation that it be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; which was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BLOOMINGTON, ILL.

Mr. QUAY. I desire to call the attention of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] to the bill I am about to report. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 89) concerning the erection and completion (except heating apparatus) of the United States post-office building at Bloomington, Ill., to report it favorably, without amendment.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask the Senate to put the joint resolution upon its passage.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to object to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. CULLOM. The joint resolution comes from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It has been considered by that committee. It has been passed by the other House. The men employed on that work are laid off and are now simply waiting until this little change in the law shall be made. It does not incur a single cent of additional expense, and delay simply results in idleness on the part of the workmen who have been engaged upon that building for the last year or more. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not object to its present consideration.

Mr. ALLEN. The statement the Senator from Illinois makes is true with reference to every public building. There seems to have been a little ring in the Senate on the question of obtaining public buildings. For instance, Illinois now has under construction in the city of Chicago a building for which an appropriation of about $5,000,000 has been made.

Mr. CULLOM. Only $4,000,000.

Mr. ALLEN. It will cost $8,000,000 before it is completed.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator has no right to make that statement.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Pennsylvania a few days ago got a bill through for the construction of a public building. At the last Congress it was quite a common thing for the Eastern States and the Middle Western States to procure large appropriations for the construction of public buildings. We west of the Missouri River, with the exception of one or two instances, have been unable to get even $25,000 or $30,000 appropriated for the construction of public buildings at places where the Federal court is held at least twice a year.

It occurs to me that the proper thing to do is for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to take up all such measures that are pending before it and consider them all at the same time, so that every locality in the Union may have an equal opportunity to procure its fair proportion of the public expenditures.

Mr. CULLOM. If this were an original bill providing for the construction of a public building at the city of Bloomington I would not seek to put it upon its immediate passage, but for years the law has been passed providing for the construction of the building and the work has been going on. A point has been reached where it is necessary to change the previous legislation a little so that there may be changes of plans with reference to the construction in order to keep the cost of the building within the amount already appropriated.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Illinois permit a question?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. Is any appropriation whatever involved in the joint resolution?

Mr. CULLOM. Not one penny.

Mr. WHITE. Then there is nothing to be taken out of the Treasury by it?

Mr. CULLOM. Not a penny is asked to be taken out of the Treasury. A specific clause in the joint resolution provides that the change shall not cost a single additional cent.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Nebraska made a very sweeping remark. I think he is in the habit of doing that. He

says that in the last Congress a great many bills were passed for public buildings in the East. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that not one single bill, as I recollect it, passed the last Congress for a public building in any one of the Eastern States. For my own State a bill had passed the Senate, I think twice, providing for a public building, but I could not even get a report from the committee in the last Congress. I think I am correct in saying that the Senator entirely misstates the fact when he says that numerous public-building bills passed the last Congress for States east of the Mississippi River.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I desire to return my thanks to the Senator from New Hampshire for his kindly remark, wherein he says that I am in the habit of being a little bit extravagant in my language. I had no idea at the time I made the remark that the Senator from New Hampshire was any considerable portion of the East, nor do I have an opinion of that kind at this time.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. ALLEN. I was not referring to New England. Therefore I think my remark does not come within the jurisdiction of a Senator from New England.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me?

Mr. ALLEN. I was referring to that portion of this country east of the Mississippi River that has constantly received appropriations amounting to millions of dollars for the construction of public buildings, and has studiously opposed, with here and there a rare and grudging exception, the appropriation of any money for the construction of needed public buildings in the transmississippi States. For instance, in my own State there are two points where a Federal court has been established for years, and where it is necessary for the transaction of public business that a public building shall be constructed. We have asked here from time to time for the mere pittance of $25,000 or $50,000 for the purchase of ground and for the construction of those buildings. Those propositions have been studiously met with resistance by the committee from which this report comes.

I am not unappreciative of the position of the Senator from Illinois, and yet it occurs to me that if this joint resolution is permitted to pass here without any objection and without due debate when taken up from the Calendar in its regular order we shall find the Senator from Illinois a little bit indifferent as to the result of public buildings that may be asked for points a little farther west than the State of Illinois.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator allow me to make a remark right there?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Nebraska will never find me opposing any legitimate appropriation that can be shown to be in the public interest, either for Nebraska or any other State in the Union. This is not a new measure, and it does not appropriate any money; it simply proposes to allow the work to go on; it has been suggested by the honored President of the Senate, the Vice-President of the United States, and I appeal to the Senator that he allow the joint resolution to go through so that those men may continue their work.

Mr. ALLEN. It is hard for me to resist the appeal of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CULLOM. I know you can not do it very well.

Mr. ALLEN. In view of the fact that the joint resolution does not involve an appropriation, I will withdraw my objection to its consideration; but I give notice here and now that I shall enter my objection to all such bills hereafter.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Nebraska is unjust to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. He makes the statement that there has been some discrimination in favor of States east of the Mississippi River. It is true that the enumeration of public buildings and the expenditures for their construction show that the appropriations were unequal in some of the States, and that one State in New England particularly had received largely more in the shape of public buildings than any other State in the Union, population considered; but in later years such discrimination has not existed, and it certainly did not exist during the last Congress. As chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at that time I can safely appeal to the record. It is very well known to all the members of the committee that we resisted the most passionate appeals for appropriations as to new public buildings, and we made appropriations only to complete buildings already commenced and to prevent the decay and deterioration of the material by reason of a postponement.

I think if the Senator will look into the appropriations he will find that Congress for the last five years has been unusually liberal to the Western States. I call his attention to the fact that at the last session almost the only public-building bill we reported—there were several—but the bill of most importance was one giving to four of the new States a public building each; a sort of omnibus bill.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him at this point, I will state that those were twenty-five-thousand-dollar public buildings at the capital of three of the important Western States; but outside of the appropriations for those three States there was not an appropriation of any consequence for the construction of public buildings in the transmissouri country.

Mr. VEST. I only know, I will state in reply to the last utterance of the Senator, that that bill was prepared and agreed upon by the Senators representing those new States, and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds simply acceded to their request.

I wish to make one other remark and I am done with the subject. Any committee that undertakes to perform its duty and does not take into consideration the condition of the Treasury of the United States as to appropriations is absolutely derelict, if not criminal. When the present Secretary of the Treasury took charge of his office, and after the financial difficulties occurred, I had an official interview with him, in which he simply made the suggestion that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the two Houses—it is a joint committee—should not recommend appropriations unless they were absolutely necessary, on account of the financial uncertainties that hung over the country. During my administration of the chairmanship of that committee in this present Administration of Mr. Cleveland, I have endeavored to be as economical as possible in regard to these appropriations because we were involved in financial uncertainty, and I think I did my duty.

If the Senator will reflect a moment he will see that it is impossible, speaking for myself, that I could have discriminated against my own section of the country, if I had any sectional views at all. There is a large public building unfinished in the State of Missouri, in the city where I live, and while I was urged and pressed by citizens for an additional appropriation in order that the money might be expended there during the hard times that were prevailing, I steadily refused to countenance any such appropriation, although I was a citizen and interested in the property of that city and a Senator from that State. I think the Senator is mistaken as to his facts, and he does injustice, without, of course, intending it.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I am exceedingly anxious that the Senator from Illinois shall get his joint resolution through, I will make a single observation in reply to the Senator from Nebraska.

If the Senator from Nebraska will refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to-morrow morning—and I assure him that it will not be changed—he will find that in my former remarks I did not allude to New England, but to States east of the Mississippi River. I so distinctly stated, and hence his disagreeable criticism on that point was very unjust.

The Senator from Nebraska says that a great many public-building bills have been passed in the last Congress for States east of the Mississippi River. I wish the Senator would examine the statutes and tell the Senate at his convenience precisely the number of public-building bills that did pass during the last Congress, either east or west of the Mississippi River. I feel confident that no such bill became a law. The only appropriations made in that Congress were to complete buildings the construction of which was already commenced.

That is all I care to say about the matter. We want to deal justly with all parts of the country, and I feel sure that we do that. If I remember correctly, an appropriation was made during the last Congress for a public building in the city of Omaha, in the State of Nebraska. I think I am correct in that, and I wish the Senator from Nebraska would note the fact.

Mr. CULLOM. Now I hope the joint resolution will be put on its passage.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MANTLE introduced a bill (S. 1742) for the relief of Thomas Cushing; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1743) to establish an additional land office in the State of Montana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1744) for increase of pension to George Hayes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1745) for the relief of Furneyfold Mercer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1746) granting an increase of pension to William H. Pulliam; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1747) for the relief of James L. Williams; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1748) appropriating money to pay the claim of James C. Wheat for expenses incurred as adjutant

of the Forty-ninth Indiana Volunteers, war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1749) to provide for an irrigation survey of the Great Plains and semiarid lands of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1750) to prevent the abuse of the writ of injunction and other legal process, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1751) granting an invalid pension to Levi Moser; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1752) to correct the military record of John Glazier; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1753) to correct the military record of Joseph A. Coble; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1754) to correct the military record of Peter Slusser; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1755) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Susannah P. Swoope; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1756) for the relief of Jacob Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HAWLEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1757) to amend section 1225 of the Revised Statutes so as to further provide for the detail of officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military instruction in the public schools; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1758) for the relief of Christopher Schmidt; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1759) providing for the purchase and distribution of certain historical publications therein named; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PLATT (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1760) relating to the incorporation and government of cities and towns in the Indian Territory, to authorize free schools therein, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1761) to incorporate the National University; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1762) to promote and encourage experiments in irrigation and in reclaiming arid lands by the use of water from artesian wells; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1763) to provide for the construction and maintenance of two day schools among the Iowa tribe of Indians of Kansas and Nebraska, and the per capita distribution of the trust funds of said Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1764) to reorganize the customs collection district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1765) to refer to the Court of Claims the claims of the confederated Peoria, Piankeshaw, Wea, and Kaskaskia tribes of Indians against the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1766) for the relief of certain employees of the United States mint at New Orleans, La.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1767) to provide for subports of entry and delivery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BACON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1768) to amend an act entitled "An act to organize the Hospital Corps of the Army of the United States, to define its duty, and fix its pay," approved March 1, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1769) giving apothecaries of the United States Navy and naval hospitals the title of naval pharmacists and the rank and pay of warrant officers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1770) providing for the appointment of pharmacists in the United States Marine-Hospital Service, and fixing their pay and allowances; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CLARK introduced a bill (S. 1771) granting a pension to Richard King; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

MEDAL OF HONOR.

Mr. VILAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. R. 55) relative to the medal of honor authorized by the acts of July 12, 1862, and March 3, 1863; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. FAULKNER, it was

Ordered, That the papers relating to the bill for the relief of Robert Thompson in the Fifty-third Congress be withdrawn from the files of the Senate under the rules of the Senate.

PROOF OF LOYALTY IN PENSION CLAIMS.

On motion of Mr. PRITCHARD, it was

Ordered, That the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 901) amending section 4716 of the Revised Statutes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. In accordance with the notice given yesterday, I desire, with the consent of the Senate, to call up the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriation for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins.

Mr. MILLS. I understand that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] wishes to address the Senate this morning. Therefore I ask that the bill (S. 1714) to repeal "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, and "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, introduced yesterday by me, and which had its first reading, may lie over until the next meeting of the Senate. I gave notice that I should ask for its second reading to-day, and that I wish to obtain a vote of the Senate on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am much obliged to the Senator from Texas.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie over, as requested by the Senator from Texas, in the absence of objection.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from North Dakota if he has any objection to allowing the Calendar of resolutions to be called.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that that order has not yet been reached. The present order of business is "concurrent and other resolutions." The morning business has not yet been concluded.

Mr. CALL. If the Senator from North Dakota desires to make a speech, he can do so after the Calendar of resolutions has been called and the morning business is over.

PAYMENT OF SUGAR BOUNTY.

Mr. CAFFERY. I ask unanimous consent to change the reference of the message of the President of the United States, received on the 22d instant, in response to the resolution inquiring what action had been taken, if any, in regard to the payment of sugar-bounty claims, and, if no payment had been made, to give the Senate the reasons therefor. I desire to have the reference of the message of the President of the United States changed from the Committee on Finance to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I would state, Mr. President, that I was not in the Chamber when the message was laid before the Senate and the reference was made to the Finance Committee. I suppose it was on the request of some Senator that it was so referred.

I desire to call the attention of the Judiciary Committee to the very grave matters springing out of this message. In the sundry civil appropriation act of March 2, 1895, there was an appropriation of some $5,238,000 for the payment of a bounty on sugar.

Some time in July, 1895, immediately after the law went into effect, the claim of the Oxnard Beet Sugar Company for some $11,000 was presented to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and was by him certified for payment to the Auditor. The Auditor took the claim and certified it to the Comptroller of the Treasury. The Comptroller of the Treasury then took it under advisement, under the authority of the eighth section of the Dockery Act, declined to pay it on the ground of its unconstitutionality, and referred it to the Court of Claims under the powers given in section 1063 of the Revised Statutes.

In response to the inquiry contained in the Senate resolution referred to by me, the President writes thus to the Senate:

To the Senate of the United States:

In response to the resolution adopted by the Senate on December 16, 1895, respecting what action had been taken in regard to the payment of the appropriation for the bounty on sugar, contained in the sundry civil bill approved March 2, 1895, I herewith transmit a communication received from the Secre-

tary of the Treasury, which contains all the information I have upon the subject.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *January 22, 1896.*

The communication of the Secretary of the Treasury, which immediately follows, sets out that this bounty appropriation came up in the shape of a claim made by the Oxnard Company, was duly certified, as I have stated, was taken before the Comptroller, and that the Comptroller referred it to the Court of Claims for adjudication under section 1063 of the Revised Statutes referred to by me. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury does not state—perhaps it was not necessary for him to state—the reasons why the Comptroller of the Treasury referred this bounty claim or this part of the bounty claim to the Court of Claims.

Mr. President, the very grave question arises whether or not a subordinate official of the Treasury Department, when a claim is properly certified to him, when the law authorizing the claim has been construed so as to include that claim and to authorize that payment, can refuse to pay the appropriation on the ground that he thinks the law authorizing it to be unconstitutional. This sets up a new construction, never heretofore adopted by any subordinate official of the Treasury or any other subordinate official that I am aware of, and places in the power of subordinate officials the practical nullification of appropriations made by Congress.

In asking for the reference of the message to the Judiciary Committee, instead of the Finance Committee, I mean no sort of disparagement to the Finance Committee, but I imagine that with the volume of work now upon them in the shape of financial legislation they, although perhaps otherwise qualified, might not be able to devote to this subject the attention it deserves. I hope, therefore, Mr. President, that the request I make will be adopted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The change of reference will be made, in the absence of objection.

ARMENIAN OUTRAGES.

Mr. CALL. I hope that the regular order will now be observed, and that the resolutions which are on the table of the Vice-President coming over from previous days will be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions referred to will be laid before the Senate at the proper time. Concurrent and other resolutions are now in order. If there be none such, the Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], coming over from a previous day.

Mr. CULLOM. Let the resolutions be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions reported by Mr. CULLOM from the Committee on Foreign Relations January 22, 1896, as follows.

Whereas the supplementary treaty of Berlin, July 13, 1878, between the Ottoman Empire and Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia contains the following provisions:

"LXI.

"The Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out without further delay the ameliorations and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds.

"It will periodically make known these steps taken to this effect to the powers, and will superintend their application.

"LXII.

"The Sublime Porte having expressed the wish to maintain the principle of religious liberty, to give it the widest scope, the contracting parties take note of this spontaneous declaration.

"In no part of the Ottoman Empire shall difference of religion be alleged against an individual as a ground for exclusion or incapacity as regards the discharge of civil and political rights, admission to the public service, functions, and honors, and the exercise of the different professions and industries.

"All persons shall be admitted, without distinction of religion, to give evidence before the tribunals.

"Liberty and the outward exercise of all forms of worship are assured to all, and no hindrance shall be offered either to the hierarchial organization of the various communions or to their relations with their spiritual chiefs.

"The right of official protection by the diplomatic and consular agents of the powers in Turkey is recognized both as regards the above-mentioned persons and their religious, charitable, and other establishments in the holy places;" and

Whereas the extent and object of the above-cited provisions of said treaty are to place the Christian subjects of the Porte under the protection of the other signatories thereto, and to secure to such Christian subjects full liberty of religious worship and belief, the equal benefit of the laws, and all the privileges and immunities belonging to any subjects of the Turkish Empire; and

Whereas by said treaty the Christian powers parties thereto having established, under the consent of Turkey, their right to accomplish and secure the above-recited objects; and

Whereas the American people, in common with all Christian people everywhere, have beheld with horror the recent appalling outrages and massacres of which the Christian population of Turkey have been made the victims:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is an imperative duty, in the interest of humanity, to express the earnest hope that the European concert brought about by the treaty referred to may speedily be given its just effect in such decisive measures as shall stay the hand of fanaticism and lawless violence, and as shall secure to the unoffending Christians of the Turkish Empire all the rights belonging to them both as men and Christians and as beneficiaries of the explicit provisions of the treaty above recited.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate these resolutions to the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia.

Resolved further, That the Senate of the United States, the House of Representatives concurring, will support the President in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey, and to obtain redress for injuries committed upon the persons or property of such citizens.

Mr. CULLOM Mr. President, I hesitate to take up the time of the Senate or to occupy its attention even for a moment, but I feel that the gravity of the subject requires that I should do so.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the Senator will allow me to say that I shall be glad to have a full explanation of the resolutions before voting upon them.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator will listen to me for a few minutes he will see the serious condition which at least prevails in Turkish Armenia.

Mr. President, I am amazed—I am astounded and appalled at the brief accounts which I have had of the awful carnival of havoc, destruction, and blood which has prevailed for a time in a country with which the United States maintains amicable relations. The concurrent and accumulated testimony of hundreds and thousands of intelligent, humane, honest, and courageous Christians and Jews alike, Catholics and Protestants, Europeans and Americans, makes it absolutely certain as a dreadful truth that a massacre of innocence unparalleled for ages has been perpetrated in the Armenian provinces of Turkey. How can we believe that in 1894 and 1895, along the very borders of the land where scriptural history was made, and where the patriarchs of old fed their flocks, almost in sight of Hermon and Lebanon, and only a short journey from Bethlehem, the most gigantic and brutal enormities have been committed upon a wholly unoffending people?

We believe, without questioning, those words which have long been part of our religion, that "of one blood God made all the nations of the earth," but I confess that my faith is somewhat shattered in the accepted belief when I see the soldiers of an organized and recognized Government, where there is no war and no enemy, killing, bayoneting, and outraging an unarmed and unoffending people—a Turkish army, under the pay of the Turkish Government, composed of Circassians, Kurds, and other barbarian soldiers, led through the rural and pastoral districts to devastate and destroy every living thing, to rob, to murder, and flay alive, old and young, male and female. Destruction and rapine have been and now are the orders obeyed in the beautiful valleys and on the rugged hills of Armenia. There has been no war, no conflict between two contending powers, but a merciless, pitiless tornado of bloody ruin. Over many square miles of territory, fire and the sword have swept the last vestige of Armenian human life. Through hundreds of Eastern villages, towns blessed with schools and colleges, with churches and missionaries, the demon of damnable and fanatical hate has spread ruin, desolation, and death.

Has it come to this, that in the last days of the nineteenth century humanity itself is placed on trial? There is responsibility somewhere. There is to be retribution some time. Who is responsible? Not alone the poor, weak, slavish Sultan who sits at Constantinople, and has been forced to let Austria manage one province and to permit other nations to manage and govern other provinces. But there are what we know as the great powers of Europe who have practically determined that they will not allow Turkey to abdicate her autonomy until they can agree among themselves as to how her territory shall be apportioned between themselves. In my judgment, if Great Britain had consented that Russia should look after Armenia, as Austria has been permitted to control Bosnia for some years, this era of blood would not have stained the history of Europe. But the fear that Russia might obtain some greater share of the "sick man's" estate than herself caused England to prevent the establishment of decent government in Armenia.

But without going into the detail of the disputes between the countries of the European alliance, it is not wrong to say that upon those great powers rests the responsibility. They have for years practically "held up" the Turkish Government and allowed her to say nothing and do nothing which they did not direct. They could have in six days put a perfect and absolute stop to the reign of death. They are responsible for the policy which has allowed this. The Turk is the puppet in their hands, and his soldiers and people are but the toys of their will and pleasure.

Mr. President, I favor the adoption of the resolutions reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations in reference to the condition of affairs in the Turkish Empire. It is a matter of some embarrassment to this nation that it can not, consistent with its declarations in the past, consent to send a fleet and an army to that country with orders to use whatever power may be necessary to put a stop at once to the indiscriminate murder and slaughter of all classes of Armenians who have so far offered practically no resistance.

As I have shown, a condition of affairs has for some time past existed in the Armenian portion of Turkey so appalling to the human heart that it is scarcely fit to be told. The Committee on Foreign Relations are not disposed to sit idly by and take no no-

tice of such condition. They have, therefore, reported certain resolutions, reciting in connection with them certain provisions of the treaty made between the Ottoman Empire, Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia which would seem almost sufficient to excuse any other nation from having anything to say with reference to the conditions existing in Turkey.

The treaty of 1878, made between the powers as above indicated, substantially obligates those powers to see to it that the Ottoman Empire shall in no way interfere with any class of its subjects on the ground of difference of religion. In that treaty the Ottoman Empire bound itself to make no distinctions for any reason whatever between one class of its subjects and another, and the combined powers in effect obligated themselves to give protection to the Armenian portion of that country, guaranteeing the same against any imposition by the Porte or any other authority in the Turkish Empire.

The people of the United States are intensely excited over the condition of affairs reported to exist in that country. It can not be questioned that such condition is well known to the Allied Powers, and yet, so far as we are informed, nothing has been done, except by diplomatic correspondence, to stop the further slaughter of innocent people or to care for the hundreds of thousands of Armenians who have been left homeless, helpless, and starving. The purpose of the resolutions reported and under consideration is to plead with great earnestness to those Allied Powers who have undertaken to care for those people to put a stop to such brutality as is practiced upon them by the Circassians and Kurds; and not entirely without the help or connivance of the Turkish soldiers themselves.

The sixty-first article of the treaty referred to recites that the Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out the ameliorations and reforms demanded by the local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds.

Mr. President, the Sultan appears to have done nothing to protect the Armenians from those savage robbers and murderers, but it is believed, and I think correctly, by the Christian world that the Sultan is knowingly allowing such slaughter to go on, the object being, it is said, to so reduce the Armenian population that they will no longer be of sufficient consequence to give him any concern.

Mr. President, it is unnecessary for me to say that it is amazing to the people of this country, at least, to witness such a terrible slaughter of those innocent people, and at the same time witness the apparent indifference manifested by the powers who agreed to see that they were protected.

Mr. Henry Norman, of the London Chronicle, in an article published recently, in the Star of this city, says:

> Yet Abdul Hamid II seems to sit firmly on his throne, secure in the jealousies of the great powers unable to agree upon the division of his kingdom. One of them will do nothing to introduce stability or further autonomy into the Balkan Peninsula, preferring to wait until the ripe and rotten fruit shall drop into her lap, and the hands of the others are thereby paralyzed. And if the Sultan loses heart for a moment in the desperate game he is playing, he can find fresh courage by thinking, as Professor Grosvenor in his great book has recently reminded us, that the British embassy stands upon land presented to England in gratitude for help against France in 1801; that the site of the French embassy was given to France in thankfulness for aid against England in 1807; that the shaft among the cypresses of the cemetery at Scutari commemorates English and French support against Russia in 1857, and that another column on the Bosphorus tells how Russia saved Mahmoud II his empire in 1833. "You think us weak," said a Turkish statesman recently to a foreign ambassador, "but the truth is we are very strong, for our strength is rooted in your divisions."

Before the treaty of Berlin was entered into by the great powers in 1878, Great Britain announced its own treaty of defense with the Porte, which, it is said, caused a great sensation among the Allied Powers. This treaty between Turkey and England provides that England was to join His Imperial Majesty the Sultan in defending certain portions of his territory against any future attempt on the part of Russia to take possession of the same, and the Sultan promised England to introduce the necessary reforms, to be agreed upon between the two powers, in his Government, and for the protection of the Christian and other subjects of the Sultan. As a guarantee of good faith, the Sultan consented to the occupation by England of the Island of Cyprus. That compact was secretly signed at Constantinople on the 4th day of June, 1878, only a few days before the congress convened at Berlin to make the treaty of 1878.

So that, Mr. President, the English Government, making greater pretensions to the observance of the rights of the people than perhaps any other Government in Europe, has an additional obligation resting upon it to protect the Armenians in Turkey, and yet nothing has been done by it, notwithstanding this double obligation resting upon it, nor by any of the other powers looking to the enforcement of their treaty obligations beyond a mere diplomatic correspondence between them and the Sultan.

So, Mr. President, it seemed to the Committee on Foreign Relations that we could not do less, that we could not say less by way of a recital of the obligations of the Allied Powers to protect those people and an appeal to them to carry out their pledges than we have done by the resolution which is now under consideration.

It may be proper for me to say that yesterday dispatches came from that country saying that Turkey and Russia had made a treaty, by which Russia was to dominate Turkey and hold it as a vassal. I see, however, what I anticipated might be true, that the former dispatches have been substantially denied this morning. So the condition prevails that these several allied powers, having taken upon themselves practically the special right, if such a right could be conferred, to protect the Armenians by name, consisting of over 2,000,000 in European Turkey and more than a million and a half in Asiatic Turkey, have, notwithstanding that obligation, permitted the indiscriminate slaughter which has been going on there for the last year, to say nothing of what occurred before that time, almost distancing any description of slaughter in the history of the world. I do not myself believe that there can be found in all the history of the world such a condition as has existed in that country for the last year and a half.

It is not necessary for me to say that apparently the Allied Powers are watching each other, each hoping by its silence or nonaction to secure, if the Ottoman Empire should go to pieces, a portion of its territory. The heart of all Christendom is stirred to its very depths as it witnesses the piteous pleas of the suffering Armenians beseeching the Christian world to give them protection.

The Armenians are said to be a harmless, industrious, and honest people. They number, in Turkey, 2,500,000 people; in Russia, 1,300,000; in Persia and other parts of the East, 150,000; scattered through Europe, 100,000; outside of the places I have named and in the United States, about 10,000. What is called ancient Armenia is said to be divided between Russia, Turkey, and Persia. The area of Turkish Armenia is about 60,000 square miles.

Mr. President, it would be very interesting, perhaps, to go back to the early history of those people. It is said that the Armenian nation is one of the oldest in the history of the world; that its beginning was soon after the flood, in the land of Ararat, and it may be said that that region of the world is the birthplace of the human race. History tells us that the glory of the Armenian nation reached its height about eighty years before Christ, and that the cause of its downfall may be traced back to about the same period; that it resulted from a war with the Romans. Since the conquest of Armenia by the Romans the Armenians have passed through many and various vicissitudes; at times they have been tributary to some nation and at times independent. It is also said that the downfall of Armenia as an independent nation was the result of aid given the Crusaders in their effort to free the Holy City from the Arabs and Turks. They have been, as a people, subject to the persecutions, outrages, and massacres of what Gladstone terms "the unspeakable Turk" for seven or eight hundred years. They have, however, retained their distinctive language and religion to this day, and are said to be the leading class in commerce as well as in education in Turkey.

I said awhile ago that nothing had been done by the combined powers looking to putting a stop to the murder of the Armenians since the treaty of 1878, aside from mere diplomatic protests. I ought to say that some eight months ago a scheme of reform for the Armenian provinces was presented to the Sultan by the English, French, and Russian Governments, which was sanctioned October 17, 1895, by imperial irade for the provinces of Bitlis, Diarbekir, Seevas, Erzerum, Van, and Harpoot. These provinces cover the region where the majority of the Armenians reside. Since the sanction by the Sultan of this proposed reform wholesale slaughter and plunder have been perhaps more frequent than before.

It is unnecessary, Mr. President, for me to detail the history of what has been going on at any greater length, but it would seem, from all the information that can be obtained, that there has been a determination on the part of the Sultan of Turkey to allow the Armenian population to be almost exterminated. It appears to be an assault upon the Armenians because of their religion. The religious leaders of those engaged in the indiscriminate slaughter which has been carried on incite the people to action by crying from the housetops, "Woe to the Mussulman who does not kill at least one Christian and carry away some of their belongings, in the name of Mohammed and His Imperial Majesty the Sultan."

This country of ours may be said to be a neutral Government, so far as interference with the internal affairs of any Government in Europe is concerned. It has no disposition to interfere in the affairs of European Governments, except in the cause of humanity itself. And we now appeal most earnestly, in the name of humanity, to the Governments which have contracted to protect those people that they shall carry out their obligations. As to the right of this Government to protect American citizens everywhere we ask no odds from any nation upon earth.

In earlier days the crusaders from western Europe swarmed over this very country in their misguided efforts to establish religion through the agency of the sword. Of late it has seemed almost necessary to inaugurate another crusade in the interest of peace and humanity, that possibly a few people might be saved

from a nation numbering about 4,000,000 in all. They are greater in number than were the people of the American colonies in the days of the American Revolution. Is it necessary, in the economy of the civilized Governments of Europe, that the blood of 4,000,000 people shall be spilled, that it shall water the soil of that vast area of country?

The sympathy of America has always gone out to the oppressed and misgoverned peoples of other countries. We extended our hands and gave of our means to Greece when Turkey, years ago, strove to crush her to the earth. We sympathized with Hungary and did what we could to relieve the people there when they were held in bonds and difficulties.

Mr. President, I can not refrain from giving here the thrilling words of our great Webster, in an address referring to the affairs of Hungary. He said:

I see that the Emperor of Russia demands of Turkey that the noble Kossuth and his companions shall be given up to be dealt with at his pleasure, and I see that this demand is made in derision of the established laws of nations.

Gentlemen, there is something on earth greater than arbitrary or despotic power. The lightning has its power, the whirlwind has its power, and the earthquake has its power, but there is something among men more capable of shaking despotic power than the lightning, the whirlwind, or the earthquake, and that is the excited and aroused indignation of the whole civilized world.

Mr. President, I know of no condition which has existed in this world for centuries which has called upon civilized nations and peoples for interference equaling the necessity for stopping the indiscriminate slaughter which has been going on in Turkish Armenia for a number of years.

I ask that an article which I find in the Chicago Tribune, which is not long, be inserted at the close of my remarks. I also ask that a statement of the number of places where this indiscriminate slaughter has been going on shall also be inserted, which shows that not less than about 40,000 of these people have been killed; and the accounts show that not less than a half million of those who have not been killed are houseless, homeless, and starving, with no relief being afforded them from any quarter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The papers referred to by the Senator from Illinois will be inserted in the RECORD, in the absence of objection.

The articles referred to are as follows:

MOSLEM OR DEATH.

It is another terrible statement of facts which E. J. Dillon sets forth in the last Contemporary Review. They are of exactly the same character as those presented in previous numbers of that Review by the same trustworthy eye-witness. These later accounts, specific and circumstantial, such as are already confirmed by a whole cloud of witnesses, only add horror upon horrors. All the world stands aghast at this modern infernalism of the Turkish ruler. But apparently there is not a power on earth that dares to face the horrid monster. Here is a strange spectacle; let history explain it as best it can.

In Asia Minor during the last two months, Dr. Dillon declares, the direct victims amount to at least 60,000, with double that number plundered of their all and sent forth as fugitives from the ashes of their pillaged and devastated homes to perish. The occasion of the massacres, he says, was the pressure put upon the Sultan to carry out certain reforms; the object of the massacres was to nullify those reforms and to carry out the established policy of the present Sultan by reducing the Christian population in this territory to an insignificant minority. That this is the simple fact in the case admits of no doubt.

To all appearances up to date the Governments of all the great civilized nations stand looking on as if smitten with insensibility and cowed into abjectest pusillanimity before this Abdul the Accurst. Even the culminating insult in the Sultan's notification to the Society of the Red Cross to keep off seems to be tamely submitted to.

The issue could not be more sharply made up. It is the Turk against Christendom—"Moslem or die!" And yet the massacres that have been systematically going on now ever since a year ago last August are, in fact, but a minor part of all that systematic and comprehensive reign of oppression, torture, and terror. The facts presented in detail in the Contemporary Review and in a multitude of letters from other witnesses on the ground reveal a diabolism of all cruelties and wickedness such as give the world a new idea of the malign possibilities of human nature.

The writer in the Review referred to speaks of a woman who, having seen her husband butchered by a Moslem mob and her daughter tortured to death by the devilish indignities of the ruffians, not to speak of her own tortures and indignities, in the wildness of her agony felt reason give way and went about declaring that God himself had gone mad and left maniacs and demons to rule the world.

The answer which the English poet, William Watson, gives in the Westminster Gazette to the question as to whether Great Britain will, after all, do anything about it is put by him in this way:

"She will act at last, when there is naught remaining to relieve! At last! When the last altar is defiled, when the last mother folds with famished arms to her dead bosom her last butchered child! Then shall our England, throned beyond alarms, rise in her might! Till this 'she bides her hour.'"

If such an outcry is not poetic, it is at any rate only too telling and pertinent.

[The Chicago Tribune, Monday, January 20, 1896.]

R. J. Suabian, a student at Northwestern University, read several extracts from letters showing the hostility the Turks bore to the Armenians. The writers said a stretch of 100 miles had been visited by the inhuman Kurds, who swept everything before them. As a result there were 50,000 killed, 500,000 made destitute, and $3,000,000 worth of property lost to the owners. Men, women, and children had been pursued into the churches and killed there, and their blood reddened the steps.

Mr. Mangasarian said the work was done by troops attired in Kurdish costumes. He read a letter from relatives in Armenia in which the terrible tale was told in a thrilling manner. He said the Armenians had excited the jealousy of the Turks from the fact they represented and were impregnated with the ideas of Western civilization and wanted to be free. The fact they were progressive and the Turk represented the civilization of 1,000 years ago; that at every turn they forced the Turk to the wall in trade, literature, and finance was enough to make the Turk envious and determined the Armenian should not have the liberty he sought.

Statement showing the number of Armenians massacred at different points in Turkey, taken from the Armenian, published in London, December 1, 1895:

Constantinople	500
Trebizond	920
Trebizond villages	200
Erzengan	450
Erzengan villages	250
Baiboot and villages	1,550
Goomish-Khaneh	200
Bitlis	800
Erzerum and villages	1,200
Diarbekir and villages	6,000
Seevas	500
Shabeen-Karahissar	100
Gurun	400
Malateeyeh	100
Arabgheer and villages	500
Marash	300
Harpoot (and 37 villages, estimated)	10,000
Kemakh	600
Keghi	200
Terdjan	100
Aintab	300
Zeytoun	50
Amasia	200
Marsivan	100
Samsoon	50
Moosh	50
Van and villages	50
Hadjin and villages	50
Ak-Hissar	100
Alexandretta	100
Guerjanis	50
Egin and its villages	100
Teharsanjak and 30 villages	300
Bayazeed	200
Urfa	100
Mosul	100
Total	26,870

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the resolutions will be promptly adopted, Mr. President.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I am glad, Mr. President, that the Committee on Foreign Relations have at last reported resolutions giving expression to the abhorrence felt by the American people at the atrocities which have been perpetrated upon the Christian inhabitants of Turkish Armenia. For more than a year the world has been shocked by what has been going on, and is still going on, in Turkey. Not only have there been indiscriminate massacres of men, women, and children, but, so far as the women are concerned, there have been worse than massacres.

These outrages in Turkey began in 1894. The world was shocked and horrified by the reports that reached us then. An expression in protest was sought from this Government then. On December 3 of that year I offered a resolution in the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but never acted on. That resolution was as follows:

Joint resolution relating to the recent massacre of Christian inhabitants of Turkish Armenia.

Whereas the Christian inhabitants of Armenia, under the dominion of the Sultan of Turkey, were recently subjected to inhuman atrocities resulting in the indiscriminate massacre of thousands of men, women, and children; and

Whereas such outrages are a blot upon the civilization of the age, meriting the severest condemnation of mankind generally, and especially of the Christian nations of the earth: Therefore

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the people of the United States view with horror and detestation the atrocities aforesaid, and do hereby protest, in the name of common humanity, against the same.

SEC. 2. That the President of the United States communicate this remonstrance to the Government of Turkey.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator from Louisiana will pardon me, he made one statement which I think was perhaps inadvertent, that the massacres and outrages began in 1894. I have in my hand now a statement from very high authority, indeed, describing the condition of things and what was going on there in the year 1890, and had been going on for several years before 1894. Undoubtedly the outrages were still more flagrant at the time of which the Senator speaks.

Mr. BLANCHARD. That is true. The outrages upon the Christian inhabitants of Turkish Armenia have been going on for years, but they became bolder and were more flagrant in the fall of 1894 than they had been previous to that time, so much so that the attention of mankind generally was called to them.

Mr. President, it may be true that the United States as a nation can do nothing within the dominions of the Sultan of Turkey save to protect the lives and property of American citizens who may be domiciliated there, but, I take it, it is not out of place for us as the representatives of a free people, a great Christian nation, to express in some official way our horror and detestation of the condition of affairs in that unhappy country.

The resolutions are timely. They perhaps do not go far enough, but they are, and will be considered by the world, an expression of the American nation and the American people of their repudiation of and protest against acts of this kind.

Mr. President, the people who are the victims of these outrages are all Christians. We do not hear that the Kurds and Circassians are committing robberies and rapes and murders upon the Moslem inhabitants of the Sultan of Turkey. They all seem to be confined to the Christian inhabitants of the Sultan's Empire, and from that the inference is inevitable that these atrocities are perpetrated upon an unoffending people because of their religion.

The Armenians as a race were the first people to embrace Christianity. It is recorded that they were converted to the religion of Christ thirty-six years before the Emperor Constantine even issued his Edict of Toleration. They and their descendants have remained Christians from that time to this, maintaining their religious creed through persecution amounting to martyrdom. Within their country is Mount Ararat, upon which, we are told in Holy Writ, the ark rested after the deluge. They are a people who would be desirable inhabitants of any country. We have some five or six thousand of them who have become citizens of our country.

Mr. CULLOM. Ten thousand.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Ten thousand. I have met and talked with some of them; one I recollect in particuliar, an Armenian merchant from Boston, who is a most cultured and well-informed gentleman. Something is due to these Armenian citizens of the United States in the way of expression of sympathy for their suffering countrymen, and certainly it is little enough for us to do to pass the resolutions under consideration.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, just one word.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] rather indicates by his first remark, in which he says he is glad that the Committee on Foreign Relations has at last evolved something, that there has been neglect on the part of the committee and on the part of Congress to take notice of the horrible condition of affairs in Turkey. From letters which I have received and from remarks I have heard made I am inclined to think that the religious people of America have looked upon Congress as moving very slowly in this affair.

Mr. President, I desire, in behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to say that at the last session of the last Congress two missionaries appeared here from Armenia, both of whom I knew personally, one of whom was formerly a resident of my own city, and stated the grievances, the troubles, the massacres, their fears. They were asked what was the remedy, and they said to the committee that in their judgment if a consulate could be established at Erzerum and another at Harpoot and consuls appointed, then there would be no trouble in that great interior, because the eye of America would then be upon it. In less than a week after that the Committee on Foreign Relations reported a bill establishing two consulates, one at Erzerum and the other at Harpoot, and it became a law. The President of the United States appointed the consuls.

Surely the committee and Congress did everything then as expeditiously as anybody could ask, and did exactly what these missionaries desired should be done. Turkey refused exequaturs to those two consuls. I do not know what the executive department has done as to that refusal. I do not know what the executive department can do as to it; but it seems to me that some pressure ought to be brought somehow, that when there can be no objection to the persons of the consuls appointed exequaturs shall be granted.

Now, Mr. President, consider this incident. If that consul had been received by Turkey, had gone to Harpoot, a consulate building had been provided for, and an American flag raised, more than 20,000 lives would have been saved. One of the most terrible massacres perpetrated in Turkey anywhere took place at that point.

The good people of the United States have planted in Turkey over $6,000,000 for a single purpose, to improve and better the condition of the people of that country. They have erected as fine colleges as there are in the world. They have been maintained by American money. They have educated thousands and hundreds of thousands of Turks, or Armenians, who are subject to Turkey. It has been a work of wonderful beneficence, a work which has had marvelous success, and yet it is stopped absolutely to-day. That American capital now is held up; it can not do an ounce of work. At Harpoot the American colleges were burned down and the Americans themselves were compelled to flee for their lives.

I do not know how far the United States of America can interfere in Turkey. I am in favor of these resolutions as an expression of our opinion upon the awful tragedies there; but if I had had my way, after the powers of Europe have waited now a solid year looking each other in the face with suspicious eyes and neither one daring to make a move lest the other shall receive a benefit—I say if I had had my way, I would have Congress memorialize Russia and say to her: "Take Armenia into your possession. Protect the lives of these Christians there. And the United States of America will stand behind you with all of its power." That, sir, is the memorial and resolution I would have passed.

Sir, American citizens are suffering there. I care not what our minister reports to the State Department. I know from better opportunity to learn it than Minister Terrell has or can have; that is, from the headquarters of the foreign missions of the United States of America, where information is received by every mail, and where the information is absolutely accurate, but where the informants dare not have their names known because their lives would immediately pay the penalty.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to say to my friend that Minister Terrell is in daily conference with those very people at Constantinople.

Mr. FRYE. I do not attack Minister Terrell. I do not know what his reports have been to the State Department, but I do know that American lives and American property are being interfered with day by day in the interior of Armenia. I know that they are compelled to flee to protect their lives. I know that they do not receive the protection of the Turkish Government there.

Mr. MILLS. Yet, if my friend will investigate and ask those very missionaries, they will tell him that Minister Terrell has done more for them than the minister from any other country. He is given universal praise by all the missionaries for what he has done. I do not know what he has reported to the State Department, but he is a personal friend of mine, I have letters from him frequently, and I have communications that he sends to me from the missionaries, who indorse everything that he has done, and say he is doing everything in his power.

Mr. FRYE. If Great Britain owned a college worth $1,000,000 at Harpoot and by Turkish orders that college had been burned down, and if the teachers, they being British citizens, had been compelled to flee for their lives, does the Senator from Texas believe that the voice of Great Britain would have been silent? Does he not believe that the demand would have been made at once for damages for that destruction of property and that those citizens should be protected?

Mr. MILLS. There is some difference between the Government of Great Britain and that of the United States. The Senator from Maine is now speaking in the Congress of the United States, that has the sole power to declare war and use the armed power of this Government. It is not so with Great Britain. There the King can make war whenever he pleases to do so. If my friend would be for war, I do not know but that I would go with him; wherever people of the United States residing in foreign countries are not protected by foreign Governments I would send the ships of the United States, and I would batter down their capital, as Jefferson did in 1802 with the pirates.

Mr. FRYE. I have no doubt that the Senator would, and I agree with him entirely in his theory about the protection of American citizens. I do not cite Great Britain because I am fond of her.

Mr. President, one could not help admiring the glowing eulogy of England so eloquently uttered a day or two since by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], but while I was compelled to unite in admiration of the speaker, I dissented from almost every word of the speech. I do not love Great Britain. I recognize her power on the land, her magnificent dominion on the sea, but I assert that in all our life as colony and Republic she has never done us a kind act or offered us a helping hand. While we were hers, her conduct toward us was antagonistic to all of our interests, repressive of our industries, domineering, unjust, and despotic, so that we were compelled to rebel.

As a Republic she was no more friendly. I can not forget that for fifty years she taunted us about our "flag of the free," our Declaration of Independence, our asserted equality of man, while we held black men in bondage, put manacles on ankle and hand, and yet when the South rebelled, undertook by arms to establish another republic whose corner stone should be slavery forever, she was prompt to recognize belligerent rights; aided France to establish a monarchy in Mexico, a perpetual menace to us; built, fitted out, and manned ships to destroy our commerce; did all in her power to establish the Confederacy, so that she might have a customer.

Sir, the British rulers are no friends of ours. Now she is sitting quietly by seeing these Armenians for a solid year murdered because they were Christians, when she was one of the very agencies agreeing to protect their lives or compel Turkey to do it, and she had the power in her hands any day to do it. So I say, regardless of what Great Britain might have thought, if I had had my way Congress would have memorialized Russia at once to take possession of Armenia, and the United States would back her in the doing of it.

Now, so far as American citizens are concerned, I would protect them there at any cost. We never agreed that the Dardanelles should be closed to us. There can not be found a line in the policy of the United States of America which ever permitted any great navigable water to be closed to our ships; not one. On the contrary, we have been ready to go to war at any time to keep navigable waters open to our ships. We have given no assent to the agreement of the concerting nations over there that the Dardanelles shall be closed. If it was necessary to protect our Ameri-

can citizens and their property, I would order United States ships of war, in spite of foreign agreements, to sail up the Dardanelles and plant themselves before Constantinople, and then demand that American citizens should have the protection they are entitled to.

Mr. President, I think one of the grandest things in the history of Great Britain, and one thing for which I admire her, is that she does protect her citizens everywhere and anywhere, under all circumstances. Her mighty power is put forth for their relief and protection, and it is admirable. I do not wonder that a British citizen loves his country. Why that little incident which all of you are familiar with is a marvelous illustration of that. The King of Abyssinia took a British citizen of the name of Campbell, about twenty years ago, carried him up into the fortress of Magdala, on the heights of a lofty mountain, and put him into a dungeon without cause. It took six months for Great Britain to find that out, and then she demanded his immediate release. King Theodore refused to release him. In less than ten days after the refusal was received, 3,000 British soldiers and 5,000 sepoys were on board ships of war sailing for the coast. When they arrived they were disembarked, were marched 700 miles over swamp and morass under a burning sun, then up the mountain to the very heights, in front of the frowning dungeon, and then they gave battle. They battered down the iron gates, the stone walls. King Theodore had killed himself with his own pistol. Then they reached down into the dungeon, with that English hand, lifted out from it that one British citizen, and carried him down the mountain heights, across the same swamps and morass, landed him on the white-winged ships and sped him away to his home in safety. That cost Great Britain $25,000,000 and made General Napier Lord Napier of Magdala.

Now, sir, that was a great thing for a great country to do. A country that has an eye that can see away across an ocean, away across the many miles of land up into the mountain heights, down into the darksome dungeon one, just one, of her 38,000,000 people, and then has an arm strong enough and long enough to reach across the same ocean, across the same swamps and marshes, up the same mountain heights, down into the same dungeon, and pluck him out and carry him home to his own country a free man—in God's name who will not die for a country that will do that?

Well, Mr. President, our country will do it, and our country ought to do it. All that I ask of this grand Republic of ours is that it shall model itself after Great Britain, if it pleases, in this one thing, that the life of an American citizen shall be protected wherever he may be, whether in Great Britain or in Turkey, and in no other thing whatsoever.

Mr. President, I beg pardon of the Senate. When I started it was for a word or two only. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the resolutions of the Committee on Foreign Relations are very feeble and emasculated utterances compared with the speech of the Senator from Maine. We fight our battles here on the Committee on Foreign Relations report of a resolution that has no significance in it, that protects no American citizens, and the Senator from Maine arises here and commends Great Britain for doing that which we refuse and fail to do, viz, not only protecting her subjects, but asserting her power everywhere.

I introduced a resolution in the Senate which I will send to the desk to be read, which did propose something for the relief of the people of Armenia and did support the dignity and power of the American Republic. Here we have a tame, insignificant declaration of opinion and sympathy, giving no protection and no relief to these people. Have we not more than that right here upon our very borders, under our eyes, within our hearing, in the Island of Cuba? The principles and spirit of the Monroe doctrine, which we seek to enforce and declare, are violated in the wholesale murder of people who have been invited by our example to take action for the establishment of institutions like our own. Yet we hear this empty declaration of duty of this Government and censure of the Executive of the Government, when we are the department upon which the responsibility rests, and upon no one else.

The President of the United States has no power but that which we give to him. I agree with the Senator from Maine that the Armenian people should have the protection of this Government, not because they are citizens of the United States, but because the people of the United States have a duty to civilization, have a duty to the progress of mankind, to perform. It is not because of any treaty between Russia and England or any other powers, but because it is our duty to maintain the principles upon which this Government and our civilization are founded. But when I introduce resolutions to that effect we find the Committee on Foreign Relations holding back, taking no action, and then introducing a mere expression of their sympathy, while murder, outrage, and ferocity such as beasts of the forest do not possess are perpetrated upon these Armenian people and upon the people upon our own immediate borders in the Island of Cuba.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida will suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President——

Mr. CALL. I ask permission, before the matter goes over, to have the resolution read which I formerly offered and to which I referred.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope that the Senator from Arkansas in charge of the bill which is the regular order at 2 o'clock will consent to its being laid aside temporarily, that this question may be disposed of.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois how long he supposes it will take? There are some Senators who desire to be heard by the Senate on the regular order. One is on the floor now and desires to proceed. I do not like to interfere with the consideration of the resolutions reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and am anxious myself to have them disposed of, if it can be done in a short time.

Mr. CULLOM. Of course, I am not aware of the number who desire to speak on the resolutions, but I have not supposed that it would take more than a few minutes longer to dispose of them. I desire to say in justification of my own desire to have them finished to-day, that I am under promise to leave the city to-morrow night for ten days, or perhaps a little less; and I should be very glad indeed to have this question settled before I go away.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, may I be permitted to make one suggestion?

Mr. PEFFER. My colleague [Mr. BAKER] has been for several days expecting to address the Senate upon the unfinished business. He is now ready to proceed and has addressed the Chair for that purpose. I hope the matter referred to by the Senator from Illinois can be postponed.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the Chair will submit to the Senate the request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside that the resolution may be disposed of.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Chair allow me to make a suggestion before that is done?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. I introduced the original resolution on this subject, and have taken great interest in it. I am prepared to speak on the question at some little length, for twenty or thirty minutes, but in order to have the matter disposed of, instead of going over until next week, I will forego my purpose of addressing the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], a vote may be taken on these resolutions. I think other gentlemen who might speak will be willing to forego that purpose. It will take only four or five minutes to reach a vote, I think.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CALL. I am entirely willing to go on and dispose of the resolutions, but the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER] is upon the floor and desires to address the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CALL. I have an amendment to offer to the resolutions. I think the resolutions, as they stand, are discreditable to the Senate of the United States. If we are to take action upon the subject let us do something that will grant the people who are suffering these outrages——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida will please suspend. The Chair desires to inquire whether there is objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOAR. Will the Chair pardon me one observation? The Government of the United States (whether right or wrong I will not now detain the Senate by discussing) has undertaken to deal with this matter diplomatically, and diplomatic negotiations are now going on. A lady, an intimate friend of mine, who I am proud to say is my constituent and personal friend, is on her way to Turkey with the ministrations of the Red Cross at her command. Whatever we may think of the opinion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], however much we may sympathize with my honorable friend from Maine [Mr. FRYE], to whose stirring speech we all listened with pleasure, I hold that it is wrong for the Senate to thrust these extreme statements, which I sympathize with almost altogether, into the diplomacy of the United States. The Senator's indignation will keep for a week. Until we learn from our President that the function of diplomacy is over, I hope that we may content ourselves to withhold the expression of our natural indignation, however difficult for manly spirits like that of my friend from Florida it may be.

Now, I appeal to him. I think I know the opinion of the Armenians; there are more of them in my city than in any other. I think I know the opinion of the American Board for Foreign

Missions, with whom I have a thousand ties of personal union in the past and in the present. We may be obliged to come to what the Senator proposes, but let us wait until the diplomatic means are exhausted. When the President and the Secretary of State of the United States are endeavoring to save the families, the wives, of American missionaries still in danger from these lawless fanatics, when Clara Barton is on her way with the Red Cross in her hand, it is a pretty serious thing to thrust our intemperate and angry utterances into that diplomatic condition.

As to what the Committee on Foreign Relations have done, does anyone suppose that my friend from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] is not as much stirred to the bottom of his heart with indignation at these things as anybody? Yet he, as the organ of that great committee, unanimously, as I understand the committee have acted, proposes for to-day this temperate and guarded expression. I say to the Senator from Florida he is taking great responsibility—and great responsibility in regard to the lives and the honor of women, which he has so much at heart—when he thrusts himself into that situation and breaks it up.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator from Florida allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to have the Chair first submit the request for unanimous consent which was suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. Let that first be submitted.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. We can then proceed in a regular manner.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will submit the request of the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Florida the vote may be taken on the pending resolutions. Is there objection?

Mr. PEFFER. I object for the present.

Mr. HOAR (to Mr. PEFFER). It will not take more than five minutes. Let us get this matter out of the way.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that if objection is interposed to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts the regular order is before the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. PEFFER. I do object for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection.

Mr. PEFFER. Let me state that if the matter can be disposed of in five minutes I shall withdraw the objection.

Mr. HOAR. It will be disposed of at the close of the remarks of the Senator from Florida, and he is nearly through, I have no doubt.

Mr. PEFFER. If the Senator from Florida is nearly through I will withdraw my objection; otherwise not.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The objection is withdrawn; and the Senator from Florida will proceed.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the Secretary read the resolution heretofore introduced by me.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. CALL December 10, 1895, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That humanity and religion and the principles on which all civilization rests demand that the civilized Governments shall, by peaceful negotiations, or, if necessary, by force of arms, prevent and suppress the cruelties and massacres inflicted on the Armenian subjects of Turkey, by the establishment of a government of their own people, with such guaranties by the civilized powers of its authority and permanence as shall be adequate to that end.

Mr. CALL. Now, Mr. President, there was a resolution which proposed something that would protect the soldiers of the Red Cross, Clara Barton and her associates. There was a declaration by the people of the United States that in behalf of our common humanity the power of this people should be interposed to prevent outrages which were shocking to the civilized world. Do Senators say that our people can be endangered by a declaration that our power shall be exercised to prevent these outrages, when diplomacy has failed for half a century to accomplish anything? The history of Armenia has been one continued scene of bloodshed and outrage of women and murder of children for more than a century. We have now a resolution here reciting an agreement between the civilized powers connected with that portion of the world that these outrages should stop, when, in the very face of that agreement, the most terrible outrages the world has ever seen have been perpetrated.

Mr. President, I object to the pending resolutions. I object to them because they mean nothing; I object to them because it is an insult to the suffering people of Armenia and because the nations of the civilized world will look upon it as an empty and unmeaning declaration of sympathy.

I do not agree with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] in his denunciation of Great Britain or the British people. Whatever of courage, spirit, and character we have come from that race of people who have made glorious the English name and have carried civilization and Christianity into every quarter of the globe. Admit that they are aggressive, admit that they have oftentimes created tyranny and wrong, yet they have been the pillars of civilization and the representatives of the virtue of every civilized people; they have advanced science and art; and what we possess we derive from their blood and from their teachings.

Mr. President, while I am in favor of maintaining the principles of the Monroe doctrine and protecting these two continents from aggression of any kind, while I am in favor of preserving civil liberty and opposing a government of caste and privilege, which was the meaning of the Monroe doctrine and its spirit and purpose, I desire to say that it is not because the Government of Great Britain will create upon this continent institutions hostile to civil liberty, for the colonies of Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia, are to-day more advanced than we are in the protection of the masses of the people in their personal rights; they are more advanced than we are in the progress of that civilization which made the Constitution of the United States. Land is free to every citizen, homes and labor are provided for the unemployed, and no part of the world presents a spectacle where the exercise of power is more for the people and for their elevation, happiness, and prosperity.

New Zealand, as a British colony, is fifty-five years old, and her European population is 690,000. She boasts the best temperate climate, the richest healing mineral springs, the most variedly beautiful and soul-inspiring scenery in the world, a coast line of 4,330 miles, and a rising generation passionately fond of the sea. Her agricultural land yields the largest and finest crops, her pastoral land supports the greatest number of sheep and cattle to the acre. Her people rule themselves by means of the most democratic central government and 500 local governing bodies. They own collectively 1,900 miles of railway, 14,000 miles of telegraph wire, all the telephones, 1,300 post-offices, 1,400 schools, and worship in 1,600 churches. They have the most complete system of compulsory, secular, free education, the lowest death rate, the lightest ratio of convictions for drunkenness, the highest standard of comfort, the most perfect land and labor laws in the world. It is not a vain dream for such a colony!

And yet, in her dream, in her aspirations, in her determined policy to stop the production of penury, New Zealand stands alone, and almost outside the pale of the sympathy of Christian England! Being alone and far ahead on that which it deems to be the right road, their small band of men and women get little guidance from the superior culture and experience of the mother country, of the great republic, or even of other colonies. What analogy can there be between a policy which starts from the principle that the land and all its hidden wealth belongs to the nation now and a policy which does not?

But this is foreign to the purpose.

We have a duty to perform. We are a great people, the light of the world, and we owe it to civilization and humanity that the power which has been given to us shall be exercised. We owe it to every principle of civilization that the people of Armenia, and by a greater interest and obligation that the people of Cuba, shall not be murdered by the brutal military despotism which now threatens to extinguish that entire race, and we owe it to the people of Armenia that we shall pass something more than an empty declaration of sympathy.

I offer the resolution heretofore submitted by me as a substitute for the resolutions reported by the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute submitted by the Senator from Florida to the pending resolutions.

Mr. BACON. I ask that the proposed substitute be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed substitute will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That humanity and religion and the principles on which all civilization rests demand that the civilized governments shall, by peaceful negotiations, or, if necessary, by force of arms, prevent and suppress the cruelties and massacres inflicted on the Armenian subjects of Turkey, by the establishment of a government of their own people, with such guaranties by the civilized powers of its authority and permanence as shall be adequate to that end.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida be laid on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois, that the substitute be laid on the table.

Mr. BATE. Before that is done, can we not have the original resolutions read so that we may understand precisely what we are to vote upon?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The original resolutions will be again read.

The Secretary read the resolutions reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM. Those resolutions were unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, including my distinguished friend on my left [Mr. FRYE].

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] to lay the proposed substitute on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the concurrent resolutions reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolutions were agreed to.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. THURSTON. I wish to give notice that, unless interfering with some previous announcement, I shall, on Tuesday morning next, after the disposition of the routine business, submit some brief remarks upon the resolutions which have been pending in respect to the Monroe doctrine.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance, on which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Before the Senator from Kansas proceeds, I ask him to allow me just one moment to request the unanimous consent of the Senate that a vote may be had at 4 o'clock on Thursday next on the pending bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HILL. I desire to assent to that, with the condition and understanding that the bill shall not be set aside for any other business, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I presume there would be no objection to that.

Mr. HILL. With that understanding, I assent to it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not suppose the Senator from Arkansas desires to put a condition of that sort on the procedure of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is the rule of the Senate now. It adds nothing whatever to its force. The regular order can not be set aside except by unanimous consent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Or by a vote of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Or by a vote of the Senate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But the Senator from New York proposes that the Senate, no matter what crisis may arise, no matter what may happen, shall not act on anything else except by unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not presume the Senator from New York means to limit the Senate in that way.

Mr. WOLCOTT. My suggestion is only to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I presume it is the intention of the Senator from New York that the regular order shall not be set aside for the purpose of taking up any other matter except by unanimous consent.

Mr. HILL. My idea is not, after this consent shall be given, that to-morrow or Monday, by a vote of the Senate, some other business shall intervene three or four days and then on Thursday we shall take up this bill and a vote be insisted upon. It is for the very purpose of guarding against that, and the Senator sees the force of it, that I make the suggestion. With that understanding clearly, that the bill is to continue as the regular order of business simply from now until Thursday, then it is all right. With that understanding I assent to it; otherwise not.

Mr. ALLEN. I wish to enter my objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being interposed, the Senator from Kansas will proceed,

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I desire to give notice that on Thursday next I shall ask the Senate to remain in session until the pending bill shall be disposed of.

Mr. BAKER. I ask to have read the amendment I offered the other day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Kansas will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 1 of the bill it is proposed to add the following proviso:

Provided, however, That this section shall apply to the coinage of the silver mined in the United States of America only.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have offered as an amendment to the bill under consideration the proviso which has just been read, limiting it to the free coinage of American silver only, believing it to be a reasonable compromise between the conflicting views of the gold monometallist and the silver monometallist. I do not believe in either gold or silver monometallism; nor am I in favor of legislation which will produce the one or continue the other. The people are divided in their opinions upon the money question, and the politicians, judging from their divergent views, are in a hopeless state of "innocuous desuetude." However, I think all shades of opinion and belief may be classified as follows:

First. Gold monometallists.

Second. Silver monometallists.

Third. Bimetallists.

A gold monometallist believes in gold only as a measure of value and the money of final redemption and silver as subsidiary coin.

A silver monometallist believes in the free and unlimited coinage of all the silver of all the world at the ratio of 16 to 1, regardless of present conditions or of other nations.

The extreme views entertained by the gold and silver monometallists appear to be irreconcilable.

The gold monometallist claims that the legislation now proposed, if enacted into law, would produce disaster, panic, and repudiation. The silver monometallist, on the other hand, claims that the same bill, if enacted into law, would be immensely beneficial to the people and restore immediate prosperity to the country.

Thus extremes meet in legislation. Both claims can not be true. No act of legislation can produce such opposite results at one and the same time, and I am of the opinion that the awful calamity predicted by one extreme would not follow any more than the beneficial and glorious results predicted by the other.

Mr. President, I am a firm believer in what I understand to be bimetallism. Our legislation should be along the line of equality and parity between the metals at the ratio of 16 to 1. In the discharge of our duty we should not lose sight of the great central idea in all legislation, to wit, "the greatest good to the greatest number." Of course, this beneficial rule should be limited to legislation for our own people. We are not the guardians or trustees of the people of other nations. Nor should we be influenced by the charges and countercharges of extremists, nor by unjust and unfriendly criticism of the press, which frequently "condemns without evidence and executes without trial."

Mr. President, it is refreshing as well as instructive to recall the history of silver legislation in this country since 1792. The first silver dollar was coined in 1794. And from that time until 1806 less than one and one-half million silver dollars were coined. Owing to the ratio of 15 to 1 then existing between gold and silver, it was believed that our silver dollars went abroad and found a market and recoinage in France, as the ratio there was 15½ to 1.

President Jefferson, in order to retain, as he believed, our silver at home, laid his Democratic hand on the coinage of silver dollars, as will appear by the following copy of a letter written by the Secretary of State, Mr. Madison, to the Director of the Mint:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *May 1, 1806.*

SIR: In consequence of a representation from the director of the Bank of the United States that considerable purchases had been made of dollars coined at the mint for the purpose of exporting them, and it is probable that further purchases and exportations will be made, the President directs that all the silver coined at the mint shall be of small denominations, so that the value of the largest piece shall not exceed a half dollar.

I am, etc.,

JAMES MADISON, *Secretary of State.*

ROBERT PATTERSON, Esq.,
Director of the Mint.

At that time two half silver dollars were exactly the weight and value of a silver dollar. It therefore appears quite incomprehensible how such an order could have any material effect on the purchase and exportation of silver for recoinage and mintage purposes abroad. It would appear to most people that the cost and expense of exportation of 10,000 silver half dollars of precisely the same weight and value of 5,000 silver dollars would be practically the same. This evidently was an experiment in silver. The order so promulgated at the instance of Mr. Jefferson, although not a law, seems to have been obeyed for thirty-four years, and during such time and down to 1840 no silver dollars were coined. In 1840 the coinage of silver dollars was resumed and was continued in a tentative way until 1873. From 1840 to 1873 only about 7,000,000 of standard silver dollars were coined. In course of time it became quite apparent that the order promulgated at the instance of Mr. Jefferson relating to the coinage of silver did not have the desired effect, for, notwithstanding such order, silver still went abroad. Gradually it dawned upon the minds of statesmen that as two half dollars weighed as much as one standard dollar and were of the same value the difficulty was not merely in the coinage, but must be attributed to some other cause. Finally it was agreed that the commercial ratio of 15 to 1 between gold and silver, fixed under the act of 1792 upon recommendation of Mr. Hamilton, by and with the approval of Mr. Jefferson, was not quite right, as the ratio then existing in France was 15½ to 1. And this difference in value of about 3 per cent was sufficient inducement and profit to cause our silver to be exported. And to stop such exportation the act of June 28, 1834, was passed reducing the number of grains of gold in the eagle, half eagle, and quarter eagle theretofore prescribed by the original act of 1792.

It was believed that this change of about 6 per cent in the value of gold would keep silver at home. It did so, what little there was of it, but gold, being now undervalued, went abroad. This was, of course, unsatisfactory, and after nearly three years of trial, and on the 18th day of January, 1837, another act of Congress relating to mintage and coinage was passed. This act repealed the act of 1834 and changed the ratio theretofore existing between gold and silver and established it at practically 16 to 1.

It provided that of the silver coined the dollar should be of the weight of 412½ grains, nine-tenths fine; the half dollar should be of the weight of 206¼ grains, nine-tenths fine, and other fractional coins of like proportional grains. It also provided that the eagle should contain 258 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, and smaller coinage a like proportional number of grains of gold.

From 1837 to 1853, a period of sixteen years, we had equal laws relating to gold and silver. But the production of the two metals during this time was not equal, largely because of the discovery of gold in California in 1849. The production was so heavily in favor of gold during this period that we had no just or practical experience with the two metals at the ratio of 16 to 1 under the act of 1837. The California gold fields were so vast and extensive, so wonderfully productive, that silver in the monetary race was distanced for the time being. And those friendly to the gold metal, ever alert, aggressive, and active, were not slow in taking advantage of the situation in fortifying and intrenching themselves behind legislation. In proof of this allegation I now refer to the act of February 21, 1853, entitled "An act amendatory of existing laws relative to half dollars, quarter dollars, dimes, and half dimes." So much of the act of 1853 as is pertinent to the discussion is as follows:

That from and after the 1st day of June, 1853, the weight of the half dollar or piece of 50 cents shall be 192 grains, and the quarter dollar, dime, and half dime shall be, respectively, one-half, one-fifth, and one-tenth of the weight of said half dollar.

At this time the number of grains in the standard silver dollar, as fixed by the act of 1837, was 412½ grains, and the half-dollar contained 206¼ grains, and all fractional coins were exact fractional parts of the silver dollar. Under the act of 1853 the silver half-dollar contained but 192 grains, or 14¼ less grains of silver than under the act of 1837. In other words, it was made an inducement to the owners of silver bullion to coin it into fractional currency. This act discriminated against the standard silver dollar and in favor of fractional currency nearly 7 per cent. The owner of silver bullion by coining it into fractional currency instead of standard silver dollars would reap a profit of nearly $70 in every thousand dollars coined. The profit was immense. As a necessary result standard silver dollars were not coined to any considerable extent while the act of 1853 remained in force.

The reason assigned for this legislation is well stated in the report of the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, as follows:

We intend to do what the best writers on political economy have approved; what experience, where the experiment has been tried, has demonstrated to be necessary and proper, to make but one standard of currency and to make all others subservient to it. We mean to make gold the standard coin and to make those new silver coins applicable and convenient, not for large, but for small transactions.

Here is a plain declaration of the object sought to be accomplished by the act of 1853:

We mean to make gold the standard coin and to make the new silver coins applicable and convenient not for large, but for small transactions.

Gold for large transactions; silver for small transactions. The advocates of the single gold standard by this act attempted to put he nation on a gold-standard basis, and they were successful in their undertaking, in so far as such object could be attained by legislation. A bounty of nearly $70 to the silver bullion owner on every thousand dollars of bullion coined was amply sufficient to induce the coinage of it into fractional currency, especially when every two half dollars thus coined were the equal of a standard silver dollar in purchasing and debt-paying power. From 1853 to 1861 all large transactions were in gold and small ones in silver. The legislation of 1853 was Democratic. Both branches of Congress were overwhelmingly Democratic. The President was "I am a Democrat." And thus the silver dollar was demonetized by Democracy. Not by direct means, because Democracy never moves in straight lines, but rather prides itself upon indirect methods. This act dealt such a fatal blow to the silver dollar that from 1853 to 1873 less than eight millions were coined. This act just as effectually destroyed the parity and equality between gold and silver as the much scandalized act of 1873. If the act of 1873, by its direct method in demonetizing the standard silver dollar, was "the greatest crime of the nineteenth century," then, pursuing the same line of declamation, the act of 1853 in its indirect method of demonetizing the standard silver dollar was the greatest crime of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

From 1861 to 1873 we had no opportunity of fairly testing the equality of the metals. The rebellion of 1861 retired to private life gold and silver. Both could not maintain the flag in the heavens. They were not sufficient in amount and patriotism. The constitutional rock of finance was struck by loyal hands and bounteous streams of revenue leaped forth. The greenback and bluecoat became very much in evidence. This was long before the greenback had been wrought into an endless chain by a discredited and shortly to be ended Democratic Administration. The unity of the States and the integrity of the nation were preserved and maintained. And a few years after the close of that memorable contest gold and silver, having finished their period of retirement and mission abroad, came "swaggering" home to find a dwelling place beneath the stars, boasting their loyalty and patriotism. If the purpose of the Democratic act of 1853 was to establish a gold standard and to make gold convenient and applicable "to large transactions and silver to smaller ones," then it is quite apparent that the act of 1873 was merely supplemental to such act, or merely a continuation of the Democratic act of 1853. And I presume it was so understood at the time by the Democratic party, as I find by the RECORD that the great leaders of that party in the Senate voted for the act of February 12, 1873, now popularly referred to as "the crime of 1873." Thurman, Bayard, Salisbury, and others voted for this "alleged crime."

Very much has been said about the act of 1873 which is not true. It has been claimed that it was surreptitiously passed; that it went through Congress with "the stealthy tread of a cat."

Anyone at all conversant with the record knows that this is imagination pure and simple, originating, perhaps, from troubled and disordered minds. Few bills were ever more thoroughly discussed. It was before Congress for nearly three years. Its Congressional career is recorded on more than 140 pages. It is true that the act of 1873 prescribed that the unit of value should be gold. It was done in direct language, recording the practical result of the Democratic act of 1853. It is also true that the bill was discussed to no considerable extent by the press of the country; but this is not unusual. Everyone knows that important bills are passed at every session of Congress which are not discussed by the press generally. The fact that silver as a commodity was at a premium at the time is to my mind the principal reason why the act of 1873 did not provoke more discussion. Silver bullion was at that time, largely because of its scarcity and because of its demand for other uses, worth from 3 to 4 per cent more than gold in the market. The silver barons of the West, if they thought about it at all, had not the slightest idea but that it would continue at a premium, and because thereof some of the present free silver extremists voted for the act of 1873—an act to which they now refer when a safe distance from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as "the greatest crime of the nineteenth century."

The senior Senator of one of the silver States who now loads the air by day and by night with his free-silver lamentations voted for the act of 1873, and in its advocacy said:

I want the standard gold; no paper money not redeemable in gold; no paper money the value of which is not ascertained; no paper money that will organize a gold board to speculate in. Gold is the universal standard of the world. Everybody knows what a dollar in gold is worth.

His demand for gold and his championship of the so-called crime of 1873 was loud, long, aggressive, and most persistent. This same Senator now leads in the cause of silver with as much vehemence and energy as he did then in the cause of gold. As champion par excellence he stands preeminently at the head of a party which demands that the standard silver dollar shall be restored to its coinage place, as in the law of 1837—a unit of value, full legal tender, of the weight of 412½ grains—and that upon one side thereof there shall be an impression emblematical of liberty and upon the other the eagle. And the love for the white metal is now so ardent that all the people of all the world, irrespective of race, color, or previous condition, are invited to bring their silver, coined or uncoined, to our mints, which shall be open to them for the coining of their silver, without cost, into standard American dollars, each of the value of a gold dollar, which shall have an impression thereon of liberty and of the eagle, irrespective of its value as a commodity or of its quantity.

The silver monometallist claims that the act of 1873 struck down one-half of our constitutional money. This is a serious charge, if true. I think I have already shown that if silver has ever been stricken down by an act of legislation it was by the act of 1853. I would therefore kindly suggest to the free-silver Democrats and Populists, who appear to be joined in wedlock by silvery bonds, the propriety of redating their marriage certificate from 1873 to 1853. The truth is that we did not really begin to coin silver into money to any considerable extent until after the passage of the so-called demonetizatoin act of 1873.

From the passage of the act of 1873 up to 1878 the coined silver trade dollars amounted to $31,699,460, and from 1878 to 1883 $4,266,460 more were coined, making in all 35,965,924 trade dollars. And each of these trade dollars contained 7½ grains more of silver than the standard silver dollar. And from 1873 to 1878 the mints were busy coining silver halves, quarters, and dimes, amounting to the enormous sum of $47,072,862, making a grand total of silver coinage for these five years of $78,722,322.

The silver industry was booming, the mints in full blast, notwithstanding the alleged crime of 1873. The silver extremists strenuously claim that fully one-half of all the silver mined in America is used in the arts and for purposes other than coinage.

There is probably much truth in this statement, and for the purpose of this argument I shall assume it to be true. It follows

then that practically all the silver of America from 1873 to 1893 was coined into money, except that used in the arts and for other than mintage purposes.

From the passage of the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 until November, 1893, when the Sherman Act was repealed, we coined of standard silver dollars $421,175,051. From 1878 to November, 1893, we coined of fractional silver currency $23,844,365. The silver account from 1873 to November, 1893, when summed up, is as follows: Standard dollars, $421,175,051; fractional silver, $70,817,227; trade dollars, $35,965,924; total silver coinage, $527,958,202.

Practically amounting to one-half of all the silver mined during those twenty years, and all this vast sum has been coined since the alleged crime of 1873. Only about eight millions of silver dollars were coined prior to that time, or during twenty years, practically under Republican Administration, we coined nearly seventy times as much silver into money as during all the preceding eighty years. Does it not look very much as though the so-called crime of 1873 is largely a Democratic and Populistic nightmare?

The United States stock of silver is now estimated at about six hundred and twenty-five millions, of which sum about five hundred and forty-seven millions is full legal tender for general purposes, and some seventy-five millions in fractional coin possessing limited legal-tender qualities.

Notwithstanding the alleged "greatest crime of the nineteenth century," we have coined more silver and have more silver money now than Russia, Germany, Austria, and Great Britain all combined, and more silver money than France. Does it not appear as though the "great and awful crime of 1873," in so far as silver is concerned, was a blessing in disguise to silver-mine owners? During twenty years time they put upon the Government nearly $500,000,000 of silver. While the Government was buying silver of the mine owner, was consuming his product, it purchased no large quantities of wheat or corn from the farmer, or of iron, or lead from mine owners. For twenty years the Treasury of the United States has been the dumping ground and market place of the silver barons.

Since 1873 the production of silver has greatly increased. By the discovery of new processes the cost of production has been greatly facilitated and cheapened. As a natural consequence, the increase of the production lessens its price as a commodity, in the same manner as like large productions of corn and wheat cheapen such commodities. Notwithstanding the extensive use of silver as money, it has steadily depreciated as a commodity since 1873. The silver monometallist claims that as a necessary result flowing from the act of 1873 property has been cheapened, and, figuratively speaking, cut in two. The gold monometallist claims that since the act of 1873 the price of property has held its own or advanced in value, and that the people have been benefited thereby.

A strange law, indeed, if such contentions are true—that at the same time it raises and lowers the values of similar property similarly situated. Of course, this can not be true.

The silver extremist exclaims that 50-cent silver produces 50-cent wheat and fifty-dollar horses. The gold extremist exclaims, it produces 40-cent corn and seventy-five-dollar steers, and thus the contention goes bravely on between the theorists. The bimetallist claims that the act of 1873 has necessarily and logically no effect upon cheapening wheat or horses, and at the same time enhancing the price of corn or steers. All such changes in value can be accounted for in accordance with facts and a moderate application of common sense.

In some parts of the country farm lands have increased in value from $5 to $50 per acre, and in other localities they have depreciated from $50 to $5 or less per acre. It is not possible that such enhanced and depreciated prices are caused at the same time by the alleged crime of 1873, but by other causes and conditions.

One faction exclaims that an increase of our circulating medium to $40 per capita would enhance the price of all commodities. The other contends if there is enough money and credit with which to easily transact the business of the country an enlarged per capita circulation would not necessarily appreciate the price of lands and commodities; that five hundred millions of business is easily transacted with ten millions of actual money; that the business of this great country is carried on with an actual cash capital of 5 per cent on the dollar of its value. One side refers to France with its $40 per capita, and the other to England, Germany, and Russia with their $20 and less per capita. And then the inquiry comes, If the circulating medium in France is double that in England, Germany, or Russia, why are not like commodities twice as high in France as in England, Germany, or Russia? We all know they are not, and that there is a common price level for all like commodities in those countries, and that the per capita theory does not accord with actual facts.

But why follow the line of argument of these extremists further? We know that their theories run counter to facts and experience, and therefore should not be followed. What, then, should be done to restore prosperity to the languishing industries of the country?

Before answering this question I wish to pay my respects a little more fully to the pretended love of Democracy for the white metal. The Democratic party in its national platform of 1892 demanded in effect the repeal of the Sherman Act of 1890, under and in pursuance of which nearly fifty millions of standard silver dollars were annually added to the currency.

If all the silver of all the world is to be coined into standard silver dollars, then I fail to see why the coinage of about fifty millions of standard silver dollars per annum was not a pretty good thing, as it practically consumed the entire annual American product of silver, less that used in the arts and for other purposes. It so appears to me, and for fear that I may be misunderstood I now quote from a speech delivered in the Senate on February 18, 1893, by one of the greatest Democrats of the nineteenth century. Among other things he said:

> I would have voted the other day to take up what is known as the Sherman Act and for its repeal but for the fact that its passage would absolutely demonetize silver and leave it unsupported by not one word of legislation. I thought the measure was audacious. I thought it was an outrage to ask men like myself and others to absolutely sweep from under the silver currency every vestige of law. That is not what we meant at Chicago. That is not what the people mean. I would not vote for the repeal of the Sherman Act because it is vicious in principle, but it must be connected with something better.

A few months later the repeal came, at the special session of 1893, without any reservation or limitation.

This is not at all strange, for we are told that in those days Democratic conversions were very numerous and very rapid, some of them in speed almost rivaling that of "Saul of Tarsus," who was converted "in the twinkling of an eye." This much, however, should be said in Saul's favor: He was marching on to no administrative pie counter.

It is true the repealing act contains something more than was necessary for an actual repeal of the Sherman Act; but is this the something better intimated? If so, then it logically follows that nothing is something better in connection with silver.

The repealing clause says:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, etc.

Silver had then been practically demonetized by the Democratic act of 1853 for more than forty years. Yet this repealing clause says it is the policy to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money. How can a thing not in existence be continued? Shall the dead live again without resurrection?

Silver as a unit of value was eliminated by the act of 1873. It no longer went to the mint on an equality with gold.

For more than twenty years it was treated as a commodity by legislation, yet it is declared by this repealing clause to be the policy to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money. By "standard money" is meant primary money, redemption money, money on an equality and parity in every respect.

Is this what is meant by the word "continue" in the repealing act, when the equality did not exist and had not existed for forty years—certainly not for twenty? Was not the currency by the repeal of the Sherman Act contracted nearly fifty millions per annum? And was not this repeal under Democratic Administration? And were not both branches of Congress Democratic? Therefore, the striking down of silver and the contraction of the currency nearly $50,000,000 per annum must be charged to the Democratic party. I know that some Republicans voted for its repeal, and I also know that some alleged Democrats voted against its repeal. However, the bill emanated from a Democratic Finance Committee; it passed a Democratic House, a Democratic Senate, and was approved by the greatest of all living, yet politically dead, Democrats, and thereby it became a Democratic act.

It is well known that the President and his followers are gold monometallists, and that the present bill, if it should pass both branches of Congress, would never become a law. It is also apparent that the people now believe Democracy incapable of properly administering national affairs. Whenever it has been intrusted with power by the people it has signally failed. Its theories, traditions, beliefs, tendencies, and policies are not in harmony with national supremacy. In 1846 it passed a bill known as the "Walker tariff." This act was practically in force until 1861. During those years the balance of trade was against us nearly $437,000,000, and this vast sum had to be paid in gold. During such time more than four hundred millions in American gold went abroad. This balance represented just that amount of business which should have been done in this country by American labor and capital. From a Democratic standpoint this was a great tariff bill. Under it our gold went abroad and our labor was largely done in foreign lands. Democracy was so enamored of this act that in 1848 they resolved at their national convention—

> That the fruits of the great political triumphs which elected James K. Polk have fulfilled the hopes of the Democracy of the Union in the noble impulse given to the cause of free trade by the repeal of the tariff of 1842 and the creation of the more equal, honest, and productive tariff of 1846.

The tariff act of 1842 was protective. The tariff act of 1846 was practically free trade. The balance of trade under the tariff act

of 1842, during the four years of its existence, was in our favor $40,092,164. This balance was paid with foreign gold. Democracy extolled the act of 1846 as productive in revenue. This was a misconception. It was productive, not in revenue, but in the exportation of gold and in the transportation of business and labor abroad. It was truly "a noble impulse given to the cause of free trade," from a Democratic standpoint. It built up and stimulated industries abroad and destroyed those at home. Mr. Buchanan was at last compelled to say the following of this Democratic measure:

With all the elements of natural wealth in abundance, our manufactories were suspended, our useful public and private enterprises were arrested, and thousands of laborers were deprived of employment and reduced to want.

Some amendments were made to the act of 1846, some more ad valorem duties were imposed. Yet gold went abroad and labor was not done at home. Our revenues for current expenses were insufficient. Bonds bearing a high rate of interest were sold at a large discount in order to raise money to supply the deficiency. The condition of the people was most deplorable. Little money in circulation, and Democratic State banks broken and insolvent. History repeats itself. In 1892, Democracy, hungry, bold, and defiant, made an assault upon the business interests of the country. It boldly announced that the method which had been pursued for more than a half century in raising revenue, principally by indirect taxation, was a fraud, and it was intimated that such taxation was unconstitutional. Upon this issue Democracy was intrusted with power in the legislative and executive branches of the Government. Immediately upon its becoming known that the Government had passed under Democratic control, business faltered and fell by the wayside, manufactories were shut down, and large numbers of men and women were thrown out of employment; banks failed; railroads went into the hands of receivers; consternation and panic stalked throughout the land. Amid all this disaster, and to add still more to the misery of the people, the industries of ten States and Territories were almost annihilated and our currency contracted many millions annually by the repeal of the Sherman Act. In 1893, after having repealed the Sherman Act, Democracy, still bold and defiant, destroyed the tariff bill of 1890 and turned to the act of 1846 for inspiration. It consulted its "curios and antiques," and brought forth, after much travail, another act of "perfidy and dishonor."

It took up again the noble impulse in the cause of free trade where it had left off in 1846. The general effect upon our industries under the Wilson bill of 1894 was the same as under the act of 1846, only more deplorable. Again, "with all the elements of natural wealth in abundance, our manufactures were suspended, our useful public and private enterprises were arrested, and thousands of laborers were deprived of employment and reduced to want."

We are now informed by Democracy that the Wilson bill is a great getter of revenue; even more productive and luxuriant than the McKinley bill; that it produces ample revenue to pay current expenses. Of course this statement is not generally believed to be true.

Under the McKinley bill, while Republicans were in control, ample revenues were collected to pay current expenses, and large annual reductions were made in the national debt. Our labor was done at home and our gold did not go abroad. The balance of trade under this act was in our favor for the year ended June 30, 1891, $39,564,614; for the year ended June 30, 1892, $202,875,686. The balance of trade from June 30, 1892, up to and until the election in November, 1892, was largely in our favor. The result of that election immediately paralyzed business, and the balance of trade on June 30, 1893, under President Cleveland was against us $18,737,728. And it has been ever since enormously against us. Since March 4, 1893, more than $350,000,000 in gold has gone abroad. The national debt has been increased by the sale of over $162,000,000 of bonds and is soon to be increased $100,000,000 more, which vast sums of money have been and will be ultimately used in paying the current expenses of the Government. It therefore appears from a Democratic standpoint that an empty Treasury under a free-trade bill and an annual increase of the national debt by the sale of interest-bearing obligations with which to raise money to pay current expenses is preferable to a full Treasury under a protective bill and the annual reduction of the national debt. The severest blows ever dealt American labor and American industries were delivered at the election in November, 1892, and by the subsequent enactment of the Wilson bill in 1894. From the wounds thus inflicted labor and capital have not yet recovered and will not for years to come. The true date of the Wilson bill in its destructive effects was November, 1892, and not August, 1894. The days of Buchanan over again. Selling bonds to obtain money to fill empty treasuries in time of peace. The gold of the country going abroad and the labor of the country being done by foreign hands on foreign soil. One declaring that a State had no right to secede, yet he could find no constitutional power to coerce a sovereign State; the other annulling the Monroe doctrine in one of its most important features. Then, as now, Democracy believed in State rights, State banks, free trade, and a gold standard.

Mr. President, a majority of the people demand two things: First, the enactment of a tariff law not quite so prohibitive in some respects as the McKinley bill and not quite so luxuriant in its free list; second, the coinage of American silver only at the ratio of 16 to 1. The people believe with a proper tariff law the balance of trade will be speedily restored and foreign gold will flow into the Treasury; and that with the coinage of American silver the money of the country will not be so easily cornered, and that panics and lockouts will not so frequently occur. We are told, however, that even the coinage of the American product would greatly inflate prices. I hardly believe this statement to be true. In case of free coinage of the American product, our mines would probably produce annually from seventy-five to eighty million dollars for a few years, when the output would undoubtedly decrease, as many mines by that time would be worked out and exhausted.

There must be an end to silver mining in this country whether we have free silver coinage or not, because large quantities of silver will be annually required for use in the arts and other purposes; many millions are now annually shipped abroad. The end, however, would come more quickly with free coinage, because of a larger use of silver. It is estimated that from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 in value of silver per annum is used in the arts and for other purposes. If this is true, then with the coinage of the American product our mintage of silver dollars and fractional currency would probably not exceed forty or forty-five million dollars per annum. Thus it will be seen that our increase of money per capita would be less than 75 cents per annum—an amount hardly sufficient to inflate the currency to any appreciable extent, nor sufficient to cause decadence and decay, nor, if we relied upon this only, to bring much prosperity. It is quite apparent that free coinage of silver will not work miracles nor do all that is claimed for it by its advocates. It also ought to be equally apparent to the gold-standard apostle that an increase of less than $1 per capita in our circulating medium per annum would not cause panic and disaster. With the free coinage of the silver produced in America it would take fully ten years of constant and active mining and the work of our mints to their fullest capacity to increase our circulating medium as much as $5 per capita. And in all human probability at the expiration of that time the production of silver in this country would gradually decrease instead of increase, because of the exhaustion of many of the mines. Is it not apparent, therefore, that the crimination and recrimination of the extremists are without substance or just foundation?

To most people the battle now being waged between them appears harmless, and its resemblance to those of Don Quixote with the wind mills very striking. Exaggeration seems to be a potent weapon. Facts are not wanted; theories predominate.

From the loud and persistent assertions of the free-silver Democrats and Populists some are led to believe that since 1873 our industries have been paralyzed, and that as a nation we have not progressed. The truth is, we never had much prosperity or much business in this country until after the rebellion of 1861; and the golden age of American industries was between 1865 and 1893.

During that time we constructed and equipped more than 100,000 miles of railroad, and in such business expended more than a half million dollars daily. We settled the public domain, organized States, and built cities. America stepped to the front as the greatest manufacturing nation of the world, and to-day she exceeds in power England, France, and Germany combined. In the field of labor one American is the equal of two Englishmen, two Frenchmen, or two Germans. In agricultural pursuits here one American can produce as much as two Englishmen, three Frenchmen, four Germans, or five Austrians. In the last thirty years the inventive genius of man has taken new flights. We have outrun all other nations in intelligence, wealth, and enterprise, and to-day 70,000,000 of Americans own one-quarter of all the wealth of all the world. During those years our progress was marvelous, incomparable. Therefore, Mr. President, does it not plainly appear that the silver question has been expanded beyond all reasonable proportions by extremists; its benefit or injury most grossly exaggerated? It is not, in my opinion, the greatest and most important question of the hour. It is not the sole cause of hard times by any means.

There are other industries which are now languishing that far exceed in value and importance the production of the silver mines.

Less than 2 per cent of the land of the great State of Colorado is under cultivation, yet its annual agricultural productions exceed in value its annual silver output. The agricultural products of Kansas for the year 1895 exceed in value the entire silver output of the Western States for any one year. The value of the products and commodities produced annually in America exceed many hundred times the annual output of the American silver mines. Thus we see that the silver product per annum is almost

infinitesimal when compared with the aggregate value of our other products and commodities.

It is but a drop in the great commercial bucket. Therefore is it not apparent that the effect of the coinage of the American silver would not be injuriously felt, and that the danger apprehended by the gold monometallist is largely theoretical and imaginary? The greatest benefit to be derived from the coinage of American silver would be to give employment to a few thousand idle laborers, the investment of some capital, and a slow, gradual, and healthful expansion of our primary or redemption money. The inflation of the currency caused by the coinage of the American product, I believe, would be beneficial, not injurious.

It would stimulate business some, but it alone would not produce general prosperity. Our misfortune is not wholly due to the demonetization of silver or a failure to coin it, although it is a factor which enters into the situation to some extent.

In my opinion there is a vastly more important question involved than the mere coinage of silver. When I see the champions of Democracy parading around the prostrate form of the silver queen, shedding copious floods of briny tears, I am led to believe that such great show of grief and sorrow is not from the heart, but rather in the nature of an exhibition before a susceptible public for political purposes. The majority of the American people do not believe in the tenets of Democracy. They have overthrown its most sacred principles, State rights, State banks, and free trade. And in my opinion they will resent its assumed leadership in finance. In the past Democratic theories have been unsound, Democratic policies unfortunate. Why will they not prove equally so in the future? What new and recent assurances have the people that they will be safe leaders in the cause of bimetallism? In discussing this question we must not forget the glorious history of the Republican party or its fundamental principles. Free speech, free schools, free press, free ballot, protection to American industries and American labor, and a currency as national as the flag and as strong as the Government. All other questions are minor and subordinate, and upon such minor questions Republicans can not afford to be led into Democratic and Populistic camps with the vain and delusive cry of the free and unlimited coinage of all the silver of all the world unaided and alone at the ratio of 16 to 1.

In my opinion, the chief cause of our misfortune originated first in the great and unfortunate mistake made by the people in the election of November, 1892, conferring power upon the Democratic party. And this most deplorable mistake was intensified by unfortunate laws relating to our revenues which Democracy placed upon the statute book. The Wilson bill is too near a free-trade act to suit the industries of the nation. Its blighting and destructive effect has been felt in all branches of industry. Nearly three years of Democratic administration has proved more expensive to the people than the national debt incurred because of the rebellion of 1861. Thus we learn that some things are more expensive though not quite so deplorable as war. When we shall have placed upon the statute book a proper revenue bill, then American labor will find full hours of employment at home and good compensation. Then the balance of trade will be in our favor and not against us. Then gold will come from abroad and remain in the Treasury, and the endless chain will be no more. Then the mints of the country can be safely opened to the coinage of American silver only. Then the fears of the gold monometallist as to the danger of bimetallism will have disappeared. His disordered brain will have assumed its normal condition. Then in the head of the silver extremist wheels will cease to revolve. Exaggeration will be forgotten. Then prosperity and contentment will be in every home, gladness will penetrate every heart, and labor will make the nation resound with its joyous acclaim. Then Democracy, what little there is of it, will again consult its "curios and antiques" and arrange its feeble battle lines along State rights, State banks, and free trade. The loud clarion voice of Populism will be heard no more in the land, sounding the praises of the free and unlimited coinage of all the silver of all the world at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Its voice will be lower, and in sad and melancholy tones it will sing of the beauties of irredeemable paper money based upon nothing, and of the inestimable blessing to be derived from free subtreasuries, maintained at governmental expense, in which the people may store their perishable and nonperishable products.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the issue of all issues at this time is the money question. I fully realize that the question is at the front, not, however, because of its merit only, but rather because of hard times, caused largely, if not wholly, by bad legislation, and because of its industrious and persistent cultivation by ambitious men, aided by the discarded and dissatisfied politicians of the old parties.

Mr. President, I am ready and willing at this time to vote for the free coinage of the silver produced in the United States only, not because money is the paramount issue of the hour, but rather because I believe that we are shortly to have more favorable laws governing our greater and more important industries, when prosperity will return.

And then good, and only good, in my judgment, can come by an increase in our redemption or primary money. I am also ready and willing to vote for a bill providing for the coinage of our silver at the rate of 16 to 1 as an object lesson. If the law proves beneficial we will retain it; if injurious, repeal it.

Whatever the result, it will stand as a monument on the highway of time as a warning or blessing to those coming hereafter. Our country is too wealthy, our resources too great, to be permanently injured by the experiment.

Mr. President, the people, as demonstrated by the elections of 1893, 1894, and 1895, have determined to place the entire control of this great Government in the hands of the Republican party as speedily as possible. It is ready and willing to accept the great trust so to be devolved. It will meet every question and decide it properly. It will be equal to every emergency. It will settle the questions of tariff and finance unaided and alone. It will establish and maintain the equality and parity between gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 to the entire satisfaction of the people. Then we shall have no personal Administration in opposition to the will of the people. The people will never forget that whatever there is in this Government for the last thirty-five years worthy of emulation or preservation is due solely to the wisdom, statesmanship, and patriotism of the Republican party. In the future, as in the past, guided by that power which controlrs the destinie of men and of nations, its mission will still be onwad and upwards.

Mr. NELSON. I had intended to submit some remarks upon the pending measure to-day, but it is now rather late in the day and I will let it go over until Monday, when I shall ask for a short time the privilege of submitting a few remarks upon the bill.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

POTOMAC RIVER MEMORIAL BRIDGE.

Mr. DANIEL. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 176) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River, which has been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments. I will state, if I may, sir, that this bill is very heartily recommended by the Secretary of War, who regards it as important for military purposes, and it has the earnest support in this body of a distinguished gentleman who was the Secretary of War under a former Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the pending measure may be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of proceeding to the consideration of the bill indicated by him. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill at this time?

Mr. PUGH. I understand that the consideration of that bill will not interfere with the unfinished business?

Mr. DANIEL. Not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at all. Unanimous consent is asked.

Mr. CHANDLER. By unanimous consent it can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLANCHARD. One moment, Mr. President. I was on my feet not for the purpose of objecting to the bill, but before unanimous consent is given I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia if it is anywhere provided in the bill that one-half of the expense of this structure shall be paid by the District of Columbia?

Mr. DANIEL. No.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I hope the Senator will agree to an amendment to that effect. Otherwise I shall feel constrained to object to the bill, much as I dislike to do it.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Senator will allow the bill to be read I think I can appropriately answer his suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must inquire whether there is objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I reserve the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and will be read.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The bill is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Louisiana to state that he does not object to its consideration.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I have arranged with the Senator from Virginia about it. I do not object.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The amendments were, in section 2, line 1, after the word "That," to strike out "the cost of said bridge shall not exceed the sum of,

$600,000; and"; in line 5, after the word "of," to strike out "securing designs and of commencing the construction of said bridge; which," and insert "making the necessary surveys, soundings, and borings on the line of the proposed bridge, and for securing designs and estimates of cost of said bridge, which"; so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of making the necessary surveys, soundings, and borings on the line of the proposed bridge, and for securing designs and estimates of cost of said bridge, which shall be used exclusively for foot passenger and vehicles, and prohibited to all tramways, whether propelled by steam, electric, cable, horse, or other power.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the bill having been perfected, I beg leave to say just a few words.

The report of the Secretary of War is not yet published in the form in which we usually have it, but no doubt Senators have read it. In that report will be found the considerations set forth in favor of the erection of this bridge by the United States Government. There is an important military post near the capital, at Fort Myer, just across the river. In addition to that, the Government is the owner of the soil. It owns some 1,100 acres of land adjacent to the city, the former Arlington estate, in which is a large national cemetery, and on which also is an immense flat, near the Potomac, which the Secretary of War considers would be of desirable use for troops in maneuvering and drilling and for the large bodies which often visit the capital to encamp.

The considerations set forth by the Secretary of War in favor of this bridge are that it is to be erected for the purpose of connecting the national capital with the military post which is its guard and with the property which is under the control of the Secretary of War, which holds a great national cemetery and a field appropriate for future military uses, both of the Army and the militia. These considerations are so weighty that in considering them we should lose sight of any view as to the mere government of the District of Columbia. I think, sir, that this is a fair charge directly upon the Treasury of the United States. It not only has the support of the present Secretary of War, but the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], who once occupied that position during the Administration of President Harrison, is now one of the committee which has passed upon and is supporting this bill.

I hope it may be the pleasure of the Senator from Louisiana to recognize the broad national considerations from a military point of view which have controlled the advocacy of this bill on the part of the War Department, and that he may not offer the amendment which had occurred to his mind, and which would be very pertinent and just if this were a mere local improvement for the benefit of the city of Washington. Though incidentally advantages will undoubtedly accrue both to the District of Columbia and to the State of Virginia, the chief benefit is that to be derived by the Government of the United States, which for its convenience desires this bridge to connect the national capital with the military post which defends it, with the military cemetery which is so often visited by citizens of this country from all portions of it, and with a military parade ground upon which both regular troops and militia and other large bodies may encamp.

An additional consideration is found in the fact that should the Government ever desire to dispose of any portion of this large area the accretion in value would be immense.

Mr. President, access to the national capital ought to be made easy to the citizens who approach it from any quarter, and communication between the Headquarters of the Army and the fortifications which concern it should also be made by an easy highway always ready to be used. It is a shame, in my humble judgment, that we have so long neglected this matter and that communication is so poor and imperfect between the capital and the places to which I have referred.

I will now throw myself upon the magnanimity and place myself at the mercy of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. President, I did not rise a while ago for the purpose of preventing the passage of this bill for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River to connect the District directly with the military post at Fort Myer and with the national cemetery at Arlington. I believe the bridge should be built. I agree with the Senator from Virginia that the facilities for crossing the Potomac River at the city of Washington are inadequate. My purpose chiefly was to suggest the propriety of the payment of one-half of the expense by the District of Columbia.

The Government of the United States pays now and has been paying for many years past, certainly as long as I have had any connection with either House of Congress, one-half of the public expenditures in the District of Columbia. That was all right so long as Washington was a straggling town, but now when Washington has grown to the colossal proportions of a city of 250,000 people, it is not just to the people of the United States at large that the Federal Treasury should continue to be taxed to pay one-half of the municipal expenses of the District. This system had its origin in the idea that the Government owned one-half of the area of the city of Washington; hence, should bear one-half of the expenses of the city. But in order to debit the Government with the ownership of half of the area of the city, they charged the area occupied by the streets and avenues to the Government. This was done when Washington was a small town as compared with its proportions now. Now, Mr. President, it is not right to charge to the Government the streets of the city. They are common to everyone and should be excluded from the computation.

Mr. FAULKNER. Will the Senator from Louisiana permit me to correct him there?

Mr. BLANCHARD. Certainly; if I am in error I desire to be corrected.

Mr. FAULKNER. Fifty-one per cent in area of the entire property within the limits of the city of Washington is in streets and reservations, not counting at all the property owned by the Government, on which its public buildings are situated, nor does it include the hundreds of lots owned by the Government as proprietor, and which the Government has the power to sell and is selling at different times, paying no taxes whatever upon it.

Mr. BLANCHARD. My remarks had reference not to the structures erected by the Government on lands owned by it, but to the area constituting the city of Washington. By the Senator's own statement 50 or 51 per cent of this area is in streets and parks. This must be according to a survey made a long time ago. I venture to say a survey made now would show no such results. Washington has been built up and spreads out over a large space.

The time has come, and I hope in the near future it will crystallize into law, when the amount that the Government will be called upon to pay of the municipal expenditures of the city of Washington will be less than one-half. What was fair and just in this regard twenty-five years ago ceases to be so now. Conditions have changed, but the policy complained of has not changed; it still exists.

Inasmuch, then, as we are still contributing one-half out of the public Treasury to the expenses of the District of Columbia, it is not an injustice to ask that when structures of this kind are sought to be built, connecting the District of Columbia with the adjacent Virginia shore, one-half of the expense of such structure should be borne by the District.

If I mistake not, one-half of the expense of the bridge that spans the Potomac River at Georgetown was paid by the District. If I am in error in this, I trust the Senator from Virginia or the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia will correct me. If that bridge was constructed by the joint expenditure of moneys pertaining to the District of Columbia and the Federal Treasury, why should not the same rule obtain in regard to this bridge, which, though it is called a memorial bridge, is nothing but an additional bridge over the Potomac River for the accommodation of the District of Columbia and the people who desire to cross the river to get into the District?

Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill by the Senate. There was an understanding between the Senator from Virginia and myself that, notwithstanding the fact the bill was laid before the Senate, if I insisted upon urging an objection, it would go over. I do not insist upon its going over, but I do hope the Senator from Virginia will accept an amendment which I offer to the bill. I send up to be read by the Secretary a proviso to be appended at the end of the second section of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana moves to further amend the bill by adding to it what will be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill add the following proviso:

Provided, That one-half of the cost of said bridge shall be paid by the District of Columbia and one-half by the United States.

Mr. DANIEL. I can not acquiesce in the amendment. I would be glad to have it passed upon by the Senate, but it hardly seems to me to be just.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not want to object to the bill if this amendment can be adopted. I will vote for it if we can have the bill disposed of, so that we can proceed to the consideration of executive business. If there is to be further debate I must object to the further consideration of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VEST subsequently said: I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill in regard to the memorial bridge was passed,

on account of an amendment which I understand was adopted while I was temporarily absent from the Chamber. If I had been here I should have expressed my opinion about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

LANDS AT PORT ROYAL, S. C.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from New Hampshire withdraw that motion for a moment?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 1297) to provide for the purchase of lands adjoining the United States naval station, Port Royal, S. C., a small bill which the Navy Department wishes to have passed, and which has been reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs favorably.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, in section 2, line 2, before the word "thousand," to strike out "ten" and insert "three"; so as to make the section read:

That for the purchase of the lands hereinbefore described there is hereby appropriated the sum of $3,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. TILLMAN. I move to amend the amendment of the committee by increasing the amount from $3,000 to $5,000. I have conferred with the Secretary of the Navy, and this is proposed in order to gain time. It is feared that the land will not be sold if an amount so small as $3,000 is offered for it. I have consulted the members of the committee and they have agreed that the amendment I propose shall be made. I ask, therefore, that $5,000 shall be inserted as the amount named.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is the appropriate amount which should be inserted.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FORT ASSINNIBOINE MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 626) providing for disposal of lands on abandoned portions of the Fort Assinniboine Military Reservation in Montana, and for the relief of certain settlers thereon.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CARTER. There are certain amendments reported by the Committee on Public Lands which I ask to have considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The amendments reported by the Committee on Public Lands were, in section 1, line 10, before the word "act," to strike out "an" and insert "any," and at the end of the section to insert:

Provided, That if the entire reservation be abandoned for military purposes this act shall not apply to an area 1 mile square embracing the Government buildings at Fort Assinniboine.

So as to make the section read:

That all lands which have been or may hereafter be excluded from the limits of the Fort Assinniboine Military Reservation in the State of Montana shall be open to the operation of the laws regulating homestead entry, except section 2301 of the Revised Statutes, and to entry under the town-site laws and the laws governing the disposal of coal lands, desert lands, and mineral lands, and shall not be subject to sale under the provisions of any act relating to the sale of abandoned military reservations: *Provided*, That if the entire reservation be abandoned for military purposes this act shall not apply to an area 1 mile square embracing the Government buildings at Fort Assinniboine.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHANDLER. I now renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 27, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 1896.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Patrick S. Nagle, of Oklahoma Territory, to be marshal of the United States for the Territory of Oklahoma, vice E. D. Nix, removed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

John A. Mason, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the Second district of New York, to succeed John A. Sullivan, resigned.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

George H. Cleaves, of New York, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Greenport, in the State of New York, to succeed E. S. Havens, resigned. Mr. Cleaves is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate. This nomination to correct error in name of Mr. Cleaves, nominated as George S. Cleaves December 17, 1895, which nomination is withdrawn.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 24, 1896.

POSTMASTERS.

Francis Riley, to be postmaster at Hoosick Falls, in the county of Rensselaer and State of New York.

William Killefer, to be postmaster at Paw Paw, in the county of Van Buren and State of Michigan.

Jonathan L. Pettyjohn, to be postmaster at Olathe, in the county of Johnson and State of Kansas.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *January 27, 1896.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell;

A bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood; and

A bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 147) granting a pension to George W. Case, late private Company B, Twenty-seventh New York Cavalry;

A bill (H. R. 711) to increase the pension of Uzziel B. Church;

A bill (H. R. 925) to pension Annie J. Corbett;

A bill (H. R. 994) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Keith;

A bill (H. R. 1020) granting an increase of pension to Gilman Williams;

A bill (H. R. 1141) granting a pension to Miss Mary E. Hull, dependent sister of John A. Hull, deceased, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the late war of the rebellion;

A bill (H. R. 1605) granting a pension to Anna Kelley;

A bill (H. R. 1616) granting a pension to Michael E. Bricker, of Edgerton, Ind.;

A bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to Caroline Parker; and

A bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane Dulany.

SENATORS FROM UTAH.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I take great personal pleasure, and a peculiar pleasure, in presenting the credentials of Frank J. Cannon, elected a Senator from the State of Utah. I ask that the credentials be read and that the Senator-elect be qualified as a member of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The Secretary read the credentials of Frank J. Cannon, chosen by the legislature of Utah a Senator from that State.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Arthur Brown, a Senator-elect from the State of Utah, and ask that they may be read and that the oath of office be administered to him.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The Secretary read the credentials of Arthur Brown, chosen by the legislature of Utah a Senator from that State.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. DUBOIS. There being no question about the regularity of the proceedings, I ask that the Senators from Utah be sworn in.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senators-elect will come forward and receive the oath of office.

Mr. Cannon and Mr. Brown were escorted to the Vice-Presi-

dent's desk by Mr. DUBOIS and Mr. BURROWS, respectively, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to them, they took their seats in the Senate.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Senate proceed to ascertain the classes to which the Senators from the State of Utah shall be assigned, in conformity with the resolution of May 14, 1789, and as the Constitution requires.

On motion of Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, it was

Ordered, That the Secretary put into the ballot box two papers of equal size, one of which shall be numbered 1, and the other shall be numbered 3. Each of the Senators from the State of Utah shall draw out one paper; and the Senator who shall draw out the paper numbered 1 shall be assigned to the class of Senators whose terms of service will expire the 3d day of March, 1899; and the Senator who shall draw out the paper numbered 3 shall be assigned to the class of Senators whose terms of service will expire the 3d day of March, 1897.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senators from Utah will please come forward, in accordance with the order of the Senate.

Mr. CANNON and Mr. BROWN advanced to the Secretary's desk and drew, respectively, in the order named, a paper from the ballot box.

The papers were then handed by the Secretary to the Vice-President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Mr. BROWN has drawn the paper numbered 3, and is accordingly assigned to the class of Senators whose terms of service will expire March 3, 1897. Mr. CANNON has drawn the paper numbered 1, and is accordingly assigned to the class of Senators whose terms of service will expire March 3, 1899. The proper entry will be made upon the Journal of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a joint resolution providing for the temporary appointment of expert money counters in the Treasury Department in order to bring up the work of counting and assorting currency sent to the Department for redemption, which is now $7,500,000 in arrears, and requesting that the resolution be enacted into a law as early as practicable; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Auditor for the State and other Departments in regard to the necessity for an additional clerk of class 4 in his office, and recommending that provision be made for such clerk for the remainder of the current fiscal year in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, in response to a resolution of the 3d instant calling for information as to what disposition has been made of the appropriation made in the act "making appropriations for the support of the Army, approved September 22, 1888," for pneumatic dynamite guns, whether any batteries have been established under the act at any of the ports of the United States, and whether it would be possible to establish such a battery at Fort Warren, Boston Harbor, transmitting reports from the Chief of Ordnance and the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, upon the subject; which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 147) granting a pension to George W. Case, late private Company B, Twenty-seventh New York Cavalry;

A bill (H. R. 711) to increase the pension of Uzziel B. Church;

A bill (H. R. 925) to pension Annie J. Corbett;

A bill (H. R. 994) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Keith;

A bill (H. R. 1020) granting an increase of pension to Gilman Williams;

A bill (H. R. 1141) granting a pension to Miss Mary E. Hull, dependent sister of John A. Hull, deceased, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the late war of the rebellion;

A bill (H. R. 1605) granting a pension to Anna Kelley;

A bill (H. R. 1616) granting a pension to Michael E. Bricker, of Edgerton, Ind.;

A bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to Caroline Parker; and

A bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane Dulany.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation for the protection of the seacoast cities of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

Mr. PLATT presented the petition of Henry Spies and 103 other citizens of New York, praying that the Congress will authorize the Secretary of War to contract with Charles Stoughton and his associates for the entire work of constructing a canal through the Harlem Kills, New York, 15 feet deep and 300 feet wide, for a sum not exceeding $1,450,000; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that appropriations be made to complete the defenses of harbors of coastwise cities; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented petitions of W. G. Conn and 304 other citizens of Fayette County, of J. A. Hart and 19 other citizens of West Lebanon, of Henry Blackwell and 61 other citizens of Montoursville, and of W. C. Elder and 76 other citizens of Red Bank, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NELSON. I present the petition of J. S. Pillsbury, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the national banking law. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 15, 1896.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have read the text of a bill which you have introduced governing our national banks. I most heartily approve of the alterations which you propose; they will be very helpful; and I am glad you have taken up the subject of national banking. After ten years' experience as director of national bank, you will permit me to make the following suggestions for further alterations in the law, as I did not notice that you will include these changes.

Amend the banking law so as to prohibit, and, in fact, make a penalty for banks to make rediscounts. This is a very important amendment, from the fact that almost any national bank would have sufficient liability when it loans its deposits; and the risk is great when any bank goes beyond this and borrows money by rediscounts.

Second. It should be made a penal offense for the officers of any bank to borrow money, directly or indirectly, from the bank of which they are officers. It has become quite the custom for the officers of banks to take the money which they use, without permission, from the fact that they are officers. This has probably had a tendency to wreck more banks than any other factor in the management of national banks. More than half of all the failures of national banks have been caused largely by the officers taking money from the banks without the directors' knowledge.

Third. The officers of all national banks should be prohibited from loaning any of the funds of the bank of which they are officers above the sum, say, of $500, except where the limits for loans to customers have been fixed by the discount committee or directors of the bank. And no loans should be made above the limit of $500 except the applicants shall first have been passed upon by the discount committee or directors of such bank.

It is entirely wrong, and should be considered a misdemeanor, for the officers of the bank to make loans on their own judgment without consulting the directors or the discount committee.

Fourth. National banks should have the advantage of all bills which may be destroyed or lost; as, for instance, when bank bills are destroyed by fire, or lost by water, or anything of this kind, banks should have the advantage of these losses, instead, as now, under the general banking law, the Government having the benefit of such losses, as the Government has full security, by the deposits of bonds, for the issuing of their bills.

The financial crisis through which this country has recently passed has given experience to those who are connected with the management of banks that it is imperatively necessary that the laws should be more strongly guarded by making these amendments for the safety of the community, and all financial institutions should be so managed that safety is the first object of a bank.

Excuse me for calling your attention to this. I should not do so, except that my experience teaches me that such amendments as suggested would make the law more perfect, and would throw around us such guards for the safety of the community as are absolutely necessary.

Very truly, yours,

J. S. PILLSBURY.

P. S.—The officers who should be prohibited from borrowing money are the president, vice-president, cashier, assistant cashier, teller, and assistant teller. The prohibition should not embrace the directors.

J. S. P.

Hon. KNUTE NELSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SQUIRE presented petitions of the Board of Trade of Savannah, Ga.; of the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, S. C.; of the Savannah Cotton Exchange, of Savannah, Ga.; of the city council of Charleston, S. C., and of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for fortifications and other seacoast defenses; which were referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Ballard, Wash., and a petition of the common council of Hoquiam, Wash., praying for the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the Government; which were referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Whatcom County, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the University of the State of Washington, and petitions of sundry citizens of Skagit County, and of sundry citizens of Snohomish County, in the State of Washington, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 735, to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a series of petitions containing thousands of signatures of citizens of King County, in the State of Washington, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 735, to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN presented resolutions adopted by the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Calumet, Mich., favoring the resolutions recently introduced by Senator HOAR relating to the Armenian persecutions; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the White Lake Farmers' Club, of Oakland County, Mich., praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of 80 citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the passage of House joint resolution No. 11, to amend the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting further appropriations to institutions under ecclesiastical control; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAMERON presented sundry petitions of employees of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, of the Franklin Sugar Refinery, of Philadelphia, and of citizens of Buttercup, Mineral Point, and Vinco, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. TILLMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fairfield, S. C., praying that an appropriation be made for the deepening of Winyah Bay bar, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation for the protection of the seacoast cities of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States, praying for the speedy passage of the emergency tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Paint, Oil and Varnish Club of New York, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Boston (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce and a petition of the Park Street Club, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation restricting immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HARRIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chattanooga, Tenn., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Worcester, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to secure the adoption of the international metric system of weights and measures; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the First Methodist Church of Calumet, Mich., remonstrating against the proposed withdrawal of American missionaries and the abandonment of American Christian enterprises in Turkey; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to the American missions in Turkey, and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WHITE presented a petition of the board of supervisors of Butte County, Cal., and a petition of the board of supervisors of Lassen County, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation developing the mining industries of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. VILAS presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Superior, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend to the port of Superior the privileges of immediate transportation in bond, and remonstrating against the enactment of any and all legislation which has in view the attachment of the city of Superior to the Duluth district for any customs purposes whatever; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BRICE presented petitions of the Board of Industries of Warren, of the Board of Commerce of Youngstown, and of the Board of Trade of Niles, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of a ship canal connecting Lake Erie and the Ohio River at Pittsburg, Pa.; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of Encampment No. 125, Union Veteran Legion, of Cincinnati, Ohio, remonstrating against the restoration of deserters to the military rolls; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of the Ministerial Associations of Troy, New Philadelphia, and Canal Dover, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation in the interest of morality; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of 35 citizens of Melrose, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I present a petition of the common council of the city of Junction, Oreg., in which the petitioners urgently request that the Fifty-fourth Congress will not fail to enact such wise and conservative legislation as will secure the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the Government, and for the benefit of our whole country, under such conditions as will secure low tolls without discrimination, safe passage, and free from the abuses which have attended franchises granted to any transportation companies. I move that the petition be referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

The motion was agreed to.

IMPRISONMENT OF JOHN LEWIS WALLER.

Mr. BAKER. I present the petition of Mrs. Susan Waller, who represents that she is a citizen of the State of Kansas, and that her husband in 1891 was appointed a consul at Tamatave, Madagascar; that on the 5th day of March, 1895, he was arrested by a French expedition that had no jurisdiction over the island; that he was tried by a drumhead court-martial on the 18th day of March, 1895, convicted in about three hours afterwards, and sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment in France; that he was transported from the Island of Madagascar to France in chains; that he has been in prison ever since, and is still in prison; and that the authorities of the United States have not yet been able to obtain a copy of the record or of the evidence upon which he was convicted. I desire to read the last four or five lines of the petition, as the relief the petitioner demands is expressed better than I could express it. She says:

> That these acts by which France has held my husband, an American citizen, as an imprisoned felon for the past ten months, are a crime against justice, and I believe and am sure that had my husband been a subject of Great Britain he would have long since been released. Therefore your petitioner, an American woman and an humble citizen of this great Republic, in behalf of my husband, the said John Lewis Waller, appeals to the Congress of the United States and prays that some suitable and immediate action be taken for his release.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

THE LATE COL. CHARLES A. ZOLLINGER.

Mr. VOORHEES. I present a paper from the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of the State of Indiana, in memoriam of Companion Charles A. Zollinger, colonel One hundred and twenty-ninth Indiana Volunteer Infantry, who died at Fort Wayne December 27, 1893. I move that the paper be referred to the Committee on Pensions to accompany Senate bill No. 1485, granting a pension to Mary Zollinger, heretofore introduced by me.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. VOORHEES, from the Select Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress, reported an amendment intended to be proposed to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1359) for the construction of two steam revenue cutters for service on the Pacific Coast, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 656) appropriating $125,000 for the construction of a light-house tender for the Gulf coast of Florida, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 56) extending the time for completion of the Washington and Maryland Railway Company, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 129) for the relief of Capt. George H. Perkins, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an

act entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1320) to confirm the title to certain lands in William Morgan and Harrison Moore, and to require the issue of patents therefor, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

DOCUMENTS FOR DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably the joint resolution (H. Res. 66) to supply the Department of State with documents and submit a report thereon. I ask for the consideration of the joint resolution at the present time.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to print, in addition to the usual number, and furnish the Department of State with 20 copies of each Senate and House of Representatives document and report.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the necessity for the joint resolution?

Mr. HALE. Instead of having the report read, I will state for the information of the Senate that the State Department, which is constantly being called upon for copies of these documents, has under the existing law only one copy for the head of the Department and each bureau and division. That number, of course, as will be readily seen, does not in any way answer the wants of the Department. The committee looked at the matter carefully, and concluded that the request for only 20 additional copies is not unreasonable, and therefore directed the House joint resolution to be reported favorably. It is not a matter of large amount, anyway, being only 20 additional copies.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HALVOR K. OMLIE.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 818) for the relief of Halvor K. Omlie, of Homen, N. Dak., to report it without amendment. It is a very short bill, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to grant a period of one year to Halvor K. Omlie, who May 12, 1893, made final proof on his preemption claim for the northwest quarter of section 8, township 163 north, of range 58 west, of the fifth principal meridian of the State of North Dakota, within which to make the necessary payment for the lands.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BRICE introduced a bill (S. 1772) to revoke the order of dismissal of Capt. Thomas M. Elliott from the service of the United States, and to amend his military record; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1773) granting a service pension to all honorably discharged soldiers and sailors who served in the war of the rebellion for the period of ninety days; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 1774) to provide for the acquirement of title to certain land in Colorado to be added to Fort Logan Military Reservation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1775) for the relief of A. J. Campbell, son of Scott Campbell, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1776) to regulate internal-revenue assessments and to modify the law so as to leave the matter in certain cases to a jury; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 1777) to increase the pension of Calvin McDaniel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1778) for the relief of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1779) to relieve John Hughes from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1780) to provide for the erection of a wall around the jail of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1781) making an appropriation to furnish flags for the schoolhouses of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1782) providing for the appointment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of the trustees of the Industrial Home School, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 1783) granting a pension to Mrs. Helen G. Heiner, widow of Capt. Robert G. Heiner, of Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1784) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Foote Fairfax; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1785) for the correction of muster of Adolph von Haake, late major Sixty-eighth Regiment Veteran Volunteer Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1786) for the relief of the legal representatives of John H. Crane, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1787) granting a pension to Nancy T. Duncklee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1788) granting a pension to William R. Lake; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1789) for the relief of Henry Hamlin Gale, alias Henry Hamlin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1790) granting a pension to Mrs. Hypolite Huard, of New Orleans, La., widow of Hypolite Huard, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1791) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bennett; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1792) to purchase a painting of Abraham Lincoln; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (S. 1793) to provide for the restatement, readjustment, settlement, and payment of dues to army officers in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 1794) to establish a military post on the Penobscot River near the city of Bangor, in Penobscot County, in the State of Maine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1795) to provide for a final settlement with the Naalem band of the Tillamook tribe of Indians, of Oregon, in accordance with a certain agreement between the United States and the said Indians, dated the 6th day of August, 1851; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1796) making an appropriation for a governmental survey of the mouths of the Yukon River, in Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1797) for the relief of C. M. Carter; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1798) granting a pension to Thomas B. Hanoum; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1799) authorizing the President of the United States to place Col. David Stuart Gordon, Sixth United States Cavalry, as a brigadier-general on the retired list of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1800) supplementary to an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 63) authorizing

the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury in preparing designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for the mint building at Philadelphia, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. HAWLEY, it was

Ordered, That James M. Miller be permitted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the petition for relief filed by him in the Fifty-second Congress, there having been no adverse report thereon.

RAILWAY TRAFFIC AGREEMENTS.

Mr. PEFFER. I submit a resolution and ask that it be read, lie over under the rules, and be printed.

The resolution was read, ordered to lie over, and to be printed, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and it is hereby, directed to inform the Senate—

First. Whether there has been a custom, rule, regulation, or agreement a long time existing among railway companies and associations engaged in interstate traffic whose lines extend to or through Missouri River points, which custom, rule, regulation, or agreement establishes and maintains different rates of charges for carrying passengers and freight east and west from said points, and whether such difference in charges is reasonable and warranted by law.

Second. Whether such agreement affects alike companies running through lines to and beyond said Missouri River points, as well as companies whose lines terminate there, giving the names of roads engaged in interstate traffic to and through such places.

Third. Whether an agreement or traffic arrangement was recently made or entered into by and between any railway companies or associations, naming them, whereby charges for carrying grain and other farm produce from points in Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Indian Territory to points in Texas and Mexico were advanced; whether such advance charges are now in force; what was the reason or purpose of the advance, and whether it is reasonable or unreasonable and in violation of the provisions of the interstate-commerce law.

Fourth. Whether, in case these agreements have been made and these proceedings had, there is, in the opinion of the commission, any additional legislation required to better protect the public interests.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 23d instant, approved and signed the act (S. 43) to amend an act entitled "An act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes," approved September 29, 1890, and the several acts amendatory thereof.

IMPRISONMENT OF EUGENE V. DEBS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. CALL, by request, that a committee of seven Senators be appointed who shall be charged with the duty of inquiring into the imprisonment of Eugene V. Debs for alleged contempt of court.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask the Senator from Florida if he will not kindly permit that resolution to lie over?

Mr. CALL. I will agree to that to accommodate the Senator, provided the resolution shall not lose its place.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, in the absence of objection.

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF VALUABLE SEEDS, ETC.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask for the reading of the joint resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, directed to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing, publication, and distribution of farmers' bulletins; and as the public exigency requires that the valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, to be purchased under the authority of the said act and by the said appropriation, may be ready for distribution at the earliest possible date, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to procure them by open purchase or contract at the places and in the manner in which such articles are usually bought and sold.

The joint resolution was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "seeds," to insert:

Provided, That the said Secretary shall not, in said purchase, pay more than a reasonable and fair price for such commodities or for any of them: *And provided further*, That he shall not be required to expend all the appropriation available for said purchase, but only so much thereof as, considering the time when distribution can be made, may profitably be expended to promote the objects named in said act.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, my object in calling up the joint resolution is not that I may have an opportunity to make a speech thereon, because I am willing that we shall take a vote at once on the joint resolution if the Senate is ready to vote.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will allow me, I desire to know whether he is proceeding under the courtesy of the Senate to call up the joint resolution so as to make a speech thereon, or whether the joint resolution itself is now the order of business before the Senate? I should like to know the parliamentary status.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. That is a matter which rests with the Chair under the rules. I was recognized to call up the joint resolution, and desire to address the Senate upon it.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator merely desires to address the Senate, to appeal to the courtesy of the Senate upon the joint resolution, of course I do not object. If, however, he moves to take up the joint resolution as a matter for consideration, that is another question. I do not know that I should object to that; but I should like to know which one of those positions the joint resolution occupies.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from North Dakota kindly repeat his request?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to have the consideration of the joint resolution. I do not desire to occupy the time of the Senate in making a speech for home consumption. I want action on the resolution. That is my object in calling it up for immediate consideration.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I understand the Senator does not propose to displace the regular order, but simply to have the joint resolution taken up in the morning hour.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I can not displace the regular order. One objection will of course prevent that.

Mr. PLATT. Taking up the joint resolution now does not displace the regular order.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like the Chair to state whether the joint resolution is up for consideration or whether the Senator from North Dakota is merely proceeding under the courtesy of the Senate to make a speech?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I did not hear the Senator.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair desires the attention of the Senator from North Dakota. Will the Senator state to the Chair whether he makes the request for unanimous consent or whether he enters a motion to take up the joint resolution?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. It was my object to ask unanimous consent of the Senate to consider the joint resolution at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to have one question answered before I can respond to that. It used to be the rule—I do not know whether it is now—that debate during the morning hour was limited to five minutes. Does that apply to this case?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That applies to debate under Rule VIII, the Chair will state.

Mr. GEORGE. And it does not apply, then, to this case?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It does not apply to this case.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. As I was saying, my object in calling up the joint resolution at this time is not that I may have an opportunity to make a speech on it, or that my constituents shall be supplied with garden seeds. I think they can exist without them. My purpose is much higher than that. It seems to me that there is a great principle involved here. The question at issue is whether an executive officer of the Government shall deliberately set aside the laws of Congress. I believe that I shall be able to show, if I am allowed to proceed, that the Secretary of Agriculture has deliberately, willfully, designedly, and premeditatedly refused to comply with certain statutes passed by the Congress of the United States. It is not a question of the value or the importance of distributing seeds and trees to the agriculturists or the horticulturists of the country, but it is simply a question of the supremacy of the law, as I take it.

Mr. President, when a Cabinet minister, one who sits at the council table of the Executive of the United States, is thus permitted to violate the law, or rather nullify the law, what may we expect of the great mass of the people who move along the pathway of private life? I very much doubt whether this particular Secretary of Agriculture really comprehends the importance of his duty in the position which he occupies. I do not believe that he understands the intricacies and the wants of the great industry of agriculture and the great industry of horticulture to a sufficient extent to direct him in performing his duties as his predecessors have performed them.

It is said that the Secretary was at one time and in some way connected with what is known as Arbor Day—a veritable Touchstone in the forest of Arden, except that Shakespeare's greatest jester knew nothing whatever about trees, and was not even conscious of his own wit until he had rubbed his shins against it. The Secretary of Agriculture is, however, every moment of his life conscious of his own wit and never fails of an opportunity to show it. It may be that this recalcitrant officer knows something about the

question of trees; it is barely probable that he can distinguish between an oak and an orchid, but I very much doubt whether he can discern the line of difference between a night-blooming cereus and a Russian thistle.

Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the law governing the duties of this officer. First, we have the provision in the agricultural appropriation act, passed at the last session of Congress, which I will read:

Division of seeds: Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, and for the printing, publication, and distribution of farmers' bulletins: For the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, and expense of labor, transportation, paper, twine, gum, printing, postal cards, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same, and to be distributed in localities adapted to their culture, $180,000.

Of that sum, I understand that it is customary to devote about $50,000 to the publication of the farmers' bulletins, which would leave $130,000 to be expended in the purchase and distribution of seeds, trees, etc. The law referred to in the appropriation act will be found as section 527 of the Revised Statutes, an act approved in July, 1866. The section referred to is as follows:

The purchase and distribution of seed by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another; and the purchase or propagation and distribution of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings shall be confined to such as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States.

None of the predecessors of the present Secretary of Agriculture ever refused to comply with this law. To show that it was the purpose of this particular officer not to carry out the will of Congress, it will be seen in a publication which is on the desks of Senators (Senate Document No. 40, page 5) that the Secretary, on April 20 of last year, addressed a communication to the honorable Attorney-General on this subject in the hope, no doubt, of securing the opinion of the Attorney-General that the Secretary of Agriculture would be justified in refusing to comply with the law. The first question asked by the Secretary is as follows:

Can the Secretary of Agriculture legally purchase any other seeds than those described in section 527 of the Revised Statutes, to wit, seeds "rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent change from one part of our own country to another," under authority of the act of March 2, 1895?

To this question the Attorney-General replied as follows:

1. The seeds purchasable under the act of March 2, 1895, are limited to those described in section 527 of the Revised Statutes, there being no reasonable ground for claiming that the act of March 2, 1895, operates, or was intended to operate, as a repeal of the earlier statute.

The second question asked by the Secretary was:

Would it be proper and lawful for the Secretary of Agriculture, in view of the verbiage of the act of March 2, 1895, and the wording of section 527 of the Revised Statutes, to advertise for proposals to furnish the Department of Agriculture seeds, bulbs, trees, vines, cuttings, and plants, "rare and uncommon to the country, and for such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another," reserving the right to reject any and all bids?

To this the Attorney-General replied as follows:

2. If not obligatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase seeds, trees, etc., conformably to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, it is certainly competent for him to make the purchases conformable to said statute, the right to reject any and all bids being reserved. But the form of the question is such that I think it proper to call attention to the fact that while seeds purchased must be such as are "rare and uncommon to the country or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another," the trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings to be purchased are such "as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States."

I submit that the Secretary of Agriculture obtained but very little consolation from the reply of the Attorney-General, but he saw that it would be necessary for him to proceed, much against his will, to advertise for proposals under the law. He did so advertise, and there were numerous bids made, numerous propositions to supply the Department with seeds, and every one of those propositions was rejected. Did the Secretary propose to readvertise, as is common in business transactions in private life, and in commercial affairs? Did he even comply with the law which requires him to readvertise? No, nothing of the kind. He seems entirely to have lost sight of the fact that there is a statute which requires a second advertisement. I call attention to it. It will be found as an amendment to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. Perhaps it will be well to read the statute in order to get at the full meaning of the amendment:

SEC. 3709. All purchases and contracts for supplies or services in any of the Departments of the Government, except for personal services, shall be made by advertising a sufficient time previously for proposals respecting the same, when the public exigencies do not require the immediate delivery of the articles or performance of the service. When immediate delivery or performance is required by the public exigency, the articles or service required may be procured by open purchase or contract, at the places and in the manner in which such articles are usually bought and sold, or such services engaged between individuals.

That law was amended in 1894, and the amendment will be found in chapter 22, volume 28, of the Statutes at Large. It is quite a lengthy amendment, and I shall read only those portions bearing upon this question.

Mr. GEORGE. What is the page of the statutes?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Page 33, volume 28, Statutes at Large. The amendment is as follows:

And the advertisement for such proposals shall be made by all the Executive Departments, including the Department of Labor, the United States Fish Commission, etc.

Then the amendment goes on and recites the Departments which are excepted from its provisions. The last paragraph of the amendment reads:

And if any or all of such proposals shall be rejected, advertisements for proposals shall again be invited and proceeded with in the same manner.

Mr. GEAR. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Certainly.

Mr. GEAR. The statute from which the Senator has quoted describes certain gentlemen connected with the Department, the Assistant Secretaries, and so on, who shall form the board to open and examine bids.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. It does.

Mr. GEAR. Then, did the Secretary comply with that statute when he appointed a board to receive those bids?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Not at all.

Mr. GEAR. Will the Senator state whom he appointed?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Before I get through I shall point that out. He appointed a board composed of subordinates in his own Department.

I desire to be entirely fair with the Secretary, and I think it is but charitable to say that I believe that he was in entire ignorance of the amendment to the statute.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture has been given every opportunity consistent with the importance of this case and with the high position which he occupies to explain to the Senate and to the country his reason for refusing to comply with the law. On the 12th of December I introduced a resolution requiring him to set forth his reasons for failing to carry out the law. He did so in a lengthy document which is printed and in the document room.

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Senator's attention been called to section 2 of an act of Congress found on page 62 of the same volume which he cites, which repeals the act upon which he relies, except as to proposals for fuel, ice, stationery, and other miscellaneous supplies? I call his attention to that act.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. To what section does the Senator refer?

Mr. GEORGE. Section 2 on page 62. It will be seen from that that the Senator's remarks, based on the former statute he cites on page 32, are wholly inapplicable to this case.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Do I understand that the Senator from Mississippi holds that the section to which he has referred repeals all of the section which I read?

Mr. GEORGE. I will read it.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Very well.

Mr. GEORGE. It reads:

SEC. 2. That the act entitled "An act to amend section 3709 of the Revised Statutes relating to contracts for supplies in the Departments at Washington," approved January 27, 1894, be, and the same is hereby, so amended that, the provisions thereof shall apply only to advertisements for proposals for fuel, ice, stationery, and other miscellaneous supplies to be purchased at Washington for the use of the Executive Departments and other Government establishments therein named.

It does not apply at all to purchases made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Then the Senator holds that under that section the Secretary of Agriculture was not required to readvertise. Do I understand that as the position taken by the Senator?

Mr. GEORGE. I hold that the provision to which I called the attention of the Senate in the first statute on page 32, which requires the readvertisement, does not apply to any advertisement made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. That of course will be a matter that I prefer to submit to the Senate. I will ask the Senator from Mississippi if he thinks, under all the circumstances, that the Secretary of Agriculture was justified in refusing to comply with the statutes of Congress on this subject?

Mr. GEORGE. To comply with what statutes?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. With all the statutes covering his duties as to the purchase of seeds, trees, etc.

Mr. GEORGE. I will answer that question by saying that so far as I am advised and informed, and I have given some attention to this matter, the Secretary has not refused to comply with any law of Congress on this subject.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Does the Senator hold that the Secretary has spent any portion of the $130,000 for the purchase and distribution of seeds and trees?

Mr. GEORGE. I hold that under section 527, which prescribes the kind of seeds, and the explanation made by the Secretary, he has not violated section 527 or any other law of Congress.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I should like to have the Senator answer a question for the information of the Senate. Has the Secretary of Agriculture purchased any seeds or trees with that appropriation?

Mr. GEORGE. He has not purchased seeds, because no seeds of the kind required by law were offered or could be had.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. That is simply the opinion of the Secretary. I think there is abundant evidence that a great quantity of seeds was offered of the kind and quality required.

Mr. President, I do not desire to argue this question any further. It must be clear to all that the Secretary did not comply with the laws of Congress. I simply desire action upon the joint resolution. If the Senator from Mississippi desires to offer some remarks, as I understand he does, I am perfectly willing that he shall proceed with his side of the case.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I do not know that I ought to participate in the debate on the pending joint resolution, and I do not think I will do so to any great extent. I know of no political opinion held by the Secretary of Agriculture with which I agree. We are entirely antipodal in our political beliefs and political affiliations. I disagree entirely with the Secretary of Agriculture as to his duty to carry out the provisions of the law which have been quoted by the Senator from North Dakota. Section 527 of the Revised Statutes is in this language:

The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another; and the purchase or propagation and distribution of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings shall be confined to such as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States.

I do not care to examine the law further than it is quoted here by the Secretary of Agriculture himself. I think it was his plain duty under this language, "or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another," to execute the law and purchase the seeds required by the last appropriation act.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to state that when the Secretary of Agriculture was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to give his reasons for refusing to comply with the law, he was asked this question by the chairman of the committee:

How did you look upon the second clause of section 527 of the Revised Statutes, the first requiring you to be "confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country"; then it says "or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our own country to another"? Might not that include the most common seed that could be made more profitable?

To this the Secretary replied:

I suppose that is true, but it is difficult to say or the Department to know just the varieties that have not been exchanged already.

It will be observed that the two propositions in the law are stated disjunctively, not conjunctively. The word "or" is used instead of the word "and," making altogether a different condition.

Mr. ALLEN. I think the Senator from North Dakota is altogether right. It is a disjunctive form of conferring power, and under the second power conferred in that section I have no doubt in my own mind that it was the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the appropriation act and purchase the seeds.

I do not agree with my distinguished friend [Mr. GEORGE] that the law to which he referred a moment ago has been in any respect repealed. The act of the Secretary of Agriculture in advertising for bids upon the seeds was perhaps a work of supererogation. Perhaps there was no express statute authorizing it, and yet it occurs to me that as an incident to his power to purchase he had a right to appoint a board, either from employees of the Agricultural Department or other competent gentlemen, to supervise the purchase of the seeds by advertisement or otherwise.

I did not rise this morning for the purpose of discussing the legal features of the joint resolution before the Senate. That will be amply done, no doubt, by the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I rose, however, for the purpose of making a statement, and correcting by that means the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, as to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary is a distinguished citizen of my State. I have no doubt whatever as to his honesty and his competency. I believe him to be a thoroughly honest man. I believe him to be thoroughly competent to discharge the duties imposed upon him by his high office. However much I believe him to be mistaken, as I do, not only upon this question, but upon other questions, I believe that no man who is acquainted in the slightest degree with the Secretary of Agriculture will doubt his great capacity to discharge the duties of his office. I believe that he sincerely desires to execute the law as he understands it.

The only fault I have ever found with the Secretary of Agriculture (and I say this with great delicacy) has been that he has not always confined himself to agricultural subjects. He has undertaken to discuss financial questions quite frequently, and in that respect perhaps has usurped to some extent the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury. But certainly the Secretary of Agriculture is a man of rare experience as a horticulturist and of rare research and rare knowledge. His great education along those lines can not be doubted. He is a man of high character and honest purposes.

That is all I desire to say.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have given some attention to this matter, and I believe it to be my duty to make some statement to the Senate, so that they may understand what they are asked to do.

I desire to call the attention of the lawyers and the other members of the Senate to the very extraordinary status which the pending joint resolution occupies. It is not the enactment of a law. It does not propose to enact a law. It proposes to do exactly what a court of justice would be required to do upon an application to that court for a mandamus against an officer requiring him to perform an official duty. The language of the joint resolution is not, "*Be it enacted*, That the law shall be so and so." That is not it. The language of the joint resolution is that an officer appointed by law shall carry out a law. It is a command to the officer to do what the Senate may regard as his legal duty under the law now in question.

Mr. President, I say that the Senate can not do any such thing. We have the power to enact laws, and we have the power to enact laws to punish men who violate laws, but we have no power to issue a writ of mandamus. I call the attention of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] to what I am saying. We have no power to issue a writ of mandamus against an officer requiring him to perform what we regard as an official duty.

In the first place, we are not authorized to construe a statute. The very first thing that a constitutional lawyer or any other sort of a lawyer learns is that courts construe statutes; that legislatures make them. What is the extraordinary position occupied here before the Senate to-day by the prosecutor, my friend from North Dakota? He assumes for the Senate to decide what the law is. The Senate can not decide that. We can enact what the law shall be, but we can not enact what the law is, and then issue a writ of mandamus to an officer compelling him to carry out the law. That is the very remarkable attitude in which the Senator from North Dakota and (with due respect to the committee of which I am an humble member) the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry place themselves in putting this measure before the Senate.

Mr. LINDSAY. Have you the joint resolution before you?

Mr. GEORGE. Here it is:

That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, directed to carry into effect—

That is the language of a court, is it not? That is the language of a court, and not the language of a legislature—

to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriations, etc.

I say we have no right to pass any such law. What have we to do in order to enact such a law? We have, first, to try the question as to what the law is. Then, secondly, we have got to try the question as to default on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture in not carrying the law into effect. Both of these questions are denied in every constitution in the United States of America, State and national, to the legislative department. That is our attitude here.

Mr. VEST. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question.

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. VEST. I ask him if it is not the custom of the Senate from day to day to pass resolutions directing the heads of Departments to do certain things—resolutions mandatory upon them?

Mr. COCKRELL. It is always done.

Mr. VEST. I ask if the point has not been repeatedly made here that a resolution which requested the head of a Department should be changed by substituting the word "directed" for "requested"?

Mr. GEORGE. The answer to that question would be no answer to the argument I have made. We may direct the head of a Department to send us information, because he is our servant, but we can not direct him to carry into effect a law, for the reason, first, that we are not competent to construe the statute, nor are we competent to decide whether he has carried it into effect. That is a judicial question.

Mr. VEST. If my friend will permit me, suppose the Secretary of Agriculture comes to the conclusion that he ought not to send certain papers to the Senate. We have had that identical question before us as to another Department of the Government. He says in his opinion the law authorizes him to withhold those papers. The Senate of the United States considers that question and then passes a resolution directing him to send them. Is his construction of the law to be put against ours? Is he not our servant and agent and compelled to obey the resolution of the Senate?

Mr. GEORGE. If I were to admit that the question propounded by the Senator ought to be answered in the affirmative, that does not cover this case. That is the performance of an official duty only as a servant of this body and not the performance of his duty

as an officer of the Government, as to whether he carries out a law over which this body has no jurisdiction.

Mr. President, that is the attitude in which we stand here. We are a court. We have assumed to summon this man before us and upon an application for a mandamus hear the case, construe the laws, hear the facts, decide that he has not performed his official duty, and then direct him, not to perform an act which he owes to the Senate, but an act which he owes under the law to the country. It would be just as well to pass a law ordering him to deliver to the owner a horse which he has. Then we decide, first, who is the owner of the horse, and next, whether the law authorized him to take the horse. That is the attitude of the case now before the Senate. We are here trying a mandamus case.

Now, let us see what sort of a case they have got on their mandamus. It is a most miserable case at that. The Senator from North Dakota arraigns the Secretary of Agriculture as if he were proceeding in the House of Representatives upon articles of impeachment for a violation of duty. We can not do that here. He arraigns him for violating the law. Let us see what the law is. We are prosecuting attorneys and bring the case before us, and then we are to try it. This is the only instance, except as to our own officers, in which we are authorized to try a question whether a man has complied with the law and punish him for not doing it.

Now, Mr. President, let us go back in this matter. All this trouble about seeds arises out of a section of the Revised Statutes which I shall read. Let us see how the Senator from North Dakota has got his foot into it in trying to get the head of the Secretary of Agriculture into his political basket. Nobody disputes now that in the purchase of seeds the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to "such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country." Let us stop on that. There is another clause there that I will get to directly. Such seeds as are rare and uncommon in the country. He is not authorized to keep a seed store for the gratuitous distribution of seeds for the American people, or to Congressmen for the purpose of securing the votes of the American people. He has no authority for that. He is confined by the statute to the purchase of "such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country." What is the object of that? Manifestly to introduce into our country rare and uncommon and valuable seeds for the purpose of being tested.

As it is but fair to the Secretary of Agriculture, and it is a very ably prepared paper, I shall ask the consent of the Senate to incorporate this paper by the Secretary of Agriculture on seed distribution in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Without objection, the paper will be incorporated.

The paper is as follows:

FREE SEED DISTRIBUTION.

Statement of Secretary of Agriculture at the joint meeting of the Senate and House Committees of Agriculture, January 15, 1896.

From a special report of the chief of the division of accounts and disbursements of this Department, received December 18, I learn that only a very small part of the appropriation for this fiscal year was paid out for the services of employees in the seed division who were engaged until the 1st of October in closing up this business. The report shows that there has been used from the appropriation the following amounts:

For the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, fiscal year 1896 ($130,000):

1895.	To whom paid.	For what purpose.	Amount.
July 31	Enos S. Harnden et al.	Salaries for July, 1895	$541.30
August 31	do	Salaries for August, 1895.	541.30
September 30	do	Salaries for September, 1895.	527.40
Total			1,610.00

For the portion thereof permitted to be used for farmers' bulletins, fiscal year 1896 ($50,000):

1895.	To whom paid.	For what purpose.	Amount.
July 31	John Hyde et al	Salaries for July, 1895	$1,322.60
August 31	do	Salaries for August, 1895.	1,332.75
September 18	The Public Printer	10,000 copies Bulletin No. 7.	98.75
Do	do	40,000 copies Bulletin No. 29.	566.44
September 24	The Springfield Envelope Co.	Envelopes	270.20
September 30	John Hyde et al	Salaries for September, 1895.	1,243.20
October 21	Easton & Rupp	Twine	15.00
October 24	The Public Printer	Printing Bulletin No. 30.	164.76
Do	do	Printing Bulletin No. 31.	411.62
October 31	John Hyde et al	Salaries for October, 1895.	824.70
November 15	The White, Corbin & Co.	Envelopes	917.60
November 30	John Hyde et al	Salaries for November, 1895.	653.00
Total			7,820.62

For printing, etc., fiscal year 1896 ($5,400):

1895.	To whom paid.	For what purpose.	Amount.
September 18	The Public Printer	Services and material, July 1 to August 14, 1895.	$2,210.88

The above statement of expenditures shows but three items charged against "that part of the act in question which appropriates $130,000 for the purchase of seeds for the gratuitous promiscuous distribution" for the year 1896, aggregating $1,610. These three items are, as explained above, for labor performed during the period from July 1 to September 30, 1895.

From July 1 to November 30, 1895, $7,820.62 was paid on account of the preparation, printing, and publishing of farmers' bulletins for the current fiscal year. It will thus be seen that of the $130,000 appropriated for the "purchase and distribution of valuable seeds" for the fiscal year 1896 the sum of $128,390 remains unexpended.

Finding that farmers' bulletins would still have to be prepared, printed, published, and distributed, "as seeds are distributed," and that this must be done by the officer provided for on the statutory roll of the "division of seeds" in the act making appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, the chief of this division and a few of the persons employed therein have been continued upon this roll for the purpose of distributing these documents in accordance with the orders of Members and Delegates in Congress. This was only done after receiving the report of the "Committee on the Distribution of Publications" (Exhibit A), and certain opinions from the Comptroller of the Treasury (Exhibit B), authorizing the continuance of the expenditure for this purpose, copies of which are submitted herewith.

It only remains to state "why such seeds have not been purchased under said appropriation in accordance with existing statutes relating thereto."

Beginning in 1839 with an appropriation to the Patent Office of $1,000 for collecting and distributing rare and improved varieties of seeds, prosecuting agricultural investigations, and procuring agricultural statistics, the appropriations for seed distribution have grown until the appropriation for the present fiscal year amounts to $199,120, including the statutory rule for the division of seeds and the expenses of printing for this division. The act says that the "Secretary of Agriculture may use not to exceed $50,000 of the amounts herein appropriated for the preparation, printing, and publishing farmers' bulletins." Deducting this, the total appropriation for the purchase and distribution of seeds for the present fiscal year is $149,120.

Down to the year 1865 the seeds distributed were purchased out of the general fund above described, so that we have no accurate information at hand with regard to the amount used for this purpose prior to that year, but since 1864 a separate appropriation has been made annually for the purpose of buying and distributing seed, as shown in the following table.

No specific appropriation for seeds was made prior to the fiscal year 1865. The appropriations were for "collection of agricultural statistics, etc., and purchase, etc., of seeds."

Year.	Appropriation.	Expenditure.	Balance.
1865	$61,000.00	$61,000.00	
1866	70,165.90	70,165.90	
1867	115,200.00	115,200.00	
1868	85,200.00	85,200.00	
1869	20,000.00	20,000.00	
1870	20,000.00	18,981.33	$1,018.67
1871	30,000.00	28,865.17	1,134.83
1872	45,000.00	45,000.00	
1873	55,000.00	55,000.00	
1874	65,000.00	64,904.89	95.11
1875	95,000.00	94,719.83	280.17
1876	65,000.00	65,000.00	
1877	85,000.00	80,000.00	5,000.00
1878	75,000.00	74,579.33	420.67
1879	75,000.00	75,000.00	
1880	75,000.00	75,000.00	
1881	102,160.31	102,157.48	2.83
1882	100,000.00	99,991.53	8.47
1883	80,000.00	80,000.00	
1884	75,000.00	74,986.48	13.52
1885	100,000.00	99,983.82	16.18
1886	100,000.00	99,980.24	19.76
1887	100,000.00	99,998.37	1.63
1888	103,000.00	102,587.55	412.45
1889	104,200.00	104,168.73	31.27
1890	104,200.00	104,174.55	25.45
1891	105,400.00	105,090.94	309.06
1892	105,400.00	104,920.35	479.65
1893	135,400.00	134,908.27	491.73
1894	135,400.00	119,664.90	15,735.10
1895	165,400.00	120,445.15	44,954.85
1896	185,400.00	14,312.80	171,087.20
Total	2,837,526.21	2,595,987.61	241,538.60

The figures for 1895 include $35,400 appropriated and $30,567.99 expended for farmers' bulletins and printing, while those for 1896 include $5,400 appropriated and $12,702.80 expended for the same purposes. The expenditures for 1896 are for the period from July 1, 1895, to December 31, 1895, inclusive.

This enormous purchase and distribution of seeds, costing the Government $2,581,674.81 in twenty years, was made under section 527 of the Revised Statutes. This section reads as follows:

"The purchase and distribution of seed by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another; and the purchase or propagation and distribution of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings shall be confined to such as are adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interest of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States."

Every annual appropriation act has read "For the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of valuable seeds," etc.

Under this statute the Commissioner of Patents, the Commissioner of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture for fifty-six years have sought "such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another," in all foreign countries and in all parts of this country, and have purchased

freely almost every seed or plant that offered the slighest appearance of novelty or prospect of value and have distributed them most liberally through Members and Delegates in Congress.

Through our representatives all foreign countries have been searched and through our own seed growers and horticulturists the resources of our own country have been completely canvassed. The law has always been construed most broadly and the money expended most liberally.

When the present Secretary of Agriculture came into office he directed that lists be made of all the seeds, plants, shrubs, vines, etc., which had been distributed to parts of our country in all the years previous, and that, guided by these lists, the seed-purchasing agent should deliberately proceed to find such seeds, plants, shrubs, vines, etc., as had not been previously liberally distributed in all parts of our country. Through the aid of the State Department and its agents in foreign countries every part of the world has contributed its share for the distribution of seeds and plants which promised to be of value to our people. Great pains were taken thus to find genuinely new, useful, and valuable things "rare and uncommon to the country and adapted to general cultivation or to promote the general interest of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States," and they were carefully distributed to every portion of the country where there was the slightest hope that they might prove useful. In this way it became each year more and more difficult to get things which came up to the requirement of the law. The tremendous pressure for quantity to supply Congress has led to the purchase of seeds, etc., on very imperfect evidence as to novelty and value. During recent years, therefore, the seeds obtained were of very doubtful value to the people of the country. Experience has shown that the vast majority of the so-called new seeds and plants offered by seedsmen or horticulturists are merely old varieties under new names. The distribution has, therefore, become very disappointing and unsatisfactory, growing necessarily more and more so as it was continued, extended in area, and increased in volume.

This was the necessary logical result of such a distribution under this law. There are only a certain number of rare and uncommon seeds or useful or valuable trees, shrubs, vines, etc., in the world, and their collection and distribution can not, therefore, be continued indefinitely. In fact, the more carefully and zealously the collection and distribution is made, the earlier must it come to a conclusion. For many years the purchases of seed by this Department were only possible under the very liberal construction of the broad provision for "such seeds as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another." During recent years almost no seed rare or uncommon to this country has been found by this Department anywhere in the world. The distribution during the last three years was kept up, therefore, through great difficulty and with growing doubt as to its legality. Every seed that could be found anywhere offering a reasonable prospect of usefulness in any portion of the country has been purchased and liberally distributed.

The extent and liberality of the distribution which has been made by the present Secretary of Agriculture will be shown by the following figures, taken from the reports of the seed division. During the three fiscal years July 1, 1889, to July 1, 1892, under his predecessor in office, there were distributed the following:

	Kinds.	Varieties.	Packages to Congressmen.	Total packages distributed.
July 1, 1889, to June 30, 1890	23	520	4,459,778	5,605,246
July 1, 1890, to June 30, 1891	22	413	4,157,931	6,013,613
July 1, 1891, to June 30, 1892	20	426	4,542,177	5,932,989
Total, 1889 to 1892	65	1,355	13,159,886	17,551,848

For the three fiscal years between July 1, 1892, to July 1, 1895:

	Kinds.	Varieties.	Packages to Congressmen.	Total packages distributed.
July 1, 1892, to June 30, 1893	18	387	6,215,781	7,704,943
July 1, 1893, to June 30, 1894	25	309	8,385,120	9,555,318
July 1, 1894, to June 30, 1895	25	288	7,209,089	9,528,653
Total, 1892 to 1895	68	984	21,809,990	26,788,914
Increase for last period	3	.....	8,650,104	9,237,066

In the three years of his term of office the present Secretary had distributed to members of Congress 8,650,104 packages more than did his predecessor in office. In doing this he believes that he went to the utmost limit of the authority given him in the statute.

Under the old plan, which prevailed in this Department before this year, the noncompetitive offers of seedsmen and horticulturists were sifted, and the most reliable and promising varieties were taken upon the representations of their producers as to their rarity and value. The fact is that the people in every portion of this country have, through the instrumentalities of this Department and our enterprising seedsmen, already secured nearly all the vegetable and field seeds, plants, trees, etc., that are well adapted to their peculiar soils and climate.

After testing the seed purchased in this way in the last three years in the field and in the garden, our correspondents and the experiment stations assure us that very few of them are really rare, uncommon, or specially valuable.

At least one-half of the so-called new varieties sent to any particular section of the country have proved comparatively unsuitable and often worthless, while the other half proved to be old varieties already well known there. Although diligently carried out, the seed distribution of the last three years has thus been extremely unsatisfactory to the people of the country as well as to this Department. By inducing interested people to spend their labor upon things that were represented to be new, but proved either common or unsuitable, the Government has imposed upon them, and has been the occasion of no little loss of the rent of land, money, time, and labor of the people.

New varieties of seeds and plants where there are any can be obtained at the present much more readily by skilled, practical botanists and horticulturists than by this Department, and it is a fact that when such commercial agencies find anything new, they are not apt to sell it to the Department of Agriculture at any price. A single year's free distribution ends their trade in it. On the other hand, it is generally stated and believed that unscrupulous dealers make a business of selling the Department of Agriculture their old seeds and their surplus stock of failures.

The Department of Agriculture has no farm or other arrangement for testing the real value of so-called rare and uncommon plants, and could not do so for all sections of the country if it had.

Being thoroughly convinced that the end of the legitimate purchase and distribution of seeds under the law, as cited, had been reached, and perhaps far passed, and being entirely unable to find any seed which would come up to its requirements by the methods which had been pursued in the past, namely, by correspondence with seedsmen and inquiries through the representatives of the State Department abroad, the Secretary of Agriculture, on the 18th of April, 1895, addressed a communication to the honorable Attorney-General of the United States, a copy of which, with his reply, is inclosed herewith, in which he asks for an opinion as to whether (1) "The Secretary of Agriculture can legally purchase any other seeds than those described in section 527 of the Revised Statutes," and whether (2) "it would be proper and lawful for the Secretary of Agriculture * * * to advertise for proposals to furnish the Department of Agriculture with seeds, bulbs, trees, vines, cuttings, and plants," etc., in accordance with section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, which requires that "All purchases and contracts for supplies or services in any of the Departments of the Government, except for personal services, shall be made by advertising a sufficient time previously for proposals respecting the same," etc.

The reply of the Attorney-General informed the Secretary of Agriculture that (1) "The seeds purchasable under the act of March 2, 1895, are limited to those described in section 527 of the Revised Statutes—there being no reasonable ground for claiming that the act of March 2, 1895, operates, or was intended to operate, as a repeal of the earlier statute"; (2) that "if not obligatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase seeds, trees, etc., conformably to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, it is certainly competent for him to make the purchases conformably to said statute, the right to reject any and all bids being reserved," etc.

In accordance with this construction, the Secretary of Agriculture immediately caused an advertisement for seeds, plants, trees, etc., stating the requirements of the Department of Agriculture in the language of the statute itself, to be published in the lawful number of papers, and to be mailed to all the seedsmen, horticulturists, and others whose addresses were on file in this Department.

Since the act of Congress requires "that the seeds allotted to the Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-second parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery on the 10th day of January, or at the earliest practicable time thereafter," and since all Representatives expect their seeds to be ready early in February in order that they may be forwarded to the people in time for their early gardens, it was necessary to stipulate in this advertisement that all seeds should be delivered in Washington on or before the 1st of November. Under the well-known rule of moving the seed from one section of the country to another, those grown in the extreme North are frequently desired for planting in the extreme South. This arrangement gave the Department only from seventy to one hundred days in which to clean, test, sort, pack, and label the seed for distribution to members of Congress, therefore it was not considered possible under the law to grant a longer time for delivery of the seed.

In order that the Department might treat their bids intelligently, it was required that the "persons submitting bids should specify the kind and varieties, with full description of each variety of seeds and plants upon which they desire to submit bids and the quantities they are prepared to contract for," etc. The bids were to be received by the Secretary of Agriculture until 2 p. m., July 1, 1895.

On July 1, the Secretary appointed Messrs. E. S. Harnden, F. L. Evans, and J. B. Bennett, of the Department of Agriculture, "a board to open and examine bids for supplying the United States Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1896 with 'seeds,'" etc., as required by law, in accordance with this advertisement (Exhibit —). This board opened and carefully examined the bids which had been received at the appointed time. They found only three which, in form, came up to the requirements of the advertisement. These bids are submitted herewith, together with the indorsements of the board thereon, and the final report of the board.

Messrs. Peter Henderson & Co., offer roses, cannas, "flower seed novelties and specialties in vegetable seeds," and two kinds of grass seeds. The board found that their bid was deficient in description; that the flower and vegetable seeds offered were not rare; and that the only farm or field seeds offered were two grasses. These were referred to the Agrostologist of the Department of Agriculture, who submitted the following opinion with regard to them:

"*Bromus inermis*, awnless brome grass, was fully described and its agricultural characters and value pointed out in German publications more than a hundred years ago. It was frequently mentioned in English agricultural works in the early years of the present century. It was introduced into this country nearly twelve years ago. It has been widely grown in this country experimentally, and the seed has been offered for sale by our leading seedsmen for a number of years.

"*Cynodon dactylon*. Bermuda or wire grass. This grass is very widely distributed in tropical and subtropical countries throughout the world, and has been known since prehistoric times. In the parts of this country where this grass is most valuable, it is known to almost every man, woman, and child, either as a weed or good hay or pasture grass. The cotton planters of the South look upon this grass as one of the very worst of weeds. The grass is best propagated by root cuttings or sets."

The vegetable seeds offered in this bid were all such as the Department had previously distributed, and could not, therefore, be called rare or uncommon in the opinion of the board. Nothing was offered that was "adapted to general cultivation or to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States." This bid was therefore rejected as a whole.

The next bid was that of J. C. Vaughan, of Chicago. He offers a number of "rare and useful flower seeds" (to quote his language) and three varieties of vegetable seeds. The flower seed include such things as "Giant Paris Pansy," at $25 per pound; "Lobelia Erinus," $35 per pound; "New Double Morning Glory," $40 per pound; "White Branching Aster," $36 per pound; "Chinese Primroses," $60 per pound; "Petunia White Star," $35 per pound, and "Chabaud Carnation," at $128 per pound. The board appears to have promptly decided that the flower seeds at these prices were not "adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States." The three varieties of vegetable seeds offered were "New Mangel, Erfurt Model," "Turnip, New Scarlet Kashmyr," and "New Victoria Spinach." The board reported that these "are not new, rare, or unique." The bid was also deficient in that the quantity of each that could be supplied was not mentioned. It is likely that a confession that they had a large quantity of the above flower seed at the above prices would render it impossible for them to sell any of them.

The bid of Messrs. J. M. Thornburn & Co., of New York, includes a variety of vegetable, but only three specimens of field or farm seeds, viz: Havana tobacco seed, Bermuda grass seed, and 25 bushels No. 1 wheat, "by parentage half wheat, half rye, at $3 per bushel."

This bid was found deficient in descriptive matter; the varieties are not new or rare; every kind and variety of seed mentioned in it, with the exception of 11 items out of 65 offered, have already been distributed by this Department, and of these 11 items none are stated to be rare or uncommon. It was therefore rejected also.

This entire lot of bids, although it includes many high-priced flower seed and so-called new varieties of kitchen-garden plants, thus includes only four kinds of field or farm seed, viz: Brome grass, Bermuda grass, and Havana tobacco, and one variety of wheat. Two bidders offer the Bermuda grass or wire-grass seed. The total amounts of field seed offered were as follows:

4,000 pounds awnless brome grass seed, at 14 cents per pound	$560	
500 pounds Bermuda or wire grass seed, at 80 cents per pound	400	
375 pounds Bermuda or wire grass seed, at 80 cents per pound	300	
		$1,260
100 pounds Havana tobacco seed, at $1.50 per pound	150	
25 bushels or 1,500 pounds Carman, No. 1 wheat, "by parentage half wheat, half rye," at 5 cents per pound	75	
		225
6,400 pounds		1,485

This would, under the law, have been less than 10 pounds of field and farm seed to each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress if every pound offered had been bought.

Having received no bids that came up to the requirements of the statutes and offered anything worthy of consideration, the board rejected them all and submitted the following report:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 6, 1895.*

SIR: The undersigned board, appointed by you on July 1, 1895, to open and examine bids for seeds to be furnished this Department for distribution according to law during the fiscal year ending July 1, 1896, have the honor to report that we have opened and examined the bids received and find that the same do not meet the requirements of the advertisement as printed, and therefore, respectfully recommend that all bids be rejected.

Respectfully, yours,

ENOS S. HARNDEN.
F. L. EVANS.
J. B. BENNETT.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

In accordance with the instructions of the resolution, I have the honor to submit herewith, also, copies of all bids or offers of seeds made to this Department in response to its advertisement dated April 27, 1895, or otherwise submitted for its consideration, together with copies of each letter sent to this Department relative to or asking any information concerning or modification of the proposals issued and its reply thereto (Exhibit E). These include all bids which were found deficient in description or otherwise failed to come up to the conditions of the advertisement. In the hope of finding something that would come up to the requirement of the statute the board informally examined all of these bids and made their indorsements upon those which might be "made profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another." Had any rare or uncommon seeds or plants "adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture or agriculture throughout the United States" been found, they would have been purchased under the "emergency" plan.

The indorsements of the board show that in the entire list of informal bids and offers no rare or uncommon seeds or plants "adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States" were to be found. In almost every case the offers were of old and well-known things at very extravagant prices. The bids that were received after the 1st of July were also informally examined, and nothing was found in them which came within the purport of the statute.

The offer of Mr. C. F. Carpenter, of Bartow, Fla., to furnish 100 pounds of "teosinte," being of slight novelty, was referred to the agrostologist of the Department for his consideration with regard to its character under the statutes and its value for general cultivation. The officer reported as follows:

"*Teosinte.*—Illustrated and described in the American Agriculturist for January, 1880, at which time reports were being received in England from a number of its colonies, including the Bahamas and the West Indies, generally south and tropical Africa, and Australia, relative to its growth in these countries. It was noticed in the Southern Cultivator in 1879, and has been repeatedly mentioned in the Southern agricultural journals since that date. Seed was distributed from this Department in 1886, and has been advertised for sale by our leading seedsmen for a number of years past. Teosinte is a subtropical American grass, and has been grown successfully in many parts of the extreme South. It does not mature elsewhere."

It is to be specially noted that none of the bids, either formally or informally made, in connection with the advertisement of the Department of April 27, 1895, or the offers made to this Department in correspondence contain any proposals to supply trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings "adapted to general cultivation and to promote the general interests of horticulture and agriculture throughout the United States." Seeds of some such things were offered, but no plants or cuttings were offered by anyone. It appears, therefore, that the horticulturists of the country have distributed these things so thoroughly through their regular agencies that nothing of this kind remains to be done by this Department. No plants or cuttings were purchased, therefore, for distribution this year.

As soon as it had been fully ascertained that no seeds, trees, plants, shrubs, vines, and cuttings could be obtained for distribution this fiscal year, a brief circular announcing the fact was published and mailed to all persons interested. This circular contains the opinion of the Attorney-General of the United States, the advertisement, and the report of the board. It announces in conclusion that in consideration of the failure of the Department to get any seeds or plants under section 527, Revised Statutes, and by the method laid down in section 3709, Revised Statutes, the seed division would be abolished, with the exception of as many persons connected therewith as would be needed to prepare and distribute farmers' bulletins. A copy of this circular is inclosed herewith, marked Exhibit G.

ADDENDA.

As an evidence of the fact that recipients of seeds, whether supplied upon the orders of Congressmen or directly from the Department, regarded them simply as a free gift, it may be cited that not one in one thousand made any report whatever of the results obtained from the planting of the seed, notwithstanding that all seed sent was accompanied with an explicit request by the Department for such a report. This experience is not that of the present administration only, for, referring to the reports of chiefs of the seed division in former years, complaint is made to the same effect with a statement in some cases that special efforts were put forth to secure a fair average of reports, but without success.

Another remarkable feature of these reports is that no one of them, for several years at least, has pointed out a single instance of benefit accruing to agriculture from this seed distribution. So patent was this omission in the reports furnished during General Rusk's administration, that while the work of every other division is generally, sometimes highly, commended, not a single reference is to be found in three out of the four reports he presented as to the work of this division or the subject of seed distribution.

Of the few reports received during the years 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896, all were so vague and indefinite, in a word, so manifestly perfunctory, as to give no valuable experimental results or information whatever. It may be safely asserted, from all the evidence available in the Department, that for the $1,100,000 and over expended for seed distribution by the Department in the past ten years no visible practical benefit to general agriculture or horticulture has resulted.

So well is this understood by those who have had occasion to give attention to the matter that not one of the hundreds of papers, mostly agricultural, received at the Department has ever printed a single word commendatory of the distribution, while many of them have persistently ridiculed it, and most of them have earnestly condemned it. Grange associations and their officers and other agricultural bodies have adopted resolutions to the same effect.

Should it, however, be deemed wise and expedient to reinstitute the gratuituous distribution of seed at the public expense, the Department should not be made a depot and packing house, but all seed should be purchased already put up in packets and properly labeled by seedsmen. The room required for packing and the skilled labor is not available in the Department, and putting up seed can be made to cost, by the seedsmen themselves, 50 per cent less than it has heretofore cost the Government.

Mr. GEORGE. We have been purchasing rare and uncommon seeds now for thirty years. We have been diligent in the purchase of them. We have ransacked the whole world. We have called to our aid the consuls and the consular agents of the United States in every country in the world for the purpose of getting rare and uncommon seeds. What is the result? The result, as the Secretary says, is that we have heretofore purchased about all the rare and uncommon seeds in the world that are adapted or might be adapted to our country.

Does the statute mean that having purchased rare and uncommon seeds all over the world, and having distributed them to the American people for the purpose of testing their value, he shall go on and repurchase the same seeds every year? Certainly, that is not the correct interpretation of the statute, because as soon as we have made the purchase and distributed them our people have had the opportunity of testing whether they are of any value or not. I want to show you what the Secretary says about that:

During recent years—

Says the Secretary—we are to try the Secretary here as if he was an officer acting under oath and in good faith—

During recent years almost no seed rare or uncommon to this country has been found by this Department anywhere in the world.

Yet he is to go on purchasing that which does not exist!

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator yield a moment?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes. Do you know of any rare and uncommon seeds anywhere in the world that he has not bought?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Please answer that? Please answer if you know of any rare and uncommon seeds anywhere in the world that the Secretary of Agriculture has declined to purchase?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I maintain that seeds and trees that are common to the State of Michigan might be very rare and uncommon in the State of Louisiana, and it is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to study that question and see that those seeds are exchanged from one part of the country to the other.

Mr. GEORGE. As the Senator from North Dakota is prosecuting the Secretary of Agriculture, I ask him to name one single rare and uncommon seed anywhere on the habitable globe that the Secretary has failed to purchase.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. If I were the Secretary of Agriculture it would be my duty to know of the rare and uncommon seeds.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Now, hold on. I want to ask the Senator a question. One of the bidders, in response to the advertisement of the Secretary of Agriculture, requested the Secretary to specify any special seeds and varieties that the Department might want. He did not specify any kind of seeds that he wanted. The reply made by Mr. Harding, who had something to do with the board of awards I believe, was that as to the special wants the Department had no special wants other than those conveyed by the advertisement itself.

Mr. GEORGE. That is for rare and uncommon seeds?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Another bidder, in writing to the Department, said that they were prepared to comply with the law, and submit and forward and deliver to the Department seeds that were rare and uncommon. Here is a seed dealer who proposes to submit seeds that are rare and uncommon, but he insisted that it would be a physical and natural impossibility to have the seeds ready for distribution by November 1, the date stated in the advertisement of the Secretary.

Mr. GEORGE. All right. The Senator can not tell me of a rare and uncommon seed, and I want to tell him, then, of one.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask the Senator from Mississippi——

Mr. GEORGE. I will tell you of one right here and now.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Just a moment. There was something——

Mr. GEORGE. Here is Bermuda or wire-grass seed. There is not a seed of Bermuda grass that ever matures in the United States or has ever germinated in the United States if it was ever sowed. It is just like the sugar cane that comes from Cuba; it is a tropical plant and it does not germinate here. Everybody who knows anything about Bermuda grass (and we know something

about it in our part of the country), knows that it is not propagated by the seed. It is propagated by cuttings of the roots of the grass, and planted in that way.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator yield just a moment? Of course if the Senator does not desire——

Mr. GEORGE. That is one. That is a rare and uncommon seed in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course. I wish he would explain how the Secretary of Agriculture could dispose of that rare and uncommon seed, the Bermuda grass, which will not germinate here and which never did mature in this country.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The Senator from Mississippi, of course, like most lawyers, seems inclined to be technical on this question.

Mr. GEORGE. Very.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Now, I want to cite one illustration. Fifteen years ago, in the State of Minnesota and the State of South Dakota, corn was a very rare thing. Five years ago such a thing as a crop of corn in the State of North Dakota could not be found anywhere; we did not raise corn at all. But experimentation and the exchange of seed from one State to another have made South Dakota and Minnesota two of the leading corn States in this country——

Mr. GEORGE. Then you do not want corn there. You have got that.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. And in North Dakota it is one of the leading crops that we produce now.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. That has been brought about by experimentation, according to the idea which the Secretary of Agriculture should entertain.

Mr. GEORGE. We are not talking about that; we are talking about what was offered the Agricultural Department as "rare and uncommon seed." Never was one seed of Bermuda grass matured in the United States or anywhere else except in a tropical country, and none ever germinated in the United States.

Here is "*Bromus inermis*, awnless brome grass," and I find it stated that—

It was introduced into this country nearly twelve years ago. It has been widely grown in this country experimentally and the seed has been offered for sale by our leading seedsmen for a number of years.

I want to show you about some other "rare seeds" which were offered to the Department, and I want the Senator from North Dakota to pay a little attention. He has indicted the Secretary of Agriculture here for a high crime and misdemeanor in refusing to carry out a statute of Congress. Here are some seeds that were offered, and I want to know if the Secretary of Agriculture is to blame for not making these purchases?

Flower seeds—

I suppose for the belles and nice women of the country—

Giant Paris pansy—

At what price?

At $25 per pound.

Ought the Secretary of Agriculture to be hung for not making a purchase of that sort? Here is another:

Lobelia erinus, $35 per pound.

Ought the Secretary of Agriculture to be hung for not making such a purchase as that? We have the morning glory everywhere over our country, but it seems a new one has been gotten up, a "new double morning glory at $40 per pound" for the seed. Would you think an officer under a republican form of government ought to be paying $40 per pound for seed even of the "new double morning glory"? What that is I do not know, unless it blooms twice in the morning instead of once, as the others do. [Laughter.]

White branching aster—

These are the things that were sent to the Department to be bought in answer to its advertisement—

White branching aster, $36 per pound; Chinese primroses, $60 per pound; petunia white star—

The petunia is found everywhere in our country; everybody has it, and yet the price of the seed was $65 per pound. Then there is—

Chabaud carnation, at $128 per pound.

And the Secretary of Agriculture is to be hung, is to be drawn, quartered, and exhibited before the American people as a man who has utterly disregarded their rights because he did not make such purchases as that.

Now, let us go on a little about the law, which my friend from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] is so familiar with.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. I have only a minute or two to speak, and I desire to finish.

This is a proceeding by way of mandamus in the United States Senate on the relation of the Senator from North Dakota against the Secretary of Agriculture. There is one thing which I think is settled, and if I am wrong about it the Senator from Kentucky can correct me, that in a proceeding by mandamus, where there is discretion allowed to an officer, the court does not undertake to decide that discretion for him. Am I right about that?

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. That is settled. Now, let us see about the discretion where a man is to exercise for himself and for the public the right of judgment. Whose right of judgment is provided for in this section?

The purchase and distribution of seed by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country.

Who is to judge about that? I ask the Senator from North Dakota and other Senators who are prosecuting the Secretary of Agriculture to answer this question: Who is to decide under the law what seeds are rare and uncommon? Is it the Senator from North Dakota? Is it the Senate of the United States, or is it the sworn officer of the Government of the United States who is intrusted with this duty? Everybody knows that it must be the Secretary of Agriculture who is to determine that question, and he determined that he could not make these purchases. Here is the fact. The Senator from North Dakota comes here and asks the Senate to say that the Secretary was wrong about that; that there are plenty of rare and uncommon seeds which are to be had at a reasonable and fair price which he ought to have bought, and when I asked the Senator from North Dakota to specify a single one of these things what did he say? He said that is for the Secretary of Agriculture and not for him. Exactly. That is what I say; and it is not for him nor for the Senate of the United States. When he wants to prosecute the Secretary of Agriculture, then the Senator assumes that the Senate can judge what is rare and uncommon. But when I ask him to tell me where is the default of the Secretary of Agriculture in not purchasing these things, and to name a single rare and uncommon seed which he has not purchased, the Senator falls back upon the law and says that is for the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I stated distinctly to the Senate a while ago that a few years ago corn was rare and uncommon in the State of North Dakota, and that it has become common simply as a result of experimentation.

Mr. GEORGE. The Secretary did not want to buy corn, then, did he, because that had ceased to be rare and uncommon? That is exactly what the Secretary of Agriculture says in another part of that paper. He says that seeds which had been rare and uncommon by purchase and cultivation had ceased to be rare and uncommon and had become very common.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. There are many other States where corn is still rare and uncommon, and if the Secretary of Agriculture were to proceed to experiment there, a time would come when corn would not be rare and uncommon.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask the Senator if he has a complaint from people anywhere in the United States that the Secretary has not purchased corn and sent it to them? Where is the man anywhere in all this broad land who is complaining before the American Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture did not purchase the rare and uncommon thing called corn? [Laughter.]

Let us go back to the law. I think it is pretty well settled that the Secretary of Agriculture is to judge of what is rare and uncommon, and not the Senate of the United States. Especially I want to call the attention of the Senate to that proof. When I asked the Senator to point out a rare and uncommon thing, he said, "That is for the Secretary of Agriculture." What is the next provision of the law? That the Secretary of Agriculture in his purchases—

Shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another.

Does the Senator know of a single seed which has not been purchased and distributed by the Agricultural Department which can "be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another"? I pause for a reply. The Secretary of Agriculture is indicted as a criminal, as a willful violator of the laws of the land, which he has sworn to carry out, because he did not purchase seeds which "may be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another."

I understand now that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is read by everybody, is the most popular journal published in the United States, containing more useful information than any other journal, and I should like to have appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the benefit of the people of the United States and for the people of the world at large, what particular seeds which have not been purchased by the Agricultural Department come under this description, which "may be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another."

I hope the Senator from North Dakota will answer that question. I pause for a reply. I think mankind everywhere, whose

attention has been called to this extraordinary proceeding, is on tiptoe to hear the answer to that question. [A pause.] There is no answer, and yet we are to condemn the Secretary of Agriculture for not purchasing a seed which nobody can describe. The Secretary of Agriculture does not know of it. He is not bound to know all about these seeds. In order to show the Senate how particular the Secretary was to get the benefit of everybody's judgment in this matter, and not to rely on his own, I want to read the advertisement. The Secretary did not sit down in his office and evolve out of his inner consciousness—I reckon that was the way he would have to get it, if he got it at all—what particular seeds were "rare and uncommon to the country," or what particular seeds could be "made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another." He did not do that. He sought the advice of every seedsman in the United States. Here is the publication. He did not advertise for Bermuda grass, nor for corn seed, nor for any particular kind of seed. He advertised for seeds that are "rare and uncommon to the country or such as may be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another." So he called upon every seedsman in the United States to produce his seed, bring it before him, and let him try it.

What did the Secretary of Agriculture get? I read you a list:

Bermuda grass seed, brome seed, petunias, etc.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi will please suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. GEORGE. I am very much in favor of that bill, and while I have a great deal more of interesting matter to bring before the Senate at this time, I am perfectly willing, in order to save the country and in the interest of the free coinage of silver, which I believe is the proposition of the bill, to give way, and let the regular business be carried on. At some other time I shall finish what remarks I have to make.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to say that to-morrow morning, at the conclusion of the routine business, I shall seek to call up the joint resolution again.

SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON Mr. President, I propose for a few minutes, perhaps not over a half hour, to discuss the so-called silver amendment to the pending bill, and shall aim to do so in a wholly impersonal manner, without lauding one party or aiming to detract anything from the other.

The free and unlimited coinage of silver, at the ratio of 16 to 1, by the United States alone, at this time and under existing conditions, will destroy the last vestige and last hope of genuine bimetallism, and will reduce us to a pure state of silver monometallism, with Mexico, China, and Japan as our chief metallic money associates.

Complete bimetallism implies not only equal mint privileges, but also equal faculties of circulation. Both metals may be freely coined and yet not freely circulate. A metal may be freely coined and yet be powerless to maintain itself in circulation. Though both metals may be freely coined, yet if, for any cause, only one of them is in active circulation, then there is a failure of that bimetallism which seeks an abundant currency and enhanced prices, the chief grounds upon which free coinage is placed.

In this full and plenary sense we have never had complete bimetallism in this country. We have been subject to that law from which no nation is exempt—that where two kinds of metallic money of equal coin value, but of unequal commercial value, circulate side by side, that money which is intrinsically and commercially cheapest will drive the dearest out of circulation, unless the two are, as a matter of law and fact, interconvertible with each other. Our own experience and our own financial history make this plain and manifest. At least three times in our experience have we suffered the penalty of this law and sought to overcome its effects.

In 1792, when our mint was established and our first coinage law was passed, the commercial ratio of silver to gold was 15.17 to 1. That law, at the suggestion of Hamilton and Jefferson, who, unlike some of the statesmen of to-day, were imbued with the desire to approximate the commercial ratio, fixed the coin ratio at 15 to 1 and provided for the free coinage of the following gold coins:

The eagle, or ten-dollar piece, of 270 grains and 0.916⅔ fineness.
The half eagle, or five-dollar piece, of 135 grains and 0.916⅔ fineness.
The quarter eagle, or two-and-a-half-dollar piece, of 67.5 grains and 0.916⅔ fineness.

And also provided for the free coinage of the following silver coins:

The dollar, or unit, of 416 grains and 0.8924 fineness.
The half dollar, of 208 grains and 0.8924 fineness.
The quarter dollar, of 104 grains and 0.8924 fineness.
The dime, of 41.6 grains and 0.8924 fineness.
The half dime, of 20.8 grains and 0.8924 fineness.

The commercial value of the gold coins coined under this act being and becoming higher than the coin value, they were withdrawn from circulation and exported. To remedy this evil, and to retain our gold coin in circulation at home, the act of 1834 was passed, by which the weight and fineness of gold coins was fixed as follows:

The eagle, 258 grains and 0.899225 fineness.
The half eagle, 129 grains and 0.899225 fineness.
The quarter eagle, 64.5 grains and 0.899225 fineness.

And this left the ratio at near 16 to 1. What had been true during this period as to gold was also true as to our silver coinage. The coin value of that was less than the commercial value, and as a consequence that, too, was shipped abroad. To remedy this evil the executive department suspended the coinage of silver from 1805 till 1836. But finally Congress intervened, and by the act of 1837 established the following weight and fineness of our silver coinage:

The dollar, of 412½ grains and 0.900 fineness.
The half dollar, of 206¼ grains and 0.900 fineness.
The quarter dollar, of 103⅛ grains and 0.900 fineness.
The dime, of 41¼ grains and 0.900 fineness.
The half dime, of 20⅝ grains and 0.900 fineness.

This same act also changed the gold to the same rate of fineness as silver. During this early period, from 1792 till 1834 and 1837, our gold and silver coins were both expelled from circulation by the cheaper foreign coins, especially by the so-called Spanish milled dollar. The act of 1837 failed to bring back our silver into circulation. Its coin value as against gold was still less than its commercial value, and so our gold usurped the entire field of circulation.

To cure this and to keep some of our silver in circulation, the act of 1853 was passed, by which the weight of the silver coinage below the dollar was changed as follows: The half dollar to 192 grains; the quarter dollar to 96 grains; the dime to 38.4 grains; the half dime to 19.2 grains.

By this act free coinage was suspended as to this subsidiary silver, and it was only permitted to be a legal tender in sums of $5 or less. Prior to this there had been no limitation, either as to free coinage or legal tender, in respect to either metal. The statesmen of those days had no scruples and could see no injustice in suspending free coinage in respect to money the coin value of which was so much inferior to the commercial or intrinsic value as our subsidiary silver then became. From the time of this legislation till 1862, when both gold and silver, through the vicissitude of war, were withdrawn from circulation, our metallic currency consisted of gold and this subsidiary and some foreign silver. The silver dollar had totally disappeared from circulation. In fact, from 1837 till 1862, so far as circulation was concerned, we had the single gold standard as completely as any country ever had it. And by the rules now laid down by the advocates of free coinage, that low prices, hard times, and financial distress are the results of a lack of silver money, surely the prices of commodities must have been tenfold lower then than now and the distress more than tenfold greater. But we know that this was not so; that the country grew and prospered even on a single gold standard.

During the period of seventy years, from 1792 till 1862, we had, except as to subsidiary silver, bimetallic free coinage, but in no sense bimetallic circulation. The most important element of bimetallism was wanting. Free coinage without parity in faculty of circulation, without a bimetallic circulation, is a snare and a delusion, is, in substance, only a form of monometallism.

Under the law of 1792, by the year 1834 our gold and silver, because its commercial value was higher than its coin value, and higher than our paper currency and a lot of foreign silver, had, by this inferior silver and paper currency, been driven out of circulation; and subsequent to 1834 our silver, except the subsidiary coins saved by the act of 1853, was driven out of circulation by our gold more completely than at any other time in our history. Did anyone ever see an American silver dollar in circulation in the fifties, or from thence until we got the Bland dollar?—and that was not a free-coinage dollar. During these seventy years we had a shifting monometallism as to circulation. Somehow, in one form or another, under the operation of the law I have described, one-half of our so-called "primary" money was "stricken down" most of the time; and part of the time our entire stock of "primary" money was "stricken down" and hid below the horizon of circulation by cheap foreign silver and cheap paper. These seventy years of our financial experience demonstrate to all fair and candid minds in search of truth, and who are willing to accept the truth, that free coinage, even at a coin ratio not very far removed from the intrinsic ratio, does not of itself lead to bimet-

allism in circulation, and does not result in an expansion of metallic currency or "primary money."

This is still more apparent if we study the coinage of our mints. Up to 1875 there had been coined in our mints a total of $919,212,930 in gold, $8,031,238 of silver dollars, and $149,132,720 of subsidiary silver, or a total of $157,163,958 of silver. And as to circulation, the disparaity between silver and gold from 1850 till 1873 was still greater.

Our own experience during the first seventy years of this century was the experience, in a greater or less degree, of the nations of Europe. Aside from England nearly all of them had free coinage of both metals, with a shifting monometallism as to circulation. It was no doubt this fluctuating monometallism, in connection with the difficulty of maintaining the parity of the two metals, that led so many countries in the seventies to adopt the single gold standard, or to suspend the free coinage of silver.

In 1873 our country adopted the single gold standard and demonetized the silver dollar. And this has been called by those who now seek the free coinage of silver the great crime of 1873. Most of our economic and industrial misfortunes from that day to this are ascribed to this cause. I am not here to defend or justify, nor have I ever defended or justified, the act of 1873. In my opinion it ought not to have passed. But that act did not accomplish all the dire results with which it has been charged. It did not strike down silver, for the reason that there was none in circulation to strike down. Silver had been stricken down—that is, expelled from circulation—long before that under the acts of 1834 and 1837. Under free coinage our silver dollars had been in hiding ever since the early fifties, and neither gold nor silver had been in circulation since 1862. We were on an exclusive paper basis. We did not commence to retire even our fractional paper currency by the substitution of subsidiary silver till 1876, and in 1878, one year before we resumed specie payment of our greenbacks, silver was remonetized and made a legal tender with an enforced monthly coinage of not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 worth of silver bullion.

The harm that the act of 1873 might have accomplished, had it remained in force when we resumed specie payment in 1879, was cured by the act of 1878. Under more than seventy years of free coinage only 8,000,000 of silver dollars had been coined, while under the act of 1878 there was coined from the time of its passage till it was supplanted by the act of July, 1890, $385,000,000 in standard legal-tender silver dollars; and from the bullion purchased under the act of 1890 there has already been coined over $40,000,000 in standard silver dollars. And "the net profit or seigniorage on the coinage of silver during the seventeen years ended June 30, 1895, including the balance in the coinage mints on July 1, 1878, aggregates $75,643,893." Only a small fraction of this profit would have inured to us had there been free coinage.

Under free coinage we were unable to keep our silver dollars, though comparatively few in numbers, in circulation, while under the restricted coinage of the acts of 1878 and 1890 we have been able to keep all our coined silver in circulation, either in coin or silver paper, and to maintain the whole of it on a parity with gold. On the 1st of November, 1895, the status of our metallic currency was as follows:

	General stock coined or issued.	In Treasury.	Amount in circulation.
Gold coin	$564,132,920	$88,951,327	$475,181,593
Silver:			
Standard dollars	423,289,309	364,935,217	58,354,092
Subsidiary	77,259,180	13,426,421	63,832,759
Treasury notes, act July 14, 1890	141,092,280	26,565,611	114,526,669
Certificates:			
Gold	50,585,889	168,230	50,417,659
Silver	342,409,504	8,953,268	333,456,236

Our total gold circulation, including coin and gold paper, was $525,599,243, and our total silver circulation, including silver dollars, subsidiary silver, and both kinds of silver paper, was $570,169,747. And the whole of this silver currency, the silver certificates being convertible into silver dollars at will, except the $63,832,750 of subsidiary silver, was in law a legal tender on a par with gold, and was as much primary redemption money in law as gold.

We thus had $506,336,997 of legal-tender silver against $525,599,243 of legal-tender gold, thus giving us almost parity in volume as well as parity in value. Here we have more of genuine bimetallism and far less of monometallism than we ever had under the free-coinage laws prior to 1873. We make a better showing as to silver than even France, which is the only country whose per capita circulation materially exceeds ours. The estimated amount of metallic money in France is, gold, $775,000,000; full legal-tender silver (5-franc pieces), $435,000,000, and limited legal-tender silver, $45,000,000. How, in the face of these figures, can it be said that silver has been stricken down, or that one-half of our so-called primary money has been destroyed? Our $8,000,000 free-coinage silver was unable to maintain itself in circulation, while our $500,000,000 of silver currency, under restricted coinage, though intrinsically worth only half of its coin value, is kept in circulation on a parity with gold. And how is this done; how is this parity maintained? It is maintained by making the cheaper metal, silver, interconvertible with the dearer metal, gold. As long as the cheaper metal can at will be exchanged, and the public believe it can at will be exchanged for gold, dollar for dollar, there is no object in retiring the gold from circulation, and it will not be retired.

It is this principle of interconvertibility in law and in practice that has kept, and is keeping, our large volume of silver currency in circulation on a parity with gold. It was because our cheap foreign silver and our paper could not be converted dollar for dollar into our dearer gold and silver that both of the latter disappeared from circulation between 1792 and 1834; and it was because our cheaper gold could not be converted at will dollar for dollar into our dearer silver that the latter disappeared from circulation after 1854.

Steady, continued bimetallic circulation, at any ratio, can only be maintained by making the dollar of one metal always interconvertible with the dollar of the other metal, for the bullion value of the two metals will inevitably, as against each other, fluctuate more or less, and this fluctuation is what necessitates interconvertibility, or the right of always exchanging the cheaper coin for the dearer coin. It is only under this principle—the principle of interconvertibility—that bimetallic circulation, in the absence of international agreement, can exist or be maintained. And even under international agreement there is need of interconvertibility, in order to insure complete and continued bimetallic circulation. For, unless the two metals are at all times interconvertible dollar for dollar, there is apt to be more or less of a shifting and fluctuating monometallic circulation.

Our large silver currency, almost equal to our gold currency, is kept in circulation, side by side with gold, and on a parity with it, though intrinsically worth only half as much, because, by law and in practice, we stand ready to make good every silver dollar with a gold dollar. The law directs us to maintain the parity, and this can only be done by maintaining interconvertibility. As long as we have the power and ability to maintain this, real bimetallic circulation, which I believe in with all my heart, can be maintained. As long as our silver currency under present conditions is kept on a parity in volume with gold and is not allowed, materially, to exceed it, we can maintain a parity in value. But the moment you destroy this parity in volume, the moment you open wide the door and get such an abundance of silver coined that we are powerless to maintain it interconvertible with gold, gold will go out of circulation and we will be in a state of silver monometallism, and silver will circulate on its bullion value, which will be a fluctuating value, liable to change from day to day, as the price of bullion goes up or down, with none of that fixity of value that silver has when its coin value is kept on a parity with gold.

Under such a system of silver monometallism no one could do business unless he took pains to post himself from day to day in regard to the bullion price of silver.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand two silver dollars. One the American dollar, the dollar of our daddies, the other the Mexican dollar, the Greaser dollar. There is a little more silver, of little more fineness, in the Mexican dollar than in ours. If I go down to Texas and cross the Rio Grande into Mexico, I can get two Mexican dollars for one of ours. Why is this? It is because in Mexico they have silver monometallism, and because silver there circulates on its bullion value, while with us it circulates on its coin value on a parity with gold, and our Government stands ready to maintain the dignity of the silver dollar on a par with the gold dollar, and to make every silver dollar good with a gold dollar. Do you want to Mexicanize our currency? If you do, then adopt free coinage. If you want genuine bimetallic circulation, then you must adhere to the principles of moderate and limited coinage, and have the two metals interconvertible.

Owing to the fact that in the seventies nearly all the nations of Europe either adopted the single gold standard or suspended the free coinage of silver, and also owing in part to the fact that there has been a large increase in the production of silver, and in spite of the efforts of India, and the United States under the act of 1890, to maintain and uphold silver, and in spite of the fact that for upward of three years these two countries consumed nearly two-thirds of the world's silver, this metal continued to fall in price until in 1894 it had reached a commercial ratio of more than 32 to 1, and has remained substantially at that ratio ever since. It will do no good to taunt or call to task the nations of Europe for demonetizing silver or suspending the coinage thereof. We can no more expect to control them in these matters than in their revenue and tariff legislation. But it is a fact that we must take into account and can not overlook.

The chief use of silver prior to the seventies was for coin pur-

poses under free-coinage laws, and under those conditions the coin value fixed or kept up the bullion price. But this kind of a market for silver has since that time ceased to exist in Europe.

Europe still uses a large amount of silver for coin purposes, almost as much as before demonetization, but it purchases the silver bullion at its commercial or market value, and not at an arbitrary coin value, as before. These facts and this condition, which we did not cause and can not control, have reduced the price of silver bullion to its present low level, and it is in the face of these facts and this condition, which no one can gainsay, and when the commercial ratio of silver is 32 to 1, that the advocates of free silver ask us to embark upon the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, without the cooperation of even a single nation in Europe; and in this request they not only ask us to increase the circulation of silver without limit, but also to double the price of it, for they are as persistent about the ratio as about the fact of coinage. They insist on a ratio that has been obsolete for over twenty years. They argue that by free coinage we can, by our own might, restore the price of silver to correspond with the coin ratio they insist upon. But our experience under the act of 1890, when we were purchasing silver at the rate of 54,000,000 ounces per year, and had the assistance of free coinage in India, shows, aside from other considerations, that we can not now, shorn of the help of India and with all Europe against us, hope to restore silver to its former, or near its former, price. By free coinage we could perhaps raise the price of it a little above the present level, but we would be utterly unable to maintain it on a parity with gold.

Bimetallism in circulation would cease and vanish, and we would be in a state of silver monometallism like Mexico, China, and Japan. The American people are in favor of ample and complete bimetallic circulation, and it is because that they have good ground to fear that free and unlimited coinage would destroy such bimetallism that they are opposed to such coinage. Our silver currency is now nearly equal in volume to our gold currency. It could bear expansion to an exact equality of volume, and it should be kept on that footing, for that would be using both metals to an equal degree, and in that proportion we can sustain their interconvertibility and maintain the parity of the two metals.

The great mass of the American people own neither silver mines nor silver bullion, and if they are content to accept and circulate, by means of a gold reserve, an inferior and cheaper silver dollar on a parity with a gold dollar, it is their business. They are the chief parties in interest, and bear the chief burden. But if there is a profit of 50 cents or less on each silver dollar, that profit ought to inure to all the people of the United States. It ought to go into the Treasury of our common country for the common benefit and advantage of all, and not into the pockets of the owners of silver mines or silver bullion, as it would under free coinage on the ratio of 16 to 1 by the United States alone.

But it is argued by the advocates of unlimited coinage that silver is primary money, and that values are measured and prices fixed by the amount of primary money in circulation, and that prices rise or fall as the volume of such money rises or falls. It is further said that silver, for want of free coinage, has ceased to be primary money, and that this has resulted in the destruction of one-half, more or less, of our total stock of primary money, and a proportionate lowering of prices and values; and finally, that it is because there is an insufficiency of currency in circulation, especially silver currency, that values and prices are low and cheap and business embarrassed and depressed. The fallacy of all this argument, though supported by scholastic dissertations and quotations from publicists, becomes apparent from a brief review and a brief consideration of our own conscious experience as a nation. Our own history, if read aright, affords us ample means of disproval.

In one sense, any coin is primary money when it is a legal tender, though it may not be freely coined. In this sense it was only from 1873 till 1878 that silver was not primary money. But at that time we were on an exclusive paper basis, so that practically the demonetization was more technical than actual. Except during that period of five years, the silver dollar has always been a legal tender, and is a legal tender to-day. In another sense—that sense which lies at the root and constitutes the very essence of bimetallic circulation, either under free or restricted coinage—there is but one kind of primary money, and that is the money which for the time being maintains the parity of the two metals, be it either silver or gold. In brief, there is a primary money of law and a primary money of fact.

From 1854 till 1862, or, if you please, till 1873, silver dollars were a legal tender and were freely coined, but there were none of them in circulation, and, as a consequence, the people had none of that money to tender. Free coinage and legal tender were there, but the actual money was wanting. Since 1878 silver, though under restricted and limited coinage, has been a legal tender, both for the individual and the Government. Where the individual does not foreclose himself by an agreement to the contrary he can at all times stand on silver as a legal tender, as primary money, and make his payments therein, and he can now obtain, what he could not do in that free-coinage period to which I have referred, a reasonable and ample amount of silver dollars with which to make such tender, provided he has something in the shape of property or labor to exchange for it, and that would be a requisite, even under free coinage. Technically and as a matter of law, the Government, too, unless by special agreement foreclosed, can stand on silver as legal tender, as primary money. But the Government is charged with a duty from which the individual is exempt—that of maintaining the parity of the two metals, that of maintaining bimetallic circulation, and on this account the Government can not afford at all times to stand on its technical right, but must always be ready to pay in the dearer metal, the primary money of fact rather than the primary money of law. Unless the Government does this monometallism will be the inevitable result. It is not true that values or prices are fixed by the volume of primary money alone. Nor is it true that the volume of business is measured by any such standard. Neither is it true that prices or business is gauged by the volume of silver in circulation.

Prices and business during the period from 1854 till 1862 were fairly good, and, on the whole, better than during the last three years, and yet during that period there was no legal-tender silver whatsoever in circulation. At no time in our history have we had, either absolutely or relatively, so large a volume of silver currency in circulation as during the last three years, and yet prices and values have scarcely ever been so low as during these years, nor have we ever before had any greater business depression.

From 1861 till 1878 we had no so-called primary money, either silver or gold, in circulation, and yet we carried on with success a great war, paid and pensioned a great army, and paid or funded a great national debt. And during all this period prices were maintained at a much higher level than to-day. And from the close of the war till 1878 we enjoyed a period of great and almost unequaled progress and prosperity. And all this without any primary money whatsoever in circulation. And during all this period our per-capita circulation of money was less than it has been at any time since 1881, and much less than it is to-day, as appears from the following table of circulation from 1860 till 1872, and from the table of circulation and prices hereinafter set forth from 1872 till 1895:

Amounts of money in the United States, and in circulation, on July 1 of each year from 1860 to 1871, inclusive.

July 1—	Amount of money in United States.	Amount in circulation.	Population June 1.	Money per capita.	Circulation per capita.
1860	$442,102,477	$435,407,252	31,443,321	$14.06	$13.85
1861	452,005,767	448,405,767	32,064,000	14.09	13.98
1862	358,452,079	334,697,744	32,704,000	10.96	10.23
1863	674,867,283	595,394,038	33,365,000	20.23	17.84
1864	705,588,067	669,641,478	34,046,000	20.72	19.67
1865	770,129,755	714,702,995	34,748,000	22.16	20.57
1866	754,327,254	673,488,244	35,469,000	21.27	18.99
1867	728,200,612	661,992,069	36,211,000	20.11	18.28
1868	716,553,578	680,103,661	36,973,000	19.38	18.39
1869	715,351,180	664,452,891	37,756,000	18.95	17.60
1870	722,868,461	675,212,794	38,558,371	18.73	17.50
1871	741,812,174	715,889,005	39,555,000	18.75	18.10

If primary money is the measure of values, of prices, and of business, then, by this token, everything ought to have been at zero—at a standstill during this period.

Values and prices are primarily fixed and controlled by the law of supply and demand, now and at all times. The abundance or scarcity of money may affect them to some extent.

Whatever effect money may have, it is not silver nor gold alone, nor both together, but the entire volume of our circulating medium—gold, silver, paper, and credit currency combined—that is controlling. In the entire country, as an aggregate, over 90 per cent of all transfers and exchanges for goods and commodities are affected and liquidated by means of checks, drafts, and bills passing, most of them, through the clearing houses. About 8 per cent are in paper currency, 1 per cent in gold coin, and one-half of 1 per cent in silver coin. In the great commercial centers, in the large towns, and among middlemen, wholesalers, and jobbers transactions are mostly in the commercial paper mentioned, while in the small country towns, among the retailers, producers, and middlemen, and in retail business, transactions are, to a large and preponderating extent, carried on in bank notes and paper currency, and but a mere trifle in gold or silver coin.

The traffic and the commerce of the country is measured and carried on, not by the silver and gold coin in circulation, but by the paper money and credit currency circulating. And this fact, it seems to me, makes it plain that values are not fixed or controlled by the most limited element of our circulating medium, but rather by the aggregate of all the elements combined. An

abundance of currency, if excessive, leads to overspeculation, overproduction, and to an unhealthy inflation of business, and such a condition is always, sooner or later, succeeded by a great reaction, often ruinous in its consequences. The high tide of 1890, 1891, and 1892 was succeeded by the ebb of 1893, 1894, and 1895.

It is a grave question, in my mind, whether the great and abnormal reaction of the last three years was not, in part, superinduced and brought about by the forced and artificial money inflation of the three preceding years. But, be this as it may, it is certain that a mere abundance of currency does not always, nor as a general rule, bring in its wake an enhancement of prices. This can be established from our own commercial and statistical history in a manner that can not be gainsaid. Our leading agricultural export crops are wheat and cotton. I have compiled from the Annual Statistical Abstract of 1894 and from the October Statistical Abstract of 1895 the following table, showing the total money circulation, the gold circulation, the silver circulation, and the per capita circulation, and the New York export price of wheat and cotton for each year from 1872 till November, 1895.

The table is as follows:

Year.	Total money.*	Per capita.*	Total gold.†	Total silver.‡	Wheat, per bushel.§	Cotton, per pound.§
						Cents.
July 1, 1872 ..	$738,309,549	$18.19	$25,000,000	----------	$1.47	19.3
July 1, 1873 ..	751,881,809	18.04	25,000,000	----------	1.31	18.8
July 1, 1874 ..	776,083,031	18.13	25,000,000	----------	1.43	15.4
July 1, 1875 ..	754,101,947	17.16	25,000,000	----------	1.12	15
July 1, 1876 ..	727,609,388	16.12	25,000,000	$21,055,128	1.24	12.9
July 1, 1877 ..	722,314,883	15.58	25,000,000	37,884,853	1.17	11.8
July 1, 1878 ..	729,132,634	15.32	25,000,000	55,134,653	1.34	11.1
July 1, 1879 ..	818,631,793	16.75	125,785,182	69,797,503	1.07	9.9
July 1, 1880 ..	973,382,228	19.41	233,659,679	74,411,914	1.25	11.5
July 1, 1881 ..	1,114,238,119	21.71	321,072,397	115,292,505	1.11	11.4
July 1, 1882 ..	1,174,290,419	22.37	363,280,345	133,289,859	1.19	11.4
July 1, 1883 ..	1,230,305,696	22.91	404,460,863	154,746,435	1.13	10.8
July 1, 1884 ..	1,243,925,969	22.65	411,770,843	182,778,019	1.07	10.5
July 1, 1885 ..	1,292,568,615	23.02	468,398,141	184,320,836	.86	10.6
July 1, 1886 ..	1,252,700,525	21.82	434,263,950	186,958,828	.87	9.9
July 1, 1887 ..	1,317,539,143	22.45	467,765,118	246,250,603	.89	9.5
July 1, 1888 ..	1,372,170,870	22.88	512,208,683	306,649,367	.85	9.8
July 1, 1889 ..	1,380,361,649	22.52	493,611,797	363,090,028	.90	9.9
July 1, 1890 ..	1,429,251,270	22.82	505,089,782	407,867,574	.83	10.1
July 1, 1891 ..	1,497,440,707	23.41	527,382,232	474,509,782	.93	10
July 1, 1892 ..	1,601,347,187	24.44	549,662,443	548,516,702	1.03	8.7
July 1, 1893 ..	1,596,701,245	23.87	501,177,852	596,413,614	.80	8.5
July 1, 1894 ..	1,660,808,708	24.33	562,316,579	590,650,772	.67	7.8
July 1, 1895 ..	1,598,859,316	22.72	525,599,252	570,169,756	.692	8.6

* Statistical Abstract, 1894, page 30. Statistical Abstract, October, 1895, page 489.

† Statistical Abstract, 1894, page 27. Statistical Abstract, October, 1895, page 489.

‡ Statistical Abstract, 1894, pages 28 and 29. Statistical Abstract, October, 1895, page 489.

§ Statistical Abstract, 1894, page 417. Statistical Abstract, October, 1895, pages 481 and 482.

This table shows that during the period of 1872 to 1878, when silver was demonetized, when there was scarcely any gold or silver in circulation, and when the per capita circulation never exceeded $18.19, and was down to $15.58, the prices of wheat and cotton were high, far higher than they have ever been since. This table also shows that, as our circulation has increased and as our gold and silver money has increased, prices have, in the main, been gradually dropping lower and lower, and that they were never so low as in the year 1894, when our aggregate gold and silver circulation was the highest, and when our per capita circulation was within 11 cents of the greatest amount it has ever attained, that of 1892. How much sophistry and how much ingenious and farfetched reasoning the figures in this table dispel. They show conclusively that prices have not been lowered through a want of currency, or through a want of either gold or silver, and, above all, they show how harmless the crime of 1873 was during the five years of its existence.

The level of prices of wheat and cotton during those five years was higher than during any five years since. And during the entire period of twenty-four years covered by this table the prices of cotton and wheat were never so low during any five-year period as during the five years succeeding the passage of the silver-purchasing law of 1890, thus pointing out to us that the silver shower, whatever else it may have done, did not rain manna into the hands of the producers of wheat and cotton. The silver countries, Mexico, China, and Japan, are not the purchasers of our surplus wheat and cotton. We have to look to the gold-standard countries for our customers. But when every other argument fails the advocates of free silver appeal to our prejudices and say that by aiming to keep our money up to the gold standard we are merely knuckling down to England, putting ourselves in her grasp and placing ourselves at her mercy. England occupies the vantage ground; she does, because her exchanges are made in the universal money of the world. Our form of government, our climate and our resources, and, above all, the restless energy and vigor of our people entitle us to stand at the head of the industrial and commercial world. But we can never hope to reach that high plane by reducing our currency to the level of Mexico, China, and Japan, the mere bullion value of silver.

If we would win and conquer we must seek the best coign of advantage, and, above all, we must equip ourselves with the best of weapons. We must adhere to the universal money standard of the world. Anything less than that is unworthy of us and will place us at great disadvantage now and in times to come.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the discussion of the question whether silver shall be restored to the same right of coinage which from the foundation of the Government until 1873 it enjoyed equally with gold has been for twenty years in the forefront of those agitating the public mind and demanding a final determination at the hands of Congress. In spite of this universal public interest and the unremitting popular agitation which has continued without cessation as a result thereof, the problem is yet unsolved and still constitutes, after this long period of contention, the most important, the most importunate, and the most irrepressible question of the day. So long as it remains undetermined it is not only natural but unavoidable that there should continue concerning it the deepest public interest and the most active political contention. This contention is not confined to the state papers of the Chief Executive, and to the debates in Congress, and to the discussions of the press, but extends to every class and condition, from those whose annual incomes are counted by millions of dollars to the humblest laborer whose week's toil will not earn the smallest gold piece now coined and issued from the mint of the Government.

It not only marks divisions between political parties, but also the most pronounced and well-defined divisions between antagonistic factions within these parties.

In the presence of such widespread and consuming interest it is a fact, to which thoughtful and conservative people of whatever political faith should not shut their eyes, that unless at an early date there is by them a fair and proper adjustment of this momentous matter its solution may be accomplished at the hands of those who have less concern for the establishment of a sound and stable currency. The possibility of such occurrence may seem to be very remote. Nevertheless, those who feel most secure in the confidence that the question of the restoration of silver has been put finally to rest, and who boast that further discussion is but a moot debate, the thrashing over of old straw, should not forget the fact taught by experience in both political and civil convulsions that the most violent and successful revolutions have frequently been developed when the power they overthrew seemed most impregnably intrenched and girt about with its defenses.

The question of the restoration of the coinage of silver upon terms of exact equality with gold, when reduced to its last analysis, is whether the basis of the money of final payment shall be narrowed to the possible supply of gold coin, or whether it shall be broadened so as to include the available supply of both gold and silver for coinage as primary standard money.

The resultant of this last analysis must embrace both the gold and the silver coin, each with equal current interchangeable value with the other. For otherwise there would necessarily be practically either gold monometallism or silver monometallism.

Pretermitting for the present the question whether the double standard of gold and silver is practically possible, it is apparent that the question whether the money of final payment shall in this country consist solely of gold, or whether it shall consist of both gold and silver, is one most deeply and directly affecting every person, rich or poor, every interest, great or small, and every occupation from that of the highest salaried official in the land to that of the humblest laborer who eats his crust as the reward of his daily toil.

In considering the importance of the restoration of silver as a standard money it is essential to keep clearly in view the distinction between real money and other forms of currency. This is especially essential because the most dangerous device adopted by those who are in truth the friends of the single gold standard is to advocate such a plan for the coinage of silver as will only make it representative or token money and not real standard money. By this cunning device many of the friends of silver coinage are deceived, and the line of division is obscured between those who are really gold monometallists and those who are in good faith bimetallists.

In common parlance all forms of currency are called money. It is nevertheless true that many of these forms of currency are not money, but only the representatives of money. Accurately speaking, only that is money which is the standard of value and which is known as the money of final payment; that form of currency which is itself paid or redeemed is nothing else, but which in itself pays and redeems everything else. All other forms of currency are but the representatives of money. Only unlimited legal-tender coin is strictly money. Even legal-tender green-

backs are not money, because while they are under the law legal tender in the payment of debts, they are themselves a demand upon the Government for redemption in legal-tender coin. All forms of paper currency are but the representatives of money. Not only so, but it is a fact which can not be too clearly understood or too strongly emphasized that all forms and grades of metallic token money, such as our subsidiary coinage, whether of silver, nickel, or copper, are but the representatives of money. They are not in themselves money, but derive their current value, just as the paper currency does, from the fact that they are, under certain regulations, redeemable by the Government in that which is real money.

To coin silver, in whatever amount or in whatever denominations, as subsidiary or token money, is but to make it representative money, at last redeemable in gold. If it is to be representative money it may as well be of paper as of silver. The important object to be accomplished in the restoration of silver is to enlarge the quantity of standard money. To accomplish this silver must be coined and used as standard money of final payment in no wise dependent on gold. Anything short of this is a delusion and a snare, cunningly spread for the feet of the unwary and the uninformed.

Whatever may be the volume of merely representative currency, whether it be of paper or of coin token money, the questions of the price of property and of labor are necessarily and materially affected by the volume of the standard coin money. Supply and demand and also other influences undoubtedly affect prices. The question whether there shall or shall not be general and individual prosperity, whether prices shall be high or low, whether business shall be active or stagnant, whether enterprise shall be productive or paralyzed, or whether wages shall be remunerative or insufficient for support, are all more or less affected by many influences. But be these influences what they may, whether for good or for evil, the important potential factor in the decision of these questions for good, is the proper supply of primary standard money in the country.

The advocates of the restoration of silver as primary money are in favor of silver, not as against gold. They favor the restoration of silver because the use of both gold and silver as ultimate redemption money is necessary to constitute true bimetallism. They are now struggling in behalf of silver because silver is the metal which is now excluded from equal rights of coinage.

If the conditions were reversed and silver were by law allowed free coinage and the same right of coinage denied to gold, all true bimetallists would contend with equal earnestness for the restoration of gold. There can be no true bimetallism which does not embrace as a constituent part silver as primary standard money.

In the discussion, therefore, of the restoration of silver, the issue should be accurately defined and clearly recognized, not as gold on the one side and silver on the other side, but as gold monometallism on one side, opposed on the other side to bimetallism, embracing both gold and silver as primary standard money. The man who favors unlimited gold coinage, and also silver coinage, but the latter only in the shape of subsidiary or token money, is not a bimetallist. Whatever be the reasons which control him, he is in effect a practical gold monometallist. He only is a bimetallist who favors both gold and silver as standard, final redemption money.

The importance of true bimetallism to the prosperity of the country is the fundamental controlling fact underlying the demand for the restoration of silver. The strength of the argument in favor of bimetallism is based on the fact that the use of both metals is necessary to supply the amount of money of final payment required to do the business of the world, for the reason that all the gold in the world available for coinage is, taken by itself, insufficient for this purpose; and that all the silver in the world available for coinage, taken by itself, is likewise insufficient for this purpose.

This is the basic, fundamental proposition in favor of bimetallism. Is this proposition true? If it is, then the restoration of bimetallism with the use of both gold and silver as the money of final payment can not be overestimated, and there can be no higher obligation on the statesmanship of the country than to find a speedy way for its accomplishment. If it is not true, but if on the contrary it is a fact that there is enough of gold available for coinage to answer all the needs of the world as the money of final payment, then for myself I am ready to admit that the question of bimetallism, and the question which it involves of the restoration of silver as primary money, except so far as they concern debts previously contracted, are comparatively unimportant questions. Upon the crucial question as to the sufficiency of the gold supply *there is little division* in the opinions of public men, judging by their former utterances, and there is little room for division. Most of them have borne direct testimony to the fact of such insufficiency. In 1878 the present senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], then Secretary of the Treasury, wrote a letter to Hon. William S. Groesbeck, of Cincinnati, from which I will ask the Secretary to read the portion which is marked.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

I have some delicacy in replying very fully. During the monetary conference in Paris, when silver in our country was excluded from circulation by being undervalued, I was strongly in favor of the single standard of gold, and wrote a letter which you will find in the proceedings of the conference, stating briefly my view. At that time the wisest among us did not anticipate the sudden fall of silver or the rise of gold that has occurred. This uncertainty of the relation between the two metals is one of the chief arguments in favor of a monometallic system, but other arguments, showing the dangerous effect upon industry by dropping one of the precious metals from the standard of value, outweigh in my mind all theoretical objections to the bimetallic system.

Mr. BACON. In May, 1894, certain Senators sent a cablegram to the International Bimetallic Conference in London, and I ask that the Secretary read from the report of that conference the portion which is marked.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

Mr. BACON. I desire to state, in order that the reading of the extract may be properly understood, that the statement which the Secretary is now reading is the preliminary statement of the presiding officer made to the meeting concerning the cablegram, which will immediately follow:

The Secretary read as follows:

I desire to read the following cablegram from America, addressed to the lord mayor, to be read to this meeting this morning:

"We desire to express our cordial sympathy with the movement to promote the restoration of silver by international agreement, in aid of which we understand a meeting is to be held to-morrow under your lordship's presidency. We believe that the free coinage of both gold and silver by international agreement at a fixed ratio would secure to mankind the blessing of a sufficient volume of metallic money, and, what is hardly less important, would secure to the world of trade immunity from violent exchange fluctuations."

This cablegram is signed by Messrs. JOHN SHERMAN, WILLIAM ALLISON, D. W. VOORHEES, H. C. LODGE, G. F. HOAR, N. W. ALDRICH, D. B. HILL, E. MURPHY, C. S. BRICE, O. H. PLATT, A. P. GORMAN, W. P. FRYE, C. K. DAVIS, S. M. CULLOM, J. M. Carey, United States Senators. Having to discharge magisterial duties for the lord mayor, I will ask my esteemed friend, Mr. Hucks Gibbs, to take the chair in my place. [Loud applause.]

Mr. Henry Hucks Gibbs: The secretary will read certain letters of apology. But before his doing so I will mention that the significance of that cablegram which has just been read to you is much enhanced by the fact that the names appended to it include those of the leading "gold men" and advocates of the repeal of the Sherman Act in the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Of course it will be recognized that both the letter and the cablegram contemplated international agreement; but whatever might be the method of relief preferred, both documents contain the emphatic declaration by these distinguished Senators of the insufficiency of the supply of gold, to be relieved from which, by the addition of silver as standard money, would be, in their language, a "blessing to mankind." Nor, Mr. President, is this testimony confined to these eminent Senators, for there is scarcely in the whole country a public man of any political party who has not repeatedly, in public speech and in printed letter, avowed his earnest desire for the restoration of bimetallism, and expressed his antagonism to the single gold standard, recognizing thereby the insufficiency in the possible supply of gold. In addition to the testimony of eminent public men in their individual capacities, the great conventions of the great political parties of the nation, when they have met to nominate their candidates for the highest offices, have in their declarations of principles vied with each other in the strength and earnestness of the avowals of their loyalty to both gold and silver as the standard money of final payment.

Every such utterance by these great national conventions is an emphatic declaration of the insufficiency of the gold supply for the needs of the country. But the crowning declaration of the fact is found in the act of 1893, by which was repealed the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act. That act of 1893, after performing the legislative function which was designed, went further, and in a most unusual manner declared in the most solemn form known to lawmakers the policy and duty of the Government to coin both gold and silver as standard money, and avowed the obligation and intention to find in one way or another the safe way in which to accomplish it. I will ask the Secretary to read the extract from the act as marked.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payment of debts.

Mr. BACON. This solemn declaration, made in this unusual form, could only have been demanded and justified upon the ad-

mitted gross inadequacy of gold to furnish the required amount of standard money.

And thus it is seen that we have the unbroken and concurrent testimony of the eminent men of the day, of the great political parties of the nation, speaking through their representative conventions, and of the Government of the United States speaking in the solemn utterance of a statute, declaring the vital importance of a restoration of bimetallism which shall embrace both gold and silver coin as full standard money. These declarations, by necessary intendment, avow the inadequacy of the possible gold supply to furnish alone the standard money necessary to properly carry on the business of the country, in such manner that there may be profitable employment of capital in other business than in bonds and mortgages—in such manner that the great natural resources of the country may be developed, that business may be active, that enterprise shall be eager, and that the labor of the country may find abundant employment at remunerative wages.

The testimony thus piled up in support of this proposition finds its indisputable confirmation in the financial conditions of the leading nations of the world. It can not be said that any one nation has more than a sufficiency of gold. If, therefore, any one of the nations has an insufficiency to supply its needs, to procure such sufficiency would require that the amount needed for this purpose should be taken from some other nation. To do so would necessarily leave the nation from which it was taken with a corresponding insufficiency. Thus it would necessarily result that to fill the treasury of one nation with needed gold would require that the treasury of another should be emptied of gold for the purpose.

What are the facts as to the supply of gold held by the leading nations? The United States and all the leading Governments of Europe are trying to hoard gold. The fearful cost at which this Government is endeavoring to keep what it considers a safe amount to enable it to maintain the gold basis leaves no room for question that our own supply of gold is woefully inadequate for this purpose. While this is so, it is furthermore a most remarkable fact that of all the six great powers of Europe only two of them, England and Germany, are on a gold specie paying basis. It is a reasonable statement that either one of these Governments, if it could command the requisite supply of gold to safely undertake it, would certainly make gold specie payments of its obligations; and yet in spite of great hoards of gold in their treasuries, their knowledge of the undoubted fact that there is not sufficient of it to go around if payments are undertaken in it, keeps every leading power of Europe, excepting only England and Germany, in a condition of suspended gold payments, and practically upon a paper or silver basis.

In Russia there is a paper currency at about 33 per cent discount. I know that Russia is classed among those using the silver standard, but she has a great hoard of gold which she is constantly struggling to increase, and there can be no doubt that her inability to maintain gold payments is the only reason why she is not on the gold basis. So that upon the question of the sufficiency of the gold supply it is practically the same thing in her case as if she had the gold standard.

In Austria there is a depreciated paper currency which is not even upon its face convertible into coin of any kind. In Italy, so far from gold, one does not even see silver, but only bills and shinplasters for amounts as small as 1 franc (less than 20 cents).

France, with the largest per capita gold and silver coinage of any other nation in the world, recognizing the insufficiency of the gold supply of the world, and knowing that she would be speedily drained of her supply if she paid it out on the demands against her, keeps her own gold supply, by arbitrarily refusing to pay it out on any demand, except in cases when it suits her convenience to do so. No government can be said to be on a gold-paying basis which does not pay gold coin to everyone demanding it. This, then, is the situation. Including the United States, there are seven great powers in the world. Of them Russia, Austria, Italy, and France are each confessedly not on a gold specie-paying basis, and Russia, Austria, and Italy not on a specie basis of any kind.

The Government of the United States, while paying gold, does so only by continually borrowing, at a ruinous cost, gold which she would otherwise not have—gold which belongs to others and which must be returned. And even with this continual borrowing, if one-fourth of her demand obligations were presented for payment she would be compelled to suspend gold payments. She, too, then, must be put down in the class which has not enough of gold to maintain gold specie payments.

And thus it is that among the seven great powers of the earth, viz, the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria, Russia, and Italy, there are only two, Great Britain and Germany, which each has the sufficiency of gold, in her own right, to enable her to maintain gold payments. This remarkable fact is not due to the poverty of either of these great powers, but solely to the insufficiency of the gold supply in the world, for each of these powerful nations is rich in resources and in products.

Another most remarkable fact in this connection is that while of these seven great powers only two of them have a sufficiency of gold, it is at the same time nevertheless true that these seven nations have in the aggregate more than three-fourths of all the gold in the whole world. The remainder, of less than one-fourth of the gold of the world, is held in small amounts by a number of lesser powers, such as Portugal, Belgium, Sweden, etc. No one of them, with few exceptions, has exceeding $40,000,000, and most of them have much less than this amount. It is a fact of momentous significance that these seven great powers, rich in every material resource and controlling the business and commerce of the world, after twenty years in which they have gathered within their borders more than three-fourths of all the gold of all the world, find it utterly inadequate to maintain one-third of them upon a gold specie-paying basis.

Nor is the insufficiency of gold in these countries only shown in the inability of their Governments to maintain gold specie payments. It is equally seen in a like inability of their citizens. No more startling evidence of this insufficiency in this country is needed than the spectacle recently witnessed of Wall street thrown into a perfect spasm of a panic the first day that England demanded gold of America for one-hundredth part of the debt which this country owes her—a foreign indebtedness which has been unnecessarily contracted and increased to enormous proportions, by reason of the suicidal policy of this Government in refusing to furnish her own people, out of the abundant resources of the country, with a sufficient supply of sound standard money.

The insufficiency of the world's supply of gold does not end with the deficiency in the case of these seven great nations taken in the aggregate. These nations embrace less than one-fourth of the population of the earth.

How is gold, the supply of which is shown to be inadequate for the needs of one-fourth, to be so spread among all the nations as to be sufficient for the business needs of the whole world as the money of final payment? For it is not to be forgotten that the argument of the gold-standard advocate is that steam and electricity and modern methods have so converted the whole world into one business community that there must be for all countries alike a uniform standard of money of final payment.

The insufficiency of the supply of gold, even for the needs of those nations striving for the gold standard, is so abundantly proven by indisputable facts that there can be no reasonable controversy as to the truth of the proposition. It is a fact which stands a very lion in the path that leads to gold monometallism.

This fact necessarily compels one of two conclusions: Either the business world and political economists have heretofore been in error, and there is no need of a due proportion of metallic standard money, as has heretofore been believed and recognized through all the centuries, or this required sufficiency of metallic standard money must be secured by the use of both gold and silver. There is no logical escape from the latter proposition, except by taking refuge in the former. In consequence of this dilemma, there have arisen among the advocates of the gold standard those who, unable to dispute the fact of the insufficiency of gold, boldly advocate the proposition that the bulk of business being transacted on credit, the question of the quantity of standard coin is unimportant, and that, the chief function of the money metal being that of a measure of value, its office can be as well performed by a small quantity as by a large quantity. I have personally heard one of the largest and most influential capitalists of New York seriously argue the soundness of this position; and I have read in a respectable gold-standard newspaper an argument to the effect that if the Government kept a few gold coins as the standard of value in the same way that it keeps standards of weights and measures, it was unimportant how small might be the volume of gold coins in the country; and the President, in his last annual message to Congress, in advocating the gold standard, uses this language:

> If a fixed and stable standard is maintained, as the magnitude and safety of our commercial transactions require, the use of money itself is conveniently minimized.

This may be to the interest of the money powers in the money centers, where, with clearing houses, these great financial associations arbitrarily suspend money payments when money is most needed by their creditors, and in violation of law issue certificates to pass as currency between themselves in the place of money which they either have not or with which, if they have it, they will not part. But to ninety-nine one-hundredths of the people there can be no substitute for money in business transactions. They have no clearing-house certificates or other credit devices which will be accepted when the demand for money is made upon them. The suggestions that we should only have a limited quantity of coin to serve as a standard of value, and that then all business should be done through credit, is utterly untenable. It is on a par with that other plan which proposes to dispense with all metallic money, and establish in lieu thereof an ideal money, fixed by the average value of certain products.

All human experience is against such propositions. From the

earliest ages gold and silver coins have been the standards of value, and either themselves the mediums of exchange or the basis for such mediums, and all the devices of men to substitute other forms of standard money and to dispense with the use of actual standard coin have signally failed. History teaches that the undue contraction in the volume of standard coin money retards the progress of nations, stagnates business, and destroys public and private prosperity.

The inevitable result from the contraction of the volume of standard money is falling prices sooner or later. Whenever in the presence of such contraction liquidation sets in prices must go down.

There can be no greater evil to the business prosperity of a country than falling prices caused by the contraction of the volume of standard money. It stagnates the current of all business. One can not afford to buy a house when he knows that prices are falling and that the house will be worth less in a month than it is the day he buys it. He can not afford to buy material and employ labor and build a house when he knows that with falling prices the house within a short time after its completion will be worth less than the cost of the labor and the material. What is true of one man is true of all others in the community. The building of houses stops, and in consequence the man who makes material stops making material and his laborers go unemployed. The laborers and mechanics, having no employment, have no wages to spend with the merchants. The merchant, having fewer customers, have less goods to buy, fewer goods to ship by the railroads, and fewer clerks to employ. The railroads, having less freight to transport for the merchants, run fewer trains, employ fewer men and at less wages in the shops and on the roads, and they in turn have less money to spend with the merchants. And so it can be traced through every industry and branch of business, the depression of each one acting upon the other and paralyzing it. The business disasters of the past three years furnish all details of the picture.

In the general stagnation caused by falling prices during the past three years the merchant has been idle behind his counter, the hammer of the mechanic has been still, the wheels of the factory have ceased to go round, and the farmer no longer has had remunerative prices for his products, and, except where supply has fallen below the normal demand, has had to sell them at less than the cost of production. Out of such conditions it is not to be wondered at that the merchants and farmers have become bankrupt, that railroads and almost all other business enterprises have gone into the hands of receivers, that valuable real estate has become a drug, that all business languishes, and that the land is filled with idle men who can find no work. And the end is not yet, for the commercial agencies report an increasing number of failures. This distress and disaster will in greater or less degree continue so long as the single gold standard is practically maintained, for the annual coinage of gold will not keep pace with the increasing population and business development.

And so it is that in this country, with undeveloped resources practically without limit, with a people resolute, industrious, and enterprising, a people with the will and the capacity to develop these resources and convert them into untold wealth, we stand like a poverty-stricken nation begging the world to lend us gold, refusing to utilize our own resources for the sufficient supply of a sound standard coinage. The London News expressed the truth when in a recent issue it spoke of the United States as "both potentially and actually the richest country in the world." And yet, in disregard of all these elements of wealth, we are sacrificing our own interest that other nations may prosper. We are fast becoming the financial vassals of England, and every year of the maintenance of the single gold standard by this country will strengthen and more closely knit the cords of our bondage. Each year the lessening price which our exports to her will command will represent a corresponding lessening payment by them upon our indebtedness to her, and the necessity will be the borrowing of more gold from her. Her domination in foreign lands is largely the power of her gold, and the people will not forget that but yesterday, when the whole country, without regard to political party divisions, rang with applause for the President in his bold assertion of the intention of this Government to maintain and enforce the Monroe doctrine at all cost, he was unsparingly denounced by those whose indebtedness made them the dependents of the British money power.

But sentiment and national pride aside the enormous price that the American people are now paying for the privilege of retaining the single gold standard should cause it to be unhesitatingly condemned and discarded, and a return to the bimetallic standard accomplished by the speediest practicable route.

For the purpose of procuring gold there have already been three bond issues made by the Secretary of the Treasury, aggregating $162,000,000. In February, 1894, United States bonds to the amount of $50,000,000 were sold. In November, 1894, $50,000,000 more were sold, and in February, 1895, $62,000,000 more. On the authority of the President of the United States, I assert that these bonds were not issued for the purpose of raising revenue for the Government or for the purpose of extinguishing the indebtedness of the Government, but solely for the purpose of maintaining the gold standard. This enormous amount of indebtedness, which the people of this country must ultimately pay, and the interest upon which they must pay annually, has been incurred for no other purpose.

The President in his last annual message to Congress says of these three bond issues as follows. I will ask the Secretary to read the portion of the President's annual message which is marked.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

At no time when bonds have been issued has there been any consideration of the question of paying the expenses of Government with their proceeds. There was no necessity to consider that question. At the time of each bond issue we had a safe surplus in the Treasury for ordinary operations, exclusive of the gold in our reserve. In February, 1894, when the first issue of bonds was made, such surplus amounted to over $18,000,000; in November, when the second issue was made, it amounted to more than $42,000,000, and in February, 1895, when bonds for the third time were issued, such surplus amounted to more than $100,000,000. It now amounts to $98,072,420.30.

Besides all this, the Secretary of the Treasury had no authority whatever to issue bonds to increase the ordinary revenues or pay current expenses.

Mr. BACON. Within a few days $100,000,000 more of bonds is to be issued, not for the purpose of revenue and not for the purpose of extinguishing the public debt, but solely for the purpose of maintaining the single gold standard. This $100,000,000 of bonds is to be issued now when there is in the Treasury in round numbers $180,000,000, and when, according to the Treasury reports, the public revenue is flowing into the Treasury at the rate of nearly $1,000,000 a day. This makes, with the previous bond issues, the enormous amount of $262,000,000 of indebtedness incurred in two years for this purpose alone.

Here is an object lesson for the people at which they should not fail to look with care. Here is, in tangible form, a presentation of a part of the bill they must pay for the privilege and honor of maintaining the gold standard. In addition to this enormous issue of bonds, the President plainly says in his annual message that more bonds are to be issued if required for this purpose. Let no man be deceived as to the question whether he must contribute his part to the payment of these bonds and of the annual interest thereon. From the richest to the poorest, the people of every State and section must pay their proportion, and under our system of revenue the poor will pay almost if not quite as much as the rich.

What benefit has the single gold standard been to the plain people of this country, those who make up the great masses of the people engaged in the ordinary avocations of the country? How much more of cotton and wheat and other agricultural products has it enabled our farmers to make each year, and how much increased price has it brought them for such products? How has it benefited the man who stands behind the counter, or in the office, or those who toil in the workshops and in the fields? How has it been such a great blessing to the country that the sweat of an unborn generation should be mortgaged to pay for the privilege of its enjoyment?

Conceding these bond issues to be in accordance with law and in obedience to law, how long a time must be required before Congress will, in the performance of a duty, sweep such a law from the statute book?

Respecting most profoundly the opinions of the distinguished men who think otherwise, for myself I am most unhesitatingly of the opinion that there is no authority in the present law for the issuance of these bonds. However this may be, if the law authorizes the continuous and enormous increase of the public debt simply to maintain the gold standard it ought to be repealed. If the law does not authorize it, but is susceptible of a construction by which the power is claimed under it, there is none the less reason why it should be repealed.

I do not forget that it is urged by many that these bonds have been in fact issued to make good the deficiency in the revenue. I will not stop to discuss what disposition has been made of the proceeds of the sale of the one hundred and sixty-two millions of bonds, or the legality of such disposition. Be this as it may, the fact can not be successfully controverted that but for the purpose of maintaining gold payments these bonds would not have been issued, nor would this additional one hundred millions be issued next month.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Georgia allow me?

Mr. BACON. Certainly; I have no objection to an interruption.

Mr. HILL. I am very much interested in the Senator's very able speech, and wish to ask him a question for information simply.

Mr. BACON. I shall be glad to give any information I can to the Senator from New York.

Mr. HILL. I ask whether it is quite fair to charge to the maintenance of the gold standard the whole amount of the bond issues. For instance, the greenbacks will have to be redeemed in some-

thing—either gold or silver—unless they are wholly irredeemable, and therefore is there not to be charged to the maintenance of the gold standard simply the difference between the gold and silver, whatever that difference may be?

Mr. BACON. I think not, and for the simple reason I shall state. There is in the Treasury now, and there was in the Treasury at the time of each of these successive issues, more than sufficient of that which the law in plain terms says is the legal-tender coin of this country to pay the amount of the greenbacks when presented, if it had been in accordance with the view of the Administration to use the money for that purpose.

Mr. PEFFER. Even more than enough of the gold.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will allow me, I wish simply to say that the bullion not used still belongs to the Government. I thought the point you were making was that it would make an additional debt. If you simply have a fund on hand and do not use it, it is merely substituting one fund for another, is it not?

Mr. BACON. It is true, as the Senator from New York says, that the money is still on hand; but it is the same as if a man had his money locked in a safe and allowed it to remain locked up while he went out and contracted an interest-bearing debt instead of using the money that was in his safe.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will allow me, that, of course, is one way of stating it. Therefore it would be a mere question of interest.

Mr. BACON. That may be the ultimate result, but if the Senator from New York will follow his argument to its legitimate conclusion I shall be most happy. The present construction of the law is that the money which is still in the Treasury, and which I say respectfully, differing of course from those who think otherwise, ought to be devoted to that purpose——

Mr. LINDSAY. Will the Senator from Georgia allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BACON. Let me complete the sentence, when I shall be most happy to hear the Senator from Kentucky. I say that money is still there. According to the present construction it will remain there. If it remains there it is the same as if it were not there at all; it is dead. The effect is to increase the debt and place that upon the people, when its creation could have been avoided by the use of this money.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Kentucky has asked leave to interrupt me, but I shall be most happy to hear the Senator from New York.

Mr. HILL. We are not so far apart possibly upon that question; but would it not be a more accurate statement to say that this indebtedness is incurred to maintain a paper currency, namely, a greenback currency?

Mr. BACON. I think not, Mr. President. There is no doubt that the greenback currency is a charge upon the Treasury, a demand charge. There is lawful money, money made lawful by the statute of the United States, in the Treasury sufficient for the payment of this demand debt when presented. Therefore, if that were used it would not necessitate the contraction of an additional debt. It is, however, not used for that purpose, but, on the contrary, it is held to be a necessity to pay the greenbacks in a certain coin, to wit, the gold coin, and if it were not for that necessity the debt would not be contracted. Now I shall be most happy to do what I can to answer the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LINDSAY. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the gold that has been bought has been bought for the purpose of meeting demands made upon the Treasury by the holders either of greenbacks or of notes issued in payment of bullion under the Sherman Act.

Mr. BACON. Exactly.

Mr. LINDSAY. Those greenbacks are payable in either gold or silver.

Mr. BACON. Yes, under the law.

Mr. LINDSAY. And not resolvable in other greenbacks.

Mr. BACON. Most undoubtedly not.

Mr. LINDSAY. The resumption act provides that the money to be used for resumption shall be acquired by the sale of bonds or else be taken out of the surplus revenues of the Treasury.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Now, during the last two years, the present Administration taking the Treasury with over $3,000,000 of deficit, has there been any free silver in the Treasury that could have been used for the redemption of the greenbacks?

Mr. BACON. I will answer the distinguished Senator from Kentucky in the words of the President of the United States, which have been read at the desk, that the purpose of the issuing of the bonds was for the maintenance of the gold standard. I do not desire to say anything which shall be disrespectful to the Administration. Like the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], it is with the greatest reluctance that I express any difference. But I do say that my conviction is very strong that so long as the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury, who in the issuance of bonds are but the agency of Congress, have within their control legal funds for the payment of the demand obligations, it is beyond the authority of law to create additional obligations for the purpose of raising additional money.

Mr. LINDSAY. The question I desire to ask the Senator from Georgia is, whether there has been at any time since the present Administration commenced free silver in the Treasury which could have been utilized for the redemption of greenbacks?

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator from Georgia allow me to answer that question?

Mr. BACON. I shall be most happy to hear the Senator from Nevada. Go ahead.

Mr. STEWART. Ever since the present Administration came in there has been over $50,000,000 of silver bullion, which the law made it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to coin, over and above all that is pledged for paper issue, whether silver certificates or Treasury notes. That $50,000,000 would have been sufficient for all the redemption which would have been required for the next fifty years, because there is no object in asking for the redemption of greenbacks except for gold for speculative purposes. The people have never asked for one dollar. It has been the duty of the Administration to have $50,000,000 there. Furthermore, that having been made the duty of the President by law, the last Congress undertook to impress that duty on him, and both Houses passed an act making it mandatory for him to coin it. The President vetoed the bill. So he is not laboring very assiduously to get silver coined for the purpose of redeeming Treasury notes and greenbacks. It is because the gold gamblers do not want that, but they want gold. He says in his message that the whole object of selling bonds is to buy gold to sustain the gold standard, and for no other purpose; that we have revenue enough.

Mr. BACON. There is still another answer which is entirely sufficient to my mind—it may be an illogical one—which I submit to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. It is the duty of the Executive as far as possible to discharge the indebtedness of the Government without contracting an interest-bearing debt. Am I not correct in that?

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Suppose there is $100,000,000 of greenbacks in the Treasury and no silver, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that those greenbacks can not be used to redeem other greenbacks when they are presented; but does any man question the ability of the Executive to take that $100,000,000 of Treasury notes and any day he wants, if that much silver is on the market, buy it and use that which is the legal coin for the purpose of redeeming the demand obligations of the Government? If there were $50,000,000, say, of greenbacks in the Treasury, and $50,000,000 of greenbacks were presented for payment, would it be proper for the Executive to decline to take the $50,000,000 of greenbacks and go on the street and get $50,000,000 of silver, which he knows he can get upon the mere intimation of a desire for it, and to issue an interest-bearing bond for the purpose of raising money which could be gotten without the contraction of any such interest-bearing debt?

Mr. LINDSAY. I ask the Senator in reply if there has been any time when silver dollars could have been bought on the market during the present Administration cheaper than gold dollars could have been bought?

Mr. BACON. I think possibly that could not have been done; but I do think the Senator will say that there has never been a time, except in 1893, when there was such a severe stringency, when anybody could fail to get silver in exchange for greenbacks, if he desired to do so. Certainly the power of this great Government could accomplish it; and if so, I respectfully submit in all deference——

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from Georgia allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator from Kentucky will look at the reports that come every day to our tables, he will find that there has been no time when the Government did not have enough silver to make a tender if it had designed to use silver. On the 24th instant the Government had $12,000,000 of silver certificates lying in the Treasury. Of course that means that the Government has $12,000,000 of silver at its disposal if it chooses to use them.

Mr. LINDSAY. I ask the Senator from Colorado if that represented surplus revenue, and if any other money can be used for redemption except surplus revenue?

Mr. TELLER. It represented nothing of the kind. It simply represented so much silver in the Treasury independent of the silver that is held to redeem the Treasury notes, for which it is never used.

Mr. BACON. Whatever might be true of the former bond issues, it is certainly not true that there is now any lack of Treasury notes and greenbacks in the Treasury for the purpose of making the exchange which I suggest. There are now, according to the report which the distinguished Senator from Colorado has al-

luded to, about $100,000,000 of greenbacks and Treasury notes in the Treasury, besides the money to which the distinguished Senator from Nevada has made allusion, and which it was within the power of the Administration to have put into coin under the law now existing.

We not only have the authority of the President in the extract which I had read for the statement that the bonds already issued were issued solely for the purpose of maintaining gold payments, but the additional statement by him that "the Secretary of the Treasury had no authority whatever to issue bonds to increase the ordinary revenues or pay current expenses." There can be no possible contention that the $100,000,000 of bonds to be issued next month are to supply any deficiency, because we now have $180,000,000 surplus in the Treasury. So that I repeat, this $162,000,000 of bonds already issued and the additional $100,000,000 to be issued within a few days constitute a direct money payment of $262,000,000 for the privilege of maintaining the single gold standard, not one dollar of which would have been paid if we were in practice, as well as in law, on a bimetallic basis, paying out at the option of the Government either gold or silver upon all demands presented. It is the money payment the people of the whole country are forced to make to prevent a return to bimetallism and to maintain the single gold standard, whether they wish it or no. It is well for Senators to count the cost to the people of their several States of this debt which has been incurred in order that silver shall remain demonetized.

The proportion of this indebtedness which falls upon the people of Georgia is not less than $8,000,000, and the annual interest which must be paid by the people of that State on this portion of the debt is more than $300,000. While this principal and interest are to be paid by them through indirect taxation, it is none the less to be actually paid by their money. The miasma which floats in the air is none the less poisonous because unseen, and this principal of $8,000,000 and this annual interest thereon of over $300,000 are just as certain to be paid in money by the people of my State as if the taxgatherer called at the door of each citizen and demanded and received from him his part of this immense payment as the price for the privilege of remaining for two years on the gold basis. We can not close our eyes to the fact that under existing law, if the same construction shall continue to be put upon it, the experience of the past two years is to be repeated again and again, and bond issue after bond issue is to be made, piling up debt upon debt to maintain the gold standard.

True the advocates of increased tariff rates contend that when such increased tariff shall bring a greater revenue into the Treasury the flow of gold from the Treasury will cease. However full our Treasury may be, the demand for gold to go to England will not cease so long as we are due her each year $150,000,000 in interest on debts and in dividends on investments her people have in America, and so long as the greenbacks and Treasury notes are outstanding and are recognized as payable at the Treasury in gold at the option of the holders, so long will those desiring gold go to the Treasury of the United States as the most convenient place to get it. Increased revenue can prevent it in one way only, and that way is found in such an abundance of revenue as will enable the Government, by continuing to issue bonds, to lock up all the greenbacks and Treasury notes in the Treasury.

If it can accomplish that, which is practical contraction of the currency to the extent of $500,000,000, it can stop the use of greenbacks and Treasury notes for the purpose of drawing gold out of the Treasury.

I presume there are very few Senators on either side of the Chamber who would favor any system which would result in such violent contraction of the currency of the country.

There is another way, and in my opinion the proper way, to stop the flow of gold from the Treasury and to entirely destroy the necessity or excuse for the issue of bonds. That way is for the Government, in reply to everyone who presents a demand for payment at the Treasury, to say as follows:

> The law makes both gold and silver a legal tender in the payment of debts, both public and private. This Government, under the law, receives either gold or silver from its debtors, at the option of its debtors, and this Government will pay to you as its creditor either gold or silver as may be most convenient for it to do.

That such position is strictly in accordance with the laws of the United States I have no doubt. I am equally assured in my convictions that if this position had been taken by the Secretary of the Treasury in 1893 the troubles which have afflicted the Treasury would have been averted. The issue of $262,000,000 of bonds in two years would have been made unnecessary by simply recognizing silver as lawful money in the payment of the demand obligations of the Government. And I confidently predict that, with existing laws, unless silver legal-tender coin is recognized, and used as well as gold, at the option of the Government, as lawful money in the payment of obligations, there will necessarily be an annual issuance of over $100,000,000 of bonds to procure gold with which to maintain gold payments, and that such will be the result whether the revenues of the Government be great or small.

Mr. President, I can not doubt that the people will compel the remedy whenever they fully understand and realize the enormity of the cost at which the gold standard is maintained. I must believe their eyes will be opened to the truth when they learn that in a State of the population and business of Georgia, because the Government does not use silver as standard money, there is to be added each year the amount of four millions or more of dollars as the proportion of the increasing debt to be paid by the people of that State, and amounts in like proportion by the people of other States, according to their population and consumption of articles upon which revenue is raised. This issue may be beclouded, the people may be deceived and misled to their own hurt; nevertheless, the truth will ultimately be known to them that to maintain a gold standard there is not only loss of untold wealth in the paralysis of enterprise and in the stagnation of business, but that hundreds of millions of indebtedness must be directly incurred, every dollar of which they must ultimately pay in money.

Mr. President, there is another effect in the practical operation of this effort to maintain the single gold standard which is entitled to the serious consideration of Senators and of the country at large. There is now in the Treasury in round numbers $180,000,000 surplus. Of course that includes the $100,000,000 held for redemption, but there is in the Treasury to-day, I should say, $180,000,000, or, speaking with more accuracy, about $177,000,000 of money of all kinds; and recognizing that $100,000,000 of that is held as redemption money, there is an absolute surplus in the Treasury to-day of $77,000,000. When the $100,000,000 bonds are sold next month there will be in the Treasury $280,000,000 or more, of which amount about one hundred millions will be greenbacks and Treasury notes; and if the revenues are hereafter equal to the expenditures, as is anticipated by the Secretary of the Treasury, this amount of $280,000,000 will remain locked up in the Treasury. There will be nothing for which to pay it out, the revenues being equal to the expenses of the Government.

The only possibility of any device, so far as I know, by which it can be paid out is by the purchase of bonds, which would, of course, necessitate their purchase at a very high premium and at a very rapidly increasing premium. This would result in the bonds sold at a low premium being exchanged for bonds purchased at a very high premium, and there would be an unnecessary increase of debt upon the people. The difference between the two rates would be but a temporary relief, because as soon as the Treasury notes were out of the Treasury these persons would again have an opportunity of presenting them for payment, and the same process would be gone through with again.

The only change in the $280,000,000 thus locked up in the Treasury will be that a large part of so much of it as is gold, say $100,000,000, will, in the course of a year, be drawn out and its place taken by an equal amount of greenbacks or Treasury notes. As soon as this occurs, $100,000,000 more of bonds are to be sold and the proceeds in gold again put into the Treasury. This will increase the amount locked up in the Treasury to $380,000,000, of which about two hundred millions or more will be in greenbacks or Treasury notes.

Mr. HILL. Assuming, as I think the Senator does, that hereafter the receipts of the Government will be equal to the expenditures, would not the one hundred extra millions still be in the Treasury subject to be exchanged for gold?

Mr. BACON. Greenbacks for gold?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. BACON. If it is possible to exchange greenbacks for gold, why is it that bonds are issued?

Mr. HILL. The Senator will understand that if we have plenty of money we can to some extent do that very thing now, can we not?

Mr. BACON. It seems not. There is in the Treasury $177,000,000 of money. It is not in gold. As the Senator says, if you have the money you can make some arrangement. If that is true, the bonds ought not to be issued, and this $177,000,000, $100,000,000 of which is set apart for the redemption fund, ought to be used for the purpose, if it can be done, of getting gold without the issuing of bonds bearing interest for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. The Senator comes right back to the question of a deficiency. Then assume that there had been no deficiency of receipts over expenditures for the last year and a half, and there would then be in the Treasury something like one hundred and some odd million dollars more than now, would there not? Would not that money still be on hand? And if the parity of gold and silver is maintained, would it not maintain the gold? To that extent is not the argument of the Senator something like this——

Mr. BACON. The situation which the Senator supposes is the exact present situation. There is in the Treasury, according to the Treasury reports, over $177,000,000 of money, made up of gold and silver and greenbacks.

Mr. HILL. And so long as that remains unused for the current expenses of the Government the present situation will be maintained.

Mr. BACON. That money is there, and it is not being used. Each day shows practically a maintenance, in spite of the expenditures, of about the same amount of money in the Treasury, and so far from what the Senator from New York says being true, in the presence of the fact that there is $177,000,000 in the Treasury, we are about to have another issue of $100,000,000 of bonds. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the hypothetical case of the Senator from New York is answered by the present situation.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. BACON. I have not got through. I only deferred to the Senator because he had sought to interrupt me and I was willing to be interrupted.

Mr. HILL. I will ask the Senator, assuming now that the receipts are going to meet the expenditures, and assuming that gold and silver are to remain substantially at a parity for the next six months, has the Government lost anything or will it lose anything? Will there be any occasion for any further borrowing of money?

Mr. BACON. As long as the greenbacks are out and as long as the Executive takes the position that he must pay gold whenever they are presented, it only depends on whether these gentlemen will present greenbacks or not.

Mr. HILL. We shall have nearly half of the first lot of greenbacks in the Treasury locked up.

Mr. BACON. Exactly. That is what I am saying.

Mr. HILL. And there will be no occasion to get them out of the Treasury unless for some purpose of expenditure, or to exchange them for coin.

Mr. BACON. There will be nôt only no occasion, but no possibility of getting them out of the Treasury. That is exactly the point I am on. I am speaking of the fact that the natural, necessary consequence of the enforcement of the present law as it is at present construed, if we have a sufficiency of revenue, is to lock up in the Treasury all the greenbacks, all the Treasury notes, and all the paper currency issued by the Government. The distinguished Senator from New York asks me whether or not, if there is a deficiency of revenue, this will occur. I say that that is the only condition under which it will occur. If there is a deficiency of revenue, of course money will be paid out; but if there is a sufficiency of revenue which meets all demands, and the money is in the Treasury, there is no way to get it out, no way to unlock it. Do we not agree on that?

Mr. HILL. I think we do; not entirely, but substantially.

Mr. BACON. That is the point I am on.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator hardly understood the point of my suggestion.

Mr. BACON. I think the distinguished Senator from New York certainly did not understand the proposition I made at the time he first interrupted me, because that was the exact proposition. I certainly could not have made any mistake in the expression of it. The exact proposition I made was, if the future revenues of the Government equaled the expenditures, that the necessary consequence of the issuing of bonds for the purpose of getting gold every time the gold reserve was depleted, and taking that gold and redeeming Treasury notes with it, would be to put that much additional in the Treasury, to remain there, and which could not possibly be gotten out unless the Government used it for the purpose of purchasing bonds, and if it were used for the purpose of purchasing bonds, that much of greenbacks would be again put upon the market, and those greenbacks would again be brought back to the Treasury and the same process gone through with again. So the result would be that the greenbacks and Treasury notes would be locked up in the Treasury under this system.

Mr. HILL. We come back to the point where we started, and that is, that all the Government loses in the matter is the interest.

Mr. BACON. It may be, Mr. President, that the Government books will balance, but does the distinguished Senator from New York dispute the fact that with the $500,000,000 of greenbacks and Treasury notes we lock up in the Treasury there would not be a contraction of the circulating medium of the country to the extent of $500,000,000? That is the point I am on now.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator state that?

Mr. BACON. Certainly. I have stated it, and I am sure the distinguished Senator from New York was not listening, or he would certainly have understood it. I was speaking of the effect, not of increasing the indebtedness, but the effect of locking up the currency in the Treasury. That was the point I was on at the time.

The same process will be repeated the succeeding year, and the amount of greenbacks and Treasury notes locked up then will be three hundred millions. It may be that the locking up of the greenbacks and Treasury notes may not proceed as rapidly as I have suggested. But, although it may proceed more slowly, there can be no successful answer to the proposition that with receipts from revenues equal to expenditures, if the Government persists in ignoring silver as lawful money for the payment of its demand obligations, and continues to redeem such obligations only in gold, the continued issuance of bonds to replenish the gold thus paid out will necessarily at each succeeding operation lock into the Treasury an amount of greenbacks and Treasury notes equal to the amount of gold thus withdrawn. I understand that to be the proposition of the Senator from New York, and I am glad we agree on it.

If the law remains as at present and is acted on as at present by this and succeeding Administrations, it is but a question of time when the entire outstanding issue of greenbacks and Treasury notes, aggregating about $500,000,000, will be finally locked up in the Treasury, contracting the currency to that amount. While it may not proceed so rapidly, it is nevertheless possible for it to proceed more rapidly. If the Secretary of the Treasury continues to pay gold alone on the demand obligations of the Government, and will each time promptly issue bonds to restore the gold in the Treasury as often as the gold reserve is reduced to a low limit, it is entirely within the power of the great financial syndicates of the day to lock up in the Treasury in one year the entire five hundred millions of greenbacks and Treasury notes. One hundred millions is all the capital which would be required to accomplish it. It is not to be anticipated that such a drastic measure will be undertaken, but it is beyond successful dispute that with, as there should and probably will be, a revenue equal to expenditures the process of locking up the greenbacks and Treasury notes will steadily go on, and the currency be contracted in the same proportion.

The contention that the gold will not be drawn from the Treasury when the revenues are adequate and there is no deficiency is not sustained by experience. In 1892, when there was a surplus of revenue, there was drawn from the Treasury in gold $36,250,560, and over $32,000,000 of this amount was drawn out in the last six months of that year. Other influences evidently induce the withdrawal of gold from the Treasury, influences which will continue after the deficiency in the revenue shall have disappeared. One of these continuing influences is readily found in the $150,000,000 which must be remitted every year to Europe in payment of interest and dividends; and still another influence in the constant struggle of the European governments to increase their stock of gold. The withdrawal of over $100,000,000 in gold from the Treasury in the year 1895 was not to equalize the balance in trade, for in that year our merchandise exports exceeded our merchandise imports by more than $23,000,000.

Mr. President, in the year 1894, when there was a very large withdrawal of gold from the Treasury—I am not prepared to say how much, because I failed to get the exact figures, but certainly there was a very large withdrawal of gold from the Treasury that year—the excess of exports from this country over imports to it was $237,145,194. That plainly shows that the withdrawal of gold from the Treasury is not to be attributed solely to the failure of our country to export as much as it imports, because when it exports in greater quantity the gold is still withdrawn from the Treasury.

With good reason, then, to anticipate continued withdrawals of gold from the Treasury, the locking up of the greenbacks and the Treasury notes must necessarily follow under existing laws and practices.

Neither of the great political parties favors the retirement of the greenbacks without other currency substituted in lieu thereof. Neither of the parties would dare go before the country on such an issue. But in what manner will they be less responsible if they refuse to enact the only legislation which can prevent the greenbacks from being either in whole or in part locked up in the Treasury and practically retired from circulation? If in the course of a few years and in the regular progression of events as they are now occurring the greenbacks are thus finally locked up, the result will be the increased bonded debt of $500,000,000 and the retirement of that amount of currency from circulation—another practical presentation to the people in tangible shape of the fearful cost to which they will have been subjected, solely to insure the continued demonetization of silver and to maintain the gold standard. This great disaster can certainly be averted by simply restoring silver as standard money and making it the duty of officers of the Government to recognize it as such and to pay to the holders of demand obligations either gold or silver, at the option of the Government, as may be most convenient. No one can doubt that the effect would be instantaneous in stopping the withdrawal of gold from the Treasury and in putting an end to this piling up of debt on the people by the continued issuance of bonds to maintain the single gold standard.

It is said by those who favor gold monometallism that to do so would drive all gold out of the country, would put us upon a silver monometallic basis, and cause us to part company with all the enlightened and progressive nations of the world. However plausible these objections may be in theory, they are all completely overthrown by the fact that France pursues exactly this plan, and in years of its practical operation there have been none of these results. As I have previously stated, France pays out to her creditors at her option either gold or silver, and in the exercise of that op-

tion she pays out little or no gold. Anyone who wishes any large amount of gold can only get it from the Bank of France by paying a premium for it as he would buy exchange. This refusal to pay gold at the option of the creditors has not debarred France from the company of all the enlightened and progressive nations of the world. On the contrary, she continues to be herself one of the recognized leaders among the enlightened and progressive nations of the world. Nor does such refusal to pay gold have any influence to drive gold out of the country. This is shown by the fact that in addition to more than $300,000,000 of gold held by the Bank of France there is about four hundred millions of gold in France outside of the Bank of France. I am speaking here in dollars, not in francs.

With this large amount of gold, France has in active circulation $700,000,000 of silver, $650,000,000 of which is, in practice as well as in name, full legal-tender standard money. This $650,000,000 of legal-tender coin is full standard money in the fact that it is a standard of value by and through its own strength. It in no manner depends upon gold payments to sustain it. It is neither directly nor indirectly, by law or practice, redeemable in gold. On the contrary, it stands on an exact equality with gold, in the hands of either the Government or of the citizen, in the payment of all debts, public or private. I have seen it stated in the gold-standard publications in this country that France has $800,000,000 of primary gold coin and $700,000,000 of secondary silver coin. This is not correct. On the contrary, $650,000,000 of her silver is in every sense as strictly primary standard money as is her gold coin. The consequence is that, with a population of 39,000,000, she has $1,450,000,000 of standard coin, all of which is money of ultimate redemption. The $650,000,000 of silver is no burden upon the gold. On the contrary, to its full amount it assists the gold in bearing the burden of money of final redemption, and actually protects the gold from being drained from the country.

The wide difference between this and the situation in the United States is this: With a population of 70,000,000, we have nominally, say, $650,000,000 in gold and $500,000,000 of silver. This silver, although by law a legal tender, and intended as standard money, is by the practice of the Government not standard money. By the Government refusing to exercise the option to pay silver as well as gold to its creditors, the silver coinage is discredited, and becomes in effect only representative or token money. It does not to the extent of its amount assist the gold in bearing the burden of money of final payment. On the contrary, it adds to the burden in this regard resting upon the gold supply, for by the act of discrediting the silver coin we are practically upon the single gold standard, and that in effect bears alone all the burden. Being thus discredited and its assistance refused and discarded, the silver coinage of the country to the immense extent of $500,000,000 is no more protection to the gold in preventing its being drained from the Treasury than are the notes of the national banks.

From this simple difference between the two countries, that in France the Government exercises the option whether, according to its convenience, it will pay gold or silver to its creditors, and that on the contrary in the United States the Government permits its creditors to exercise their option whether they will demand and receive either gold or silver, follow the widely differing results and conditions in the two countries. France, with $800,000,000 of gold and $650,000,000 of standard silver, has $1,450,000,000 of coin which is standard money of final redemption. The United States, with nearly double the population, having $650,000,000 of gold and $500,000,000 of silver, has only $650,000,000 of coin which is full standard money of final redemption. France has about $40 per capita of coin standard money. The United States, by practically limiting it to gold, in effect has about $9 per capita of coin which is standard money of final payment. France has ample money for the industries of her people, and keeps all of her gold coin at home without piling up debt to enable her to do so. The United States is, by a contracted and still further contracting volume of standard money of final payment, strangling the industries of the country, and loading the people with an ever-increasing debt in the vain effort to keep gold in the country.

It is a most interesting and instructive fact that the French 5-franc piece is in current business on an absolute parity with gold, although its bullion value is only 50 per cent of its coin value, and although there is no law in France and no practice in France by which the silver coin is either directly or indirectly redeemable in gold, and although the Government in no manner undertakes to keep the silver coin on a parity with the gold coin. Ask a French financier the explanation of this remarkable fact and he will tell you that it is because the silver coin is good for the payment of all debts, public and private, and the further fact that the option to use it equally with gold is constantly exercised by the Government and by the citizens in the payment of all debts due by either to the other. Say to him in reply that that is quite simple as regards debts due within the territory of France, but ask him further how it is that the interest coupon on a French rente (or bond) will command par in gold in single gold standard England, when that same interest coupon when presented for payment will only command silver in France. He will answer that it is because the holder of that interest coupon, while it probably will be only paid in silver, can convert that silver into goods which, at the same price, are worth gold in England. What is true of the interest coupon which can only command silver when carried to France would be equally true of the silver 5-franc piece, less only the cost of transportation and ordinary exchange, if it should be carried to England.

Mr. President, time will not permit me to pursue this branch of the argument. But the fact of the parity of silver coins with gold coins in France under the circumstances mentioned are exceedingly suggestive of the ability of this growing country, with its immense products more than twice as great as that of either France or Germany, and 25 per cent greater than that of Great Britain, to safely use a corresponding per capita volume of silver coin, not as secondary or token money, but as standard money of final payment. The essential thing to accomplish it is that the Government as well as the people should ridgidly exercise the option to use either gold or silver in the payment of all debts, public and private, and that the option to the public or private creditor to demand and receive gold should be denied to him.

The reply will be made by the opponents of free coinage that France has stopped free coinage and that this remarkable silver and gold parity is under limited coinage. This is true, but the fact can give no possible support to the gold monometallists or to those who regard the question of bimetallism as settled in this country, who refuse to consent to any remedy proposed by others and fail themselves to propose any. As I have said, the great object to be attained is the restoration of bimetallism—not that pretended bimetallism where, while there are coins of both metals, the gold coin is the standard and the silver coin only a secondary, representative token, but real bimetallism, where the silver and the gold coins are each primary standard money. The French system proves incontestibly that in the hands of those who are really friendly to silver such real bimetallism can exist with limited coinage. But the essential element of true bimetallism under limited coinage, and without which it can not exist, is that the coin of the metal thus limited shall be an unlimited legal tender, which the Government and the citizen must fully recognize as such in exercising, at its will and convenience, the option of paying in the settlement of all debts.

Good faith and sound finance will always require the exercise of such option in favor of either metal to prevent the undue withdrawal of the other. The French system of limited coinage gives to the people of France about $18 per capita of legal-tender standard silver money. If our legal-tender silver coinage were authorized to the same per capita amount it would be about $1,260,000,000, a larger amount than would be coined at the mints by free coinage in the next ten years, even allowing for the $500,000,000 already coined. But neither this amount of silver coinage nor any other amount would bring the needed relief which can alone be found in true bimetallism, unless it was in practice as well as in name standard money. There is no benefit in coining token money except for small change. Token money had just as well be made at the printing office as at the mint, and is just as potential, and just as powerless, for the accomplishment of good in the one case as in the other.

Personally I am in favor of unlimited coinage of silver, not as a sentiment and not in deference to a popular cry. Upon what I think to be sound reason I believe in unlimited coinage as the best means to an end, viz, true bimetallism. There are many arguments in favor of it, but the controlling reason is this: The best form of bimetallism will undoubtedly be found where the bullion value is the same as the coin value. It is the only safe and permanent basis for bimetallism. This equality of bullion and coin value will never exist under limited coinage. That portion of silver which is denied coinage will, as the surplus, always fix the bullion price. As that surplus can only be used for the baser purposes of the arts, its price will always be less than the coin value. Besides this, a money metal which is denied right of coinage can not hold its proper place in the public estimate as the material for standard coin, clothed with the power of final payment.

I do not favor a depreciated silver dollar, nor does any other true bimetallist, and I believe the surest way to secure the parity of the silver dollar with the gold dollar is to give it the franchise of unlimited coinage.

The basis of the argument against unlimited coinage is the alleged danger that with our mints open we would be flooded with the silver of the world. How could this occur? Whenever the value of silver rose here because of unlimited coinage, it would rise correspondingly in every market in the world. The world has no silver to spare to us. On the contrary, the remainder of the world needs more than is made outside of the United States. The remainder of the world would not leave us all of our own product for our own mints. The proof of this is incontestibly shown in the fact that there has never been a single year since 1864 when

our exports of silver did not largely exceed our imports, showing that the product of silver outside of the United States is not sufficient for the remainder of the world's requirements. In one year the excess of exports of silver over imports exceeded $37,000,000, and even when the coinage under the Bland-Allison Act was in full blast there was one year when the excess of exports of silver over imports was more than $18,000,000 and another year when such excess of exports was more than $17,000,000.

There is great misapprehension as to the world's supply of silver and as to the world's annual product of silver. There has been such an outcry about the great production of silver that many suppose that the supply is practically limitless. This is very far from the truth. I can not lay my hand at this moment on the statements of the product for 1893 and 1894, which I assume was some greater than in previous years. But, taking the report ending with 1892, we have the following significant statements of the product of silver and of the relative products of silver and of gold:

According to official reports, in the one hundred years ended in the year 1892 there was nearly twice as much gold produced in America as there was of silver. The gold produced was $1,937,881,769, and the silver produced was $1,146,869,000.

In the same period, from 1792 to 1892, taking the production of the whole world, there was produced $550,000,000 more of gold than of silver. The figures are: Gold, $5,633,908,000, and silver, $5,077,961,000.

According to the official reports of the United States Government of the product of silver in 1892, if every ounce of silver produced in the United States in that year were coined, leaving none for the arts or for export, it would only make a very small fraction more than $1 per capita to the people of the United States. And yet the product of that year was greater than it had ever been in any previous year excepting one.

According to the same report of the product of silver in the whole world for that year, if every ounce produced that year in the whole world were brought to America and coined, leaving not an ounce for the arts or for coinage by other nations, such entire product of silver of the whole world for that year, would, when coined, make considerably less than $3 per capita to the people of the United States. The total amount produced in the world in 1892, was $196,605,000, and that was a larger annual world's product of silver than there had ever been in the hundred preceding years.

Although somewhat out of its order in this place, I can not forbear, before leaving the question of free coinage, to notice briefly one argument against it, which is drawn from the comparison between the Mexican silver dollar and the American silver dollar. The same argument was repeated by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] who preceded me. It is a stock argument with many, based on the fact that an American silver dollar bearing the stamp of a government which prohibits free coinage is worth two Mexican silver dollars stamped by a government where there is free coinage, although the latter has more silver in it than the former. Well, what does that prove? What is true of the American silver dollar is true of the American paper dollar. The American paper dollar is also worth two Mexican silver dollars, and the fact simply proves that neither the American silver dollar nor the American paper dollar is in fact a standard dollar, but that each is only a token dollar, a representative of the American gold dollar, which is so artificially appreciated in value that American products must be sold in it at half their former value.

Mr. President, as a contribution to the history of this struggle in this country between gold monometallism and bimetallism, I will attach as an appendix to my remarks a copy of a circular which I have here for the inspection of Senators who wish to see it, or to be read if anybody desires it. It is a copy of a circular recently issued by the so-called "committee on sound currency" of the Reform Club of New York.

I regret that time will not permit me to comment on this effort of the single gold standard advocates to blind the plain people of the country to their true interest and induce them to place the fetters on their own limbs. It may be interesting to them to note how patent outsides and plate matter have been furnished, in the language of this committee, to "papers the subscribers of which are in the main readers of no other periodicals." It may open the eyes of these people as to the motives of these advocates of the single gold standard when they read in this report that this single committee distributed among them through newspapers and otherwise 9,700,000 documents, and has expended in that time $54,403.74 in the disinterested work of trying to convert them to a financial system which will make them poor while it enriches their benefactors.

Nor, Mr. President, are some of the advocates of the gold standard, who disguise themselves under the name of sound-money men, content to resort to only argument and persuasion. In the arrogance of their power and in their impatience that any should oppose them, they openly announce their purpose to control the elections of Senators in other States, so that those chosen may be in accord with their interests. In a recent issue of one of the leading newspapers in New York there appeared a publication looking to the overthrow of 24 United States Senators by the exercise of the power and influence of the gold-standard advocates in other States. Among those named who are destined to the sacrifice is my humble self. I will ask the Secretary to read the extract from this article which I send to the desk.

Mr. HILL. From what paper is the extract taken?

Mr. BACON. It is stated at the head of the paper that it is from the New York Sun, published on the 28th day of December last.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLANCHARD in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Extract from the New York Sun, December 28, 1895.]

The bankers and merchants of New York City having extensive business relations with the bankers and merchants of other States believe that the time has come when at least 24 United States Senators should be called to account by their constituents for misrepresenting them in matters of financial legislation at Washington. Of these 24 Senators, 16 were elected as Democrats and 8 as Republicans.

The New York business men said they believed that the constituents of the 24 Senators who have joined hands with the silver men should, either through the legislatures of the States they represent, or through the boards of trade and the chambers of commerce in the cities of these States, demand of these 24 that they cease misrepresenting them in matters of financial legislation at Washington and come out hearty and strong for sound money. It is declared that some such line of action should be adopted at once in order to bring these 24 Senators to their senses, and it is even said that this must be done if the merchants and others represented by these 24 men are to be considered in the matter of credits with New York and Eastern merchants generally. The false light in which these 24 Senators have put the business men of their States has deterred Eastern manufacturers and business men from extending lines of credit, even though they are convinced that these Senators do not rightly represent their constituents.

Mr. BACON. I will say, in justice to the newspaper from which that article is copied, that it does not appear on the editorial page, nor does it appear as a dispatch, but is simply published without headline or signature. It covers a column and a half, and, of course, it is therefore impracticable for me to burden the RECORD with the insertion of the article in its full extent; but I have given the date of it, and any Senator can see the full article in which the names of the 24 Senators are given who are to be controlled by the withholding of credit by New York merchants. I present this remarkable utterance without further comment than that it is a most significant indication of the absolute domination of the entire Government in all of its branches to which the gold power evidently aspires.

Mr. President, the gravity of the situation is not to be put aside with the suggestion, as recently made in this Chamber, that this is a moot question and an idle academic discussion. It is a situation which, if the law remains unchanged, involves the prospect of a continually increasing bonded debt, the steady decrease in the per capita standard coin, and the practical retirement of the greenbacks and Treasury notes. Are Senators who oppose the measure reported by the Finance Committee prepared in view of this situation to say they are content for the law to remain as it is, and that they have no remedy which they favor?

In the presence of the insufficiency of gold the scramble among the nations for gold will continue. With this as a fact, our financial troubles must continue so long as we remain on a gold basis and have outstanding the greenbacks and the Treasury notes. I believe the remedy is in getting entirely off the gold basis, and on the true bimetallic basis, and at the same time retiring all paper currency of the Government. I say, at the same time, because all idea of retiring the greenbacks and Treasury notes may as well, in my opinion, be dismissed, unless in the same law there is provision for a return to true bimetallism, involving as a necessary feature the unlimited coinage of silver.

As an original proposition I would be opposed to greenbacks or any other form of Government paper currency, but as such currency now exists to the amount of $500,000,000, I am opposed to any retirement of the same by any means, direct or indirect, until by the same law provision is made for a return to a hard money, bimetallic currency. I believe in hard money and in a sufficient supply of it—a supply which it is impossible for gold alone to furnish. I do not believe that the Government should issue any form of currency excepting only the coin which is stamped at the mints. I regard Government paper currency as a foe to true bimetallism; and an adequate supply of standard coin is none the less the enemy of such paper currency. Whenever those who wish to retire greenbacks and Treasury notes will meet us on this basis, it is probable that a plan can be devised which will relieve the Government and the people from the present financial ills. There is no reason in sound finance why the entire proper per capita supply of currency in the country should not consist in standard coin of both gold and silver, and there is no reason to anticipate that the unlimited coinage of silver would, when added to the gold coinage, swell the supply beyond this amount. The effort to restrict standard money of final redemption to gold alone,

and also to retire the Government paper currency, must certainly fail.

The danger is that the single gold-standard advocates, who boastfully call themselves "sound money" men, in their efforts to restrict the coinage of standard money to gold, may place in power those who will sweep away all standard coin money and put the country on the basis of irredeemable paper currency.

The effort to unreasonably control the great political and social forces is frequently attended by the same results as are the efforts to control great physical forces. The higher the dam is built to stay the stream, the more certain is the mighty power of the gathering waters to finally sweep away the barrier and carry destruction, mayhap, to those who seek to turn back the course of nature.

APPENDIX.

REFORM CLUB.

Committee on sound currency.—Charles S. Fairchild, chairman; Calvin Tomkins, secretary; E. Ellery Anderson, William J. Coombs, Henry Hentz, Henry L. Nelson, Charles Biggs, Lawrence E. Sexton, John De Witt Warner, Horace White, Henry De Forest Baldwin, A. Augustus Healy, Wallace Macfarlane, William S. Opdyke, Fred. Perry Powers, James Speyer, Henry B. B. Stapler, William L. Trenholm, Everett P. Wheeler, Louis Windmuller, Frank S. Williams.

Executive committee.—John De Witt Warner, chairman; Calvin Tomkins, secretary; Charles S. Fairchild, Wallace Macfarlane, Henry L. Nelson, Charles Biggs, Henry B. B. Stapler, Lawrence E. Sexton, Fred. Perry Powers.

ANNUAL REPORT.

52 WILLIAM STREET, *New York, December 3, 1895.*

To the Reform Club:

Your committee on sound currency submits the following report:

November 22, 1894, the committee adopted plans for work in 1895. We commenced at once a canvass for funds. Subscriptions have been liberal, and in large measure from those who had not hitherto contributed to the club's work.

Early in the year our expenditure increased at such a rate that we were compelled to confine ourselves to the few more promising of the lines along which work could be economically done, and to decline even to consider sound-money propaganda in more than one direction where the field seemed inviting. In accord with our rule, we have accepted funds only for expenditure the details of which we could direct; and have declined to supervise the work or audit the accounts of outside individuals, committees, or organizations. We are thus able to cooperate to the fullest extent with local friends and organizations, while keeping free from embarrassing relations or unpleasant responsibilities.

The following is a summary of the work of the committee for the year ended November 30, 1895:

I.—*Meetings and speakers.*

In the way of local meetings for discussion:

(1) On the occasion of the annual dinner of the club, December 8 last, after an introductory address by Mr. Fairchild, an address on the problem of currency reform was delivered by Mr. C. C. Jackson, of Boston, followed by Mr. Henry W. Cannon, Hon. A. B. Hepburn, and others.

(2) At a club dinner on December 29 the principal address was delivered by Mr. William C. Cornwell, president of the New York State Bankers' Association. Mr. Fairchild, Mr. Alfred S. Heidelbach, Mr. Henry Hentz, and others also spoke briefly.

(3) On the evening of March 2 Mr. Horace White delivered an address at the clubhouse on the "Relations of public opinion to banking."

The general interest in sound-currency questions had by this time so increased as to make it unnecessary to incur the trouble and expense of continuing the series of meetings at the Reform Club, the invitations from various quarters of organizations ready to bear the expense and trouble of meetings being so numerous as to make the question simply one of providing speakers; and in a score of instances speakers were furnished from the committee to meetings—political, business, and economic—that offered appreciative audiences.

With the advancing season, however, the engrossment of our funds in other urgent work made it impossible for us to meet peculiarly inviting opportunities that were offered for sound-currency meetings, especially in several of the Western States. In one, however, Indiana, the expense involved was so moderate and easily limited, and the call so urgent, that it was decided to cooperate with friends there. Under this arrangement a series of some forty meetings was arranged, all addressed by Hon. William D. Bynum, to whom the cause and the committee is thus peculiarly indebted. The programme as a whole proved such a success that nothing but the lack of funds prevented its extension into other States.

II.—"*Sound-currency*" *periodicals.*

The following table summarily indicates the progress of our "Sound-currency" series and the extent and distribution of its several numbers:

	Number printed.
1. National and State Banks, Horace White, 16 pages	44,500
2. Canadian Bank-Note Currency, L. Carroll Root, 16 pages	82,500
3. Bimetallism in History, Henry L. Nelson, 16 pages	90,000
4. The World's Currencies, Richard P. Rothwell, 24 pages	55,000
5. New York Bank Currency, L. Carroll Root, 24 pages	50,000
6. The Currency Famine of 1893, John De Witt Warner, 20 pages	65,000
7. The People's Money, W. L. Trenholm, 32 pages	70,000
8. Scotch Bank Currency, Adam Smith, 12 pages	65,000
9. Our Paper Currency, W. Dodsworth, 16 pages	65,000
10. States as Bankers, L. Carroll Root, 32 pages	55,000
11. Coin's Financial Fool, Horace White, 20 pages	300,000
12. A Financial Catechism, Fred. Perry Powers, 16 pages	250,000
13. New England Bank Currency, L. Carroll Root, 32 pages	40,000
14. The Bullion Report, Parliament committee (1810), 32 pages	40,000
15. A Stable Monetary Standard, Henry Farquhar, 20 pages	30,000
16. Free Coinage Dissected, John De Witt Warner, 16 pages	100,000
17. United States Coinage and Currency Laws, 48 pages	30,000
18. Bimetallism in France, W. A. Shaw, 12 pages	40,000
19. Quality of Money and Wages, Frank L. McVey, 16 pages	40,000
20. Executive Committee Report, August 20, 1895, 8 pages	30,000
21. Sound Currency Illustrated, 32 pages	25,000
22. Gold Movements in 1894 and 1895, Worthington C. Ford, 16 pages	25,000
23. Silver Monometallism Exposed, "Merchant," 16 pages	25,000
24. United States Currency Statistics, 32 pages	20,000
	1,637,000

The extent to which these pamphlets have been favorably noticed by the sound-money press and the orders received for single copies are proof alike of the general interest in the questions mooted and the effective way in which they have been treated.

A subscription list of some 15,000 has justified our securing second-class postal rates, which has greatly cheapened distribution.

III.—*General newspaper cooperation.*

(*a*) From the beginning we have adopted the plan of sending out advance copies of "Sound Currency," together with a tersely written synopsis of each number, to the principal newspapers of the country. This plan has proved peculiarly effective.

(*b*) Encouraged by the favorable notice of the press, we suggested to leading newspapers to advertise their offices as supply points for sound-currency literature, we furnishing them a limited supply for distribution free of charge. Over 100 papers in different parts of the country accepted this offer, and we thus secured that number of most effective distributing centers.

IV.—*Broadside supplements.*

In April last we commenced supplying broadside supplements sufficient to accompany the full editions of cooperating local papers in every part of the country. In this way sound-currency literature was carried direct to the homes of rural voters.

This branch of our work has steadily grown in extent and importance, and in the opinion of your committee is, perhaps, of all the branches of our propaganda work, the one by which the greatest permanent effect is secured, at the least expense, in just those quarters where educational propaganda is most needed. It is an unrivaled means of putting into the hands of rural voters—in the most sparsely settled counties of the most critical States, in just the shape in which it will be welcomed and read by them—a full supply of sound-currency argument and illustration. How effective is this may be somewhat appreciated when it is remembered that it is just these papers the subscribers of each of which are in the main readers of no other periodical.

Finding that the broadsides were in general better adapted to papers of smaller circulation, a constant effort has been made to extend this work among the smaller local papers in the South, the West, and Southwest.

The newspapers thus supplied by us have been as follows: In New England 21, with a circulation of 26,600; the Middle States 88, circulation 83,100; Southern States 215, circulation 169,900; North Central States 78, circulation 116,800; Northwestern States 67, circulation 55,200; Southwest 137, circulation 94,300; Pacific States 15, circulation 17,900—making a total of 621 papers, with aggregate circulation of 563,800. Through these papers some 2,650,000 printed sheets have been distributed.

V.—"*Plate*" *matter.*

In March last we arranged to compile and edit sheets of sound-currency literature, to be circulated by so-called "plate-matter" agencies. In this line the expense to us was not great, the main item being the expert editorial service and tact necessary to collect and adapt available matter for the purpose indicated.

This matter goes out, a full newspaper page at a time, to papers in the main of from 1,000 to 10,000 circulation, which, though ready to do all possible for sound currency, wish to have more latitude as to the amount of space which can be given to this matter and the time at which it shall be published than is possible on the "broadside" system. We have been surprised to note, however, the extent to which papers receiving our "plate" matter have in general promptly utilized either the whole or nearly all that was sent them.

The following indicates the field covered, which could have been more than doubled had our funds permitted: New England States 22 papers, with a circulation of 54,925; Middle States 101 papers, circulation 208,316; Southern States 139 papers, circulation 165,768; North Central States 78, circulation 156,368; Southwestern States 138, circulation 192,990; Northwestern States 159, circulation 136,600; Pacific Coast 11, circulation 10,050—making a total of 648 papers, with an aggregate circulation of 925,017.

For some two months prior to election the engrossment of papers and their readers in the issues of local elections was such as to make less frequent supply of this matter advisable, and the former biweekly issues of both plate and broadside matter were supplanted by a monthly issue. Arrangements are now being made to offer a more frequent supply whenever popular interest in currency questions shall justify it.

VI.—*Special bureau.*

Another branch of work developed during the year is what might be called a "special bureau," by which a corps of contributors was organized, furnishing special series of articles for the propaganda work of papers of the very highest grade, and special articles to groups of papers. In this field, however, we were glad some time since to report a total cessation of work. The extent to which the urgent need of the articles supplied was being met by developing research and writings of independent editors and writers in all parts of the country was such that we did not feel justified in further expending the energies of this committee in work which was, on the whole, becoming so well done by others. Under this head should also be mentioned the issue or reprint of monographs, speeches, or special discussions, which, though not appropriate for either of the series noted under II, IV, or V above, was of use in our general work, and handled through the supply bureau below referred to.

VII.—*Sketch and cartoon bureau.*

In accordance with plans outlined in April last, the committee established a sketch or cartoon bureau, the object of which was to furnish designs for cuts, sketches, cartoons, posters, etc., both for our own publications (especially plate and supplement matter) as well as for use by others in every shape in which they might be found effective. From every available source—mainly from members of the committee and club—we secured designs and suggestions, upon the basis of which were supplied by our corps of artists, headed by Mr. Dan Beard, more than a hundred cuts and sketches. Extensively used in our "broadside" and "plate" matters, these have been perhaps the chief factor—outside of the strong general interest in currency matters—in producing the great and increasing demand for our literature. Those who have seen even the preliminary catalogue do not need to have explained the extent to which the Bible, Shakespeare, Mother Goose, Pilgrim's Progress, and a score of other sources have been liberally drawn upon. The continually increasing demand for "more" from every direction in which our illustrations have been so far supplied leaves no question as to their popularity.

VIII.—*Sound-currency supply bureau.*

Our supply bureau, organized in June last, was promptly perfected until our semimonthly catalogue of sound-currency publications, forwarded on receipt of price, included not only those regularly issued by ourselves, but practically everything worth seriously considering under each of the following heads: (*a*) Standard works, such as those of Laughlin, McLeod, Nelson, Trenholm, Shaw, White, and others; (*b*) Popular monographs and special discussions, such as the various replies to "Coin's Financial School"; (*c*) Speeches, leaflets, etc., mainly such as it has been found necessary to reprint—in all, some ninety different titles. For purposes of convenience, not merely to ourselves, but to our friends, a duplicate stock, with clerk in at-

tendance, was kept during the summer at the Reform Club's office at Washington.

It should be understood that this bureau had no connection with gratuitous supply of literature, but was established simply for the convenience of friends in all parts of the country, who were thus enabled to secure any assortment of sound-currency literature without the delay and trouble otherwise necessary.

IX.

Two items of work now practically closed deserve special mention.

First. The late political conventions in the different States caused calls to be made upon us for special work in supplying literature to delegates and local committeemen. Kentucky, Georgia, and Ohio were the States most thoroughly and systematically covered by this work.

Second. The circumstances attending the Memphis, Springfield, and Louisville conventions, and the speeches of Mr. Carlisle in Kentucky and of Mr. Hoke Smith in Georgia, caused such a demand for these speeches that we promptly went as far as possible in meeting it, though we felt this particular work to be one the expense and labor of which should ultimately be otherwise arranged for, as in fact has already been done. Before this, however, the club had expended some $2,000, mainly in printing and forwarding in bulk for local distribution by others some 280,000 copies of the speeches referred to.

X.—*Currency Red Book.*

In view of the success of the Tariff Reform Red Book, issued by the club in each of the years 1890, 1891, and 1892, we early commenced the compilation of a Currency Red Book. This is now in press and will contain as full a collection as possible of statistics and argument, digested and indexed for handy use by writers, speakers, and others, on every phase of the currency questions now pending or likely to be mooted in the near future.

XI.—*Extent literature distribution.*

Counting "plate" matter supply (for which some, though, as explained above, very little, deduction should be made from the gross figures given below), the number of documents issued, either as pamphlets or "broadsides," or otherwise printed to an equal extent, to which the committee has given circulation since the beginning of its work for the year is approximately as follows:

Sound-currency pamphlets	1,637,000
Broadside newspaper pages	2,650,000
Plate matter, newspaper pages	5,000,000
Reprints and miscellaneous documents through supply bureau	125,000
Speeches, Carlisle, etc., (not including the much greater number lately furnished at expense of others)	300,000

Making a total of over 9,700,000, the current average, on the above basis, of documents issued being about 950,000 per month. The majority of these have been illustrated; and less than one-fourth of them have been those of statistical and literary character, which our friends have too frequently assumed to be the only ones issued by us. Taken as a whole, indeed, there could scarcely be a more thoroughly "popular" assortment of literature.

XII.—*Cooperation.*

Cooperation has not developed as fast as we had hoped, though this is partially due to the fact that the extraordinary success of and demand for our "plate" and "broadside" supply has too much engrossed our means to permit of exploiting promising fields for cooperation in other items of work.

We note, however, that at Fremont, Neb., at Corsicana, Tex., at St. Louis, at Boston, and at Philadelphia associations have been doing important and extensive work to such an extent as in large measure to relieve us from responsibility and permit us to offer instead of ask assistance. From the committee and members of the Boston Merchants' Association alone the direct contributions to our work have aggregated some $16,000. The expense of our cartoon bureau has been lessened some $400 by sharing with the Chamber of Commerce committee the expense of the preliminary work, and the expense of our plate and broadside supply in Pennsylvania has been met by the Sound Money League of Pennsylvania.

Our total expenditures, including unsettled liabilities, to date are $52,779.05, as shown in statement appended.

The rate of expenditure has varied from $700 per month to $10,000 per month, the highest rate being reached in June, 1895. In spite of the at first rapidly increased rate and scope of expenditure, and the later necessity for scarcely less rapid retrenchment, and the fact that our force has varied from 3 to 35, our office arrangements have worked without friction and our business, as well in expenditure and full accounting therefor as in the prosecution of our propaganda work, has been constantly kept well up to date, a full accounting, with vouchers, having been filed by the executive committee each week for the criticism of auditors appointed by the full committee from its general membership.

XIII.—*Progress and plans.*

In March last, after a full discussion both in the executive committee and the general committee, the following platform was adopted as that upon which the Reform Club's sound-currency committee should ask for support and plan its work:

"Pledged to oppose all fiat money, we recognize in the legal-tender greenback the worst form of such currency, and urge the payment by Government of its demand notes and their final withdrawal from circulation as the financial reform first in importance.

"We appreciate that attempts to secure forced currency for depreciated silver, or to regulate by law the value of silver as compared with gold, are most virulent phases of fiat-money agitation; and we consider provisions for a safe and elastic bank-note currency as not merely a desirable adjunct of greenback retirement, but a proper means to obviate any fear that our currency may become too restricted."

Even at the time when this was adopted it was apparent that the issue of free coinage at 16 to 1 was being forced to the front in many parts of the country. It was appreciated, however, that this issue was but incidental to the main one—that of fiat money; and hence it was not thought best in any way to narrow what it was unanimously agreed must be the ultimate scope of our work.

Events have justified this decision. During the six months last past the free-silver issue has been aggressively pressed as never before, but has been so successfully met through this organization and other sound-money agencies, political and otherwise, as not merely to have roused and rallied the hitherto timid opposition to free silver, but to have so defeated the free-silver movement at every important point as to have given it the first general setback which its friends have appreciated as such. The way has been cleared for an aggressive movement upon our part in favor of sound finance, the withdrawal of our Government from the banking business, and the renunciation by the United States of the fiat money heresies by which for a generation our politics and finances have been cursed.

This committee proposes to agitate for the prompt payment and final retirement of our legal-tender notes. It proposes to do this without reference to what, if any, new plan of bank-note currency shall be adopted. We are confident that, with our present banking and credit facilities, any possible unfavorable result from the retirement of our legal-tender paper as fast as it could be withdrawn by redemption would be more than compensated by the accession of business confidence which such a programme would assure. The committee recognizes that our bank-note system is rigid, inadequate, and fatally vicious in its entanglement of political with financial considerations, and it therefore hopes and expects that a safe and adequate system will be promptly developed; but it considers the adoption of some definite plan for the retirement of our legal-tender notes as the aim first and foremost to be kept in mind; and to this work invites the cooperation of every friend of sound currency.

The outlook is most encouraging. Never in so short a period have we seen so great a revulsion of feeling as that which has developed within the last few months upon currency questions, though we fully appreciate that the present setting of the tide toward sound currency is as little indicative of great change in popular conviction as was the late apparent yielding of a great part of the country to the silver craze a sign that lunacy was then epidemic.

There can be no question, however, of the deep interest now roused among all classes of people in all parts of the country. Nor can there be any question as to the ability of the American people to honestly and intelligently settle the problems involved, provided the facts are placed before them.

Cash statement sound currency committee from December 1, 1894, to November 30, 1895.

	Receipts.	Disbursements.
Total subscriptions (paid)	$52,593.89	
Sundry receipts for literature furnished	1,809.85	
Office organization, clerical expenses, and expense of canvassing		$4,455.60
Wages of employees engaged in distribution of documents		3,896.28
Editorial services		2,619.08
Postage		6,446.28
Delivery of pamphlets, etc., in city		441.83
Broadsides		7,692.52
Plate matter		3,087.10
General printing		12,614.36
Expenses of Washington office, including special supply of documents		1,915.31
Rent of New York office, paid in advance to May 1, 1896		1,888.64
Janitor's fees, electric lighting, etc		115.55
Office stationery		626.95
Manila envelopes		950.15
Expressage		606.33
Cartage		204.64
Supply bureau (books)		532.60
Telephone, telegrams, and messenger service		259.98
Drawings and sketches for cartoons, cuts, etc		1,109.50
Engraving for cartoons, etc		413.68
Expenses of sound money meetings in other States		750.00
Advanced for petty cash		25.00
Office furniture, carpentry, and incidentals		1,377.97
Total	54,403.74	52,029.05
Balance, cash on hand in New York Security and Trust Company		2,374.69
	54,403.74	54,403.74

NOTE.—Unpaid subscriptions not included in above statement, $825; unpaid printing bills, $750.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

SOUND CURRENCY COMMITTEE.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as there seems to be a desire for an executive session this evening, I shall now take the floor, but will yield for that purpose.

Mr. LODGE. I desire merely to give notice of an amendment which I propose to move at the proper time to the bill now pending before the Senate. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LODGE to the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiences of revenue.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue bonds to a total amount of $100,000,000 at such times and in such amounts as may be required to carry out the purposes of this section as hereinafter described. Said bonds shall be payable in coin twenty years from the date of their issue. They shall be offered at par to the people of the United States in denominations ranging from fifty to one thousand dollars and shall bear interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum. The subscriptions to the loan, or to such portion of it as may then be required, shall be opened on July 1, 1896, and at such subsequent dates as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine at all subtreasuries of the United States and at all national banks, and the subscribers shall have the right to pay for the bonds in lawful money of the United States.

The sum of $3,000,000 shall be annually set aside from the revenue of the Government for a sinking fund to pay the bonds issued under this act at maturity, and the $3,000,000 thus annually appropriated shall take precedence of all other appropriations except those for the sinking fund, now established by law, and for the payment of the principal and interest of the public debt.

The bonds authorized by this act shall constitute a loan, to be known as the "coast defense loan," and the proceeds of said bonds shall be kept in the Treasury as a fund apart, and shall be used only for providing for the defense of the seacoasts and lakes of the United States and for the manufacture of guns, the purchase of sites, and the erection of forts and batteries for that purpose, in accordance with plans prepared by the War Department,

as authorized by existing law or by laws hereafter passed by Congress to provide for coast defenses.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire merely to say in regard to the amendment that it has no reference to the gold reserve, nor to the question of currency, nor to the question of gold and silver. It is simply to provide a method for placing in the Treasury a fund immediately for the construction of coast defenses, instead of leaving the coast defenses to be provided for from year to year, which renders a comprehensive and efficient plan impossible. The sensible thing to do is, by a loan, to place in the Treasury from time to time sums of money sufficient to carry out a comprehensive plan, and to carry it out at once. It is the most economical way; it is the proper way. I believe that it is the wish of all the people of this country, whatever their differences may be on other subjects, to have their coasts, both on the lakes and on the ocean, properly defended. As I say, it does not interfere in any wise with any currency question; it is simply introduced by me in the hope that we may take this step toward the protection of our coasts, and at the proper time I shall move the amendment.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to inquire of the Senator before he takes his seat——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the amendment is offered to the pending bill?

Mr. LODGE. It is intended to be moved to the bill now pending.

Mr. STEWART. I am in sympathy with the objects proposed by the amendment. I believe that we need coast defenses and that ample provision should be made for them; but if we provide for them in this way, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts by what means we are going to get the $200,000,000 which is put in the Treasury by the bonds which are now proposed—$100,000,000 immediately and another $100,000,000 later? If we do not have some way of getting the money out again, what will the people do for money during the current year? Why not use the money which is accumulated by the selling of bonds? Are there not bonds enough being sold, with the $100,000,000 now being negotiated and another $100,000,000 proposed to be negotiated? That will tie up pretty much all the circulation we have, and if we do not have some way of getting it out what are we going to do for money?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think the Senator understands exactly the way in which the amendment is framed. It provides that the bonds shall be issued from time to time in order to meet from year to year the amounts required for the expenditures in coast defenses for each particular year; so that the money as soon as it is taken into the Treasury will immediately go out to meet the cost of the defenses. It is made large enough to cover the estimates now before the Senate for a comprehensive scheme of coast defenses. My desire is simply to put the amendment on that plane where it can be dealt with at once. It is not to get money into the Treasury and to hold it, but to give the Treasury a means of getting money without being dependent on the varying needs of the revenues from year to year.

Mr. STEWART. I will state my point. The Senator does not quite comprehend me. We have the Treasury full to overflowing now, and it is liable to create great distress. The money that the people need for surplus is to be bought up with bonds and kept in the Treasury, unless we have some means of getting it out. This is a very worthy object, and it being also a worthy object to get that money out of the Treasury so that the people can have something to do business with, why not utilize the conditions that are upon us? It is not a theory at all; it is a condition that confronts us now, a condition of universal distress and contraction from the buying up of the circulating medium and piling it in the Treasury by the sale of bonds. It seems to me that it becomes rather a duty to avail ourselves of this opportunity to provide for coast defenses. There is an abundance of money to be out of the Treasury that the people need.

Mr. LODGE. I still think the Senator does not understand the purport of the amendment. It has nothing to do with the question of money in the Treasury. I am not undertaking to deal with the gold or silver question. There is a deficit in revenue at this moment, as we all know. We need money for coast defenses. We can not take it out of the revenue, for our revenues are now overdrawn. The object is, instead of by taxes, to supply the Treasury by loan with sufficient money to deal with the coast defenses in a quick and comprehensive manner. I do not desire to detain the Senate at this late hour by trying to get a vote upon the amendment.

Mr. STEWART. It is not revenue that is injuring us now. It is an accumulation of money brought about by the sale of bonds that we want to get at; and we want to make use of the necessity for coast defenses as a means of getting some of that money out of the Treasury.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have intended from the first to say something on the pending financial question, but I did not desire to intrude on the dignity of the Senate by pressing forward too early in the debate. I wish to give notice that if the Senator from Arkansas expects to get a vote on the bill upon Thursday I shall occupy the floor, with the consent of the Senate, at the expiration of the morning hour on Wednesday.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE HEARING.

Mr. JONES of Nevada. Will the Senator from Arkansas permit me to submit a report from a committee?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Nevada. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] on the 22d instant, to report it without amendment. I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That the Committee on Woman Suffrage be authorized to employ a stenographer to report the proceedings at the hearing of the delegates of the woman's suffrage convention.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Is there a request for immediate consideration?

Mr. CALL. This resolution was introduced by me in pursuance of a request from the delegates to the woman's convention here that they may have a hearing. A hearing has been accorded to them for many years at their annual conventions here by the Committee on Woman Suffrage, and it has been accorded to them on the present occasion. The resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and is reported back favorably.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If I could have information as to whether present consideration is asked for the resolution I should be obliged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the present consideration of the resolution which has just been reported.

Mr. CALL. I will state to the Senator from Arkansas that the hearing is to be had to-morrow morning.

Mr. HOAR. Let the resolution be read again.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 28, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 27, 1896.

POSTMASTERS.

Adam Uhl, to be postmaster at Montowese, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut, in the place of George H. Cooper, whose commission expired January 6, 1896.

Franz F. Metschan, to be postmaster at National Military Home, in the county of Leavenworth and State of Kansas, in the place of Edward Colbert, whose commission expired January 21, 1896.

John R. Andrews, to be postmaster at Redlodge, in the county of Carbon and State of Montana, in the place of Alice Shannon, whose commission will expire January 27, 1896.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1896.

POSTMASTER.

Lewis W. Reed, to be postmaster at Beaver, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 27, 1896.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, January 23, was read and approved.

CHIPPEWA INDIANS, MINNESOTA.

Mr. TOWNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union the bill (H. R. 1442) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," as reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, and that it may have immediate consideration.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the fifth section of the act of Congress passed January 14, 1889, providing for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, be, and the same is, amended, so far as the same relates to the White Earth and Red Lake reservations, and as to the other reservations mentioned in said act whenever all the allotments of land in severalty shall have been made to the Indians of each reservation, respectively, therein provided, so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That whenever, and as often as the survey, examination, and appraisal of 100,000 acres of said pine lands, or of a less quantity, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, have been made, the portion so surveyed, examined, and appraised shall be proclaimed as in market and offered for sale in the following manner: The Commissioner of the General Land Office, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall cause notices to be inserted once in each week, for four consecutive weeks, in one newspaper of general circulation published in Minneapolis, St. Paul, Duluth, Stillwater, Taylors Falls, St. Cloud, Brainerd, Crookston, and Thief River Falls, Minn.; Chicago, Ill.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Detroit, Mich.; Philadelphia, Pa.; and Boston, Mass., of the sale of said land at public auction to the highest bidder for cash at the local land office of the district within which said lands are located, said notice to state the time and place and terms of such sale. At such sale said lands shall be offered in 40-acre parcels, except in case of fractions containing either more or less than 40 acres, which shall be sold entire. In no event shall any parcel be sold for a less sum than its appraised value. The residue of such lands remaining unsold after such public offering shall thereafter be subject to private sale for cash at the appraised value of the same, upon application at the local land office: *Provided*, That no timber upon sections numbered 16 and 36 in each township so surveyed shall be sold until the claim of the State of Minnesota to the ownership of said sections, as part of the school lands of said State, shall have been determined."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota to make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. TOWNE. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Clerk read the report of the committee. It is brief, and explains the bill as fully as could be done in any other way.

Mr. CRISP. As far as I am concerned, I do not ask to have the report read. I understand this is substantially the bill that was passed at the last session.

Mr. TOWNE. It is exactly the bill that was passed at the last session, with two exceptions, one comparatively slight and the other to meet an objection that was made in the Senate.

The first change merely enables the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to sell the pine-timber lands in lots of less than 100,000 acres, instead of limiting the disposition to exactly 100,000 acres, as in the original bill. The advantage of that is obvious, because not all of the salable timber is contiguous, and for various reasons he might find it more advantageous to dispose of some of the timber in smaller blocks. That change was made at the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior.

The other change from the bill of the last session is in the proviso at the end of the bill, which was placed there for the purpose of obviating the objection that was raised in the Senate, namely, that the State of Minnesota had certain interests in the school lands in sections 16 and 36 in each township, which it was not clear were taken care of in the other bill. Accordingly, the bill as now drawn adds a proviso that before the sale shall take place of any of the lands in the school sections, the rights of the State of Minnesota, if any, to those lands shall be determined.

Mr. CRISP. The bill, as I understand, is recommended by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. TOWNE. The bill is recommended by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Indian Commissioner.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to ask whether this bill is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and also the Indian Office?

Mr. TOWNE. It is.

Mr. DINGLEY. Have you the letters of the Department recommending this bill with you, so that they can be put into the RECORD and make the case complete?

Mr. TOWNE. My associate from Minnesota has the letters.

Mr. EDDY. I visited the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and also the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and they informed me personally that where they had recommended a similar bill the previous year they did not make a formal recommendation again. They assured me that they concurred in the recommendation of the bill last year, and that they even more strongly approved it now.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then these recommendations accompanied the bill last year, and it was substantially the same.

Mr. EDDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. Can not you put them in the RECORD, so that they may be a part of the case?

Mr. TOWNE. There can be no objection to that. It can readily be done.

Mr. DINGLEY. I understand that this is a change in the act of 1889, so that the pine lands may be sold in smaller lots than were provided for by the act of 1889, and that in other respects, as to notice of sale and other conditions, it is the same as the act of 1889.

Mr. TOWNE. Exactly so; and I will say that the act of 1889, as construed by the Department, compels the examination and appraisement of all these lands before any of them can be disposed of. Now, anybody who knows anything about the sale of timber land knows that an appraisement more than two years old is valueless as a basis for the disposal of the land. This bill is simply for the purpose of enabling the land to be sold in blocks of 100,000 acres or less upon an appraisal that is of subsisting value at the time of the sale.

Mr. DINGLEY. If the gentleman will put the letters of the Secretary of the Interior and of the Commissioner of the Land Office and also of the Indian Office in the RECORD, then we shall have the whole case completed.

Mr. TOWNE. That can be done. The report accompanying the bill of the last Congress can be put in.

Mr. LACEY. What is the present condition of the title of these lands?

Mr. TOWNE. The lands covered by this bill have been ceded, under the act of 1889, to the General Government.

Mr. LACEY. Why ought not this bill to have gone to the Committee on the Public Lands, instead of to the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. TOWNE. The gentleman will see that this matter comes up under the act of 1889, entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in Minnesota."

Mr. LACEY. It is a part of the public domain, is it not? It is not an Indian reservation at the present time. It is public land, is it not?

Mr. TOWNE. Yes; it is public land, under the condition provided for by the act of 1889, for the civilization of the Chippewas. The proceeds of the sales of these lands go to a fund for the benefit of the Indians.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. The lands sold belong to the Indians, and are sold for their benefit.

Mr. TOWNE. Yes; the lands are sold for their benefit.

Mr. LACEY. I understand the gentleman to say, Mr. Speaker, that this land has already been ceded to the Government, and is therefore a part of the public domain; and if so, the Committee on Indian Affairs would not have jurisdiction over it, so that the matter could not be properly before the House.

Mr. TOWNE. It is ceded only for the purpose of the act of 1889, Mr. Speaker, and the disposition of the land is for the benefit of the Indians. The proceeds of the sale of these lands go to the General Government, in trust for the Indians, upon which they are paid interest.

The following is the report accompanying H. R. 5103, second session Fifty-third Congress:

Mr. Hall of Minnesota, from the Committee on the Public Lands, submitted the following:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5103) entitled "A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act for the relief of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota,'" hereby report the same back to the House of Representatives with the recommendation that the said bill be amended as follows, to wit:

First. Insert after the word "amended" and before the word "so," in line 6 of the printed bill, the words, viz, "so far as the same relates to the White Earth and Red Lake reservations, and as to the other reservations mentioned in said act whenever all the allotments of land in severalty shall have been made to the Indians of each reservation, respectively, as therein provided."

Second. After the word "Duluth," in line 16 of the printed bill, insert the words, viz, "Stillwater, Taylors Falls, St. Cloud, and Brainerd."

And that as thus amended the bill do pass.

The act of January 14, 1889 (chapter 24, page 642, volume 25, U. S. Stat. L.), entitled "An act for the civilization and relief of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota," provides, among other things, for the cession of the Indian title to lands occupied by the different bands of Chippewa Indians in Minnesota, the survey thereof, the separation of the same into "pine lands" and "agricultural lands," and the appraisal and sale of such "pine lands."

Under said act such sale can not be made until the entire area of such lands, some 4,000,000 acres, shall have been thus surveyed, designated, and appraised.

The pending bill amends the original act to the extent of allowing such sales to be made as fast as tracts of not less than 100,000 acres have been surveyed and appraised.

The amendments proposed to the bill limit its application to the Red Lake and White Earth reservations only, for the reasons set forth in the letter of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, hereto attached, and also provide for the publication of notices of sale at four additional lumber centers tributary

to the said reservations, as recommended in the letter of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, hereto attached.

The propriety of selling these pine lands as rapidly as they are in condition to be sold, instead of keeping them unsold for many years until all are ready for the market, can not be reasonably questioned. The growing timber is subject to deterioration and destruction by fire and trespassers, and it is believed also that better prices can be obtained from these sales if they are made at different times and in smaller quantities than the entire area.

The letters of the Commissioner of Public Lands, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and the Secretary of the Interior, all approving of the passage of this bill with the amendments proposed, are hereto attached as part of this report.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 24, 1894.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of 12th instant and accompanying H. R. 5103, "To amend an act entitled 'An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota.'"

In response thereto I transmit herewith copy of a communication of 16th instant from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and of 22d instant from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to whom your letter was referred.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs expresses the opinion that the provisions of the amendment should be limited to the Red Lake and White Earth reservations, or that the appraisals with a view to sale on the other reservations should not be commenced until all the allotments on that particular reservation shall have been made, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office recommends that for greater publicity there should be inserted among the cities in which public notice is to be published the names of Stillwater, Taylor Falls, St. Cloud, and Brainerd.

Very respectfully, HOKE SMITH, *Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
House of Representatives.

—

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1894.

SIR: I am in receipt, by your reference of the 18th instant for report, of a report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office upon a communication from Hon. THOMAS C. MCRAE, chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, House of Representatives, dated the 12th instant, inclosing a copy of House bill 5103, Fifty-third Congress, second session, entitled "A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota,'" with the request that the committee be furnished with the opinion of the Department as to the necessity and propriety of passing the same.

In reporting on this matter I have the honor to say that, so far as I can see, the bill in question amends the original act (the act of January 14, 1889, 25 Stats., 642) only so far as to permit the sale of the pine lands embraced in said act in 100,000-acre lots, as fast as the surveys, examinations, and appraisals of areas of this size shall have been completed, while the original act provided for such sale only after all the lands embraced within the act shall have been surveyed, examined, and appraised.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office reports in favor of the passage of the bill, for reasons stated by him. In this recommendation this office fully concurs.

I desire to invite your attention to the fact, however, that as the bill now reads the pine lands on any of the reservations embraced in the original act may be sold as fast as areas of 100,000 acres are surveyed, examined, and appraised, while under the provisions of the original act it can not be ascertained or determined to what portions and how much of the lands within the boundaries of the several reservations, except the Red Lake and White Earth reservations, the Indian title will be extinguished, by and under the agreements entered into with the Indians, until the allotments provided for shall have been made. This results from the proviso to section 3 of the original act which provides "that any of the Indians residing on any of said reservations may, in his discretion, take his allotment in severalty under this act on the reservation where he lives at the time of the removal herein provided for is effected, instead of being removed to and taking such allotment on White Earth Reservation."

This would seem to make it necessary that the provisions of the amendment should be limited to the Red Lake and White Earth reservations, or that the appraisals with a view to sale on the other reservations should not be commenced until all the allotments on that particular reservation shall have been made.

It is known to this office through correspondence with the Chippewa commission that the Indians generally have indicated their desire and purpose to take their allotments under the original act on the reservations where they resided at the time the agreements were negotiated and entered into. In the full and free enjoyment of this right, it seems to me, they should be fully protected. It is true that the proposed amendment provides that the sales shall be made by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and it would be within his province to prevent the sale of any of the lands on any given reservation until all the allotments in severalty shall have been made on that particular reservation.

If this does not afford the Indians the protection to which they are rightly entitled under the original act by virtue of the proviso to section 3 thereof, to which your attention has been invited, it is respectfully suggested that this omission could be cured by inserting in the bill after the word "amended" and before the word "so," in line 6 thereof, the words "so far as the same relates to the White Earth and Red Lake reservations, and as to the other reservations mentioned in said act whenever all the allotments of land in severalty shall have been made to the Indians of each reservation, respectively, as therein provided."

Unless you think your authority in the matter is sufficient to prevent the examinations, appraisals, and sale of any of the lands on the other reservations than the Red Lake and White Earth reservations until all the allotments in severalty shall have been made on each reservation, respectively, this office would respectfully recommend that the above suggested amendment or some other amendment that would cure the difficulty be inserted in the bill.

The report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and all its inclosures are returned herewith.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
D. M. BROWNING, *Commissioner.*

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

—

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1894.

SIR: I have had the honor to receive from the Hon. THOMAS C. MCRAE, chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, House of Representatives, a letter of the 12th instant, addressed to the honorable Secretary of the Interior, inclosing a copy of H. R. bill 5103, entitled "A bill to amend an act entitled an act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," with the request that you give the committee your opinion as to the necessity and propriety of passing the same.

In connection with the subject, I find that said bill proposes to enact as follows, viz:

"That the fifth section of the act of Congress passed January 14, 1889, providing for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, be, and the same is, amended so as to read:

"'SEC. 5. That after the survey, examination, and appraisals of at least 100,000 acres of said pine lands have been made, the portion so surveyed, examined, and appraised shall be proclaimed as in market and offered for sale in the following manner: The Commissioner of the General Land Office, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall cause notices to be inserted once in each week for four consecutive weeks in one newspaper of general circulation published in Minneapolis, St. Paul, Duluth, and Crookston, Minn.; Chicago, Ill.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Detroit, Mich.; Philadelphia and Williamsport, Pa., and Boston, Mass., of the sale of said lands at public auction to the highest bidder for cash at the local land office of the district within which said lands are located, said notice to state the time and place and terms of such sale. At such sale said lands shall be offered in 40-acre parcels, except in case of fractions containing either more or less than 40 acres, which shall be sold entire. In no event shall any parcel be sold for a less sum than its appraised value. The residue of such lands remaining unsold after such public offering shall thereafter be subject to private sale for cash at the appraised value of the same upon application at the local land office. And from time to time, as fast as a quantity of 100,000 acres of the remaining pine lands, the disposal of which is provided for in this act, or a final residuum of a less quantity, shall have been surveyed, examined, and appraised, the same course shall be pursued for the disposal thereof until all shall have been disposed of as provided for herein.'"

The fifth section of the act of Congress passed January 14, 1889 (25 Stats., 642), as it now stands, provides for such a sale, but not until all the lands shall have been surveyed, examined, and appraised, and seems to contemplate the offering of the entire body of lands at one time and place.

The lands in question comprise a large area, some 4,000,000 acres, of which a large portion, the exact proportion not yet ascertained, are pine lands. Before this great body of lands can be properly surveyed and examined, and the pine lands segregated from the agricultural lands, as contemplated by the statute, a considerable time must elapse, at the present rate of progress from five to eight years from the present time, and the existing statute makes no provision for disposing of any portion thereof until the whole work shall have been accomplished.

The pine lands in question are not fit for agriculture, and are chiefly valuable for the timber thereon. The offering of so large a body of lands at once would be inconvenient in many regards, and there appear no compensating advantages likely to be attendant thereupon. There exists a present demand for the timber. While it continues in the possession of the Government, it is liable to injury at any time from the depredations of trespassers, from accidental or intentional fires, from storms, and perhaps other occurrences. As soon as sold the interests of the individual owners will be effectual to provide adequate protection therefor, the timber become available for business purposes, and the proceeds of the sale for the purposes of the law in the civilization of the Indians. A large portion of the pine lands, comprehending considerably more than 100,000 acres, have already been surveyed, examined, and segregated from the agricultural lands embraced in the cession, and might be offered for sale without delay, if there were legal authority for so doing. Such authority the present bill proposes to furnish, while providing for successive offerings in convenient quantities of the remaining lands as fast as they shall be brought into condition therefor.

The bill provides for giving proper publicity to the intended offering by publishing the notices thereof in newspapers of general circulation in the cities mentioned therein. I am of opinion that for greater publicity there should be inserted among them, after the name of "Duluth," where it occurs in the seventeenth line thereof, the names of "Stillwater, Taylors Falls, St. Cloud, and Brainerd."

Thus amended, I am of the opinion that said bill should be passed.

Mr. MCRAE'S said letter, with the copy of the bill inclosed therein, is transmitted herewith.

Very respectfully, S. W. LAMOREUX,
Commissioner.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KIEFER. Mr. Speaker, I desire, if this is the proper time to do so, to offer an amendment on page 2, line 22, after the word "Stillwater," to insert the words "Taylors Falls."

The SPEAKER. The Chair must first ascertain if there is objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. TOWNE. There is no objection to the insertion of the words "Taylors Falls," as well as the word "Fosston." The word "Fosston" was inserted because it was considered a more important point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on the amendments recommended by the committee.

The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 22, strike out the words "Taylors Falls," and insert the word "Fosston."

Mr. KIEFER. I must object to that, Mr. Speaker, in so far as striking out the words "Taylors Falls" is concerned.

The SPEAKER. The amendment is pending, and a single objection is not effective against it.

Mr. KIEFER. I have no objection to the amendment, except the striking out of the words "Taylors Falls." This city, in my district, is of importance sufficient to be one of the localities in which the advertisements should be published.

Mr. TOWNE. Mr. Speaker, I will now move to amend the amendment of the committee, which has just been read, so as to include the objection of the gentleman from Minnesota, my colleague, and provide that "Fosston" shall be inserted and "Taylors

Falls" remain. I understand there is no objection to that on the part of the committee.

Mr. KIEFER. With the words "Taylors Falls" included I have no further objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota will put his amendment in writing.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment in line 22, page 2, so as to read: "Stillwater, Taylors Falls, Fosston, St. Cloud."

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. EDDY] what is the smallest amount of these tracts that will be allowed to be sold under this bill?

Mr. EDDY. Under the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior he can sell such parcels as he may desire.

Mr. PICKLER. He can do that now under this bill as it stands?

Mr. EDDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. PICKLER. What is the smallest amount he can sell?

Mr. EDDY. One hundred thousand acres, or less, may be sold at the discretion of the Secretary.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, before we proceed further in the consideration of this bill, I would like to hear read the letter from the Commissioner of the Land Office which has been referred to, in order that we may fully understand the purposes and the necessity of this proposed legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can have the letter read as a part of his remarks.

Mr. LACEY. Yes; I will ask that the Clerk read it as a part of my remarks. I have not had an opportunity to read it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk informs the Chair that the letter is not in his possession.

Mr. LACEY. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNE] has informed the House that he has such a letter, and in view of the fact that this bill provides for the sale of 100,000 acres of these lands, or less, in a body, the matter is a very important one, which we ought to understand a little more fully than we do at present before we take final action. The Commissioner's letter will probably throw light upon the subject.

Mr. TOWNE. Mr. Speaker, I will say that I was under the impression that my colleague had a copy of the report which accompanied the bill two years ago, but I find that in some way it has disappeared. However, pending the obtaining of a copy of it, I suggest that the Clerk read the report of the committee. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that no light is thrown upon the provisions of the bill by the recommendations of the Secretary and of the Commissioner of the Land Office beyond that which is supplied by the report, the effect of their letters being simply to say that they indorse the provisions of the bill.

Mr. LACEY. Have you the act of 1889 at hand?

Mr. TOWNE. We have the act of 1889 here.

Mr. LACEY. Then I would like to hear so much of that act read as this bill proposes to amend.

Mr. TOWNE. I will hand it to the Clerk.

Mr. FISCHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Iowa will permit me, I will say that I was one of the subcommittee having this bill under consideration, and I called upon the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and learned that the Department desired to have it passed; that they regarded it as necessary legislation. Under the Nelson Act, so called, they have no power to sell small parcels of these lands, but the passage of this bill would enable them to sell in 40-acre parcels, and they desire that it shall become a law.

Mr. LACEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to hear read the section of the act of 1889 which this bill proposes to amend. I believe it is section 5.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That after the survey, examination, and appraisals of said pine lands has been fully completed they shall be proclaimed as in market and offered for sale in the following manner: The Commissioner of the General Land Office shall cause notices to be inserted once in each week for four successive weeks in one newspaper of general circulation published in Minneapolis, St. Paul, Duluth, and Crookston, Minn.; Chicago, Ill.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Detroit, Mich.; Philadelphia and Williamsport, Pa.; and Boston, Mass., of the sale of said lands at public auction to the highest bidder for cash at the local land office of the district within which said lands are located, said notice to state the time, and place, and terms of such sale. At such sale said lands shall be offered in 40-acre parcels, except in case of fractions containing either more or less than 40 acres, which shall be sold entire. In no event shall any parcel be sold for a less sum than its appraised value. The residue of such lands remaining unsold after such public offering shall thereafter be subject to private sale for cash at the appraised value of the same upon application at the local land office.

Mr. LACEY. Then, as I understand the proposition in this bill, it is simply this: Under the act of 1889 there could be none of these lands sold unless the whole 4,000,000 acres had been first appraised and got ready for sale, and this bill proposes to change the law so that whenever the Department gets a hundred thousand acres ready for sale those lands may be sold in parcels, as under the act of 1889. I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota whether that is the purport of the bill?

Mr. TOWNE. That is correct.

The amendment as amended was adopted.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the second amendment of the committee, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 36, strike out the words "no timber upon"; so that the proviso will read:

"*Provided*, That sections numbered 16 and 36 in each township so surveyed shall not be sold until the claim of the State of Minnesota to ownership of said sections as part of the school lands of said State shall have been determined."

The amendment was adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. TOWNE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

W. W. ROCKHILL.

Mr. HANLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill which I send to the desk, which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Claims of this House.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3886) to reimburse W. W. Rockhill for moneys erroneously paid United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to repay W. W. Rockhill, postmaster at Fort Wayne, Ind., the sum of $117.50, to reimburse him for moneys erroneously reported and paid as "key deposit forfeiture fund," when the same should have been reported "key deposit redemption fund."

Mr. HANLY. In explanation of this bill, permit me to say that the mistake referred to occurred in the accounts of the postmaster, he having reported as belonging to the "key deposit forfeiture fund" a sum that should have been returned as the "key deposit redemption fund." He was afterwards compelled to pay not only the $117.50 to the "key deposit redemption fund," but also the same amount to the "key deposit forfeiture fund." The Postmaster-General has sent to the committee a letter recommending the passage of this bill, which proposes simply to correct in this particular this postmaster's accounts.

Mr. SAYERS. At what time was this erroneous payment made?

Mr. HANLY. Within the last year or two. The bill proposes simply to correct the account, which has now been closed. The measure is a just one, about which there can be no question. I ask the Clerk to read the letter from the Postmaster-General.

Mr. LOUD. Has this bill been reported by any committee?

Mr. HANLY. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Claims. I ask that the letter be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1896.

[Subject: Reimbursement, postmaster Fort Wayne, Ind.]

SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your esteemed favor bearing date of the 21st instant, inclosing House bill 3886, entitled "A bill to reimburse W. W. Rockhill for moneys erroneously paid United States." The facts set forth in the bill are correct, to wit, that the postmaster at Fort Wayne, Ind., erroneously advised this Department that he had on hand $117.50 as key-deposit forfeiture fund, when in reality same was key-deposit redemption fund. Upon receipt of this information the postmaster was instructed to remit $117.50 to the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, which was done. The money can not now be returned to him by reason of the fact that the accounts for that period have been closed. The key-deposit redemption fund should have been retained in the postmaster's possession, to be utilized for the purpose for which it was intended. The bill is a meritorious one, and should be passed. The key-deposit forfeiture fund at various offices in the United States has been turned into the Treasury.

Very respectfully,

WM. L. WILSON, *Postmaster-General.*

Hon. J. FRANK HANLY,
House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HANLY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution to print a paper entitled "Geology and mineral industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado."

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 50) authorizing the employment of a skilled architect to assist the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in preparing the designs, plans, specifications, and other drawings for the public building at Chicago, Ill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, upon the Hon. Marcus C. Lisle,

late a Representative from the State of Kentucky, and upon the Hon. George W. Houk, late a Representative from the State of Ohio, be printed as required by law.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the following titles:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 88) authorizing the distribution of copies of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in Congressional districts where distribution has not been made; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 89) concerning the erection and completion (except heating apparatus) of the United States post-office building at Bloomington, Ill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 626) providing for disposal of lands on abandoned portions of the Fort Assinniboine Military Reservation in Montana, and for the relief of certain settlers thereon; and

A bill (S. 1297) to provide for the purchase of lands adjoining the United States naval station, Port Royal, S. C.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution (in which the concurrence of the House was requested) relative to outrages in Armenia.

OUTRAGES IN ARMENIA.

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, if I correctly heard the message just received, there has come from the Senate a concurrent resolution touching the situation in Armenia. I ask that the resolution of the Senate may be read, after which I shall ask its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the supplementary treaty of Berlin, July 13, 1878, between the Ottoman Empire and Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia contains the following provisions:

"LXI.

"The Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out without further delay the ameliorations and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds.

"It will periodically make known these steps taken to this effect to the powers, and will superintend their application.

"LXII.

"The Sublime Porte having expressed the wish to maintain the principle of religious liberty, to give it the widest scope, the contracting parties take note of this spontaneous declaration.

"In no part of the Ottoman Empire shall difference of religion be alleged against an individual as a ground for exclusion or incapacity as regards the discharge of civil and political rights, admission to the public service, functions, and honors, and the exercise of the different professions and industries.

"All persons shall be admitted, without distinction of religion, to give evidence before the tribunals.

"Liberty and the outward exercise of all forms of worship are assured to all, and no hindrance shall be offered either to the hierarchial organization of the various communions or to their relations with their spiritual chiefs.

"The right of official protection by the diplomatic and consular agents of the powers in Turkey is recognized both as regards the above-mentioned persons and their religious, charitable, and other establishments in the holy places;" and

Whereas the extent and object of the above-cited provisions of said treaty are to place the Christian subjects of the Porte under the protection of the other signatories thereto, and to secure to such Christian subjects full liberty of religious worship and belief, the equal benefit of the laws, and all the privileges and immunities belonging to any subjects of the Turkish Empire; and

Whereas by said treaty the Christian powers parties thereto having established, under the consent of Turkey their right to accomplish and secure the above-recited objects; and

Whereas the American people, in common with all Christian people everywhere, have beheld with horror the recent appalling outrages and massacres of which the Christian population of Turkey have been made the victims: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is an imperative duty, in the interest of humanity, to express the earnest hope that the European concert brought about by the treaty referred to may speedily be given its just effect in such decisive measures as shall stay the hand of fanaticism and lawless violence, and as shall secure to the unoffending Christians of the Turkish Empire all the rights belonging to them both as men and Christians and as beneficiaries of the explicit provisions of the treaty above recited.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate these resolutions to the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia.

Resolved further, That the Senate of the United States, the House of Representatives concurring, will support the President in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey, and to obtain redress for injuries committed upon the persons or property of such citizens.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] has the floor.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I wish to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. QUIGG. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House agreed last Thursday upon certain resolutions with regard to the Armenian question, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] was authorized to report. I wish to ask the gentleman whether he proposes to substitute for those resolutions which the Committee on Foreign Affairs directed him to report the resolutions adopted by the Senate?

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the resolutions which I have been directed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to report, and I will send them to the Clerk's desk to be read; but there is so little difference between the resolutions agreed to by the House committee and the resolutions which have been sent to us from the Senate that I think the gentleman from Kentucky will agree with me that it would be desirable that the Senate resolutions, which have already been adopted by that body, be passed, and that our resolutions lie on the table. There is practically no difference between the two sets of resolutions. I have no wish to occupy the time of the House with unnecessary discussion on this question, and it does not seem likely that much argument will be required in advocacy of these resolutions.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry. I have not understood that the resolutions which have been read are before the House.

The SPEAKER. The resolution read is not before the House except by unanimous consent.

Mr. BAILEY. And that has not yet been given.

The SPEAKER. It has not. The question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolutions?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, if it can be done by unanimous consent, I would like to hear read the resolutions reported or ordered to be reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House, reserving my right to object.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that can be done.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Whereas by Article LXI of the treaty between Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, Russia, Turkey for the settlement of affairs in the East, signed at Berlin on July 13, 1878, and duly proclaimed thereafter, it was provided that Turkey should without delay carry out "the improvements and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians," and should "guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds"; and

Whereas the powers signatory to the said treaty engaged to watch the steps taken in the progress of these reforms and to superintend their application; and

Whereas by Article LXII of the said treaty Turkey agreed to give the widest scope to religious liberty throughout her dominions and to protect all her subjects and all foreigners resident in her dominions in the free exercise thereof; and

Whereas by a conditional treaty between England and Turkey, dated June 4, 1878, it was provided that if any attempt should be made by Russia to take possession of any other Armenian provinces than those at that time occupied by Russia, England would assist Turkey in defending them by force of arms, and that, in return for this engagement on the part of England, the Sultan would surely reform the local administration of those other provinces, and would fully protect his Christian and other subjects there, and would assign to England the Island of Cyprus to be occupied and administered by England to the end that she might be in a position to perform her engagement to prevent by force of arms the Christian provinces of the Ottoman Porte from passing into the hands of the Christian government of Russia; and

Whereas it appears that these said improvements and reforms have not been carried out, and that the Armenian subjects of the Porte have not been secured against Circassians and Kurds, and that the free exercise of religion is not permitted in many places within the dominions of the Porte, and that under color of suppressing and punishing political disorder outrages have been perpetrated upon the Armenian Christians of a most cruel and malignant character: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to communicate to the Governments signatory to the treaty of Berlin the profound regret of the American people and their Government that the engagements made in that convention for the security of the Armenian Christians have not been performed; and

Be it further resolved, That the Government of the United States expresses its sympathy for the Armenian people and its hope that the Government of the Sultan will at once extend to them full and adequate protection for the preservation of life, the security of property, and the free exercise of religion.

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the report of the committee be read.

There being no objection, the report was read, as follows:

Mr. QUIGG submitted the following report:

That the present Armenian troubles are religious in their origin admits of no reasonable doubt. Trustworthy information of their extent is not available, but it is more than probable that within the last two years as many as 30,000 Armenian Christians have been wantonly murdered, often with accompanying crimes of the most infamous description.

It does not positively appear that any American citizen, native or naturalized, has been killed or injured in these disturbances. The property of American citizens has been in some cases destroyed, but the Government of Turkey does not avoid its responsibility for such injuries.

Turkey gave spontaneous assurance at the Berlin Conference that she would reform the local government in her Armenian provinces, grant freedom of worship to the Armenian Christians, and fully protect them against the Circassians and Kurds. These assurances were accepted by the powers, who jointly agreed to see to it that they were carried out.

They have not been carried out and the powers have taken no efficient steps to require their performance. To these facts, without doubt, the terrible situation now existing is due.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolutions?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I understand the gentleman proposes to lay the House resolutions on the table and take up for present consideration the Senate resolutions?

Mr. QUIGG. That is what I shall ask permission to do.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I have no objection to that, be-

cause there ought to be some action, and prompt action, in my opinion, on this Armenian question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate resolutions?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, I think it will be admitted by everybody that something should be said by Congress concerning the deplorable state of affairs in Asia Minor, and I think a very brief statement of the situation and of the considerations that have led the two committees on foreign affairs of the two Houses of Congress to report these moderate resolutions will suffice to show the House that, however inadequate they may be to express our feeling of indignation and just resentment at the fearful atrocities that have been committed, they are better calculated to effect a good result than would be a more irritating declaration.

It will be conceded, Mr. Speaker, that our interest in the situation in Armenia is chiefly humane and but slightly political. Although newspaper dispatches from Oriental points have from time to time mentioned American citizens as having been killed or injured in the Kurdish-Armenian riots, our official information is to the contrary. And it gives me pleasure, in behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to accept the assurances of the State Department as to the zeal and activity that it has manifested in its efforts to protect the rights of American citizens throughout the Turkish Empire; and also to testify to the good work that has been performed by our minister to Turkey, to whose prompt intervention, supported by the near presence of three American ships of war, the fact is no doubt due that the perpetrators of these outrages have been so scrupulously careful to overlook those persons of American or Armenian birth who are known to be able to claim the protection of the American flag.

But however remote we may be, Mr. Speaker, whether by distance or political interest, from the scene of these shocking iniquities, the fact of their occurrence excites the profound grief of the American people, and imposes upon Congress the duty of uttering such a protest as will be heard by those who, of their own free motion, have given bonds to civilization for the good behavior of Turkey. We do not need to inquire too curiously into the motives of those Christian Sovereigns of Europe who uphold with one hand a Government that they constantly menace with the other. We are not interested in their jealousies, and have no part in their ambitions. But since they have chosen, sooner than take the risk and consequences to themselves of allowing events to follow their natural course, to assume the place of guardian and trustee of the Ottoman Porte, frankly professing the responsibility that thereby attaches to them—since they in the name of peace and humanity have pledged the Sultan to just and liberal policies toward his Christian subjects, since he has acknowledged their right of supervision, and he for them and they for him have given solemn assurance to the Christian world that liberty of conscience and freedom of worship shall exist in every part of the Turkish Empire, that the Armenian Christians shall be protected against Kurds and Circassians, and that the local administration of the Porte in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians shall be thoroughly reformed, we have the right to summon them into the high court of national honor and good faith and ask why these pledges have not been performed, and upon what excuse they stand idly and shamefacedly by while 10,000 Christian homes are being plundered and devastated, and while men are murdered, women dishonored, and children sold into unthinkable slavery, and all because they will not cry out that Mohammed is the prophet of God. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered, as the preamble to these resolutions recites, that immediately after the late war between Russia and Turkey the Government of the Czar appropriated certain provinces theretofore subject to the Sultan and inhabited chiefly by Armenian Christians. Those provinces border on these, where for the last six years disorder and wanton crime have displaced every semblance of civilized government.

The Armenians are a noble and intelligent race, who have preserved for three thousand years their language and their national characteristics. Those of them inhabiting the provinces that are now administered by Russia have resented and resisted every attempt that has been made to Russianize them, and a persistent attempt of that kind has been made; but they have been treated with such consideration and have been so respected in their religious rights and practices that during the entire eighteen years of their subjection to Russia not a hint of disorder has come from their villages. This fact is extremely important, for it is a sufficient answer to the allegations that come so constantly from Constantinople that the disorders in Turkish Armenia are political and not religious in their origin and revolutionary in their purposes. It helps also to fix the responsibility for their further continuance. For it will be remembered, certainly by every Representative in this House, that it was the intention of Russia to appropriate the entire Armenian country, or at least that she was suspected of such a purpose by the Porte, and that the Government of Turkey turned in prompt appeal to the Government of Great Britain. It will be remembered that just prior to the Berlin conference a secret convention was formed between Turkey and England, in which, Turkey having agreed to reform the local administration in her remaining Armenian provinces and to protect the Armenian Christians against the Circassians and the Kurds, England agreed to protect Turkey by force of arms against Russia in case a further effort was made to seize these remaining Turkish-Armenian provinces, and that in order to place the Government of Great Britain in a position the better to carry out this agreement the coveted Island of Cyprus was assigned by Turkey to be occupied and administered by the British.

These facts, Mr. Speaker, carry with them their own conclusion as to where the main responsibility lies for what has already occurred in Armenia and for what may occur there hereafter. I shall not seek to enforce that conclusion by any comment or argument. The Christian world is looking with intense solicitude and infinite compassion upon the unhappy people whom ten centuries of persecution have not sufficed to destroy. Their tears and sufferings are a charge against the whole of Christendom. They suffer for not what they do, but for what they think, and because they think as we think. The offense against them is an offense against Christian civilization. I can very easily say whose the duty is to put an end to it, but whose the duty is not involves a question far more difficult to dispose of. But this I know, and I submit it to the serious judgment of the representatives of the American people, that the time has gone by in the development of the human race when one nation can shut its eyes to the mighty transgression of another and indifferently ask, "Am I my brother's keeper?" [Applause.]

I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that the resolutions which have been read are probably inadequate to accomplish what needs to be accomplished upon the conscience, and perhaps upon the fears, of the rulers of the Turkish Empire; but if they shall succeed in showing that the American people are watching occurrences in Armenia, and watching them with solicitude and regret, it is possible that the protest and the warning they contain may not pass wholly unheeded.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to ask the gentleman a question for information.

Mr. QUIGG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Have your committee any information of the murder of American citizens or the destruction of their property?

Mr. SAYERS. We can not hear the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen must recollect that they must address the Chair so that the House can hear.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman whether his committee has any information of the murder of an American citizen or the destruction of American property in Armenia?

Mr. QUIGG. The committee has no information of the murder of any American citizen or of physical injury to any American citizen during any of these riots. There was a bicyclist, about two years ago or less, who was journeying from Persia through Armenia, who was murdered, and he was an American citizen; but it does not appear that the attack on him related to these religious riots. Aside from that case there is no information before the committee as to physical injury to any American citizen.

The property of American citizens in several cases has been destroyed in these riots. The Government of Turkey, however, does not deny its responsibility in this matter.

Mr. BOWERS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. QUIGG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if there was any evidence whatever before the committee which tends to show that there has been any neglect, however slight, on the part of the American minister at Constantinople to inquire into, and, so far as he could, meet the troubles which are occurring there in reference to the Armenian Christians and naturalized citizens of the United States?

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, there is no such information before the committee; but, on the contrary, such information as the committee has, which of course is derived from the State Department, is to the effect that the American minister has been uncommonly zealous, and has done his duty with efficiency, intelligence, and zeal; and I desire to add my personal belief, for what it is worth, having inquired into this matter very carefully, and inquired into it from other sources than official ones, that the American minister in Turkey has met the situation there and has performed his trust as well as anyone could.

Mr. SAYERS. I am very glad to hear the gentleman from New York say so. The American minister is a citizen of Texas, and of course we feel proud that he has discharged his duty in such a manner as to meet the commendation of the gentleman from New York and of gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. QUIGG. He is a citizen of Texas, and there can be no doubt that he has done his duty; and I do not feel any sympathy

with the criticisms made with reference to our minister to Turkey.

Mr. BAILEY. Without intending to inquire into the secrets of the committee room, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if the committee considered the propriety or impropriety of this Government requesting the enforcement of a treaty to which it is in no wise a party?

Mr. QUIGG. I do not think I quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. BAILEY. The treaty of which this resolution desires the enforcement is one to which the United States was not a party.

Mr. QUIGG. That is right.

Mr. BAILEY. And my question is, whether the committee considered the propriety of expressing a desire for the enforcement of a treaty among European powers to which this Government is not a party?

Mr. QUIGG. The committee did not consider the impropriety.

Mr. BAILEY. Did the committee consider the question?

Mr. QUIGG. It considered the obvious propriety of the Government of the United States calling upon those Governments with which it is in friendly relations who had undertaken a certain duty, and who had published that duty to the world, to go ahead and do as they agreed.

Mr. BAILEY. The resolution assumes that they have not done their duty, of which they are to be the judges, and not we.

Mr. QUIGG. I will not accept that. Every nation must be its own judge.

Mr. BAILEY. I was going to suggest to the gentleman from New York that I entirely sympathize with that part of the resolution which deprecates the atrocities committed against the Armenians; but at a time when we are denying the power of European Governments to interfere on this continent, it seems to me unwise for us to assume a right to insist upon the enforcement of a treaty to which we are not a party.

Mr. QUIGG. We assume no such right. We do not undertake to do so. We do not do a single thing by the resolutions which can be criticised in the spirit in which the gentleman from Texas criticises them.

Mr. BAILEY. They either mean something or nothing.

Mr. QUIGG. They mean a great deal. They mean the request of a Government in friendly relations with certain other Governments that they perform the pledges they have undertaken to perform. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to speak to that point?

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman from Illinois and myself were to enter into a contract, it would be no part of the business of the gentleman from New York to demand that the gentleman from Illinois should keep his obligation or that I should keep mine.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I desire to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

Mr. HITT. Will the gentleman permit me to make a statement on the question.

Mr. QUIGG. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, the measure which is before the House is a Senate resolution. The gentleman from Texas asks whether our committee had considered the precise point of our Government taking any part in the European combination.

Our committee had considered the propriety of the Congress of the United States, in pursuance of a humane purpose, appealing to the Governments of Europe who had direct right and power by treaty over this question, and adopted language which is analogous to that which is before the House now. That is an answer to that part of the gentleman's question which asked whether it had been considered. It was considered carefully, and the House committee adopted a resolution requesting the President to communicate to those powers the profound regret of the American people and Government that no measures had been taken to stay the long agony of the Christian world in the Turkish Empire.

Mr. CANNON. May I ask my colleague [Mr. HITT] a question?

Mr. QUIGG. I do not yield further, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentleman from New York that he has already yielded to me. I suppose he intends to retain the floor, and I ask him to yield me ten minutes of his time.

Mr. QUIGG. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has thirty-five minutes left.

Mr. QUIGG. Then I shall be glad to yield ten minutes of that time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY].

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I heartily indorse the resolutions adopted by the Senate. The cause of Armenia seems to me to be the cause of humanity and justice. The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives had under consideration certain resolutions on this subject and they have been reported favorably to the House, but as the Senate resolutions seemed to be appropriate and to be very much in the same line as the House resolutions, in order that there might be, at the earliest possible time, some expression by the Congress of the United States, it was agreed this morning that the House resolutions should lie upon the table and that we would ask the House to take up and consider the Senate resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the civilized world is astounded and appalled at the outrages and the crimes that have been committed in the last few years in the Armenian provinces of Turkey. Men, women, and children have been murdered; property has been destroyed; devastation and ruin have been spread over those Armenian provinces. A Turkish army composed of Kurds and Circassians has invaded happy homes, peaceful cities and towns, sacred churches and colleges, and we have authentic information that within the last two or three years nearly 30,000 men, women, and children have been murdered in the Armenian provinces of Turkey; that near 300,000 Armenians are to-day homeless and destitute; that more than $3,000,000 worth of property has been destroyed within the last two years; and all this because of the religious sentiments of the Armenian Christians. The people of all Christendom should be aroused by the sufferings and piteous appeals of the Armenians. The responsibility should be placed where it belongs, and a just Providence will surely send retribution soon.

The Armenians are a peaceful and industrious, yet courageous people. About two millions and a half of them reside in Turkey; about one million and a quarter reside in Russia; in other parts of Europe there are perhaps 200,000 of them, and about 10,000 reside in the United States. These people have been conspicuous in history for many centuries. For sixteen hundred years they have stood up for Christian homes and for the Christian religion. They have maintained their religion through many centuries amid the persecutions of the worst kind, so that they have made themselves heroes and martyrs. Within these Armenian provinces we find Mount Ararat, where it is said the ark rested after the deluge. Near by is Bethlehem, where our Saviour was born, and history tells us that these Armenian people excel all the rest of the inhabitants of Turkey in education and in commerce. Mr. Speaker, our sympathies here in America go out to all persons that are oppressed and suffering. That has been the history of our country, and to-day there are more reasons why our sympathies should go out to these oppressed and suffering Armenians than to any other people on the face of the earth. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, there is a treaty known as the supplemental treaty of Berlin, made July 30, 1878, between the Ottoman Empire, Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia. That treaty contains the following provision:

> The Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out without further delay the ameliorations and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds.
>
> It will periodically make known the steps taken to this effect to the powers, and will superintend their application.
>
> The Sublime Porte having expressed the wish to maintain the principle of religious liberty, to give it the widest scope, the contracting parties take note of this spontaneous declaration.
>
> In no part of the Ottoman Empire shall difference of religion be alleged against an individual as a ground for exclusion or incapacity as regards the discharge of civil and political rights, admission to the public service, functions, and honors, and the exercise of the different professions and industries.

This is the treaty which was entered into in 1878, and to which my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] has referred. This treaty obligates the powers named to see to it that the Ottoman Empire shall in no way interfere with any class of its subjects on account of their religion.

The United States is not a party to this treaty; but there is no reason why the people of the United States or the representatives of the people of the United States should not take an interest in the suffering people of Armenia, who have been murdered, who have been robbed, and who have suffered every indignity. There is no reason why we should not declare, in the strongest yet the most diplomatic language, that we protest against such a course as has been pursued toward those suffering people, and that we regret that any nation in the world should permit such outrages within its domain. The purpose of the resolution now under consideration is to ask the European powers to enforce the treaty obligations of 1878. Our country stands to-day not only the peer of any nation in the world, but it stands as one of the leading nations, if not the leading nation, of the world. There is nothing which marks our country more distinctively than its love of justice, its love of fairness, its love for humanity, and condemnation of all that is wicked, of all that is unjust, of all that is outrageous, especially when the atrocities and outrages are committed upon a people simply because of their religious convictions. [Applause.]

Therefore we call upon the European powers to enforce these treaty obligations. It is true that we can do nothing so far as regulating and controlling the Sultan of Turkey is concerned. He sits in his palace to-day not respected for that wisdom, that courage, or that fairness which should characterize every ruler,

whether he be at the head of a monarchy or an empire. We can here only express our regrets as regards the outrages and atrocities committed against the Armenians, and hope that the hand of fanaticism and lawless violence will be stayed. The protection and security of American citizens in Turkey and proper redress for injuries committed upon the persons or property of such citizens is a duty our Government owes to every American citizen. It is reported that at Harpoot, a city in Armenia, where Americans have built churches, and where Americans have built colleges, one of our colleges has been burned and American citizens have been compelled to flee for their lives.

I wish to say that if such is the fact—if upon examination those statements turn out to be true, then our Government should use all the power it possesses, if necessary—its ships and its soldiers—to obtain reparation and indemnity for any injury or outrage that may have been perpetrated upon American property or American citizens.

The members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House have endeavored this session and last session to do all in their power as regards Armenia. During the last Congress we received information of these robberies and murders in Armenia. Hoping and believing that we might accomplish something, we authorized the appointment by the President of the United States of a consul at Erzerum and a consul at Harpoot, in the Turkish provinces where the greatest atrocities had been committed. These consuls were appointed by the President, but they were at first denied their exequaturs. After months of delay I believe they have at last reached their posts of duty. At this session of Congress, to still further aid them, we authorized in the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill the appointment of interpreters for those consuls.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman pardon an inquiry at this point? He has stated that the last Congress authorized the appointment of consuls at Erzerum and Harpoot, the two points where these massacres have been the most serious——

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. And that these consuls were refused exequaturs by the Turkish Government. What I desire to ask is, whether the Committee on Foreign Affairs has any information that while our consuls have been refused exequaturs a British consul has, during the same period, been given his exequatur to proceed to a point near these two cities, and has actually gone to that point? If that be so, I should like to know why an exequatur has been refused to American consuls and has been granted to a British consul.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I do not know that an exequatur was granted to the British consul except so far as I have seen reference to it in the newspapers. As I have already stated, exequaturs were denied to our consuls for months, but I have been informed that the exequaturs have recently been received by our consuls.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman permit me one moment further? Do I understand him to say that exequaturs have been granted to those two American consuls?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. QUIGG. I understand that they have now been granted.

Mr. DINGLEY. After the massacres have taken place the exequaturs have been granted!

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. That only goes to show that the conduct of the Turkish Government as regards Armenia has been characterized all the time by unfairness and injustice.

Mr. QUIGG. Allow me to add that the condition of affairs is very much worse than would appear by the mere fact that these consuls were not granted their exequaturs until after the harm was done, because no protection is allowed to those American representatives to reach their posts of duty. That is a very serious matter which is now engaging the attention of the State Department.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I wish to say further, Mr. Speaker, that the very fact that exequaturs were denied to our consuls when duly appointed, accredited, and sent to Harpoot and Erzerum is another important reason why the Congress of the United States should take an interest in this matter and do all that can properly be done.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I ask my friend from New York for two or three minutes more, which will enable me to close what I desire to say.

Mr. QUIGG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I have but a few words more to say. I have already expressed my hope that if damage has been done to colleges or churches erected by Americans in Armenia, or if our citizens have been arrested and deprived of their liberities, all the power of our Government will be used to restore to them their freedom and correct the wrongs that have been done.

I shall vote for the pending resolutions cheerfully, and I am ready to vote for other resolutions if they are necessary in the future, but always, of course, within the scope and authority of the Congress of the United States. As has been said in the report read this morning, these outrages in Armenia seem to have been committed mainly because of the religion of Armenians. The doctrine of our country is that religion shall be free, and so far as we have the power we should undertake to uphold and support that doctrine not only in our country, but in every part of the world. Daniel Webster said on a great occasion:

> There is something on earth greater than arbitrary or despotic power. The lightning has its power, the whirlwind has its power, and the earthquake has its power, but there is something among men more capable of shaking despotic power than the lightning, the whirlwind, or the earthquake, and that is the excited and aroused indignation of the whole civilized world.

If the Sultan of Turkey continues to allow the murderers and robbers of Armenians to go unpunished, if the Turks persist in the massacre of innocent and defenseless men, women, and children because of their devotion to the Christian religion, then, Mr. Speaker, the time may come when the excited and aroused indignation of the civilized world may cause the dismemberment of Turkey and that it be blotted from the map of nations forever. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

Mr. QUIGG. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I find the following appended as a part of one of the Senate resolutions:

> *Resolved further*, That the Senate of the United States, the House of Representatives concurring, will support the President in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey, and to obtain redress for injuries committed upon the persons or property of such citizens.

I understood from the reading of the report of the House committee that no American citizen has lost his life or had received any personal injury in Armenia. I understood further that the House committee had information which they had embodied in their report that some of the American citizens had lost their property in Armenia, but that the Sultan of Turkey had expressed a willingness to redress the wrong and make reparation for such loss. I understand further that there are at least three American war ships in Eastern waters. Now, if all that be true, is there any necessity for the resolution—that part of the Senate resolution—which I have just read; and may it not imply that the Administration had not heretofore performed its duty, and thereby work an injustice? Because, if the gentleman is correct in the report made to the House, I am very glad indeed to have an opportunity to express my cordial indorsement of the Administration and of its vigilance in the matter.

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, as his habit is, has answered his own question so exceedingly fully that it is unnecessary for me to occupy more of the time of the House upon it. [Laughter.]

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, if the resolution now before the House covered exclusively the offenses which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] declares have been committed against American citizens in Armenia, I would cheerfully support any adequate measure which the Committee on Foreign Affairs might recommend in order to secure redress. I am sure that there is no man on the floor of this House who would go farther, and go more willingly to any extent necessary, in defending the rights and the property of American citizens.

But, remarkable to say, while offenses are said to have been committed against our own people, there is not a line or a syllable in this resolution reciting them. But, sir, the resolution recites, as a preamble, the stipulations of a treaty to which the United States was not a party, and one of the stipulations recited deals with a matter of domestic policy, which according to our theory must be determined by each country for itself. We could not assert our right to intervene in such matters affecting other nations without admitting the right of other nations to intervene in such matters affecting us.

Mr. Speaker, there is a question in my own mind as to the propriety of this Government undertaking to even recommend to any other Government the policies which it ought to adopt and pursue. But I have no doubt that it is obviously improper for this Government to practically censure other nations for violating a compact made among themselves, and with which the United States has no connection. This resolution, if adopted, is an impertinence, if not a downright insult, to the nations making this treaty. It says in effect that the great powers of Europe have entered into a combination and assumed an obligation which they have so grossly disregarded that this Government feels it incumbent upon it to call attention to their offense.

I submit to the judgment of the House that this is not different from the case where two parties enter into a contract in which a third party who has no interest should demand of them that they enforce its stipulations. I believe that it is as gross an affront to a nation to tell it that it has violated its treaty as it would be to

an individual to tell him that he had disregarded the obligation of his contract. I can see no difference between them.

I had supposed that this Government had no policy better settled than that it will not interfere with the affairs of a foreign nation and will not suffer a foreign nation to interfere with its affairs. I submit, in conclusion, to the judgment of the House that while we are denying the right of foreign nations even to interfere in the affairs, not of our country, but of this continent, we ought not to attempt an interference with the affairs of other nations. To do so must involve us in a departure from our traditional policy, and for that reason I believe the resolution ought to be amended so as to eliminate from it all reference to the treaty of Berlin.

Mr. QUIGG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] ten minutes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, the recital of outrage and wrong that has just been made to this House by the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] is one that seldom falls upon human ears. It is seldom, indeed, in this day of civilization, that such a story is told to men; 30,000 Christian people, within twenty months, slaughtered by the unspeakable Turk solely because of their religious views. And what do we propose to do about it? This resolution contains, first, our mild protest against outrages like these. Then we express our sympathies for those that yet remain in Armenia and that may be the subject of slaughter. Sympathy for the people menaced with a peril like this, or suffering grief for slaughtered friends! They do not want sympathy, Mr. Speaker; they want rescue. They do not want our mere words; they want Christian people to come to their relief. And we ask that those nations that have witnessed all these transactions of outrage, that are as familiar with all of these facts as we are—we ask these people who for years have been derelict of duty now to respond to the dictates of duty and see to it that their treaty stipulations are enforced. That is what we do. We protest, and the gentleman from New York tells us that he scarcely thinks it possible—that it is "barely possible"—that something may come from this action which has been reported by our Committee on Foreign Affairs after a month of deliberation.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the English Government owns largely of Turkish bonds. We know that English capital, to the extent of hundreds of millions, is invested in Turkey, and that capital is intent upon preserving the autonomy of Turkey in order to protect those investments. We know that it is that and that alone which has kept this foul blot of a Government upon the map of the world for the last twenty years. [Applause.] We know that Russia stands anxious to get to the Mediterranean Sea, and that France and Germany and Austria and England are unwilling that the balance of power in Europe shall be disturbed. We know that they will continue the situation as it is, and yet we appeal to them to do that which humanity says we should do and that we know they will not do. We have it in our own hands to do something more than make this mild protest, and at the proper time, Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer this amendment:

That for the purpose of emphasizing our protest against the murders and outrages above recited, the President is directed to furnish the Turkish minister his dismissal as a representative of the Sultan at this capital, and to at once terminate all diplomatic relations with the Government of Turkey.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. Speaker, that kind of a protest would mean something. Gentlemen around me say this is too drastic, that this is not diplomacy. It may be that it is not diplomatic and that it is drastic, but it means something more than mere words. It is within the limitation of that action that we can take. We can say here to all the world that we will not recognize as a civilized government that government which permits the outrages against its citizens that the Turkish Government has permitted. [Applause.] We can do that. We can say that it is unworthy of a place among the nations, and we ought to do it. [Applause.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, the remedy suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] would terminate all intercourse with a Government which to-day is in friendly relations with us by treaty pledge, and which meets every demand that we have made for the protection of American citizens——

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me to say that we do not want friendly relations with this murderer. [Applause.]

Mr. HITT. Let me answer you with facts. You are speaking in declamation. The Turkish Government in every case where an American citizen has been touched has responded——

Mr. HEPBURN. How about the 30,000 Christians that it has butchered. [Applause.]

Mr. HITT. The power of the United States to protect its citizens in Turkey, which is now something, which is now a substantial fact——

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit me? Has it suspended the knife in one instance or stopped one murder?

Mr. HITT. If the gentleman will allow me to speak for a minute or two I will give him all day, if I have control of the time.

Mr. HEPBURN. You are kind. I beg your pardon.

Mr. HITT. I have no want of sympathy such as the gentleman expresses for those who suffer; but his remedy, dismissing the Turkish minister, to be certainly followed by the dismissal of our minister at Constantinople, is a strange, extraordinary one—to take away the one instrumentality by which we now are protecting many; an instrumentality which, by the code of the world, by international law, stronger than the applause of the gallery, enables us to put out our arm and save an American anywhere in the midst of massacre, of burning, and of blood, and it has done it.

That is the testimony. No one regrets more than I do that these resolutions seem so weak, that the remedy is so feeble. But how far can we go? Our action is limited by our power. Gentlemen have suggested to the committee and numerous letters from eminent men and from societies have proposed that we seize the ports of Turkey. That is still more drastic than dismissing the Turkish minister. It has been proposed that we send a fleet. Another distinguished gentleman whose name it would not be proper to mention here proposed that we should join with Russia in what is substantially an invasion of Turkey.

These are not methods consonant with our traditions or our policy. We can do something—not much.

We do not want—

As an eminent Armenian said to me, representing their great association—

We do not want you to utter things in the House of Representatives that will simply exasperate the murderous bands that are killing our mothers, our sisters, and our brothers at home. We want, if we can, a voice from you that will add to that multitudinous cry which comes up from humanity everywhere in this wide world, that will create a public opinion which in the end will be irresistible, which will constrain the Governments of England, and of Russia, and all the great States of central Europe to stop the policy of selfish standoff in which they are watching each other and make them do something to stay that slaughter, to protect the helpless, who under the sway of fanaticism are being murdered.

We only by this resolution appeal to those great powers to act as we would act. We wish that they shall move on behalf of the unhappy—be the defenders for a time of those who are suffering and falling for the sake of their religion. It is our duty to do it. We can not shrink from it. Any swagger which we may ourselves indulge toward Turkey will be wholly ineffectual. Dismissing their minister and bringing home our own, we will simply exasperate them and take away from ourselves the power we have now of preventing the property and lives of our citizens in Turkey from being destroyed. The Turkish Government is responding to the claim for property being destroyed, that every cent will be paid in full. They are taking the same time to examine the bill that we took in making out the bill. That is not only the usage of nations, but of private individuals in private disputes.

Protection has been given to Americans in perhaps overabundance, in order that we might not have a claim for intervention on behalf of those unhappy victims of cruelty and fanaticism who are falling all about the Americans there. An American citizen who is here in this city, it was related to me the other day, saw right before his face, while he stood in the midst of an armed guard he had by Turkish authority, these poor, unhappy Christians, imploring mercy, cut down, nine of them, while he could only look on helpless.

Mr. HARDY. He was not a good American, or he would not have stood still and seen that.

Mr. HITT. He was helpless, and for him to have taken any part, one man as against an army, it would have been folly. The missionaries there have suffered inconvenience, and we all feel a sympathy for the great and noble cause in which their lives are enlisted, but they have not been physically hurt. Their property has been destroyed, and it is supposed it will be paid for, but for that greater cause, for that vast multitude who will perish to-morrow and beyond, it is not in our power to directly do anything. The great powers of Europe, with 2,700,000 armed men ready, are where they can do something, and have the treaty right and obligation to do it, but we can not march there and disturb that country. It is not in our power, in the name of humanity, to invade that country, to overturn the Government, or to renew or reorganize the government of the provinces. I am sorry it is not. The days of the Crusades have passed, and we can not organize to-day a crusade, as was done eight hundred years ago.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman will allow me.

Mr. QUIGG. I would like to ask how much time I have?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question.

Mr. QUIGG. I would like to know what time I have, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that the time be extended and left within my control, if the House will be kind enough, for thirty minutes longer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for thirty minutes longer. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Now will the gentleman from Iowa allow me a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] whether it is not clear that the object of these pending concurrent resolutions is to ameliorate the condition of the Armenians and in some way help those suffering people? The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa is not before the House, and I wish to say to the gentleman that I hope he will not offer it. I do not believe it is in order, and if he does offer it I shall make a point of order against it, but I hope that the gentleman from Iowa, with his usual fairness and wisdom, will let us adopt these Senate concurrent resolutions without amendment, and thus take one step toward aiding and benefiting these suffering Armenian people. I do not believe that such a severe remedy, such a drastic measure, as that which he proposes will help them. On the contrary, I fear that if it should be adopted it would injure them. Therefore, I trust the gentleman will withhold his amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman from Kentucky now tell me in which part of his speech his question is to be found? [Laughter.]

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Yes, sir; I asked you if you did not think that the pending resolutions were designed to give relief to the Armenians, and also if you thought your amendment was in order on these resolutions, and then I asked you not to offer it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] to yield to me to make a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. QUIGG. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] be allowed to control thirty minutes' time in this debate.

Mr. QUIGG. I object, Mr. Speaker, and yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CANNON. I suppose this subject is up for consideration and that the debate can run until the previous question is ordered. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer the query of the gentleman from Kentucky in the language of the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG]. The gentleman from Kentucky asks me if I do not understand that these resolutions are intended to ameliorate the condition of the suffering Armenians, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] said a while ago, "These resolutions are probably inadequate to accomplish their purpose. It is possible, barely possible, that something may come from this protest." Now, Mr. Speaker, to that extent I do understand that these resolutions are intended to ameliorate the condition of the Armenians, and that it is possible, that it is "barely possible," that "something" may work out from the adoption of these resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, I am always sorry when I fail to reach the high standards that are fixed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT]. With all matters diplomatic that gentleman is so familiar that whenever anyone disagrees with one, he must do it at the peril of his own doubts. But I take the liberty to disagree with the gentleman on this subject. I want this protest of ours to mean something when it goes abroad. [Applause.] I do not want it to fall, as protests ordinarily do, upon dull ears. What does England, with her millions of investments, care about our opinion as to her conduct in this matter? What do the other Governments care? But if we can challenge the attention of their people by the extraordinary, aye, by the drastic means that we propose in the amendment I have offered, then we may accomplish something. If we can startle public opinion abroad into activity until it reaches the condition that it has reached in this country, then, indeed, something may come from our action here, and that is what I want.

The gentleman from Illinois tells us that we are cutting off by this amendment the only means now within our reach of putting an end to the existing condition of things and helping these suffering people. What one of them have we helped? Where have we stayed the assassin's arm? Where have we diminished the roll of death by even one victim? But the gentleman tells us complacently that they (the Government of Turkey) are offering to pay all our accounts, that they are scanning all the bills that we present. Yes; but we are told that American citizens have not been harmed, and where, then, are the bills for damages? Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, while they are scanning the bills, let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that they are continuing their murders and rapes. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against the amendment. Shall I state my reasons for making the point now, or reserve them until later?

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the gentlemen from New York [Mr. QUIGG] yield for the purpose of letting this amendment be offered?

Mr. QUIGG. I do not.

Mr. HEPBURN. I offered it in my own time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time was given to him by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes; but it had not terminated.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed by the Clerk that the gentleman's time had terminated.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Then, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the amendment is not before the House.

The SPEAKER. The amendment is not before the House.

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, I shall ask the gentleman from New York to give me an opportunity to offer this amendment.

Mr. QUIGG. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I introduced resolutions upon this subject some weeks ago, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in the interval I have received so much correspondence conveying information about it that I shall not be able to conclude my remarks within the time which the gentleman from New York gives me, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to extend them in the RECORD.

Mr. SAYERS. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on January 14 I offered in this House resolutions asking the Committee on Foreign Affairs to consider the expediency of an expression by the Congress of the United States on the subject of the Armenian outrages.

These resolutions were referred to that committee, with other petitions and memorials upon the subject from every section of the country, and in their wisdom they reported resolutions on the subject to this House, which are now under consideration and will receive the indorsement of Congress, of the country, and humanity throughout the wide, wide world.

Since I offered the resolutions to which I have referred I have been overwhelmed with letters from every section of the country, all of a similar tenor, and all expressing deep and abiding abhorrence and indignation at the conduct of the Turkish Government.

One of my correspondents describes it as a travesty on government. Another correspondent calls the "Sublime Porte" the "Bluebeard of the nations."

The Armenians are an ancient people. Their history goes back to a time the memory of man runneth not, and to a point where history melts into story and fable, in the dim twilight of time.

But its later history, since it has been under the sway and government of the "Sublime Porte," has been a history of cruel wrongs, oppressive taxation, and not infrequently of murder and pillage, culminating in the massacre and slaughter of thousands of these innocent and unoffending people during the last few months; and the blood of these murdered and innocent victims cries to Heaven for justice.

Undoubtedly the Christian churches of Armenia are the oldest Christian churches in the world, and certainly date back to the third century, and possibly to the time of the apostles.

I regret that the President of the United States could not have sent a message to Congress upon this subject, calling the attention of the nations of the earth to this crime against God and man. I hope he may yet see his way clear to do so.

Surely the Venezuela boundary dispute was trivial and unimportant as compared with the Armenian question. I desire to call the attention of Congress and the country to the weekly bulletins issued by the Turkish minister in this city, denying these cruelties and butcheries, or saying that they are greatly exaggerated.

I suppose he does this by order of his master, the Sultan. Now, I think I have the honor to represent upon this floor 200,000 of as intelligent and progressive people as there are in any land, and I desire to pay my respects to the Sultan of Turkey, and tell him that I do not believe a man, woman, or child in my district would believe him under oath. [Laughter.]

Such denials are utterly idle in the face of thousands of private letters now being received in this country by our Armenian citizens giving minute details as to time and place of these horrid crimes and butcheries that have shocked the civilized world, many of them too revolting to record or narrate in a public speech. Whole families have been butchered in cold blood; whole villages have been burned and laid waste; thousands who have escaped to the mountains are dying of cold and starvation; women have been driven into a captivity worse than death.

The rule of the Turkish Sultans for centuries has been marked by duplicity, treachery, lying, murder, lust, and every known crime. These crimes have well earned for the present ruler the appellation of "the Unspeakable Turk," for the reason that the present language is inadequate to record these awful butcheries and crimes.

The refusal of the Sultan of Turkey to allow the Red Cross Society to enter his dominions and feed the starving and succor the dead and wounded and dying victims of the atrocities if persisted

in will earn for him the execration of the civilized world. [Applause.] It ought to ring the death knell of his Empire. There is abundant evidence that these massacres are not only condoned by him, but are openly encouraged. Certain it is that they are the most mournful event in the nineteenth century.

I would that it were in our power to induce the signatory and allied powers of Europe to combine together and drive from his throne a bloodthirsty prince so unworthy to be a ruler. I would that the Committee on Foreign Affairs in their wisdom could have seen their way clear to have gone much further and used harsher and stronger language in denunciation of these appalling crimes, and if it were possible, more earnestly invoke the cooperation of the European powers to end the miserable, bloodthirsty Government of the Sultan of Turkey.

I desire to append to these remarks some press comments that have come under my notice, as well as several resolutions of various bodies and a few letters that have been written to me on this subject since this matter has been under consideration. They speak with more eloquent words than any I can command, and I am sure will receive the consideration of Congress and the country.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union is a sisterhood which spans not only this continent, but the world. It is an organization banded together for the highest and noblest causes. That organization recently presented a memorial to the President of the United States and to Congress, bearing 1,200,000 signatures, in over fifty dialects and tongues, praying legislators, rulers, and monarchs of the earth to suppress the drink and opium traffic. This was the largest petition ever presented on the face of the earth. And now comes this great sisterhood and asks our sympathy and assistance for their suffering sisters in Armenia. Listen to what they say. I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

We, the officers of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, representing a membership and following of not fewer than a million people, who believe that the protection of the home is the supreme duty of statesmen, do hereby most earnestly and solemnly beseech you to take such action as shall put our home-loving Republic on record as having used its moral and material influence for the relief of Armenia, the martyr nation, at this time of its supreme distress. We respectfully urge that our country should no longer remain a silent spectator of the agony and outrage inflicted by Moslem savages upon our brother and sister Christians, whose only fault is their devotion to Christ and their loyalty to a pure home.

We beg you, therefore, as the legally constituted representatives of the wives and mothers of our nation, to give heed to our devoted prayer and aspiration that America may, through her highest legislative authorities, give expression to all the world of her abhorrence of the atrocities in Armenia, and may make an appropriation from the people's money for the relief of our brothers and sisters who have been driven to the last extremity by the fatal fanaticism of the Sultan and his soldiers. We are, with esteem and good-will, your fellow-countrywomen.

FRANCES E. WILLARD, *President.*

L. M. N. Stevens, vice-president-at-large; Katherine Lente Stevenson corresponding secretary; Clara C. Hoffman, recording secretary; Frances E. Beauchamp, assistant recording secretary; Helen M. Barker, treasurer.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Clerk read also the following important communication from a great representative religious body, composed of every evangelical denomination?

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Honorable House of Representatives of the United States:

The managing board, to wit, the executive committee and other officers of the Boston Evangelical Alliance, comprising evangelical ministers and laymen, who have, in public session, three times during the last year passed resolutions as successive facts were published, now that the events we speak of are matters of common notoriety and public history, respectfully but urgently memorialize the Congress of the United States, the honorable Senate and the honorable House of Representatives, to make to the Sultan of Turkey the emphatic formal protest of the Government of the United States, on behalf of the American people, against the blows inflicted upon Christianity and humanity in the atrocities and massacres perpetrated upon our Armenian fellow-Christians in the Turkish Empire, and to accompany this protest with the affirmation and declaration in behalf of the people of the United States that only impartial justice and toleration of all religions as the accepted policy and practice of a Government can, in this enlightened age, be the ground of moral respect of the American people, for any nation, of whatever race or religion.

Arthur Little, president; Chas. L. Goodell, Nathan E. Wood, Fred. B. Allen, James T. Black, Cyrus Cunningham, vice-presidents; Wm. Nast Brodbeck, M. D. Kneeland, E. H. Byington, Edwin S. Meeler, John M. Lowden, W. Fred. Allen, executive committee; Will C. Wood, secretary.

A true copy.

WILL C. WOOD,
Secretary, 77 Revere Street, Boston, Mass.

Mr. MORSE. As representing thousands of churches who have made expressions to members of Congress, I ask the Clerk to read the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF PLYMOUTH, MASS.

Whereas our fellow-men and brethren of the Christian faith in Armenia are obliged for conscience sake to endure most inhuman sufferings and death: Therefore,

Resolved, That the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass., in special meeting January 17, 1896, do utterly protest against and condemn such barbarities as not only unchristian, but uncivilized; that we heartily indorse the efforts of our Congressman, ELIJAH A. MORSE, in his recent criticism of the inactivity of the present Administration and all other efforts looking to the amelioration of the oppressed; that the spirit of Jesus Christ and the spirit of Plymouth Rock demand that right stand before policy.

RESOLUTIONS ON THE ARMENIAN QUESTION ADOPTED BY THE UNION CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH AND CONGREGATION IN EAST BRIDGEWATER, MASS., SUNDAY, JANUARY 26, 1896.

Resolved, That we, the members of the Union Church, East Bridgewater, Mass., in public meeting assembled, hereby record our indignation and horror at the awful deeds of violence, oppression, and slaughter perpetrated on a vast scale in Armenia, under the connivance if not by the agency of the Turkish authorities, constituting the darkest blot on the fair name of the civilization and Christianity of the nineteenth century. Believing as we do, that the great powers of Europe might, if they would, put a speedy end to these atrocities, we pray that our own Government will use every legitimate means to induce the Governments of the Old World, especially Great Britain, to take such immediate action as shall lead to this result. We urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use all their influence to secure such action as shall lead to the protection of endangered lives, whether American or Armenian, in the Ottoman Empire. By these resolutions, as well as by our gifts and prayers, we record our protest of this church, representing, as we believe, the sentiments of the entire community, against this enormous sin and outrage upon Christian civilization.

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be spread upon the church records and sent to our Representative at Washington.

FRANK H. PALMER, *Pastor.*
JAMES S. ALLEN, *Clerk.*

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT MASS MEETING IN HADDONFIELD, N. J., JANUARY 15, 1896.

Whereas the Government of the Sultan of Turkey has systematically deprived the Armenian people of its inalienable rights, including those of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness;

Whereas he has refused to carry out his oft-repeated promises to reform said evils, but has rather increased them by giving his assent for quartering large bodies of troops among them; for protecting these troops by a mock trial from punishment for any murders which they should commit; for cutting off the trade of Armenia with all parts of the world; for imposing taxes on them without their consent; for transporting them to different places to be tried for pretended offenses;

Whereas the Sultan has practically abdicated government in Armenia by declaring the Armenians out of his protection and waging war against them;

Whereas he has plundered their country, burned their towns, and destroyed the lives of their people;

Whereas he is at this time transporting large armies of mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation, and tyranny already begun, with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy not paralleled in the most barbarous ages and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation;

Whereas he has brought into their country the merciless Kurdish savages, whose known rule of warfare is an indiscriminating destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions;

Whereas in every stage of these oppressions the Armenian people have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms, but their petitions have been answered only by repeated injury; and a prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant is unfit to be the ruler of a people; and

Whereas the representative of the Imperial Government of Turkey at Washington has officially notified our Government that it will not permit any distribution among its subjects, in its own territory, by any foreign society or individuals, however respectable the same may be (as, for instance, the Red Cross Society), of moneys collected abroad: Therefore,

Resolved, That we, citizens of Haddonfield, N. J., in mass meeting assembled, solemnly declare that, in our opinion, the Sultan of Turkey has forfeited all right to rule over the Armenian people; that we respectfully urge our Government to make every possible effort to induce the governments of Christendom to rouse themselves from their apathy and put an end to this intolerable state of affairs which threatens with extermination thousands upon thousands of innocent fellow-Christians; that we urge upon our Government, also, to do everything in its power to preserve the fruits of American missionary toil; that we express our ardent sympathy with the unutterable suffering of this persecuted race; that we call upon all the people of Christendom to insist that these unutterable sufferings shall cease, and that we heartily indorse the resolutions introduced by Senator HOAR in the United States Senate and by Representative MORSE in the House of Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, these resolutions are only specimens of hundreds if not thousands of communications and resolutions which have been received by members of Congress from every section of the country before and since I offered the resolutions in the House on January 14, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and to which the resolutions now before the House are at least a partial response.

The following quotations from the press of Massachusetts fairly represent the sentiment of the Commonwealth that I have the honor, in part, to represent:

[Articles by Rev. Jesse H. Jones, in the Rockland Standard of January 17, 1896.]

THE BLUEBEARD OF THE NATIONS.

The Turkish Government officially refuses to allow Miss Clara Barton and her assistants to go into Armenia and distribute relief to the perishing.

This act is a confession that the charges of cruelty and destruction are true, else the Government would say to so noble a lady, "Go and see for yourself and your people that the stories you have been told are false."

This act shows the cold-blooded brutishness of the Turkish officials, that they would rather tens of thousands should starve to death than that relief should come from the infidel. Would the bread which was brought by the giaour relieve hunger and nourish the famishing any less than that furnished by the faithful? Verily, as an ancient said, "The tender mercies of the wicked are cruel."

In this act the Turk has exhibited to Christendom his real heart toward Christendom. A sort of half-wild-beast human, destitute of the capacity to originate any improvement, or lift up mankind in any way, he, a mere devourer of his subjects, shows to all mankind how he despises Christians. The word given out last Monday was of such tone, temper, and quality that it was the spitting into the face of the American people by the Turk. No such national utterance of contempt and despite has happened before in our day. When so gentle and noble a lady as Miss Barton, going on an errand of unmingled mercy for the relief of intolerable suffering, is thus grossly flouted by insolent despotism sitting a veritable Bluebeard in the bloody chamber of

his Empire, hung with the ghastly trophies of his hideous crimes, it becomes insulted Christendom to ask, "What shall be done with the Bluebeard of the nations?" for that is what the Turk is to-day.

[From the Springfield Union.]

The present inactivity of Christian nations is worse than disgraceful; it is wicked, and this country can not escape its share of condemnation if it longer refuses to interfere. We will despise a man who will stand by and see a bully abuse a child, but the great powers of the world, the United States included, are calmly looking on while the unspeakable Turk kills and tortures men, women, and children who had a right to expect constant protection.

[From the Milford (Mass.) Journal.]

In refusing to allow Clara Barton and her assistants to do their work of mercy in Armenia, Turkey is only emphasizing the before well-known fact that it is the most thoroughly brutal nation that blurs God's green earth.

Mr. QUIGG. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] speaks of the treaty of 1878 as a contract, and he protests against the adoption of the Senate resolution because it interferes with a contract to which the Government of the United States is not a party. Sir, the nations of the civilized world, in equity, have become parties to that contract and have a right to be heard, since the interests of humanity are involved.

I shall support the Senate resolution and am opposed to the amendment of my colleague [Mr. HEPBURN], although every drop of blood in my heart is in sympathy with the spirit of his amendment. But I am opposed to it because the bondholders of England and the parties to the contract, so called, of 1878, who have the power to stop these murders, should be ejected from the United States diplomatic force before the representative of the Government of the infidels. And that we are not prepared for. I say graver responsibility lies at the door of every civilized Government of Europe that has a right to enforce the contract with Turkey than lies at the door of Turkey itself.

The Senate resolution is not strong enough to suit me, but I do not see what better we can do now. For my part, though I am opposed to war until everything else has been exhausted, I would be glad if every line of that resolution was shotted with lead for the murderers under the Turkish Government. And as for Europe, I would that another Peter the Hermit would arise, who, as his prototype, with his eloquence enlisted millions for the crusade to Jerusalem, might raise his voice to alarm the hearts of Europe to strike in defense of those who are being assassinated in cold blood under the wing of the Government of the infidel.

Mr. Speaker, whatever power this Government has should now be expressed, not under the system of jingoism, not wildly, but calmly and earnestly; for the heart of this great Government is against the atrocities that have shocked, not the Christian world—I do not use that term—but the civilized world. And I would be glad if this House of Representatives, in close touch with the people, the people's body, could with united voice express its opinion of the murders which we have witnessed going on across the seas. We may not be prepared to go further; but let us sound this American keynote on this question. The last clause of the resolution has warning in it that we can strike harder yet, if the conditions approach the threshold of our homes.

If need be, I am ready to have the two-edged sword of civilization pierce the cruel heart of the Ottoman Empire.

Mr. QUIGG. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, under the Constitution of our country the relations of this nation with foreign Governments are intrusted to the Executive of our land. The only power conferred upon Congress in that regard is that the Senate of the United States shall have the power to ratify or confirm the treaties so made. But there seems to be a feeling of unrest, a disposition on the part of both Houses of this Congress to take part and interfere in our foreign affairs.

No man in this House has more sympathy for the sufferings that are going on in any part of the world than the one who has the honor to address you now. But, sir, I ask this House and I ask this Congress to pause a moment before proceeding to the extreme measure contemplated by the amendment now proposed to these resolutions. Sir, in my mind there is a grave doubt whether if we wish to preserve that comity which should be maintained among the nations—if we wish to follow the rule of fair dealing which has distinguished us in our recognition of rights between individuals in our own country and the recognition of the rights of masses of men in the aggregate of nations—if we wish to preserve the reputation that has caused foreign countries to ask us to arbitrate their disputes—in view of the fact that we have the Argentine Republic and Brazil asking us to settle their difficulties—in view of the fact that among the infidel nations of the world to which my friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] has referred, China and Japan, who called upon our ministers plenipotentiary to defend their citizens in those respective countries and who called upon our ex-Secretary of State to assist them in their negotiations for permanent and lasting peace—I say, if we wish to preserve the character we have for fair dealing which we have established among the nations of the earth, we must not rush into every trouble or difficulty that besets other nations with whom we are on friendly terms.

We have here a proposition that the President of the United States shall be requested to give the Turkish minister his passports and send him home. Why, sir, is that the way to appeal in proper spirit to humanity for these suffering people? That, sir, is equivalent to a declaration of war. We have recently enunciated the great doctrine of our country bearing the name of Monroe that no foreign nation shall interfere in our affairs; and as part and parcel of that same doctrine we have recently sent forth to the world the declaration that we shall not entangle ourselves in foreign complications. Yet here to-day it is proposed that we stultify one enunciation of that doctrine by stepping forward in this incipient stage, I may say, of these negotiations and demanding the expulsion of the minister of Turkey from this country.

Let us at least be consistent, and if we propose to carry on diplomatic negotiations with other countries, if we propose to maintain our position among the civilized nations of the world, let us proceed in decent order. Here is a country with whom we have been on friendly terms, and where, as we have been advised by our foreign representatives, there has not been the life of an American citizen lost in the recent disturbances; and we have been advised further that that country is ready to indemnify us for any loss of property which may have occurred. If we now undertake to break off our friendly relations with that country, is that a proper way to reciprocate the conduct of that nation toward our own? When she has protected our citizens and stands ready to indemnify any loss of property that they may have suffered, can it be proper for us to propose that his excellency the representative of that country to our nation be handed his passports?

I say no, Mr. Speaker; and I do not believe that the House will vote for such an amendment. More than that, I should have preferred that the resolution of the House of Representatives, which is in courteous language, but full of feeling for the sufferings of these people, had been allowed to stand as the expression of this body rather than these Senate resolutions, which are more pronounced in their expression. But it should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that in the Senate resolution they call upon the signatories to the Berlin treaty to perform their duty. We were not a part or parcel of that compact, and it is therefore a serious question in my own mind whether this is a proper way to conduct a negotiation of this character.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. QUIGG. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in obedience to my duty as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, having in charge the resolution now under discussion, I rise for the purpose of supporting the committee's action.

Details of the sufferings of some of those who hold advanced religious opinion in the Turkish Empire have come to my notice from a citizen of my own Congressional district who, while pursuing a worthy and honorable vocation, was thrown into a Turkish prison and subjected to indignities and suffering that should arouse the patriotic ire of every true American. He was formerly a citizen of Persia, but sought this country, sir, to get an education, being admitted into one of our great universities. Returning to his native land, he sought to use the knowledge acquired, in the interest of the benighted Oriental, soon following the Christian cross to Turkey. He had no sooner landed at Diza, on Turkish soil, than he was arrested by the authorities as an Armenian spy and thrown into a dungeon, although he carried an American passport in his pocket, which he confidently displayed. He submitted to treatment that should not be tolerated by the American people anywhere. He was chained, both hands behind him, a heavy girdle about his neck and manacles upon his feet, placed upon the cold ground in a sitting posture, and was permitted to linger unattended in filth and vermin until a faithful servant could call the attention of the American consul to his assistance, but no relief could be obtained until the high authorities at Constantinople could formulate their decree. He had committed no crime; indeed, he was on an errand of mercy. I believe it to be the duty of this Government, founded upon the principles of liberty and freedom, to speak out boldly in behalf of its own citizens and of Christian civilization.

You who have read of the terrible crimes committed in the name of authority at Mount Andak know well the butcheries committed with the apparent sanction of reigning authority and of the suffering to which Christians in Armenia have been subjected. It is said that rather than meet death by the slow process of barbaric torture inflicted on innocent women and children by Turkish soldiers, great bodies of Armenians have leaped from the mountains at Mount Andak in order to hasten their death.

One instance will illustrate the desperation to which humanity has been goaded near Mount Ararat: A beautiful young woman

was directed to march down a line of Turkish soldiers and choose from among them a lover. She paused before a brutish fiend, leaned over, with a coquettish smile on her face, pretending to whisper something to him, and seizing a dagger from his girth drove it quick to her heart, rather than live by the lustful courtesy of those who had murdered her brothers and sisters. [Applause.]

I was told by an ex-American minister to Turkey, one whose great literary ability has gilded the horrors of that Empire with an interest undeserved, and which I do not believe a visit now would confirm, that a prominent Turkish officer once asked him, "Why is it that we never see an American war ship in the Bosphorus or the Black Sea?" Is it not indeed humiliating to feel that our ships are never seen in Eastern waters, and that the rights of our citizens are not guarded with sufficient jealousy?

While I would not go so far as my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] and sever all official relations with the Government of the Sultan, I would not dispatch this joint resolution expressing the sentiment of the American people by the ordinary method of transmission, but after it passes and receives the sanction of the Executive, I would authorize him to place it in the hands of a captain of an American man-of-war and ask him to deliver the resolution in person to the reigning authority on the shores of the Black Sea. [Applause.]

While the powers bound by the treaty of Berlin are jealously guarding their commercial interests in the Dardanelles and the Mediterranean, the great compact in which they so solemnly engaged lacks the sanction of enforcement. Commercial considerations are exalted above those of humanity. Christianity suffers at the hands of barbarism in the Ottoman Empire, and the duty of civilized nations everywhere should be to come to the relief of struggling and suffering humanity.

We do not live in the darkness of the Middle Ages; the light of the closing days of the nineteenth century beams upon us. Let the new century not dawn until the most advanced Government in civilization has fulfilled its duty to mankind. No matter how distant the cry of suffering humanity, struggling to throw off the yoke of tyranny and oppression, let us not turn the deaf ear. No matter into what land our citizens may go, let the strength and power of the Mother of Republics be to them an inspiration in every worthy effort and their firm reliance in time of unjust trial. In this solicitude of the Government for the citizen the citizen can be relied upon to die if need be for the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. MORSE. I understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] has withdrawn his objection to my extending my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can ask for permission to extend them after the debate is concluded.

Mr. QUIGG. How much time have I remaining.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has five minutes left.

Mr. QUIGG. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BOWERS].

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to one point in connection with this resolution, more especially in view of the words used by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY], wherein he stated to the House that some thirty thousand, more or less, people had been murdered in Armenia because they professed the Christian religion. I want to call the attention of the House to one fact, that the Christian people of the United States have protested through their religious organizations to every one of you against this House or this Government or the President of the United States taking any steps that might lead to any complication or that might tend to bring on war with any foreign country.

We are assured by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House that they have no official intelligence that any American has been harmed; only Armenians have been murdered; therefore, it is said, we should not interfere. If this be true, we are exactly in line with those Governments whom we hold responsible for these horrible murders. Their citizens have not been hurt and ours have not been hurt, therefore why should we interfere? I want to say right here that I am not in sympathy with the religious sentiment of this country that does not want a war, but always wants its missionaries protected, by resolutions and prayers. Now, sir, as we are assured that this resolution is simply an expression of sympathy; that it really does not mean anything at all; that it is words, words, words; that it does not involve us in any trouble or complications whatever with any nation, I can not see any particular harm in passing it; but if I read the last paragraph of the resolution aright, we pledge ourselves to the President of the United States that we will stand by him in any measure he may take in this matter, and that means to the extent of war, if necessary.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Will the gentleman from California allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BOWERS. Most certainly.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. If the gentleman from California will read the resolution to which he refers he will find he is mistaken in his declaration. That resolution says "that the Senate of the United States, the House of Representatives concurring," will support the President in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey and to obtain redress for injuries. Now, we have been doing that all the time for the protection of American citizens.

Mr. BOWERS. I hope the gentleman will not take all my time.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The gentleman was mistaken in his statement.

Mr. BOWERS. The gentleman has removed almost the last objection to this resolution, and all this talk about the Armenian outrages is irrelevant in connection with it. He says it does not mean anything from beginning to end, excepting a mere expression of sympathy; that it is words and nothing else, and that we are not responsible for it. Pass it, and what does it amount to? There is nothing in it but buncombe.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask for five minutes more in addition to the two minutes that remain, in order that I may yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] asks that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KEM. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Subsequently Mr. KEM withdrew his objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska withdraws his objection. Is there further objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSVENOR. What is the request? Is the time all to be controlled by one side?

The SPEAKER. It is to be under the control of the gentleman in charge of the proposition.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] desires to offer an amendment, and I yield at this moment for the purpose of enabling the gentleman to offer that amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment which I read a few moments ago, and which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

That for the purpose of emphasizing our protest against the murders and outrages above recited the President is directed to furnish the Turkish minister his dismissal as a representative of the Sultan at this capital, and to at once terminate all diplomatic relations with the Government of Turkey.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. My grounds for making the point of order are that the concurrent resolution recites the provisions of the supplementary treaty of Berlin of July 13, 1878, and then says:

That it is an imperative duty, in the interest of humanity, to express the earnest hope that the European concert brought about by the treaty referred to may speedily be given its just effect in such decisive measures as shall stay the hand of fanaticism and lawless violence, and as shall secure to the unoffending Christians of the Turkish Empire all the rights belonging to them both as men and Christians and as beneficiaries of the explicit provisions of the treaty above recited.

The next resolution provides that—

The Senate of the United States, the House of Representatives concurring, will support the President in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey, and to obtain redress for injuries committed upon the persons and property of such citizens.

These concurrent resolutions refer simply to the desire of Congress that treaty stipulations be carried out, and also to the announcement that Congress will support the President in protecting American citizens.

The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa is on a subject not germane to the concurrent resolutions; therefore, I think not in order. But there is a second reason to which I call the attention of the Chair. It will be observed that the resolutions under consideration are concurrent resolutions. Concurrent resolutions are employed where the assent of the Senate and House only is considered necessary. It has been the practice for many years not to present concurrent resolutions to the President for his approval. The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, I contend, is not in order, because this relates to a subject which unquestionably should require the approval of the President.

Mr. HEPBURN. I desire to be heard upon this point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HEPBURN. Upon the last point, I want to call the gentleman's attention to the constitutional provision which in direct terms provides that every joint and concurrent resolution of the two Houses shall be presented to the President for his approval. So that it seems to me there is a complete answer to the second objection made by the gentleman. In any event, this resolution would have to go to the President for his approval.

JUN 3 1940